

Copyright Notice

Staff and students of this University are reminded that copyright subsists in this extract and the work from which it was taken. This Digital Copy has been made under the terms of a CLA Licence which allows you to:

- Access and download a copy
- Print out a copy

This Digital Copy and any digital or printed copy supplied to or made by you under the terms of this Licence are for use in connection with this module or course of study. You may retain such copies after the end of the course, but strictly for your own personal use.

All copies (including electronic copies) shall include this Copyright Notice and shall be destroyed and/or deleted if and when required by the University.

Except as provided for by copyright law, no further copying, storage or distribution (including by e-mail) is permitted without the consent of the copyright holder.

The author (which term includes artists and other visual creators) has moral rights in the work and neither staff nor students may cause, or permit, the distortion, mutilation or other modification of the work, or any other derogatory treatment of it, which would be prejudicial to the honour or reputation of the author.

Title of extract: **Homosexuality and Warfare in Ancient Greece**

Name of Author: **Ogden, D.**

Title/Author of book/edition (if applicable): **Battle in Antiquity. Lloyd, A.B.**

Name of Visual Creator or other acknowledgement (if applicable):

Journal details –title/Vol/Year (if applicable):

Publisher: **Duckworth**

Pages scanned: **107 - 168**

Course of Study (Module name and number): **Armies and Navies CLAH6003**

Name of Designated Person

authorising scanning: *E.L. Hamis*

Date authorised: 21.03.17.

Moodle/Powerpoint

HOMOSEXUALITY AND WARFARE IN ANCIENT GREECE

Daniel Ogden¹

The Ministry of Defence sacks up to one hundred men and women each year from British armed forces for homosexuality, which is deemed 'incompatible with military service'. The cost to the taxpayer, both in terms of the loss of experienced personnel and in terms of the detailed investigations into and surveillance of the private lives of suspected individuals, is estimated to be between ten and twenty million pounds a year (see the article by Edmund Hall in *The Independent*, Saturday 11 March, 1995, p. 15, and his forthcoming *We Can't Even March Straight* [London, 1995]). The Ministry's attitude would have astounded the folk of the many historical societies that have considered the army the social home of homosexuality, and developed ideologies that associated it with the structuring of the fighting force and the promotion of valour: the Celts,² the Vikings, the Templars,³ the Zulus,⁴ the Hitler Youth⁵ and the pirates of the Spanish Main⁶ are among the more obvious examples of such societies. And indeed such customs and beliefs can still be found in a number of societies in Papua New Guinea (see appendix). We shall see that at least some of the Greeks also entertained similar ideas.⁷ It is the purpose of this paper to **assess** the character, extent and role of homosexuality in Greek armies, to **examine** the ways in which the Greeks conceptualised homosexuality in the context of battle, and to consider how conducive was homosexuality, as constructed by the Greeks, to the making of efficient warfare.⁸

Warfare, pederasty and the other Greek homosexuality

In his famous *History of Education in Antiquity*, first published in French in 1948, Marrou attempted to explain Greek homosexuality as deriving from 'the comradeship of warriors', and built up his case with series of historical and ethnographic parallels from societies similar to

those listed above.⁹ More recent scholars tend to refer fleetingly to Marrou's idea, and dismiss it.¹⁰ Two reasons might be advanced for this dismissal – one proper, the other improper.

The proper reason is that it is now recognised as at best naïve and at worst dangerous to seek the 'cause' of homosexuality in any context, whether historical, sociological, psychological or biological, since attempts to do so almost inevitably present it as an *aberration* from or *failure* of heterosexuality (which is taken as a given and without cause). Such attempts therefore, whether intentionally or otherwise, licence the marginalisation and oppression of homosexuality. For this and other reasons recent writing on Greek homosexuality does not seek its *cause*, but seeks rather to elucidate the ways in which the Greeks *constructed* it, that is, to understand the modes and contexts of its practice and the meanings attributed to them.¹¹ Indeed Halperin considers the concept of 'homosexuality' itself as a construct of the last century and not an appropriate tool for the investigation of any part of ancient Greek sexuality.¹²

The second, and improper, reason for the relative lack of attention given to Marrou's thesis is that it apparently requires the widespread existence of a mode of homosexuality among the Greeks that is almost totally excluded from the currently received model of Greek homosexuality: the received model is pederasty,¹³ and the excluded mode is sex between two adult males. The received model, largely constructed from Athenian evidence (some of which we shall see later) might be summarised as follows:

Sex between males in Greece almost always consisted of an *erastēs* (lover), a young man, ideally a bachelor, courting a beardless adolescent boy, the *erōmenos* (beloved)¹⁴ between the ages of 12 and 18,¹⁵ and, if successful, consummating his desire by sodomy.¹⁶ As the boy turned to manhood in the period between the ages of 18 and 20 (the period of life associated with the *ephēbeia*), he would himself cease to be a passive partner, and himself in turn pursue other boys, and then later on, by around the age of thirty, give up homosexuality altogether in favour of marriage.¹⁷ The *erastēs*' role was one of dominance, the *erōmenos*' one of subjection (see below for further discussion of this particular point). As a result, the pursued boy was in a morally precarious situation, but he retained his honour so long as he was extremely discriminating in his acceptance of a lover, took extravagant gifts for his favours,¹⁸ but money on no account, and did not enjoy being sodomised. The lover would use his dominant position to give the boy valuable help – material or ethical – in becoming a full adult member of the community (this particular aspect of Greek pederasty encourages many scholars to derive it from an 'initiation rite').¹⁹ It is the educative aspects of pederasty that led Plato to

dwell so much upon it in the *Symposium*. In the Greeks' view, only an extremely deviant grown man would put himself in the role of the *erōmenos*, and those who did, whether as prostitutes, as Timarchus was alleged to have been,²⁰ or as men who simply enjoyed and actually sought to be sodomised, '*kinaidoi*',²¹ were conceptualised as effeminate and utterly reviled; and at Athens the former group was deprived of citizenship.

It can be seen at once that this model militates against the acceptance of widespread and institutionalised homosexuality in Greek armies, since Greek armies were normally made up entirely of grown men (aged 20+; indeed fitness to be taken into the army might be said to have been the basic criterion of manhood); all soldiers therefore ought to have been either only heterosexually interested (if over 30) or (if under 30) potential *erastai*, and there ought not to have been any *erōmenoi* available,²² apart, I suppose, from the few that dared risk the 'life of the *kinaidos*'.²³

Inadequacies of the pederasty model

Nonetheless Greek homosexuality in a military context is worth pursuing, in defiance of the pederasty model, not only because comparative evidence from other societies obliges us to suspect its existence, but because there is firm evidence that there was indeed institutionalised military homosexuality in some Greek states at least (as we shall see later on). And, furthermore, there is reason for doubting the integrity of the pederasty model in itself, particularly in regard to its hierarchical differentiations and age-boundaries.

Firstly, much iconographical evidence has been collated recently for homosexual relationships between adolescent age-peers (and indeed the vases of one, admittedly idiosyncratic, painter, the 'Affecter', actually portray bearded *erōmenoi*).²⁴ Some scholars do grudgingly concede the possibility of the existence of adolescent peer homosexuality within the Spartan schooling system.²⁵ On the basis of what criteria were the roles of *erastēs* and *erōmenos* assigned within such relationships? Perhaps such roles simply were not assigned. Adolescent relationships disturb the pederasty model's requirement of hierarchical differentiation between the members of the couple, but not necessarily its age-boundaries, if we assume that such couples belonged to the transitional phase of 18–20 years.

But there is nonetheless plenty to indicate the inadequacy of the model's age-boundaries. Aeschines makes it clear that grown men of any age are potentially interested *erastai*: he talks of himself (in his

early forties) as such, and mentions men older than himself still interested in boys.²⁶ Sophocles is known to have courted boys at 55 and 65.²⁷ Lysias speaks of his love for Theodotus when aged over 50.²⁸

Erastēs-erōmenos relationships that endure well past the boyhood of the *erōmenos* are attested. Agathon is the *erōmenos* of Pausanias at 18 in Plato's *Protagoras*,²⁹ and is still such in his *Symposium*, which has a dramatic date twelve years later (416), and it is also known that Pausanias went on to follow Agathon to Macedon at some point after 411;³⁰ the adult and bearded Agathon was also the *erōmenos* of Euripides until the former was 40 and the latter 72.³¹ If the historical indications of Plato's references to the relationship between Socrates and Alcibiades are taken literally, the two had a relationship for at least twenty years, beginning when the *erōmenos* Alcibiades was well past 15, and hence going on until he was well past 30.³² Athenaeus tells that the Stoics maintained that one should keep an *erōmenos* until he was 28.³³ And the *relative* age relationship of the traditional model is violated by the couple mentioned in Xenophon's *Anabasis*, where the *erastēs* is a beardless youth, Aristippus, and his *erōmenos* bearded.³⁴

Nor does marriage clearly operate as a watershed: quite apart from all the old married *erastai* just mentioned, Xenophon in his *Symposium* portrays a just-married *erastēs* pursuing an *erōmenos*.³⁵ Even granted that Greek male sexuality was structured in a radically different fashion to our own (in that all young men – at least of certain classes – were presumed to have and apparently did have a significant interest in boys as well as women), it is difficult to accept that their sexuality underwent a sea-change at a certain time of life; those socialised to pederasty before 30 must have retained some homosexual interest after 30. (However the Sambian material reviewed in the appendix does provide a possible model for such a change, and one that would accommodate our new bridegroom and his *erōmenos*.)

Therefore all members of Greek armies were potential '*erastai*', and undoubtedly many of them were potential '*erōmenoi*' also. And in any case, modern scholars often work with excessively rigid ideas about the exclusivity and differentiatedness of 'active' and 'passive' sexual roles within even truly pederastic relationships: who is to know the secrets of the boudoir?³⁶ It is very hard to imagine, given this background, that there was no significant institutionalised homosexuality in Greek armies in the field, where women will have been hard to come by. Evidence for hosts of female camp-followers in the trains of Greek armies is rather scant: the big exception is Alexander's *anabasis*;³⁷ less can be made, for instance, of Theopompus' description of the de-

bauched Chares taking around with him flute-girls, dancing girls and 'foot-prostitutes' (*pezai hetairai*) in 343/2.³⁸ Indeed the Greeks themselves clearly believed that soldiers sodomised each other on campaign. An important fragment of the Athenian comic playwright Eubulus, to which we shall return, tells of the Greek army during the siege of Troy:

Nor did any of them see a courtesan (*hetairan*), but they kneaded (*edephon*, i.e. masturbated) themselves for ten years. Bitter was the military service they saw, who, having taken but one city, went away far wider-arsed (*euryprōktoteroi* – i.e., more thoroughly buggered) than the city which they took at that time.
Eubulus F118 K-A³⁹

The pederastic model (which is, for the most part, legitimately constructed from the Greek evidence) represents an ideal of Greek homosexuality that in no way accounts for the entirety of the practice. 'Military' homosexuality has impinged relatively little on the consciousnesses of modern scholars partly because it impinged relatively little on the consciousness of the Greeks themselves; we shall investigate the reasons for this below.

Modern scholarship's tendency to identify Greek homosexuality with pederasty may, paradoxically, stem from a desire to 'neutralise' it. Pederasty may seem initially more threatening, since the phenomenon in our own culture which most closely, albeit quite misleadingly, translates it is paedophilia (a point that particularly exercises Buffière);⁴⁰ but pederasty, particularly when explained with reference to initiation, has the advantage of belonging to the distant and morally unevaluable realm of the anthropological, and so tends to remove the practices of the ancient Greeks far from the threat of the banal inter-adult homosexuality of our own culture.

Let us turn to the evidence for institutionalised homosexuality in the context of warfare in ancient Greece. I shall present the evidence out of chronological order, for the sake of greater clarity.

Classical Thebes and elsewhere

Thebes (Boeotia)

The most detailed account of institutionalised military homosexuality at Thebes in the fourth century is provided by Plutarch in a text that is worth quoting at some length, because it introduces many important ideas that we will meet in other contexts:⁴¹

18. Gorgidas first founded the Sacred Band (*hieros lochos*), as they say, from three hundred picked men [possibly in around 378].⁴² The city provided them with their daily bread and gave them opportunity to

exercise. They encamped on the Cadmeia [the acropolis]. Because of this they were called the Band from the City, for the men of those days properly used to call acropolises 'cities' (*poleis*). Some say that this unit was formed from *erastai* and *erōmenoi*. A joking remark of Pammenes is recorded:⁴³ he said that Homer's Nestor did not understand tactics when he bade the Greeks to be ordered by tribes and phratry, 'So that phratry may help phratry, and tribes tribes,'⁴⁴ and that instead he ought to have drawn up *erastēs* beside *erōmenos*. For tribesmen did not take much account of other tribesmen nor phratrymen of other phratrymen in times of danger, but a band that was fitted together (*synērmomenon*) by sexual love was indissoluble and unbreakable, since they stood firm in the face of danger on account of each other, the *erastai* out of love for their *erōmenoi*, and the *erōmenoi* out of shame before their *erastai*. This is not surprising, since men feel more shame towards their partners when absent than towards other people that are actually present. So it was that an *erastēs* begged and besought the enemy that was about to slaughter him as he lay on the ground to put the sword through his breast, 'So that,' as he said, 'my *erōmenos* may not see me with a wound in my back and be ashamed of me.'⁴⁵ It is said that Iolaus participated in Heracles' labours and fought by his side (*paraspizein*) as his *erōmenos*, and Aristotle⁴⁶ says that still in his time *erōmenoi* and *erastai* exchanged their pledges at the tomb of Iolaus.⁴⁷ So it was reasonable that the band should have been called 'sacred', because Plato termed the *erastēs* a friend 'inspired by god.'⁴⁸ It is said that the band continued unbeaten until the battle at Chaeronea. And when Philip was looking over the dead after the battle, he stopped at that place at which it happened that the Three Hundred had fallen, in their armour, after having met, every one of them, the sarisas head on, all mixed up with one another. It is said that he was amazed by the sight, and, on discovering that this was the band of the *erastai* and the *erōmenoi*, wept and said 'May those that suppose that these men do or suffer something shameful perish!'⁴⁹

19. More generally, it was not, as the poets say, the passion of Laius [for Chrysippus]⁵⁰ that made a beginning of the customs concerning *erastai* for the Thebans, but the lawgivers, who wished to relax and soften their naturally undilutedly hot-tempered ways from earliest boyhood, involved the flute (*aulos*) in their work and play in a major way, bringing the instrument to a position of respect and precedence, and they reared love to be splendid in the palaestras, and thus diluted the tempers of the young men.⁵¹ In view of this they were right to establish in their city with them the goddess that is said to have been born of Ares and Aphrodite, since, wherever a battleworthy and warlike nature is associated with one that is persuasive and graceful, all are brought to a most melodious and orderly civil life – through Harmony. Anyway Gorgidas at first divided up and distributed this Sacred Band along the front rank of the whole phalanx of the hoplites, but by doing that he did not allow the valour of the men to distinguish itself, and the band was

not able to use its power for a common end, since the power was all broken up and mixed up in a large body of inferior soldiers. But then Pelopidas, when their valour shone out at Tegyra, where they fought alone and unmixed around him, did not continue to divide them up and distribute them, but using them as a single body put them in the forefront of the most dangerous battles. For just as horses run more quickly when harnessed to a chariot than they do on their own, not because they force the air out of the way by throwing themselves at it more heavily, but because the competition and rivalry with each fires their spirit, so he thought that brave men were more helpful and eager in pursuit of a common end when inspiring in each other the desire to do glorious deeds.⁵²

Plutarch *Pelopidas* 18-9

The culture described here is encapsulated in a dedicatory Boeotian epigram by Phaedimus, for a certain Melistion (written in the mid third century):

... Apollo...your wolf-slaying quiver is of no use to you in redirecting the arrows that Love sends against the Bachelors, whenever they defend their fatherland, made bold by the love of lads. Love has the strength of fire [?], and is the chief of the gods in helping those that fight in the forward line...

Phaedimus *Palatine Anthology* 13.22⁵³

A number of observations may be made. Firstly, and most importantly, Plutarch's passage clearly attests the extreme institutionalisation of homosexual relationships between adult males in the Theban army, and the positive value attached to them. Such relationships are specifically argued to enhance the efficiency and abilities of the fighting force as a whole (marshalling by sex-partner being held superior even to the organisational advice of Nestor).⁵⁴

Because the relationships within the army are inevitably between adults, they cannot be in the normal sense pederastic. Nonetheless, Plutarch does actually use the vocabulary of pederasty of them ('*erastai*', '*erōmenoi*' etc.), and associates them with pederasty both in his reference to education from 'earliest boyhood', possibly in his reference to the gymnasium⁵⁵ (in Athens and Sparta at any rate a locus for pederasty: see below), and in his reference to the love of Laius for Chrysippus. Pederasty is indeed attested at Thebes by other sources: Pindar speaks of pederasty there in the fifth century;⁵⁶ Xenophon says that in Boeotia men and boys form unions and live together;⁵⁷ and the love of Pammenes for Philip of Macedon, who was aged between 14 and 18 during his sojourn at Thebes,⁵⁸ would have been pederastic. Presumably then, if pederasty was to have anything at all to do with homosexuality in the Theban army, the loving partners in the army were of unequal age and initially came together when the younger was

still a boy (*pais*), though he will have matured to manhood by the time of his inclusion in the army. This is consonant with Plutarch's statement elsewhere that at Thebes it was the custom of the *erastēs* to present his *erōmenos* with a suit of armour upon his official coming of age.⁵⁹ The lover therefore seems to bring the *erōmenos* into the army under his own wing. Perhaps the elder continued to sodomise the younger, and perhaps the master-pupil relationship was preserved. Such relationships could perhaps be termed 'post-pederastic'. That homosexual relations were altogether less morally circumscribed at Thebes than at Athens is the message of Plato, when he scornfully tells us that since the Boeotians have no art of speaking, they ordain that it is fine and not all disgraceful to gratify an *erastēs*, in order to save themselves the trouble of having to persuade their *erōmenoi*.⁶⁰ But we must bear in mind that Plutarch may be drawing upon Athenian sources that have to some extent recast Theban military homosexuality between men who are more or less peers into an Athenian pederastic mould; his account of the lovers' exchange of vows at the tomb of Iolaus perhaps implies that the relationship between the men was more symmetrical.

