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Abstract

In this paper I argue that comparing views derived from texts and material culture highlights the conscious manipulation of both media by their creators in order to communicate specific messages. I suggest that an awareness of this kind of manipulation has a vital role to play in the interpretation not only of textual sources (as is often recognized), but also of archaeological ones (which is more rarely acknowledged). To demonstrate this point I focus on the debate concerning the roles of women in Classical Athens. With the support of a theoretical framework established by Amos Rapoport and elaborated by Richard Blanton, I argue that Athenian domestic architecture was deliberately designed to convey messages about the gender roles and social status of a house's residents. I suggest that such an interpretation is in keeping with previous studies of sacred and civic architecture in Classical Athens, which have demonstrated that the builders and users of such structures were aware of the communicative potential of architectural space.

Introduction

The title of my paper is taken from a famous passage from the fifth-century-B.C.E. Athenian general Perikles' funeral speech, as related by the historian Thucydides (History of the Peloponnesian War 2.45). This view that the most virtuous women should remain invisible in the civic sphere, which I refer to as the "rhetoric of seclusion," forms part of a wider perspective on women's roles that can be seen across a variety of Athenian literary genres from the late fifth century B.C.E. to the
early fourth century B.C.E. For example, in Euripides' tragic play *Trojan Women*, Andromache laments that a woman's reputation suffers if she sets foot outside (*Trojan Women* 647–49), while the speaker in Lysias's legal speech *Against Simon* claims that the women in his household have led such sheltered lives that they are embarrassed to appear before the men of their own family (*Against Simon* 6). This rhetoric is, of course, reinforced by philosophical ideas about natural differences between men and women. In the Aristotelian *Oikonomika*, for example, man's active, outdoor character is contrasted with woman's passive, indoor one (*Oikonomika* 1343b–44a).

Representations of women in other Athenian cultural products also appear to construct norms for female behavior and have frequently been cited as supporting a rhetoric of seclusion. For example, on Archaic and early Classical painted pottery, where a setting is implied at all, women tend to be associated with interior space in contrast to the exterior space in which men are often depicted (Lissarrague 1995: 93; Lewis 2002: 137). In their interior settings, women are shown performing a variety of activities including domestic tasks such as weaving and childcare, as well as attending to their appearance by washing, looking in a mirror, or selecting jewelry from a casket. All these scenes may have been carefully constructed and aspirational, rather than offering straightforward reflections of the lives of those who bought and used the vessels on which the images were painted (Lewis 2002: 138). Although pottery styles changed around 440 B.C.E. to encompass a wider range of imagery, funerary stelai such as those from the Kerameikos began to offer idealized images of women, also representing them in apparently domestic settings, perhaps seated on a chair or with a casket. These images, too, have been interpreted as paradigmatic, alluding to women's role as one of "domestic seclusion" in contrast to the military responsibilities assumed by men (e.g., Leader 1997: esp. 683–93).

Some scholars have taken such evidence literally, viewing the wives of Athenian citizens as having been closeted in their homes, coming out only to fulfill religious obligations and not playing an otherwise significant role in the civic life of the polis (citizen-state) (e.g., Goff 2004: 25). Others, however, have noted that underlying this ideal of female seclusion there is actually a much more complex set of ideas and assumptions about male and female roles. Evidence from oratory, for instance, suggests the possibility that juries may have been persuaded by stories about women who played active roles outside the domestic sphere, working to support their families and even engineering their own social advancement (e.g., Pseudo-Demosthenes' Neaira, in *Orations* 59). Similarly, the philosopher Aristotle
asks how a state official could prevent the wives of the poor from going outside (Politics 1300a). Furthermore, women seem to have performed significant roles as priestesses in civic cult (e.g., Connelly 2007). With respect to painted pottery there has been much discussion of whether the depictions of men and women bear any relationship to their actual patterns of daily activity, and if so, what the nature of that relationship might be (e.g., Ferrari 2002b; Lewis 2002: 1–12). Certainly, alongside the types of domestic scenes mentioned above, there are others dating to the late sixth and fifth centuries B.C.E. that seem to show women playing active roles outside the domestic context, at the fountain house or graveside, for example (respectively, Kosso and Lawton 2009 and Oakley 2004).

