Popular Perceptions of Elite Homosexuality in Classical Athens

T. K. HUBBARD

MOST SCHOLARLY TREATMENTS of Greek homosexuality since the time of Sir Kenneth Dover's seminal work have been erected upon three basic premises: (1) that sexual object-choice was not in any sense an "identity" category for ancient Greeks, as it is for us, (2) that homosexual relations seldom occurred among age equals, and (3) that no prejudice existed against homosexual activity on the part of adult citizen males, as long as they assumed the dominant and penetrative role in the relationship, isomorphic with their status of superior political empowerment.[1] Within the last few years, John Thorp has challenged the sexual identity premise in a short, but trenchant article, and iconographical evidence has introduced important qualifications into our assumptions about stereotypical age roles.[2] Amy Richlin has also challenged the validity of this paradigm for the very different society of Ancient Rome by arguing that something like a homosexual identity and subculture existed there.[3] However, few have questioned the validity of the third premise for ancient Greeks, to the effect that sexual passivity was the sole focus of any moral or legal sanctions, not same-gender preference per se.[4] The nation's newspaper of record has recently reported it as an "apparent fact" that "men in Athens in the fifth century B.C. were not judged by whether they had sex with other men, only whether they were seen as the penetrator or the penetrated."[5] Indeed, this belief has approached the status of dogma in post-Foucauldian discourse on ancient sexuality.

And like much dogma, it is wrong. I would argue that the exclusive focus on sexual passivity as the object of social censure stems from an uncritical and one-sided reading of certain texts which, when situated within their broader ideological and generic contexts, reveal a condemnation not merely of adult passivity or effeminacy, but of the institution of pederasty more generally. Passivity and effeminacy were not the root of the problem, but the logical consequence and most extreme manifestation of the problem (even as today child molestation and AIDS serve as the most

potent images for what is really a broader fear of all homosexuality). Pederasty was an ethical crux for the Greeks, even as homosexuality in general is an ethical and political crux in the present day. Its practitioners were often apologetic, its opponents censorious or derisive. It was never, at least in classical Athens, unproblematic.

As a literary critic, I have been conditioned to inquire of a text what its intended audience is, and what its rhetorical strategies are for appealing to that audience and its ingrained values. In genres such as Athenian comedy and forensic oratory, we see texts aimed at a mass audience, but which often take as their subject matter the members of Athens' political and intellectual elite. And as is well known, Athenian pederasty was a social practice especially characteristic of the upper classes—the young men who had the time and leisure to lounge about the gymnasia watching beautiful boys in all of nature's glory, who had the financial resources to offer them the conventional gifts of courtship, and who had the intellectual and social skills necessary to offer pleasing companionship. Moreover, both literary and iconographic evidence strongly suggest that it was upper-class boys who were the favored objects of such pursuit: the boys are often depicted on vases with lyres or strigils,[6] appurtenances of the musical and gymnastic education available only to the more affluent.[7] Pederasty seems therefore to have been a strongly class-marked institution, of which subsistence-level laborers and farmers, the vast bulk of the citizen population, had little experience. Theognis and Cyrnus, Pindar and Theoxenus, Aristogiton and Harmodius, Callias and Autolycus, Critias and Euthydemus, Pausanias and Agathon, Eryximachus and Phaedrus—every one of them an aristocrat. In contrast, both Plato and Xenophon show Socrates, the proletarian philosopher, having no interest in any physical relationship with a youth and indeed no small measure of disapproval, however popular homosexual relations may have been among the wealthy youth who followed him.[8] This is not to say that pederasty never occurred among the lower classes, and Socrates' behavior might legitimately be called "homosocial" even if not homosexual. But the cultural image of pederasty is always elitist, whether in the Sacred Band of Thebes or the Cretan ritual abduction of the *kleinos,* "the famous one," as narrated by the historian Ephorus.[9] And, as in so much else, it is the image that matters. To an average Athenian, the practice would have been associated either with Dorians, thus confirming the

often suspected philo-Laconian leanings of its upper-class practitioners, or with the soft-living, effeminate Ionians of Anacreontic tradition, thus confirming prejudices against upper-class luxuriance and self-indulgence.[10] To the extent that a comic poet or orator could cast this upper-class predilection in a negative light as an instrument of defamation against elite opponents, it could be counted on to impress the masses as a distinguishing "us versus them" criterion.

Some methodological caveats should be made at the outset. Reconstructing ancient sexual practices and attitudes is notoriously difficult, in the absence of diaries, autobiographical confessions, or even authoritative scriptural pronouncements such as existed for the Jews and early Christians. Reconstructing popular attitudes in the absence of any genuinely proletarian authors is particularly difficult. In reading Attic comedy or oratory, we rather see how certain elite authors may have interpreted and pandered to the attitudes of the masses, and our interpretation of their interpretation necessarily stands at a second remove from the mass attitudes we wish to reconstruct. The slippery question of what, if anything, can be taken seriously in a comedy is one which has long bedevilled critics of that genre. *Mutatis mutandis,* critics face the same problem in Attic oratory, which is often not far from the world of comedy. All of the texts I am about to treat are disputed, but none of these reservations should deter us from looking at the evidence afresh.

Let us first focus on the evidence provided by Attic comedy. The bias of the genre is unquestionably agrarian and populist, heterosexual and fertility-oriented. Homosexual acts of any sort tend to be associated with elite self-indulgence and corruption.[11] Let me take as my starting point a passage from my favorite part of Aristophanic comedy, the parabasis, in this case, that of *Wasps*. Aristophanes uses this parabasis to give a brief resumé of his own dramatic career. With typical self-advertising hyperbole, he speaks of being honored with victories like no previous comic poet:

> Being raised up to great height and honored like no one among you ever before,
> He did not turn out haughty nor puff up his pride,
> Nor raise a ruckus and make passes at the boys in the gym.
> Not even if any lover
> Asked him to make fun of a hated boy-love

Did he ever comply, as he says, but he kept fitting thoughts in mind,
Lest he make bawds out of the Muses whom he employs.
(*Wasps* 1023–28)

Although honored like none before him, Aristophanes does not rise above his common station and act like an aristocratic pederast, trying to seduce boys at the wrestling school, nor does he associate with such men and write his comedies to please their tastes.[12] As always, his allegiance is to the common man, on behalf of whom he claims always to fight a few lines later on. So much the greater is his disappointment not to have been supported by his public in his most recent comic offering, the ill-fated *Clouds* of 423 B.C. The concluding point of the parabasis is that the poet feels his loyalty to his public has not been equally repaid. It is significant that the poet chooses to highlight his personal disinterest in pederasty as the distinguishing mark of his solidarity with the masses in the theater. Dover misses the point altogether in claiming that Aristophanes could just as well have professed a disinterest in girls at dancing schools.[13] What Aristophanes shares with his public is not a preference for sexual abstinence, but a dislike for pederasty. It is no accident that less than fifty lines later (1066—70), the poor jurymen's chorus introduce themselves also in contradistinction to an upper-class, homosexual Other—here imaged as affected young men with their curls, mannered bearing, and *euruprôktia*. Aristophanes' self-contrast with a homosexual political elite is the culminating point of at least one other parabasis, that of *Acharnians*, where he differentiates his behavior toward the city from Cleon's:

Let Cleon plot against these things,
And contrive every plan against me.
For the good and just will be
Allied with me, and never shall I be found
To be, like that man, a wretch and a bugger
In matters of state.
(*Acharnians* 659–64)

Standing as the emphatic final word of the parabasis, *lakatapugôn* ("bugger") sums up the essential nature of Aristophanes' nemesis.

The boys involved in pederastic relations are also the object of comic opprobrium. In *Plutus,* the powers of the god Wealth are illustrated by the behavior of prostitutes, both male and female:

> *Chremylus.* They say that the Corinthian whores pay no heed,
> Whenever a poor man happens to approach them,
> But if a rich man does so,
> They wiggle their ass in his direction right away.
> *Carion.* And they say that boys do the same thing,
> Not for the sake of lovers, but for money.
> *Chr.* Not the good and noble boys, surely, but the male whores.
> For the good and noble ones don't ask for money.
> *Ca.* What then?
> *Chr.* One wants a good horse, another asks for hunting dogs.
> *Ca.* Perhaps because they are ashamed to ask for money,
> They cover their baseness with pretense.
>
> (*Plutus* 149–59)

The practice of giving and receiving pederastic courtship gifts, so richly illustrated on Athenian vases, is here regarded as no different from outright male prostitution. *Chrêstos* is, of course, an aristocratic code word, as we see in the Old Oligarch.[14] But here, the *chrêstoi,* the "good and noble" boys, are trained to be adolescent bribe-takers. The lovers who encourage them in such practices are surely not to be admired either.

