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Abstract

This thesis is a critical analysis of the methods and application of gendered research in classical archaeology, with specific focus on funerary, settlement and public space archaeology. This study concentrates on the archaeological work conducted at three selected case study sites across the Mediterranean. For the funerary archaeology case study, the Pantanello Necropolis was selected, for settlement archaeology, Olynthus and for public space archaeology, the Athenian Acropolis. Through the analysis of research conducted at these sites, I intend to compare archaeological approaches to gender in classical archaeology to the rest of the discipline, with the aim of providing commentary on the past, present and future state of gendered analysis in the discipline.

Gender theories began to be applied to archaeological studies on a wider scale in the 1980s, with the work of primarily Scandinavian and North American scholars. This thesis considers how gendered analysis has come into archaeology, specifically that of the classical world, and how notions of gender have changed and been changed by archaeological research. While this thesis positions itself as a critical analysis, it is intended to be a critique in the most productive sense of the word, emphasising good practices and methodologies for future elaboration and use.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

Gender is a fundamentally important aspect of society. It is a category by which society is ordered and organised, and is valuable in that it can be used to analyse, amongst other things, the relations and interactions between social groups that construct society, social inequalities and the varying functions of space. However, it is an area of research that scholars agree was relegated to the margins of archaeological studies and neglected for a large part of archaeology’s history.¹ This thesis will critically analyse how and why classical archaeologists have come to utilise gender and gender theories in their studies, and how this translates in their results. This thesis aims to consider diverse approaches to gender and its significance in classical archaeology. In order to contextualise these aims, this thesis will first review theoretical and practical approaches to gender in archaeology beyond the boundaries of the classical sub-discipline. It will then undertake a comparative study of three sites across the Mediterranean and the approaches and methods adopted in studying gender issues for each of them. These sites are not only spatially diverse, but also encompass different spheres of archaeological study, focusing on the domains of funerary, settlement and public space archaeology at Pantanello, Olynthus and the Athenian Acropolis respectively.

It is firstly important to acknowledge definitions of terminology relevant to this thesis, in particular the definition of gender that will be employed. Gender can be defined as neither correlated to biological sex, nor fixed, but is a spectrum along which individuals identify. Notions of gender can change throughout an individual’s lifetime, as gender is shaped by other social factors such as age or status. Gender now, and in the past, is not a fixed binary between male and female, but encompasses the many gender identities that fall along the spectrum, including non-binary individuals, androgynous individuals, trans individuals and all others. While these definitions reflect modern understandings of gender, it is fundamentally important to qualify that they may not reflect the understanding of individuals in the classical world and their definition of gender may well have been completely different. Furthermore it would be ethnocentric and anachronistic to assert that these definitions are applicable across time and space.² Gender is different to biological sex: biological sex refers to characteristics present at birth such as sexual organs and skeletal difference, although this

¹Hill 1998, 100.
²Moral 2016. This is relevant to the discussion of sex and gender as Moral advocates for an intersectional approach, arguing that the notion of ‘third’ sex categories ignores nuance, 789.
too can be a spectrum. Gender, however, relates to a series of proscribed behaviours, features, dress and other attributes that mark an individual as belonging to a social category. Other relevant definitions include cisgender and transgender. Cisgender refers to the instance when an individual’s gender correlates to their biologically assigned sex. Transgender refers to the instance when an individual’s gender is not aligned with their biologically assigned sex. While these terms might be contemporary, there is literary and archaeological evidence to suggest that the identities they signify could have been present in the ancient world: for example, the gender variant identity of the Gallae, priests of Cybele, whose ambiguous gender is attested to in written sources. Regarding archaeological representation, a figurine identified as a transgender priest has been identified in Phrygia, created from silver which was a prestige metal. There is also evidence of an intersex figurine, defined as a ‘hermaphrodite’ from Olynthus, and examples of intersex figurines have been found in many areas of the world. Other relevant terms for the study of gender include intersex and sexual dimorphism. Intersex refers to individuals born with a sexual anatomy that does not adhere to the convention for male or female. Sexual dimorphism refers to the range in which an individual’s appearance including sexual organs and skeletal structure deviates from what is considered the convention for that individual’s biological sex. The archaeological difference between sex and gender is something this thesis will address later, and that creates controversy specifically for funerary archaeology.

Interest in the study of gender in the past through material remains has been an aspect of all archaeology for almost fifty years. Gender and feminist archaeology developed as a result of a combination of factors – feminist politics, Post-processual archaeology and subsequent criticisms of androcentric bias in the discipline. Feminist politics created a social discourse surrounding the lives of women, and this translated into feminist research which focused on the significance of women throughout history. Post-processual archaeology was important in providing a gateway through which gender could enter archaeology. It challenged the notion that to be considered valuable research should seek to be empirical and objective, but rather encouraged the acknowledgement of personal subjectivity and social and cultural difference.

In 1985, Scandinavian archaeologists held a conference in Norway on women in the past.

---

3 This definition of sex is debated and this will be discussed in the literature review.
4 Lucker 2005, 29.
5 Lucker, 2005, 55.
6 Robinson 1929, 62 for the example ay Olynthus, and Kletter et al. 2003 for an example from Israel.
7 Gilchrist 1999, 26.
Although this was certainly not the beginning of the study of gender in archaeology and was the culmination of many years of hard work on behalf of dozens of scholars, this was the first of many conferences dedicated to the subject and placed a value on gendered research that had not yet been publically acknowledged. As a result of criticism of this method, which suggested that compensation for androcentrism could lead to ‘gynocentrism’, changes have been made to the methodologies and aims of feminist and gender studies of the past. These changes are discussed in more depth in the literature review and main body of this thesis. However, the most important theoretical change is the introduction of intersectional theory into archaeological analysis. Intersectional theory is a fundamentally important concept that posits gender as one of a number of factors—including age, ethnicity, class and sexuality among others— that are relational and work to form an individual’s identity and social positioning regarding levels of privilege and oppression. Archaeologically, intersectional theory can be applied to the study of identity and how it influences individual experiences, and can assist in dismantling the assumption of homogeneity and avoiding the proliferation of oversimplifications regarding gender roles and experiences. In the twenty-first century, when gender has become a fundamental focal point in various fields of the humanities and social sciences, it is more crucial than ever that archaeology look back at what has been done in terms of gendered research, and how this can be improved.

The scope of this thesis has been necessarily narrowed to a discussion of the impact of gendered research in classical archaeology generally, and more particularly thematic areas. While it would be interesting to consider gender in the discipline of archaeology as a whole, due to limitations on time this would be too heavy a task for an Honours thesis. Classical archaeology was selected as the field for this study owing to a variety of factors—my own personal scholarly interests, the nature of classical sites where the material evidence can be analysed against written sources, and the tradition of gender studies in classical world

---

8 Hays-Gilpin 2000, 95.
10 Kennedy et al. 1998, 221.
12 Levy 2015, 232.
studies.\textsuperscript{13} The first chapter, a literature review, will discuss the development and use of
gender in archaeology generally, analysing the development and influence of gender in
archaeology on a broad scale. Following the literature review, three main chapters are based
on the three case study sites of Pantanello, Olynthus and the Athenian Acropolis and consist
of focused reviews of what work has been undertaken in regards to gender at these sites. A
subsequent chapter will compare and evaluate the classical approaches to gender with the
approaches of the discipline at large. It is important to acknowledge that the research into
gendered approaches in classical archaeology in this thesis is not all-inclusive. The focus of
the study on classical archaeology – and specifically funerary, settlement and public space
archaeology – does indeed leave some important aspects out. One of the fields which this
thesis will not cover, but which is an increasingly fundamental part of gender archaeology, is
iconography. While iconographic approaches to gender will be briefly considered in the
chapter on public space archaeology and the Acropolis, this is merely the result of the nature
of the Acropolis finds and not an explicit consideration.

Funerary archaeology is a fundamentally important avenue for gendered inquiry in
archaeology. Through the analysis of human skeletal remains, the sex of individuals in the
past may be determined. However, as previously emphasised, this presumes that all
individuals are cisgender. There is also a margin of error in sex identification that can be a
problem for funerary archaeology and skeletal analysis. Funerary archaeology can inform
scholars about gender in the past as it provides an opportunity to physically determine sex
and, based on the attribution of gender expression to associated material items, draw
conclusions in relation to social difference and (in)equality between genders.\textsuperscript{14} This thesis
will use the necropolis at Pantanello in south Italy as an example through which gender
analysis in the funerary archaeology of the classical world can be considered and critiqued.
Pantanello has been selected owing to its extensive publication in English, and the diversity
of studies undertaken. The Pantanello necropolis is located in the \textit{chora} of the Greek
settlement of Metaponto. Excavations first began in 1982 under the direction of J.C Carter
when graves were uncovered following the devastation of an olive grove, and since then
scholars have analysed various aspects of the population. Studies range from analysis of

\textsuperscript{13} Studies of gender began earlier in classical archaeology than in other regional archaeologies perhaps as a result of the
position of classical archaeology as the oldest regional archaeology, or because of studies of gender in related areas such
as ancient history, as noted in Spencer-Wood 2006, 296.

\textsuperscript{14} Brumfiel 2006, 32. This is a problematic method based on assumptions and will be discussed further in the chapter on
Pantanello and in the literature review.
metal finds\textsuperscript{15} to studies of sex, age at death and other demographic factors.\textsuperscript{16} Pantanello provides an excellent case study for south Italian burials as it had remained mostly undisturbed and was excavated in a systematic manner.\textsuperscript{17}

Domestic space is a clear and obvious choice when investigating archaeological approaches to women and men in antiquity. Classical scholars are informed by ancient, male, writers that social relations between the genders in many Greek societies were based on a dichotomy between women as house-keepers and men as citizens.\textsuperscript{18} This dichotomy was supposedly manifested in the existence of a distinctive division of space within Athenian houses that saw the existence of a \textit{gynaikonitis} and \textit{andronitis} – a female and a male space.\textsuperscript{19} Thus, studies of domestic space were for many years seen as being hypothetically capable of elucidating the daily lives of women in the ancient past and providing evidence for or against restricted relations between genders. This was the damaging perspective from which domestic spaces have often been approached – from the assumption that they will confirm notions of gender segregation, notions which often correlate with contemporary beliefs.\textsuperscript{20} This can be seen in the excavations at Olynthus, a Greek site on the Chalikidiki peninsula. Archaeological studies of Olynthus have been ongoing since 1928, beginning under the direction of David M. Robinson whose original expectations of the site were unmet and problematic.\textsuperscript{21} Olynthus has been the subject of many studies owing to the fact that it represents a rare, well-preserved example of domestic spaces in Greece. This thesis will focus on studies undertaken at the site to discover more about relations between genders and space in the classical world, and will analyse these studies diachronically to investigate how approaches have changed.

The final category of analysis for this thesis is public space archaeology, and uses the case study of the Athenian Acropolis. If ancient written sources are to be believed, then there existed in antiquity a dichotomy between male use of public space and female use of private.\textsuperscript{22} Again, this highlights the benefit of archaeology in the study of the classical world – testing material evidence against biased literary evidence. Archaeologists studying public

\textsuperscript{15} For example Prohászka 1995.
\textsuperscript{16} Henneber et al. 2001, 464.
\textsuperscript{17} Carter et al. 1998, 27.
\textsuperscript{18} Aristot., \textit{pol}, 3.4.
\textsuperscript{19} Xen. \textit{Oec}, 9.5-6.
\textsuperscript{20} Nevett 1999, 34.
\textsuperscript{21} Nevett 1999, 53 further discussion will be included in the chapter on Olynthus.
\textsuperscript{22} This false dichotomy is based off the works of those such as Aristotle, and the validity of this notion and its application in archaeological studies will be discussed in the Public Space chapter.
spaces in the classical world must look at how these spaces were spheres of social interaction and thus how different aspects of identity were performed within them, particularly when considered alongside the religious and political significance of many public areas. The Athenian Acropolis is one of the most recognisable archaeological sites in the world, and has been subject to intensive study, reconstruction and excavation throughout its history. The Acropolis has been considered for its iconography, for its representation of Athenian identity and for what it symbolised in ancient history. However, the Acropolis can and should be studied further as evidence for the interactions of genders in public spaces in Athenian society. The Acropolis was a hub of activity in the ancient world, and not only for men. It was a space for the performance of ritual and creation of Athenian identity and it is increasingly considered insightful for what it can display about social organisation and interactions. It is these studies of the structures atop Acropolis which will be analysed and compared in this thesis, in order to exemplify how archaeologists look at public spaces and landscapes in the classical world and consider their value and importance.

This thesis is an analysis of not only gendered approaches in classical archaeology to date, but also of where classical archaeology can and must go from here. In undertaking this study, I seek not to engage in negative criticism but to provide pathways to improve our knowledge and understanding of gendered relations in the past and how archaeologists can most productively analyse them. The three case study sites chosen will allow a more specific focus and thus allow for more clarity and careful consideration. Through the comparison of gendered approaches to funerary, settlement and public space archaeology in the classical world, the ways archaeologists do, and might in future, employ gender theories will be critiqued and analysed in order to provide opportunity for growth and development within the discipline itself.

---

23 See Papadopoulos 2013 for a review of four studies of the Acropolis.
Chapter 2
Literature Review

This chapter will focus on the literature surrounding gender in the field of archaeology on a broad scale, before subsequent chapters will consider literature on gender in the specific case studies within the realm of classical archaeology. In focusing on the literature surrounding gender, I will look at when and how the study of gender was introduced into archaeology and how it has developed from this time. Approaches to gender in archaeology vary regionally and across archaeological sub-field. As there is a vast amount of literature on gender, I cannot cover it all in this chapter or this thesis. Instead, I will consider attempts to synthesise gender-based research in archaeology, and the diverse approaches to gender across regional and temporal variation and in funerary, settlement and public space archaeology on a broad scale. In doing so, I will use examples from the literature to illustrate these approaches.