The contradictory view presented by these sources is sometimes explained by attributing the seclusion model to a minority of elite households that had the resources to maintain different mores from the rest of the Athenian population (e.g., Brock 1994: 346; Blundell 1995: 138). I myself have proposed that the idea of seclusion was an idealistic rhetoric articulated in opposition to the patterns of daily activity of citizen households, and that the duties of citizens’ wives actually required them to be active both within and beyond the boundaries of the city, taking part in a variety of activities (Nevett 2011). What I would like to explore here is how this argument might intersect with the archaeological evidence for residential neighborhoods and households. In particular I consider what this case study can contribute to the broader question of how domestic architecture should be addressed so that it can contribute significantly to our understanding of ancient society.

In the larger houses of Classical date, both in Athens and in the Greek world more generally, the architecture and organization of space appear to present somewhat contradictory messages about the rhetoric of seclusion. Physical and visual access to the house was normally limited to a single entrance that was often screened from the street, dividing the occupants of the interior from the world outside (fig. 1). Inside, however, the courtyard played an essential role as a communication route (Nevett 1995; 1994; 1999: esp. 88–91; in prep., chap. 3). A few houses from the fifth century B.C.E. onwards incorporated a square room with an off-center doorway, a plaster or mosaic floor with a raised border, colored plaster walls, and occasionally an anteroom. This has been interpreted as an andron, a room mentioned in a variety of Athenian texts and apparently depicted in numerous scenes on Attic painted pottery. This space seems to have been associated with the symposium, the male drinking party. Nevertheless, rather than being separated from the rest of the house as the seclusion model might imply, the andron is usually integrated among the other rooms of the house and entered from the courtyard,
just as they are. What I would like to explore here is how such a pattern might
be explained. I argue that in Classical Athens the built environment operated as
a means of communication: just like texts, domestic architecture was subject to
manipulation in order to carry messages. I suggest that by exploring some of the
mechanisms by which that manipulation took place and by contextualizing the
issue of seclusion as an element of a wider communication network, we can gain a
better understanding of these contradictions.

Fig. 1 – Plan of Houses C and D from the Athenian Agora (after Nevett 1999, fig. 19).

Manipulation of the Built Environment in Classical Athens: An
Analytical Framework

The idea of manipulating the built environment is not a new one: researchers in
various disciplines have noted different ways in which buildings can convey a
wealth of messages using a range of techniques and with varying subtlety. Here
I wish to build, in particular, on a framework developed by Amos Rapoport as
part of his non-verbal communication approach, which suggests, in general terms,
some of the different kinds of messages that can be conveyed and some of the ways
in which this can be done (Rapoport 1988).

To paraphrase briefly, Rapoport distinguishes three levels of meaning: first, at the
"high level," ideas relating, for example, to religion and philosophy; second, at the
"middle level," ideas such as those relating to status, identity, and wealth; finally, at
the "low level," instrumental meanings such as cues that enable individuals to adjust
their behavior to fit in with the cultural expectations for a particular location. Rapoport
suggests that while high- and middle-level meanings may be present to varying
extents in different contexts, the lowest level is a constant in any situation in which
the number of people using a space is large enough for social rules to be necessary.
An important aspect of his work is that there is a degree of redundancy such that
meaning is conveyed by multiple different physical features, in order to ensure that
the meaning is received and understood by the intended audience. A second important
element is the agency of the individual viewer, who interprets the visual cues encoded
into the built environment through the lens of his or her own identity and experiences,
so that different people may respond in different ways to the same cues.