There may in fact have been a significant precursor to the Sacred Band. Diodorus mentions another élite Theban force of 300 in 424, who were known as 'charioteers and chariot-fighters' (*hēniochoi kai parabatai*).⁶¹ Diodorus tells that they acted as the front rank the length of the army, so their role was precisely the initial one attributed to the Sacred Band by Plutarch. The names applied to this older élite force are terms from Homer, where they describe pairs that work together in chariots, the one man steering, and the other using his spear (the term I have translated as 'chariot-fighter', for want of anything better, *para[i]batēs*, literally means 'one that goes beside'). This élite band was, like the Sacred one, a band of footsoldiers, and so these terms are applied metaphorically.⁶² It is difficult to resist the conclusion that the metaphor of chariot-pairs is applied to actual sexual pairs of *erastai* and *erōmenoi*. It is not clear which of the terms was supposed to describe the *erastēs* and which the *erōmenos*, or indeed whether the metaphor was pressed so far. One might think that 'chariot-driver', literally 'reins-holder', denoted the *erastēs*, since horsemanship was a fertile source of sexual metaphor for the Greeks, as for us, and as such usually described the active role.⁶³ Furthermore, the term 'the one that goes beside' (*parabates*) strongly resembles the technical term for the *erōmenos* of the Cretan warrior, 'the one that is stood beside' (*parastatheis*).⁶⁴ And note Plutarch's description of Iolaus, the *erōmenos*

of Heracles, in the passage quoted above as 'fighting beside' (*paraspizein*) his *erōmenos*. On the other hand, it seems likely that in Homer it was the *parabatēs*, the man doing the actual work of the warrior, that was, in military terms at any rate, the dominant member of the pair, since the *Iliad* gives us a pair of half-brothers, sons of Priam, acting as chariot-fighters, the legitimate brother Antiphos as *parabatēs*, and the bastard brother Isos as *hēniochos*.⁶⁵ At any rate Dover is perhaps wrong (in his attempts to date Plato's *Symposium*) to build so heavily on the assumption that 'until 378 nothing had been done to justify dissemination of a belief that any Theban or Boeotian force was deliberately organised on an erotic principle.'⁶⁶

It is noteworthy that the Sacred Band seems, from what Plutarch says, to have lived permanently in a separate mess (akin to the Spartan *syssitia*), apart from women, in war and peace alike.

It is also noteworthy that Plutarch is a little uneasy with the material he relates here: he introduces it almost as if it is disputed matter ('but according to some accounts...'), even though the very detail into which he goes indicates strongly both that the basic facts at any rate are beyond dispute and that Plutarch himself accepts them to be true.⁶⁷ And the utterance of Philip of Macedon is doubtless included to allay any misgivings we may feel about the information provided. We shall consider a possible reason for this diffidence below.

Elis (and Megara?)

Both Xenophon (twice) and Plato mention Elis in the same breath as Boeotia, which it is taken to resemble for holding it in no way shameful to gratify an *erastēs*,⁶⁸ and Xenophon also says that it was the practice of the Eleans to place *erastai* and *erōmenoi* side by side in battle line, just like the Thebans.⁶⁹ Elsewhere Xenophon refers to Elean élite forces of 300 and 400 in the year 366; perhaps, as with the Sacred Band, it was these groups in particular that were formally organised along homosexual lines.⁷⁰ Quite compatibly with this, it is known that the Eleans held beauty competitions for boys, and that the prize was a set of arms, which the winner would immediately dedicate to the warrior-goddess Athene.⁷¹ The bestowal of arms upon the desirable boy suggests, in the light of the Theban material, and the Cretan material (discussed below), that he is henceforth to be incorporated into the army. (Perhaps the boys' kissing competition at Megara was a similar thing.)⁷²

Chalcis (Euboean and Thracian) and Pharsalus (and Thessaly in general)

There is a scrap of evidence for what appears to have been a similar

kind of military homosexuality in Chalcis on Euboea and Pharsalus in Thessaly – or possibly Chalcis in Thrace. The former Chalcis is separated from Boeotia only by the strait of the Euripus. Plutarch tells that during the Lelantine war the Chalcidians were aided by Cleomachus of Pharsalus, who was accompanied by his *erōmenos*. Cleomachus was much encouraged on learning that his *erōmenos* was going to watch him in battle, and on being kissed by him.⁷³ Cleomachus gave up his life in the battle, and his bravery led the Chalcidians to institutionalise homosexuality in their army. Plutarch goes on to say that an Aristotle⁷⁴ told that the inspired and inspiring *erastēs* was a different man, from Thracian Chalcis (the poet Dionysius identified him as Anton), and quoted this song in proof:

O boys to whose lot has fallen good grace and good fathers, do not begrudge brave men association with your youthful beauty (*hōra*). For Love (*erōs*), who slackens limbs, thrives beside Courage in the cities of the Chalcidians.⁷⁵

Also, one of the Greeks' many terms for sodomy was 'Chalcidise' (*chalkizein*).⁷⁶

But if it was indeed Cleomachus of Pharsalus, he can be put in context: Plutarch also goes on to tell of another Thessalian, Theron, who, in competition over an *erōmenos* with another *erastēs*, cut off his thumb as a gesture of bravery.⁷⁷ Quite apart from the fact that a sword was evidently to hand, this passage seems to relate to homosexuality in a military context because it is situated in a discussion of military homosexuality at Thebes.

Plutarch tells that the Boeotians, Spartans and Cretans are both the most susceptible of the Greeks to (sc. homosexual) love,⁷⁸ and the most warlike, again linking homosexuality to military prowess⁷⁹ (a further thing that distinguishes these three in particular is that in them the élite of the warriors at least lived sexually segregated lives).⁸⁰ We turn now to the two states that Plutarch compares with the Boeotians in this way.

Crete

The main evidence for homosexuality in Crete consists of a fragment of Ephorus (quoted by Strabo), a text of great importance for the Greek schematisation of homosexuality as initiatory.⁸¹ Ephorus tells how the Cretans take their *erōmenoi* by capture (*harpagē*)⁸² rather than persuasion (perhaps like the Thebans, who had not the art to persuade?). The *erastēs* enlists the help of the boy's friends, and sets up an ambush in advance. If the friends think the *erastēs* is worthy, they help

him catch the *erōmenos* (the Cretan term is *parastatheis*, 'stander-beside'). The caught boy is taken to the men's house (*andreion*: akin to the Spartan *syssitia* and the Theban *Cadmeia*).⁸³ The *erastēs* then gives the boy presents and takes him off into the country, together with the friends that helped in the capture, where they hunt together and are feasted by him for two months (the hunt was an important locus of homosexuality).⁸⁴ The boy is then released back to the city and given statutory presents: a military cloak, an ox for sacrifice and a drinking cup. While feasting on the ox, the boy recounts his adventures, and declares whether or not he is pleased with his *erastēs*. The law allows him this privilege, we are told, in order that, if he has been taken against his will, he may be avenged on his *erastēs* and be rid of him. It is disgraceful for handsome or well-born youths to fail to acquire an *erastēs*.⁸⁵

This is a key text for the pederasty model, but it does in fact imply that *erastēs* and *erōmenos* would normally continue their relationship together in the army. It is true that the process does initiate the boy (and his friends) into manhood, and is therefore at least in part 'pederastic': he is introduced to the man's house of his *erastēs*, given a cup to use for the drinking parties in it, and a military cloak that symbolises and surely entails his inclusion in the army.⁸⁶ But it also is clear from the fact that the boy is given the opportunity to rid himself of a bad *erastēs* after the country sojourn that the relationship between *erastēs* and *erōmenos* normally continued beyond the latter's inclusion in the army. There is no specific evidence about the usual or (if applicable) statutory age limits for *erastēs* and *erōmenos* in Crete.⁸⁷ The probability that couples did exist in the same units (which were perhaps based on *andreia*), and did fight side by side, is suggested by the information of Athenaeus that the Cretans sacrificed to Eros before going into battle;⁸⁸ the Spartans did the same (see below), and, as we saw, members of the Theban Sacred Band exchanged their vows at the tomb of Iolaus.⁸⁹ Buffière thinks that the perceived function of the kidnap rite was to inculcate (by insemination) warrior-courage into the boy (as at Sparta: see below and appendix).⁹⁰ It is interesting that although it is the implication of Ephorus and Strabo that homosexual relationships continued between adult members of the army, they fall short of making the point explicitly; we shall consider some possible reasons for this below.

Sparta

The entire Lycurgan system, and the hard physical training regime of *agōgē* in particular, in which Spartan male citizens were reared and

lived (at least until 30), segregated from the womenfolk, was conceived to be a training for warfare. Consequently, homosexual practices within it were almost inevitably likewise conceived in terms of their efficacy in the creation of warriors.⁹¹ In Plato's *Laws* the Athenian tells the Spartan that it is his gymnasia that undermined the old and natural law (of heterosexuality).⁹²

Plutarch tells that when boys in their training 'herds' (*agelai*) had turned twelve, they became subject to the interest of 'respectable young men' (*erastai tōn eudokimōn*) and 'older men too' (*presbyteroi*), even more so, and particularly in the gymnasium.⁹³ This again indicates no upper limit on the age of potential *erastai* in Sparta. Elsewhere in the *Lycurgus* Plutarch indicates the existence of adult warrior *erōmenoi*: at 25.1 he tells that men under thirty never went to market but had their household business carried out for them by their kinsmen and their *erastai*. The simple reading of this passage suggests the existence of male adult *erōmenoi*, although it is conceivable that *erastai* only shop for those under eighteen, whilst kinsmen alone do the shopping for those between eighteen and thirty.⁹⁴ Xenophon implies that it was normal practice for Spartan loving couples to be drawn up alongside each other in the battle line, by beginning a hypothesis about Spartan *erōmenoi*, 'even when (*kan*) not stationed in the same line with their *erastai*...'⁹⁵ Also, Athenaeus tells that before battle the Spartans sacrificed to Eros on the ground that safety resided in the love of those drawn up alongside each other.⁹⁶ This similarly suggests that loving couples were posted side by side in the battle lines as at Thebes. A specific example of a loving couple fighting side by side in a Spartan army is to be found in Anaxibius and his *erōmenos*: Xenophon tells that when the Spartan leader Anaxibius sought death in battle, his *erōmenos* stayed with him to the end.⁹⁷ Another adult *erōmenos* may in fact be identifiable: Cleonymus, son of Sphodrias, was the *erōmenos*, after his completion of *agōgē*, of Agesilaus's son Archidamus.⁹⁸ Some scholars have speculated, also outside the pederasty model, on the existence of homosexual relationships between adolescent peers within their military or training units at Sparta, and the possible bonding or loyalty-enhancing effects of these.⁹⁹

It seems likely that there were other ways in which the Spartans considered homosexuality to be conducive to effectiveness in battle. Bethe hypothesised that the Spartans considered that the semen injected during sodomy transmitted the *erastēs*'s military prowess to the *erōmenos*.¹⁰⁰ The hypothesis, based upon an interpretation of some obscure Spartan homosexual technical terms, and fleshed out with

anthropological parallels from New Guinea, is an important one, and has been followed by many scholars, including Cartledge. It is discussed in detail in the appendix.

There may be a homoerotic undercurrent in a fragment of the archaic Spartan poet Tyrtaeus (F10.27–30 West) which praises the death of a beautiful young man on the battlefield, 'desirable for women, admirable for men.'¹⁰¹ And similarly in the tale of Isadas, who astonished Epaminondas and his Thebans when they attacked Sparta by fighting against them in the streets, nude, oiled and beautiful.¹⁰²

Other evidence testifies to the high value placed upon homosexual relationships at Sparta. Aelian tells that a fine *kaloskagathos* who did not act as *erastēs* to a boy was fined by the ephors.¹⁰³ Plutarch also says that *erastai* shared the standing of their *erōmenoi*, with the result that an *erastēs* was once punished for a cowardly cry his beloved had let out during a fight;¹⁰⁴ this demonstrates the importance attributed to the lover in the education of the boy. And *erastai* who found themselves in competition for the same boy, he tells us, worked together to educate the beloved;¹⁰⁵ however, this seems a highly implausible thing in agonistic Sparta¹⁰⁶ (we shall return to this problem below). Cartledge believes that the masculine forms of female nudes from Sparta are the product of a male homosexual aesthetic.¹⁰⁷

We saw in the case of Crete that the time of the 'ritual marginalisation' of the youth in transition, his relegation to the countryside and the life of the hunter, was also an occasion for his sodomisation (perhaps partly because he had to play the extreme opposite role of a woman in order to define better his transition to manhood). Spartan youths also underwent a period of ritual marginalisation to the countryside and the life of the hunter in the *krypteia*, and perhaps homosexuality was practiced there (again it was viewed as a preparation for warfare). However, no texts explicitly attest homosexuality in the *krypteia*.¹⁰⁸

Again it is interesting that the evidence does indeed imply the existence of homosexual relationships within the army, but the sources fall short of asserting this explicitly. Nonetheless, despite Cartledge's assertion that 'Pederasty never became the basis of the Spartan military organisation',¹⁰⁹ the Spartans do seem to have thought that homosexuality did them some military good.

Macedon

As Plutarch's comparison of Thebes, Crete and Sparta suggested, these three states form a natural group in regard to the evidence for

military homosexuality. This may be more because the three were associated together in the Greek tradition of constitutional analysis than because they did in fact have more in common with each other than with other Greek states. Whatever the case, we move on now to consider three other Greek military homosexualities for which the evidence is a little less neat, beginning with Macedon.

Theopompus humorously attests a high level of homosexual behaviour between the (necessarily) adult members of the Royal Companions:

Some of them used to shave themselves and keep making their bodies smooth, even when they were men, and others dared to permit others to sodomise them, despite having beards. They took round with them two or three catamites (*hetaireuomenous*), while themselves providing the same services to others. Therefore, one might justly refer to them not as 'companions' (*hetairoi*), but as '[female] prostitutes' (*hetairai*), and not soldiers but common whores (*chamaitypoi*: literally 'earth-pounders'). For although they were by nature man-slayers (*androphonoi*), they behaved like man-whores (*andropornoï*).

Theopompus FGH 115 F225a (= Polybius 8.9.9–12)¹¹⁰

However Theopompus delighted in ridiculing the Macedonians (notice the opportunistic wordplay here), and his assertions may not be taken at face value.

A safer example of institutionalised homosexuality in Macedon is that of the Royal Pages (*basilikoi paides*).¹¹¹ The Royal Pages were established as we know them by Philip, although a similar but perhaps less formal institution seems to have existed under earlier kings at least as far back as Archelaus.¹¹² These were boys, sons of the nobles and companions, who served the king at table and guarded him as he slept;¹¹³ they were treated and beaten as slaves by the king.¹¹⁴ Griffith guesses that they were aged between around 14 and 18, and that there would have been about 85 at any one time, at least under Alexander.¹¹⁵ The institution certainly socialised the sons of the great to respect for the king, though it may also have had the darker function of hostageship against those in a position to threaten the king's authority.¹¹⁶ It would be from amongst these that the king was likely to draw his *erōmenoi*¹¹⁷ (they also assisted the king in other sexual matters: it was their job to escort his concubines to him).¹¹⁸ A connection therefore between pederasty and preparation for warfare is implied by Curtius's observation that the institution was 'a kind of school for generals and commanders'.¹¹⁹

Hammond notes that all attempts on the lives of Philip and Alexander came from among the Royal Pages, or former Royal Pages.¹²⁰ We

may add that all the attempts seem to have had some homosexual affair turned sour in their background: the 'school' was clearly one of intense sexual passions and jealousies.

Diodorus tells how Philip was assassinated by one of his bodyguards, Pausanias, who had been his *erōmenos*.¹²¹ When the king turned his attention to another Pausanias, the first abused the second as an androgyne, who in grief let himself be killed in defence of Philip in a battle against the Illyrians. Attalus, friend of the dead Pausanias, in revenge got the first Pausanias drunk, and gave his inebriated body over to the pleasure of his muleteers. Pausanias appealed to Philip, who needed Attalus too badly to punish him, and so merely compensated Pausanias with promotion. Pausanias's resentment simmered until he assassinated the king.¹²²

The most famous episode involving the Pages was their conspiracy against Alexander. Arrian explains that the Page Hermolaus had killed a boar on the hunt before Alexander had the chance to strike it (NB the homoerotic context of hunting), and Alexander had him whipped before the other Pages, and took his horse from him. Hermolaus then got up a conspiracy to murder Alexander among the Pages, with the prime help of his *erastēs*, another Page, Sostratus.¹²³ Alexander's crime was *hybris*: almost akin to a sexual humiliation.