Pederasty was the subject of ridicule not only in Aristophanes, but in other comic poets as well. Eupolis wrote a play named *Autolycus,* after the *erômenos* of the wealthy Callias—the same boy depicted as a model of chaste love in Xenophon's *Symposium.* Callias' susceptibility to sexually manipulative male prostitutes and flatterers was also ridiculed in Eupolis' *Flatterers* (fr. 178 *PCG*) and Aristophanes' *Seasons* (fr. 583 *PCG*).[15] Plato Comicus, Antiphanes, Diphilus, Eubulus, and Strattis all wrote comedies centering on pederastic themes.[16] Timocles, Alexis, and Antiphanes all made fun of the pederastic excesses of the rich *bon vivant* Misgolas, named by Aeschines as one of the lovers of Timarchus.[17] Cratinus' *Malthakoi* (fr. 104 *PCG*) ridicules an active male lover as an "empty-headed fool." Aristophanes'

Triphales (fr. 556 *PCG*) makes fun of the Ionians for being pederasts. Eubulus (fr. 127 *PCG*) criticizes the practice of sacrificing only tail and thigh to the gods, as if they were pederasts. Cratinus, Crates, Telecleides, Pherecrates, Plato Comicus, and Aristophanes all use vocabulary and images suggesting that the active lovers of boys are indeed ripe targets of comic ridicule.[18] In the fragments of fifth- and fourth-century comedy, pederasts are attacked just as frequently as passives or effeminates.

An anonymous comic fragment says οὐδεὶς κομήτης ὅστις οὐ ψηνίζεται: "there is no long-hair who is not pollinated with the gall-fly" (Adesp., fr. 12 K). The reference is to the horticultural practice of placing branches of a wild fig next to a blooming cultivated fig, so that the gall fly native to the wild species may pollinate the other. *Erastês* and *erômenos* are the wild and cultivated fig respectively. The active partner infects the other, as in the process of pollination. In other words, every long-hair is created by another one. In Comedy, long hair is associated with aristocratic youth, with Laconizing sympathies, with Socratics, with effeminacy, and, as here, with homosexuality.[19] As each long-hair creates others, we see a fundamental identity among them: every *erômenos* will eventually become an *erastês* infecting new *erômenoi*.

Pederastic philosophers come in for particular criticism in Comedy. Cratinus' *Panoptai,* a play attacking the philosopher Hippon and his followers, abuses a character for turning away from women and devoting himself only to *paidika* (fr. 163 *PCG*). The Middle Comic poet Alexis wrote a *Phaedrus,* satirizing Plato's dialogues on love. One lengthy fragment (fr. 247 *PCG*) is a spoof on the speeches of the *Symposium* attempting to define Love, and seems particularly modelled on Diotima's opening series of paradoxes about Love's intermediate status between god and man, wealth and poverty, wisdom and ignorance (201e–204b).

In a play of Amphis, we find the philosophical ideals of chaste love so popular in Plato and other fourth-century authors cynically deconstructed:

> What do you say? Do you expect to persuade me
> That there is such a thing as a lover of a ripe young boy
> Who is merely a lover of character, who overlooks his
> appearance
> And is truly modest? I am not persuaded of this

Any more than that a poor man who often annoys the
prosperous
Does not want to take something.
(Amphis, fr. 15 *PCG*)

Returning to Aristophanes, Dover cites three passages as evidence that pederasty was positively valued by the comic poet and his audience, merely one sexual taste among many.[20] In *Acharnians,* Dicaeopolis sings a phallus-hymn, celebrating Phales as the god of "adultery and pederasty," and illustrating his powers with a graphic fantasy of raping a female slave. Similarly, the Weaker Logic in *Clouds* links pederasty together with adultery, gambling, drinking, and gourmandizing as pleasures that will be freely available to the young under his tutelage. To link pederasty with adultery, however, is hardly a way for a comic poet to express social approval of the practice, particularly in the context of ancient Greek attitudes toward adultery. Dover says of adultery, "nice work, if you can get away with it," but this seems to express a curiously modern trivialization of a crime Greek law regarded as capital in some cases. Moreover, adultery, like pederasty, gambling, and gourmandizing, was thought to be a habit particularly characteristic of rich men who could buy their way out of trouble if caught.[21] Clearly both of these passages group pederasty together with other forms of upper-class antinomian self-gratification which contravene accepted ethical norms.

The same is true of the third passage Dover cites as evidence of Aristophanes' approval of pederasty. In *Birds,* Peisthetaerus imagines the ideal city as one where the worst that can happen is:

. . . the father of a ripe young boy meets me
And blames me thus, as if wronged by me:
"A fine thing you did, Stilbonides, seeing my son
Coming away from the gym, having just bathed!
You didn't kiss him, you didn't speak to him, you didn't hug
him close,
You didn't even tickle his little testicles!
And you claim to be my old family friend."
(*Birds* 137–42)

Far from evidencing either Aristophanes' or the general public's acceptance of pederasty, the passage suggests that most fathers did

not want their sons involved in such relationships. Peisthetaerus presents an image here not of Athens as it was, but of a counter-Athens where the reverse of normal expectations occurred.[22] Normally, fathers would rebuke friends for making advances on their sons; in Peisthetaerus' imaginary utopia, fathers rebuke friends for not doing so.

As we have observed, the orthodox view of Greek homosexuality is predicated on a strict division between penetrator and penetrated, dominator and dominated, politically empowered and politically disenfranchised. Dover formulates this conceptual division for comedy by declaring, "there is no passage in comedy which demonstrably attributes an active homosexual role to anyone who is ridiculed for taking a passive role." I would argue on the contrary that the roles are perceived as much more fluid and interchangeable in Attic comedy. Any active pederast in comedy can reasonably be supposed to have been himself an *erômenos* in his youth,[23] and thus putatively an *euruprôktos,* a man with a wide anus. And in comedy, once an *euruprôktos,* always an *euruprôktos*.[24]

Let me give some examples of this interpenetration of sex roles. In the agon of *Clouds,* the Stronger Logic paints an idyllic picture of old-fashioned gymnastic and musical education—a tableau filled with bronzed, muscular, well-behaved boys, lovingly described as having large buttocks and small penises, with dew and velvety down blooming on their testicles as on ripe quinces. These orderly, respectful boys of old would sit with their legs modestly crossed, and then smooth over the sand where they sat so as not to leave suggestive traces which might torment the eyes of their lovers. The Stronger Logic's old-time education is without question the enthusiastic fantasy of a traditional pederast.

However in the second half of the debate, the Weaker Logic counters his opponent's condemnation of adultery by proposing that a stretched anus, the usual punishment, might not be such a bad thing after all (*Clouds* 1083–1105). Pointing to members of the audience, the Weaker Logic forces his interlocutor to admit that most of the prominent orators, politicians, and poets of Athens are in fact *euruprôktoi* themselves, not necessarily in virtue of being adulterers, but as a mark of the homosexuality popularly imputed to the elite classes. The Stronger Logic admits his defeat in the debate and rushes offstage to join the *euruprôktoi* in the audience. The implication is that a lover of boys like the Stronger

Logic is very likely an *euruprôktos* himself, and may even be interested in adult men. Penetrator becomes penetrated, even as adulterers, who are sexually aggressive penetrators of other men's wives, are punished by being turned into victims of violent anal penetration.

The concept behind this curious mixture of roles is, as Foucault has emphasized, that any form of sexual excess, whether adultery or, as here, pederasty, is a state of moral passivity toward physical appetites, a weakness of character like that of women.[25] One also finds this interchangeability of sex roles as a leitmotiv in Aristophanes' *Knights*. As Henderson has observed, the sexual imagery of this play is exclusively and programmatically homosexual throughout.[26] In competing for the favor of master Demos, the Paphlagonian slave and the Sausage-seller both "screw" the public, and where it will help them gain favor, allow themselves to be "screwed." Both positions are equally useful as instruments for their rise to political power. In *Knights* 732–40, the two competing politicians present themselves as rival lovers of Demos, who is imagined as a temperamental *erômenos* who prefers base lovers to the better ones. Only a few lines earlier (*Knights* 719–21), Paphlagon boasted of being able to control Demos by making him "wide and narrow," which the Sausage-seller interprets as an allusion to anal manipulation. The Paphlagon and the Sausage-seller also assert their masculinity by exchanging threats of anal violation against each other (*Knights* 364–65).

