



---

# **ANCIENT HISTORY: RESOURCES FOR TEACHERS**

---

**Vol. 41–44 2011–2014**

**Transforming Sparta:  
New Approaches to the Study of Spartan Society**

**The Position of Attic Women in Democratic Athens**

**An Unforgotten Episode in the Life of Caesar**

**Women Historians of Ancient Greece and Rome**

**Imaginations of Ancient Rome in 19th Century  
Historical Novels**

**The Graves of Gallipoli: ‘Mad Franks’ in Charles  
Bean’s own Copy of *The Anzac Book***

**Book Reviews**

**MACQUARIE ANCIENT HISTORY ASSOCIATION**

**ANCIENT HISTORY:  
RESOURCES FOR TEACHERS**

**Vol. 41–44 2011–2014**



**MACQUARIE ANCIENT HISTORY ASSOCIATION**

***ANCIENT HISTORY: RESOURCES FOR TEACHERS***

A publication of the  
Macquarie Ancient History Association  
Macquarie University

Editor: Dr J. Lea Beness

Editorial Board: Dr Peter Brennan (University of Sydney), Associate  
Professor Tom Hillard (Macquarie University), Hugh Lindsay (University  
of Newcastle), Associate Professor Boyo Ockinga (Macquarie University),  
Associate Professor Iain Spence (University of New England)

Reviews Editor:  
Dr C.E.V. Nixon

Reviews Assistant  
Editor:  
Dr Peter Keegan

Editorial Assistants:  
Anne Irish  
Ann Nixon

All articles in this journal are peer reviewed.

Copyright 2011–2014, Published 2015  
Macquarie Ancient History Association

Published by the Macquarie Ancient History Association  
Faculty of Arts, Macquarie University, NSW 2109

Apart from fair dealing for the purpose of study, research, criticism or review, as  
permitted under copyright law, no part of this publication shall be reproduced by any  
process without written permission of the owners of the copyright. Request for such  
permission should be directed to the editor of the journal.

*Ancient History: Resources for Teachers*  
ISSN 1032 3686

## CONTENTS

Stephen Hodkinson	<i>Transforming Sparta: New Approaches to The Study of Spartan Society</i>	1
David M. Pritchard	<i>The Position of Attic Women in Democratic Athens</i>	43
Doug Kelly	<i>An Unforgotten Episode in the Life of Caesar</i>	66
Ian Plant	<i>Women Historians of Ancient Greece and Rome</i>	77
Tom Stevenson	<i>Imaginations of Ancient Rome in 19th Century Historical Novels</i>	93
Samuel N.C. Lieu	<i>The Graves Of Gallipoli: 'Mad Franks' in Charles Bean's own Copy of The Anzac Book</i>	127

## REVIEWS

Margaret Sampson	Peter Charles Hoffer, <i>Clio among the Muses: Essays on History and the Humanities</i>	147
Alexander Toomey Westcott	Edward M. Anson, <i>Alexander the Great: Themes and Issues</i>	150
Peter Keegan	Alison E. and M.G.L. Cooley, <i>Pompeii and Herculaneum: a Sourcebook</i> , 2nd ed.	157

Subscriptions within Australia: \$40.00 (incl. GST)  
Overseas Subscription: AUD 45.00 (incl. postage)  
Back volumes are available. Prices on request.  
Cheques should be made payable to  
**Macquarie University**  
(ABN 90 952 801 237)

**Subscriptions and all orders** should be directed to  
The Secretary  
Macquarie Ancient History Association  
Ancient History/Faculty of Arts  
Macquarie University  
NSW 2109  
FAX 02 - 9850 8240

**Editorial correspondence** should be directed to  
The Editor  
*Ancient History: Resources for Teachers*  
Ancient History/Faculty of Arts  
Macquarie University  
NSW 2109  
FAX 02 - 9850 8240  
Email: [lea.beness@mq.edu.au](mailto:lea.beness@mq.edu.au)

The best efforts have been made to trace all rights holders with regard to images used in order that they might be appropriately credited. Please contact the editor if you believe any images have been used without the appropriate credit.

## **Notes on Contributors**

**Stephen Hodkinson** is Professor of Ancient History and Director of the Centre for Spartan and Peloponnesian Studies at the University of Nottingham. In 2010 he was made an Honorary Citizen of modern Sparta for his contributions to Spartan history.

**David M. Pritchard** is a Senior Lecturer in Greek History at the University of Queensland. In 2015 he is also a Research Fellow in Durham University's Institute of Advanced Studies.

**Doug Kelly** is a retired Senior Lecturer from the Department of Classics and Ancient History at the Australian National University.

**Ian Plant** is a Senior Lecturer and currently the Head of Department of Ancient History at Macquarie University.

**Tom Stevenson** is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Classics and Ancient History at the University of Queensland.

**Samuel N.C. Lieu** is Inaugural Distinguished Professor of Ancient History at Macquarie University.

# THE POSITION OF ATTIC WOMEN IN DEMOCRATIC ATHENS\*

David M. Pritchard  
The University of Queensland

## 1. Evidence

The study of the women of classical Athens involves an evidentiary paradox.<sup>1</sup> Women and their pastimes were prominent subjects in this state's literature and the pictures on its painted pottery, while its comedies and tragedies regularly had articulate and forthright female characters.<sup>2</sup> But none of this gives us access to the ways in which women conceived of their own lives; for they were—as the late John Gould explained so well—"the product of men and addressed to men in a male dominated world".<sup>3</sup> What is more we lack any works from democratic Athens by female writers to counter this persistently male perspective.<sup>4</sup> Two further biases complicate the study of Attic women. What evidence we have focuses almost without exception on the girls and the wives of Athenian citizens and so provides limited insight into the different circumstances of female slaves and female resident aliens. Typically this evidence also presents the life of wealthy females as the norm for every Attic woman, hampering our ability to reconstruct how exactly the daughters and the wives of poor citizens lived their lives.

To a large extent this second bias can be overcome. This article will show how archaeology reveals similarities between the lives of rich and poor women. Moreover, while public speakers, comedians and tragedians belonged to the city's upper class, they had to win over audiences of lower-class citizens and so had to tailor their works to the latter's point of view. Consequently we can call their speeches and plays popular literature and the

---

\* A slightly different version of this paper has appeared in *Greece and Rome* 61.2 (2014) 174–193.

<sup>1</sup> The translations of the Greek are my own unless it is indicated otherwise.

<sup>2</sup> R. Just, *Women in Athenian Life and Law* (London and New York 1989) 1–12; A. Powell, *Athens and Sparta. Constructing Greek Political and Social History from 478 BC* (London and New York; 2nd ed. 2001) 348–50, 384–7; S. Lewis, *The Athenian Women. An Iconographical Handbook* (London and New York 2002) 13–58.

<sup>3</sup> J. Gould, 'Law, Custom and Myth: Aspects of the Social Position of Women in Classical Athens', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 100 (1980) 38.

<sup>4</sup> Though we do have such texts from other eras of antiquity: see, e.g., I.M. Plant, *Women. An Anthology of Ancient Greece and Rome. An Anthology* (London 2004).

lower-class point of view which they articulated popular culture.<sup>5</sup> Thus this literature may have focussed on the pastimes of wealthy Attic women but its assumptions about the nature of Attic women and what they should be doing were those of poor Athenians. In light of these evidentiary constraints this article seeks to analyse the man-made parameters within which Attic women lived and what social and religious roles they performed inside and outside the home. It shows how the subordination of daughters and wives under the democracy was legitimised by the prevailing view of the ‘nature’ of women in popular culture.