Possibly the killers of Archelaus (c. 399) were drawn from a group of boys around the king that foreshadowed the Pages. Crateuas and Hellenocrates of Larissa had been the *erōmenoi* of Archelaus, but both felt themselves the victims of *hybris* rather than love because they had seen their concession of favours to Archelaus as part of a bargain upon which the king reneged: he had promised the one a daughter for bride, and the other a dispatch home.¹²⁴ He had also given a third boy Decamnichus to Euripides to be beaten, for abusing the poet's bad breath.¹²⁵ A similar thing may have occurred a few years later when Amyntas the Little was reputedly killed by Derdas (another proto-Royal Page?), since Amyntas had taunted Derdas with his youthfulness.¹²⁶

There is clear evidence of peer-homosexuality among the Royal Pages (which Berve considers a phenomenon of military comradeship):¹²⁷ the Page Sostratus, the *erastēs* of the Page Hermolaus, is said to have been the same age as him.¹²⁸ And the Page Charicles was the *erastēs* of the Page Epimenēs.¹²⁹

Some homosexual *rite de passage* may underlie the tale that Alexander I murdered some ill-mannered Persian envoys by dressing up beardless youths as women to assassinate them.¹³⁰

Both Philip and Alexander are known to have had a number of male partners. Philip himself had been the *erōmenos* of the Theban Pammenes whilst a hostage in his house;¹³¹ if one *were* to suggest that Philip invented the institution of the Pages, then it was perhaps because of the Theban example that he encouraged homosexual relations between them (and cf. again Plutarch's report of Philip's approval of the homosexuality of the dead Thebans at Chaeronea). We have also seen that he loved the two Pausaniases. Justin tells that Alexander of Epirus, brother of Philip's wife Olympias, was another *erōmenos* of Philip.¹³²

Alexander's homosexual preference was famous in antiquity.¹³³ Athenaeus (possibly quoting either Hieronymus of Rhodes or Theophrastus) tells that Philip and Olympias put the beautiful Thessalian courtesan Callixeina to live with him, fearing that he might prove to be womanish (*gynnis*),¹³⁴ and elsewhere tells that he was 'madly obsessed with boys' (*philopais ekmanōs*).¹³⁵ Alexander's most famous homosexual affair was that with Hephaestion,¹³⁶ whom he ultimately made his chiliarch. The relationship was between age-peers, for they were brought up together.¹³⁷ Aelian tells that when Alexander made his pilgrimage to Troy, he garlanded the tomb of Achilles, whilst Hephaestion garlanded that of Patroclus, allowing it to be understood that he was the *erōmenos* of Alexander, as Patroclus had been that of Achilles.¹³⁸ Alexander continued the analogy after the death of Hephaestion by an extravagant show of mourning for him, similar to that of Achilles for Patroclus.¹³⁹ Alexander gave other clear indications of his affection: he claimed to value Hephaestion as much as his own life,¹⁴⁰ and that Hephaestion was himself Alexander too (in response to Sigambris' mistaken identification).¹⁴¹ Hammond apparently believes that a clique, in part bound together by homosexuality, formed itself around Alexander when he was himself a Page of his father, and that this clique consisted of many of the men that came to power after Alexander's accession – Hephaestion, Ptolemy, Nearchus, Erigyius, Laomedon and Harpalus.¹⁴² Curtius refers briefly to another homosexual liaison of Alexander's with a young man (*iuvēnis*) usually known as Excipinus, who had the look of Hephaestion.¹⁴³ Perhaps Alexander's most distinctive homosexual affair was with the eunuch Bagoas;¹⁴⁴ however, Alexander's adventures with him, despite Bagoas's appointment to a trierarchy,¹⁴⁵ are not really relevant to the sort of *military* homosexuality we are discussing here.¹⁴⁶

Virtually all our evidence for homosexuality in the Macedonian army has focused on the Pages, veterans from the school of Pages, and

the historical forerunners of the Pages. It has also focused around the person of the king. This may be simply due to the fact that our sources for obvious reasons focus on the court and its élite. But it may also be that it was particularly among the group of élite trainee warriors around the king that homosexuality was promoted as part of a military ethic. That many of the rank and file could turn to heterosexual comfort on campaign is evidenced by the existence of a host of campfollowers that attended Alexander's *anabasis*.¹⁴⁷

There is little evidence for homosexuality in hellenistic armies. Launey draws attention to the (humorously alleged) slave-catamite of the soldier-master at Plautus' *Pseudolus* (though this can hardly portray military homosexuality proper), and to the graffito 'Amatokos is beautiful' (*Amatokos kalos*), inscribed by a hellenistic soldier on the Memnonion at Abydos.¹⁴⁸ Perhaps the decline in military homosexuality in the hellenistic period should be related to the apparent rise in the tolerance of campfollowers (see above).

Homer's Achilles and Patroclus

It was a controversy among the ancients and continues to be among modern scholars whether or not Achilles and Patroclus are sexual partners in the *Iliad*.¹⁴⁹ Although they are not explicitly so described, a number of the details of their representation imply that they are; and in particular, it is Achilles's love for Patroclus (and his desire to avenge his death), that finally brings him back to the battle after all else, including magnificent gifts, has failed.¹⁵⁰ Before proceeding further with the issue, we should bear in mind that the *Iliad* is the product of many minds, many epochs and indeed many sexualities and moralities, and the representation of the relationship between Achilles and Patroclus is bound to some extent to be a compromise between all of these. We may suggest, by way of example, two possible ways in which representation of the relationship as we have it developed:

1. An 'original' full homosexual relationship, first represented in the Mycenaean age, where such things may have been a banal fact of military life, is inherited by more prudish dark age singers, who tone down the descriptions of the relationship to a point where it is at least arguably compatible with being merely strongly homosocial;¹⁵¹
2. An 'original' Mycenaean homosocial relationship is recast by a dark age which assimilates the relationship to the sort of homosexual relationship with which it is now familiar.

There are of course many complex variants available between and even beyond these two models. My own view is that there is at least one

homosexual strand in the representation of the relationship, and that this therefore attests homosexuality in a military context in or before the dark age.

So to the evidence: the case for the representation of the relationship between Achilles and Patroclus as homosexual has been made most emphatically by Clarke.¹⁵² He draws attention to three passages in particular. Firstly Achilles expresses the extreme wish that all the Trojans and Greeks should perish alike, and that only he and Patroclus should be left to take the city.¹⁵³ Secondly he is shown weeping in his desire for the 'manliness and goodly might of Patroclus' (*potheōn androtēta te kai menos eu*).¹⁵⁴ Thirdly Achilles's mother addresses her grieving son and tries to encourage him to forget his cares by eating, sleeping and having sex with a woman;¹⁵⁵ the encouraging phrase she uses (*agathon de gynaiki per en philotēti misgesthai*) must be translated along the lines of: 'it is a good thing to copulate in love *even* with a woman,' or 'it is a good thing to copulate in love – at any rate with a woman'¹⁵⁶ (commentators tend to deny this interpretation on the basis of a bogus philological claim).¹⁵⁷ Either way, it is implied that Achilles has recently been copulating with a man (though clearly he also has a woman – Briseis – in his past). Further evidence for the physicality of the relationship may be drawn from the fact that Achilles lay in the arms of the dead Patroclus,¹⁵⁸ and indeed the *Odyssey* adds that the bones of Achilles were later buried mingled in a coffer with those of Patroclus, while those of Antilochus, his favourite after the death of Patroclus, were buried separately nearby.¹⁵⁹ A number of other passages also show Patroclus doing services for Achilles that are elsewhere typically done by a wife for her husband,¹⁶⁰ and it is particularly noteworthy that Patroclus, in sending Achilles back to war after his wrath, fulfils the same function as Meleager's wife in the tale told by Phoenix.¹⁶¹ (Other myths of Achilles may associate him more indirectly with homosexuality, most notably the myth that he was brought up on Scyrus dressed as a girl, which may reflect a rite of passage towards adult manhood, but which has also been seen as a reflection of a homosexual initiation rite.)¹⁶²

Ancient sources and modern scholars that deny the homosexuality of the relationship between Achilles and Patroclus point to the fact that it does not fit into the expected pederastic model: Patroclus is the elder – though lower born – of the two,¹⁶³ yet Achilles is clearly the dominant partner,¹⁶⁴ and indeed Patroclus is often referred to as the servant (*therapōn*) of Achilles.¹⁶⁵ Hence, for example, Xenophon's representation of the relationship as merely a strong friendship between men,

and Sergeant's approval of this view.¹⁶⁶ But of course the relationship does not even begin to fit the pederasty model proper because it is between two adult warriors. We have already seen that the pederasty model does not describe all Greek homosexuality, and is particularly problematic in the context of war. We should simply accept that the sexual relationship between Achilles and Patroclus is an unhierarchised one between men who are to all intents and purposes peers: it is 'military' homosexuality.

The Hadrianic Straton of Sardis took the relationship between Achilles and Patroclus to be the archetype of homosexual relations within Greek armies:

You're going off as a soldier...and you're just a boy still white and soft. Think about what you're doing, and change your mind. Oh! Gods! Who inspired you to take up the spear and take a shield in your hand? Who told you to hide this head inside a helmet? Well blessed is this new Achilles, whoever he be, that's going to enjoy such a Patroclus in his tent!

Palatine Anthology 12.217

There is possibly a further example of homosexuality between peers in Homer: Pisistratus sleeps beside Telemachus in the *Odyssey*.¹⁶⁷ But both are clearly adult and approximately equal in age and status: Telemachus has significantly reached adulthood in making the decision to strike out in search for his father, whilst Pisistratus is still unmarried, but already a 'leader of warriors'. And again, because these indications sit uncomfortably with the pederasty model, scholars have pointlessly disputed which of the two is the elder and the *erastēs*.¹⁶⁸

At any rate it seems that the Homeric evidence probably does acknowledge military homosexuality, but is reticent about it, as we have seen other sources to be.

Athens

Military homosexuality in theory and practice

Although we have a great deal of evidence for Athenian warfare, although most of our evidence for homosexuality in general comes from Athens, and although in fact much of the evidence quoted above for military homosexuality in other places was filtered through Athens at some stage in its life, there is little that can be considered direct evidence for military homosexuality at Athens.¹⁶⁹ This is not to say that it did not exist, and indeed we will assemble some indications that it did. But the inexplicitness of our sources on the matter is something that will also require explanation.

To begin with, it is worth recalling the fragment of the Athenian

(middle) comic playwright Eubulus (quoted above), that assumes that armies in the field turn to sodomy for sexual gratification.¹⁷⁰ And we perhaps see a hint of homosexual comradeship at arms in a fragment of Sophocles's *Niobe*, in which one of her sons calls out for aid to his *erastēs*, as he is being shot and is about to die.¹⁷¹

The nearest we come to the purposeful exploitation of homosexuality in a military unit among Athenian armies is an intriguing reference in Xenophon's *Anabasis*.¹⁷² Xenophon relates how (in the campaign which took place at the beginning of the fourth century) he explained to the Odrisian Seuthes how fond of boys was his soldier, the Olynthian Episthenes,¹⁷³ who had just impulsively offered his own life in exchange for that of a beautiful boy that Seuthes was about to execute. Xenophon tells that he had himself once put together a company of soldiers solely on the criterion of beauty (*kaloi*), and that Episthenes had been a brave fighter in the midst of them. Presumably then Episthenes was himself one of the beautiful. Clearly he was inspired to bravery by his attraction to the other beautiful men around him, or perhaps to one of them in particular. At any rate, it seems that Xenophon's purpose in assembling the unit was to exploit homosexuality in the interests of warfare. It is frustrating that Xenophon does not tell us more about his reasons for and methods in assembling the unit, and why he only did it once; perhaps he had Theban practice in mind.

Military homosexuality was later to play an important role in the Socratic school of philosophy. In his *Symposium*, probably published in the late 380s or early 370s,¹⁷⁴ Plato hypothesises that an army composed of loving couples would be invincible:

If therefore there could be some means for a city or army of *erastai* and *erōmenoi* to come about, there is no way in which they could inhabit their city better than by refraining from all that is shameful by competing with each other for honour. And if such men fought side by side with each other in battle, it is almost true that a few of them could beat all the men in the world. For an *erastēs* would find it less acceptable to be seen leaving his post or throwing away his arms by his *erōmenos* than by all the rest, and would choose to die many deaths before this.

Plato *Symposium* 178e–179a¹⁷⁵

It is difficult to believe that Plato does not have the Theban élite force in mind in writing this; he does indeed go on to mention Boeotian homosexuality a few sentences later,¹⁷⁶ albeit disparagingly and in a rather different context, and Xenophon does indeed make explicit mention of the Theban élite in what might be considered a parallel

passage in his *Symposium*.¹⁷⁷ Dover, however, argues hard that Plato's *Symposium* was written *before* the formation of the Sacred Band (which he locates in 378) and therefore in ignorance of it, while Xenophon's was composed subsequently to it¹⁷⁸ (it should be stressed that there is no agreement in general about the priority of the two *Symposia*).¹⁷⁹ But we have seen that there is a strong case for believing that the Theban élite force was homoerotically organised from at least 424, so that it is quite possible that Plato did after all have Thebes in mind, whenever precisely he composed his *Symposium*, and whenever precisely the Theban élite became the 'Sacred Band.' Although he does not make it explicit, Dover's argument, if accepted, surely entails the supposition that the Sacred Band was formed *in response to* the 'hypothesis' raised by Plato's *Symposium*.¹⁸⁰

Homosexuality encourages valour also in a work of Plato's which is even harder to date – the *Republic* (guesses range from the early 380s to the early 360s); here it is suggested that guardian-knights be rewarded for the display of valour by a kiss from the lads on campaign with them.¹⁸¹

Perhaps we also have an example of homosexuality operating in a more mainline (and exclusively Athenian) force. Alcibiades tells, again in Plato's *Symposium*, how he tried to become the *erōmenos* of Socrates; he denies, implausibly, that Socrates sodomised him, but even if we take Plato's Alcibiades at his word, he and Socrates clearly developed a traditional homosexual relationship in all but actual copulation.¹⁸² Alcibiades then recounts their experiences as hoplites¹⁸³ on campaign together at Potidaea in 432 (by which time, other Platonic evidence suggests, they had already been partners for three years).¹⁸⁴ They were messmates (*synesitoumen*)¹⁸⁵, which is probably significant in itself. Alcibiades speaks of the fantastic feats of endurance he admiringly observed in Socrates there, and in particular his endurance of cold – he would walk unshod on the ice.¹⁸⁶ But it was the circumstances under which Alcibiades won his prize for valour that best reveal the two as loving partners on the battlefield:

You should hear about him in battle. It is just that we pay him this due. For when it was the battle as a result of which the generals actually gave me the prize for valour, it was no other man that saved me than this one. He refused to abandon me in my wounded state, and he saved my armour as well as my person. And I, Socrates, at that point bade the generals give you the prize for valour, and I don't think you will find fault with me here or say that I'm lying. But when the generals wanted to give me the prize for valour out of consideration for my social

standing, you yourself were more insistent than they were that I should take the prize rather than you. Plato *Symposium* 220d

Alcibiades goes on to explain how he stood in wonder of Socrates also at Delium, eight years later.¹⁸⁷

Socrates had clearly gone out of his way to save his *erōmenos*. The competitive attempts of the pair to have the other considered the braver seem typical of homosexual couples on the battlefield (we shall pursue this point below).

Perhaps we get a feel of the ethos of homosexual hoplite life from the austere work of Thucydides, whose mainly military narrative hardly even mentions women, with such references as there are typically being of a scathing nature.¹⁸⁸ While homosexual love affairs are featured, such as that of Pausanias and his *erōmenos*¹⁸⁹ and that of Harmodius and Aristogiton,¹⁹⁰ there is some reason to think that Thucydides goes out of his way to suppress heterosexual ones, at least two of which were arguably of some significance for the course of the Peloponnesian war, namely that between Pericles and Aspasia¹⁹¹ and that between Alcibiades and Timaea, the wife of king Agis.¹⁹²

Homosexuality and preparation for war: the gymnasium and ephēbeia

There is some evidence for homosexuality playing an important role in the preparatory stages for warriorhood at Athens. Admittedly, homosexuality in this context does conform much more to the pederasty model.

Firstly, an important association between homosexuality and the preparation for warfare can be found in the culture of the gymnasium, when we consider that the Athenians conceptualised it as a training ground for warfare on the one hand, and the prime site for the enjoyment of homoeroticism and the courting of boys on the other.

A number of ancient sources represent effective warfare as the goal of gymnastic exercise.¹⁹³ The Lyceum gymnasium at Athens, built by Pericles, was the place where the soldiers actually drilled before war, and where military reviews were held.¹⁹⁴ Plato says in the *Protagoras* that boys are sent to the gymnastic trainer so that they will not play the coward in war,¹⁹⁵ and in the *Republic* he overrides the distinction between athletics and the training for warfare altogether.¹⁹⁶ Euripides is (as often) being sophistically controversial when he denies the usefulness of athletics as a training for war.¹⁹⁷ (In Sparta those that had won a victor's wreath in the games were stationed in line next to the king in battle.¹⁹⁸) The most sustained treatment of athletics as a preparation for warfare is that of Philostratus in his *On Gymnas-*

tics.¹⁹⁹ A number of games, dances and exercises were explicitly military in nature: e.g. the *hoplitodromos*, a race in hoplite armour,²⁰⁰ the Pyrrhic dance, a preparation for drilling, performed in half armour, and the *gymnopaideia* dance, itself a preparation for the Pyrrhic.²⁰¹ Socrates claimed the best dancers made the best soldiers.²⁰² Delorme argues that the growth in athletics in Greece, marked by the introduction of the great Games, was occasioned by the introduction of hoplite tactics.²⁰³ Some modern writers view Greek athletics as a displacement of warfare.²⁰⁴

The homoerotic atmosphere of the gymnasium needs little illustration.²⁰⁵ It is present already in Theognis: 'Blessed is the man in love that exercises in the gymnasium (*gymnazetai*), and goes home to sleep with a pretty boy all day long.'²⁰⁶ Plato in general represents the gymnasium as the home of homosexual interest.²⁰⁷ In the *Euthydemus* the boy Cleinias enters followed by a host of *erastai*, including Ctesippus.²⁰⁸ In the *Lysis*, Socrates takes an interest in a beautiful boy in the gymnasium.²⁰⁹ In the *Charmides* Socrates looks for the most beautiful boy in the wrestling school, and sees that Charmides stands out from the rest.²¹⁰ In the *Theaetetus* nude boys are spied on in the gymnasium.²¹¹ In the *Symposium* Plato has Alcibiades tell how he attempted (as prospective *erōmenos*) to seduce Socrates by wrestling with him.²¹² In Aristophanes's *Clouds* the Better Argument drools over the boys as they do their exercises.²¹³ In his *Birds* Euelpides hopes to find a place where the father of an attractive boy will upbraid him for not kissing and playing with the testicles of his son as he comes home from the gymnasium.²¹⁴ In two parabases Aristophanes denies that he himself revelled around the wrestling schools trying to seduce the boys.²¹⁵ Aeschines repeatedly talks of the attraction of the gymnasium for *erastai*.²¹⁶

In the *Laws* Plato brings these ideas together: Sparta and Crete are said to have framed their laws with regard to their military organisation; their common meals and gymnasia in particular are said to promote valour, but in the process these states have become primarily responsible for 'corrupting the pleasures of love' (i.e. instituting homosexuality).²¹⁷ And we saw above that Plutarch made the gymnasium the home of Theban military homosexuality.

Secondly, there was a more formal training institution for the Athenian army: the *ephebeia*.²¹⁸ Again there are some reasons for supposing that ephebes were particularly associated with homosexuality.²¹⁹ There is little that can be said about the *ephebeia* that is not disputed, but most would agree that it was, as we know it, an institution reorganised in the

later classical period (on the basis of a very similar forbear),²²⁰ in accordance with which young men, who had just been admitted to the deme at eighteen, were dispatched to patrol the borders of Attica under light arms in a lone-hunter and wolf-like fashion for two years (again, the homoeroticism of the hunt).²²¹ The ephebes were at an oddly transitional stage between boyhood and manhood, as their name implies, and although they were theoretically adult, could not actually exercise their full citizen rights until the period of their service was over (at which point, rather like the 'initiated' Cretan boy, they received their panoply from the state).²²² The roots of the *ephēbeia* in a Greek *rite de passage* are clear: it represents the ritual marginalisation of youths in transition, and parallels the Spartan *krypteia* (wherein the boys were again compared to wolves) and the Cretan hunting expedition²²³ (and indeed Athenian ephebes were often conceptualised as hunters).²²⁴

It is in the mythological prototypes for Athenian ephebes that the homosexual culture of the institution is best revealed: Melanion (the 'Black Hunter') and Hippolytus. Both these characters flee to the rural margins in order to avoid sex with women. Thus Aristophanes tells of Melanion:

I want to tell you a story which I heard once when I was a child. There once was a young man (*neos*), Melanion, who fled from marriage, and came to the wilderness, and lived in the mountains. And then, weaving nets, he hunted for hares, and he had a dog, and he wouldn't go back home again because of his hatred, so much did that man abominate women, and we, being prudent men, hate them no less than Melanion did.