But on the other side, we see both Paphlagon and the Sausage-seller characterized by sexual passivity as well. The Sausage-seller boasts of stealing meat from the cooks when he was a boy, and hiding the meat between his thighs (*Knights* 417–28). As Henderson has demonstrated, "meat" had the same slang connotation for the Greeks as for us.[27] It is not only the boy's thievery, but also his sexual receptivity that makes an astute onlooker predict his future political prominence. At the end of the play (*Knights* 1240–42), he even boasts of having been a male prostitute as a young man. Paphlagon is also characterized as an occasional pathic, who, before being slaughtered like a pig, must have his anus examined for anal warts (*Knights* 375–81). In *Knights* 875–80, he boasts of erasing sexual passives like Gryttus from the citizen lists (probably a reference to the same kind of *dokimasia* procedure under which Timarchus was later tried), to which the Sausage-seller retorts that it must be because he feared the competition. In *Knights* 78–79,

his anus is located "among the Chaonians," a pun on the Greek verb *chaskô,* frequently used of the gaping anus of passive homosexuals; Aristophanes makes use of the same pun in *Acharnians* 604. Curiously, sexual passivity goes side-by-side with political power: the capping reward of the political leadership offered the Sausage-seller at the beginning of the play (*Knights* 164–67), along with the power to humiliate the Council and the generals, is the ability to perform fellatio in the Prytaneum,[28] i.e., to gratify people with his mouth, which is clearly an obscene metonymy for his oratory.

There is, however, a difference between Paphlagon and the Sausage-seller in sexual styles. Paphlagon himself never admits to being sexually passive; he is merely accused thereof by others, usually by implication. The Sausage-seller, on the other hand, displays no hesitation whatever in admitting and even boasting of his self-prostitution. Paphlagon, who of course stands for the demagogue Cleon, wishes to maintain a surface pretense of masculine respectability, whereas the Sausage-seller, who presumes to be a demagogue of even baser origins, outdoes his rival in utter shamelessness. The contrast between the two is in fact exactly the same as that between the Stronger and Weaker Logic in the agon of *Clouds*: the former is a figure of pretense and hypocrisy, who presumes to be a morally respectable old-style educator, but is, beneath the surface, sexually obsessed and corrupt. The Weaker Logic, like the Sausage-seller, makes no attempt to conceal his sexual turpitude, but openly justifies it.

A final example will further illustrate the fluidity and interchangeability of sex roles in Comedy. The most notorious of all Aristophanic effeminates is the tragedian Agathon, depicted in women's dress in *Thesmophoriazusae* and apparently also in the lost *Gerytades*. Agathon's homosexuality is well known from other sources, most notably Plato's *Symposium,* which situates its dialogue concerning male love at the house of Agathon after his first tragic victory. Aelian's *Varia Historia* and the Platonic scholia both tell us that Agathon was the life-long *erômenos* of Pausanias, together with whom he went to the court of King Archelaus of Macedon after growing weary of life in an unsympathetic Athens.[29] Agathon remained clean-shaven and punctiliously youthful in appearance for his entire life, and was identified as the *erômenos* of an older man to an age well beyond that which was normal for such relationships. Nevertheless, Aristophanes depicts

Agathon as a lover of boys in his own right. In *Thesmophoriazusae* 253–55, Agathon hands to Euripides' in-law a saffron robe that smells sweetly of *posthion,* a diminutive term which refers specifically to the sexual organs of boys, as Henderson has demonstrated.[30] Agathon's conoisseurship of boys' genitals may also be implied by *Thesmophoriazusae* 57, where he is identified as a "cocksucker."[31] Just as Agathon can slip in and out of gender roles as either man or woman, so also he has the capacity to alternate age roles as either man or boy.[32]

A similar identification of an effeminate as an active pederast is implied in Pherecrates' picture (fr. 70 *PCG*) of a male perfume-seller—a man in a typically female profession—who sits underneath his parasol and chats all day with attractive youths. Indeed, the actual reason some adult Greek men chose to shave their beards was more likely a desire to remain youthful-looking and attractive to youths rather than a desire to be passive partners to older men, as comedy so often alleges.[33]

Far from articulating a strict bifurcation between active and passive homosexuality, the very vocabulary of comedy is itself often ambiguous. *Binoumai* can be construed as either middle or passive. The common term of abuse *katapugôn* is ambiguous: itmerely signifies orientation toward the *pugê* or buttocks, whether actively or passively. In *Thesmophoriazusae* 200–201 it is addressed to Agathon in juxtaposition with the term *euruprôktos* and a reference to his *pathêmata* or passive experiences. However in *Acharnians* 659–64, a passage we have looked at before, the word seems likely to have a more active meaning: a few lines earlier in the same parabasis the Athenians are designated *chaunopolitai,* or "gaping citizens"—citizens who allow themselves to be sodomized by their political leaders. If this metaphor is sustained here, Cleon the *lakatapugôn* would be the agent of the public's penetration. In *Knights* 638–42, the Sausage-seller prominently displays his anus for the benefit of a *katapugôn* on his right, as he makes his maiden speech in the Council; this *katapugôn* is more likely a penetrator than a pathic.[34] Cratinus (fr. 58 *PCG*) ridicules the general Xenophon for *katapugosunê*; Aelian's gloss on this fragment (*H.A.* 12.10) equates the word with the superlative adjective *lagnistatos,* which refers specifically to a superabundance of male lust, since it is derived from the noun *lagneia,* which the medical writers use of semen. Aelian thus clearly read this line as meaning that

Xenophon was oversexed like a mouse, and too eager to find outlets for his abundant semen. The parallel formation *kata prôkton* can also refer to anal penetrators: in *Ecclesiazusae* 357–71, Blepyrus seeks one of those *kata prôkton,* like Amynon, to help him with his constipation. It is clearly an anal penetrator whom Blepyrus requires to loosen him up here; a pathic could hardly perform the service needed. In many cases, however, the precise configuration of the terms *katapugôn* and *kata prôkton* cannot be determined; as with the pejorative use of the English epithet "anal," the exact semantic associations are conveniently vague, but clearly enough negative.[35] Whether one is actively or passively anal is not the point.

Without question the greatest scorn in Aristophanes is heaped upon visible effeminates like Agathon, Cleisthenes, or Agyrrhius. But these were merely the most obvious members of an etiolated socio-political elite whose sexual mores invert Athenian norms. Effeminacy becomes a common charge in Comedy not because there was actually a large contingent of transvestite men running Athens, but because it was seen as the logical telos of elite pederasty, and dovetailed effectively with general popular resentment of the soft-living upper classes. A whole tradition of comedies even before Aristophanes exploited such prejudice. I have argued elsewhere that Eupolis' *Astrateutoi,* which carried the alternate title *Androgynoi,* was based on Cleon's demagogic charges of *leipostratia* against the upper-class cavalry; other early plays of Eupolis also refer to upper-class youth as effeminate and unwarlike, and Cratinus' *Malthakoi* may have centered upon the same theme.[36] In contrast, Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* shows the average fighting soldier's orientation as entirely heterosexual. Robert Fowler has recently argued that the sex strike makes dramaturgical sense only if it could be taken for granted that homosexuality was not even an option for most non-elite Athenian males;[37] as the Athenian ambassador says (*Lys.* 1091–92), having to resort to the homosexual Cleisthenes for sex would be only the last act of desperation. Homosexuals, whether pederasts or effeminate pathics, were for Aristophanes a species apart from the Athenian norm, in every sense an identity category. It should come as no surprise that this is also the essentialist view of Aristophanes' speech in Plato's *Symposium.*

Let us turn now to a different, but not altogether dissimilar genre, that of Athenian forensic oratory. Here too we often hear

the voice of an elite speaker addressing a mass audience and having to calibrate his rhetoric to identify with the tastes and prejudices of that audience, consisting mostly of poor and sometimes elderly jurymen.[38] Josiah Ober has studied in detail the problematic role reversals this process necessitates.[39] I shall treat here four speeches which problematize the issue of elite pederasty from different perspectives: Lysias' speech *Against Simon* is the defense of a wealthy pederast on a charge of attempted murder against a rival boy-lover. Isaeus' speech *On the Estate of Aristarchus* attacks the defendant for wasting a fortune on boys. Aeschines' infamous speech *Against Timarchus* is the prosecution of a prominent politician who had been a beloved of many men in his youth, and is accused by Aeschines of having been a male prostitute. Demosthenes' *Against Androtion* makes use of a similar charge.