Gender began to gain prominence as a field of archaeological study in the 1980s. Gendered studies in archaeology began first in classical archaeology, owing to its strong connection to ancient history where interest in gender analysis was evident throughout the 20th century. The first archaeological studies of gender in archaeology were based in the classical realm, with studies undertaken on inscriptions in Greece. However, gendered analysis in archaeology found far more support in other sub-fields such as Prehistoric and Near Eastern archaeology, where gender-based research did not come about as a result of classical influence but as the result of the recognition of a need for varied approaches. Since its introduction, the role of gender in archaeology has changed and its importance has developed. Bruce Trigger remarked of gender archaeology “instead of simply representing an alternate focus of research, it has established itself as a necessary and integral part of all other archaeologies”. Before considering changes to gendered research in archaeology, it is important to acknowledge the context in which it arose. Gender was able to become an integral part of archaeology owing to the rise of feminist politics in the 1980s, and the move away from Processual to Post-processual archaeology, which shifted focus from empirical scientific research to the study of social differences in the past. Furthermore, the emphasis on multivocality that arose in Post-processual archaeology allowed for new interpretations, ones that focused on gender. Feminist theories in politics and in disciplines such as anthropology

26 McClees 1920.
27 Trigger 2006, 14.
and sociology assisted in the development of methods of analysis for the study of women and gender in archaeology, and in the disruption of androcentric and patriarchal dominance in scholarship. There are several key events, figures and themes notable in the development of gender in archaeology. Scandinavian archaeologists were the first to hold formal events for gender in archaeology, with a workshop in 1979 entitled *Were They All Men: An Examination of Sex Roles in Prehistoric Society* and a conference in 1985 entitled *Women in Archaeology in Norway.* These events assisted in legitimising the study of women and gender in the past; however, it is telling that the 1979 workshop refers to ‘sex roles’ in its title and not gender. Key figures in the development of gender in archaeology include Janet Spector, Margaret Conkey, Joan Gero and Alison Wylie. In 1991, Margaret Conkey and Joan Gero together co-edited the first collected volume of feminist and gender research in archaeology. This synthesis of research displayed both how far archaeology had come in recognising the importance of gender, and how far it still had to go. Other exemplary compilations of research include the annotated bibliography of gender in archaeology published in the same year by Bacus et.al, which critiqued all of the available literature at the time. The *Handbook of Gender Archaeology* edited by S. M. Nelson is also noteworthy: published in 2006 as part of a series it brought together a wide range of research on gender focusing on various regions, classifications and themes and providing a comprehensive starting point for understanding gender and its place in the history and the future of archaeology. Conkey and Gero are exemplary founding figures of gender and feminist archaeology, both contributing substantially to their development. Gero challenged the discipline of archaeology itself, objecting to the way the discipline was financed, structured and institutionalised. Conkey has published many works on gender and has identified her aims as being to acknowledge and rectify the absence of a paradigm through which gender can be studied archaeologically. Spector’s feminist work on a Dakota Wahpeton Village, *What this Awl Means: Feminist Archaeology at Wahpeton Dakota Village* exemplified the aims of early feminist research – using material remains, in this case an awl, to illuminate gender roles and critique archaeological methodologies. Alison Wylie is a notable feminist archaeology fore-runner for many reasons. Wylie not only analysed and criticised the delay in

32 Gero 1994, first presented in 1980. This interest in the discipline and it’s gendered hierarchy and structure has been evident in the works of many scholars, for example Moser 2007.
33 Conkey et al. 1984, 2.
34 Spector 1993.
the development of feminist influence in archaeology, but also in doing so summarised the developments that had occurred in this area at the time of writing. Wylie encouraged archaeologists across the discipline to recognise the many ways gender impacted all societies and cultures and to consider gender as a valuable and intrinsic part of all archaeological research.\textsuperscript{35} The application of intersectional theory into archaeological studies has not been without controversy. In 2005, MaCall noted that not only does intersectionality appear to be an issue only for feminist scholars, but that intersectional analysis is limited by the absence of methodologies.\textsuperscript{36} There are also other scholars who advocate for a return to original feminist goals in archaeology, suggesting that intersectional ideology undermines the focus of feminist studies as being about women, as discussed by Fahlander.\textsuperscript{37} These events and scholars created space in a previously hostile and androcentric discipline for the study of women and gender. Through the sharing of ideas, the creation of methodologies and the encouraging of self-reflexive development, they assisted in the creation of the far more inclusive archaeology recognisable in the 21\textsuperscript{st} century.

**Regional and temporal differences**

The diversity of the discipline of archaeology itself has necessitated the creation of a variety of approaches for studying aspects of society such as gender. Like all things in the humanities, there is no one correct way to consider gender in archaeology. Different societies, cultures and archaeologists have various motivations and interests and thus gender is analysed and considered in diverse ways as a result of these factors. The influence of differing gender ideologies, defined as the assigned importance given to gender categories across cultures, cannot be overstated.\textsuperscript{38} Here I will consider some of the questions and problems for different regions and temporal divisions of gender analysis in archaeology, and the literature which compares these differences. By ‘temporal divisions’ I am referring to the division of the archaeological discipline by time periods.

There have been attempts by scholars to compile and compare various regional approaches to gender in archaeology. Sarah Milledge Nelson and Myriam Rosen-Ayalon’s 2006 *In Pursuit*

\textsuperscript{35} Wylie 1992, 16. It is notable that all of these scholars, except Wylie, are North American – while the importance of gender archaeology was first acknowledged by Scandinavian archaeologists, it was American archaeologists who generated interest and incorporated gendered studies into the discipline more completely.
\textsuperscript{36} Leslie McCall 2005, 1771.
\textsuperscript{37} Fahlander 2012, 140.
\textsuperscript{38} Hays-Gilpin et al. 1998, 4.
of Gender: Worldwide Archaeological Approaches collates the work of several scholars, providing the opportunity to undertake in-depth analysis of the differences in methodologies and various complexities across the discipline.\textsuperscript{39} This text presents the works of different scholars from across the globe in a unified manner where the emphasis is not on their separation by region, but on their specialisation in gender and the different directions the editors’ perceived studies of gender in archaeology could take – gender ideology, gender roles and gender relations.\textsuperscript{40} The contributors and editors of this text acknowledge the different nature of challenges to studying gender in archaeology across the globe. For example, for those studying gender in Neolithic Italy there is a tendency toward earlier feminist goals of simply locating women and women’s roles, and a negligence of gender as a classificatory system.\textsuperscript{41} Furthermore, gender research in Italian archaeology has been minimal. This was noted by Ruth D. Whitehouse who, when compiling her 1998 volume on gender in Italian archaeology, acknowledged that not only was there a lack of deeper engagement with current theories and frameworks, but that at the time no Italian archaeologists were conducting gender-based research. Thus, Whitehouse produced a volume on gender in Italian archaeology that was entirely dependent on Anglo-American contributors, although she expressed hope that this would not become the norm.\textsuperscript{42} However, there are different traditions and methods of study for other areas of archaeology. For gender research in Western Thai archaeology, the focus is on rock art as indicative of gender roles and group specific differences in these roles.\textsuperscript{43} The diversity of interests globally necessitates a variety of approaches and methodologies and Nelson and Rosen-Ayalon bring these together.

There are many other examples of the necessity for varying paradigms to accommodate for regional and temporal diversity. For example, a major focus for Prehistoric archaeologists is the gendered division of labour and its influence in the creation of complex societies. This was discussed as sex-based division of labour by Vinsrygg at the 1979 workshop, and although the use of ‘sex roles’ rather than gender roles is problematic, their conclusions are still relevant – that divisions based on gender, or sex, can be identified through varying tools and are indicative of different social and economic patterns and responsibilities.\textsuperscript{44} Similarly,

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{39}] Nelson et al. 2002.
\item[\textsuperscript{40}] Nelson et al. 2006, 7.
\item[\textsuperscript{41}] Whitehouse 2001, 15.
\item[\textsuperscript{42}] Whitehouse 1998, 2.
\item[\textsuperscript{43}] Shoocongdej 2002, 187.
\item[\textsuperscript{44}] Vinsrygg 1987, 25.
\end{itemize}
historical and contemporary archaeology face unique challenges, although they are not unrelated to the challenges faced by classical archaeologists. The primary challenge for archaeologists of these time periods is that they are dealing with literate societies, with records and sources which detail aspects of life for individuals within society. However, the written record is not always, or even often, an adequate representation of all members of a society, and often contrasts with the material evidence. As Whelan noted with regards to Native American archaeology, literary evidence is often written from the perspective of white colonial males and thus cannot be considered to accurately represent the Native American cultures or people themselves, nor provide credible insight into their gender systems. Thus archaeologies which analyse literate societies must seek to overcome the flaws within the literary evidence through the study of material remains. However, this is complicated when considered alongside the fact that Western education systems teach students to value literary sources as primary sources, although they are often medieval monastic copies not the original texts themselves, and to view them as more valid than material remains. Literary evidence and material analysis can be used to complement one another and test for consistencies and inconsistencies, but should not be allowed to invalidate one another. There is also variation in methodologies and points of interests within studies of literate societies. Historical and contemporary archaeology, for the most part, have a far more extensive and comprehensive literary record owing to their temporal proximity to the present. Although there are always exceptions to this rule, for example where records have been intentionally or accidentally destroyed, this presents a serious complication. As Rathje displayed in the Arizona ‘Garbage Project’ of 1974, what is said does not always correlate with the archaeological record. Classical and Near Eastern archaeology must also face the task of overcoming the literary evidence, but to a lesser extent as the literary record is sparse and widely recognised as biased. Classical and Near Eastern archaeologists also have the benefit of an extensive iconographic record, although as Lewis states it is important that iconography is not portrayed as a representation of reality.

As has been illustrated here, there are multiple examples throughout the literature of specific challenges and approaches for varying regional and temporal sub-disciplines of archaeology.
in regards to approaches to gender. Different archaeological contexts and materials also require diverse methodologies, as will be discussed in the rest of this literature review.

Funerary Archaeology and Gender

The analysis of skeletal remains and their funerary context have wide applications in archaeology and for the understanding of gender construction in past societies. There are two easily identifiable and obvious ways through which archaeologists can consider gender in mortuary contexts – through both the skeletal remains of the individual and the trends in grave good deposition. However, it is not as straightforward as it seems. As has been acknowledged, gender is a distinct category to sex, where sex is seen as a static dichotomy between male and female, and gender is a culturally constructed spectrum related to bodily sex differences.49 However, there remains a controversial trend of assuming the gender of an individual based on the skeletally indicated sex, which infers all individuals in the past were cisgender.50 There is also debate as to whether sex can be considered as not biologically but culturally determined. This debate centralises around the argument that sex is cultural in terms of the importance of sex differences, challenging the notion that Western ideas of sex differences are universally relevant.51 The relationship between funerary archaeology and studies of gender is far more complicated than it would originally seem.

Determining the sex of an individual on the basis of skeletal remains is a fundamental part of osteological analysis in archaeology, alongside the determination of age. The most common methods are through the examination of the pelvis and cranium, but there are also other skeletal aspects that can be used to determine sex, as well as scientific procedures such as DNA testing which can prove useful when the skeleton is only partially preserved.52 Ditch and Rose proposed a method of sexing remains via the use of dental evidence, which although not always present can be highly insightful. They concluded that, while dental evidence should be cross-compared with other evidence where possible, their methods are able to provide an indication of individual’s sex based on teeth.53 Despite the fact that this

49 Gowland 2009,147.
50 This is evident in the title and content of Vinsrygg 1987.
52 Skoglund et al. 2013, 4479.
53 Ditch et al. 1972, 64.
study was undertaken in the 1970s, its validity has been discussed and improved upon by many in more recent years.\textsuperscript{54}

There is also another method designed for fragmentary skeletal evidence, suggested by Black in 1978. This method proposes the analysis of long bones such as the femur in order to determine difference in circumference, which can indicate sex on the basis that female femora are smaller in circumference than male.\textsuperscript{55} While this study was undertaken in the seventies, it is still very much relevant and the techniques Black employs have had proven success. However, in determining sex from skeletal remains, particularly fragmentary remains, a number of factors must come into consideration. This is made evident in Krogman’s example. Allowing for bias in the sample of medical school cadavers, with males more likely to donate their bodies to science, Krogman studied and concluded success rates of sexing skeletal remains based on intactness as follows: 100\% for full skeletons, 95\% for pelvis, 92\% for skull, 98\% for pelvis and skull, 80\% for long bones and 98\% for long bones and pelvis.\textsuperscript{56} These margins of error are controversial but clearly show that sex is most determinable when the skeletal remains are intact or contain numerous diagnostic features. Other figures for the margins of error in regards to sex determination vary, with some implying more optimistic figures and others less. Chamberlain cites that pelvic sex determination has an accuracy rate of 96\% and 92\% for cranial based estimation.\textsuperscript{57} However, in other studies the great sciatic notch width, considered an indicator of sex related to pelvic examination, is given an accuracy rate of 79.15\% and the skull 70.56\%.\textsuperscript{58} As is

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
          & Krogman & Đurić & Chamberlain & Stone \\
\hline
Full skeleton & 100\% & X & X & X \\
\hline
Pelvis    & 95\% & 79.15\% & 96\% & X \\
\hline
Skull     & 92\% & 70.56\% & 92\% & X \\
\hline
Pelvis + Skull    & 98\% & X & X & X \\
\hline
Long bones & 80\% & X & X & X \\
\hline
Long bones + Pelvis     & 98\% & X & X & X \\
\hline
DNA       & X     & X & X & 95-100\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{given rates of accuracy for sex determination in skeletal analysis}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{54} Vodanović et al. 2007, 912.
\textsuperscript{55} Black 1978, 228.
\textsuperscript{56} Krogman, cited in Iscan and Steyn, 2013, 143.
\textsuperscript{57} Chamberlain 2006, 97.
\textsuperscript{58} Đurić et al. 2005, 159.
demonstrated with these figures, accuracy rates vary with great dependency on the experience of the archaeologists and other factors such as skeletal preservation. However it is often the case that skeletal remains are not well preserved and there are many cases where sex determination cannot be done, or cannot be done conclusively. Cremation burials also remove the opportunity for archaeologists to investigate sex as there are no bones to analyse, although DNA testing can be undertaken with a given success rate for DNA testing between 95-100%.