Aristophanes *Lysistrata* 781–96

And Euripides says in the *Hippolytus*:

The son of Theseus, the child of the Amazon [says Aphrodite], Hippolytus, the pupil of holy Pitheus, alone of the citizens of this Troezenian land, says I am the worst of deities, and refuses the bed and does not touch marriage.

Euripides *Hippolytus* 11–14.²²⁵

Granted, the eschewing of women is not the simple equivalent of homosexuality, but it encourages the presumption of it. The two men themselves exhibit womanish traits: Melanion is closely associated with Atalanta (whom, surprisingly, he eventually marries), and Hippolytus is very much the son of his Amazon mother. The associations, in turn, between these androgynous women, the Amazons, and ephebes have been recognised: they too live the wild lives of light-armed huntresses on the margins of civilisation, the antitheses of hoplites.²²⁶ It has often

been noticed that the life of the lone wolf which ephebes were supposed to lead was, despite its purpose, in fact rather inappropriate training for hoplite warfare as it developed, which depended on precise team discipline; indeed Vidal-Naquet argues that it is the significantly symbolic opposite of the hoplite's life – it is rather, as being a kind of *rite de passage*, a mode of life symmetrically inverted from that which it precedes and defines.²²⁷ We shall return to this important observation.

So why, if there was institutionalised homosexuality in the Athenian hoplite army, are our sources so reticent about it? It is to this problem we turn in the next section.

Sodomy on the battlefield

There have been two curious reticences in the evidence we have reviewed. As to the first of these reticences, we have noticed that although Athens provides us, separately, with the most information on both homosexuality²²⁸ and Greek warfare, both in an Athenian context and in a wider Greek one, there is a particular dearth of information about institutionalised homosexuality in Athenian armies. This may simply be because there was not any, or at any rate because there was comparatively little, but I think other answers are preferable. One reason might be that, whatever homosexual licences were sanctioned in Athens, homosexuality remained something that fundamentally belonged to the 'other', with the result that the Athenians felt happier describing the homosexual customs of others rather than their own, or indeed tended to ascribe homosexual customs to others in preference to themselves.²²⁹ But such a theory perhaps sits uneasily with the heavy discussion of homosexuality among Athenians that we do get in Plato and other Athenian sources.

As to the second reticence, we have seen that our evidence time and again indicates that there was institutionalised homosexuality in some Greek armies, or at any rate some parts of them, but that it often falls short of explicitly affirming its existence. The sources are in general much happier discussing military homosexuality at a certain remove, attributing their assertions to others (as does Plutarch on Thebes),²³⁰ or at a theoretical level (as does Plato in the *Symposium*),²³¹ or at what might be called the training phases of soldiery (as do Ephorus on Crete and Plutarch on Sparta),²³² than they are discussing it between actual soldiers in the camp or on the battlefield.

The reason for this second reticence, I would like to suggest, is due to a conflict between ultimately incompatible conceptual paradigms of

homosexuality (and its ethical significance) among the Greeks. The first paradigm we may call the 'education' model:²³³ it is a positive one for the *erōmenos*, and it is the model that the Greeks on the whole felt most comfortable in discussing. According to this model, the *erōmenos* achieves a prize in exchange for being sodomised, or indeed simply by being sodomised: Plato has it in the *Symposium* that the *erōmenos* is educated in virtue; the Spartans had it that the *erōmenos* was imbued with valour (see appendix); the Cretans had it that the *erōmenos* was initiated into the community of men. It will be immediately clear that the mode of homosexual practice that is most easily assimilated to this model is pederasty. Hence, I think, the relative willingness of our sources to discuss pederasty (and the extent to which pederasty has come to dominate modern discussions of Greek homosexuality); in particular, as we have seen, our sources are quite content to discuss homosexuality in the context of the training of the warrior. The education model is also specifically positive for the *erastēs*, because it encourages him to be exemplary and to be the best in the eyes of his *erōmenos*.

The second paradigm may be called the 'subjection' model: this model is a distinctly opprobrious one for the *erōmenos*.²³⁴ The important concept here appears to be that of penetration: to penetrate is to subject, and to be penetrated, to be subjected; the penetrated are to some extent assimilated to women, who can only *be* penetrated and not themselves penetrate (and whose sexual role correspondingly affirms their subject status).²³⁵ A simple example of this way of thinking is provided by Mnesilochus in Aristophanes's *Thesmophoriazousae*: after being insulted by the pomposity of Agathon's slave, he retorts that he is ready to bugger the 'foundations' of slave and poet alike.²³⁶ Subsequently the old man abuses Agathon himself: 'And you, you *katapugōn* ('habitual pathic' [?]), are wide-arsed – not just in words, but in submissiveness.'²³⁷ A more complex example is provided by the punishment meted out to the adulterer, in accordance with which the cuckold, having singed off the adulterer's pubic hair (a thing women do to themselves), inserts a radish or a mullet into the anus of the adulterer (*raphanidōsis*).²³⁸

Therefore homosexuality on the battlefield constituted a conceptual aporia for the Greeks: the battlefield is precisely an arena of defeat and subjection. In such a context the bad, 'subjection' model of homosexuality must come into play. The Greeks, as we shall see, often conceptualised military defeat in particular in terms of being buggered; indeed vase paintings often identify penetration by penis and penetration by a

weapon.²³⁹ Consequently, it was difficult for them to rationalise homosexuality within an army at the site of and on the point of battle. If an army was sodomising itself on the battlefield, then it was *already* defeated – or at least half of it was: buggery was for the vanquished, not the victors.

A number of passages may be quoted to illustrate the 'subjection' model of homosexuality in a military context. The most obvious passage is the fragment of Eubulus (F118 K–A) quoted above: the Greeks spent ten years defeating Troy, but, the joke is, they came back wider-arsed than the city they took – in other words, it was they themselves that were, paradoxically, the more defeated.²⁴⁰

Perhaps the most renowned example of buggery as metaphor for military defeat is the Attic red-figure 'Eurymedon vase', first published by Schauenburg in 1975 (Hamburg, Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe, inv. 1981.173).²⁴¹ The pot depicts a man, wearing only a Thracian mantle, running, erect penis guided by hand, towards the proffered bottom of a second. A four-word text stretches between the head of the pursuer and foot of the pursued, of which the meaning is not in doubt, even though the end of the third word is illegible: 'I am Eurymedon. I stand bent over.' The usual interpretation of this picture takes the running figure to be a Greek and the bending figure to be a Persian, and ascribes the text as a whole to the bending figure. Thus the image can be taken to illustrate the Greek military victory over the Persians at Eurymedon by a sexual metaphor: 'We buggered the Persians at Eurymedon.'²⁴²

In Aristophanes's *Frogs* Dionysus jokes that he recently served as a marine aboard (the) Cleisthenes, and sunk twelve or thirteen of the enemy's ships. The phrase that describes his service, *epebateuon Cleisthenei*, is a *double entendre* which also means 'I buggered Cleisthenes.'²⁴³ So here again the act of sodomising is associated with victory, and by implication, the act of being sodomised with defeat.

Dover persuasively argues that the Athenian comic abusive term *kysolakōn* ('arse-Spartan', used of the laconising Cleinias) is to be explained with reference to the fact that Sparta and Athens were almost constant enemies during the period of Old Comedy.²⁴⁴ Presumably then the Athenians express their wish to defeat the Spartans in using the term. Perhaps in a similar way Theopompus's assertion that the Macedonians were ever eager to be buggered, quoted above, is an example of a similar wish-subjection of a feared enemy.²⁴⁵

The importance of the differentiation for the (Athenian) Greeks between those in the army and the buggered is clearly shown by a

famous passage of Aeschines, addressed against Demosthenes and in defence of Philon:

I am amazed that you should dare to abuse Philon, especially since we are among the most respectable Athenians, who have come here to make a judgement upon what is best for the city, and who pay more attention to our lives than to our rhetoric. For which of the two do you expect that they would pray for – ten thousand hoplites like Philon, with bodies like his and as disciplined in soul as he is, or thirty thousand *kinaidoi* like you?
Aeschines 2.150-1²⁴⁶

The *kinaidos* is an eager pathic, effeminate both because of his habitual role as the penetrated (the only role that women can take on), and because he has lost control over his desires (the state of '*akrasia*', similarly regarded as typical of women: see above). Winkler shows well that by contrast the ideal hoplite-citizen²⁴⁷ is a staunch defender of household and country:²⁴⁸ 'The contrast between hoplite and *kinaidos* is a contrast between manly male and womanly male.'²⁴⁹

That successful warriorhood is associated with integrity from penetration, and unwarlikeness with being penetrated, is evidenced also by the alternative surviving titles for a lost comedy of Eupolis: *Astrateutoi* and *Androgynoi*: 'Those who have not seen military service' and 'Men-women.'²⁵⁰ At Sparta those who were classed as cowards, *tresantes*, had to shave off half their beards, and so become half man, half woman – precisely *androgynos*.²⁵¹ According to Plato in the *Timaeus* cowardly males are in fact reincarnated as women.²⁵²

If we turn again to the Amazons and some similar mythical warrior women, the equivalence between sexual penetration and military defeat (penetration by a weapon) becomes clear. It was told that Achilles slew the Amazon Penthesilea on the plain of Troy, and on the point of killing her, fell in love with her; indeed the incorrigible Thersites abused Achilles for his love for Penthesilea (accusing him of necrophilia?), and for this was slain himself.²⁵³ It is clear that the moment of defeat, the moment of weapon-penetration, is equated with the moment of (at any rate desired) sexual penetration, and indeed the two are somewhat assimilated in portrayals of the scene, for example, in that by the great black-figure painter Exekias.²⁵⁴ Tyrrell well makes the point that slaying an Amazon and marrying her are structurally equivalent acts.²⁵⁵ (Also, Loraux has interestingly argued that the sacrifice of virgins, in which their throats are cut with a knife [*sphagē*], is a kind of displacement of marriage, where the 'upper neck' is penetrated in place of the 'lower neck'.²⁵⁶) Similarly there was a Spartan myth that served as an aetiology for that state's cult of Armed

Aphrodite: the women of Sparta took up armour in order to beat off an ambush by the Messenians, but they then met the Spartan men, who took them to be a Messenian force and attacked them in turn; they preserved themselves by baring their breasts and having sex with their menfolk in the field.²⁵⁷ Military defeat is deflected at the last minute into its metaphor, sexual defeat. (These myths make it clear that in so far as it is a woman's natural role to be penetrated, so she must always be in the position of vanquished enemy towards man.)

To conclude this section: Greeks found it difficult to think about homosexuality close to the battlefield and between members of the same army because at such a point the paradigm of penetration as military defeat seemed far more relevant than any more positive paradigms of homosexuality.

Homosexuality and the efficiency of the fighting force

Having reviewed the evidence for military homosexuality, and having attempted to account for a partial dearth in evidence for something we have reason to believe did exist, we are now in a position to consider a question consonant with the main theme of this volume: Did homosexuality in Greek armies make them more cohesive, efficient fighting forces? Some scholars have argued that it did, particularly in the cases of Sparta and Crete.²⁵⁸ But the evidence is far too scant for a definitive answer, and far too many other unquantifiable factors, for which we can not control, obviously contributed importantly to efficiency. But what we can do is investigate some theoretical possibilities, suggested by the Greek evidence itself, for the effects of homosexuality on Greek armies; ultimately then we are not answering the question at a truly sociological level, but merely at the level of what the Greeks themselves believed.

At a superficial level, it is clear, particularly from Plutarch's writings on Thebes and the theoretical assertions of Plato and Xenophon,²⁵⁹ that the Greeks did believe, in general, that homosexual relations within or around an army improved its efficiency. Leaving aside Sparta's custom of physical valour-insemination, we learn from Plutarch's account of the Theban army that it was precisely the homosexual relationships within the Sacred Band that made it such a superlative force. In this account homosexuality is elevated to the position of tactical principle: posting lovers side by side is joked by Pammenes to be a better tactic even than Nestor's hallowed advice to marshal clan by clan and tribe by tribe; and the soundness of the tactic is vouched for by the approval of the greatest of all tacticians, Philip. And it is further

argued that when pairs of lovers are concentrated together in the same unit, the effect of the whole is greater than the effect of the sum of the parts; this effect is seen in terms of an extrapolatable natural principle, comparable to a phenomenon observable in chariot teams.

Loving couples are said by Plutarch to be brave for two reasons: firstly, because they have the highest interest in protecting the body of the one they love; and secondly because they are ashamed to be disgraced by cowardliness before the one they love, and therefore compete with their fellows to appear to be the bravest (Greek agonism again).²⁶⁰ It is presumably this last factor that is supposed to create the 'booster effect' of concentrating pairs of lovers together in the same unit: competition with other competitive pairs will be fiercer than that between a single loving pair and the non-paired men around them. However, it perhaps appears from Xenophon's tale of Episthenes that a man could be inspired to display bravery not just before one special partner of his own, but also before a wider range of men he found attractive, and perhaps saw as potential partners. There could also be an element of competitiveness between the two members of a loving couple: such we observe in the dispute between Socrates and Alcibiades over the prize for valour at Potidaea.

It is perhaps in Homer above all that homosexuality is seen as a positive force for an army and its prospects: the dreadful war was brought upon the Greeks in the first place by a heterosexual love, that of Paris for Helen; the Greek army is devastated by the withdrawal of its principal champion, Achilles, again for a reason that is at any rate connected with heterosexual love – his loss of the woman Briseis to Agamemnon (itself motivated in turn by Agamemnon's loss of his heterosexual love, Chryseis); the Greeks' fortunes in the battle are only restored when Achilles is inspired by his homosexual love for Patroclus to return to the fray.

But the competitiveness that homosexual love induces is a double-edged thing: it might encourage outstanding feats at an individual level, but only at the cost of group cohesion, for it is often plainly a divisive thing. Homosexual relationships are usually characterised as extremely selfish at the level of the couple: they care about each other but no-one else. The most graphic example of this is Achilles's wish (discussed above), that not only the whole Trojan army should perish, but the whole Greek one too, except for him and his love. When Alcibiades's *erastēs* Socrates was the only one of the Athenian army to come to Alcibiades's aid when he lay wounded, what was the rest of the army doing? Was Socrates breaking rank to help his *erōmenos*? (And

might this have been another reason why the generals were unwilling to award the prize for valour to Socrates?) In his Theban material Plutarch apparently thinks that the strong bonding within each pair also operates across the group as a whole, but he is not persuasive: 'a band that was fitted together (*synērmomenon*) by sexual love was indissoluble and unbreakable, since they stood firm in the face of danger on account of each other, the *erastai* out of love for their *erōmenoi*, and the *erōmenoi* out of shame before their *erastai*.' No account is given of how the 'indissoluble sexual love' between the two men in each loving pair expands to become an indissoluble bond between all the men in the army: Plutarch does not seem to think that all members of the loving couples are like Episthenes. Perhaps in a similar vein, Plutarch talks of the co-operation between competing *erastai* who find themselves in pursuit of the same boy at Sparta; but as Cartledge observes, this is hardly plausible.²⁶¹ Even more implausible is Xenophon's assertion that (chaste!) homosexual education at Sparta is so successful at inculcating the virtues of valour and loyalty that the warriors never abandon a companion on the battlefield, whether their *erastēs* or not.²⁶²

The most extreme example of the selfishness, at the level of the couple, of those inspired by homosexual love is their often-reported desire for self-sacrifice: Plutarch remarks that such men often seek danger beyond need.²⁶³ Thus Achilles is told by Thetis that he will live into old age if he does not slay Hector, but will die himself if he does, but he nonetheless scorns the interest of the Greek army as a whole (that he should live to fight on), and kills Hector to avenge his partner.²⁶⁴ We recall how Cleomachus of Pharsalus sacrificed himself in battle after a kiss from, and before the gaze of, his *erōmenos*. Xenophon tells that the Spartan leader Anaxibius sought to throw his life away in battle, to make up for his military negligence (this was selfish enough), and that his *erōmenos* stayed by his side to the end.²⁶⁵

The wasteful selfishness of self-sacrificing loving pairs is perhaps best illustrated by a Roman source – Virgil's tale of Nisus and Euryalus, a pair of very Greek-seeming Trojans.²⁶⁶ Here was a pair of lovers that fought side by side in battle.²⁶⁷ The elder of the two, Nisus, is inspired to undertake the foolhardy mission by his love for the 'boy' Euryalus.²⁶⁸ Euryalus in turn insists on coming too, inspired by his love for Nisus.²⁶⁹ When Euryalus is caught by the Rutulians, Nisus compromises his mission by leaping out of hiding and offering his own life in Euryalus's place.²⁷⁰ Both, of course, are slaughtered. (An indication of Virgil's disapproval of the effect of love on these soldiers may be found in the preceding episode in Book 5,²⁷¹ where Nisus is inspired by his

love of Euryalus to cheat and trip up Salius in a race so that the boy can win.)²⁷²

Some further Greek examples away from the battlefield itself are nonetheless relevant. Neanthes of Cyzicus tells that when Cratinus, a beautiful youth, offered himself for sacrifice, his *erastēs* Aristodemus killed himself too.²⁷³ Likewise Cleomenes's *erōmenos* Panteus committed suicide over his body.²⁷⁴ Again, we remember that Episthenes was prepared to throw his own life away for the sake of a boy he had no more than clapped eyes upon. Aristogiton was prepared to throw his own life away on a point of honour that only directly affected his *erōmenos* Harmodius.²⁷⁵ The death-wish can also be inspired by passionate jealousy towards one's (erstwhile) partner: hence the Macedonian Pausanias threw his life away in battle in defence of his former *erastēs*, Philip. Dover states that the willingness of loving partners to sacrifice themselves was exploited for military purposes;²⁷⁶ perhaps so, but these examples show that a loving partner selfishly seeking death could do his side as a whole rather more harm than good.²⁷⁷

The potential that intensely proud, jealous homosexual relationships had to undermine an army is best illustrated by the assassination of Philip. Here then was a man, the second Pausanias, driven by passions arising out of a homosexual relationship to commit an act than which none could have been more disastrous for his army as a whole.²⁷⁸ The homosexually-inspired conspiracy of the Pages against Alexander would have had an even more devastating effect, had it succeeded.