Before doing so we must clarify the nature of social classes in democratic Athens.<sup>6</sup> Sometimes the Athenians divided themselves up on the basis of military roles, income-bands, occupations or places of residence. But the distinction which they used much more often than others and which demarcated the most important social cleavage was between *hoi plousioi* (“the wealthy”) and *hoi penētes* (“the poor”). The wealthy led lives of *skholē* or leisure and so did not have to work for a living (e.g., Aristophanes *Wealth* 281; *Wasps* 552–7; Menander *Bad-Tempered Old Man* 293–5). Wealth enabled them to pursue pastimes which were simply too expensive and time-consuming for the poor. Thus groups of wealthy friends regularly came together for a *sumposion* or drinking party (e.g., Aristophanes *Wasps* 1216–17, 1219–22, 1250). This class’s members stood out for their wearing of distinctive clothes, their undertaking of public services, such as sponsorships of a chorus or a warship, and their paying of the *eisphora* or emergency tax on property for war (e.g., Aristophanes *Knights* 923–6; *Frogs* 1062–5; Demosthenes 4.7; 10.37; 27.66; Lysias 22.13). Politicians were also drawn from their ranks. The wealthy numbered around 5 percent of the whole body of Athenians. The Athenians classified the rest of the citizen body—ranging from the truly destitute to those sitting just below the elite—as the poor. What the members of this social class had in common was a lack of *skholē* and hence a need to work for a living (e.g., Aristophanes *Peace* 632; *Wasps* 611; *Wealth* 281; Lysias 24.16).

## 2. A Man’s World

Athenian democracy was, truly, a men’s club where the right to attend the assembly, the law courts and the council was restricted to adult males whose fathers were Athenian citizens and whose mothers were legitimate daughters

<sup>5</sup> For this performance-dynamic, see D.M. Pritchard, *Sport, Democracy and War in Classical Athens* (Cambridge 2013) 9–20.

<sup>6</sup> Pritchard (n.5) 2–9.



of citizens.<sup>7</sup> This exclusion of ‘Athenian’ women from politics operated simultaneously at the levels of mythology, language, institutions, popular culture and social practice. At the level of mythology every male Athenian—it was believed—was a direct descendant of the demi-god Erichthonios.<sup>8</sup> According to this myth, Erichthonios’ parents were two of the city’s major deities, Athena and Hephaestus, while this hero was born out of the earth herself. That every Athenian male had come from this divine birth was used by the Athenian democracy to justify the political equality of every citizen (e.g., Euripides *Ion* 670–5; Plato *Menexenus* 239a). Women had no part in this myth. The Athenians accepted the account of the origins of the *genos gunaikōn* (‘race of women’) as spelt out in the *Theogony* of Hesiod.<sup>9</sup> In order to punish mankind Zeus created Pandora, from whom, Hesiod explains (381–92):

... comes the fair sex;  
yes, wicked women are her descendants.  
They live among mortal men as a nagging burden  
and are no good sharers of abject want, but only of wealth.  
Men are like swarms of bees clinging to cave roofs  
to feed drones that contribute only to malicious deeds;  
the bees themselves all day long until sundown  
are busy carrying and storing the white wax,  
but the drones stay inside in their roofed hives  
and cram their bellies full of what others harvest.  
So, too, Zeus who roars on high made women  
to be an evil for mortal men.<sup>10</sup>

A woman was almost never called a *politēs* or citizen.<sup>11</sup> This word was used to describe a male who enjoyed full political and legal rights in a *polis* (‘city-state’). Instead she was called an *astē* (‘a woman belonging to the city’) or an *Attikē gunē* (‘an Attic woman/wife’). Notably the adjective *Athenaios* (‘Athenian’) was typically reserved for male citizens. Moreover, the city’s administration never registered women as citizens: their names were not

<sup>7</sup> E. Fantham, H.P. Foley, N.B. Kampen, S.B. Pomeroy and H.A. Shapiro, *Women in the Classical World. Image and Text* (Oxford 1994) 74.

<sup>8</sup> R. Parker, ‘Myths of Early Athens’, in J. Bremmer (ed.), *Interpretations of Greek Mythology* (London and New York 1988) 200–202; N. Loraux, *The Children of Athena. Athenian Ideas about Citizenship and the Division between the Sexes*, trans. C. Levine (Princeton 1993) 37–71; J.L. Shear, *Polis and Panathenaia. The History and Development of Athena’s Festival*, unpublished PhD thesis (University of Pennsylvania [Philadelphia] 2001) 55–60.

<sup>9</sup> For this myth, see Loraux (n.8) 72–110. For its currency in Athens, see, e.g., Aristophanes *Women of the Thesmophoria* 789–99; Euripides *Hippolytus* 616–24.

<sup>10</sup> Trans. A.N. Athanassakis.

<sup>11</sup> S. Blundell, *Women in Ancient Greece* (London 1995) 128; Loraux (n.8) 116.

registered in the *lexiarkhikon grammateion*—the register of citizens held by each suburb or village in Attica—nor were they ever presented to a phratry, that is, one of the ‘brotherhoods’ to which every Athenian male belonged and whose members served as witnesses of his legitimacy and citizenship.<sup>12</sup> After the introduction of Pericles’ citizenship law of 451/0 BC, which restricted citizenship to the sons of Athenians and women who were daughters of Athenians, Athenians not infrequently found that they had to prove in a law court that their mothers were indeed ‘Attic women’.<sup>13</sup> In the absence of public records this was done by calling surviving witnesses to her betrothal (see Part 4, below) and by drawing attention both to the state’s repeated acceptance of her male relatives as citizens and also to her participation in religious rites which were reserved for the wives of citizens, such as the Thesmophoria (e.g., Isaeus 8.18–20).<sup>14</sup>

In popular culture and social practice it was the norm for the wives and the daughters of citizens to have no part in politics nor the secular affairs of Athenian democracy. Thus the eponymous heroine of Aristophanes’ comedy *Lysistrata* complains that whenever she asks her husband about what happened in the assembly, he tells her to be quiet, as it is none of her business (507–15) or “at once he’d give me an angry look and tell me to spin my thread or else he’d see I had a headache for weeks: ‘war is for men to take care of’” (519–20). Such passages help us to see that comedies, such as *Lysistrata* and *Assembly-Women* by Aristophanes, in which women take over the running of public affairs were not proto-feminist works. Rather they were male-chauvinist fantasies which represented and legitimised the views that the male theatregoers had of women.<sup>15</sup>

Women were not only expected to keep clear of politics but also to avoid being mentioned in public fora.<sup>16</sup> And so in legal speeches the names of the wives and the daughters of citizens were usually suppressed and they were referred to by roundabout phrases. Here we can recall what Pericles says about the *aretē* (‘excellence’) of women in his *Funeral Oration* (Thucydides 2.45.2): “About the virtues of a wife, I can convey my whole message in a

<sup>12</sup> Gould (n.3) 45.

<sup>13</sup> A.L. Boegehold, ‘Perikles’ Citizenship Law of 451/0 BC’, in A.L. Boegehold and A.C. Scafuro (eds), *Athenian Identity and Civic Ideology* (Baltimore 1994) 57–66.

<sup>14</sup> C. Patterson, ‘The Case against Neaira and the Public Ideology of the Athenian Family’, in A.L. Boegehold and A.C. Scafuro (eds), *Athenian Identity and Civic Ideology* (Baltimore and London 1994) 199–216.

<sup>15</sup> The presence of even a small number of Attic women at the dramatic contests for Dionysus continues to be hotly debated: see, e.g., D.K. Roselli, *Theater of the People. Spectators and Society in Ancient Athens* (Austin 2011) 158–94.

<sup>16</sup> Gould (n.3) 45.

brief exhortation: your glory is great if you do not fail to live up to your own nature, and if there is the least possible talk of you among men either for praise or blame.”<sup>17</sup>

The proper place for Attic women was thought to be in the home. But even here they were subordinated to men and treated as perpetual minors.<sup>18</sup> A woman never gained complete independence: she was always considered to be part of an *oikos* (‘household’), which was controlled by her *kurios* or male guardian.<sup>19</sup> Before marriage she was under the guardianship of her father, with her husband becoming her *kurios* in due course.

### 3. Girlhood and Schooling

From the age of six boys were sent to the classes of a *grammatistēs* or letter teacher and—if their families were wealthy—also to the classes of an athletics teacher and a music teacher.<sup>20</sup> For their part girls remained inside the *oikos* until marriage, learning how to run a household.<sup>21</sup> Instruction in domestic duties took the form of helping with cooking, cleaning, child-rearing and the making of clothing. Wealthy girls do not seem to have missed out on such lessons; for even the bride of Ischomachus, who was a wealthy man, apparently knew how to make a cloak and to get the slave girls to spin wool (Xenophon *Oeconomicus* 7.6).