Of interest in Lysias' speech are not so much the facts of the case as the speaker's evident embarassment over the public exposure of his relationship with the Plataean youth Theodotus. The defendant is accused of having attempted to kill Simon in a brawl, when Simon and his friends tried to seize Theodotus from him. This brawl was one in a series of such incidents. The defendant was evidently a citizen of hereditary wealth and prominence, since he declares that he has performed liturgies and that his ancestors have also performed such services to the city. Moreover, he identifies himself as a man of mature years who is apparently unmarried: he refers to the *gynaikeion* of his house as inhabited only by his sister and nieces. The defendant is an aristocratic but aging pederast, who fears the negative judgment of the jury because of prejudice against his sexual orientation.[40] He tries to soften their anticipated hostility in the prologue to his speech:

> If I prove that I am innocent in regard to the things Simon has sworn against me, and if otherwise I am revealed to you as one foolishly inclined to this boy in a manner unseemly for a man of my age, I ask that you not regard me the worse for it, knowing that passion is within the capability of all men and that this man would be best and most temperate, whoever can bear his misfortunes in a most orderly way. This man Simon has become an obstacle to me in all this, as I shall show you.
>
> (Lysias 3.4)

That a mature man should be involved with a *meirakion,* a youth eighteen to twenty-four years old,[41] is presented apologetically as a form of excessive desire or *epithumia.* To gain sympathy, the defendant speaks of his love as a "misfortune," *symphora.* He says he would like to have endured his misfortune in a sober-minded and quiet way, but Simon's violent attacks made it impossible and gave him the added misfortune of being not merely a pederast, but a pederastic brawler.

His embarassment over public exposure of his romantic involvement with the boy was such that he preferred not to seek legal remedy against Simon on his own part, since he feared that a common jury would be unsympathetic to an aristocratic boy-lover:

> So I, O Council, considered that I had suffered terribly, but was ashamed at my misfortune, as I have told you before. Therefore I put up with it, and preferred not to demand justice for these wrongs rather than to seem foolish to the citizens, knowing that what had happened would be deemed appropriate to the baseness of this man, but that many of those who are accustomed to envy anyone who desires to be noble in the city would laugh at me suffering such experiences. (Lysias 3.9)

His desire to be considered *chrêstos,* a noble citizen, is a source of envy in itself. When combined with a love that some would regard as foolish and would laugh at, the speaker's ambition for good standing makes him an even greater target of envy. He therefore preferred leaving Athens (Lys. 3.10) to having his love-affair publicly exposed in a lawsuit. Such an action can only be understood in a culture which did not routinely accept pederastic love. The apologetic rhetoric of the defense presupposes a public unsympathetic to the form of love in question here. And as we have seen in Attic Comedy, the prejudice against pederasty is linked with envy of the upper classes. Interestingly, however, the speaker deploys the fear of lower-class resentment to his advantage in addressing the more elite Areopagus jury hearing the present case; they too know what it is like to be envied for being *chrêstos,* and while not necessarily sympathetic to boy love, their attitude toward it may have been less intolerant than that of an ordinary jury.

Contrast the apologetic tone of this speech with the comparable case of Lysias 4, where two rival lovers have come to blows over an

attractive slave girl (characterized as a *pornê*—Lys. 4.19) whom they owned in common for explicitly sexual purposes. Here we see absolutely none of the embarrassment which Lysias attributes to the pederastic lover. Instead the story is presented in a straightforward manner which betrays no hint of anxiety about the audience's reaction to this manifestation of heterosexual eros. Indeed, the speaker at the end of Lysias 3 tries to minimize prejudice against him by pleading that his case is really no worse than a fight over a *hetaira* (Lys. 3.43), which seems to have been taken for granted as a common and not particularly shocking occurrence.[42]

From a different angle, Isaeus' speech *On the Estate of Aristarchus* invokes popular prejudice against pederasty. At the end of a rather convoluted and shaky inheritance case (10.25), the speaker tries to grab the jury's flagging attention by accusing his cousin of having squandered his own estate on boys (*katapepaiderastêkenai*) and now wanting to appropriate a second estate illegally for the same purpose. In contrast, the speaker himself has spent what little money he had attempting to provide sufficient dowries for his sisters. The opposition is clearly between irresponsible homosexual extravagance on the part of the cousin who has more than he needs, and dutiful maintenance of heterosexual family values on the part of the impoverished speaker. Pederasty is connected with a surplus of wealth and a spendthrift lifestyle: the speaker calculates that these are all hot button issues which will appeal to the jury's prejudices. Even if the men of the jury do not understand all the legal issues or the complicated family genealogy which he has traced in the bulk of the speech, the speaker believes that this final contrast between himself and his opponent will convince them that he deserves the estate more.

Aeschines' *Against Timarchus* is a speech much discussed in standard accounts of Greek homosexuality, and is indeed the centerpiece of Dover's book. It is usually mined as a source text for Athenian laws, and particularly for the law which disqualified from citizen rights anyone who had ever prostituted himself.[43] However what is interesting to me is again the rhetorical strategy of the speech and what it reveals to us about the assumed moral attitudes of the audience.

Aeschines devotes the first section of his speech to a review of Athenian moral legislation, starting with the law of Solon which prevented teachers or coaches from being alone with boys or even

present in the school or *palaistra* after dark. Solon's law also regulated pedagogues and *chorêgoi* to insure that they would be less likely to molest the boys whom they supervised. Aeschines next describes the laws against pandering or hiring free-born boys as prostitutes. Any father who has let out his son for such treatment need not be supported in old age. Aeschines then proceeds to the law on *hybris* or rape, which protected not only boys and women, but even slaves. David Cohen has argued that the Athenian law on *hybris* could also function as an age of consent law under which a father who disapproved of his son's relationship with a lover could sue the offending party.[44] It is only after this inventory of laws that Aeschines finally comes to the law on self-prostitution and citizen rights, which is the one germane to the present case.

Our question here should be, why does he enumerate and describe at length the other laws, when they have nothing to do with the offense of which Timarchus is accused? Aeschines' nominal reason is to establish that Athenian law is traditionally concerned with questions of sexual morality. But Aeschines does not mention adultery, incest, or other offenses against women; his focus is rather entirely on one aspect of sexual morality—namely homosexuality. And homosexuality is here defined in terms of child abuse: molestation of boys by teachers, coaches, pedagogues, or chorus sponsors, forcible prostitution of children by their parents or guardians, and rape of children. In other words, he seems determined to lay the foundation for his case by evoking the very worst images of homosexuality possible and thus appealing to the jury's most ingrained prejudices. Of course, Timarchus is not himself accused of having been involved with younger boys, and indeed he was not really a boy himself at the time of his alleged self-prostitution, but a *meirakion,* a youth of about eighteen to twenty-one. Nevertheless, Aeschines' review of these irrelevant laws puts us in mind of a sleazy underworld of rapists, child-molesting schoolteachers, and parents who sell their children into prostitution. Aeschines' tactic here is one not unfamiliar in some contemporary political debates concerning homosexuality, where "Save Our Children" becomes the automatic rallying cry of those who oppose any gay rights initiative.

The chief problem Aeschines faces in this prosecution is that he has no actual evidence to support his claim concerning Timarchus' self-prostitution. There are no witnesses to any exchange of money. No former lovers come forward. Aeschines must instead

argue from *eikos* or probability. But even here he faces a difficulty: how can he plausibly argue that a young man of the upper-class, who had inherited his late father's estate at an early age, would have needed to support himself through prostitution? Aeschines' strategy cleverly plays upon the jury's prejudices against both wealth and homosexuality by charging that Timarchus was a carousing spendthrift who had gambled away his inheritance and who supported himself by living with a succession of older men, every one of them an individual of equally disreputable habits. Of course Aeschines never fully explains the source of Timarchus' current income, but the portrait he paints of a loose-spending young wastrel is so vivid as to sway even the sceptical:

> What is it fitting to say whenever a young man leaves his father's home and spends the night in other men's houses, a young man who is more attractive than most, who dines on expensive meals without paying his share, who possesses the most expensive flute-girls and harlots, who gambles without himself paying anything, but always another pays on his behalf? Does this need prophecy to figure out? Isn't it clear that the man who makes such demands on others necessarily himself also provides certain pleasures in return for these things to those who spend money on his behalf? By Olympian Zeus, I don't have any more tactful way of recording the deeds so despicably done by you. (Aeschines 1.75–76)

This portrait of a young man plays upon two assumptions: that any attractive young man who lives with older men must be sexually involved with them and must be financially supported by them. The further inference is that this financial support is tantamount to prostitution. The line of reasoning is much the same as that of the dialogue in Aristophanes' *Plutus* 149–59. There is the usual lower-class prostitution, in which money is exchanged, and there is also upper-class prostitution, in which expensive gifts are provided, whether to an ambitious boy or an elegant courtesan.[45] But to the commoner's eye, both are equally forms of prostitution.

The rooted premise here is that virtually all pederasty, at least as it was practiced in Athens during the classical period, could be seen as prostitution. Courting an upper-class youth with love-gifts or lavish entertainment is considered not much different from handing a bag of coins to a *pornos*, which is not much different

from bribing a corrupt politician. The most common Greek verb for giving or accepting bribes, *dôrodokein,* so much as acknowledges that bribery is merely a specialized form of gift-exchange. What made the Athenian law on self-prostitution such a potent weapon in political disputes was the vagueness and fluidity of what could be defined as prostitution.