This competitiveness and selfishness of military homosexuality is fundamentally incompatible with the ideal of equality, *homoiotēs*, that underpinned the hoplite army (particularly the Spartan one), an army in which all had to act as equals.²⁷⁹ This may have been less of an issue for Achilles and his fellows in the midst of the army and in the context of the tactical practices described by Homer. In this volume Hans van Wees has elucidated the individual, showy, competitive nature of Homeric battle tactics, which may indeed have been well served by homosexually driven competitiveness and selfishness. The ideal of *homoiotēs* in a hoplite army would also have been undermined by the *inequality* attributed to *erastēs* and *erōmenos* in homosexual relationships.

It is, I suppose, possible to posit a model of military homosexuality more conducive to unit cohesion: such a model would comprise a more casual, promiscuous, hedonistic practice of homosexuality within the group as a whole, such as that portrayed within the Roman unit in

Derek Jarman's film *Sebastiane*. If there was such a thing in Greek armies, there is little evidence for it; again, perhaps Episthenes in the midst of Xenophon's host of *kaloi* is the nearest we get to this. And even so, if such a practice was to contribute to the military cohesion of the unit, one would expect this to be occasioned by a celebratory pride in a sexuality that differentiated them from other people in general, or the enemy, or even the other units of their own army. However, such a pride would probably depend upon the identification of the individual soldiers as homosexual as opposed to heterosexual, and it is a difficulty that this sort of radical categorisation of individuals by sexuality (whether by themselves or others) seems not to have happened in Greece²⁸⁰ (perhaps with the exception of the supposed spectacular deviance of the *kinaidos*).

Nonetheless, homosexuality does appear to have been associated in particular with élite parts of the army: the Theban Sacred Band were clearly the élite corps; the Royal Pages of Macedon may not actually have been an élite part of the army, but it was certainly a school for the training of the élite officers; Achilles and Patroclus certainly envisage themselves as the élite of the Greek army. Cartledge has argued also that pederasty was used at Sparta specifically to recruit the politico-military élite²⁸¹ (despite the fact that the entire citizen army was in many ways an élite force, Sparta also had within this an inner élite of 300.)²⁸² Most Greek states had some kind of military élite unit, a standing band of paid and highly trained guards,²⁸³ and perhaps many of these employed homosexuality in their organisation: before the Sacred Band, Thebes had had an élite of 300 in 424;²⁸⁴ Syracuse had a 600 in 461;²⁸⁵ Argos had a 1,000 in 421–18;²⁸⁶ the Arcadian League had its *Eparitōi* between 371–363;²⁸⁷ Elis had élites of both 300 and 400 between 365–64.²⁸⁸

Let me repeat that this last section has only been able to focus upon the beliefs of the Greeks themselves about the efficacy of homosexuality in their armies: it has not claimed to be a sociological or psychological study. If the Greeks themselves entertained positive beliefs about the effects of homosexuality in their armies, this belief may in itself have further boosted morale, but we have seen that they also believed a great many negative things about it, and by the same token, these negative beliefs may well have undermined morale.

Appendix: Sparta and Sambia

Spartan and Cretan homosexual warrior initiation rites have been compared in passing to the customs of peoples in Papua New Guinea

(Melanesia), specifically to those of the Keraki Indians and the Marind-Anim,²⁸⁹ but to my knowledge the customs of one New Guinea people in particular, the Sambia, have not yet been adduced to the issue in any detail. This society has been documented in an impressive anthropological study by Gilbert H. Herdt.²⁹⁰ As a structuralist I generally distrust the comparison of institutions between societies, for I believe that an institution in society X is better understood in terms of its relationship to other institutions in society X than in terms of its relationship to ostensibly similar institutions in societies Y and Z. However, the ostensible similarities between Sambia and Spartan initiation rites (for all that the Sambians employ fellatio and not sodomy, as the Keraki Indians and Marind-Anim do) are so striking that they beg to be aired, if only for curiosity's sake. But the Sambia material does in fact raise a number of important issues for the foregoing study. The round-bracketed references in the following account are to Herdt's *Guardians of the flutes* (second ed., NY 1987).

[A] Sambia boys live with their parents until they reach the age range of 7–10. They are then taken away to live in the men's house, and will not set eyes on a woman again until marriage (3, 31). Girls will remain with their parents until marriage (31). [B] The boy then begins to undergo six stages of initiation, of which the first three are before marriage (marriage itself being the fourth), and which are undergone within a group of age-peers (54).

[C] The purpose of life in the men's house and of these initiations is the inculcation of manliness and the production of vigorous warriors, than which nothing is more prized (14, 44). [D] On first being taken into the men's house a boy is thrashed with the branches of prickly bushes until he bleeds. This is to purify his skin of the pollution he has picked up from the menstrual women around him (56, 174, 222–3). [E] The pollution of women's menstruation is particularly threatening, so much so that women must retire to a special hut when menstrual (75, 162, 182). Things female are in general the opposite of vigour (14). Women are not permitted to enter the men's portion of a family house. Women are cold and damp like the earth, with which they are identified as bearers of fruit (79), whereas men are fiery like the sun. It is women's task to grow the crops because of their affinity with plants. Sweet potatoes are the female crop par excellence (78). [F] Cowards are therefore appropriately known as 'sweet potato men' (52).

[G] In order to grow big, strong and courageous, the prepubertal boys must drink semen: it is vital if they are to become men (1, 204–5,

232–3, 236). This they do by fellating the postpubertal boys, puberty occurring around the age of 15 (2, 232). [H] The boys are taught what they must do with the aid of bamboo flutes, objects which take on great ritual significance (85, 233, 383–4). The boys are formally denied heterosexual knowledge (165). The fellatio becomes a way of daily life (234). The relationship of the postpubertal fellated to the prepubertal fellators is one of dominance, and the fellators hold the lowest status in the men's house (2, 53, 242, 288). [I] Age-peers are forbidden to be sex partners (238). As the boy reaches puberty, he has developed a pool of semen inside himself (236), and so he ceases to fellate and becomes in turn fellated by the boys of the age years below him (2). [J] But in giving his semen to help the younger boys grow, he puts his own warrior vigour at risk (233). He must replace his lost semen by drinking the milky sap of the Pandanus tree, which is believed to be the lifeblood of the tree and which resembles both breast milk and semen, and has the nourishing power of both (100, 111, 250). Boys in the men's house deny wasting their semen in masturbation (165). [K] In his years in the men's house a boy is also taught to hunt (85). The penis and the hunting stick are associated, and both called by the term *moyu* (38). The most important prey is the cassowary (whose rump is thought to resemble a woman's), and married men must abstain from sex with their wives whilst hunting it (138, 141, 146). [L] The boys display their warrior vigour by making showy raids upon the enemy (53).

At some point between the ages of 16 and 25 the man will marry an arranged bride, who is just premenarchic (3, 39). Surviving his bride's menarche constitutes the man's fifth stage of initiation (54). [M] The couple do not initially live together: the bride moves into her father-in-law's house, but the groom will continue living with the men, and only pay brief visits to his wife (177, 185). Eventually he will build a house and they will begin a joint life together (29). [N] For about a two-year period the grooms lead a bisexual existence, continuing to receive fellatio from the prepubertal boys (252). Their sexual relationship with their wife begins, as elders recommend, with the fellatio with which they are familiar, and gradually progresses to regular sex (186). Fellatio helps a woman grow strong for childbearing, and, in particular, helps her to develop breast milk (178, 186).

[O] It is a father's semen that creates and nourishes an embryo (38). [P] A man's sixth stage of initiation is the birth of his first child (34). From this point on a man should only have heterosexual sex, and the vast majority of the men lead exclusively heterosexual lives, although a

few continue to display a preference for homosexuality (3, cf. 311). [Q] A man's status is transformed again after the birth of his fourth child (54). [R] Some men practice polygyny (29). [S] Women are regarded as wantonly hungry for men's semen to strengthen themselves (150, 188). Men are warned against committing adultery, but also told that if a woman invites them to it, it is unmanly to refuse (112, 167).

[T] Elders, former warriors, carry themselves with great dignity, and are held in great respect (45).

I tabulate the correspondences with Spartan society:

[A] At 7 Spartan boys were removed from their families to go to live in the men's houses (?), the *syssitia* until the age of 30, by which time they will normally have been married. Girls continued to live at home with their parents. (Xenophon *Lac.Pol.* 2–5, Plutarch *Lycurgus* 12, 16 etc.)

[B] The stages of Spartan youth were many and complex and codified to a high degree. A Spartan boy moved up through the *syssitia* system with his age-peers. (Xenophon *Lac.Pol.* 2–5, Plutarch *Lycurgus* 16–7.)

[C] The purpose of the organisation of Spartan society was conceived of as being the production of the best possible warriors. (Xenophon *Lac.Pol.* 9, Plutarch *Lycurgus* 15 etc.)

[D] Spartan youths were whipped in a cheese-stealing ritual at the altar of Artemis Orthia. (Xenophon *Lac.Pol.* 2–5, Plutarch *Lycurgus* 17–8.)

[E] The perception of women as cold and damp and allied to plants, and of men as fiery like the sun, was a general one in Greek society, though it is not specifically attested at Sparta.²⁹¹

[F] Cowards (*tresantes*) were reviled at Sparta and compelled to shave off half their beards, apparently in recognition of their effeminacy. (Xenophon *Lac.Pol.* 9, Plutarch *Lycurgus* 20 and *Agesilaos* 30.)

[G] It is believed that Spartan boys were inseminated, usually by older boys and men, for similar reasons. (See discussion below.)

[H] The Sambian imagery of the flute is striking when we consider that the Spartan technical vocabulary of insemination speaks of 'blowing in.' (See below.)

[I] Despite my arguments that peer homosexuality did exist at Sparta as elsewhere in Greece, many scholars do believe, as we have seen, that homosexual relationships between age peers seldom occurred among any Greek peoples. (See above.)

[J] Anxiety about the waste of semen seems to have informed the various marital crimes at Sparta. (Plutarch *Lysander* 30; see below.)

[K] Hunting was often seen as the locus for homosexuality in ancient Greece. (See above: NB Crete especially.)

[L] We have investigated the links between homosexuality and competitive display in warfare in a range of Greek societies, including Sparta. (See above.)

[M] Spartan married couples began their lives apart, with the bride living in her husband's house, but the husband himself continuing to live in the men's house, and just paying her brief and surreptitious visits. (Xenophon *Lac.Pol.* 1, Plutarch *Lycurgus* 15.)

[N] It has been argued that the dressing of the Spartan bride as a man, may, in addition to marking a symmetrical-inversion *rite de passage* to womanhood for the girl, have helped to wean her husband off homosexuality. (Xenophon *Lac.Pol.* 1, Plutarch *Lycurgus* 15.)²⁹²

[O] The ideology of childmaking at Sparta implies that the Spartans (as indeed most Greeks) considered that semen alone made children. (Critias DK 88, Xenophon *Lac.Pol.* 1, Plutarch *Lycurgus* 15.)²⁹³

[P] Childless men at Sparta were ritually humiliated, hence the birth of his first child either positively transformed a man's status or precluded a negative transformation of it. (Xenophon *Lac.Pol.* 9, Plutarch *Lycurgus* 15, *Lysander* 30.7.)

[Q] Spartan men with three children were exempted from military service: their semen had done its work. (Aristotle *Politics* 1270b1–4.)

[R] The Spartans were formally polyandrous, but not polygynous; however, they had an elaborate system of wife-swapping practices. (Xenophon *Lac.Pol.* 1, Polybius 12.6, Plutarch *Lycurgus* 7 and 15; see below.)

[S] Other Greeks used to contemplate the 'licence' of Spartan women. (Aristotle *Politics* 1269b19–23, Plutarch *Lycurgus* 15).

[T] The Spartans were famously reverential of age. (E.g. Xenophon *Lac. Pol.* 5, 9–10, Plutarch *Lycurgus* 20.)

The chief point that I wish to draw from this elaborate Sambian parallel is the absolute interdependence of the warrior ideal, separation from women, and an extreme homosexual lifestyle. This raises the possibility, if no more, that these three factors were similarly interdependent at Sparta. The Sambian material interestingly suggests that a complete transition to heterosexuality is indeed perfectly possible for most individuals, but that a bisexual transitional period of readjustment is needed. Thus it would be theoretically possible to argue that while Greek males were socialised to homosexuality as boys whilst training to be warriors, there was nonetheless not much homosexuality within the actual armies of adult males themselves. My view is, however, that the positive Greek evidence for homosexuality within adult Greek armies is too strong for us to be able to apply such a hypothesis to them very successfully.

Insemination at Sparta

A prime interest of the Sambian material lies in the fact that it raises the possibility that the Spartan terms of homosexuality, *eispnēlas*, 'blower in' (?), *eispnein*, *empnein*, 'blow in', and *aītas*, a word used to denote the *erōmenos* of which the derivation is obscure, relate similarly to fellatio, and to the metaphor of the flute.

The common understanding, which derives ultimately from Bethe, and which employs the Keraki and Marind-Anim parallels, is that the Spartan term denoting the *erastēs*, *eispnēlas*, read as literally meaning 'blower in', metaphorically describes his anal insemination of the *erōmenos*.²⁹⁴ Scrutiny of the evidence for these terms, however, which is mainly lexicographical, suggests that the Sambian flute/fellatio metaphor may be more appropriate to the interpretation of this and related terms.

Eispnēl-as/-ēs/-os, eispnīlos or ispnīl-ēs/-os

It is clear that *eispnēlas* was a Spartan term denoting an *erastēs*. Callimachus tells of a lad (*kouros*) drawing the attention of *eispnēlai*.²⁹⁵ [Theocritus] speaks of a loving couple, telling that one of them would have been called an *eispnēlos* in the Amyclaeon (i.e. Spartan) dialect, and the other an *aītēs* in the Thessalian.²⁹⁶ There is no doubt, as we

shall see, that *aītēs* always denoted the *erōmenos*, which means that *eispnēlos* must be a term denoting the *erastēs*. The scholiast to the passage confirms this, as do Choeroboscus commenting on Theodosius, and, at one point, Eustathius commenting on Homer and, at one point, the *Etymologicum magnum*.²⁹⁷ At other points, however, Eustathius and the *Etymologicum magnum* respectively explain *eispnīlos* and *eispnēlēs* with *erōmenos*. This is almost certainly wrong, not least because the *Etymologicum magnum* cites the passage of Callimachus mentioned above to justify this meaning.²⁹⁸

But what does *eispnēlas* actually mean? Its derivation is clear enough, if a little odd: it is built on *eispneo*, 'blow in(to)', using the productive adjectival ending *-los*.²⁹⁹ This does not really give us much of a clue as to whether the *erastēs* thus denoted 'blows in' or 'is blown into.' While it has been generally assumed that he 'blows in', the only ancient evidence explicit on the matter, the scholiast to [Theocritus], is on the other side: he is 'blown into'.³⁰⁰

Eispnein, eispneisthai, empnein and empneisthai

Aelian tells us that *eispnein* is an item of Spartan homosexual vocabulary, and the scholiast to [Theocritus] that *empnein* is likewise.³⁰¹ The concomitant of the belief that *eispnēlas* means 'blower in' as opposed to 'one that is blown into' is that *empnein* and *eispnein*, 'blowing in', are held to be what the *erastēs* does to the *erōmenos*. Again though, much of the evidence is on the other side: we are told a number of times that 'blowing in' is what the *erōmenos* does to the *erastēs*.³⁰²

But there is some evidence that takes *eispnein*, 'blowing in', as something that the *erastēs* does to the *erōmenos*: Aelian tells that beautiful boys in Sparta require their *erastai* to *eispnein* them,³⁰³ *Etymologicum magnum* glosses *eispnein* with *eran*, the action of an *erastēs*, and Hesychius and the the scholiast to [Theocritus] likewise gloss *empnein* with *eran*.³⁰⁴ We should count here also Eustathius's application of the passive form *pneisthai* to the *erōmenos*.³⁰⁵

It is not always clear therefore whether, when the form *empneisthai* or *eispneisthai* is applied to *erastai*, it should be read as middle or passive,³⁰⁶ but the *Etymologicum magnum* does twice use *eispneisthai* in a clearly passive sense.³⁰⁷ Interestingly, the scholiast to Theocritus speaks of a loving couple 'blowing (*epneusan*) mutual love to each other'.³⁰⁸

aītas, aītēs, aeitas or aeitēs

The sources are unanimous that *aītas* etc. is a term describing an *erōmenos*.³⁰⁹ Although no source actually says it is a Spartan term, and

indeed the passage of [Theocritus] referred to above might even be taken to imply that it is not one,³¹⁰ the fact that the feminine equivalent, *aītis* (on which see below) was used by Alcman strongly suggests that it was indeed a Spartan term.³¹¹ The etymology is obscure. It is apparently understood today to derive from *aiō*, 'hear', and to mean 'listener'; this derivation is, however, only remotely plausible (linguistic difficulties aside) if one accepts an active meaning of the type 'inspirer' for *eispnēlas*, and Chantraine is right to distance himself from this explanation.³¹² The ancients derived the term from *aēmi*, 'blow', and understood it to mean 'one that blows in.' If a verb *aiō* is indeed acceptable as the etymology of *aītas*, it would seem far preferable to relate the term to the homonymous *aiō*, 'breathe out', found once in Homer's *Iliad*, and probably related to *aēmi*.³¹³

'Blowing in'

The bulk of this evidence therefore associates the act of 'blowing in' primarily with the *erōmenos*, not the *erastēs*, but the latter can not be separated entirely from active 'blowing in.' What did 'blowing in' mean in each case? In the case of the *erastēs*, one thinks first of the Homeric usage of *empnein*, with *menos* or *tharsos*, 'to inspire with courage';³¹⁴ this is, after all, what a good *erastēs* was supposed to do to the *erōmenos* under his charge. But it could equally well mean 'inseminate', particularly since Aristotle equated the action of ejaculation with blowing.³¹⁵ In the case of the *erōmenos*, the sources as a whole clearly understand 'blowing in' to mean, 'inspire love in an *erastēs*.' But is there a meaning to correspond to 'inseminate'? It could possibly mean 'give a blow job'. It is particularly interesting here that Antipater uses *empnein* of blowing a flute.³¹⁶ It is conceivable, then, that the Samburgian parallel is closer to Sparta in this distinctive respect too than at first appears. It is worth recalling also Plutarch's remarks on the development of homosexuality at Thebes, which are prefaced with a seemingly irrelevant sentence upon the introduction of the flute (*aulos*) into all aspects of Theban life.³¹⁷ Did the flute occupy a symbolic significance at Thebes similar to that which it occupies among the Samburgians?