Some wealthy girls may have been taught reading and writing, although the existence of female literacy in classical Athens continues to be hotly debated.<sup>22</sup> For sure we do have 35 images on Attic pots depicting women using book-rolls for the reciting of poetry.<sup>23</sup> The women of 19 examples are clearly identified as the Muses, that is, the goddesses of poetry and music.<sup>24</sup> Another is explicitly named as the poet Sappho.<sup>25</sup> Nonetheless the status of the women on the 13 others is not entirely clear. As Attic pots usually depicted the lives of the wealthy, they might be literate women of this social

<sup>17</sup> Trans. P.J. Rhodes.

<sup>18</sup> Gould (n.3) 43; Blundell (n.11) 114.

<sup>19</sup> Powell (n.2) 357.

<sup>20</sup> Pritchard (n.5) 34–83.

<sup>21</sup> Blundell (n.11) 131–4; S. Blundell, ‘Women in Classical Athens’, in B.A. Sparkes (ed.), *Greek Civilization. An Introduction* (Oxford 1998) 234.

<sup>22</sup> Powell (n.2) 352–3.

<sup>23</sup> S.G. Cole, ‘Could Greek Women Read and Write?’, in H.P. Foley (ed.), *Reflections of Women in Antiquity* (New York 1981) 223, 229 nn.22–3. See, e.g., F.A.G. Beck, *Album of Greek Education. The Greeks at School and Play* (Sydney 1975) figs 349–73.

<sup>24</sup> Cole (n.23) 223–4; Powell (n.2) 356.

<sup>25</sup> Beck (n.23) cat. no. X.27, fig. 366.

class.<sup>26</sup> Alternatively they might be unnamed Muses, Sappho or even *hetairai* ('courtesans'), whose educated conversation was greatly savoured by their wealthy clients.<sup>27</sup>

Contemporary written evidence for female literacy is also ambiguous. In Euripides' tragedy *Hippolytus* the non-Athenian Phaedra seems to be literate (856–81), while in another of his plays a wealthy maiden does not know her letters (*Iphigenia among the Taurians* 582–7). More promisingly, Ischomachus is proud that his teenage wife is able to write down what furniture and utensils she gives out to the slaves (Xenophon *Oeconomicus* 7.5, 9.10). There is, however, no uncontested visual evidence and certainly no literary evidence for Attic girls ever going to school classes to learn how to read and to write.<sup>28</sup> Consequently if some rich girls could do so, they probably were taught literacy in private classes at home.

#### 4. Marriage

At the onset of menstruation, which seems to have occurred around 14 years (e.g., Demosthenes 27.4, 29.43; Xenophon *Oeconomicus* 7.6), a girl would be married.<sup>29</sup> Puberty was thought to make girls more wild and difficult to control.<sup>30</sup> As such a girl of marriageable age could be described metaphorically as a young female horse (e.g., Euripides *Andromache* 621; *Hecuba* 142) and marriage as her 'taming' or 'yoking' (e.g., Euripides *Medea* 804). Normally a girl's bridegroom would be around 30 years old.<sup>31</sup> Since marriages were arranged by guardians, she had no say in who her husband would be.

That girls did not choose their husbands is borne out by Menander's *Bad-Tempered Old Man*, despite its dramatisation of a betrothal which ostensibly involves *erōs* or sexual desire (786–7). In this play the god Pan causes a rich youth, Sostratus, to fall in love with a girl, who, being a respectable woman, is not named. Yet Sostratus never converses with her nor is she asked what

<sup>26</sup> For the elite perspective in the pictures on Attic pots, see D.M. Pritchard, 'Fool's Gold and Silver: Reflections on the Evidentiary Status of Finely Painted Attic Pottery', *Antichthon* 33 (1999) 1–27.

<sup>27</sup> W.V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge [Massachusetts] and London 1989) 107; M. Golden, *Children and Childhood in Classical Athens* (Baltimore and London 1990) 74; Lewis (n.2) 157–9.

<sup>28</sup> Cole (n.23) 226; Harris (n.27) 9; *contra* F.A.G. Beck, 'The Schooling of Girls in Ancient Greece', *Classicon* 9 (1978) 1–9.

<sup>29</sup> Just (n.2) 40–75; Blundell (n.11) 119–24.

<sup>30</sup> Blundell (n.11) 79, 99.

<sup>31</sup> Blundell (n.21) 234.

she thinks of him. Instead he tries unsuccessfully to get permission to marry her from her *kurios*, namely her father, who is unfortunately a violent misanthrope (72–3; cf. 57–68). By the end of the play the guardianship of the girl has passed to her stepbrother, Gorgias (735–9). As Gorgias, who is poor, now counts Sostratus as his best friend and wants to find a way to support this male friendship, he betroths his stepsister to him (759–66). For the same reason Sostratus tries to convince his father, Callippides, to betroth his sister to Gorgias. This wealthy man initially refuses to do so on the grounds that he does not want two ‘beggars’ in the family (794–6). But he is finally persuaded. Thus he stands in front of Gorgias and declares (842–4): ‘I hereby betroth my daughter to you, young man, for the plowing of legitimate offspring, and I settle on a dowry of 3 talents.’

This declaration constituted the *enguē* or betrothal of a girl, which was the most important proof of a marriage.<sup>32</sup> Thus it was performed in front of several witnesses. This metaphor of a husband ‘plowing’ his wife is by no means accidental. Female and agricultural fertility were strongly associated in popular culture and the chief value of a woman—not to mention the goal of marriage—was her bearing of children.<sup>33</sup> The dowry was agreed upon at the time of the *enguē* and usually represented between 10 and 20 percent of the estate of a girl’s *kurios*.<sup>34</sup> While the dowry, as her share of her father’s estate, remained her property, it was managed by her husband alone.

The *gamos* or wedding served as further proof of a marriage. Just before it sacrifices were offered by the bride and the bridegroom’s families to Hera, Aphrodite and Artemis, with the last goddess receiving as dedications the girdle of the bride to be and her toys and other tokens of childhood.<sup>35</sup> These goddesses were so honoured because of the power which they had over important aspects of marriage or a girl’s transition to womanhood. Aphrodite ensured a marriage had enough *erōs* to be a success. Thus it is no surprise to find the winged Eros or Cupid, who is Aphrodite’s regular companion in Greek art, helping brides to prepare for the wedding-ceremony on red-figure pots.<sup>36</sup> Hera as the wife of Zeus guaranteed the prerogatives of the wedded wife. Since Artemis had protected the bride to be in the wildness of her

<sup>32</sup> Blundell (n.11) 122.

<sup>33</sup> Blundell (n.11) 100, 106; R. Parker, *Polytheism and Society at Athens* (Oxford 2005) 276.

<sup>34</sup> Blundell (n.11) 115–16; Powell (n.2) 358.

<sup>35</sup> L.B. Bruit-Zaidman and P. Schmitt-Pantel, *Religion in the Ancient Greek City*, trans. P. Cartledge (Cambridge 1992) 68–72.

<sup>36</sup> V. Sabetai, ‘Aspects of Nuptial and Genre Imagery in Fifth-Century Athens: Issues of Interpretation and Methodology’, in J.H. Oakley, W.D.E. Coulson and O. Palagia (eds), *Athenian Potters and Painters. Issues of Interpretation and Methodology* (Oxford 1997) 319–35.

childhood, she had to be thanked so that she would not cause calamities for the young wife, such as death during childbirth.