There are scholars who suggest that the sex of an individual may impact their state of preservation, with female skeletons being generally more susceptible to bone loss with age and generally more gracile, thus at greater risk of disintegration.

There is also an issue with sex determination for of children, where the skeletal remains of young individuals cannot be subject to conclusive sex-based analysis owing to the absence of meaningful diagnostic differences. These factors – accuracy rates of methods, level of preservation and age – influence the validity of conclusions and interpretations based in the analysis of skeletal remains, and must be considered in any assessment of sex determination.

Once sex has been determined, there is often the assumption that gender is determinable. This is not necessarily the case, and is usually based on problematic cisnormative assumptions in reference to the correlation of biological sex and anthropological gender, and furthermore in the attribution of gender and significance to material grave goods. Concluding gender on the basis of the correlation of grave goods can be a complicated and controversial practice. While gendering of material items is often a necessary and useful practice, it is generally perceived as difficult owing to its basis in subjective assumptions.

The gendering of material artefacts has been a common practice throughout the history of gender in archaeology, and is exemplified in the work of earlier feminist archaeologists such as Janet Spector in her research both at the Wahpeton Dakota Village and of the Hidatsa Indians. It is also discussed by Elizabeth Brumfiel, who strongly defends the practice. For Brumfiel, the association of grave goods and gender is a point of entry to understanding gender systems and ideologies of the past. Attributing gender to grave items can be a very informative practice when undertaken cautiously and within context, and gendering artefact combinations can also assist in creating an understanding of gender markers. However, the assigning of
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59 Stone et al. 1996, 236.
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61 Ashmore 2006, 206.
gender to material items, particularly for societies for which no ethnographic study can be undertaken, introduces an aspect of speculation which is influenced by the archaeologists’ preconceptions about how society was gendered and what roles were assigned based on gender.

Archaeologists are also able to analyse the ways that graves are presented for indications of gendered differences. While the grave goods deposited with an individual may provide insight into their gender, the monuments used to mark graves can also be highly useful as can the clustering and arrangement of graves within the burial site. This was discussed at the 1979 ‘Were they all men?’ workshop, where the preferential use of grave offerings over the use of grave construction to determine gender and other intersecting factors of identity was emphasised and criticised. In studying Iron Age Scandinavian sites, Trond Løken examined the correlation between grave monuments and sex of the individual, determined through skeletal evidence and objects within the grave. Løken tracks the diachronic change of the burial monuments of females in comparison to males on the basis of size, style and decoration. He concludes that there was a difference in grave types that was clearly influenced by the sex of the deceased. In classical archaeology in particular, grave stelae are often used to inform interpretations relating to gender. Grave monuments and markers, particularly when inscribed, provide the opportunity not only to infer the gender of the individual interred, but also to analyse gender relations and roles within society in relation to death. Grave monuments, and grave construction, must be considered in light of intersectional theory, however, with recognition of the fact that gender is not necessarily static throughout an individual’s life, but is continually shifting and modified by intersectional factors. Age and status affect the quality not only of grave monuments, but also grave goods and construction. Leader uses the example of Hergeso, who is presented on the funeral stelae as a wealthy woman using iconographic traditions to depict her high status; however her identity in the inscription is framed through her relation to her father, and the image itself upon further examination presents the Athenian male conception of ideal femininity. Thus, while grave monuments may provide insight into gender in societies, they must be analysed critically like all other evidence, through multivariate analysis.
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Funerary archaeology also faces unique challenges in terms of legislative restrictions and the sensitivity surrounding human remains in many cultures. In many cultures and societies, human remains are considered to hold a special status that should not be violated through excavation or scientific analysis, or furthermore may have legislation to prohibit this excavation. An example of this is the Australian legislation surrounding the excavation and treatment of indigenous remains, largely a result of the horrific treatment of the indigenous population in the past.\(^{68}\) This can result in archaeologists relying on data collected prior to the acknowledgement of the importance of cultural sensitivity, where legislation against excavation did not exist. One example is Crass’ study of indigenous Inuit burials. While Crass suggests that as graves can be sexed they can inform archaeologists about gender, which is based on the dangerous correlation of sex and gender as intrinsically related, she does discuss the complication of legislation and the use of legacy data for gendered analysis.\(^{69}\) Through the sexing of remains, the cautious attribution of gender to grave goods and the analysis of grave construction, funerary archaeology can provide evidence for the influence and construction of gender in various societies.

**Settlement Archaeology and Gender**

Domestic space and settlements can inform archaeologists’ interpretations of gender in societies in many ways. In 1983, Lévi-Strauss encouraged new interpretations of dwellings by describing the house as a corporate entity, through which wealth is perpetuated and transmitted.\(^{70}\) Thus the study of the ideological and social nature of houses became a distinct area of study, distanced from the interpretation of the house as simply a structure. Lévi-Strauss has been criticised and rethought since 1983.\(^{71}\) However, the notion of the house as a social platform has been adopted into many archaeological studies. As noted by Hingley, domestic households can represent a microcosm of society and thus social factors influence the form of a household structure.\(^{72}\) One of the many ways that domestic space archaeology can contribute to understandings of gender relations in past societies is their power in overcoming androcentric bias. Throughout the history of archaeology, economic power of

\(^{68}\) The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage Protection Act, 1984 (amended 1987). See Seidemann 2003, 559.
\(^{69}\) Crass 2001, 120.
\(^{71}\) For example, see Carsten et al. 1995 which critically addresses Lévi-Strauss’ claims and subsequent ideas about households.
\(^{72}\) Hingley 1990, 125-6.
men in societies has dominated interpretations of social development, however studies of domestic space, in many cultures understood as a place for women’s work, allow for analysis of the contribution of women to the economy and for focus on women as actors, although it is mildly androcentric and anachronistic to state that the domestic sphere is where evidence of women’s activities can be located.\(^{73}\) This relates to one of the early goals of gendered studies in archaeology – to find and value the roles of women in the past. However, through analysing women’s economic power in the home, archaeologists can also come to understand the gendered division of labour and the ways that different genders interacted through a mutually beneficial economic relationship, and thus it is important to study domestic space through gendered perspectives. Furthermore, while the classical sources should be interrogated for their validity, the archaeological evidence attests to the honesty of many of their points, including that the domestic sphere was where activities undertaken by women such as weaving took place. Thus the gendered analysis of domestic space in archaeology can contribute to archaeologists’ interpretations of the past in various ways.

Over time, settlement archaeologists have developed more complex understandings of the use of domestic space in the past. Early considerations of gender in settlement archaeology focused on the definition of the ‘domestic’ as subordinate to the public and as the sphere of women. Thus women’s historic connection to the domestic was used as an explanation for their subjugation and diminished social, political and economic standing.\(^{74}\) However, this understanding of household space has changed, with focus shifting to the economic role of the household and the construction of the household as another form of institution where interactions are mediated through gender and other forces. An excellent example of a study which examines the role of the house and architecture in social structure and gender ideology, and emphasises the domestic as central and significant, is Stephen Hugh-Jones 1995 study of Northwest Amazonian homes. Hugh-Jones argued that social relations in the culture could be understood through gendered interpretations of the house, which presented contradictory views to those previously accepted.\(^{75}\) In this study, the *maloca* (longhouse) is viewed as a complex entity, which mirrored social hierarchy through conventions such as where individuals slept and which door they used.\(^{76}\) This analysis of the house as paramount to
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\(^{73}\) Hendon 1996, 172.
\(^{74}\) Hendon 1996, 177.
\(^{75}\) Hugh-Jones 1995, 226-7.
\(^{76}\) Hugh-Jones 1995, 230.
social interaction and as a force through which social conventions were enforced emphasises the importance of domestic space and the insights these spaces can provide to archaeologists.

Gender has become an integral part of the archaeological study of domestic space, and this is evidenced by the literature. In a 2015 book entitled *Archaeology of Domestic Architecture and the Human Use of Space*, there are entire sections of the text dedicated to the consideration of gender and how it may be analysed in studies of households. Steadman here argues for the, somewhat problematic, use of gender attribution to artefacts in order to analyse the gendering of space in past societies without acknowledging the risks involved, and based on the assertion that gender does not manifest in the architecture. Steadman acknowledges the often used approach of relying on “activity area research and household archaeology methodology” to analyse the sexual division of labour and gendering of space.  

Another method suggested by Hingley in an earlier example of a collaborative volume which seeks to interpret domestic spaces in light of social archaeology, *The Social Archaeology of Houses*, suggests the use of spatial archaeology methodologies. He suggests employing these methods through the analysis of room access patterns and furthermore suggested spatial use through evidence of more permanent structures such as ovens. This contradicts Steadman’s later suggestion that architectural features cannot provide insight into the gendering of domestic spaces, and highlights the abundance of different approaches available. In the analysis of domestic space and gender, and attempts to draw conclusions from architectural features, it is fundamental that archaeologists acknowledge the flexible use of space by different groups across time. Vom Bruck’s study of house and space in the Yemen, compared to Bourdieu’s model of understanding derived from Algerian houses, provides evidence for the contentious problems of gendering space in households. Many problems are emphasised, such as the interpretation of features as signifying the gendering of space, which may not have been permanent as room function is subject to change to suit varying needs. Furthermore, the segregation of space on gendered lines may be seen through intersectional theory, as an elite ideal not attainable to the vast majority, particularly in regional areas. As these examples show, in household studies, interpretations of the segregation of space can be
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based on problematic culturally contextualised knowledge of gender roles and gender attribution.

Settlement archaeology can contribute to understandings of gender in past societies by viewing the household as a microcosm, through which identities are formed and performed. These studies can also contribute to archaeology through analysis of the household as an economic force, and one which was often dominated by women and thus exemplifies their power and agency. Ultimately, studies of domestic space provide the opportunity to consider the structuring of gendered interactions in domestic settings, although evidence must be treated cautiously.

**Public Space archaeology and Gender**

There has often been in the past, and in some ways there remains, a perceived binary distinction between public and private space that is regarded as inherently gendered. This dichotomy, which is rooted in ancient literary sources, suggests a division of space with public seen to be the domain of men and the private as the sphere of women. Some scholars suggest that this dichotomy has often functioned as a means of oppressing and regulating the actions of women.\(^81\) Archaeologically, this distinction is visible both in the evidence and in the interpretations of archaeologists, where it has been assumed that private dwellings were the domain of women and public areas the domain of men.\(^82\) However, as is emphasised by Stig Sørensen, this infers that spatial organisation was static and universal, which ignores the fluidity of gender.\(^83\) For many societies and cultures throughout history, the public sphere has been a place of religious performance and politics, and to assume that gender had no presence in these spaces and interactions is a fallacy. Through similar methods employed by household archaeologists, public space archaeologists can consider gender, once it is accepted that these public areas were places of social interaction where gender identities were performed.

The religiosity of public space in the past is important for studies of gender. Spaces where religious ritual took place are potentially useful for the analysis of gendered interactions as they are areas where entire communities came together and can inform archaeologists on the

\(^81\) Duncan 1996, 127-8.
\(^82\) Based on ancient literary evidence and discussed in detail in subsequent chapters.
\(^83\) Stig Sorensen 2006, 147.
structure of gender within a society and the role of gender and other factors in social organisation. Roberta Gilchrist analyses the role of women within medieval religious spaces. She discusses how religious spaces were designed to emphasise the distinction between male and female roles, with nunneries constructed to convey the strict enclosure of the nuns. Gilchrist uses access analysis to determine how the architecture reflected the division of space. She determines that public spaces such as the guest-hall were kept external and inaccessible from the nuns cloisters, and within castle complexes that reflected higher status, the women’s quarters often had their own separate and more private chapels and feasting areas. In her analysis, Gilchrist uses architectural features to determine how spaces were divided and how women were given the illusion of private spaces within public domains. This study produces a deeper understanding of the segregation of space within the medieval period, and reflects the desire to seclude women within the private sphere even when they were fulfilling public religious roles.

Commerce is another aspect of society where the influence of gender can be recognised. Marketplaces and centres of commerce and trade were extremely important places of social contact in the past, where individuals would engage with others from all aspects of society. If the binary distinction between public/male and domestic/female space is to be believed, then the evidence of female presence in marketplaces would be limited. However, this is not the case. Two studies cited by Suzanne Spencer-Wood make this abundantly clear, where archaeologists have uncovered material remains which exemplify the presence of women in public commerce and thus the public sphere in past societies. The first is Jackson’s 1994 analysis which concluded that native Alaskan women received payment for domestic and public work, including work as translators. The second is McEwan’s 1991 study on Native American women who traded domestically produced products, which also intersects with issues surrounding slavery in the early Americas. Gender can also be considered in public spaces such as factories and markets where women worked as manufacturers, which relates to the gendered division of labour. Another aspect to the private/female public/male dichotomy is the belief that production was related to the sphere of men. Although textile production remained the responsibility of women, this was seen as a private and domestic task. However, Rotman emphasises the public nature of craft production by women in Deerfield, as a social endeavour that related to women’s suffrage. Rotman also emphasises that men held a role in
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craft production, such as furniture making. Thus craft work can be seen as not exclusively private or public, male or female, but instead was an example of deviation from traditional understandings of gender. The role of gender in commercial activity challenges the public/private binary and exhibits occasions where genders worked together in production activities, contrasting against traditional understandings of commerce as an exclusively male activity.

**Conclusion**

There are many studies which analyse and synthesise the history of gendered research in archaeology and the developments that have happened over time. Gender in archaeology can be understood as having begun in the 1980s and developed in complexity since. As the literature attests, gender in archaeology is a field that has and continues to grow in popularity and importance. Archaeology is not a homogenous discipline with one set of principles or approaches, and this is evident in the multitude of diverse methodologies applied to the study of gender across regional and thematic differences.