To what extent might it be justifiable to apply this framework to interpreting the
archaeological evidence from Classical Athens? How useful might it be and what
might it reveal? Although his ideas are developed from observations of modern
Western culture, Rapoport argues strongly for their applicability in other contexts,
particularly past societies studied through archaeological evidence. He refers to the
work of several archaeologists, including Lewis Binford, Kent Flannery, Ian Hodder,
Andrew Fleming, and Colin Renfrew. Although these scholars were working in
prehistoric contexts, I think Rapoport's ideas also provide a helpful framework for
exploring possible modes of communication through the built environment of other
past societies. As Rapoport himself says, his categories represent a heuristic device
describing points on a spectrum rather than discrete facets of the built environment, but
his distinctions are useful in revealing how, just like texts, the built environment can
articulate a variety of different kinds of meaning. Furthermore, if there is redundancy
in the use of physical cues, this improves the chances that specific meanings may
survive among the features that are archaeologically recoverable. One implication
of this, I would suggest, is that if a range of meanings can be encoded into the
architectural features of a single building, and if the messages and the cues carrying
them cannot be entirely separated, then the building might encode meanings that are
in conflict with each other, ultimately giving mixed messages. I argue below that, in
the context of the organization of residential neighborhoods and the architecture of
individual houses in Classical Athens, this is indeed the case.
Readings have been offered of civic buildings in Athens, such as those on the Akropolis (sanctuary to the city's patron goddess, Athena) and in the Agora (civic center), that view them as communicating along the lines outlined by Rapoport. Most prominent have been discussions of their "high-level" or ideological significance. On the Akropolis, for example, the treatment of the sanctuary of Athena following the Persian sack has been regarded as articulating the reaction of Athens to those events, most obviously through the decision to leave the sacred monuments unreconstructed for a generation. Another particularly striking example of this is the prominent use of column drums and frieze blocks from the Archaic temple that was under construction at the time of the sack as elements in the fortification walls on the north side, where they served as a memorial to the Persian atrocities (e.g., Rhodes 1995: 32). Jeffrey Hurwit also points out the self-conscious symbolism involved in the construction, in the mid fifth century B.C.E., of the monumental statue of Athena Promakhos, which presided over the ruins of the Archaic sanctuary but was turned to face the island of Salamis, scene of the ultimate rout of the Persians by the Athenian fleet. Others have shown how, when viewed from the interior looking out, the Propylaia (monumental gateway) of the newly rebuilt sanctuary framed the city of Piraeus in the distance, perhaps alluding to the continued importance of the Athenian fleet and its control of overseas territories (indeed this is the only experiential aspect of the Akropolis commented on by Pausanias in his discussion of the monuments on the Akropolis: Description of Greece 1.22.5; Martin-McAuliffe and Papadopoulos 2012). One could add to these examples the kinds of ideological readings that have been made of the decorative programs of the individual structures that were part of the Periklean reconstruction. For example, the procession sculpted on the Ionic frieze of the Parthenon (temple of Athena Parthenos) appears to unite and display the different categories of individuals resident in the city (Graf 1996: 58).

Rapoport's emphasis on the importance of the viewer's individual perspective suggests, in relation to the Akropolis, that not all users and perhaps not even all those involved in building the Periklean structures would necessarily have been equally attuned to the potential ideological content of the monuments and of their spatial organization. At the lower end of the range of meaning, however, he suggests there is a tendency for individuals to conform to the patterns of behavior suggested by architectural cues. In the context of the Classical Akropolis, this might imply that in general the users of the space could pick up and interpret practical guidance about the proper ways to behave in and around the sanctuary. Rapoport's framework implies that the most important cues would be features such as visual
and physical access to different spaces, as well as gradients of penetration. Other potentially important elements would include architectural features that advertised the character and role of individual buildings. Today, these offer some indications of how the built environment of the sanctuary shaped the responses of visitors as they approached. While the main structures of the Akropolis were distinguishable when viewed from a distance, as visitors grew close their view would have been progressively restricted by the monumental facade of the Propylaia, the culmination of the single route into the sanctuary (fig. 2). This gateway must have played a key role, marking the entrance to the sacred temenos and the transition between exterior and interior. Its monumental scale and use of the sacred architectural vocabulary, the architectural orders, emphasized the importance of that transition. The effect of the doorways would have been to control views of the interior, revealing the sanctuary progressively as the visitor approached. The orientation of the Propylaia on axis with the temple of Athena Parthenos itself, along with the similarities in their proportions, must have suggested a relationship between the two buildings (Camp 1989: 89; Hurwit 2004: 156).

Once they were inside the sacred enclosure, the passage of visitors must have been channeled not only by the major structures but also by the smaller monuments.
Discussing this experience in detail is beyond the scope of this paper, but such channeling is visible even in the location and orientation of major buildings. For example, the position and orientation of the Parthenon (and indeed of its incomplete predecessor) would have required anyone approaching the facade and altar at its east end to pass through a relatively narrow space on the north side of the temple.\footnote{It would have been especially narrow if the Old Temple of Athena was still standing at this time, a question that has been debated (see Ferrari 2002a).} The visual effect of the sculptural program of the Parthenon itself may also have encouraged visitors to move onwards to the east facade (Osborne 2000: 238–43).