The Spartans certainly did develop elaborate ideas about the role of sperm – 'noble seed', in Plutarch's phrase – in the begetting of children.³¹⁸ They clearly believed that the warrior-vigour of their nation was passed on in their seed; it was therefore imperative that all should pass on their seed: hence childmaking (*teknopoia*) was a duty,³¹⁹ and there were punishments and humiliations for the unmarried.³²⁰ It was also believed that the sperm of two fathers could mingle in the womb

and jointly engender a child: hence Zeus and Amphitryon jointly begat Heracles (with Alcmena), Zeus and Tyndareus jointly begat the Dioscuri and Helen and Clytemnestra (with Leda), and Astrabacus and Ariston perhaps jointly begat Demaratus (with Ariston's wife).³²¹ No doubt both these beliefs underpinned the practice of polyandry at Sparta.³²² It was further believed that sperm gave the father's contingent properties to his child as inherent ones: hence old men were discouraged from marrying,³²³ cowards (*tresantes*) could not find wives,³²⁴ and the criterion of porphyrogenesis was used in royal succession.³²⁵

Aītis

There was also a feminine version of *aītas*, *aītis*:³²⁶ is this simply a term calqued on the masculine one, for the lesbian equivalent of an *erōmenos*? Plutarch does attest such relationships between women and girls at Sparta.³²⁷ Or is it the term for an (inevitably heterosexually) inseminated maiden? Hagnon of Tarsus tells that unmarried Spartan girls had male lovers who sodomised them.³²⁸ This initially seems incredible. However, the main rational reason for objecting to the existence of such a custom would be the threat that it constituted to legitimacy (i.e., could the lover be trusted not to sire children after all, and did the relationship threaten to alienate the girl's affections from her future husband?), but Xenophon's, Polybius's and Plutarch's information on Spartan marital customs reveals that the Spartans had remarkably little concern for legitimacy as we or most Greeks would have understood it.³²⁹

Notes

1 This paper has been greatly improved by the comments of Dr James Davidson of Trinity College Oxford, but the views it expresses are not his.

2 Aristotle *Politics* 1269b23, Diodorus 5.32.7 (= Posidonius FGH 87 F116), Strabo C119, Athenaeus 603a, e. There is also homosexuality in Celtic epic narratives, particularly concerning Cu Chulainn: see J. Markale, *Women of the Celts* (London, 1975), 39, translation of *La femme Celte* (Paris, 1972), C.L. Crumley, *Celtic Social Structure: the Generation of Archaeologically Testable Hypotheses from Literary Evidence* (Michigan, 1974), 83–6 (on the sources), M. Chapman, *The Celts: the Construction of a Myth* (London, 1992), 172–3, G. Herm, *The Celts* (London, 1976), 57–8, J. Bremmer, 'An Enigmatic Indo-European Rite: Pederasty', *Arethusa* 13 (1980), 279–98 at 288, 296 nn. 84–7, F. Buffière, *Eros adolescent: la pédérastie dans la Grèce antique* (Paris, 1980), 35–7.

3 Of particular interest here are their homosexual initiation rites, details of which came out at their famous trial (they were known as 'anus-kissers'); see

M. Barber, *The Trial of the Templars* (Cambridge, 1978), 162–6, 178–82, 190–1, 223, and index s.v. 'homosexuality'.

4 An interesting development of which is discussed by T.D. Moodie et al., 'Migrancy and Male Sexuality on the South African Gold Mines', in M.B. Duberman et al. (eds), *Hidden from History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past* (London, 1989), 411–25.

5 Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 17.

6 See B.R. Burg's enchantingly titled *Sodomy and the Pirate Tradition* (New York and London, 1984). Surprisingly, there is no good evidence for homosexuality on board Greek ships. There is the mythical relationship between the Argonauts Heracles and Hylas as portrayed in Theocritus 13 and Apollonius *Argonautica* 1. In Xenophon of Ephesus's *Ephesiaca*, the pirate Corymbus falls in love with the hero Habrocomes, who is old enough to have a fiancée, Anthia (1.14.7); the pirate finds that his ardour increases owing to their common life on board ship (1.16.4); however, it is not possible to take this episode as evidence that homosexuality was the typical mode of gratification for Greek pirates, since Corymbus's fellow pirate, Euxinus, equally and oppositely falls in love with the heroine Anthia. Cf. Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 378–382, 627.

7 Some of the societies just listed are sometimes referred to as 'warrior societies'; this is a term I regard as problematic, and so have avoided. Ancient Greece too is often regarded as a series of 'warrior societies': see the views recorded, and partly challenged, by W.R. Connor, 'Early Greek Land Warfare as Symbolic Expression', *Past and Present* 119 (1988), 3–29. Undoubtedly there were *parts* of ancient Greek societies which would have to be called 'warrior (sub-) societies', whatever the term was supposed to mean: the Theban Sacred Band, the Spartan *syssitia* etc.

8 No apology is needed for making repeated reference in what follows to two studies in particular: firstly K.J. Dover's *Greek Homosexuality* (London, 1978), which remains the authoritative foundation for the study of the subject, as noted by M. Golden, 'Thirteen Years of Homosexuality (and Other Recent Work on Sex, Gender and the Body in Ancient Greece)', *EMC/CV* n.s. 10 (1991), 327–40 and D. Cohen, 'Sex, Gender and Sexuality in Ancient Greece', *CP* 87 (1992), 145–60; and secondly to Buffière's exhaustive *Eros adolescent* (cited at n. 2). In researching this article it has become apparent to me that the intersection between homosexuality and warfare is covered rather better by the homosexuality specialists than by the warfare ones (who indeed rarely even mention it). Whatever this may indicate about the relative horizons of the two groups, the immediate result is that most of the secondary material pertinent to the study of this topic is to be found in the works of the former group, as the notes to this article will make clear.

9 H.-I. Marrou, *History of Education in Antiquity* (third edn, London, 1956), 26–9, translation of *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité* (Paris, 1948).

10 Thus Bremmer op. cit. (n. 2) 279 and Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 201 n. 10, although Dover does himself toy with the idea that the constant state of warfare which city-state organisation imposed on the Greeks may have occasioned the idolisation of the all-important up-coming warriors, and that this

may have favoured the development of pederasty (201–2). Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 5, however, does see warfare and the inculcation of valour as an important aspect of pederasty in many Greek states.

11 See, e.g., J.J. Winkler, *The Constraints of Desire* (NY and London, 1990).

12 D.M. Halperin, *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality* (NY and London 1990), esp. 15–53.

13 Witness, above all, the title of Buffière's massive work (n. 2), and cf., e.g., P. Cartledge, 'The Politics of Spartan Pederasty', *PCPS* 27 (1981), 17–36 at 17: 'For "homosexuality" in ancient Greece, therefore, we can normally read "pederasty"': Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 16: 'the reciprocal desire of partners belonging to the same age-category is virtually unknown in Greek homosexuality'; Bremmer op. cit. (n. 2) 279: 'socially approved homosexuality in Greece was virtually restricted to paederasty' (the qualification renders the last assertion more plausible).

14 In what follows I adopt the usual terminology to define the sodomiser and sodomised within the loving pair: see, e.g., Dover (n. 8) 16. A useful summary of the 'pederasty model' may be found at Halperin op. cit. (n. 12) 130–1.

15 The ideal age-range for an *erōmenos* is argued to be 12–17 in an epigram of the Hadrianic Straton of Sardis, *Palatine Anthology* 12.4, followed strongly by E. Cantarella, *Bisexuality in the Ancient World* (New Haven, 1992), 36–44, translation of *Secondo natura* (Rome, 1988). Other sources place the acme of desirability at 18, or at the age when the beard begins to grow: cf. Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 566, 606, 609–11.

16 Unsurprisingly, this particular point has been the subject of much debate in the history of the scholarship of the topic. There are contradictory indications about the anality of homosexuality both at Athens and at Sparta. For example, on the Athenian side, vase paintings of pederastic couples only depict intercrural copulation (except for a few black figure vases made for the Etruscan market), whereas Aristophanes exclusively talks of sodomy as the mode of homosexual gratification: see Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 98–100, importantly qualified by G. Vlastos, 'Socratic Irony', *CQ* 37 (1987), 79–96 at 96; cf. also R.F. Sutton, 'Pornography and Persuasion on Attic Pottery', in A. Richlin ed., *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome* (Oxford, 1992), 3–35 at 13, H.A. Shapiro, 'Eros in Love: Pederasty and Pornography in Greece' in Richlin op. cit. (this note), 53–72 at 57, Buffière op. cit. (n. 8) 123–48, Golden op. cit. (n. 8) 332. On the Spartan side Xenophon's and Plutarch's testimonies to the chastity of Spartan homosexual relationships (Xenophon *Lac. Pol.* 2.13, Plutarch *Moralia* 237bc) conflict with a variety of other evidence (including Plato *Laws* 636b and 836a–c; see below for further discussion on Sparta). It is also possible that Aristotle *Politics* 1269b26 attempts to sweep the practice of homosexuality at Sparta in general under the carpet in implicitly contrasting the Spartan warrior-race with the Celts and other warrior-races that 'give public honour to relationships with men.' For anal sex at Crete, see *Palatine Anthology* 12.38 (Rhianos); Bremmer op. cit. (n. 2) 281, 287; Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 189.

17 The theory of such a progression through sexual phases strongly tied to

age is classically stated by G. Devereux, 'Greek "Pseudo-homosexuality" and the Greek Miracle', *SO* 42 (1967), 69–92. Cf. also, e.g., Bremmer op. cit. (n. 2) 287, Cartledge op. cit. (n. 13) 21–2, Sutton op. cit. (n. 16) 13, Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 171, Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 21, 560, 605–13, Cantarella op. cit. (n. 15) 40–1. This theory does gain some support from pottery illustrations, but as the anal sex problem demonstrates, pottery need not give a complete picture.

18 Cf. Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 631–4. A common though not universal view. The distinction between gifts of money and objects was and is a fine one.

19 Cf. especially Bremmer op. cit. (n. 2), H. Patzer, *Die griechische Knabenliebe* (Wiesbaden, 1982), B. Sergent, *Homosexuality in Greek Myth* (London, 1987), translation of *L'homosexualité dans la mythologie grecque* (Paris, 1984), K.J. Dover, 'Greek Homosexuality and Initiation', in K.J. Dover, *The Greeks and their Legacy* (Oxford, 1988), 115–34 (summarised in the postscript to the second edition of Dover op. cit. [n. 8]), Golden op. cit. (n. 8), with further bibliography.

20 Timarchus is accused of having been a prostitute man and boy (see Aeschines 1.157; cf. Dover op. cit. [n. 8] 29, 39); and the Sausage-seller at Aristophanes's *Knights* 1242 is said to have earned his money by being sodomised as an adult.

21 The *kinaidos* is an eager adult pathic, effeminate both because of his habitual role as the penetrated (the role which is the only one a woman can take on), and because he has lost control over his desires (the state of 'akrasia', similarly regarded as typical of women). Aeschines 1.185 seems to be thinking of a *kinaidos* when he talks of a man that is physically male, but a woman by his ignominies. [Aristotle] *Physiognomonica* 808a12–6 describes the *kinaidos* as follows: 'The signs of the *kinaidos* are an unsteady eye [a sign of cowardice at 808a7–11] and knock-knees [all female animals have knock-knees at 809b8] and he inclines his head to the right; he gestures with his palms up and his wrists loose; he has two styles of walking – either waggling his hips or keeping them under control. He tends to look around in all directions. Dionysius the sophist would be an instance of this type.' See Winkler op. cit. (n. 11) 45–7, 50–4, 67 (and see index s.v.), to whom belong the *Physiognomonica* translation and notes given, Halperin op. cit. (n. 12) 133, M.W. Gleason, 'The Semiotics of Gender: Physiognomy and Self-fashioning in the Second Century C.E.', in D.M. Halperin et al. (eds), *Before Sexuality* (Princeton, 1990), 389–416 at 396–9, Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 75; Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 435–49, 602, 617.

On *akrasia* see Aristotle *Nicomachean Ethics* 1145a–1152a, and M. Foucault, *The Use of Pleasure* (NY, 1985), part 1 chapter 3, translation of *L'usage des plaisirs* (Paris, 1984), J.J. Walsh, *Aristotle's Concept of Moral Weakness* (NY, 1964), G.S. Shrimpton, *Theopompus the Historian* (Montreal, 1991), 136–156.

22 However Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 201 n. 10 concedes, rather against the model with which he works for the most part, that there could indeed have been *erōmenoi* in Athenian armies.

23 The phrase comes from Plato *Gorgias* 494e.

24 See Golden op. cit. (n. 8) 337, H. Mommsen, *Der Affecter* (Mainz, 1975), 56–60, C.A.M. Hupperts, 'Greek Love: Homosexuality or Pederasty? Greek Love in Black Figure Vase Painting' in J. Christiansen et al. (eds), *Proceedings*

of the Third Symposium on Ancient Greek and Related Pottery (Copenhagen, 1988), 255–68. The odd Affecter's pots were destined, as were many others, for the odd Etruscan market.

25 Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 193, Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 558–9, Cartledge op. cit. (n. 13) 32 n. 24; cf. Golden op. cit. (n. 8) 333.

26 Aeschines 1.49, 136; cf. N.H. Demand, *Thebes in the Fifth Century* (London, 1982), 158 n. 52, Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 42.

27 Athenaeus 603f–604d; cf. Plutarch *Pericles* 8; see Cantarella op. cit. (n. 15) 41–2.

28 Lysias 3.5; Cantarella op. cit. (n. 15) 41–2.

29 Plato *Protagoras* 315e; cf. Xenophon *Symposium* 8.32.

30 Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 84, cf. 144. Of course, it must be remembered that Plato often makes chronological fudges.

31 Plutarch *Moralia* 770c; at Aelian *Varia Historia* 13.5 the two are shown as lovers at the end of Euripides's life, in Macedon, and Euripides defends his love by saying 'the Spring of Beauty is splendid; the Autumn too' (cf. here the Hadrianic Straton's poem, *Palatine Anthology* 12.78, 'the setting sun is still the sun'); Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 613, Golden op. cit. (n. 8) 337, Cantarella op. cit. (n. 15) 39, 42.

32 W.M. Ellis, *Alcibiades* (London, 1989), 20; Cantarella op. cit. (n. 15) 39.

33 Athenaeus 563e (= *SVF* i p.247), Antigonus of Carystus *Life of Zeno* p.117 Wilam.; cf. Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 476–7, 614.

34 Xenophon *Anabasis* 2.6.28; cf. Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 217.

35 Xenophon *Symposium* 2.3, 4.12–6.

36 Cf., importantly, Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 440–3.

37 For courtesans on the anabasis see Curtius 5.7.2 and Plutarch *Alexander* 38.1–2, and for wives and children generally Justin 12.3–4, Diodorus 94.4, Arrian *Anabasis* 6.25.4–5, 7.4.8. It seems that, in first allowing, and then ultimately encouraging campfollowers, Alexander's behaviour was unusual in its time, and conditioned by the distance, spatial and temporal, from home. Philip had forbidden wives and women to accompany the army (Athenaeus 557b). Alexander initially continued the ban, since he sent recently-married troops back home to join their wives (Arrian *Anabasis* 1.24.1). By the time he got to Hyrcania he allowed his troops to marry captive women to stop them wanting to go home (Justin 12.3–4). See D.W. Engels, *Alexander the Great and the Logistics of the Macedonian Army* (Berkeley, 1978), 11–3. There was perhaps an increase in the phenomenon of campfollowers in the hellenistic period; for some of the evidence, see W.K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War* (5+ vols, California 1971–), v 173–4 sub c. *apokeuē*. M. Launey, *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques* (2 vols, Paris 1987), 802 notes, with exhaustive references, the tendency of soldiers in New Comedy to be keen always to spend their money on courtesans (NB in particular Pyrgopolynices and Philocomasium and Acroteleutium in Plautus's *Miles Gloriosus*, and Polymachaeroplages and Phoenicium in his *Pseudolus*).

38 Theopompus FGH 115 F213 (Athenaeus 532b–d).

39 Cf. on this passage Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 135, G.F. Pinney, 'For the Heroes are at Hand', *JHS* 104 (1984), 181–3; cf. also Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 17 for the

presumption that men deprived of women, as in the field, turn to homosexual solace. Opponents of the idea of Greek military homosexuality might retort by quoting another comedy, Aristophanes's *Lysistrata*, in which the men away in the field become sexually frustrated when their wives (who are not present) begin to withhold sex. This might be taken to imply that soldiers in the field did not seek homosexual relief. But the entire premiss of the play is of course illogical: men away in the field have no access to their wives in any case and can hardly therefore be affected by a sex strike; and the plot equally excludes the possibility of relief through masturbation: see further Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 148, J. Henderson, *Aristophanes: Lysistrata* (Oxford, 1987), p. 33.

40 Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 11–3.

41 Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 97, 101, 192–3 asserts that Theban homosexuality ('pederasty') appears to have a military origin.

42 The earliest dateable battle in which the band is said to have participated is that of Tegyra in 376/7 (Plutarch *Pelopidas* 16–7, Diodorus 15.37.1–2, Xenophon *Hellenica* 5.4.63). Three men appear to be credited with the formation of the band in different places: Gorgidas (here, and cf. 19.3), Epaminondas (Hieronymus F34 at Athenaeus 602a) and Pammenes (Plutarch again, at *Moralia* 761b, on which see below). Gorgidas seems the most likely, because he is reassuringly obscure in comparison to the great Epaminondas (and NB Epaminondas, the 'philosopher of warfare', is clearly said to have inherited the band at Dio Chrysostom 22.2), and because Pammenes's floruit was in the 350s (Plutarch may therefore be referring at *Moralia* 761b to a mercenary band of Pammenes's own). Gorgidas appears to have had a short floruit at the beginning of the 370s, being Boeotarch in 378, and it is in this year that K.J. Dover credits him with the formation of the band: op. cit. (n. 8) 192 and 'The Date of Plato's *Symposium*', *Phronesis* 10 (1965), 2–20 at 11–3. But we must remember that there is evidence for a Theban élite of 300 as early as 424 (discussed below in main text), and that it may therefore be the case that any one or all of these three men tinkered with something that already existed in essentials.

