

Pederasty and Democracy: The Marginalization of a Social Practice

Thomas K. Hubbard

Any serious historian of the early gay rights movements in England and Germany cannot doubt the centrality of Greek pederasty as a cultural and intellectual model at a time when even a vocabulary for describing same-gender love scarcely existed. Oscar Wilde, on trial for sodomy in 1895, roused the courtroom to spontaneous applause by declaring in response to the Prosecutor's question about a poem by his young lover:

'The Love that dare not speak its name' in this century is such a great affection of an elder for a younger man as there was between David and Jonathan, such as Plato made the very basis of his philosophy, and such as you find in the sonnets of Michelangelo and Shakespeare. It is that deep, spiritual affection that is as pure as it is perfect. . . . It is beautiful, it is fine, it is the noblest form of affection. There is nothing unnatural about it. It is intellectual, and it repeatedly exists between an elder and younger man, when the elder man has intellect, and the younger man has all the joy, hope and glamour of life before him. That it should be so, the world does not understand. The world mocks at it and sometimes puts one in the pillory for it. (Hyde 1962: 201)

Wilde's oration is remarkable not only for applying an ideal, Platonic framework to the defense of what were unquestionably physical relationships, but also for its frank insistence on the age-differential character of male love, again based on the Greek model and its Renaissance imitators. Wilde, an unabashed devotee of the Cult of Youth, had even ten years earlier written to the then 20-year old H. C. Marillier, whom he had first met at the age of 16, "I have never learned anything except from people younger than myself and you are infinitely young."

Contrast these prettified Victorian sentiments with the modern, "scientific" analysis of Greek man-boy love by a noted classical scholar and gay activist of our own day:

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 essentially 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 relationship between the 'active' and 'passive' sexual partner is thought of 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. (Halperin 1990: 30)

Amid all the seemingly objective sociological jargon, there is an ideological agenda at work here, just as surely as in the Victorians' more enthusiastic appropriation of the Greek paradigm. Rather than an arena for pedagogical mentorship, Greek pederasty has been transformed into an institutionalized power dynamic that exploits boys no differently from women and slaves, certainly no model for the enlightened, self-accepting gays of late 20th century liberal bourgeois society. Our past, rather than being an inspiration, is now something we can smugly congratulate ourselves on having transcended and forgotten, or better yet, on never having learned to begin with. The intellectual matrix that has produced this systematic estrangement from our cultural heritage bears investigation.

Linda Dowling (Dowling 1994) has argued that the scene was set for an intellectual defense of same-gender love by a series of reforms in the Oxford curriculum in the mid-19th century, opening the great universities to intellectually talented students from the upper middle-class, emphasizing Greek texts over Latin, and presenting the Great Books as serious models for philosophical and moral engagement, not merely as exercises in philological antiquarianism. In particular the prominence accorded the works of Plato exposed Oxford undergraduates to the image of a male intellectual society in which inti-

mate emotional and physical relations were taken for granted. Impressionable young men inevitably came to see the tutorial relationship on which Oxford education was based as in some sense mirroring the sublimated pedagogical eros of Socrates for his young students.

Even before Wilde, Oxford stimulated others to a critical reevaluation. Particularly notable was the poet and belles-lettrist John Addington Symonds, whose impassioned *Studies of the Greek Poets* (1873-76) unashamedly embraced their frankly homoerotic verse and honored "the furnace of Sappho, whose love, however criminal in the estimation of modern moralists, was serious and of the soul" (Symonds 1879: I, 318). Indeed Greece itself embodied for Symonds the figure of the beloved youth, human civilization in its heady and carefree adolescence:

Like a young man newly come from the wrestling-ground, anointed, chapleted, and very calm, the Genius of the Greeks appears before us. Upon his soul there is no burden of the world's pain; the creation that groaneth and travaileth together has touched him with no sense of anguish; nor has he yet felt sin. The pride and strength of adolescence are his—audacity and endurance, swift passions and exquisite sensibilities, the alternations of sublime repose and boyish noise, race, pliancy, and stubbornness and power, love of all fair things and splendours of the world, the frank enjoyment of the open air, free merriment, and melancholy well beloved. Of these adolescent qualities, of this clear and stainless personality, this conscience whole and pure and reconciled to nature, what survives among us now? (Symonds 1879: II, 384)

Adoration of this spirited cultural adolescent was central to Symonds' belated recognition of his own homosexuality, and led to his composing the first systematic treatment of Greek homosexuality in 1883, *A Problem in Greek Ethics*, followed eight years later by a work of explicit advocacy, *A Problem in Modern Ethics*.