Hence Aeschines does not really need to prove actual prostitution or exchange of money, but only that Timarchus is a scandalous enough character that he might as well be viewed as a prostitute. We thus hear a lengthy narrative of a dissolute and riotous life-style carried on not with one, but with a string of older men. Aeschines exploits the common man's prejudice against the upper classes by portraying profligate and unrestrained self-indulgence. He mobilizes suspicion against upper-class homosexuality not only by his insinuations of prostitution and his citation of laws pertaining to child abuse, but also with the same charges of effeminacy which were deployed so effectively against the upper classes in Attic comedy. Even as an adult and a member of the Council, Timarchus is popularly derided as a "woman", not because of any particular effeminacy in his bearing or habit, but simply inasmuch as he is the companion and thus putatively the beloved of Hegesandrus:

> In the same archonship as Timarchus was a member of the Council, Hegesandrus the brother of Crobylus was the treasurer of the Goddess, and he and Timarchus were trying to steal a thousand drachmas from the city, together and in a very cozy arrangement. A respectable man, Pamphilus of Acherdous, who had a quarrel with Timarchus and was angry with him, perceived this matter and standing up at a meeting of the Assembly said: "Athenian men, a man and a woman together steal a thousand drachmas from you." When all of you were wondering what he meant by "a man and a woman," he said after pausing a little, "Don't you know what I mean? The man is now that Hegesandrus, although he was himself the woman of Laodamas previously. And the woman is this Timarchus. And I shall say how the money is being stolen." (Aeschines 1.110–11)

Although Aeschines refers to Hegesandrus as one of Timarchus' many lovers earlier in his speech, it is not clear whether their relationship was still of that nature at the time of this incident. The

charge of being a woman may resonate merely from the fact that Timarchus was once the beloved of Hegesandrus, even as Hegesandrus was once a woman in relation to Laodamas. Pamphilus' remark suggests that the charges of effeminacy so commonplace in comedy may also have more to do with a public reputation for having once been a pederastic beloved than with any current oddity of behavior. And as a fragment of Hyperides shows, preserved for us in a grammarian's Latin translation (fr. 215 Kenyon), these charges of gender reversal were just as commonplace in oratory as in comedy.

The charge of effeminacy is also turned by Aeschines against Timarchus' ally and defender Demosthenes:

> Also in the case of Demosthenes' nickname, it is by rumor, not by his nurse, that he is called Batalus, assigned the name from his lack of manliness (*anandria*) and sexual passivity (*kinaidia*). For if someone should strip off you those exquisite little mantles and your soft little shirts, in which you write these diatribes against your friends, and if he should pass them around in the hands of the jurors, I believe that they would be quite at a loss, unless someone were to inform them in advance, whether they had taken a hold of a man's or a woman's clothing. (Aeschines 1.131)

The joke on the name Batalus may relate to its slang meaning as "anus," attested in a fragment of Eupolis (fr. 92 *PCG*). More interesting here is the reference to Demosthenes' fine, luxurious garments as similar to those of women. Aeschines dramatically invites the poor jurymen to imagine themselves passing Demosthenes' beautiful clothing around and contemplating how different it is from theirs. As in so many other contexts, upper-class luxury is connected with homosexuality and effeminacy.[46] Aeschines' other speeches also contain scattered references to Demosthenes' "unmanliness" (*anandria*) and sexual passivity (*kinaidia*), but the only specific evidence he ever adduces is a reference in the speech *Against Ctesiphon* to an attractive Plataean youth named Aristion, who lived in Demosthenes' house.[47] As we have observed in Comedy, even being an active pederast can be seen as a possible basis for charges of also being passive and effeminate.

Aeschines repeatedly emphasizes that the active pederasts who hired Timarchus as a prostitute are just as morally and legally

blameworthy as he is (Aeschines 1.72, 87, 90, 162–63). In each of these passages, he explains the reason no actual witnesses have come forward to testify about hiring Timarchus is that such testimony would constitute self-incrimination. Aeschines 1.87 claims the punishment for hiring an Athenian citizen as a prostitute is death; Aeschines 1.163 specifies death by stoning; Aeschines 1.72 and 90 say more euphemistically "the greatest penalties" (*tois megistois epitimiois*). As Dover has noted,[48] Aeschines is speaking legal nonsense here: no law against hiring a citizen prostitute ever existed, merely a law specifying that such a prostitute could not in the future hold office or address the courts and Assembly. Aeschines appears to hope that the jury will have been confused by the long list of laws he gave at the beginning of the speech (see 1.72, "for I do not believe that you are so forgetful as to be unmindful of the laws which were read just a little while ago"), at least one of which, the law of Solon regulating schools, did carry the death penalty, but for a very different set of offenses than the one dealt with here. Even though no such law against hiring voluntary citizen prostitutes actually existed, Aeschines takes it for granted that such a law would not have seemed implausible to his audience. This assumption presupposes a generally hostile public attitude toward all pederasty involving citizen youths, since, as we have seen, the dividing line between prostitution and courtship by gifts is very thin. What is especially clear is that the active partner is thought no less disreputable than the passive.

One might object to my analysis by citing the section at the end of Aeschines' speech in which he himself admits to being an *erôtikos,* but contrasts his chaste and idealizing love of boys to Timarchus' prostitution. Does this maneuver not prove that Aeschines' intent was not to condemn pederasty wholesale, but merely its corruption and abuse? We must recognize that a forensic oration such as this one had more than one audience. Most of the jurors would indeed be poor and fairly hostile to upper-class pederasty, but some may have come from wealthier strata of society where the practice was more familiar; for the benefit of these latter jurors, Aeschines needs to modify his rhetoric by distinguishing between good and bad pederasty. Moreover, it cannot be taken for granted that this section of the speech was even part of the original version delivered in court. It is cast as a rebuttal to the defense speeches, which were of course delivered after the prosecution's side of the case. It may have been added only when

Aeschines prepared his speech for publication.[49] The literate, well-educated reading audience for a published speech was likely a different clientele from the original jury, certainly more upper-class; for them, a defense of pure and noble love, replete with quotations from Homer and Euripides, is entirely appropriate. With this addendum to the speech, Aeschines appears less the homophobic boor and more the Platonic saint.

What is most interesting about Aeschines' rebuttal is the information it gives us about the strategy of defense, which was to offer a general apologia for pederasty, full of historical and poetic examples—Harmodius and Aristogiton, Achilles and Patroclus. Apparently Demosthenes and Timarchus' other defenders felt that Aeschines' ability to exploit the jury's general hostility to pederasty was more of a threat to Timarchus than any specific factual allegations. And indeed Aeschines' speech *is* based more on condemnation of Timarchus' character and lifestyle than on any specific evidence. Aeschines' moral fervor is undercut and embarrassed by the defense exposure of some pederastic poems Aeschines himself had authored in earlier years. In the face of these, Aeschines has no alternative but to modulate the otherwise unreservedly anti-pederastic ideology of his speech with a coda presuming to distinguish between good pederasty (his own kind) and bad pederasty (Timarchus' kind).

Demosthenes himself had made use of the same charge against a political rival a few years earlier in a speech he wrote for Diodorus to deliver against the despised tax collector Androtion. As in Isaeus 10, the actual legal issue in the case (having to do with an illegal proposal to award a crown) is an abstruse technicality unlikely to hold the jury's attention for very long. Barely a quarter of the way through the speech, the speaker therefore shifts focus and adds that Androtion's proposal was also illegal because he had been a prostitute and therefore should have no legal right to address the Council with any proposal. The speaker gives us no details and appears to possess even less proof of this charge than Aeschines does in Timarchus' case. Since Androtion had been active in Athenian politics for nearly thirty years and had made many enemies in his role as a zealous tax collector without this accusation having ever before been brought forward to disqualify him, it seems likely that Androtion's opponents concocted it from nothing as a salacious supporting argument in the present prosecution. Although the speaker devotes twelve paragraphs to this

law and its relevance (22.21–32), we never hear who Androtion served as a prostitute or when he did it.

Despite the lack of real evidence, Demosthenes and Androtion's enemies seemed confident that the mere charge would be enough to turn the jury against him. While Androtion's present wealth and social class are not made an issue in this case (it might undermine the credibility of the *pornos* charge), the speaker is at pains to emphasize that his victims as a tax collector are not wealthy, but mainly men of modest means who genuinely could not pay their arrears (22.60–65). The speaker imputes Androtion's heartlessness and lack of compassion as a tax agent to his rough experiences as a young hustler, trading his body for money with no feeling or emotion (22.58). Counterposed to this unattractive picture of the male prostitute/tax collector, the speaker presents sympathetically the female prostitutes Sinope and Phanostrate, two of Androtion's victims, whose house was raided and whose furniture was carted off, even though they owed nothing (22.56–58). Clearly Demosthenes assumes on the part of the jury more sympathy for poor female prostitutes than for a former male prostitute who rises above his station. As in the other speeches, we see here a complex mingling of class resentment against the rich and powerful with suspicion of the homosexual Other.