Over the course of this literature review, I have considered the works of many scholars and the various approaches based on region, time period or context of archaeological work. Throughout the next chapters I will focus on the variety of approaches specific to classical Mediterranean archaeology and also the three chosen subfields and case studies in archaeology: Pantanello, Olynthus and the Athenian Acropolis.
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Chapter 3
Funerary Archaeology

In previous chapters, I have discussed the role of gender in funerary archaeology in general. In this chapter, I will consider funerary archaeology in the classical world and the gendered approaches of classical archaeologists concerned with mortuary analysis. Sex is one of the fundamental categories of analysis applied to studies of skeletal remains. Studies of sex in skeletal remains often intersect with other demographic features such as age and gender, in order to construct an understanding of social structure, both within past communities and in the burial systems themselves. In the archaeology of the classical past, funerary analyses provide an insight into these demographic factors and furthermore an opportunity to study the intricacies of life and death outside of the constraints of literary evidence. It also presents the opportunity to test theories generated from literary evidence against other lines of evidence, using a multifaceted approach.

The study of skeletal remains, often termed ‘bioarchaeology’ or ‘oste archaeology’, has a long history in the discipline, coming to the forefront with processual archaeology. In early Antiquarian studies, when there was little information in regards to bone analysis, classical graves were regarded as a prime opportunity to claim artefacts with relatively little damage and highly aesthetic qualities, with little importance placed on the skeletal remains that accompanied them. As archaeology developed as a scientific discipline, so did the study of the skeletal remains. Human skulls found across the globe were analysed to trace racial differences and subsequent interpretations used to support racist assertions of European
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dominance and justifications of colonialism and control. In classical archaeology, the study of human remains has historically been influenced by, and influenced, social issues. One of the first studies in classical archaeology to attempt to analyse in considerable detail the skeletal remains of a population is Angel’s work at Troy which, despite the limited non-fragmentary skeletal evidence, was regarded as highly informative and useful. However, it is fundamentally important that archaeologists acknowledge that data obtained from burial contexts represents a fraction of the societal population, and cannot be interpreted as representative of the population as a whole, but rather as a reflection on the burial population. Osteoarchaeology has many possible applications in the interpretation of classical societies, not least its ability to inform archaeologists about demographic variables within the burial group. The identification of factors of population structure such as sex and age is one of the basic steps in preliminary skeletal analysis, and one of the many ways that approaches to gender and sex in funerary archaeology of the classical world does not differ from gendered approaches in other sub-disciplines. However, there are methods and issues specific to classical archaeology in relation to mortuary analysis. These will be addressed in the following case study of the Pantanello Necropolis in Metaponto.

**Case Study: Pantanello Necropolis, Metaponto**

In this section, I will use the case study of the excavations at the Pantanello Necropolis in Metaponto to emphasise and analyse the use of gender in funerary archaeology of the classical world. The Pantanello Necropolis is situated in the *chora* of Metaponto, and was described in the interim report published in 1990 as “one of the major archaeological discoveries in southern Italy in the last half a century”. Pantanello has been selected as a case study site owing to its significance and location, along with the fact that it has been the subject of study by various archaeological groups and individuals. Pantanello is
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an intriguing example of what studies in funerary archaeology in the classical world can look like and how they can consider gender as a category of analysis. The Pantanello Necropolis was discovered in 1982 and excavated from 1982-1986. It represents the burial site of the farmers living in the *chora* of Metaponto between ca 580 BCE and ca 250 BCE. The Necropolis lay under the burnt remains of an olive grove and was very nearly destroyed by further agricultural development, but was saved by the attention of the archaeological authorities in the area. The 320 intact burials discovered at the Pantanello Necropolis represented a highly significant find, and thus they were treated carefully with archaeologists permitted time over five seasons to excavate systematically, preserve skeletal remains and study them in considerable detail. This is, unfortunately, not always the case and there are numerous examples throughout classical archaeology where burial sites have been treated poorly and where skeletal remains have not been examined to their full potential, owing to a number of constraints such as time, financial matters, ignorance and disinterest. For example, skeletal analyses at Rutigliano in South Italy have been criticised as having insufficient evidence for complete analysis. There are also comparable South Italian burial sites which will be considered for their approach to gender alongside Pantanello. The Pantanello Necropolis provides an excellent opportunity to track the development of gendered analysis in funerary archaeology situated within the classical sphere. There have been a range of studies undertaken on the population of the Necropolis and their associated finds, and much of this has taken into consideration sex and gender as important categories of analysis. I will start first with the analysis of skeletal remains conducted at Pantanello, and then consider analysis of grave goods and how these studies have approached gender. I will then compare the research undertaken at Pantanello with research undertaken at various sites in Samnium, North Campania, and discuss future directions for gendered analysis in funerary archaeology and what could have been done better at Pantanello.

Maciej and Renata Henneberg conducted a comprehensive study of the biological characteristics of the Pantanello population on the basis of their skeletal remains, published in 1998. They identified their aims in this endeavour as “to reconstruct the demographic makeup and its dynamics, to provide a description of the morphology of living people, and to draw conclusions about their genetic affinities, health status and nutrition”. Henneberg and
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Henneberg identify their dataset as 251 individuals; however Prohászka has identified her dataset as 320. This discrepancy in figure could potentially be explained when the sex estimations undertaken by Dr. Marshall Becker are taken into account. Becker independently sexed all of the graves at Pantanello excavated up to the 1984 excavation season, using unspecified methods, and Henneberg and Henneberg do not indicate that they had attempted a revision of these sex determinations. It is thus likely that Prohászka’s dataset includes skeletal remains analysed by Becker, bringing her total number of individual graves to 320, while these were excluded from Henneberg and Henneberg’s study. This is important to note as it emphasises the disparities between Prohászka and Hall, who uses only Henneberg and Henneberg’s data. Furthermore, this has the potential to cause doubt in Prohászka’s conclusions given she utilises sex estimations which were obtained using unspecified methods, which are thus impossible to analyse and critique. Henneberg and Henneberg are very clear on the methods they used to determine individual’s sex. They independently sexed all of the skeletal remains at least twice over the course of a few years checking their estimations, and they indicate the use of a multivariate approach, testing multiple diagnostic features where possible. The features and tools used to estimate sex on the full and fragmented skeletal evidence are also identified with reference to methods employed by others. They utilised a variety of techniques including craniometric analysis through the use of calipers and tape and dental analysis, with 170 individuals retaining at least partial jaws with some teeth. Through testing multiple lines of evidence against one another, the conclusions drawn by Henneberg and Henneberg are given more validity, as they are not reliant on one feature. One of the important aspects of the Pantanello dataset was the bias in the population toward female graves, with variation across time period. This has implications, discussed later, for the associated artefact finds and subsequent interpretations. Henneberg and Henneberg identify a sex ratio of 1.85:1 in favour of females, with this over-representation of women particularly prominent in younger age groupings. They suggest a potential reason for this as being that high status young males may have been buried in prestigious urban necropoleis. This is not the only interpretation suggested, with other references to the oligandria known in Greek colonies, and the often cited excuse that men may have died in military service, which Henneberg and Henneberg dismiss. These
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interpretations illustrate the applications of sex determination in necropolis populations. The archaeologists are able to pose and answer questions about the burial population of Pantanello through the analysis of sex determination and ratios, which can influence interpretations as to how factors such as sex, gender and status contributed to the social organisation of burial within the population. Thus, the work of Henneberg and Henneberg in determining the sex of individuals at the Pantanello Necropolis is able to inform conclusions on social structure both within the burial system and the living population.

While the study of skeletal remains undertaken by Henneberg and Henneberg emphasises how sex determination can be used to approach questions related to gender and social organisation, analyses undertaken on the associated grave goods at Pantanello have the potential to be equally informative. Marianne Prohászka 1995 and Jon Hall 1998 are the two studies that will be used here to discuss the approach of archaeologists to grave goods at Pantanello. While Prohászka’s study focuses exclusively on the metal finds in the Pantanello Necropolis, Hall considers grave goods more generally, including ceramic finds. These two studies exemplify approaches to gender in classical funerary archaeology, and display the extent to which different methods of analysis can collaborate to create a detailed image of past societies and gender systems.

Prohászka considers the metal finds at the Necropolis of Pantanello, with explicit interest in regards to sex and gender. Prohászka relies heavily on the sex determinations of Henneberg and Henneberg, and from their identifications and her own analysis and assumptions draws conclusions as to the gender of individuals and their associated artefacts. However, it must be acknowledged that Prohászka’s study was not officially part of Carter’s project in the sense that her work was published separately and without permission, and thus her access to project materials may not have been all-inclusive. Prohászka’s study exemplifies many notable problems with funerary archaeology and the attribution of gender to material grave goods. Prohászka may first be criticised for her use of the terms ‘gender’ and ‘sex’ interchangeably throughout the text. As has already been established, these are separate categories which refer to completely different social and biological phenomena, and this has been defined and accepted in academia since 1972. There are multiple examples of this
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mistake throughout the text, for instance in her reference to grave T231 where she states “the gender was, however, based on the pelvis”, with gender indeterminable from biological factors.\textsuperscript{102} This illustrates a basic problem with not only Prohászka’s work but with funerary archaeology in general – that gender and sex are accepted as different in theory, but that this acceptance is not reflected in the actual analysis and publication.\textsuperscript{103} Prohászka analyses grave goods in types, from toilet articles to special objects, with these categories divided further by groupings of similar items and types within these groups. For example, strigils are identified under the broad category of toilet articles, with 29 strigil tombs identified. These are divided into metal type and Prohászka makes further distinctions on the basis of gender, arguing that the strigils identified in female tombs constitute a separate type, being more gracile.\textsuperscript{104} This leads to a discussion of another major flaw in Prohászka’s approach, which is the method through which she attributes gender to material items. Prohászka often gives no explicit statement as to what her assumptions are based on in relation to the gender of material items, with no reference to justifications and thus her reasoning appears unclear, contradictory and based in obscure and biased assumptions. This becomes an issue from early on in the study, with her analysis of mirrors and strigils. Prohászka interprets mirrors as an exclusively female grave object, and strigils as an almost exclusively male grave object, with the exception of the four she identifies as a separate type.\textsuperscript{105} There is no reason given for this beyond that mirrors occur in mostly female burials and strigils in mostly male, which she views uncritically, providing insufficient evidence. Furthermore, Prohászka challenges the sex determination of Henneberg and Henneberg on the basis of grave goods, which should better be understood as indicating gender not sex. For example, in grave T209 which contained a mirror, fibulae and two lebetes gamikoi but was sexed from the skull as male, Prohászka overturns this sex determination and argues instead the individual should be viewed as female, ignoring the distinction between sex and gender.\textsuperscript{106} This interpretation would not be inherently flawed had Prohászka discussed these graves as potential examples of individuals whose gender identity did not perfectly correlate with their biological sex. However, in this she treats grave goods as indicative of sex when she should be considering them as part of gender construction, separate from the biological sex of the grave. The only point at which she comes close to suggesting a similar interpretation is in a footnote, where she argues for
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grave T231 to be viewed as an exception in relation to the prominence of fibulae and dress pins within the burial, with the possibility that “certain roles in the ancient society may have included dresses with metal adornment”. Another example of Prohászka’s problematic circular reasoning is her discussion of ‘special objects’. Prohászka see’s special objects as heavily associated with men, often connected with skill or status such as the lyre found in grave T336, the inkwell in grave T190 and the spearhead from grave T315. This is controversial in many ways, firstly in how one defines ‘special’ objects and secondly in the obvious presumptions in initial analysis. It seems that Prohászka defines special objects as those that are rare and associated with skills or trades, and often male burials. Rare items such as the two keys found – one in grave T13 and one in grave T59 – are seen as household equipment rather than special items, with their special connection to women as a symbol noted, although one is associated with a female grave (T59) and the other with a male (T13). There is an exception to this definition, however, with reference to the cosmetic tools found in grave T193 as ‘special objects’, sexed as female. In relation to the spearhead, the only weapon found in the necropolis, Prohászka literally states “of course” when referencing the fact that it was found in a male sexed burial. She again fails to provide information as to the methodologies used to sex this grave, nor why the spearhead and other speciality items are so strongly associated with masculinity. In these example’s Prohászka displays circular reasoning influenced by obvious prior assumptions which are not acknowledged or discussed.

The inherent flaws in Prohászka’s methodology have been heavily criticised. J. E. Robb suggests that Prohászka did not utilise the evidence to its full potential in challenging previous conceptions of gender in grave goods that have “a long pedigree but no particularly sound theoretical basis”. Furthermore, Robb argues that Prohászka did not engage with intersectional theory, viewing gender as a single aspect of identity and not in relation with other social and political structures. Hall criticises Prohászka’s reasoning as I do, as circular and based on assumptions that do not reflect the high quality of preservation at
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Furthermore, Prohászka’s actual gender attributions have been rebutted by other scholars. For example, Burkhardt challenges Prohászka’s conclusion of the strigil as an almost exclusively male grave item. Burkhardt discusses the strigil as a male item, signifying athletic ideals and social status and as a symbol of male sexuality. However, she also argues against the assumption of the strigil as exclusively male as it is found not only in female graves but furthermore in sanctuaries to female deities as votive offerings. However, this argument is not infallible, with instances of strigils dedicated to female deities otherwise seen as evidence of male dedications of simply of the dedication of a valuable item.