43 The great Theban in whose house Philip of Macedon spent his hostageship (Plutarch *Pelopidas* 26.5); Suda s.v. *Karanos* tells that Pammenes became Philip's lover. This tale of Pammenes is told by Plutarch also at *Moralia* 618d and 761b (at the latter of which he appears to credit Pammenes himself with the creation of the band: see above).

44 Homer *Iliad* 2.362–3.

45 The tale is repeated at Plutarch *Moralia* 761c.

46 Aristotle F97 Rose.

47 Cf. Plutarch *Moralia* 761de, where it is also said that Heracles was roused to the brave feat of rescuing Alcestis from Hades because he had been Admetus's *erōmenos*.

48 Plato *Symposium* 179a.

49 Cf. W.K. Pritchett, 'Observations on Chaeronea', *AJA* 62 (1958), 307–11 for the excavation of the tumulus of the Sacred Band at Chaeronea.

50 Laius is often portrayed as the inventor of homosexuality: e.g. Euripides F838 Nauck (Aelian *De Natura Animalium* 6.15); cf. Sargent op. cit. (n. 19) 59–

70, Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 199–200, Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 95–6.

51 The mention to the flute seems bizarrely irrelevant here, unless we are to refer it to the role of the flute in Sambilan homosexuality: see the appendix.

52 Cf. on this text Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 97–101.

53 Cf. Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 99–100.

54 Cf. Plutarch *Moralia* 761b.

55 For the classical Theban gymnasia, see Demand op. cit. (n. 26) 14.

56 Pindar F123 (the fragment for Theoxenus); cf. Demand op. cit. (n. 26) 94.

57 Xenophon *Lac. Pol.* 2.12.

58 Cf. N.G.L. Hammond and G.T. Griffith, *A History of Macedon ii* (Oxford, 1979), 204–5.

59 Plutarch *Moralia* 761bd; cf. Demand op. cit. (n. 26) 94, Bremmer op. cit. (n. 2) 285.

60 Plato *Symposium* 182b. The implication is, oddly, that the Athenians, by contrast, surround pederasty with ethical traps in order to promote the art of rhetoric.

61 Diodorus 12.70.1.

62 See Oldfather's note in the Loeb edition of Diodorus ad loc. His suggestion that the names derive from those of an original wealthy class that formerly provided their own chariots in warfare (cf. the Roman 'knights') is implausible.

63 J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse* (second ed., Oxford, 1991), 165–6.

64 Strabo C483, on which see below.

65 Homer *Iliad* 11.102–3; cf. also, e.g., 23.132.

66 Dover op. cit. (n. 42) 13.

67 As noted by Dover op. cit. (n. 42) 12.

68 Xenophon *Lac. Pol.* 2.12, Plato *Symposium* 182b; cf. Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 89–91.

69 Xenophon *Symposium* 8.34.

70 Xenophon *Hellenica* 7.4.13, 16, 31.

71 Athenaeus 565, 609 (including Theophrastus F111 Wimmer); cf. Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 90–1, Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 181 and M.P. Nilsson, 'Kallisteia', *RE* x (1919), 1674.

72 Theocritus 12.30–7, with scholiast; cf. Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 92.

73 Plutarch *Moralia* 760e–761b; cf. Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 104–5.

74 It is unclear whether Plutarch refers to the great Aristotle or to the lesser Aristotle of Chalcis (FHG ii p.141); cf. Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 191–2, Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 102.

75 Cf. Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 105–6.

76 Hesychius s.v.; Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 103–4.

77 Plutarch *Moralia* 761c.

78 Plutarch *Moralia* 761d.

79 The ancient sources (and indeed modern scholars) often compare Cretan and Spartan customs: cf., e.g., Aristotle *Politics* 1271b40.

80 Cf. Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 192, Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 62, 644.

81 Ephorus FGH 70 F149, apud Strabo C483. For these Cretan customs as

initiation see Dover op. cit. (n. 19) 115–34, Bremmer op. cit. (n. 2) 284–7, Sergeant op. cit. (n. 19) passim, esp. 7–39, Cantarella op. cit. (n. 15) 3–8, K.M.T. Chrimes, *Ancient Sparta* (Manchester, 1949), 224–5.

Aristotle *Politics* 1272a25 tells that homosexuality was instituted by a Cretan lawgiver in order to control the birthrate; see Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 186 for other sources asserting that the Cretans invented homosexuality, and Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 59–62, 351 for homosexuality in Cretan myth in general. The old thesis that there was a distinctive phenomenon of 'Dorian' homosexuality in Greece (of which the strong form claims that the Dorians 'introduced' pederasty to the rest of Greece; cf. Plato's assertion at *Protagoras* 342bc that the Spartans introduced pederasty to Athens) is still favoured by Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 49–57 (cf. 75–6).

82 *Harpagē* was apparently a technical term for the seizure of *erōmenoi*, for the term is used also of Laius's seizure of Chrysippus and Zeus's seizure of the Cretan Ganymede (e.g. Athenaeus 601–3 and esp. 603a [cf. Plato *Laws* 636d], Ibycus F289P; cf. Bremmer op. cit. [n. 2] 285, with further references). It is also the technical term used by the Spartans for the seizure of their wives (e.g. Herodotus 6.65.2, Plutarch *Lycurgus* 15.4, Athenaeus 555bc), which is the reason this Cretan rite is sometimes seen as a kind of homosexual 'marriage': cf. D.M. MacDowell, *Spartan Law* (Edinburgh, 1986), 78–81, Cartledge op. cit. (n. 13) 100–1, Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 55–6.

83 See Aristotle *Politics* 1272a12, 26 for a comparison of Cretan and Spartan dining in the men's messes.

84 See below on Sparta and Athens. Also, the pursuit of the *erōmenos* by the *erastēs* is often represented in terms of images and metaphors drawn from hunting: e.g. *Palatine Anthology* 12.92 (Meleager); cf. Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 81–91, esp. 87–8, Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 310–2, A. Schnapp, 'Eros the Hunter', in C. Bérard, ed., *A City of Images* (Princeton, 1989), 71–88, translation of *Cité d'images* (Paris, 1984), H. Lloyd-Jones, Review of K.J. Dover op. cit. (n. 19), *CR* 39 (1989), 370–2 at 372.

85 Cf. on this text Bremmer op. cit. (n. 2) 284–5, Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 189–90, H. Jeanmaire, *Couroi et Courètes. Essai sur l'éducation spartiate et sur les rites d'adolescence dans l'antiquité grecque* (Paris, 1939), 450–5, R.F. Willetts, *Ancient Crete: a Social History* (London, 1965), 116.

86 Cf. Bremmer op. cit. (n. 2) 285–7 for the significance of the cloak and the cup (a particularly interesting discussion of the latter). In all probability the boys had already undertaken the role of wine-pourers within the men's houses of which they had not yet been members: see J. Bremmer, 'Adolescents, Symposium, and Pederasty', in O. Murray, ed., *Symptica* (Oxford, 1990), 135–148.

87 Bremmer op. cit. (n. 2) 287 presses Aelian *De Natura Animalium* 4.1 too hard in his attempt to establish that only young men (*neaniai*) could be lovers in Crete.

88 Athenaeus 561ef; cf. Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 87.

89 Plutarch *Pelopidas* 18.

90 Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 52–3, 56–9.

91 For *agōgē* as the basis for Spartan pederasty, see Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 192–

4 (with important references), P. Cartledge op. cit. (n. 13) 18, 26, 'Hoplites and Heroes: Sparta's Contribution to the Technique of Ancient Warfare', *JHS* 79 (1977), 11–27 at 16–7, Bremmer op. cit. (n. 2) 282, A. Brelich, *Paides e parthenoi* (Rome, 1969), i 120–1, 158, 184, 198–9, Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 24 ('military pederasty'), 50, 65–76, 88. Cartledge op. cit. (n. 13) is the most convenient treatment of homosexuality at Sparta specifically.

92 Cf. Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 186.

93 Plutarch *Lycurgus* 17–18; cf. Cartledge op. cit. (n. 13) 21–2, and esp. 27 for the Spartan gymnasium as a prime institution of homosexuality. Cf. below for the Athenian gymnasium.

94 Cf. Cartledge op. cit. (n. 13) 22.

95 Xenophon *Symposium* 8.35; the implication of this phrase is misread by Cartledge op. cit. (n. 13) 22; cf. also Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 192.

96 Athenaeus 561ef; J. Lazenby, 'The Killing Zone', in V.D. Hanson, ed., *Hoplites: the Classical Greek Battle Experience* (London, 1991), 87–109 at 107, Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 87.

97 Xenophon *Hellenica* 4.8.39; cf. Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 192.

98 Xenophon *Hellenica* 5.4.25; cf. Cartledge op. cit. (n. 13) 22, 29, 32 n. 31, 36 n. 79. Cartledge refers to this case as the 'locus classicus' of Spartan pederasty; cf. also Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 81–2.

99 Thus Cartledge op. cit. (n. 13) 32 n. 24, Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 193, Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 78, and cf., importantly, 558–9.

100 Xenophon, doubtless under the influence of Plato's ideals as expressed in the *Symposium*, implausibly denies that homosexuality at Sparta involved sodomy (*Lac. Pol.* 2.12–3) and [Plutarch] *Moralia* 237bc, building on the fallacious trend, actually claims that sodomising *erastai* were deprived of citizen rights at Sparta; but Plato at *Laws* 836a–c (cf. 636b) admits that sodomy was widely practised at Sparta and in Crete, and Athenian comedians saw Spartans as fond of sodomy (it was probably a comic poet that coined the term *kysolakōn*, 'arse-Spartan', found at Hesychius s.v.): see Henderson op. cit. (n. 63) 218 n. 37, Bremmer op. cit. (n. 2) 283, Cartledge op. cit. (n. 13) 19–20, Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 187–9, 194, Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 69–73.

101 Cf. Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 195 n. 20.

102 Plutarch *Agessilaus* 34.8–9; cf. Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 83–4.

103 Aelian *Varia Historia* 3.10, 12; Cartledge op. cit. (n. 13) 21. We are reminded of the penalties for refusing to marry: in both cases the posterity of the community is deprived of the warrior-vigour transmitted by seed.

104 Plutarch *Lycurgus* 18.

105 Plutarch *Lycurgus* 18.

106 Cartledge op. cit. (n. 13) 21.

107 Cartledge op. cit. (n. 13) 23.

108 Cf. Brelich op. cit. (n. 91) i 156–7, with *testimonia* printed at n. 33, Sergeant op. cit. (n. 19) 225–6, Schnapp op. cit. (n. 84).

109 Cartledge op. cit. (n. 13) 34.

110 Similar sentiments in Théopompus FGH 115 F225 version b (Athenaeus 260d–261a), with the more usual form *chamaitypai* (first declension); cf. Shrimpton op. cit. (n. 21) 119, 157–171, esp. 164–7 on this passage,

and also Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 194.

111 On which see Hammond and Griffith op. cit. (n. 58) 154, 401–2, H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage* (2 vols, Munich, 1926), i 37–9.

112 Arrian *Anabasis* 4.13.1, Aelian *Varia Historia* 14.48; cf. Hammond and Griffith op. cit. (n. 58) 168 n. 1, 401, A.B. Bosworth, *Conquest and Empire* (Cambridge, 1988) 7.

113 Served king at table: e.g. Curtius 5.1.42. Guarded king as he slept: e.g. Arrian *Anabasis* 4.13, Curtius 8.6.13–5; see generally Curtius 8.6.2–6, 8.8.3, Diodorus 17.65.1; cf. Hammond and Griffith op. cit. (n. 58) 396.

114 Arrian *Anabasis* 4.13.1 (*therapeia basileōs*), Curtius 8.6.2 (*servilibus ministeriis*), and cf. Curtius 8.6.5, 19.

115 Hammond and Griffith op. cit. (n. 58) 401.

116 Cf. Hammond and Griffith op. cit. (n. 58) 401.

117 Hammond and Griffith op. cit. (n. 58) 154, 505.

118 Curtius 8.6.3.

119 Curtius 8.6.6 cf. 5.1.42; cf. Hammond and Griffith op. cit. (n. 58) 401, N.G.L. Hammond and F.W. Walbank, *A History of Macedon* iii (Oxford, 1988) 13.

120 Hammond and Walbank op. cit. (n. 119) 13.

121 Diodorus 16.93–4.

122 Other sources: Justin 9.6.4–8, Plutarch *Alexander* 10.6, Aristotle *Politics* 1311b; cf. J.R. Ellis, *Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism* (London, 1976), 223–7, Hammond and Griffith op. cit. (n. 58) 684–5, Buffière (n. 2) 227–9.

123 Arrian *Anabasis* 4.13, Plutarch *Alexander* 55, Curtius 8.6–8. See Bremmer op. cit. (n. 2) 289 for an argument about pederasty in Macedon based upon a comparative reading of the boar-hunting custom; cf., in general, Schnapp op. cit. (n. 84).

124 *Hybris* is a notoriously difficult concept to define (see most recently N.R.E. Fisher, *Hybris* (Warminster, 1992); a good shorter treatment is that of D.M. MacDowell, 'Hybris in Athens', *G&R* 23 (1976), 14–31, esp. 30. Fisher's definition (p. 1): 'Hybris is essentially the serious assault on the honour of another, which is likely to cause shame, and lead to anger and attempts at revenge...often...an act of violence...essentially deliberate activity, and the typical motive for such infliction of dishonour is the pleasure of expressing a sense of superiority...often seen to be characteristic of the young and/or of the rich and/or upper classes...often associated with drunkenness.' MacDowell 30 concludes 'it is having energy or power and misusing it self-indulgently.' In this case it seems to describe the action of an *erastēs* on an *erōmenos* when he sodomises without giving anything, or without giving sufficiently, spiritually or materially, in return: reciprocity is the key. For *hybris* in a sexual context, see Fisher 13–4, 27–9, 63–4, 107–11, 458–76, 485–8, and 29 for the Crateuas incident in particular.

125 Aristotle *Politics* 1311b8–35; on this episode, cf. Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 225–7, Hammond and Griffith op. cit. (n. 58) 154, 167–8, with other references.

126 Aristotle *Politics* 1311b4; Hammond and Griffith op. cit. (n. 58) 170.

127 Berve op. cit. (n. 111) i 39.

128 Arrian *Anabasis* 3.13.3 (*hēlikiotēn*).

129 Arrian *Anabasis* 4.13.7.

130 Herodotus 5.20.

131 Suda s.v. *Karanos*.

132 Justin 8.6.4–8; Hammond and Griffith op. cit. (n. 58) 505.

133 See Berve op. cit. (n. 111) i 10–1 and W.W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great* (2 vols, Cambridge, 1948), ii appendix 18 for unconvincing arguments that Alexander did not have any homosexual partners.

134 Athenaeus 434–5. But Athenaeus also here tells that Carystius of Pergamum told that Alexander was impotent due to drunkenness.

135 Athenaeus 303b.

136 Berve op. cit. (n. 111) no. 357.

137 Curtius 3.12.16 (*cum ipso pariter educatus*), Pseudo-Callisthenes 1.18, Julius Valerius 1.10; cf. Berve op. cit. (n. 111) ii p. 169.

138 Aelian *Varia Historia* 12.7; cf. Justin 12.12.11, who tells that Hephaestion was dear to Alexander because of his *pueritia* – which implies Hephaestion was both younger than Alexander and his *erōmenos*, although, as we have said, there can not have been any effective age-difference between the two. On the other side, some have argued, on the analogy between Alexander and Hephaestion and Achilles and Patroclus, that since Patroclus was the elder in his pair, so too must Hephaestion have been, and that he must therefore have been the *erastēs*, but this is to explain *obscurum per obscurius* (see below); cf. Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 231; R. Lane Fox, *Alexander the Great* (London, 1973), 56–62, 64–7, 112–5, 510.

139 Arrian *Anabasis* 7.14–15.1 (the comparison is explicit), Aelian *Varia Historia* 8.8, Plutarch *Pelopidas* 34.2, *Alexander* 72; further references at Berve op. cit. (n. 111) ii p. 174; cf. Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 231–2.

140 Arrian *Anabasis* 7.14.6.

141 Diodorus 17.37.5–6.

142 Hammond and Walbank op. cit. (n. 119) 14, cf. 28.

143 Curtius 7.9.19. There is little agreement in the MSS about the exact form of the name.

144 On whom see E. Badian, 'The Eunuch Bagoas', *CQ* 8 (1958), 144–57. Bagoas was a former favourite of Darius given to Alexander by Nabazanes, one of Darius's assassins, in the hope that the eunuch would intercede for his life (Curtius 6.5.22–3). Bagoas persuaded Alexander to put Orxines to death for the plunder of Cyrus's tomb because Orxines had given presents to all of Alexander's friends except him (Curtius 10.1.22). Alexander repeatedly kissed Bagoas in the theatre at Gedrosia, for his dancing (Plutarch *Alexander* 67.3, Athenaeus 603b, quoting Dicaearchus).

An apologetic tradition also arose that emphasised Alexander's self-restraint (*enkrateia*) in matters homosexual: Plutarch tells that he refused an offer to be bought pretty boys (*Alexander* 22, cf. 21), and that he was courteous to everyone except pretty boys (*Moralia* 338d), Athenaeus that he refused a kiss from a pretty boy (603b), and Curtius that there was nothing improper in his relationship with Bagoas (10.5.32).

145 Arrian *Indica* 18.8.

146 For Greek (and ancient) eunuchism in general, see Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 30–4, who treats the practice as a variation of pederasty.

147 e.g. Arrian *Anabasis* 6.25.4–5, 7.4.8; cf. above for campfollowers.

148 Plautus *Pseudolus* 1180–1; P. Perdrizet and G. Lefèbvre, *Les graffites grecs du Memnonion d' Abydos* (Nancy, 1919), no. 910; Launey op. cit. (n. 37) ii 802.