The wedding day began with a sacrifice in the house of the bride's father. In the evening the bride was formally escorted from the *oikos* of her father to that of her husband. Depictions of it on pots have the wife conveyed on a donkey cart, with slaves carrying her *lebēs gamikos*, which was a pot which was specifically used for a bride's pre-wedding bath, and her other possessions. However, as pottery painters represented the lives of the wealthy, these pictures cannot be used as evidence that every bride enjoyed such a procession. Fortunately other archaeological evidence suggests that brides of both social classes had similar weddings; for the *lebēs gamikos*, which is the "nuptial vase *par excellence*", has been found in the houses of rich and poor residents of Attica.<sup>37</sup> For example, fragments of such a pot were found during the excavations of the so-called Dema House.<sup>38</sup> The great size of this country house and the absence of any evidence of farming or business activity around it show that it was owned by a wealthy family.<sup>39</sup> A *lebēs gamikos* was found too in the House of Mikion and Menon in the south-west corner of the *agora*.<sup>40</sup> The broken tools and chips of marble found on its floors prove that this was the house and the workshop of a family of marble workers.<sup>41</sup> As wealthy citizens avoided direct contact with business, this family were non-elite residents of the city.

## 5. The Normal Place for a Wife

A woman's place was in the *oikos* where she would be responsible for its management. Ischomachus explains to his new wife that she will be "the queen bee" of the household, who "does not allow the bees to be idle; but those whose duty it is to work outside she sends forth to their work; and whatever each of them brings in, she knows and receives it, and keeps it till it is wanted" (Xenophon *Oeconomicus* 7.32–4).<sup>42</sup> This account of a woman's place, which probably reworks Hesiod's misogynist view of women as

<sup>37</sup> Quotation from C. Bérard, 'The Order of Women', in C. Bérard et al., (eds), *A City of Images. Iconography and Society in Ancient Greece*, trans. D. Lyons (Princeton 1989) 97.

<sup>38</sup> J.E. Jones, L.H. Sackett and A.J. Graham, 'The Dema House in Attica', *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 57 (1962) 88.

<sup>39</sup> S. Walker, 'Women and Housing in Classical Greece: The Archaeological Evidence', in A. Cameron and A. Kuhrt (eds), *Images of Women in Antiquity* (London 1983) 84–5; Pritchard (n.26) 5–6.

<sup>40</sup> Inv. no. P28056; T.L. Shear, 'The Athenian Agora: Excavations of 1968', *Hesperia* 38 (1969) 391–2.

<sup>41</sup> T.L. Shear (n.40) 383–94; Pritchard (n.26) 15–21.

<sup>42</sup> Trans. E.C. Marchant.

‘drones’ (see Part 2, above), dovetails with popular literature where the role of the Attic woman is always to be a homemaker.<sup>43</sup> She was to supervise slaves undertaking—or in the absence of slaves undertake herself—the household’s food preparation and storage, cooking, cleaning, spinning, weaving, clothes-making and child-rearing.<sup>44</sup> Thus the *aretē* of the wife consisted not only of her invisibility in public but also of her being “a good housewife, careful with her stores and obedient to her husband” (Plato *Menexenus* 71e–72a).

For the classical Athenians spinning and weaving were “the quintessential feminine accomplishments”.<sup>45</sup> Their pots regularly depicted women undertaking these tasks. And the eponymous heroine of *Lysistrata* by Aristophanes presents them positively as the activities which allow the women of Greece to fix up public affairs (567–86). Tragedy sometimes horrifies male theatregoers by making wives use their products of spinning and weaving to murder their husbands or his loved ones (e.g., Aeschylus *Agamemnon* 1125–6; Euripides *Medea* 785–9, 1156–230). Archaeology confirms again that the wives of both social classes undertook these tasks: loom weights, whorls and other equipment for spinning have been found in rich and poor homes, such as the Dema House (see Part 4, above) and the modest Houses C and D in the south-west corner of the *agora*.<sup>46</sup>

As part of her explanation of why women have hard lives Medea declares (Euripides *Medea* 248–51): “They say of us women that we live a life without danger at home, while they fight with the spear. In this they think badly. How I would prefer to stand three times by a shield than to give birth once.” This passage bears out the parallel between childbirth and battle in the thinking of the ancient Greeks. Whereas the goal of a man was to be a hoplite, the goal of a woman was to bear children. In particular she had to bear males, who alone could guarantee the continuity of her husband’s *oikos* and could serve as soldiers in the city’s army (e.g., Aristophanes *Lysistrata* 588–90; Thucydides 2.44.3–4).<sup>47</sup> And so it is unsurprising that the babies depicted on Attic pots were always male.<sup>48</sup> In the same vein, Athenians

---

<sup>43</sup> E.g., Aristophanes *Lysistrata* 16–19; *Assembly-Women* 211–12, 215–17, 221–8, 599–600; Lysias 1.7.

<sup>44</sup> Blundell (n.11) 140–5.

<sup>45</sup> Blundell (n.21) 237.

<sup>46</sup> For these objects in the Dema House, see Jones, Sackett and Graham (n.38) 83. For Houses C and D, see R.S. Young, ‘An Industrial District of Ancient Athens’, *Hesperia* 20 (1951) 206, 242.

<sup>47</sup> Powell (n.2) 362.

<sup>48</sup> Fantham et al. (n.7) 104.

believed that soldiering and giving birth involved *ponoi* or toils.<sup>49</sup> This view of childbirth was justified: the ancient Greeks had no medical procedures for dealing with problem births, which would presumably have been common, as many first-time mothers were young teenagers.<sup>50</sup> Consequently, child mortality may have been as high as 30 to 40 percent and maternal mortality 10 to 20 percent.<sup>51</sup>

## 6. The Ideal and the Reality of Seclusion

The twentieth century witnessed a hot debate about the place of Attic women which focused on the issue of their seclusion.<sup>52</sup> The first salvo was fired by F.A. Wright whose book of 1923 argued that Attic wives were treated really badly and kept in 'oriental seclusion' by their husbands.<sup>53</sup> Wright's argument was not especially new. The accounts by the first Europeans to travel to Greece under the Ottomans made much of the oriental seclusion in which contemporary Turks and Greeks kept their female relatives.<sup>54</sup> As this period's ancient historians thought that modern observations could be drawn on productively to write the history of the ancient Greeks, they used these descriptions of 'oriental seclusion' as evidence of how the ancient Greeks had treated their wives and daughters.

By the early twentieth century ancient historians had changed their minds. An increasing number of them refused to believe that an Athenian would have treated his wife differently from the way, for example, an English gentleman treated his. This change was due to the fact that in the intervening century Athenian democracy had become an inspiration for the English upper class and a powerful historical case study for proponents of political reform. Indeed George Grote and other leading liberals of Victorian England employed this example of a stable democracy to build support for extending

<sup>49</sup> N. Loraux, *The Experiences of Tiresias. The Feminine and the Greek Man*, trans. P. Wissing (Princeton 1995) 45–7.

<sup>50</sup> Blundell (n.11) 110–11.

<sup>51</sup> Golden (n.27) 83; Blundell (n.11) 110.

<sup>52</sup> S.B. Pomeroy, *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves. Women in Classical Antiquity* (New York 1975) 58–9; D. Cohen, 'Seclusion, Separation and the Status of Women in Classical Athens', *Greece and Rome* 36 (1989) 3–15.

<sup>53</sup> F.A. Wright, *Feminism in Greek Literature. From Homer to Aristotle* (Port Washington [New York] 1923).

<sup>54</sup> C. Schnurr-Redford, 'Women in Classical Athens: Their Social Space: Ideal and Reality', in M. Golden and P. Toohey (eds), *Sex and Difference in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Edinburgh 2003) 23–9.



the right to vote.<sup>55</sup> The women of Great Britain themselves gained this franchise in the aftermath of the First World War.