Hall’s study of the grave goods at Pantanello is inclusive of the metal finds that form the subject of Prohászka’s study and other categories of material including ceramics. Hall ultimately asserts that there is little exclusivity evident amongst grave goods. He provides evidence for this assertion, going through various grave goods and exemplifying their presence in graves sexed as both male and female. For example, he points out that the lebes gamikos, traditionally associated with females, has too many exceptions at Pantanello where it is present in male-sexed graves to solely correlate it with any one sex. This has implications for understanding gender in the Pantanello Necropolis, as it challenges the basis for the gendering of lebetes gamikoi as an inherently female item. Pantanello also provides exceptions to previously accepted rules on a wider scale, not just in the necropolis itself. In Locri the skyphos and kylix are heavily associated with males. However, Hall concludes that this association is not evident in the Pantanello sample, nor is the association of hydriai with women that is present in Sicily. The acknowledgement of these associations as not statistically significant within the Pantanello sample provides a challenge to previously accepted understandings of gender associated items. However, Hall also fails to engage with the notion of gender as a social construct. He discusses the lack of exclusivity amongst grave goods as evidence of their multiple uses, but does not acknowledge the potential that the presence of supposedly ‘female’ gendered grave items in a sexed as ‘male’ grave could exemplify non-binary individuals, the fluidity of gender in society or further that gender may not have been the primary defining characteristic of the association of said item with an individual. Hall also incorrectly uses the term ‘gender’ in reference to the determination of
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biological sex of the individuals, for example when he states “the criterion for gender determination – the pelvis”. Hall discusses the disparate sex ratio and the implications of this for the inference of gender in grave goods. As there were more biological females in the sample than biological males, he correctly states that this has the potential to skew interpretations of associated material items. The distortion of the dataset to more heavily represent females will make artefacts appear to have stronger associations with female graves, simply owing to the fact that there are more of them, and the presence of these items in male graves appear as exceptions, making correlations appear more of less statistically significant than they may be – which has further implications for the understanding of gender at the site. Artefacts found to be strongly associated with female graves – Hall uses the example of mirrors – come to represent to archaeologists feminine identity and thus become heavily symbolic of female gender in the burial system, without consideration of the complexities and nuances within the dataset. Hall briefly discusses the nature of tomb types and their lack of correlation with grave goods. He gives the example of grave T17, a modest vault burial that contained one of the most elaborate finds, the only pair of gold earrings found at Pantanello. This discussion of tomb types could have been better had Hall gone on to consider the implications of tomb types and status intersecting with gender. For example grave T17 is the burial of an individual sexed as female, and Hall could have included a consideration of the implications of a modest burial with expensive finds belonging to a female. Hall’s study at Pantanello exhibits the issue with gender attribution to material artefacts, particularly when the gender attribution is based on correlation of material items and skeletal sex determination, and when the dataset is skewed heavily to one sex. He treats the various categories of material items within the graves at Pantanello well, analysing and criticising the methods and justifications of other scholars for gendering items. However, Hall himself fails to engage adequately with gender, simply describing inconsistencies as not statistically significant for gender analysis while failing to approach these inconsistencies as potential evidence of gender and sex disparities.

At the Samnite sites studied by Scopacasa in North Campania analyses of skeletal remains from the perspective of sex and material attributes from the angle of gender have been undertaken. Samnium represented an Italic community of Oscan-speaking people, which
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prospered from around 600 BCE until 290 BCE when it fell under Roman influence. Studies at the various necropoleis of Samnium have challenged the notion of a gender system which saw men as warriors and women as homemakers, using evidence from burials. Scopacasa, in his 2014 study of the grave goods and skeletal data from Samnium, suggests that arguments attributing gender to certain grave goods which support the dichotomy of male warriors and female homemakers are circular, with a limited and incomplete view of gender roles and nuances within the society. Scopacasa is far more critical of the two-gender construction of ancient South Italy than those who have undertaken studies at Pantanello, although this may be influenced by advances in archaeological understanding between 1998 and 2014. Scopacasa presents an intersectional approach, whereby items that were seen as evidence of the two-gender dichotomy, such as weapons, are instead viewed as complex signifiers of varying vectors of social identity. For example, ornaments associated with female burials are also heavily associated with youth in general, which could indicate a connection between maturity and masculinity, with everything non-adult male being related to the feminine. Studies of gender at the various burial sites throughout Samnium can be compared to studies of gender at Pantanello through analysing the difference in approach. While, at Pantanello, the sex determination data and attribution of gender to material items are used in many ways to support assumptions of a binary gender system, at Samnium the evidence is employed in a more complex way to challenge prior assumptions and engage with intersectional theory. Scopacasa’s study embraces intersectional theory and engages with gender at a far deeper level than any of the studies undertaken at Pantanello. Scopacasa’s analysis of gender throughout the burial systems in Samnium is indicative of a change in archaeological approaches across time, moving toward research that values the interrelation of various vectors of identity and utilises anthropological theories on a serious level.

While not always treated well, there have been attempts by both Carter’s team and other archaeologists to include gender and sex in their consideration of the Pantanello Necropolis in Metaponto. Whether through sex determination of the skeletal remains, or a conscious effort to consider the gendering of material items, these studies have taken the first steps to recognising gender and sex as fundamental categories of analysis. However, gender could have been incorporated into studies at Pantanello far better. While there were attempts to
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consider the placement and format of graves, these could have been far more detailed. There are many grave types exhibited at the Pantanello Necropolis, from fossa burials and *a cappucina* tombs to sarcophagi, and it would be incredibly interesting to have seen further analysis of these tombs not only for their association with the status of individuals as Hall acknowledged but with the gender of individuals. Furthermore, Carter’s chapters on burial rites and tomb types and grave markers and rites could also have included a far more detailed discussion of sex and gender correlations in burial markings, rites and tomb types.\textsuperscript{128} However, as with the gendering of material items, this must be done carefully with the disparate sex ratio taken into account and with an acknowledgement of the factors that influence gendered assumptions. There has also been a basic study of the positioning of burials within the grave in nuclei, and it would again have been interesting to see this analysed further from a gendered perspective.\textsuperscript{129} Ultimately, funerary analyses in classical archaeology must move toward approaches like that of Scopacasa in Samnium which engage with current theories prevalent in wider archaeological studies and challenge binary assumptions. Overall, the studies undertaken on the individuals interred within the Pantanello Necropolis are informative examples of the complications with gendered research and artefact attribution in funerary archaeology and study of skeletal remains and mortuary context in classical archaeology.
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Chapter 4
Settlement Archaeology

In the archaeology of the classical world, domestic space has the potential to be exceptionally enlightening, particularly on issues regarding gender. In studies of ancient households concerned with questions of gender, the contrast between literary and archaeological evidence is manifest. In this chapter, the importance of settlement archaeology in the classical world and the use of gender in these studies will be considered. The house in the ancient world has been the subject of extensive study in classical archaeology, owing to a number of factors. The mere fact of convenience – there are many partial or complete ancient houses to study – has contributed to the prominence of household archaeology, as has the interest of processual archaeologists in issues of population. Processual archaeologists utilised the evidence from domestic spaces in attempts to ascertain population figures, extrapolating conclusions from factors such as estimations of individual habitation space and number of rooms.\(^{130}\) Gender came later to studies of households in the classical world, as it did to the discipline in general. However, gender is now one of the primary categories of analysis in studies of domestic space in antiquity, from the assumption that behaviour and interactions can be interpreted through architectural and material remains. These studies must also navigate engagement with the literary sources of the ancient world, which have in the past shaped understandings of the use of space within the home. As has been discussed in previous chapters the architecture, division of space and location and gendering of material items within domestic space can create a picture of how living space was organised and structured in past societies. This chapter will consider the theories and methodologies pertinent to studies which attempt to create this picture of classical households, and then go on to analyse the various studies undertaken at Olynthus in northern Greece to exemplify how these methods can be, and have been, employed. The studies at Olynthus will be analysed chronologically to construct a sense of the change in approaches over time.

Settlement archaeology has come to be viewed as one of the primary ways through which we may seek to understand gendered interactions within society. This has been developed, by those such as Hingley, from Lévi-Strauss’s suggestion of the house as a microcosm of society, mirroring social organisation and interactions.\(^{131}\) Domestic space as a social entity

\(^{130}\) Naroll 1962, Hill 1970.
can be understood through the architectural remains, the material finds and the literary sources, although all of these methods of analysis have problematic aspects. Antonaccio discusses the struggle to define the domestic, particularly for classical archaeology. In ancient Greece, the physical house represented the *oikos*, the family unit, and punishment for wrongdoing could be acted out through the dismemberment of the physical.\(^{132}\) However, as Antonaccio argues, the physical structure of the house was not paramount in the construction of the cultural meaning, and the architectural features did not alone constitute conceptions of domesticity.\(^{133}\) The analysis of finds and contexts is a similarly complex process. As Ault and Nevett argue, archaeologists have often omitted the importance of artefactual assemblages, with no detailed paradigms for analysing depositional processes in domestic contexts.\(^{134}\) Archaeologists analysing domestic space in the classical world must also contend with the literary and iconographic evidence. There are many references to the domestic sphere and the segregation of space in ancient literature, and the iconographic record depicts many scenes of domesticity. This presents a problem when fieldwork is conducted with the ancient sources viewed as primary and superior to the archaeological record.\(^{135}\) Literary evidence of the segregation of space in classical Greek households abounds, with references from Xenophon in Ischomachos’ description of his house to Socrates, Aristophanes’ *The Thesmophoriazusae* and a speech from Lysias to name a few.\(^{136}\) From the basis of the literary evidence, it has been assumed that the domestic sphere is where evidence of women and their activities will manifest most clearly. However, this is a problematic view. This ‘women at home’ model is not only sexist but ignores the reality of women’s activities in the public sphere, at the Agora and in religious ritual for example.\(^{137}\) Domestic space can be better seen not as an avenue through which the activities of women can be determined, but as a space that was not only inherently gendered but subject to change over time, not only over the course of a year but also over the course of its occupation, and thus as a platform for the analysis of gendered interactions. This is discussed at length by Marilyn Goldberg, who suggests interpretations of domestic space as female are flawed.\(^{138}\) Her critique of these interpretations takes the form of a seven-point list which, in summary, argues against: the focus on a male/female dichotomy and assumption of strict gender rules leading to
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circularity; the assumption of literary superiority over the archaeological record and ignorance of the socially constructed nature and classist bias of literary evidence; the assumption of homogeneity amongst females which does not allow for intersectional considerations; and the influence of the archaeologists own perspective. Domestic space in classical antiquity must be studied carefully, with consideration of the artefact assemblage and distribution, architectural features and the consistencies or inconsistencies of these archaeological features and the literary record.

**Case Study:**

**Olynthus, Chalkidiki Peninsula**

Olynthus is one of the most impressive sites in the world, with an array of domestic dwellings which have been studied by various archaeological teams. Situated on the Chalkidiki Peninsula, the site of Olynthus was occupied from the seventh century BCE down to 348 BCE, with a prior Neolithic settlement on the South Hill. Olynthus was destroyed by Phillip II of Macedon after a short siege, although part of the North Hill was re-occupied until 318BCE after the rest of the city was razed. The destruction of Olynthus, violent and sudden as it was, left a significant number of artefacts strewn on the floors of houses, which presented an opportunity to archaeologists.¹³⁹ Excavations at Olynthus began in 1928 under the direction of David Robinson who continued to direct over four seasons until 1938, with many now famous archaeologists beginning their careers as workers there. There have been many studies at Olynthus since then, including conservation work by Julia Vokotopoulou, household analysis and an attempt at publishing the database online by Nicholas Cahill and further excavations directed by Bettina Tsigarida, Zosia Archibald and Lisa Nevett.¹⁴⁰ Olynthus has been chosen as the case study for this thesis as it not only represents an excellent example of households in ancient Greece but furthermore because of the extensive
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archaeological research undertaken and because it has been the subject of study for almost one hundred years with more than one hundred houses excavated. Scholars have described the site of Olynthus as, “the single most valuable archaeological resource for anyone interested in Greek domestic organisation”. The ongoing research at Olynthus means that it illustrates changes to archaeological methods and interests and through analysis of the studies undertaken can be used to display changing attitudes towards gender in archaeological research.

David M. Robinson was the first to direct excavations at the site of Olynthus in 1928, despite an attempt to begin excavations between 1914-1916 by the British School at Athens. Robinson’s excavations were conducted through Johns Hopkins University and the American School of Classical Studies at Athens and were extensive. Including massive teams of hundreds of workmen, 350 refugee workers and 15 experts in the 1931 season alone, these original studies at Olynthus uncovered thousands of artefacts across over one hundred structures. Robinson’s work was heavily praised at the time, for the extensive publication, the quality of the study materials and the richness and carefulness of his commentary, amongst other things. His original discovery of the site is cast dramatically, comparable to Schliemann’s discovery of Troy. He states that while on a tour around parts of the Mediterranean, after reading about Olynthus from ancient literary sources, he realised that the identification of Hagios Mamas as Olynthus was incorrect and after walking east and climbing a hill he found evidence of ancient occupation – pottery, terracotta figurines and coins – and there discovered the great classical city of Olynthus. In regards to actual excavation, the Preliminary Olynthus Report identifies the initial aim of trial trenches as locating public structures and temples. However, it is evident from subsequent publications that these objectives shifted, primarily to focus on the domestic housing and the Hippodamian plan. This change in focus is clearly attributed to the wealth of domestic evidence, with over 100 houses excavated and recorded, and they jumped on the opportunity to emphasise the importance of Olynthus. In a 1952 publication, Olynthus is named as “the Greek Pompeii”, with insistence that the residential discoveries constituted the first example in the Greek world of a planned development of private dwellings. However, Robinson’s treatment of
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gender is, perhaps unsurprisingly given the period in which he conducted excavation and analysis, disappointing. He deals with the representations of women found at Olynthus at length, describing images found on vases, such as the Amazon which he remarks is similar to the style of the Parthenon frieze, and even identifying a figurine he describes as a possible “hermaphrodite”. However, these descriptions are basic and do not engage with any further analysis. In reference to the segregation of space in Olynthian households, Robinson is often uncritical. The ancient sources detail the existence of a women’s quarter within Athenian houses, however there was no evidence for this at Olynthus. Rather than viewing the lack of evidence for a gynaikonitis as an opportunity to challenge the literary sources, Robinson sees this as a distinction between town life at Olynthus and the ‘polite’ city of Athens, where evidence for gendered segregation came mostly from literary evidence with no real archaeological support until later excavations. Robinson also devotes far more energy in discussion of the andron than he does on the gynaikonitis. This is problematic, although symptomatic of archaeology at the time, for a number of reasons. Firstly it is important to acknowledge that in many of the publications on Olynthus it is the wealthy households which are emphasised, which can result in interpretations of material remains at Olynthus being biased on the basis of status, with overrepresentation of wealthier upper echelons. This is evident in his focus on larger houses, such as the ‘Villa of Good Fortune’ or houses with mosaics and other expensive and elaborate finds. In his discussions of the segregation of space, Robinson often presents his interpretations as objectively true and has a clear interest in the evidence of male activity over female. For example, he discusses the andron and its identification through architectural features including a cement platform around the walls and elaborate decoration including mosaic floors, and specifies that it was “the most important room in the house”. When discussing the mosaic from the andron of the ‘Villa of Good Fortune’, Robinson refers to the andron as “the main living room”, suggesting no gendered connotations. In his identification of the andron, Robinson’s reliance on literary evidence is clear. He identifies the andron through the correlation of architectural features and literary evidence, although he challenges the literal interpretation of literary evidence to suggest that “the andron was only peculiarly, and not exclusively, the men’s room”. This is how Robinson analyses and interprets Olynthian houses – through the lens of literary evidence,
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indicating where the archaeological features differ as necessitating a less literal reading of the sources. In relation to female activity, Robinson uses the abundance of loom weights and spools found throughout Olynthian houses as evidence that the women were “capable housewives”, but in this discussion does not make mention of the well dispersed find spots for these items throughout the house, nor their centrality to the controversy surrounding the presence and identification of a *gynaikonitis*. Robinson’s excavations at Olynthus constituted the first analysis of residential space in Greek antiquity and, although at times flawed, is a product of the time period in which it was undertaken. There are definite attempts within Robinson’s publications of Olynthus to identify gendered use of space, and although he is heavily reliant on the problematic literary sources, he also identifies where the literary evidence differs to the archaeological, and in these cases he uses the archaeological evidence to inform alternate interpretations on the use of space. Ultimately his excavations at Olynthus must be recognised for generating interest in classical Greek households and cementing Olynthus as a place for further studies, which are more inclusive of gendered questions.