A whole school of "Uranian" poets (named after Aphrodite Urania in Plato's *Symposium*, the goddess of spiritual male love) coalesced during this period, with their own specialty journals (see the anthology of Reade 1971). While many of these insisted on remaining true to the sex-transcendent ideal of Platonic eros, some, such as Theodore Wratislaw and Wilde's young lover, Lord Alfred Douglas, advanced a more frankly physical vision, albeit one still rooted in classicizing imagery. E. M. Forster's suppressed gay novel *Maurice* (written in 1914, but published only after his death) surely spoke to the experience of a whole generation of educated English homosexuals in making their mutual

reading of Plato the basis for two Cambridge undergraduates' initiation into what became a very un-Platonic and physical love. At about the same time Plato's *Phaedrus* became the intellectual substrate to the strange, silent obsession of the famous author Gustav Aschenbach with the winsome 14-year old Tadzio in Thomas Mann's novella *Death in Venice* (1912).

Whereas in England the homosexual movement was almost entirely an intellectual and literary phenomenon, the legal and political struggle for emancipation was considerably more advanced in the newly unified nation-state of Germany. Here too, the Greek model was no less influential on early pioneers. As early as 1862, K. H. Ulrichs used the Platonic myth of the Uranian and Dionean Aphrodites to form the terminological basis of his essentializing sexual typology. The leading and most persistent activist of the next generation was Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld, founder of the Scientific-Humanitarian Committee in 1897 and later of the Institute of Sexual Science, which flourished until ransacked by Nazi stormtroopers in May 1933. His first published statement on the issue was a pseudonymous pamphlet in 1896, titled *Sappho and Socrates: How Can the Love of Men and Women for Persons of Their Own Sex Be Explained?* Hirschfeld's massive scholarly work, *The Homosexuality of Men and Women* (1914) devotes over 70 pages to classical antiquity, but his real goal was to demonstrate the universality of homosexual practices in all cultures of the world. However, Hirschfeld's emphasis on legal reform and his desire to win acceptance for homosexuality in mainstream thought led him to deemphasize the age-differential aspect of the historical phenomenon: his petitions to the Reichstag always specified legalization of consensual acts only for those above the age of 16.

In contrast to Hirschfeld's reticence on this issue, a competing organization, Adolf Brand and Benedict Friedländer's Community of the Special, addressed it more directly. Brand's journal *Der Eigene* (*The Special*) was devoted especially to literature, art, photography, and polemical essays on boy love, in which classical motifs were pervasive. The principal theoretical statement of this movement was Friedländer's *Renaissance of Uranian Eros: Physiological Friendship, a Normal Human Activity and a Question of Manly Freedom of Association* (1904), which aggressively appealed to classical Greece for a model of aesthetic/romantic boy love consistent with maintaining procreative family relations as well. Efforts at practical reform failing, many Northern European homosexuals abandoned their homes for the comparative sexual openness offered by the lands of classical inspiration, Greece and Italy (see the account of Aldrich 1993): notable among these was Baron Wilhelm von Gloeden, a photographer who dressed Sicilian peasant boys in the garb of Theocritean shepherds and stationed them in stereotypical classical poses. His work still enjoys some popularity.