At the same time as Athens was being used as part of the campaign for extending the right to vote, the artists and the writers of European countries were representing ‘the orient’ as the opposite of their civilisation and so ripe for European colonisation.<sup>56</sup> In view of these changes it is not surprising that two years after the publication of Wright’s book A.W. Gomme attacked the idea of oriental seclusion. In ‘The Position of Women in Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC’ Gomme, who would go on to write a famous commentary on Thucydides, argued that Attic wives could come and go freely from their homes and were held in the highest possible regard by their Athenian husbands.<sup>57</sup> This reaction had as much to do with the changing place of Greece in European discourse and the new voting rights of English women as it did with the actual place of women in classical Athens.<sup>58</sup>

The seclusion debate which Gomme’s article started ran its full course in the previous century and ended with, unexpectedly, a qualified rejection of his position. In fact the Athenians agreed that their sexually mature females ideally should be segregated from men who did not belong to their household (e.g., Aristophanes *Women of the Thesmophoria* 789–99).<sup>59</sup> This ideal of seclusion required women to stay indoors as much as possible and not to be seen by passers-by (e.g., Euripides *Trojan Women* 648–52; Lycurgus 1.40). The *Electra* of Euripides shows how it was “shameful for a women to be standing outside with young men” (343–4; cf. Lys. 3.6–7). Menander’s *Bad-Tempered Old Man* shows too how not just a woman’s *kurios* but her male relatives also were anxious about unrelated males approaching her on the grounds that it could lead to a shameful scandal (218–47). Men had to live up to this ideal too. They were under pressure not to enter another man’s household if he was not in (e.g., Demosthenes 47.35–8; Lysias 1.25, 3.6–7). They were also supposed to be ashamed to speak in public with females to whom they were not related (e.g., Euripides *Iphigenia in Aulis* 821–34).

<sup>55</sup> D.M. Pritchard, ‘The Symbiosis between Democracy and War: The Case of Ancient Athens’, in D.M. Pritchard (ed.), *War, Democracy and Culture in Classical Athens* (Cambridge 2010) 3–4.

<sup>56</sup> E.W. Said, *Orientalism* (London 1978).

<sup>57</sup> A.W. Gomme, ‘The Position of Women in Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC’, *Classical Philology* 20 (1925) 10.

<sup>58</sup> B. Wagner-Hasel, ‘Women’s Life in Oriental Seclusion? On the History and Use of a *Topos*’, in M. Golden and P. Toohey (eds), *Sex and Difference in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Edinburgh 2003) 241–52.

<sup>59</sup> Gould (n.3) 47–9; Blundell (n.11) 134–8.

Keeping males outside the family away from its women lies behind the design of houses in classical Athens.<sup>60</sup> The typical house of a rich or poor family had one outside doorway leading to a courtyard into which the rooms of the dwelling opened.<sup>61</sup> As the walls of Athenian houses were made of unfired mud-bricks, which disintegrate when exposed to the elements, no examples of them have survived. But the excavations of ancient houses made out of stone elsewhere in Greece indicate that the windows of a house were placed high enough in the walls to prevent passers-by from peering in.<sup>62</sup> A house's internal rooms were divided into the *andronitis* or men's quarters, which included the *andron* ('men's room'), and the *gunaikonitis* or women's quarters (e.g., Lysias 1.6–9).<sup>63</sup> A sense of shame stopped male guests from entering the *gunaikonitis*, while females would not join them in the men's room; doing so in a wealthy home was the preserve of courtesans and the flute-playing prostitutes who were hired for a drinking party. Interestingly, domestic excavations show how rooms, excepting the *andron*, were used by both sexes on different occasions.<sup>64</sup> Thus the boundary between the gendered spaces of a classical Greek house was "essentially conceptual and behavioural".<sup>65</sup>

In spite of this ideal of seclusion women were not prisoners in their homes.<sup>66</sup> They visited each other to borrow commodities, to help with a baby's birth or to celebrate its arrival.<sup>67</sup> They left the house for family funerals (e.g., Lysias 1.8) and religious festivals, such as the Thesmophoria (1.20). For many poor women too seclusion was very far from a reality, as their families lacked enough or any slaves (e.g., Aristotle *Politics* 1323a5–7) and so had to rely on

<sup>60</sup> L. Nevett, *House and Society in the Ancient Greek World* (Cambridge 1999).

<sup>61</sup> J.E. Jones, 'Town and Country Houses of Attica in Classical Times', in H. Mussche, P. Spitaels and F. Goemaere-De Poerck (eds), *Thorikos and Laurion in Archaic and Classical Times* (Ghent 1975) 127 fig. 21; M.H. Jameson, 'Private Space and the Greek City', in O. Murray and S. Price (eds), *The Greek City. From Homer to Alexander* (Oxford 1990) 181–2.

<sup>62</sup> L. Nevett, 'Separation or Seclusion? Towards an Archaeological Approach to Investigating Women in the Greek Household in the Fifth to Third Centuries BC', in M.P. Pearson and C. Richards (eds), *Architecture and Order. Approaches to Social Space* (London and New York 1994) 108, 110 n.7.

<sup>63</sup> Jameson (n.61) 187–90.

<sup>64</sup> Jameson (n.61) 183–93; L. Llewellyn-Jones, *Aphrodite's Tortoise. The Veiled Woman of Ancient Greece* (Swansea 2003) 193–4; J. Davidson, 'Bodymaps: Sexing Space and Zoning Gender in Ancient Athens', in L. Foxhall and G. Neher (eds), *Gender and the City before Modernity* (Malden and Oxford 2013) 107–24; *pace* Walker (n.39).

<sup>65</sup> Jameson (n.61) 192.

<sup>66</sup> Blundell (n.21) 243.

<sup>67</sup> E.g., Aristophanes *Assembly-women* 348–9, 526–34; *Lysistrata* 700–2; *Women of the Thesmophoria* 407–8, 795–6; Lysias 1.14.

the labour of children and wives.<sup>68</sup> The result was that some poor women travelled outside to fetch water from a fountain (e.g., Aristophanes *Lysistrata* 327–31; Euripides *Electra* 102–3), to help with a family's farming (e.g., Menander *Bad-Tempered Old Man* 329–34) or to perform other tasks (Aristotle *Politics* 1300a5–6). Some of them took paid work beyond the household.<sup>69</sup> While many of the female workers in classical Athens were resident aliens, Attic women are known to have worked as grape pickers (Demosthenes 57.45), wet nurses (57.35), washerwomen, and sellers of bread, garlands and vegetables.<sup>70</sup>

Despite not always being able to keep their women inside, poor Athenians manifestly endorsed the ideal of seclusion.<sup>71</sup> Tellingly, for example, those voicing concern about violations of this ideal in *Electra* and *Bad-Tempered Old Man* are poor, while the speaker of Demosthenes 57 explains to predominantly lower-class jurors that his women were ashamed to take jobs outside the home (31). Moreover, as Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones has put beyond doubt, Attic women of both social classes veiled their heads and their faces as is done in conservative Islamic cultures today.<sup>72</sup> The veil was conceived as an extension of the house.<sup>73</sup> Indeed the veil of the late classical and hellenistic periods was actually called a *tegidion* or little roof. As long as she had a proper sense of shame about consorting with strange men, this veiling helped a woman to respect the ideal of seclusion while moving outside her *oikos*.

## 7. The Perceived Wantonness of Women

In *Women in Athenian Life and Law* Roger Just details how the exclusion of Attic women from politics and their ideal seclusion at home were justified by the perceptions which the classical Athenians had of their 'nature'.<sup>74</sup> Just cautions: "By 'nature' I mean simply the set of characteristics, real or imaginary, which in the writings of fifth- and fourth-century Athens men

<sup>68</sup> For child labour, see Golden (n.27) 34–6. For women's labour, see Blundell (n.11) 145; M. Jameson, 'Women and Democracy in Fourth-Century Athens', in P. Brulé and J. Oulhen (eds), *Esclavage, guerre et économie en Grèce ancienne. Homages à Yvon Airlan* (Rennes 1997) 104. For the extent of slave holding, see, e.g., E.M. Wood, *Peasant-Citizen and Slave* (London 1988) 173–84.

<sup>69</sup> Cohen (n.52) 7–9; Blundell (n.11) 136–7, 145–6.

<sup>70</sup> For washerwomen, see, e.g., M.R. Lefkowitz and M.B. Fant, *Women's Life in Greece and Rome. A Source Book in Translation* (London; 2nd ed. 1992), nos 50–51. For Attic women as sellers, see, e.g., Aristophanes *Frogs* 840; *Wasps* 497, 1390–1; *Women of the Thesmophoria* 387, 443–58; Demosthenes 57.31, 34.

<sup>71</sup> Jameson (n.68) 104; Llewellyn-Jones (n.64) 192.

<sup>72</sup> Powell (n.2) 371.

<sup>73</sup> Llewellyn-Jones (n.64) 194–5.