The data produced by the initial excavations has been reanalysed by a number of scholars including Nicholas Cahill and Lisa Nevett. These studies considered questions relating to gender and interrelating social factors more closely than Robinson. Lisa Nevett has published several works not only on Olynthus but on domestic space and organisation in classical antiquity in general. In her work, she considers the gendering of domestic space at length, arguing against the notion of a public/male private/female dichotomy. She analyses archaeological, iconographic and textual evidence to argue that the idea of female seclusion and the ‘woman at home model’ is an oversimplification that assumes homogeneity and reflects the expectations of a limited group rather than the reality of the vast majority of households. Nevett emphasises the importance of Olynthus in archaeological discourse as well as the funding and extent of research undertaken at the site as an exception to an unfortunate rule. Research subsequent to Robinson’s initial excavation at Olynthus across the classical Mediterranean world in general has been limited by funding and thus represents a much smaller sample size of houses studied, which has implications for analysing overall trends as opposed to individual variation. This makes Olynthus particularly unique and valuable as a case study, as it has had access to resources that other sites have not. Nevett also
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warns against viewing the finds and structures at Olynthus as exemplars of normal activity and organisation, making reference to the siege and destruction of Olynthus that will undoubtedly have impacted the context, presence and distribution of artefacts.\textsuperscript{156} In her study of Olynthus, the analysis of the gendering of space and social interactions is a priority, as is a consideration of intersectional theory, as can be seen in her specified aim to “build a more coherent picture of the way in which different factors within a society may interrelate”\textsuperscript{157} She supports Robinson’s interpretation that space was not segregated at Olynthus to the extent of an exclusively female area as it may have been at places like Athens. By the time Nevett began studying domestic space, archaeological studies of houses had begun at Athens, which meant rather than relying on literary evidence for the segregation of space as Robinson did she was able to refer to archaeological evidence and other studies. This includes work by Susan Walker, who presented a model of Greek housing that aimed to assimilate archaeological and literary evidence.\textsuperscript{158} Nevett develops the argument that space was not segregated at Olynthus to suggest that rather than specifically segregated rooms and spaces within the house, space may have been gendered through use. This interpretation posits that male visitors were prevented from entering certain areas of the house rather than female family members being restricted to them, with the use of space static and varying over time.\textsuperscript{159} For Nevett in this interpretation, the primary distinction is between members of the oikos and outsiders.\textsuperscript{160} Nevett considers the archaeological evidence at Olynthus through the gendering of artefacts and analysis of assemblage distribution, to try and determine if items considered heavily associated with female activity were concentrated in any one area. She concludes that these items – such as loom weights, alabastra and kalathoi – were distributed throughout the houses, with no apparent restriction.\textsuperscript{161} As a result of this archaeological evidence, Nevett makes a valid comparison employing ethnographic techniques to analyse similarities between Olynthian houses and those of Islamic cultures. In doing so she refers to the scheduling of space on gendered premises which is common in Islamic households in Tunis, for example, and it this archaeological and ethnographic evidence that informs her interpretation of Olynthian organisation of space.\textsuperscript{162} Nevett’s research on Olynthus goes beyond the interpretations given by Robinson to place Olynthus in a wider context of
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problematic funding issues for settlement archaeology and to emphasise the implications of artefact distribution. She also focuses her study on the actions and interactions of women, rather than the bias toward male representation that is evident in Robinson’s discussions. She considers how space is gendered and uses the evidence of Olynthus not only to challenge the literary evidence but to question the use and interpretations of literary evidence, stating “we need to go a stage further and use it [archaeological evidence] as an independent source”. Nevett has gone on to direct the re-excavation of Olynthus which will provide her with the opportunity to conduct analysis with her own data rather than Robinson’s legacy data which, as discussed later, is somewhat problematic.

Nicholas Cahill, in 2002, published both in print and online a book entitled *Household and City organisation at Olynthus*. This book covers in detail the site itself and the excavations undertaken by Robinson, as well as the work undertaken by those such as Nevett in reanalysing Olynthus. Cahill attempted to publish the database from Olynthus online, to increase public accessibility, although owing to complications this remains incomplete. Cahill aims to analyse the organisation of space within Olynthian houses through reference to the architectural features, literary evidence and the location of artefacts, noting the important fact that houses in Olynthus were not homogenous and there is evidence for variation of use permitted by the unspecialised nature of much of the architecture. Cahill critically analyses the archaeological evidence produced by Robinson’s excavations alongside the suggestions of space segregation from literary sources. He makes a vital distinction between the ideology of Greek houses reflected in literature, the architecture of Greek houses and the actual functional use of space, which he determines as evidenced by the assemblages present. While scholars have debated the existence of the *gynaikonitis*, the presence of the *andron* is often assumed uncritically, as was made evident in Robinson’s publications. Cahill follows suit in his research, remaining uncritical about the *andron* despite the 74 years of development between the two studies. When discussing the attributes of the ‘House of Many Colours’ Cahill argues that in this house more than any other, gendered segregation of space was most evident. While no exclusively female space was identifiable, despite high concentrations of female-gendered artefacts in rooms A and B, Cahill suggests the *andron* illustrates the gendered division of space in its restriction to male diners and their female
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He does not give archaeological evidence for this assumption, and it is probably the case that he came to this conclusion on the basis of literary evidence. However, in literary and iconographic evidence, the andron represents an area where gender intersected with age and social status. Citizen men, as well as young boys, attended symposia, with different roles based on age. Further, it was not an exclusively male space as women were permitted to be there, on the provision that they were not high-status women or relatives of citizens – they were women of low social class, whose presence was solely for the entertainment of the men attending. Cahill discusses the use of space through architectural features, analysing the architecture for evidence of restriction. He concludes that the architectural layout of the houses at Olynthus did not allow for the limitation of access, with many being open plan and all rooms accessible from the court. 

Cahill disagrees with many other scholars to argue that, in many Olynthian houses, there is evidence for space that, while it may not have been called a gynaikonitis, was inherently associated with exclusively female activity. Cahill identifies the kitchen-complex as a female area on the basis of female association with cooking, and its architectural placement far removed from the house entrance, which he interprets as a deliberate move to keep them private.

Cahill’s study of Olynthus analyses domestic space through architectural features, and the correlation of literary evidence and artefactual remains. Cahill goes beyond simply identifying features to infer the implications of their presence or absence for the functioning of the household and activities. While Cahill’s interpretation of the gendering of space at Olynthus differs to those of other scholars such as Nevett, his interest in questioning the role of gender in Olynthian households displays how gender has become a critical part of studies of settlement space in classical antiquity. However, Cahill is at times still uncritical of gendered assumptions, such as in his discussion of the andron or his assumption that the kitchen-complex were female areas owing to women’s connection to food preparation. This study illustrates changing attitudes to gendered analysis in classical archaeology, and the importance of domestic space in developing an understanding of gendered relations in the classical Greek world.
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In more recent years, a team of female archaeologists – Dr Bettina Tsigarida, Dr Zosia Archibald and Professor Lisa Nevett – have reopened excavations at Olynthus. This team have received permission from the Hellenic Ministry of Culture to excavate at Olynthus for four years, between 2014 and 2018. As this excavation is ongoing, publications are not yet
available. However, in keeping with modern archaeology and Cahill’s aims to publish research from Olynthus online, the team have a very detailed website for the “Olynthos Project” that states their objectives in excavating at the site as well as information on their methodologies and blog posts from those working at the site. One of the fundamental aims of the project is to address the flaws within Robinson’s legacy data. Robinson’s team did not record stratigraphic information and, furthermore, were selective with the artefacts recorded and saved. Locally produced pottery was often discarded, and the number of artefacts per house recorded by Robinson’s team is at odds with what the Olynthos Project has been finding. The Olynthos Project is a multidisciplinary endeavour that seeks to understand household activities and how they related to the region on various levels, with specific research questions aimed at understanding the details of household, neighbourhood and community life and activity at Olynthus. While gender is not identified as a specific objective or question on the Olynthos Project website, there are many research questions that could not be answered without a detailed consideration of how spaces and interactions were gendered, particularly on a household level. These include, for example, questions about the use of space and how space shaped social interactions, and what goods were produced by the household. Furthermore, at the University of Liverpool’s website detailing the aims of the project, gender is named as a specific concern. Here one of the research aims is stated as to question “How did men and women interact in the domestic space”. The Olynthos Project focuses on stratigraphic and topographic analysis, with no mention of the ancient literary sources having an impact on the analysis. The researchers identify their methods as interdisciplinary, with a focus on archaeological sciences not previously available to Robinson in his early excavations that may enhance interpretations. The Olynthos Project exemplifies modern approaches to archaeological analysis, with emphasis on interdisciplinary approaches, accessibility of research and questions of social organisation. The inclusion of investigating gendered interactions in domestic settings as a specific research aim is incredibly important and illustrates how archaeology has progressed to include gender since Robinson’s study in the early 20th century.
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The modern Olynthos Project, along with the studies of Nevett and Cahill, exhibit how gender has become a more integral part of contemporary archaeological studies of the classical household and the benefits of engaging with gendered interpretations in archaeology. While Robinson did discuss gendered features of the Olynthian houses excavated, such as the segregation of space, he did so uncritically, with great reference to ancient literature and minimal discussion of the implication of identifiable gendered spaces, such as the andron, and the absence of a gynaikonitis. In the subsequent studies, there is a critical engagement with the archaeological and literary evidence, and scholars have questioned what can is inferable about social organisation and activity from the presence or absence of gendered space. They have hypothesised theories relating to the use of space based on the dispersion of gendered artefacts and the architectural features. This deeper engagement with gender in household archaeology can better inform interpretations and provide an insight into how space was used in classical antiquity, although with caution so as not to assume homogeneity or ignore how gender intersected with other social factors. It will be incredibly interesting to see the interpretations and conclusions from the Olynthos Project when they become available over the coming years.
Chapter 5
Public Space Archaeology

In light of the supposed dichotomy of space eluded to in the previous chapter, logic dictates that evidence of male action would dominate the public sphere. However, as has already been stated, this dichotomy is false and does not reflect the reality of daily activity and use of space. Archaeological studies of the public sphere can better be used to understand the complex relationship between space, gender and other intersecting vectors of identity and social organisation. This chapter will discuss archaeology of the public sphere in the classical world. As mentioned in the previous chapter, in much of the literary sources remaining from the classical world the ideal was that women remain at home, undertaking activities that displayed their femininity. Just like the conception of the gynaikonitis was achievable for only wealthy households, the ideal of the ‘woman at home’ was for wealthy citizens alone, who could afford to have slaves that fulfilled daily activities such as shopping. Public spaces in the classical world may have been mostly reserved for the social, economic and political activities of men, but there can be no doubt that women inhabited these spaces as well, albeit in different and potentially less visible ways. Religion was an integral part of life in the ancient world, and as such was one of the main arenas for female activity outside of the home in the ancient world. In religious ritual, women held important roles – they were capable of holding high status as priestesses, and there were exclusively female rituals and roles, access to which intersected with other social factors such as status and age. This chapter will consider the analysis of gendered interactions in public space in reference to ritual and religious landscapes. However, it must be acknowledged that religious space makes up only a portion of public space that survives down to modern society, and the interactions between genders must also be analysed in other spaces, such as those designed for economic, political or social purposes. This chapter will
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first discuss archaeological methods for analysing public space in the classical past, and how these methods incorporate considerations of intersectional factors such as age, wealth, class and gender. I will then move to a discussion of the Athenian Acropolis and how gendered interactions have been analysed in specifically religious public spaces in the classical world, with reference to iconography and methodologies for analysing the use and gendering of space and activity.