Early academic study of Greek pederasty by classicists, where it existed, was positive and non-judgmental. Building on K. O. Müller's *The History and*

Antiquities of the Dorian Race (1824; English trans. 1839), Erich Bethe published a seminal essay on "Dorian Boy Love" in the venerable academic journal *Rheinisches Museum* (1907), not only appropriating Müller's concept of a manly, militaristic comradeship of older and younger warriors among the Spartans and other Dorian tribes, but attributing to this relationship initiatory significance, with the act of anal insemination as a conduit infusing the developing ephebe with his older lover's courage, virtue, and wisdom. Written at the high point of the efforts to repeal the anti-sodomy statute in Germany and in a society saturated with Prussian concepts of military discipline, Bethe's thesis was very much a product of his time, imagining Greek pedagogical eros as a precursor of the Wandervogel movement glorified by Hans Blüher and others in the Community of the Special. Indeed, as David Dodd's essay in this volume demonstrates, the evidence on which scholars reconstruct early Cretan or Dorian social practices is often drawn from later Greek texts which may be constructing the past to fit their own ideological agenda (on military bonding, see also the forthcoming essay of Leitao).

The first comprehensive scholarly treatment of Greek sexuality, both heterosexual and homosexual, was produced from 1925 to 1928 (English trans. 1932) by Prof. Paul Brandt of Leipzig, writing under the enlightening pseudonym Hans Licht. With a Germanic penchant for exhaustive recording of detail, this work is still useful and largely succeeds in presenting the material free of moral judgment or bias, recognizing that Greek attitudes toward pederasty were complex and not always positive. J. Z. Eglinton's *Greek Love* (1964) is not so much a history of the practice in classical Greece as a more synthetic history of "Greek love" (i.e. pederasty) in Western culture since the Greeks, including a polemical defense of its value for modern society.

Modern scholarship on Greek pederasty is generally considered to begin with K. J. Dover's *Greek Homosexuality* (1978). Wide-ranging, yet scrupulous in its evaluation of source texts and one of the first books to integrate literary and artistic evidence, Dover's work has become established as the basic reference point for subsequent studies. However, despite the work's pretensions to objectivity, Dover, himself a happily married heterosexual, frequently draws analogies from modern English heterosexual mores (see especially Dover 1978: 84-90), and his influence has largely been responsible for the dogma that homosexual behavior was generally acceptable among the Greeks as long as adult male citizens retained the dominant role of active pursuer (*erastês*), and was scorned only with reference to the effeminized status of the passive, usually young beloved (*erômenos*), whom Dover sees as comparable to the "violated" and disgraced maiden in modern times.

In this regard, Dover's influence has been insidious. His polarization of sex roles was taken over and assumed by the French social historian Michel Foucault, whose projected multi-volume *History of Sexuality* accorded the Greeks intensive examination in volume 2, *The Use of Pleasure* (1984; English

trans. 1985). However, it was not fundamental to Foucault's project, which was not in any event a comprehensive history of sexual relations in Greece (such as Licht had done), but an exploration of Greek "practices of the self," whereby sexual morality is deployed by social and intellectual elites as one element within an internalized regimen of self-regulation. For Foucault, the pederastic relationship becomes a critical locus for testing equally the capacity of both adult lover and adolescent beloved to assume the responsibilities of wielding power within the family and the state, as demonstrated by their capacity to maintain mastery over their own passions and appetites.

Halperin's radical dichotomization of active/passive roles, as exhibited in the quotation at the beginning of this essay, presumes to develop Foucault's concern with sexuality as a vehicle of elite power, but it misunderstands Foucault's nuanced articulation of internalized power over the self as an external and unequal power relation between lover and beloved (for a systematic demolition of Halperin's scheme, see the outstanding work of Davidson 1997 and my own remarks in Hubbard 1998). It should not surprise us to find an American academic choosing to read Greek pederasty in such terms at the end of the decade that discovered "child abuse" as a supposedly pervasive phenomenon in American society: the Greeks were destined to fall victim to the same witchhunters who sent scores of innocent men and women to prison on such dubious theories as recovered memory syndrome, ritualized Satanic child abuse cults, or observation of children at play with anatomically correct dolls. Halperin's strongly negative portrayal of Greek pederasty coincided with the systematic strategy of mainline, assimilationist gay rights organizations to marginalize any consideration of youth sexuality or reform in age-of-consent laws and instead present to the public the most unthreatening, plain vanilla image of gays and lesbians—average, dull, middle-aged, middle-class couples with the same bland careers and "marriages" as everyone else.