<sup>74</sup> Just (n.2) 153–93.

commonly attribute to women as natural to their sex".<sup>75</sup> In Athenian popular literature women lacked *sōphrosunē* ('moderation') and so could not regulate their bodily appetites and desires.<sup>76</sup> Thus they were thought to be gluttons and big drinkers of alcohol.<sup>77</sup> More worryingly, they were much too fond of sex.<sup>78</sup> As far as Athenian men were concerned, their wives enjoyed sex much more than they did and so found it hard to reject the advances of a handsome youth or man. This surprising characterisation of women as nymphomaniacs can be seen very clearly in the comedy *Lysistrata*, when the eponymous heroine explains how a sex strike will force their husbands to stop making war (124–37):

Lysistrata: What we must do is abstain from penises. Why are you turning away from me? Where are you slinking off to? Why are you going pale? What are those tears? Will you do it or not? Tell me.

Myrrine: I could not do it. Let the war go on.

Calonice: My god, me neither. Let the war go on.

Lysistrata: What about you, little flounder? You said you would split yourself in two for peace?

Calonice: Anything you want. I could walk through fire if I have to. But not penises. There is nothing like them, Lysistrata.

Lysistrata: And you?

Myrrine: I would rather walk through fire.

Lysistrata: Oh, what a thoroughly buggered race (*genos*) we are. No wonder they write tragedies about us.

What the Athenians feared was that this wantonness of their wives could turn casual contact between them and unrelated men into adulterous affairs (e.g., Lysias 1.8). Such an eventuality would be a disaster for a husband. His enemies could question the legitimacy of his sons, which, because bastards could not be heirs, also threw the continuity of his *oikos* into doubt.<sup>79</sup> As citizens had to have an Athenian father and an Attic mother, who also, by the fourth century, had to be properly married, a wife's adultery might also imperil the citizen status of sons. Here we see the impetus for sexual segregation and the close supervision of Attic women.

<sup>75</sup> Just (n.2) 153, 164.

<sup>76</sup> Just (n.2) 166–7.

<sup>77</sup> For gluttony, see, e.g., Aristophanes *Women of the Thesmophoria* 418–20. For alcohol, Aristophanes *Assembly-women* 14–15, 32–6, 153–7, 1118–24; *Lysistrata* 114, 195–206, 395, 466; *Women of the Thesmophoria* 347–8, 733–61.

<sup>78</sup> E.g., Aristophanes *Assembly-women* 228, 877–1111; *Clouds* 1068–70; *Lysistrata* 23–5, 125–39, 404–19, 715–80.

<sup>79</sup> Powell (n.2) 368.

Women, finally, were thought to lack a capacity to reason (e.g., Aeschylus *Agamemnon* 1401; Xenophon *Oeconomicus* 2.9–12)—which was something every citizen in Athenian democracy was thought to have—and to be cowardly by nature (e.g., Aeschylus *Seven against Thebes* 259; Lysias 2.5).<sup>80</sup> For their part philosophers too judged females to be much less intelligent than males (e.g., Aristotle *Politics* 1254b; Plato *Republic* 455c–e). Therefore, like barbarians and slaves, they were unable to deliberate about public affairs and could not fight in battles as citizens were required to do. Their nature, clearly, did not allow them to be citizens.

### 8. Women and Religion

Classical Athenians may never have extended the right to vote to female relatives and may have kept them at home as much as possible. But they did not deny that their wives had a unique relationship with goddesses and performed rituals which were vital for maintaining the fertility of farms and families.<sup>81</sup> Thus religion was the one area in which Attic women had prominence and independence. Indeed, for rich women, festivals and funerals were among the few activities for which their husbands or fathers would allow them to leave the *oikos*.

This prominence of women in religion rested on three popular beliefs. The first was that the age and the gender of the personnel of a cult should correspond to those of the object of worship.<sup>82</sup> Thus it was usually the case that males served as priests for gods and females as priestesses for goddesses. The second belief was that an undertaking could only succeed if it had the support of the god or the goddess who had most influence over it. The Athenians believed that the individual or the group who depended most directly on such assistance should have the leading role in the rituals which maintained the *kharis* ('gratitude') of the relevant deity. The corollary was that Athenian males, for example, conducted festivals and set up thanks-offerings for Zeus and other gods whom, they believed, brought them victory on the battlefield (e.g., Aeschylus *Seven against Thebes* 230–2), while their wives and daughters took responsibility for worshipping the goddesses who had power over childbirth, childhood and marriage. Finally, the Athenians allowed their wives to have religious roles, as they believed that they were

<sup>80</sup> Just (n.2) 154, 164–5.

<sup>81</sup> Blundell (n.11) 134–5, 160–9; (n.21), 241–2; M. Dillon, 'The Construction of Women's Gender Identity through Religious Activity in Classical Greece', *Australian Religious Studies Review* 19 (2006) 221–43; J.B. Connelly, *Portrait of a Priestess. Women and Ritual in Ancient Greece* (Princeton 2007).

<sup>82</sup> Blundell (n.11) 160; Connelly (n.81) 29–30.

more capable than men of keeping divine support for agriculture and progeny (e.g., Euripides *Suppliant Women* 28–31). This belief was a consequence of the analogy which the Athenians drew between agricultural and human fertility and the fact that the deities who controlled them were female. Thus the roles, Sue Blundell concludes, which they “accorded both to the goddesses and to their female worshippers can be seen to entail an acknowledgement of the social significance of the female principle”.<sup>83</sup>

Attic women had a variety of roles in the state’s festivals (e.g., Aristophanes *Lysistrata* 638–48).<sup>84</sup> For example, some daughters of traditional priestly families served as basket carriers in the processions of the Great Dionysia and the Panathenaea (e.g., Thucydides 6.56.1–2), while 40 Attic women served as the priestesses of the city’s cults, including those of Demeter and Persephone and Athena Polias.<sup>85</sup> For Athena Polias girls served year round as bearers of sacred things, cleaners of her temple and the workers who wove her *peplos* or robe. The wives of rich and poor Athenians participated too in several female-only festivals, including the Adonia and the Thesmophoria (e.g., Aristophanes *Women of the Thesmophoria* 834–5).

This last festival was held in honour of Demeter Thesmophoros and took place just before the sowing of the wheat and barley crops.<sup>86</sup> The Thesmophoria was supposed to be celebrated by every Attic wife and so participating in it could be used as more proof of a marriage (e.g., Isaeus 6.49–50; 8.19).<sup>87</sup> The Thesmophoria was celebrated on the hill of the Pnyx where the Athenian assembly met and in many other sanctuaries of the goddess across Attica. In it wives performed rituals which were connected to their own fertility and that of agriculture and re-enacted the mourning of the goddess for her abducted daughter, Persephone. The festival’s three days were called *anodos* (‘going up’), *nēsteia* (‘fasting’) and *kalligeneia* (‘beautiful offspring’). A commentator’s note on a manuscript of Lucian provides the best account of its rituals.<sup>88</sup> The women brought to it piglets and penis-shaped cakes, which they tossed into pits. On the last day some women climbed down into pits which contained the offerings of the previous year’s Thesmophoria, scooped up “the rotten remains” and distributed this goo to the other worshippers. This commentator explains: “They think that anyone

<sup>83</sup> Blundell (n.11) 163.

<sup>84</sup> M.R. Lefkowitz, ‘Women in the Panathenaea and Other Festivals’, in J. Neils (ed.), *Worshipping Athena. Panathenaea and Parthenon* (Madison 1996) 78–91.

<sup>85</sup> Bruit-Zaidman and Schmitt-Pantel (n.35) 105–7.

<sup>86</sup> Blundell (n.11) 163–5; J.D. Mikalson, *Ancient Greek Religion* (Malden, Melbourne and Oxford 2005) 144–5; Parker (n.33) 270–83.

<sup>87</sup> K. White, ‘Demeter and the Thesmophoria’, *Classicon* 39 (2013) 3–12.