The intense manipulation of the viewer through the architecture and organization of the Sanctuary of Athena is highlighted by contrast with the other cult sites on the north slope of the Akropolis, which visitors would have seen as they passed along the Sacred Way towards the Propylaia. Here sanctuaries such as that dedicated to Eros and Aphrodite consisted of natural caves and shelters in the rock of the Akropolis itself, embellished with small niches cut for worshippers to leave votives and commemorative plaques (Robertson 2005: 59–68).

The Sanctuary of Athena also contrasts markedly with a second space, the Agora. Here again, aspects of the architecture and spatial organization have previously been identified as communicating information corresponding to the lowest of Rapoport’s levels of meaning, providing a subtle pattern of visual cues suited to a wide variety of different users and activities. From an instrumental perspective there are a number of ways into and out of the central area. Wide streets, particularly the Panathenaic Way, catered to large volumes of traffic and also offered visual access to major buildings and monuments. By around 500 B.C.E. there seems to have been a clear conceptual boundary between the interior and exterior of the Agora. In contrast to the monumental Propylaia of the Sanctuary of Athena (and its Archaic predecessor), however, that boundary was relatively inconspicuous, apparently demarcated only with stone horoi (boundary markers; see, e.g., Thompson and Wycherley 1972: 117–19).

The wide variety of activities attested in and around the Agora suggests that it was frequented by a range of individuals: Utilitarian structures such as fountain houses were set alongside civic and religious buildings, such as the Bouleuterion (council house), altars, and temples. Commerce presumably took place at temporary stalls erected in the open space of the square, and craft production is certainly attested in workshops in the surrounding area (see, e.g., Tsakirgis 2005 with earlier references). Kostas Vlassopoulos refers to the Agora as a "free space,"
suggesting that individuals of different statuses would have mingled here, perhaps including women and slaves, who might have been involved in commerce and in fetching water, as well as citizens participating in formal aspects of the political process (Vlassopoulos 2007; cf. Millett 1998: 215). Sara Forsdyke has stressed the importance of such informal interactions in the social and political life of the city (Forsdyke 2008).

The larger individual buildings surrounding the Agora seem to have communicated a variety of high- and mid-level messages concerning the nature of Athens as a political community: for example, the Old Bouleuterion, constructed around 500 B.C.E., is the earliest-known non-sacred building to use the architectural orders. As well as making the building stand out, their use on this and its successor must have expressed the significance of the boule (council) housed within and of its activities, inviting comparison with sacred temples (cf. Paga 2017: 198). In the same way, the mingling of temples and shrines with the Bouleuterion and other structures associated with the workings of government must have highlighted the complex relationship between the different religious and civic institutions. While perhaps lacking the artfully constructed viewsheds and overtly symbolic iconography of the structures on the Akropolis, the Agora still speaks to an awareness and manipulation of appearance and form to carry explicit messages to the individuals visiting and using it.

In these two major urban spaces, the Akropolis and the Agora, one can see a range of the types of meaning encompassed by Rapoport's model. Alongside the kinds of high-level readings proposed in the past, the model throws attention onto the sorts of lower-level cues that have previously tended to escape consideration. I have not tried to represent any of these kinds of messages fully; rather, I have offered examples that I think demonstrate the validity and usefulness of Rapoport's framework as a way to understand the built environment of Classical Athens. Finally, if further support is needed for the claim that at least some Athenians inferred meaning from the built environment in this way, we can look to the Classical historian Thucydides: in his History of the Peloponnesian War (1.10.2), he comments that future generations might estimate Athens to have been twice as powerful as it really was, based on the physical appearance of the city.

The Built Environment and Gender Roles in Classical Athens

Having tested Rapoport’s model on the Athenian urban environment in the civic sphere, I return to the issue of gender roles highlighted in my introduction, focusing
particularly on how these seem to be expressed through the medium of residential space. In the context of the domestic environment Rapoport's work has been picked up and developed by others, notably Richard Blanton (1994). Blanton highlights the symbolic use of domestic architecture and spatial organization, again based on ethnographic data. In particular, he contrasts the messages conveyed by the front areas of the house, which are aimed at outsiders, with those expressed by the interior areas, which reinforce the values of the inhabitants (his distinction between "indexical" and "canonical" communication, respectively: Blanton 1994: 8–13). Blanton suggests that although the two types of communication cannot in practice be separated completely, the facade and front space generally convey information about the status of the household, while the pattern of organization of the interior tends to express something more enduring—the social mores of the inhabitants. Blanton's work suggests that not only can architecture be manipulated to carry complex social messages, as Rapoport showed, but also that this process applies to houses as well as to communal buildings, and that different aspects of the structure may communicate information about different dimensions of the resident household. How might this perspective inform our understanding of the houses of Classical Athens?