However, there is a more deeply rooted ideological substrate to the current marginalization of our Greek heritage than mere political opportunism. Halperin's self-conscious trashing of the Greek model forms part of a general overthrow and rejection of classical paradigms by classicists themselves, especially feminist scholars and social egalitarians uncomfortable with the traditional glorification of societies even less progressive than our own in their treatment of women and minorities. Weary of trying to teach grueling courses of study in classical languages and ancient history to attention-deficient students brought up on MTV, many contemporary Classics professors will opt instead for a few neat and easily digested formulae drawn from the social sciences, which seem to provide global explanations of classical cultures by deposing them from their former thrones of academic privilege to be now on a level of interpretative equality with Australian aborigines or Indian tribes of the Brazilian rainforest. To the extent that one can find more "victims" in the classical civilizations, the more grist for the mills of insecure classicists anxious to jus-

tify themselves in the eyes of their more contemporary and trendy colleagues. In this ultra-egalitarian context, a form of love based on age difference appears unfathomable and can only be explained as "exploitation." Greek love seemed more credible as a model for earlier generations that took for granted that some social inequality would always exist in the world; indeed for our ancestors age- and class-differential erotic relationships were appealing precisely because they offered routes of subversion and escape from rigid class and gender hierarchies.

It is worth observing that much the same development of attitudes toward pederasty took place in ancient Athens itself: as the politics of the city became more radically democratic and contentious during the fifth and into the fourth centuries BCE, traditional man-boy love was put on the defensive. Too many scholars have treated Greek pederasty as if it were a single immutable institution that remained constant throughout the centuries, but Greek social attitudes were just as capable of change from one generation to the next as 20th century attitudes toward homosexuality. Moreover, practices and attitudes varied widely in different regions of Greece, as Pausanias acknowledges in Plato's *Symposium* (182A-C).

Lyric poets of the late seventh through the early fifth centuries BCE portray an aristocratic culture in which same-gender age-differential love was commonplace and even the romantic norm. As Sara Monoson demonstrates in this volume, even Athens elevated the man/youth couple Aristogeiton and Harmodius to the status of martyrs and cult-figures in the early fifth century, despite their relatively minor and incidental role in the overthrow of the Peisistratid tyranny. For the early, more moderate Athenian democracy, still dominated by the leadership of a few aristocratic families, this man/youth couple became an icon of "democratic" resistance to tyranny and the happy coincidence of public and private interests. But later authors, including Thucydides and Aristotle, tried to discredit the story as a hoary legend which had done more harm than good: rather than democratic heroes, Aristogeiton and Harmodius came to be perceived as aristocratic plotters whose machinations only made the Peisistratid tyranny worse.

And as Alan Shapiro shows in his essay, Athenian vase painting of the sixth and early fifth centuries proudly displayed a profuse variety of scenes of man-boy courtship and intimacy, with sufficient ease and self-assurance that even the vase painters themselves could be cited as pederasts by other vase painters. But as Shapiro established in an earlier article (Shapiro 1981), one finds very few such scenes later in the fifth century; indeed, one also finds few scenes of heterosexual pornography in the vase iconography of that period. The conclusion should therefore not be that there was a decline in homosexual conduct, but that the visual iconography of an increasingly democratic Athens was one grounded in "family values" rather than the freely expressed sensuality and hedonism of earlier art. In this environment, homoerotic art did not

disappear, but it became more implicit and coded in its techniques of expression: it is now a matter of exchanged glances or naked youths at the bath, not scenes of overt physical contact or proposition.