To sum up, it has been my argument that the active/passive dichotomy was of far less salience to ancient Greek judgments of homosexuality than the class-dynamics associated with its practice. Inasmuch as pederasty was perceived as an upper-class phenomenon, any practitioner, whether man or boy, was suspect in the eyes of the masses, a participant in a closed and incestuous system of aristocratic gift-exchange which included even the exchange of one's own body for the privilege of admission into the chosen circle of the Athenian political and intellectual elite.

Of course, suspicion of pederasty was not unique to the lower classes. Even among the upper class, it was probably practiced only by a minority. Several sources report that Pericles chided Sophocles for being too inclined to boys.[50] However, this might be just what we would expect from the political leader of the democratic faction in Athens.[51] Xenophon's work betrays a distinct bias in favor of heterosexuality; his attitude toward boy love might be characterized as one of detached bemusement, but not hostility.[52] The chaste, non-physical love which is praised in both Xenophon's and Plato's *Symposia,* as well as in the pseudo-Demosthenic *Erotic Essay* and the closing section of Aeschines'

speech, should perhaps be understood as a sanitized version of elite pederasty for public consumption, rather than as a description of the actual social practice of fourth century Athens.[53]

It may well be that lower-class suspicion of pederasty was augmented by the perception that it turned future citizens into passive objects of upper-class desire and thus made them too much like slaves. As Mark Golden has observed, the lower classes in ancient Greece were just close enough to being slaves economically that maintaining their sense of heterosexual virility intact was perhaps more of an issue than it would be for the financially secure, who need never worry about actually being mistaken for a slave.[54] It may also explain why there seems to have been less anxiety over pederastic relations that were in fact with a slave rather than a free-born youth.[55] To this limited extent, passivity was an issue, but it is clearly an oversimplification to contend that it was the principal issue or that active pederasts were free of negative moral judgment, since they, after all, were the ones responsible for seducing citizen boys. The principal issue was always class, not who was penetrating whom.

My view may be contrasted with the aggressive polarization of active/passive roles that has become something of a canard in the Gender and Sexuality courses which have proliferated in Classics departments across the country over the last decade. This viewpoint receives its clearest and one of its most influential articulations in David Halperin's widely-read essay, "One Hundred Years of Homosexuality":

> Not only is sex in classical Athens not intrinsically relational or collaborative in character; it is, further, a deeply polarizing experience: it effectively divides, classifies, and distributes its participants into distinct and radically opposed categories. Sex possesses this valence, apparently, because it is conceived to center especially on, and to define itself around, an asymmetrical gesture, that of the penetration of the body of one person by the body—and, specifically, by the phallus—of another. Sex is not only polarizing, however; it is also hierarchical. For the insertive partner is construed as a sexual agent, whose phallic penetration of another person's body expresses sexual "activity," whereas the receptive partner is construed as a sexual patient, whose submission to phallic penetration expresses sexual "passivity." Sexual "activity," moreover, is

> thematized as domination: the relation between the "active" and the "passive" sexual partner is thought of as the same kind of relation as that obtaining between social superior and social inferior. "Active" and "passive" sexual roles are therefore necessarily isomorphic with superordinate and subordinate social status; hence, an adult, male citizen of Athens can have legitimate sexual relations only with statutory minors (his inferiors not in age but in social and political status): the proper targets of his sexual desire include, specifically, women, boys, foreigners, and slaves—all of them persons who do not enjoy the same legal and political rights and privileges that he does.[56]

The reductionist fallacies of this approach, not to mention its phallocentrism, are too numerous to deconstruct here. It is a mistake to assimilate Greek pederasty to male/female or master/slave relations, even as it is a mistake to assume that either pederastic or heterosexual relations were themselves of a uniform character. Although Halperin's essay aims to liberate us from what he regards as the nineteenth-century intellectual construct of "homosexuality," his formulation of Greek sexuality is itself firmly rooted in the even more modern intellectual constructs of victimization theory and child molestation. Halperin's portrait of Athenian pederasty loses sight of the fact that the chosen youths were themselves usually upper-class and the relationship prepared them for inclusion in adult society, in the style of other initiation rituals. It equally loses sight of the notion, commonly articulated by the poets, that the lover is the yoked horse whose reins the beautiful boy controls at will.[57] Those who have actually been in love with attractive men or women twenty years younger than themselves know where the true power in the relationship resides. The interest of Aeschines' charges against Timarchus is not that Timarchus was the exploited "victim" of Hegesandrus or Misgolas, but that all three of them equally represent a corrupt social elite which average Athenians suspect. Such is also the interest of Aristophanes' homosexual characters, who are much freer in switching sexual positions than Halperin might care to acknowledge, but none of whom can possibly be viewed as politically subordinate. Plato's Phaedrus (*Symp.* 179b–180b) cannot even keep track of who is the *erastês* and who is the *erômenos* in his mythological exempla, since the *erômenoi* sometimes behave like *erastai*.

Halperin's mission, of course, is to present the Greeks as radically different from the modern homosexual—exploitive, slave-owning, woman-abusing, child-molesting moral primitives—hardly a palatable model for gay liberation. While I would certainly not minimize the differences between ourselves and the Greeks, I would submit that there may be more in common than many would care to admit. In our culture too, homosexuality is often most visibly identified with an intellectual and artistic elite, although not so much with a political elite as in Athens. And in our culture also, it is the lower classes who are most characterized by a social conservatism hostile to homosexuality and suspicious of its legitimation by the cultural elite. For the classical Athenians, as for us in post-Stonewall America, homosexuality was neither persecuted nor completely accepted, but was, to borrow a term from Foucault, "problematized." As Pausanias tells us in the *Symposium*, this is what differentiated Athens from oligarchies like Boeotia and Elis, where it was routine, and from monarchies like the Persian empire, where it was repressed. In a democratic society, sexual dissidence and sexual minorities are inevitably a critical pressure point in the ongoing *Kulturkampf* which accompanies the negotiation of political power between mass and elite.[58]

NOTES

1. K. J. Dover, *Greek Homosexuality* (Cambridge, Mass. 1978). Pp. 84–90 make it quite clear that Dover constructs his categories from improper analogies to modern heterosexual experience. His assumptions are followed and developed most prominently by M. Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Vol. II: The Use of Pleasure*, tr. R. Hurley (New York 1986); D. M. Halperin, *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality and Other Essays on Greek Love* (New York 1990), especially 15–40; J. J. Winkler, *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece* (New York 1990), especially 45–70; E. Cantarella, *Bisexuality in the Ancient World*, tr. C. Ó Cuilleanáin (New Haven 1992), 44–48; M. Williamson, *Sappho's Immortal Daughters* (Cambridge, Mass. 1995), 94–97.

2. J. Thorp, "The Social Construction of Homosexuality," *Phoenix* 46 (1992), 54–61. For a revaluation of the iconographic evidence, see C. A. M. Hupperts, "Greek Love: Homosexuality or Pederasty? Greek Love in Black Figure Vase-painting," in J. Christiansen and T. Melander (eds.), *Proceedings of the 3rd Symposium on Ancient Greek and Related Pottery* (Copenhagen 1988), 255–68; K. DeVries, "The 'Frigid Eromenoi' and Their Wooers Revisited: A Closer Look at Greek Homosexuality in Vase Painting," in M. Duberman (ed.), *Queer Representations: Reading Lives, Reading Cultures* (New York 1997), 14–24; M. Kilmer, "Painters and Pederasts: Ancient Art, Sexuality, and Social History," in M. Golden and P. Toohey (eds.), *Inventing Ancient Culture: Historicism, periodization, and the*

ancient world (London 1997), 36–49. Even Dover (note 1) 86–87 and 99, admits that age-equal relations sometimes appear on the vases. What has not yet been investigated in iconographic scholarship is the implied homoeroticism involving age-equal youths in gymnastic and music-school scenes.

3. A. Richlin, "Not Before Homosexuality: The Materiality of the *Cinaedus* and the Roman Law against Love between Men," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* (1993), 523–73.

4. Two studies which do take some preliminary steps in this direction, although with different emphases from mine, are D. Cohen, *Law, Sexuality, and Society: The Enforcement of Morals in Classical Athens* (Cambridge 1991), 171–202, and B. Thornton, *Eros: The Myth of Ancient Sexuality* (Boulder 1997), 99–120 and 193–212. Also important is J. N. Davidson, *Courtesans and Fishcakes: The Consuming Passions of Classical Athens* (London 1997), 168–72, who views appetitive excess of all kinds as the object of censure.