Blanton's category of indexical communication draws attention to how individual houses appeared from the street, and in particular, to their facades, an aspect that is not usually considered in relation to Classical Greek houses (for an exception, see Nevett 2009). The most extensively investigated residential area of Classical Athens forms part of the ancient demes of Melite and Koile, running from the area southwest of the Akropolis, out towards Piraeus. These were planned and to some extent excavated in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries by Émile Burnouf, Walter Judeich and others (Burnouf 1878; Judeich 1931). Those early studies suggest that different districts may have had separate characters, having been laid out to fit the contours of the steep slopes on which they lay. On the west side of the Areopagos Burnouf notes a wide street with a lower level for carts and a higher one for pedestrians. In the Koile Valley, individual properties located away from the main routes like the Koile road were often accessed via narrow flights of steps. While these neighborhoods presumably took their form in part from the local topography, the narrowness of many of the access routes implies that only local traffic was being invited. Thus the theoretically "civic" or "public" thoroughfares of these neighborhoods are likely, in practice, to have been frequented mainly by those with business in the immediate vicinity, namely, residents and their friends and families. The neighborhood thus seems to have formed an organically defined, readily discernable intermediate level on a scale between the individual house and the city as a whole, both spatially and
socially. On the back streets, neighbors may have been the primary recipients of any messages carried by house facades. This is in contrast to the orthogonally planned residential areas of many other Classical cities (such as Olynthos and Halieis), which are frequently laid out in a much more open fashion with less differentiation between main avenues and side streets. In these Athenian neighborhoods the leveling of the rock, together with a variety of cuttings, indicates where buildings once stood and even reveals the original locations of wooden crossbeams, but it is unfortunately no longer possible to gain information either about the appearance of the individual house facades or about the overall organization of space in the interior.

More detailed information about the potential for both indexical and canonical communication comes from excavated houses on flatter ground adjacent to some of the more major thoroughfares of the city. Most extensively investigated is the area south of the Agora, where the valley between the Areopagos and the Pnyx hosted a street with a variety of houses and other buildings facing onto it. Like the superstructures of most ancient Greek dwellings, the upper parts of the walls must have been made of unfired mud-brick and had typically disappeared long before excavation took place, leaving only stone socles to indicate the arrangement of the rooms. Nonetheless it is still clear in a few cases that the facade offered passersby information about the occupants. The most striking example is the so-called House of the Roman Mosaic, originally constructed in the fourth or third century B.C.E. (Thompson 1966: 53 with pl. 18). Although most of the house is unfortunately poorly preserved, a decorated andron is identifiable by its off-center door and tessellated mosaic floor. This mosaic was installed in the Roman period (hence the modern name for the house), but it seems to have replaced an earlier one that would have been original to the building. The andron was placed in a prominent location at the corner of the house, with two exterior walls abutting intersecting streets. Unlike the other surviving socles, those of the andron were marked by massive orthostates of Akropolis limestone, which must have attracted the attention of passersby, advertising the room's presence. From this cue an acculturated viewer would presumably have drawn conclusions regarding the

---

2 A second, later house in this neighborhood may have been engaged in a similar practice: The "House of the Greek Mosaic," built around 300 B.C.E., also has an andron placed at a street corner. Although no part of the socle compares with that of the andron of the House of the Roman Mosaic, both the andron and a second room at the facade (to the north) are made of regularly shaped and evenly sized blocks that contrast with those of the other surviving rooms (Thompson and Wycherley 1972, pl. 89). The practice of advertising the presence of an andron in this way is paralleled in other Classical Greek cities, such as Halieis and Olynthos (Nevett 2009: 120–23).
economic, and perhaps also social, status of the occupants of the house because, as far as we can tell, an andron was a feature found only in a minority of Classical Athenian houses. Even if such rooms were, in practice, used for other purposes as well as, or instead of, the drinking parties suggested by the literary and iconographic sources, the andron still materializes ideas about the importance of male sociability in the domestic sphere. In terms of Rapoport's schema, such a house communicated at a middle level, signaling the degree of wealth and status attained by the occupants. Given the location of the house, there would have been potential to do this to a relatively wide audience.