In the literary sphere, one finds a parallel evolution of attitudes toward pederasty. The sexual concerns of Greek tragedy were overwhelmingly heterosexual, but we do know of at least two lost tragedies with homoerotic themes. Early in the fifth century Aeschylus wrote a dramatic version of Homer's *Iliad* in which the heroic friendship of the warriors Achilles and Patroclus was depicted in explicitly homoerotic terms, with Achilles styled as the older lover of Patroclus. In contrast to this idealized relationship, however, Euripides' *Chrysis*, from later in the fifth-century, presented a pederastic relationship which gave rise to kidnapping, rape, and ultimately the boy's suicide.

The marginalization of pederasty as an elite practice foreign to the homogenizing impetus of late Athenian democracy is also apparent in the evidence afforded by two literary genres which came to the fore in the late fifth century as expressions of popular values—comic drama and forensic oratory. I have argued at length in an earlier article (Hubbard 1998) that these two genres highlight pederasty as a strongly class-marked institution in Athens, identified with upper-class men who had the money, leisure, and social skills to court attractive adolescents, who in turn came from equally privileged social backgrounds affording them the license to habituate the gymnasia and philosophical schools popularly imagined as the hotbeds of male love. To working-class Athenians surviving on subsistence incomes (about 95% of the population), the practice and its milieu were a world apart, and it is no surprise that the two literary forms which most appealed to a mass audience were largely hostile to pederasty.

Athenian comedy, particularly in its late fifth-century incarnation, was generally sceptical of the political, social, and intellectual elites of the day. Adult pederasts were lampooned either as extravagant, easily bamboozled spend-thrifts like Callias and Misgolas or as luxuriant effeminates like the tragic poet Agathon, dressed in full-scale drag in the prologue of Aristophanes' *Thesmophoria Women* so that he can empathize more with female characters in his dramas. Boys, for their part, are characterized in comedy as manipulative male hustlers, whose permanently widened anuses will qualify them to become successful politicians as adults, skilled in the arts of flattery and gift-taking. As one example out of many, we can look to Aristophanes' *Clouds* (originally produced in 423 BCE), a satire on Socrates and the philosophical schools. One scene of the play features an allegorical debate between the figures of Right Logic and Wrong Logic: the former is an advocate of the old ways and especially of the traditional pederastic education. Wrong Logic, on the other hand, is a modern sophist, a permissive moral relativist and hedonist who can deploy clever argument in the service of any goal, such as the seduction of other men's wives. When Right Logic objects that adultery is frequently pun-

ished by stuffing foreign objects into the miscreant's anus, *Wrong Logic* points out that all the most prominent men in Athens already have wide anuses (in virtue of having engaged in passive sodomy as boys) and therefore have nothing to lose. *Right Logic* must then concede the debate and admit that he too belongs among this wide-assed elite, a hypocrite with no moral authority to condemn his overtly self-indulgent interlocutor.

Another literary genre that flourished in the late fifth and fourth centuries was forensic oratory, that is, speeches delivered before a court of law. It was a concomitant development of Athenian democracy that important cases came to be tried before juries of up to 500 members drawn from a representative cross-section of the citizen population. The art of public speaking grew out of the need to sway such audiences to one's cause and not allow them to be swayed by a more clever opponent. Unlike later Roman law, Greek law was never systematically codified, and success in cases at law had far more to do with establishing one's personal credibility before the jury as superior to that of one's opponent. Hence unabashed personal invective was common, often with little concern for factual evidence. Charges of irregular sexuality, particularly of a homosexual nature, were calculated to estrange the jury's sympathy from one's opponent. The fourth-century politicians Demosthenes and Aeschines both delivered speeches attacking rivals as onetime boy prostitutes (and therefore ineligible for political involvement). Aeschines reviled Demosthenes for being "unmanly" and sexually passive, for wearing fine clothes similar to a woman's, for pursuing youths and even keeping one at his house. However, Aeschines himself was embarrassed by the exposure of some pederastic poems he wrote earlier in his life and defended himself by declaring his own love for boys pure and spiritual, in contrast to the physical lust and desire for gain he imputed to his opponents.