<sup>88</sup> Parker (n.33) 272–5. I am using Parker’s translation.

who takes some of this and mixes it in when sowing will have good crops.” As Greek words for pig were “the commonest slang terms for the female genitalia”, the wives at this festival no doubt associated their offerings with their own fertility.<sup>89</sup> Indeed the commentator states that the Thesmophoria was thought to guarantee agricultural *and* human fertility. Athenian husbands manifestly judged their wives’ celebration of this festival important. In spite of the ideal of seclusion they allowed them to spend three days camping away from home. Each suburb or village of Attica appointed a wealthy resident as a liturgist to pay for their local celebration of the Thesmophoria and some of their wives as magistrates to take charge of it (e.g., Isaeus 3.80; 8.19; *Inscriptiones Graecae* ii<sup>2</sup> 1184.3).

The performance of services and rituals for the dead was another important aspect of women’s religious activities.<sup>90</sup> The classical Athenians believed that the burial of the dead was a common custom of the Greeks which was sanctioned by the gods (e.g., Euripides *Suppliant Women* 16–19, 24–8, 61–2). It was the responsibility of citizens to uphold this *nomos* at home and to make sure that the customary rituals were performed at the graves of their forebears (e.g., Isaeus 6.40–1, 65; [Demosthenes] 43.57–8, 65; Lys. 1.8). The Athenians took a dim view of anyone who failed to pay these honours to the dead. The failure to bury an *oikos*-member could be held against a citizen who was seeking to be a magistrate ([Aristotle] *Athenaion Politeia* 55.3), while the neglect of the customary visits to the tombs of parents, grandparents and even great grandparents left a man open to prosecution for *kakōsis goneōn*, that is, the poor treatment of ancestors (Demosthenes 24.107).

Athenians relied on women to carry out these customary honours. Indeed the mothers, the sisters and the daughters of the dead were thought to be deeply committed to ensuring their burial and the visiting of their graves (e.g., Euripides *Iphigenia among the Taurians* 700–5; Sophocles *Antigone* 450–70).<sup>91</sup> They judged it right for their women to ready the dead for burial by washing and clothing their bodies, to mourn for them at the *prothesis* or pre-burial display and to take part in their *ekphora* or procession to the tomb (e.g., Isaeus 6.40–1; 8.21–4). Thus in images on Attic red-figure pots it is women who wash and dress the body, and who, at the viewing of the dead,

<sup>89</sup> Parker (n.33) 275; cf. J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy* (Oxford 1991) 131–2.

<sup>90</sup> S.C. Humphreys, ‘Family Tombs and Tomb Cult in Ancient Athens: Tradition or Traditionalism?’, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 100 (1980) 96–126; R. Garland, *The Greek Way of Death* (Ithaca 1985) 21–37, 104–20; Blundell (n.11) 161–2.

<sup>91</sup> M. Alexiou, *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition* (Cambridge 1974).

raise their hands, strike their heads and tear their hair.<sup>92</sup> Likewise on white-ground *lekythoi*, which are common offerings for the dead, women are depicted more frequently than men making a visit to a tomb where they leave pots of this shape, wreaths, ribbons and food.<sup>93</sup>

Athenian democracy had laws in operation which sought to regulate the behaviour of Attic women who were performing these rituals for the dead ([Demosthenes] 43.62–5). Fourth-century Athenians certainly believed—as did writers of the Roman period (e.g., Plutarch *Solon* 21)—that they had been introduced by Solon in the early sixth century. These *nomoi* forbade women from being part of a *prothesis* or *ekphora*, unless they were closely related to the deceased, and from lacerating themselves or wailing as part of their mourning. They required too that the *prothesis* take place inside a house, that the *ekphora* set out before sunrise, that the women follow the men in this procession and that none of the mourners lament for anyone other than the relative being buried.

Thus classical Athenians would appear to have had a contradictory view of this religious role of their female relatives: while they thought it right for them to perform these acts for the dead and relied on them to do so, they still felt uneasy about female emotionalism.<sup>94</sup> What they feared was that such displays on the part of their females could undermine their own self-control (e.g., Aeschylus *Seven against Thebes* 182–202). Certainly they wished to limit the scope of Attic women to speak out about or mourn for sons and husbands who had fallen in battle.<sup>95</sup>

Thus it is unsurprising that at the public funeral for the war dead bereaved females were pushed to the margins.<sup>96</sup> By providing a funeral and a tomb for the war dead and honouring them annually through yearly contests and sacrifices Athenian democracy appropriated the traditional obligations of close relatives to bury their kin and to look after their tombs (Plato *Menexenus* 249b; Thucydides 2.34). The orators at the public funeral may have noted in passing their *lupē* ('pain') and *penthos* ('mourning') but consistently urged them to restrict these troubling emotions as best as they could by remembering the *aretē* which the war dead had put beyond doubt

<sup>92</sup> Blundell (n.11) 161.

<sup>93</sup> J.H. Oakley, *Picturing Death in Classical Athens. The Evidence of the White Lekythoi* (Cambridge 2004).

<sup>94</sup> Humphreys (n.90) 100; Fantham et al. (n.7) 78.

<sup>95</sup> E.g., Aristophanes *Lysistrata* 37–8, 588–90; *Peace* 647–56; Euripides *Suppliant Women* 942–6.

<sup>96</sup> N. Loraux, *The Invention of Athens. The Funeral Oration in the Classical City*, trans. A. Sheridan (Cambridge [Massachusetts] 1986) 22–8.



and the support which the city would give those relatives whom they had left behind.<sup>97</sup> The involvement of bereaved females was limited to the leaving of offerings for their dead relatives during the public *prothesis* or pre-burial display of their remains and the lamenting of their own relatives beside the grave (e.g., Thucydides 2.34.2, 46.2).<sup>98</sup>

## 9. Conclusion

For the classical Athenians the right place for Attic women was at home. They encouraged their wives to focus on making meals and clothes and on running the *oikos* more generally. They expected them to produce sons so that their households could live on. The Athenians genuinely valued their wives as homemakers and mothers. But they also constantly worried that they lacked self-control. They were obsessed by the possibility that Attic women might have sex outside marriage. The result was that husbands tried to keep their wives away from unrelated men. They expected male guests whom they had invited into the *oikos* to keep out of the rooms where their wives were. They built houses which lacked windows for passers-by to look in and wives to look out. At the same time they believed that their wives were better placed than they were to worship the goddesses who controlled the fertility of crops and households. They also relied on them to perform the customary rites for dead relatives. Often too poor wives had to help to keep family businesses or farms going. Thus every Athenian allowed his wife to participate in female-only festivals and funerals and—if his poverty made it necessary—to work outside the *oikos*. Yet in doing so he insisted that she keep away from men who were not part of the family. Thus as she walked through streets she had to avoid talking with such men and to keep her face well hidden behind her veil.

---

<sup>97</sup> E.g., Demosthenes 60.32–7; Hyperides *Funeral Oration* 41–3; Lysias 2.71–6; Plato *Menexenus* 247c–8d; Thucydides 2.44.