Much of classical archaeological research has been dominated by studies of the public sphere. Public structures where communities met and interacted are some of the most recognisable ancient archaeological features in the world – from the Colosseum in Rome to the sanctuaries at Delphi and, as discussed later, the Athenian Acropolis. These various arenas of public activity created a social landscape which can be analysed as a whole. Anschuetz, Wilshusen and Scheick analyse the existence of a paradigm for the study of landscapes in archaeology, identifying four premises that form the basis of this paradigm. They suggest that landscapes are synthetic culture structures; that they are transformed into meaningful places by activity, beliefs and values; that they are the platform for community activity and interaction; and that landscapes are dynamic, changing through different communities and generations. These scholars also assert that intersectional factors in social roles – such as gender, ethnicity and class - influence the negotiation and development of landscapes. Gender becomes a part of the study of landscapes archaeologically when landscapes are conceived in this manner, as a collection of structures which are given significance through action and interaction of social roles. Problematically, the public landscapes of the classical past are often conceived as male spaces, in relation to the previously discussed false dichotomy between male/public and female/private, an idea which is rooted in the ideals upheld in the ancient sources. Scholars have acknowledged that in the ancient world, despite the perception of this dichotomy, men were involved in household affairs, and women were very much involved in the public sphere as a result of their various roles in religion. Challenging this false dichotomy has been the major task of feminist and gender studies not only of landscapes and public spaces in the ancient world but also of households, with numerous publications challenging and providing evidence for the dismissal of this binary concept. In overcoming
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this, scholars have analysed public spaces for signs of female presence and furthermore considered how this dichotomy of space may have assisted in the creation of masculine civic identity. For studies of religious landscapes, as will be discussed in the subsequent section, iconography, votive dedications, inscriptions and other literary sources are used in approaches to gender and analysis of the use of space.

**Case Study: The Sacred Rock of the Athenian Acropolis, Athens**

The Athenian Acropolis is one of the most famous archaeological sites in the world. In 2013, John Papadopoulos stated “it seems that every generation has to discover the Athenian Acropolis for itself. Indeed, few areas of classical archaeology have received the sustained attention bestowed on the Athenian Acropolis”. A UNESCO World Heritage Site, the Acropolis has been the subject of heavy tourism and archaeological interest and controversy. Many of the archaeological remains of the Acropolis were constructed under the coordination of Pericles in the 5th century BCE, but the Acropolis itself has been occupied from the Neolithic period and continues to be developed and restored down to the present day. The Acropolis has been the subject of excavations, restoration projects and intense study from analyses of the buildings themselves to the dedications and associated inscriptions. In relation to gender, the Athenian Acropolis provides the opportunity to analyse not only the role of gender in religion and ritual, but also the presence of women in the public sphere, the construction of masculine citizen identity in Athens, how gender was expressed in dedications and who was permitted to dedicate votives at the many temples. The Athenian Acropolis is understood in archaeological discourse, and thus in the public eye, as an expression of empire through masculine iconography, with Greek masculinity triumphing over effeminate ‘others’. The inherently masculine nature of the Acropolis can be seen in what Hurwit identifies as two of its fundamental ideologies – patriarchy and autochthony, which excludes the important role of women in birth. It is the aim of this chapter to show that the Acropolis can be, and in some cases has been, studied through a different lens, one that emphasises its importance of this space not only for men but women and their religious roles. Rather than approaching this section as has been done the other case studies, by analysing studies diachronically and separately, This case study will instead be addressed by separately analysing archaeological approaches and interpretations to the structures
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themselves, beginning with the Parthenon and ending with the more peripheral sanctuaries. This is done out of necessity as, despite advances in paradigms for studies of landscapes in archaeology, the Acropolis has not often been considered as a landscape but rather as a series of disparate monuments.

Both mortal and divine women appear in statue form at the Acropolis. Before analysing archaeological approaches to the structures atop the Acropolis, I will begin by discussing the importance of a female deity as the patron of a masculine city and go on to discuss Keesling’s exceptional study of the votive offerings from the site. Athena was the patron of Athens, and it is her temples which stand most prominently atop the Acropolis. However, Athens was a city where masculinity defined citizenship and as previously mentioned the Acropolis has been viewed as a monument to the ideology of the patriarchy. Athena can be seen as a deity that subverted her gender, as a goddess whose realms of influence were almost exclusively related to the masculine sphere, and thus she was capable of being the Patron of Athens.  

Hurwit takes this further to argue that the representation of Athena’s birth from Zeus on the Parthenon pediment is intended to elevate the masculine to the exclusion of women. The primary temple of the Acropolis, the Parthenon, was probably the original home for the many statues found and subsequently studied. However, none were found in situ. Catherine Keesling’s study of the votive offerings from the Acropolis excellently displays how gender can be considered in studies of the classical past. Keesling analyses the kore statues and other dedications at the Acropolis in terms of what they symbolised, whom they were given by and whom they were intended to represent. Regarding female representation, Keesling determines that there were 13 women who dedicated statues on the Acropolis, which encompasses only 10% of the total, while of the fifth-century bronzes, women make up 35% of dedicators. These numbers show that however small, women held a presence on the Athenian Acropolis and were capable of dedicating gifts to the gods there, which can be analysed from an intersectional perspective, and her figures indicate that female dedications increased in the fourth century. In reference to whom the statues were intended to depict, Keesling asserts that they “cannot represent their dedicators”, stating this on the evidence of the statue bases which are mainly dedicated by men.
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analyses questions relating to gender in terms of who was dedicating and who the statue dedications were intended to represent, and in doing so she exemplifies how the archaeological evidence from the Acropolis can be used to form and address questions relating to gender and the presence of women in public spaces.

When discussing the Acropolis, the image that immediately comes to mind is that of the Parthenon. If the Athenian Acropolis is one of the most recognisable archaeological sites in the world, then it is the Parthenon that makes it iconic, standing as a publicly glorified ruin and a “martyr of Greek heritage”.¹⁸⁹ Many of the studies undertaken on the Parthenon have been concerned with iconography, focusing on the marble frieze, metopes and pediments, the identity of those depicted and their use as symbolism for Athenian identity. Questions relating to gender have filtered into many of the discussions surrounding the Parthenon and its iconography. The iconography of the Parthenon frieze was the subject of study as early as the eighteenth century, with the drawings and descriptions of Stuart and Revett, identifying the procession as representative of the Panathenaia festival on the basis of the presence of the woven Peplos in the arms of a child on the east frieze.¹⁹⁰ Gender has become prominent in the dialogue surrounding the friezes in relation to the identity of figures depicted. The child is shown holding what is arguably a peplos; the garment presented by young women to Athena at the Panathenaia and is interpreted by some scholars as male and others as female.¹⁹¹ Connelly has argued that the
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sex of the child is indeterminable through anatomical analysis. She further claims that owing to Greek discomfort to female nudity; the figure may be intentionally androgynous, potentially filling the female role of *arrephoros* but unable to be depicted as feminine due to the exposed buttock.  

This exposed buttock has been the subject of much scholarly debate, with John Younger indicating his interpretation as being that it was a mistake.  

Boardman sees the buttock, along with lines depicted on the neck of women in the frieze, as evidence for the child’s female identification, stating that the buttock is anatomically feminine.  

Connelly goes further to argue that, rather than demarking the scene as the Panathenaic procession, this image shows the frieze depicts mythology, with the youngest daughter of Erechtheus changing clothes for sacrifice.  

Harrison argues against much of Connelly’s interpretation of the frieze as mythological. She interprets the iconography as the representation of process in festival, as symbolic for the “greatness and continuity” of Athens, and with links to the changing definition of a citizen as those with both mother and father of Athenian descent. She supports this interpretation by referencing the presence of women as exemplary of their growing importance for citizenship.  

In relation to Athenian identity and social organisation, the Parthenon frieze has been interpreted by others as representing the order of society with individuals fulfilling their designated, ideological roles.
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The frieze is seen as representing the young male soldier as the citizen body of Athens, with the qualities of the citizen exalted through imagery. Osborne states the frieze “presents the very aristocratic image of Athenian democracy at its most elitist, where all citizens are not just soldiers but the quintessential soldier, the young man… a model of physical fitness”.197 This interpretation would be stronger had Osborne discussed what this meant for the gender relations and roles in Athenian society, and the use of public space to reinforce these ideals. If the citizens of Athens were to be defined by this soldier, then that is to the exclusion of not only women but children and the elderly and those who were not involved in the military. In subsequent volumes, Osbourne has gone on to discuss the Parthenon frieze as defining masculinity through “collaborative and community virtues”, in conflict with other representations of masculinity across the city.198 The frieze is not the only iconographic representation of women on the Parthenon. The Parthenon metopes depict women in a different role. Here they are the enemy of the Athenians, in the form of the Amazons. Some scholars have interpreted this as an allegory for the Persians, feminised to represent their negative qualities which were seen as comparable to feminine qualities and their antithesis to masculine Athenian ideals of “moral, social and political order”.199 On the Parthenon pediments, the birth of Athena is depicted and this has been interpreted by scholars as intended to symbolise Athena’s lack of femininity, elevating the masculine to the exclusion of women.200 Gender has become a prominent concern in the academic dialogue surrounding the iconography of the Parthenon. Questions have surrounded the importance of the presence of women and the roles they are depicted in, in the frieze as well as the metopes and pediments. However, there are many ways through which archaeologist’s interpretations could be bettered and extended, to discuss the significance of not only what was included, but what was excluded.

The Erechtheion is another of the many temple structures atop the Acropolis. Dedicated to Athena and Poseidon, the Erechtheion was constructed under the instruction of Pericles. The early debate, now outdated, surrounding the location of the Erechtheion displays discord between the literary sources and the archaeological remains, with ancient sources identifying features such as the infamous trident marks of Poseidon which are disputed in the
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archaeological record as potentially under the North Porch.\textsuperscript{201} Despite the possible representation of the Panathenaia on the Parthenon, it was the Erechtheion that was the central part of the procession, where the Palladion, the wooden statue of Athena, was housed and received the Peplos. Indeed the Erechtheion was of central importance to Athenian identity and history, housing many of the most important historical artefacts such as the trident strikes of Poseidon and the sacred Palladion.\textsuperscript{202} Gender has not been an explicit concern of studies of the Erechtheion, despite its importance in the Panathenaia. It is in a mere footnote that Nicole Loraux discusses the social and political significance of the Erechtheion, and even then it is only to state that these things were secondary to its primary function as a space of religious significance.\textsuperscript{203} Studies of the Erechtheion could include gender in consideration of its role in the landscape of the Acropolis itself and the obvious social and political connotations of iconography within the complex, and through considering the role of women in the Erechtheion during the Panathenaia.

The Sanctuary of Artemis Brauronia, also referred to as the Brauroneion, was a place of worship primarily for women that stood atop the Acropolis. The sanctuary has indications of a Mycenaean wall as well as three distinct phases, indicating continued importance throughout the history of the Acropolis, although little survives to modern day.\textsuperscript{204} As established by Cole, Artemis was not the primary deity on the Acropolis, and the Sanctuary of Artemis Brauronia atop the Acropolis held the chief purpose of displaying inventories of gifts given to her at the sanctuary in Brauron.\textsuperscript{205} However, the Sanctuary of Artemis Brauronia was located near the Propylaia, the gates of the Acropolis, and is the only sanctuary atop the Acropolis without connection to Athena, indicating Artemis’ importance to the Athenians. The gifts listed in the inventory of the Sanctuary of Artemis Brauronia are identified as gifts given by women, such as bear figurines, and this fact places the sanctuary as an important place for the women of Athens.\textsuperscript{206} Despite the importance of the cult of Artemis Brauronia for young women, scholars have interpreted the sanctuary on the Acropolis as reinforcing masculinity and civic values, with the Artemis invoked at the sanctuary being Artemis of initiation, politics and war.\textsuperscript{207} In Keesling’s study of the votive
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finds at the Acropolis, she discusses the identification of the Peplos Kore as Artemis. She argues if the kore was intended to represent Artemis, then this presents interesting connotations for dedications to Artemis at the time. However it does not, therefore, mean that it was dedicated at the Sanctuary of Artemis Brauronia. Keesling identifies the Peplos Kore as dated ca. 55-530 BCE, with the earliest ceramic evidence from the Sanctuary being from the end of the 6th century BCE. Thus the statue outdates all other evidence from the Sanctuary and is instead interpreted as dedicated at the Parthenon, representing a ‘visiting god’ to Athena. The Sanctuary of Artemis Brauronia on the Acropolis is the subject of few studies, as the Sanctuary at Brauron is far more impressive and the sanctuary on the Acropolis is barely existent to modern scholars. However, its inclusion in archaeological discussions of activity on the Acropolis as a landscape is important, as it represents a cult fundamental to the development of young women, specifically aristocratic girls. Furthermore, given the wider context of the Acropolis and its imagery and connotations, the existence of a sanctuary to Artemis is worthy of consideration given her role in female worship and what she is intended to represent in this context. Here, a female deity connected with the rites of young girls is used to exalt civic male values, and thus it is worthy of archaeological consideration despite the poor preservation.