This strategy of defending elite homoeroticism to a hostile and suspicious public by pretending that it is chaste and non-physical may lie behind the concept of "Platonic love." As Josiah Ober (Ober 1998) and others have documented, the trial and condemnation of Socrates in 399 BCE was merely one in a series of events in the political history of Athens in this period which evidenced a growing distrust of intellectual elites by the masses and their political leaders, and *vice versa*. Intellectuals, mainly from the leisure class, were generally suspected as oligarchs and Spartan sympathizers who contributed to Athens' disastrous defeat in the 20-year long Peloponnesian War and then collaborated in the short-lived pro-Spartan regime afterward. To the extent that pederasty was widely identified as a Dorian (and therefore Spartan) custom practiced mainly by the intellectuals and upper classes in Athens (see David Dodd's essay in this volume), it became an associated target of the popular backlash.

Early Platonic dialogues such as the *Lysis* and *Charmides* acknowledge a flourishing culture of male homoerotic attractions among the *jeunesse dorée* who frequented the gymnasia and listened to the iconoclastic teachings of

Socrates. But Socrates himself, although enjoying their company, never participated in a physical relationship with his young followers. Indeed, Xenophon's *Memorabilia of Socrates* (1.2.29-31, 1.3.8-15, 2.6.28-33) records several episodes in which Socrates openly rebuked young men in his circle for kissing or making physical advances on boys. It is the two middle Platonic dialogues, the *Symposium* and *Phaedrus*, that are best known for articulating the doctrine of Platonic love. In the *Symposium* (180D-182A), the character Pausanias distinguishes sharply between Aphrodite Urania, defined as a chaste, spiritual, fundamentally non-sexual love between man and youth, practiced by a select group of the philosophically enlightened, and Aphrodite Pandemos (or Dionean Aphrodite), the more common carnal love, whether heterosexual or homosexual, called "Pandemos" because it belongs to all (*pan*) the people (*dêmos*). Later in the *Symposium* (210A-211C), Socrates presents physical attraction to a beautiful object, such as a boy, as merely the first and lowest step in a ladder of erotic relations ascending ultimately to a disembodied, philosophical contemplation of ideal and essential Beauty.

The *Phaedrus* (230E-234C) attributes a speech to the popular orator Lysias, explaining to a youth why a non-lover is a better companion than a lover: in Lysias' view, a lover will manipulate a boy into becoming weak and dependent. Although Socrates ultimately convinces Phaedrus to reject this view in favor of a doctrine of love as the subconscious memory of a state of prenatal union with ideal and essential Beauty, the speech of Lysias does suggest the existence of an anti-pederastic tradition even in the intellectual discourse of this period. Indeed, Plato's latest work, the *Laws* (636B-E, 836B-841E), drops all pretense of defending pederasty as chaste love or as a metaphor for union with ideal Beauty: instead it is dismissed as an unnecessary and "unnatural" pleasure, best regulated out of existence in the ideal state that work imagines. Plato, Ephorus, and Aristotle all trace the origins of pederasty to the Dorian tribes of Crete; as David Dodd's essay suggests, this need not be considered reliable historical evidence so much as a fourth-century elite construction of pederasty as an institution fundamentally foreign to Athens' radicalized democracy, but associated with more disciplined and arguably better governed societies elsewhere.

Pederasty did not disappear in classical Athens, but over the course of the fifth and fourth centuries became progressively deinstitutionalized and covert. Where it was once central to the city's self-definition as a moderate democracy under the leadership of an aristocratic elite, as Sara Monson has shown in the legend of Harmodius and Aristogeiton, it later came to be seen as an embarrassment in the broader and more radicalized democracy of the late fifth- and fourth-centuries. Philosophers took refuge in the fiction of a "chaste" pederasty, which only contributed further to the marginalization of actual physical love. By creating such a sharp dichotomy between Uranian, intellectual love and sexual love, Plato and other fourth-century intellectuals unwittingly pro-

moted a conceptual matrix in which all physical love of boys came to be only physical love. Robbed of cultural status and its civic mission of providing role models to future citizens, pederasty came to be identified more with male prostitution (hence the charges in comedy and the orators) and the fair-skinned slave boys of later Greek epigram.