<sup>98</sup> P. Hannah, 'The Warrior *Loutrophoroi* of Fifth-Century Athens', in D.M. Pritchard (ed.), *War, Democracy and Culture in Classical Athens* (Cambridge 2010) 266–303.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexiou, M., *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition* (Cambridge 1974).
- Athanassakis A.N. (trans.), *Hesiod. Theogony* (Baltimore 1983).
- Beck, F.A.G., *Album of Greek Education. The Greeks at School and Play* (Sydney 1975).
- 'The Schooling of Girls in Ancient Greece', *Classicum* 9 (1978) 1–9.
- Bérard, C., 'The Order of Women', in Bérard et al., (eds) (1989) 89–108.
- Bérard, C. et al., (eds), *A City of Images. Iconography and Society in Ancient Greece*, trans. D. Lyons (Princeton 1989).
- Blundell, S., *Women in Ancient Greece* (London 1995).
- 'Women in Classical Athens', in Sparkes (ed.) (1998) 232–247.
- Bruit-Zaidman, L.B. and P. Schmitt-Pantel, *Religion in the Ancient Greek City*, trans. P. Cartledge (Cambridge 1992).
- Boegehold, A.L., 'Perikles' Citizenship Law of 451/0 BC', in Boegehold and Scafuro (eds) (1994) 57–66.
- Boegehold, A.L. and A.C. Scafuro (eds), *Athenian Identity and Civic Ideology* (Baltimore 1994).
- Bremmer, J. (ed.), *Interpretations of Greek Mythology* (London and New York 1988).
- Brulé, P. and J. Oulhen (eds), *Esclavage, guerre et économie en Grèce ancienne. Homages à Yvon Airlan* (Rennes 1997).
- Cameron A. and A. Kuhrt (eds), *Images of Women in Antiquity* (London 1983).
- Cohen, D., 'Seclusion, Separation and the Status of Women in Classical Athens', *Greece and Rome* 36 (1989) 3–15.
- Cole, S.G., 'Could Greek Women Read and Write?', in Foley (ed.) (1981) 219–45.
- Connelly, J.B., *Portrait of a Priestess. Women and Ritual in Ancient Greece* (Princeton 2007).
- Davidson, J., 'Bodymaps: Sexing Space and Zoning Gender in Ancient Athens', in Foxhall and Neher (eds) (2013) 107–24.
- Dillon, M., 'The Construction of Women's Gender Identity through Religious Activity in Classical Greece', *Australian Religious Studies Review* 19 (2006) 221–43.
- Fantham, E., Foley, H.P., Kampen, N.B., Pomeroy, S.B. and H.A. Shapiro, *Women in the Classical World. Image and Text* (Oxford 1994).
- Foley H.P. (ed.), *Reflections of Women in Antiquity* (New York 1981).
- Foxhall, L. and G. Neher (eds), *Gender and the City before Modernity* (Malden and Oxford 2013).
- Garland, R., *The Greek Way of Death* (Ithaca 1985).

- Golden, M., *Children and Childhood in Classical Athens* (Baltimore and London 1990).
- Golden, M. and P. Toohey (eds), *Sex and Difference in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Edinburgh 2003).
- Gomme, A.W., 'The Position of Women in Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC', *Classical Philology* 20 (1925) 1–25.
- Gould, J., 'Law, Custom and Myth: Aspects of the Social Position of Women in Classical Athens', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 100 (1980) 38–58.
- Hannah, P., 'The Warrior *Loutrophoroi* of Fifth-Century Athens', in Pritchard (ed.) (2010) 266–303.
- Harris, W.V., *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge [Massachusetts] and London 1989).
- Henderson, J., *The Maculate Muse. Obscene Language in Attic Comedy* (Oxford 1991).
- Humphreys, S.C., 'Family Tombs and Tomb Cult in Ancient Athens: Tradition or Traditionalism?', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 100 (1980) 96–126.
- Jameson, M.H., 'Private Space and the Greek City', in Murray and Price (eds) (1990) 171–195.
- 'Women and Democracy in Fourth-Century Athens', in Brulé and Oulhen (eds) (1997) 95–107.
- Jones, J.E., 'Town and Country Houses of Attica in Classical Times', in Mussche, Spitaels and Goemaere-De Poerck (eds) (1975) 63–140.
- Jones, J.E., Sackett, L.H. and A.J. Graham, 'The Dema House in Attica', *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 57 (1962) 75–114.
- Just, R., *Women in Athenian Life and Law* (London and New York, 1989).
- Lefkowitz, M.R., 'Women in the Panathenaea and Other Festivals', in Neils (ed.) (1996) 78–91.
- Lefkowitz, M.R. and M.B. Fant, *Women's Life in Greece and Rome. A Source Book in Translation* (London; 2nd ed. 1992).
- Lewis, S., *The Athenian Women. An Iconographical Handbook* (London and New York 2002).
- Llewellyn-Jones, L., *Aphrodite's Tortoise. The Veiled Woman of Ancient Greece* (Swansea 2003).
- Loraux, N., *The Invention of Athens. The Funeral Oration in the Classical City*, trans. A. Sheridan (Cambridge [Massachusetts] 1986).
- *The Children of Athena. Athenian Ideas about Citizenship and the Division between the Sexes*, trans. C. Levine (Princeton 1993).
- *The Experiences of Tiresias. The Feminine and the Greek Man*, trans. P. Wissing (Princeton 1995).
- Marchant, E.C. (trans.), *Xenophon. Memorabilia and Oeconomicus* (London 1923).

- Mikalson, J.D., *Ancient Greek Religion* (Malden, Melbourne and Oxford 2005).
- Murray, O. and S. Price (eds), *The Greek City. From Homer to Alexander* (Oxford 1990).
- Mussche, H., Spitaels, P. and F. Goemaere-De Poerck (eds), *Thorikos and Laurion in Archaic and Classical Times* (Ghent 1975).
- Neils, J. (ed.), *Worshipping Athena. Panathenaea and Parthenon* (Madison 1996).
- Nevett, L., 'Separation or Seclusion? Towards an Archaeological Approach to Investigating Women in the Greek Household in the Fifth to Third Centuries BC', in Pearson and Richards (eds) (1994) 98–112.
- *House and Society in the Ancient Greek World* (Cambridge 1999).
- Oakley, J.H., *Picturing Death in Classical Athens. The Evidence of the White Lekythoi* (Cambridge 2004).
- Oakley, J.H., Coulson, W.D.E. and O. Palagia (eds), *Athenian Potters and Painters. Issues of Interpretation and Methodology* (Oxford 1997).
- Parker, R., 'Myths of Early Athens', in Bremmer (ed.) (1988) 187–214.
- *Polytheism and Society at Athens* (Oxford 2005).
- Patterson, C., 'The Case against Neaira and the Public Ideology of the Athenian Family', in Boegehold and Scafuro (eds) (1994) 199–216.
- Pearson, M.P. and C. Richards (eds), *Architecture and Order. Approaches to Social Space* (London and New York 1994).
- Plant, I.M., *Women Writers of Ancient Greece and Rome. An Anthology* (London 2004).
- Pomeroy, S.B., *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves. Women in Classical Antiquity* (New York 1975).
- Powell, A., *Athens and Sparta. Constructing Greek Political and Social History from 478 BC* (London and New York; 2nd ed. 2001).
- Pritchard, D.M., 'Fool's Gold and Silver: Reflections on the Evidentiary Status of Finely Painted Attic Pottery', *Antichthon* 33 (1999) 1–27.
- 'The Symbiosis between Democracy and War: The Case of Ancient Athens', in Pritchard (ed.) (2010) 1–62.
- (ed.), *War, Democracy and Culture in Classical Athens* (Cambridge 2010).
- *Sport, Democracy and War in Classical Athens* (Cambridge 2013).
- Rhodes, P.J. (trans.), *Thucydides, History II* (Warminster 1988).
- Roselli, D.K., *Theater of the People. Spectators and Society in Ancient Athens* (Austin 2011).
- Sabetai, V., 'Aspects of Nuptial and Genre Imagery in Fifth-Century Athens: Issues of Interpretation and Methodology', in Oakley, Coulson and Palagia (eds) (1997) 319–35.

- Schnurr-Redford, C., 'Women in Classical Athens: Their Social Space: Ideal and Reality', in Golden and Toohey (eds) (2003) 23–29.
- Shear, J.L., *Polis and Panathenaia. The History and Development of Athena's Festival*, unpublished PhD thesis (University of Pennsylvania [Philadelphia] 2001).
- Shear, T.L., 'The Athenian Agora: Excavations of 1968', *Hesperia* 38 (1969) 382–417.
- Sparkes, B.A. (ed.), *Greek Civilization. An Introduction* (Oxford 1998).
- Wagner-Hasel, B., 'Women's Life in Oriental Seclusion? On the History and Use of a *Topos*', in Golden and Toohey (eds) (2003) 241–52.
- Walker, S., 'Women and Housing in Classical Greece: The Archaeological Evidence', in Cameron and Kuhrt (eds) (1983) 81–91.
- White, K., 'Demeter and the Thesmophoria', *Classicum* 39 (2013) 3–12.
- Wood, E.M., *Peasant-Citizen and Slave* (London 1988).
- Wright, F.A., *Feminism in Greek Literature. From Homer to Aristotle* (Port Washington [New York] 1923).
- Young, R.S., 'An Industrial District of Ancient Athens', *Hesperia* 20 (1951) 135–288.