5. E. Bronner, "Study of Sex Experiencing 2d Revolution," *New York Times* (28 December, 1997), section I, 1 and 11.

6. I shall not attempt here a detailed catalogue of vases, but readers are referred to the rich collections of iconographic material in Dover (note 1) and M. F. Kilmer, *Greek Erotica on Attic Red-Figure Vases* (London 1991). See also G. Koch-Harnack, *Knabenliebe und Tiergeschenke: Ihre Bedeutung im päderastischen Erziehungsystem Athens* (Berlin 1983). H. A. Shapiro, "Courtship Scenes in Attic Vase Painting," *AJA* 85 (1981), 135–37, and "Eros in Love: Pederasty and Pornography in Greece," in A. Richlin (ed.), *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome* (Oxford 1992), 56–58, emphasizes the decorum of man-boy courtship (and sexual) scenes as marks of the boys' high status and respect, particularly when contrasted with the more exploitive postures and iconography of heterosexual pornography.

7. See Aristophanes, *Frogs* 729 and Dover's note *ad loc.*, referring to Plato, *Prot.* 326c and (Xen.), *Ath. Pol.* 1.13.

8. In addition to the famous episode with Alcibiades narrated in the *Symposium* (216d–219d), see Xen., *Mem.* 1.2.29–31, for Socrates' criticism of Critias' physical love of the boy Euthydemus, which Critias much resented, and 1.3.8–14, for his criticism of Critobulus kissing a beautiful boy. See also 2.6.31–33, for his warnings to the young Critobulus.

9. For the 150 chosen male couples who constituted the Sacred Band of Thebes, see Plutarch, *Pelopidas* 18–19; Xen., *Symp.* 8.34. For Ephorus' account of the Cretan ritual, which emphasizes that the boy must be of the best family and his abductor of an equally high or higher status, see 70F149 *FGrH* (= Strabo 10.4.21), and the discussion of B. Sergent, *Homosexuality in Greek Myth*, tr. A. Goldhammer (London 1987), 7–39.

10. The equation of pederasty with Dorian practice is implied in the comic use of the term *lakônizein* in that sense (Aristoph., fr. 358 *PCG*; Eupolis, fr. 385.1 *PCG*; however, Dover [note 1], 187–88, thinks the term a more general reference to anal sex regardless of gender); for the general evidence concerning the widespread practice of pederasty in Dorian cultures, see the classic study of E. Bethe, "Die dorische Knabenliebe," *RhM* 62 (1907), 438–75, and more recently P. Cartledge, "The Politics of Spartan Pederasty," *PCPS* NS 27 (1981), 17–36. For the connection with the Ionians, see Aristoph., fr. 556 *PCG*, and Shapiro (note 6 [1981]), 133–43, who stresses the artistic influence of Anacreon; for the associated use of Ionian luxury

and easy living as a topos in Athenian moral and political discourse of the fifth century, see L. Kurke, "The Politics of ἁβροσύνη in Archaic Greece," *CA* 11 (1992), 91–120.

11. See J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*, 2nd ed. (Oxford 1991), especially 57–78.

12. *Schol. Vesp.* 1025 (= Eupolis, fr. 65 *PCG*), says that Eupolis accused Aristophanes of something like this in *Autolycus*, but the scholiast cannot be right about this passage being a reply to Eupolis, since Athenaeus 216c–d clearly dates *Autolycus* two years later than *Wasps*. More likely Eupolis responded to Aristophanes' statement (possibly aimed at him), by asserting that Aristophanes was indeed guilty of what he denied: such an attack would protect Eupolis from charges of being too interested in boys in a play which itself centered on Callias' *paidika*. In a study of this play forthcoming in *Antichthon*, Ian Storey argues from other evidence that Aristophanes may have even been put on stage as a character involved in an agon with Eupolis.

13. Dover (note 1), 138.

14. (Xen.), *Ath. Pol.* 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.6, 1.9, etc.

15. As Davidson (note 4, 162–63 and 199–200) notes, Callias was also ridiculed as an adulterer with excessive desires for women—another hobby of rich wastrels who could afford to buy off the wrath of offended husbands.

16. Strattis wrote a *Chrysippus* (fr. 54–56 *PCG*), and Plato a *Laius*, perhaps take-offs on Euripides' *Chrysippus*. Eubulus, Alcaeus, and Antiphanes all wrote a *Ganymede*, and Antiphanes also had a *Paiderastês* (fr. 179 *PCG*); compare Diphilus' *Paiderastai* (fr. 57 *PCG*).

17. Alexis, fr. 3 *PCG*; Antiphanes, fr. 27.12–18 *PCG*; Timocles, fr. 32 *PCG*. Interestingly, the Antiphanes fragment links Misgolas' taste for boys with his extravagant epicurean appetite for fish (another topos of comic satire against the wealthy), here the "citharode fish."

18. In addition to the previous fragments cited above, Crates (fr. 1 *PCG*), says we have had enough of *paidika*. Telecleides (fr. 52 *PCG*), refers to a man as *paidophilês;* Plato (fr. 279 *PCG*), uses the related verb *paidophileô*. Cratinus (fr. 163 *PCG*), and Pherecrates (fr. 70 *PCG*), we shall discuss below.

19. See Aristoph., *Knights* 580, *Clouds* 1098–1101, *Wasps* 466, 475–77, 1068–70, *Birds* 1281–83; Dover (note 1), 78–79; M. Ostwald, *From Popular Sovereignty to the Sovereignty of Law* (Berkeley 1986), 235–36.

20. Dover (note 1), 135–37.

21. See Davidson (note 4), 199–200.

22. On the generally sophistic and unattractive character of Peisthetaerus' Utopian construction in *Birds*, see my expanded remarks in "Utopianism and the Sophistic City in Aristophanes," in G. W. Dobrov (ed.), *The City as Comedy: Society and Representation in Athenian Drama* (Chapel Hill 1997), 23–36.

23. As Aristophanes says in Plato's *Symposium* (191e–192b), "While they are boys, because they are chips off the male block, they love men and enjoy lying with men and being embraced by men . . . .When they're grown men, they are lovers of young men, and they naturally pay no attention to marriage or making babies, except insofar as they are required by local custom" (tr. Nehamas and Woodruff).

24. As Aristotle tells us (*EN* 7.5.3–4 and *Prob.* 4.26), being abused during childhood leads some men to accustom themselves to the pleasure of anal sex and continue taking the passive role even as adults.

25. Foucault (note 1), 84–86.

26. Henderson (note 11), 67–69.

27. Henderson (note 11), 129, who notes that the term is used of the male genitals exclusively in homosexual contexts.

28. The verb *laikasei* in *Knights* 167 must refer to this act, as demonstrated by H. D. Jocelyn, "A Greek Indecency and its Students: *Laikazein*," *PCPS* NS 26 (1980), 12–66, and accepted in the second edition of Henderson (note 11), 249.

29. Aelian, *V.H.* 2.21; *Schol. Areth. Symp.* 172A. The Platonic scholia identify as the source of this story the Hellenistic logographer Marsyas of Philippi (136F8 *FGrH*), who wrote a history of Macedon. The anecdote would therefore appear to have some historical authenticity, and is confirmed by Strattis' comedy *Pausanias,* which Athenaeus (13.589a), attests with the alternate title *Macedonians*. See the forthcoming article of David Armstrong on this subject.

30. Henderson (note 11), 109. One cannot discount the possibility that Agathon himself is characterized as having a small, boyish member, but this seems less likely.

31. Our lack of iconographic attestation for oral sex as a form of love-making between man and boy need not prove that it never occurred or was necessarily considered disgusting; we also find little evidence for pederastic anal sex in the idealizing iconography of the vases, but no one doubts that it often took place. We frequently see older lovers fondling boys' genitals, and Philocleon refers to such examination at the *dokimasia* as a pleasurable prerogative of jury duty (*Wasps* 578). Oral delectation could be merely another form of appreciating boys' organs, even as "trolls" today are accustomed to provide such service to younger and more desirable men in the context of gay saunas and video arcades. As we have seen, *Knights* 167 offers the opportunity to eat boys' cocks in the Prytaneum as the crowning reward of state service; it therefore must have been considered an enjoyable activity for those men who were inclined to boys, even as it is nowadays. See Henderson (note 11), 51–52, for the status of fellatio and cunnilingus as pleasurable alternatives for Greek men, when practiced in moderation. All of the evidence for male-male fellation as something disgusting is much later: see the collection of material in W. Krenkel, "Fellatio and Irrumatio," *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Wilhelm-Pieck-Universität Rostock* 29.5 (1980), 83–84.

32. It is interesting to note that Cleisthenes, the other notorious Aristophanic passive/effeminate, has a grown son who depilates his anus in mourning for his dead lover Sebinus (= "Fucker"), in *Frogs* 422-27. Being a passive/effeminate in no way rules out having children, apparently, although they may turn out to share their father's habits.