Similarly the man-boy love that was acknowledged and even celebrated by early homosexual activists has been marginalized within our own progressively democratic and homogenized society, isolated as the province of "perverts" and "child molesters." Again, the squeamishness and timidity of gay intellectuals in the face of public hostility have made them tacit collaborators: even as Plato and others sold out the real pederasts by pretending that there could be a chaste, purely spiritual pederasty (never a trend likely to win many converts), gay leaders today sell out their brothers (and in many cases their own repressed desires) by creating the public fiction that most gays are involved in long-term monogamous age- and class-equal relationships, and that the only men attracted to teenage boys are a few sickos in NAMBLA whom they would like to see in prison just as much as straight society does.

"Greek love" as a cultural icon has always been an object of ideological construction, or "reconsideration," even by the Greeks themselves, as the three other essays in this volume will demonstrate. Oscar Wilde's and J. A. Symonds' idealistic version of Greek love was just as much an over-simplification of the complex historical phenomenon as David Halperin's ghastly nightmare vision of a society where the penetrating phallus was the universal wrench of subordination. Similarly elite Athenians of the fifth century constructed colorful stories grounding their own sexual practices and values in earlier times. While no scholarly analysis can ever claim to be completely value-free, it is the goal of this collection to present nuanced, non-judgmental studies of Greek pederasty which do justice to the diachronic development of the practice and carefully deconstruct the array of ideological filters through which our fragmentary information about it has been transmitted.

Leagros and Euphronios: Painting Pederasty in Athens

H. A. Shapiro

Recent discussions of Greek homosexuality have rightly laid considerable stress on the evidence of Athenian black- and red-figure vase-painting, a body of primary source material that had been largely neglected in earlier text-based studies. Sir Kenneth Dover's landmark *Greek Homosexuality* of 1978 was the first full-scale attempt to exploit the evidence of the vases in writing social history. His work was in turn facilitated by that of Sir John Beazley, the greatest scholar of Greek vases, whose 1947 study of homosexual courting scenes was the first systematic collection and analysis of this substantial body of vases (now numbering well over 100). Though Beazley's study has at times been criticized as incomplete (Kilmer 1997), the fact is that the essential typology he established for courtship scenes has held up extremely well and continues to accommodate the great majority of new vases that have come to light since he wrote. The only needed precaution, as we shall see, is not to use this typology as a Procrustean bed for an art form that was not always as formulaic as some scholars have imagined.

Courtship Scenes: Standards and Exceptions

Beazley established that three stock motifs occur repeatedly in erotic scenes pairing a bearded man and a beardless youth or (less often) a youth with just the beginnings of a beard and a slightly younger boy (Beazley 1989: 4-25). In type alpha, the pair face each other, and the older wooer (*erastês*) through hand gestures makes clear his interest: chucking the boy's chin with one hand, while the other reaches for his genitals (Figs. 1, 3). The beloved (*erômenos*) may or may not resist, with varying degrees of determination. Beazley's type beta encompasses the giving of gifts from *erastês* to *erômenos* (Figs. 2, 7), typically live animals that may be held by either the donor or the recipient (Koch-Harnack 1983). Finally, type gamma represents the sex act itself (Fig. 2), in one specific and somewhat cumbersome form, the *erastês* rubbing his erect penis between the thighs of the *erômenos* (Beazley's "intercrural intercourse").

This typology was just that, an attempt to bring order to a previously unstudied group of vase-paintings, without any attempt to relate them to other evidence for the practises or ideology depicted. Aside from establishing the chronological parameters (namely, that courtship scenes enter the Attic black-figure repertoire ca. 560 B.C., reach their greatest popularity in the later sixth century, and continue, though less frequent, in red-figure down to ca. 475, when they abruptly stop), Beazley did not attempt to relate their appearance and disappearance to the historical, social, or political development of Athens