Transactions of the American Philological Association 129 (1999) 301–303

Presidential Panel 1998
Washington, D.C.

Classics and Material Culture: A Panel Honoring the 100th Anniversary of the Archaeological Institute of America*

Helene P. Foley
Barnard College, Columbia University

This panel aimed to celebrate the AIA's 100th anniversary and to honor the intellectual fertility of the relation between classics and material culture. We defined "classics" in this instance as the study of ancient history, literature, philosophy, and philology, which tends to represent the scope of most APA papers, whereas problems in material culture and art history represent the scope of most AIA papers. In fact, the study of written texts and material culture has not always been so separate in practice, and interdisciplinary projects have in recent years become increasingly popular. Nevertheless, few scholars are qualified to master this twofold body of material well.

The work of the participants on this panel has repeatedly bridged the divide in interesting ways. Each of the following papers attempted to demonstrate the fertility of the interaction between classics and material culture in the study of a period, ranging from archaic Greece to imperial Rome, by examining a specific issue of the panelist's own choosing. Yet each contribution framed the topic in such a way as to raise broader issues about this relationship. Can a combination of material and textual evidence illuminate the origins of gender inequality, measure the consequences of imperialism in a specific historical period, contribute to the study of historical memory, explain

**Editor's Note*: The following panel was organized by APA President Helene Foley and presented at the 1998 joint Annual Meeting in order to mark the centennial year of the AIA. We have chosen to publish the entire set of papers in the expectation that they will be of particular interest to members of both organizations.

how and why Rome appropriated Greek culture to create specifically Roman monuments, or illuminate the relation between Rome and its provinces?

Ian Morris' paper, "Household Archaeology and Gender Ideology in Archaic Greece," suggests that we can reach a better understanding of the evolution of gender inequality in Greece by combining archaeological and textual evidence into a single cultural history. Morris' paper focuses on the critical role that changes in the organization of household space may have played in the transition from archaic to classical Greece. Whereas Dark Age houses (c. 1100–750 B.C.E.) were typically one-room oval structures, in which all activities went on in a single space or in the open air, multiroom, rectilinear houses began to emerge around 750 and by 600 the courtyard house typical of the classical period was well established. These changes would have made possible the "gender asymmetry" in the use of household space that is familiar from written sources extending from Hesiod to Demosthenes.

Robin Osborne's paper, "Archaeology and the Athenian Empire," investigates whether the failure to erect monumental buildings in Ionia should be explained as the result of impoverishment produced by payments to Athens and/or Persia during the Athenian empire. He shows that Ionia's record does not differ substantially from that of other cities both inside and outside the empire, and suggests that building during this period relates more closely to assertion of identity than to wealth. Literary evidence can help us to determine whether the failure to build was a sign of oppression or a mark of Athenian popularity.

Sue Alcock's paper, "The Pseudo-History of Messenia Unplugged," examines whether the history of archaic and classical Messenia was largely invented after Epaminondas freed the region or instead reflects genuine memories of the Messenians' experience under Spartan domination. A combination of textual (Pausanias *et al.*) and material sources (especially excavation and surface surveys) confirms that Messenian history was continually reinvented on the basis of both past memories and new exigencies. The record deliberately forgets the period of enslavement. Monumental and cultic continuities undermine the notion of a total disjunction between periods of servitude and of freedom. Yet new cults and practices reflect close awareness of post-liberation and, subsequently, imperial Roman conditions and contingencies.

Ann Kuttner's paper, "Culture and History at Pompey's Museum," bridges Greek and Roman worlds in a study of the overall design and purpose of the spectacular and highly influential Pergamene-style garden museum complex dedicated by Pompey in 55 B.C.E. on the Campus Martius at Rome. The paper

expands on the material and textual evidence for Pompey's conception and examines its own assumptions as an instance of interdisciplinary scholarship.

Bruce Hitchner's paper "Eating in Provence: Reflections on the Economy and Culture of Food in Narbonensis," argues that recent archaeological evidence can be used in conjunction with literary sources to illuminate the remark of the Elder Pliny that Provence was "more Italy than Provence." A shift from the consumption of mussels by coastal communities to a broad regional preference for oysters (as well as scallops) reflects both Italian culinary tastes and opportunities created by the Roman rule in Provence. Under the Romans, Provence indeed became Italianized, yet simultaneously developed its own regional economic and cultural identity, which differed from that represented in Roman writers and monuments.

Because these papers present often surprising new perspectives on our written sources, they accordingly demonstrate, we hope, the value of future interdisciplinary collaboration.