33. Here it is worth noting the iconographic evidence of Kilmer (note 2), 42–45, who analyzes scenes of younger males courting or even penetrating older men. See also Xen., *Anab.* 2.6.28. It may not have been the norm, but it did occur.

34. For the same conclusion, see Davidson (note 4), 172.

35. In an extended semantic discussion of the term *katapugôn,* Davidson (note 4), 171–73, opts for the vague LSJ translation "lewd." In some cases, it clearly cannot be made any more precise, but like many other Greek words, it retains its more specific etymological sense in other contexts. My argument is that this sense can be equally active or passive.

36. T. K. Hubbard, *The Mask of Comedy: Aristophanes and the Intertextual Parabasis* (Ithaca 1991), 82–83.

37. R. L. Fowler, "How the *Lysistrata* Works," *EMC* NS 15 (1996), 245–49. Cf. Thornton (note 4), 109.

38. Although the question is not without controversy, most recent scholarship favors a predominantly lower-class composition of the Athenian jury: see M. M. Markle, "Jury Pay and Assembly Pay at Athens," *History of Political Thought* 6 (1985), 265–97; R. K. Sinclair, *Democracy and Participation in Athens* (Cambridge 1988), 124–35; M. H. Hansen, *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes*, tr. J. A. Crook (Oxford 1991), 184–86. S. C. Todd, "*Lady Chatterley's Lover* and the Attic Orators: The Social Composition of the Athenian Jury," *JHS* 110 (1990), 146–73, argues for the predominance of small farmers on the jury. J. H. Kroll, *Athenian Bronze Allotment Plates* (Cambridge, Mass. 1972), 261–67, examines the prosopographic evidence of dikastic *pinakia* and concludes that most jurors were indeed of undistinguished background, but the upper class did participate as a minority roughly equal to their proportion of the overall population.

39. J. Ober, *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens* (Princeton 1989).

40. It should be noted that this speech was delivered before the Council of the Areopagus, and therefore had a more elite jury than the typical case at law. Even the majority of the upper class might be unsympathetic to a man who was excessively devoted to boys.

41. Such is the definition of the Byzantine lexicographers. However, E. Cantarella, "'Neaniskoi': Classi di età e passaggi di 'status' nel diritto ateniese," *MEFRA* 102.1 (1990), 41–42, notes that the term *meirakion* is used interchangeably with *neaniskos* in Aristophanes, *Knights* 1375–84, of young orators, i.e., of those who already had political rights. But Aristophanes may be using the term derisively to make the young orators seem too young to speak up.

42. Cf. Dem. 21.36, 54.14; Athenaeus 13.555a. These passages suggest a very nonchalant attitude toward fights over *pornai* or flute-girls.

43. Most scholarship has focussed on the speech as evidence for the abhorrence of sexual passivity on the part of a citizen: see Dover (note 1), 19–109; Foucault (note 1), 217–21; Halperin (note 1), 88–112; Winkler (note 1), 56–64; Cantarella (note 1), 48–53; Thornton (note 4), 113–14. Davidson (note 4), 253–77, argues at some length against this view, emphasizing (rightly in my opinion), that the issue of passivity scarcely comes up at all, and that the speech puts far more emphasis on Timarchus' character as a man of unlimited appetites and venality.

44. Cohen (note 4), 177–80, and at greater length, "Sexuality, Violence, and the Athenian Law of *Hubris*," *G&R* 38 (1991), 178–85. His view is controversial: for arguments revising it, see E. Cantarella, "L'omosessualità nel diritto ateniese," in G. Thür (ed.), *Symposion 1985: Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte* (Cologne 1989), 171–72, and M. Golden, *Children and Childhood in Classical Athens* (Baltimore 1990), 58–62.

45. On the *hetaira*'s art as one of accumulating expensive gifts from hopeful lovers, rather than the fee for specific sexual services characteristic of mere *pornai*, see the instructive remarks of Davidson (note 4), 202–203. Cantarella (note 1), 49, also emphasizes the distinction: the activity of the *pornos* or *pornê* was taxable, whereas that of the *hetairos* or *hetaira* was not.

46. Compare the Syracusan law to the effect that any man who dressed extravagantly and cultivated his physical appearance could be accused of being either an adulterer or a homosexual (*kinaidos*). See Phylarchus 81F45 *FGrH*.

47. Aesch. 2.179 refers to Demosthenes as "unmanly and womanlike," 3.155 as "unmanly and a deserter." Aeschines applies the term *kinaidos* to Demosthenes in

no fewer than five other contexts (1.181, 2.88, 2.99, 2.151, 3.167); curiously, Timarchus never earns the epithet. For Aristion, see 3.162. Aesch. 2.166 also refers negatively to Demosthenes as an active pursuer of boys: "were you not ashamed of the reputation you claimed for yourself, of being a pursuer of the boy's youth?" That Demosthenes can be characterized as both a *kinaidos* and an active pederast in the same speech shows that a considerable degree of reversability could be imagined in the roles.

48. Dover (note 1), 26–31. See also Cantarella (note 1), 50.

49. For a recent review of the evidence in favor of what could often be quite extensive revision of forensic speeches at their published stage, see I. Worthington, "Greek Oratory, Revision of Speeches and the Problem of Historical Reliability," *C&M* 42 (1991), 55–74. K. J. Dover, *Lysias and the Corpus Lysiacum* (Berkeley 1968), 167–72, also argues for such revision, particularly in the case of Aeschines.

50. See Plutarch, *Pericles* 8.5; Cicero, *Off.* 1.144; Valerius Maximus 4.3.ext.1.

51. Interestingly, Pericles' Funeral Oration (Thuc. 2.43.1), uses a distinctly heterosexual image in asking citizens to become "lovers" *(erastas)* of Athens (referred to with a feminine pronoun). As throughout, the Funeral Oration appropriates the imagery of private activities and relations and transfers it to citizens' relationship to the state, which for Pericles takes precedence over all private concerns.

52. In addition to the passages listed in note 8 above, see *Oec.* 12.13–14 (where devotion to *paidika* is a distraction from good household management), *Mem.* 2.1.24 and 30 (where *paidika* are part of the life of gentle ease offered by Vice in Prodicus' *Allegory*), *Anab.* 2.6.28 (a reference to Menon's love for a bearded *paidika,* as part of a generally hostile portrait of his character), and 5.8.4 (a derisive reference to fights over boys). But *Anab.* 7.4.7, *Cyr.* 1.4.27–28, and *Hiero* 1.29–38 are more indulgent anecdotes concerning boy-lovers; the first reveals that Xenophon himself even constituted a military unit on the model of the Sacred Band of Thebes. Xenophon's *Symposium* seems in many ways to be a heterosexual response to Plato's: 8.21–22 contrasts the mutual pleasure of heterosexual intercourse favorably with the pederastic variety, and the dialogue ends (9.5–7), with male and female dancers enacting the wedding of Dionysus and Ariadne, motivating all the married guests to go home to their wives at once, and all the unmarried to swear that they would take wives. However, Thornton (note 4), 103, goes beyond the evidence in claiming, "Like Plato, Xenophon considers sexual relations between men a depravity that all right-thinking men should abhor as much as they would incest."

53. As Thornton (note 4), 113, emphasizes, the repeated insistence in the *Erotic Essay* (61.1–2 and 5) on physical love between man and boy as "shame" *(aischunê)* presupposes a hostile public judgment. Compare the words of Pausanias in Plato's *Symposium* on the subject of vulgar lovers of boys, i.e., those seeking physical gratification (181e–182a), or the wholesale condemnation of the Athenian Stranger in the *Laws* I (636b–e).

54. M. Golden, "Slavery and Homosexuality at Athens," *Phoenix* 38 (1984), 320.

55. Hyperides 3, which like Lysias 3 concerns a dispute among rival lovers of a boy, shows far less embarassment over the affair, since in this case the boy is a slave rather than a freeborn Plataean.

56. Halperin (note 1), 30.

57. See, among others, Anacreon, fr. 360 *PMG*; Ibycus, fr. 287 *PMG*; Theognis 1357–60.

58. I cannot possibly enumerate all of the friends and colleagues who have contributed insights to this essay, but I would particularly like to thank David Armstrong, Michael Gagarin, Greta Ham, Jeff Henderson, Lisa Kallet, Jack Kroll, Gwyn Morgan, Doug Olson, Joseph Roisman, Marilyn Skinner, Ian Storey, John Thorp, and Andrew Zissos, as well as the other members of audiences in Austin, Boulder, Charlottesville, Halifax, New Haven, and New York, who have heard various oral incarnations of this paper and helped out with constructive questions. No one is to be held responsible for the conclusions or errors of the essay other than me.