The Acropolis is a vast and complex landscape of sanctuaries, temples, and sacred spaces dedicated to different divinities serving different functions. However, few of the structures survive to modern day in a state that allows for intensive analysis and association of artefactual evidence. There are many other sanctuaries and precincts that held significance within the Acropolis complex; however, their low level of preservation have complicated archaeological analysis, despite the efforts of conservation projects. Thus, in studies of these structures, scholars become reliant on literary evidence with little opportunity to cross-reference it with archaeology. The Aglaureion and the Pandroseion, for example, were two structures dedicated to the daughters of Cecrops who were said to have been entrusted with the care of Erichthonios. These structures held important roles within the ritual landscape of Athens and the Acropolis. The Aglaureion, dedicated to the daughter Aglaurus who opened the box containing Erichthonios, functioned as a place for ephebes to pledge their allegiance to Athens, and to the preservation of her shrines and precincts, and was located at the base of

Keesling 2008, 139.
the Acropolis wall near the Erechtheion. The Pandroseion is more complex, with its function probably being as the place of a mystery cult. The Pandroseion was dedicated to Pandrossos and was located inside the precinct of the Erechtheion. The priestess of Athena Polias oversaw the performance of mystery rites, the most important of which are identified as the Arrephoria, which was directly related to the young women who transported sacred items. The Hersephoria, a fertility ceremony, was also indicated to have taken place at the Pandroseion. The occurrence of these predominantly female rites and ceremonies in the Pandroseion have the potential to inform on the importance of female ritual atop the Acropolis, although the secrecy surrounding exclusively female rites is also informative. Conversely, the androcentric rites undertaken at the Aglaureion, and their less secretive nature, demonstrate masculine values and the role of protection in Athenian male identity. Another religious space within the Acropolis complex is the Eleusinion, located on the north-west slope. This space was connected with the worship of Demeter and Kore (Persephone) and once again held importance for the ephebes, which were responsible for the transportation of the hiera to the sanctuary at the beginning of the Eleusinian Mysteries. The Eleusinion is yet another of the structures on the Acropolis that has fallen into disrepair and subsequently received minimal archaeological attention. A further temple to Athena, this time to Athena Nike, also sits atop the Acropolis. It celebrated Athena of Victory and reportedly housed a statue that held a helmet in one hand and a pomegranate, a symbol of the dead, in the other. The temple was completely dismantled during the 17th century and thus what is left to present audiences is reconstructions carried out with the remaining parts. The Temple of Athena Nike is an important component of the Acropolis landscape, and in considerations of gender can be viewed for what it symbolises for Athena, here representing war and victory, as the patron of the city. Furthermore, this was a temple representing the victory of the city that was run by a priestess who, according to literary evidence, was elected by lot by Athenian women, thus emphasising the importance of women in religious decisions. The many structures on the Acropolis combined to create the rich and diverse landscape of religion in ancient Athens. This sacred space housed numerous different cults with specific focuses and rituals aligned with various identities. Special rites at the
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Aglaureion and Eleusinion for Ephebes provide evidence for the importance of these spaces to young, emerging citizen men. However, the fundamentally important rites performed by women at the Pandroseion emphasise the importance not only of the sanctuaries on the Acropolis to young women but also of young women to the city and attests to their presence in the public sphere. It is important that all of these structures be viewed as a landscape and analysed as a whole to generate deeper understanding as to how gender was expressed within the Acropolis complex.

According to Aristotle’s public/private dichotomy, women were relegated to the private sphere, with public space dominated by men. However, as acknowledged previously, women arguably held critical roles in ritual which required their presence and activity in the public arena of Athens. Evidence is abundant for the role of women in public ritual, from text to artefacts. Connelly cites a fragment of a red-figure krater found on the Acropolis depicting female worshippers in a leadership role – and goes on to suggest this could reflect the reality of ritual atop the Acropolis. The festival of the Panathenaia was the most important festival in Athens, celebrating Athena, and appears in iconography often, even arguably on the frieze of the Parthenon itself. In this significant festival the main event was the gifting of the peplos to Athena, and what is most important about this is the role of women in the procession and preparation of the peplos. The Peplos took nine months to weave, with only women permitted to be involved and the weaving overseen by the priestess of Athena and the arrephoroi. During the procession, young women took the role of kanephoros, basket-bearers, and were at the front of the procession. However, all of this is not without controversy. Jennifer Neils argues against the view of women as prominent in religious activity in Athens and suggests they did not have much of a public role in ritual. Neils states women in Athens “had little if any presence at the major state-sponsored religious festivals”. Neils goes on to argue that traditional roles for women in ritual were not public roles, but roles connected with the domestic sphere, and that the rituals where they were prominent were secret, private and exclusively female – such as the mysteries at the Sanctuary of Artemis Brauronia or the Eleusinian Mysteries. This interpretation of women in ritual as largely excluded from major festivals and relegated to secretive worship is at odds
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with many other scholars, and her understanding of the female role in the Panathenaia relies heavily on the contested identification of the frieze on the Parthenon as the Panathenaia. Neils analyses iconographic evidence to conclude that rituals involving women were, to a large extent, secretive and private thus arguing that they do not represent female importance in public ritual at all, but rather an outlet for women in a fundamentally patriarchal society, where they were given time alone in secretive locations and were temporarily abstaining from their normative gender roles. Neils argument is based on sound iconographic evidence, but her lack of detailed references, for example where she mentions “newer studies suggest that professional male weaves actually produced [the Peplos]”, make her work difficult to analyse and critique.

As is evident from this discussion, the role of women in ritual is heavily debated in classical archaeology, with various textual and artefactual remains cited as evidence to support claims. This is fundamentally important, displaying that gender in archaeology has come to a point where assertions of female presence critical to early studies can be criticised and debated against, creating dialogue.

As has been discussed in this case study, studies of the Acropolis landscape and its structures have focused on what can be inferred about masculine Athenian identity rather than gendered roles and interactions in ritual space. This is not for lack of evidence, but the result of selective inclusion and interest and poor preservation of much of the landscape. Predominantly female deities were worshipped atop the Acropolis, with Athena as the patron of the city and the presence of other goddesses such as Artemis and Demeter, and in the rites of these goddesses’ women played important roles. However, these deities and their homes in the sanctuaries of the Acropolis were used to emphasise masculine civic values – the Parthenon frieze and its symbolism for the soldier, and the Sanctuary of Artemis Brauronia and its emphasis on war and politics. While gender has been approached in studies of the structures on the Acropolis, these studies have not been exhaustive and are impeded by the preservation of evidence. Studies of the Acropolis landscape from a gendered point of view should go on to further engage with the idea of the Acropolis as a fundamentally important enforcer of Athenian civic identity and also with the opportunity present to challenge the false dichotomy of the gendering of space in the ancient world. More comprehensive studies of the many roles of women in the rituals conducted atop the Acropolis – and how they differed on the basis of wealth, status and age – would benefit understandings of gender
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relations in the ancient world, the gendered use of space, and the spatial organisation of ritual landscapes.
Chapter 6
Discussion

The goal of this thesis has been to analyse classical archaeological approaches to gender in the spheres of funerary, settlement and public space. In doing so, I have given an overview of approaches in the discipline in general and then narrowed in on classical archaeology and the three given case study sites. In this chapter, I will discuss how the discipline in general correlates or differs with classical archaeology, with a discussion on how archaeology can improve and advance to better consider gender and related social factors in the future, and then move to a discussion of the limitations of this thesis.

In funerary archaeology, issues relating to gender have become a prominent concern across the discipline. Sex determination is a basic step in skeletal analysis, and the gendering of material artefacts is common practice in the analysis of mortuary contexts, although this draws valid criticism. While the distinction between sex and gender was not immediately adopted into archaeological research, in the discipline as a whole this is a concept which has come to be central to gendered analysis. For example, studies of Native American societies and their non-binary gender systems illustrate the growing trend of recognising gender as distinct to sex and as a varied construct that shapes and is shaped by social concerns, and this recognition has had positive results for understanding of the complexities of Native American cultures. However, there remains an apparent cognitive dissonance in classical archaeology in relation to the definition of gender – where gender is recognised as a distinct category to sex on an academic theoretical level, but this fails to permeate through to actual studies. There remains an assumption in classical archaeology that all individuals identified in funerary contexts were cis, with sex and gender treated as universally correlating. This is evidenced in Prohászka’s study of the Pantanello grave goods and her indiscriminate use of terminology along with the failure to consider interpretations that presented the complexities of sex and gender. Despite this fundamental issue, the work conducted at Pantanello demonstrates the application of gender theory to funerary archaeology and how it can contribute to interpretations. Carter’s team considered questions of gender and sex in relation to sex determination, artefact correlation and grave distribution. The inclusion of gender into inquiry allowed the researchers to develop a better understanding of the structure of the
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Necropolis, which can then be extrapolated to the living population, and challenge assumptions about gendered items. At other South Italian funerary sites studies of gender have been further improved through consideration of intersectional factors, for example in Scopacasa’s study of Samnite grave sites. The model provided by Scopacasa study, through which the construction of a two-gender system is challenged and other factors that influence funerary systems such as age and status are considered alongside gender, is one which classical archaeology should embrace in future funerary studies to provide a more holistic view of social structure. Classical archaeology in the realm of funerary analysis and gender is still somewhat lagging behind the rest of the discipline, with studies needing to better incorporate the concept of gender as a social construct into their studies and query more into the subject of gender identity in antiquity, challenging the prevalent cisnormative assumptions.

Studies of settlement spaces in archaeology have also developed across the discipline. Here classical archaeology has been fundamentally important, with classical archaeologists such as Lisa Nevett and Lin Foxhall contributing to the development of ideas and paradigms of analysis. Studies of gender in settlement archaeology have developed from the ‘women-at-home’ model to the analysis of the house as paramount to social interaction. Settlement archaeology in the classical world engages with the rest of the discipline through reliance on the methodologies of household archaeologists. Furthermore, the use of ethnographic parallels by Nevett at Olynthus exemplifies how approaches from other areas of archaeological inquiry, ethnoarchaeology, can be employed in studies of the ancient world. At Olynthus, gender has become intrinsic to research undertaken, particularly concerning the question of social organisation within households and the gendering of space. While Robinson’s initial study intended to identify public spaces, the wealth of domestic evidence shifted the aims and, although reliant on literary evidence; he did analyse gender on a basic level, considering the lack of evidence for a gynaikonitis as illustrating a distinction between city and country life. Further reanalysis of Robinson’s work by Nevett and Cahill has better engaged with gendered inquiry, particularly in the case of Nevett who analyses Olynthus from an intersectional perspective, suggesting space should be seen as segregated
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not primarily on gender premises but on the basis of family members and non-family members.\textsuperscript{229} The re-excavation at Olynthus will see the gendering of space as a primary research question, and this displays how archaeology of domestic areas has changed. Studies at Olynthus have progressed to the point where gender and other social factors are a primary concern of the researchers, and this is the direction in which all studies of settlement spaces should be moving. Classical archaeologists analysing the gendering of space are increasingly accepting that space was used variably and that architectural features are not the only means of analysis, with artefact distribution influencing interpretations of the use of space, while also challenging literary evidence. Going forward, studies of domestic space in classical antiquity must be increasingly critical of assumptions about the use of space, particularly those based on literary evidence, and readdress the problems with earlier research, as Nevett et al. are doing in the re-excavation of Olynthus.

The perceived dichotomy of space that has pervaded interpretations of public space in archaeology is inherent to classical archaeology, developed from the basis of classical literary evidence. The androcentric bias of the literary evidence is not a problem exclusive to classical archaeology and has influenced other spheres, which suggests a need for archaeologists studying literate societies to be less dependent on literary evidence in their analyses.\textsuperscript{230} While paradigms for the study of public spaces and the inclusion of gendered issues have been provided in other sub-disciplines of archaeology – such as that utilised by Anschuetz, Wilshusen and Scheick – these have not been entirely integrated into classical research, and this is heavily problematic.\textsuperscript{231} Analysing public space from a gendered perspective cannot be done without the use of methodologies that emphasise the importance of an intersectional approach. In classical archaeology, public spaces are still very much viewed in light of this supposed dichotomy between male/public and female/private and not analysed to their full potential for the understanding of gender on an intersectional level, which has the power to show that access to public space was mitigated through a variety of social factors. The Acropolis was used as the example for this section and illustrates how religious landscapes are viewed from a perspective of male dominance and identity, with ignorance toward the important roles of women in these landscapes. While studies such as Keesling’s analysis of votives offerings have asserted the presence of women, others such as

\textsuperscript{229} Nevett 1999, 72.
\textsuperscript{230} Meyers 2003, 187.
\textsuperscript{231} Anschuetz et al. 2001, 160-1.
Neils have argued against the notion of public female importance in ritual, exemplifying the presence of discourse on the matter of gender in public space archaeology. For future studies of public space in classical archaeology, the primary objective should be not only to utilise methodologies that provide the opportunity to analyse gender to the exclusion of literary evidence but furthermore to change both public and academic perception of spaces such as the Acropolis.

The scope of this study was intentionally limited to focus mostly on classical archaeology and the areas of funerary, settlement and public space. In doing so, the focus was further narrowed to the case study sites of Pantanello, Olynthus and the Athenian Acropolis. However, it is fundamental that it be acknowledged that the parameters of this study excluded important aspects of gendered analysis in the discipline in general and classical archaeology specifically. Iconography is an important area of archaeological inquiry, particularly for classical archaeologists, and it is an area in which gender has very much come to the forefront with studies analysing women and challenging the interpretation that iconography reflected reality. In my focus on the Athenian Acropolis, I further narrowed my public space section to exclusively religious space and would also like to acknowledge that other public spaces, such as those for commerce or socialisation, should be analysed from gendered perspectives to create a more in-depth understanding of the gendering of landscapes. The importance and use of gender in archaeology in general, or even classical archaeology specifically, is a massive topic and one that would be worthwhile to continue to research in future years.

Gender has been a part of archaeological discourse for almost 50 years now, and yet classical archaeology still fails in many ways to embrace it to the same extent as the rest of the discipline. In general, all studies of the archaeology of the classical world need to be more inclusive of gender and move from early feminist archaeological goals of simply identifying the presence of women to engage with modern theories such as intersectionality. Gender in archaeology has reached a point where it is considered a valuable area of inquiry to most scholars, with multiple volumes on gender and women in antiquity being published. It must now move to be increasingly self-reflexive, with consideration of how individuals interacted.

233 For example Lewis 2002.
in their societies on the basis of the multiple factors that constructed individual’s social identity and positioning.\textsuperscript{234} The importance of well-informed, gender-based analysis can be seen in the power it has to change interpretations – from Holliman’s study of third and fourth gender categories in Native America to Nevett’s reanalysis of segregated space in Olynthus, these studies have addressed gendered questions and the results have been to re-evaluate prior assertions about behaviour or social structure.\textsuperscript{235} This thesis was aimed at encouraging the classical archaeological discipline to continue to improve its engagement with modern gender and gender theories prevalent in other realms of archaeology.

\textsuperscript{235} Holliman 2006; Nevett 1999.
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