More detailed information about interior domestic arrangements is provided by a small number of excavated houses closer to the Classical Agora (for summaries, see Nevett 1999: 88–91 and Tsakirgis 2005, both with earlier references). These range considerably in size from as few as three spaces up to as many as 12. The larger buildings offer more scope for discussion of the layout. Three adjacent structures from the north shoulder of the Areopagos exemplify some of their recurring features (fig. 3): In each case a single entrance leads into a central courtyard, even where the location of the house was such that additional entrances could have been provided. From the perspective of the exterior, such an arrangement supports the rhetoric of seclusion in that it ensures maximum separation between the interior of the house and the street outside, especially where—as in the central house—visual access is also restricted by a lobby or corridor between the entrance and courtyard. In the central house, provision seems to have been made for entertainment of guests: an andron, which in some phases boasted a mosaic floor, lies on the east side of the house. Exceptionally, two other rooms were paved with mosaics at various times during the house's history. This house materializes the apparently contradictory ideologies noted at the start of this paper: that the domestic sphere is a female space (where women are secluded) and also an important locale for male activities (display to and entertaining of male visitors). At the same time, the radial organization of space and the location of the andron alongside the other interior rooms both undermine the rhetoric of seclusion.

3 Such measures are common in houses generally, both in Athens and in other Greek cities. For examples, see Nevett 1999: 80–153.
In sum, although the houses of Classical Athens are often relatively poorly preserved, sufficient cues survive (perhaps due to the kind of redundancy in messaging identified by Rapoport) to suggest that this kind of vernacular, domestic building operated as a medium for the communication of a range of messages to different audiences. The facade had the potential to highlight the role of the domestic sphere as a masculine one, symbolizing the owner's wealth, status, and participation (or desire to participate) in symposium culture. At the same time it also reinforced the role of the house as a female sphere, articulating the rhetoric of seclusion through the use of the single entrance. By contrast, the arrangement of the interior is concerned with a third aspect of social life: the cohesion of the household as a group. The architecture thus conveys contrasting, and to some extent contradictory, messages, and the rhetoric of seclusion is only one of several ideas or ideals encoded therein. Rapoport's and Blanton's frameworks offer a means of understanding these apparent contradictions. Like the marking of the andron on the exterior of the house, the seclusion message is an indexical one designed as a status marker directed at passersby. The arrangement of the interior, by contrast, can be viewed as canonical—a reinforcement of the cultural and social patterns governing daily life. Its principal audience consisted of the members of the household and their invited guests. For these individuals, the tight integration of the different spaces via the central courtyard suggests social cohesion and the unity of the household as a group. The radial arrangement, meanwhile, would have emphasized the authority of the householder by facilitating control and oversight over the occupants' activities. The power of the contradiction between these different messages is reduced by the fact that they are aimed primarily at different audiences.
Conclusions

The juxtaposition of the theoretical frameworks provided by Rapoport and Blanton with the Athenian evidence shows that, just like texts and monumental architecture, domestic buildings are likely to have been manipulated in order to convey messages about their occupants. This discussion highlights the potential of the Classical house to convey a range of different types of information and also emphasizes the importance of the viewer's identity in determining how that information was received. At a general level, highlighting the manipulation of domestic architecture in this way has implications for how textual and archaeological materials are handled as sources of evidence for social behavior, both individually and in relation to each other. It is probably naive to assume that the sort of vernacular architecture that houses represent offers a "reality check" on the texts, revealing "actual patterns of activity" that can be compared to the highly idiosyncratic and carefully constructed narratives of individual authors of texts. Instead, in interpreting the physical remains of the domestic environment, scholars need to maintain a critical stance, taking account of its potential manipulation and of the likelihood that a variety of inconsistent, and even conflicting, ideas may have been conveyed. Finally, this analysis suggests that by comparing the different messages expressed through both textual and material media, and by including the full range of kinds and levels of communication encompassed in each, we stand the best chance of unraveling the complexities of social issues such as gendered patterns of activity in Classical Athens.
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