149 Xenophon *Symposium* 8.31 is the only firm ancient assertion that they were not partners (this is part of a blanket denial of homosexuality in a series of heroic pairs; we are already familiar from the Spartan material with Xenophon's tendency to deny physical homosexuality). Many believed that they were, e.g. Aeschylus F135 Nauck, Plato *Symposium* 179e–180b, Aeschines 1.142–50 and the many other sources quoted at W.M. Clarke, 'Achilles and Patroclus in Love', *Hermes* 106 (1978), 381–97 at 381 n. 1, and Sergent op. cit. (n. 19) 310 n. 3; cf. Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 367–74. Clarke 381–3 and Sergent 310 n. 4 review earlier modern scholarship on the issue. Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 194, 196 and Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 369, 372 deny homosexuality in Homer.

150 The (unrelated) Patroclus is dearer to Achilles even than the members of his own family: Homer *Iliad* 19.321, 21.46–7.

151 Cf. Sergent op. cit. (n. 19) 205–15, 250–1, who argues that while Homer's reference to Zeus and Ganymede (Homer *Iliad* 22.230–35) contains no explicit reference to homosexuality, the episode makes no sense unless we accept that it is there; cf. also Shapiro op. cit. (n. 16) 58, Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 351–7, 373; Bremmer op. cit. (n. 86) 141–3.

152 Clarke op. cit. (n. 149); cf. Sergent op. cit. (n. 19) 250–7. Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 197–8, Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 373–4, Cartledge op. cit. (n. 13) 35 n. 62 and E. Keuls, *The Reign of the Phallus* (Berkeley, 1985), 287–9 deny the homosexuality of the relationship.

153 Homer *Iliad* 16.97–100.

154 Homer *Iliad* 24.6–9.

155 Homer *Iliad* 24.128–132.

156 Clarke's interpretation of this line, op. cit. (n. 149) 386–7.

157 e.g. C.W. MacLeod, *Homer: Iliad book xxiv* edited with an introduction and commentary (Cambridge, 1982) and N. Richardson (G.S. Kirk, general ed.), *The Iliad: a Commentary vol. vi, books 21–4* (Cambridge 1993) ad loc. Both insist that the *per* be taken with the phrase as a whole, rather than with *gynaiki* in particular, citing J.D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (second ed., Oxford, 1952) 482 s.v. Denniston does not however record any such usage of *per*, while his own interpretation of the particle in this phrase is odd: 'a grim hint that this intercourse will not continue for much longer.'

158 Homer *Iliad* 19.4. Cf. Clarke op. cit. (n. 149) 393. On the passages discussed here see also Sergent op. cit. (n. 19) 255–6.

159 Homer *Odyssey* 24.76–9; cf. Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 373.

160 e.g. Homer *Iliad* 8.568–9; cf. Clarke op. cit. (n. 149) 390–1.

161 Homer *Iliad* 9.590–9; cf. Clarke op. cit. (n. 149) 394.

162 Apollodorus *Bibliotheca* 3.13.6–8; cf. Sergent op. cit. (n. 19) 253 and above on Macedon.

163 Homer *Iliad* 11.786–7.

164 e.g. Homer *Iliad* 11.648–54, 16.140–4.

165 Homer *Iliad* 23.90, 17.271, 18.152. Thus Aeschines 1.132–3, 142–50 argues that Achilles was *erastēs* and Patroclus *erōmenos*, because, for example, Achilles promises Menoetius that he will look after his son, whereas Plato *Symposium* 179e–180b argues (against Aeschylus) that Patroclus was the lover and Achilles the beloved, who nonetheless avenged Patroclus's death out of love.

166 Xenophon *Symposium* 8.31; Sergent op. cit. (n. 19) 251.

167 Homer *Odyssey* 3.397–401, 4.302–5 and 15.4–5.

168 See Clarke op. cit. (n. 149) 383, Sergent op. cit. (n. 19) 29, Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 373–4, G. Koch-Harnak, *Erotische Symbole* (Berlin, 1989) 142, W. Poole, 'Male Homosexuality in Euripides', in A. Powell, ed., *Euripides, Women and Sexuality* (London, 1990), 108–50 at 129–131. (However, we may think that Pisistratus is the *erōmenos* in the light of Bremmer's observation about the role of wine-pourers at symposia: op. cit. [n. 86] esp. 137).

169 Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 197 explicitly distinguishes Athenian homosexuality from, e.g., Spartan, as *not* being militarily based.

170 Eubulus F18 K–A.

171 Plutarch *Moralia* 760e, including Sophocles F44 Radt.

172 Xenophon *Anabasis* 7.4.7.

173 This may be the same man as the 'Amphipolitan' Episthenes who made an *erōmenos* of the hostage-son of a village-chieftain at Xenophon *Anabasis* 4.6.3 (however, the MSS are divided as to whether this man was called Episthenes, Pleisthenes or Cleisthenes); cf. Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 621.

174 See Dover op. cit. (n. 42), but NB the qualifications below.

175 Cf. on this passage Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 191, Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 403–4. Cf. also, for homosexual love and the inculcation of virtue, Xenophon *Symposium* 8.38 (discussed below), Plutarch *Moralia* 760.

176 Plato *Symposium* 182b.

177 Xenophon *Symposium* 8.34.

178 K.J. Dover op. cit. (n. 42) 9–16, op. cit. (n. 8) 51, 192, *Plato: Symposium* edited with introduction and commentary (Cambridge, 1980), 10; contra, H.B. Mattingly, 'The Date of Plato's *Symposium*', *Phronesis* 3 (1958), 31–9.

179 Athenaeus 216e–f and Dover op. cit. (n. 42) 9 think Plato's *Symposium* the earlier of the two.

180 It could of course be the case that Plato phrases himself hypothetically here, despite the known existence of a homoerotic Theban élite force, because he is (for once!) trying to preserve the integrity of the dramatic date of his dialogue (416); cf. Dover op. cit. (n. 42) 14–5. However, as we have seen, the Theban élite seems to have been organised homoerotically even before this (from at least 424; incidentally, this also allows the integrity of the dramatic date of Xenophon's *Symposium*, 422, to be preserved). And even if he did compose before the institution of a homoerotic Theban élite, he did not *have* to write hypothetically, for he could easily have referred to Xenophon's experiment some twenty years earlier.

181 Plato *Republic* 468b; cf. Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 425; admittedly, the context here is not exclusively homosexual.

182 Plato *Symposium* 217a–219e. Alcibiades's assertions about the nature of his relationship with Socrates here are made very much under the pressure of the argument Plato has in hand. Other Platonic contexts are less coy: at *Gorgias* 481d Socrates calls himself Alcibiades's *erastês*; at *Protagoras* ad init. Socrates is shown to chase the youthful beauty of Alcibiades; in *Alcibiades i* Socrates describes himself as the first of Alcibiades's lovers. Cf. Ellis op. cit. (n. 32) 20, Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 153, R.J. Littman, 'The Loves of Alcibiades', *TAPA* 101 (1970), 263–76, Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 161–78 (esp. 168–74), 430–2.

183 The tale reveals clearly that Alcibiades did indeed serve as a hoplite at one point, for all that he enjoyed the wealth of a knight; cf. Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 172.

184 They are already portrayed as a couple in the *Protagoras* (ad init.), which has a dramatic date of c. 435; they are lovers also in *Alcibiades i*, which has a dramatic date of 432, the same year as Potidaea. There are some chronological difficulties with having Alcibiades and Socrates together at Potidaea: see Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 158, op. cit. (n. 178) 165, Ellis op. cit. (n. 32) 26–7. The principal difficulty is that Alcibiades seems rather young to be a hoplite in 432, since he is thought to have been born close to 450 (see Ellis op. cit. (n. 32) 1, 20, J.K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* (Oxford, 1971), 18. Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 172 puts Alcibiades's birth in 452 and thus squeaks him into the hoplites at the minimum age of 20.

185 Plato *Symposium* 219e.

186 Plato *Symposium* 220b.

187 Plato *Symposium* 221bc; Plutarch *Alcibiades* 7 tells that Alcibiades, now a knight, was able to return Socrates's favour by coming on horseback to the aid of the embattled hoplite.

188 For Thucydides's attitude to women see T. Wiedemann, 'Elachiston en tois arsesi kleos: Thucydides, Women and the Limits of Rational Analysis', *G&R* 30 (1983) 163–70, D. Harvey, 'Women in Thucydides', *Arethusa* 18 (1985) 67–90, N.S.R. Hornblower, *Thucydides* (London 1987), 14–5, 42 and 148.

189 Thucydides 1.132.

190 Thucydides 6.53–9.

191 For Aspasia's alleged role in driving Pericles to declare war, see Plutarch *Pericles* 30. Cf. N.S.R. Hornblower, *Thucydides: a Historical Commentary* (Oxford, 1991) on Thucydides 1.67.4 (i.111).

192 Glossed over at Thucydides 8.12.2, despite the fact that it ultimately revived Athens' fortunes by sending Alcibiades back into the Athenian camp; contrast Plutarch *Agesilaus* 3, *Alcibiades* 23; cf. Harvey op. cit. (n. 188) 78–80.

193 See R.T. Ridley, 'The Hoplite as Citizen', *Antiquité classique* 48 (1979) 508–48, Pritchett op. cit. (n. 37) ii 213–9, J. Delorme, *Gymnasion* (Paris, 1960), 275–6 (for the epigraphic evidence for sport as preparation for warfare).

194 Aristophanes *Peace* 355–6, with scholiast; Suda, Hesychius, Photius s.v. *Lykeion*; cf. C.A. Forbes, 'Expanded Uses of the Greek Gymnasium', *CP* 40 (1945) 32–42 at 37–9, with many references. Note that in 410 Thrasybulus used the Lyceum as a base against the Spartans (Xenophon *Hellenica* 1.1.33), and in 405 the Spartans under Pausanias camped in the Academy (Xenophon *Hellenica* 2.2.8). Also, Agesilaus used the gymnasium in Ephesus to train his

soldiers (Xenophon *Hellenica* 3.4.16, *Agesilaos* 1.25). Dio Chrysostom 23.3 says that a general goes to the gymnasium to improve his knowledge of tactics.

195 Plato *Protagoras* 326b.

196 Plato *Republic* 404a: *polemikois athlêtais*.

197 Euripides *Autolycus* F284 Nauck.

198 Plutarch *Moralia* 639e.

199 Thus Philostratus *On gymnastics*: c. 3, the pentathlon was so warlike that they included the javelin in it; 4, the long race (*dolichos*) originated in Arcadian heralds running to bring the message of war (cf. the 'marathon'); 8, Boeotian and Plataean hoplites were considered the best because of the length of the race they ran; 9, Spartans developed boxing to learn how to take blows to the head, since they used not to wear helmets in battle; 11, wrestling and pankration were invented as being useful for war, as was demonstrated by Marathon and Thermopylae; 19, Spartans teach gymnasts tactics, because athletics are a preparation for war, and even exploit the dance, the mildest of peacetime occupations, for warfare, as they imitate the avoidance of missiles, or the handling of the shield, or the picking up of a weapon from the ground; 27, Lycurgus made girls exercise in order that they should bear athletes fit for war; 43 ancient athletes considered war a preparation for gymnastics, and gymnastics a preparation for warfare. A full list of citations for the associations made by Philostratus between gymnastics and warfare may be found at J. Jüthner 1909, *Philostratos über Gymnastik* edited with an introduction, translation and commentary (Leipzig and Berlin, 1909), 131 n. 1.

200 For which see Aristophanes *Birds* 291, Plato *Laws* 833, Pausanias 6.10.4, 5.12.8 and especially Plutarch *Moralia* 639e, who tells that while boxing, wrestling and running mimic and train for battle, the *hoplitodromos* was presented last at games to testify that military fitness was the aim of athletics and competition; cf. Ridley op. cit. (n. 193) 544 for the iconographic evidence.

201 Athenaeus 631bc; Ridley op. cit. (n. 192) 545–8, J.J. Winkler, 'The Ephebes' Song' in J.J. Winkler, et al. (eds), *Nothing to Do with Dionysus?* (Princeton, 1989), 55.

202 Athenaeus 628f.

203 Delorme op. cit. (n. 193) 19–20; but the introduction of the great games significantly antedates the effective introduction of hoplite warfare, according to the usual thinking: see A. Snodgrass, 'The Hoplite Reform and History', *JHS* 85 (1965), 110–22, J. Salmon, 'Political Hoplites?' *JHS* 97 (1977), 84–101.

204 e.g. A.W. Gouldner, *The Hellenic World: a Sociological Analysis* (NY, 1965), 49; cf. D.G. Kyle, *Athletics in Ancient Athens* (second edn, London, 1993), 10. O. Murray, *Early Greece* (Glasgow, 1980), 193 and Bremner op. cit. (n. 86) 143 argue that the Greek aristocracies developed athletics in order to preserve their identities after the business of warfare had been opened up to the masses with the introduction of hoplite armour.

205 Note that the words 'gymnasium' and 'palaestra' appear on almost every page of Buffière's *Eros adolescent* (cited, n. 2); NB p. 199, 'schools, and above all gymnasia, were throughout Greek history the site of choice for pederasty' and pp. 561–73, 'Privileged places of love: gymnasium and palaestra.'

- 206 Theognis 1335–6.
- 207 Note the important remarks of Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 154–7 on Plato and Socrates in the gymnasium; cf. also Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 6, 28, 76.
- 208 Plato *Euthydemus* 273a; cf. Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 568–9.
- 209 Plato *Lysis* 203a–207b; Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 564–6.
- 210 Plato *Charmides* 153d, 154d, 155cd; cf. Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 567–8. Cf. also Vlastos op. cit. (n. 16) 96 with n. 52 for the exceptional nature of the *kalos*; note that the question ‘who is the best?’ played a significant role in homosexual education at Sparta (Plutarch *Lycurgus* 18), and possibly underlies Sappho’s lesbian poem, F16 Voigt (the Anactoria ode).
- 211 Plato *Theaetetus* 162b.
- 212 Plato *Symposium* 217c.
- 213 Aristophanes *Clouds* 973–80, 1002–24; cf. Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 125.
- 214 Aristophanes *Birds* 136–42; cf. Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 137.
- 215 Aristophanes *Wasps* 1025, *Peace* 762–3.
- 216 Aeschines 1.135, 138, 156–7; cf. Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 69.
- 217 Plato *Laws* 635e–636b; cf. Plutarch *Moralia* 751f; cf. Clarke op. cit. (n. 149) 382.
- 218 On this institution see in particular P. Vidal-Naquet, ‘The Black Hunter and the Origins of the Athenian *Ephēbeia*’, in R.L. Gordon, ed., *Myth, Religion and Society: Structuralist Essays in the Classics* (Cambridge, 1981), 147–62, translation of ‘Le chasseur noir’, *Annales ESC* 23 (1968), 947–64, Winkler op. cit. (n. 201).
- 219 Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 11 and passim in fact argues that it was to boys of ephebic age in particular that Greek *paiderastai* were attracted, and that they should really have been called therefore ‘ephebophiles’.
- 220 See *Ath. Pol.* 42; cf. Vidal-Naquet op. cit. (n. 218) 147, Winkler op. cit. (n. 201) 26–35, Ridley op. cit. (n. 193) 531–7. See C. Pélékidis, *Histoire de l’éphébie attique* (Paris, 1962) for the problem of how and when the *ephebeia* was organised.
- 221 Cf. Schnapp op. cit. (n. 84).
- 222 For the panoply, see *Ath. Pol.* 42.3 and cf. Aeschines 3.154; see M.H. Hansen, *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes* (Oxford, 1991) 89, 109, 129. See also Vidal-Naquet op. cit. (n. 218) 148 (‘He both is, and is not, a member [of the *polis*]’), Winkler op. cit. (n. 201) 33. It is not clear whether, in pederastic scheme of things, they are more appropriately *erastai* or *erōmenoi*.
- 223 For the comparison cf. Vidal-Naquet op. cit. (n. 218) 153–4, 158.
- 224 Plato *Laws* 763b; Schnapp op. cit. (n. 84) 72.
- 225 Many similar references could be quoted from this text.
- 226 Cf. W.B. Tyrrell, *Amazons, a Study in Athenian Mythmaking* (Baltimore, 1984), 50–1, 64–7, 72–3, 83–5.
- 227 Winkler op. cit. (n. 201) 34; likewise Tyrrell op. cit. (n. 226) 72–3 notes that in terms of warrior-styles the hoplite and the ephebe were really antitheses; cf. Vidal-Naquet op. cit. (n. 218) 150, 152–4 with further references.
- 228 For a review of the major sources for Greek homosexuality, see Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 4–15. Of the five principal sources, the most important three are from Classical Athens: Old Comedy, especially Aristophanes; Plato, especially

the *Symposium* and the *Phaedrus*, and Aeschines 1 (*Timarchus*).

229 Thus at *Symposium* 182b–184b Plato contrasts the promiscuity of homosexual relations in other states with the elaborate set of principles (the ‘*nomos*’) that governs them in Athens; cf. Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 81, 83, 190, Vlastos op. cit. (n. 16) 79.

230 Plutarch *Pelopidas* 18.

231 Plato *Symposium* 178e–179a.

232 Ephorus FGH 70 F149, Plutarch *Lycurgus* 17–8.

233 Plato’s *Symposium* is the key text here: see Marrou op. cit. (n. 9) 29–45, Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 91, 202–3.

234 There have been some dubious attempts to find a ‘sociobiological basis’ for this paradigm in observed patterns of phallic display by animals for the purpose of territory protection; cf. Pinney op. cit. (n. 39) 180, W. Burkert, *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual* (Berkeley, 1979) 39–41, Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 105, Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 518–21.

235 See Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 76, 100–9, esp. 101 and 106, 143–5, 168, 188, Foucault op. cit. (n. 21) part 4 chapter 3, Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 179–93, 211–24, Halperin op. cit. (n. 12) 129–137, Bremmer op. cit. (n. 2) 290, Golden op. cit. (n. 8) 329–9, Cantarella op. cit. (n. 15) 42–8. The habitual pathic is represented as a woman at e.g. Aeschines 1.185, ‘a man male in body, but having committed the sins of a woman’.

236 Aristophanes *Thesmophoriazusae* 59–62; cf. Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 143.

237 Aristophanes *Thesmophoriazusae* 200–1 (translation: Dover). I concede that these two paradigms, that of education and that of subjection, need not always be completely incompatible, in that the educated is properly subject to the educator; nonetheless it will become clear that they are usually very different in their significances. The two paradigms are brought together quite harshly in the bantering rustic exchange in Theocritus 5.39–43, where Lacon asks ‘When can I remember learning or hearing anything good from you?’ and Comatas replies ‘When I went up your arse and it hurt you...’ (translation: Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 104, and cf. K.J. Dover, *Theocritus: Select Poems* edited with an introduction and commentary [London, 1971], ad loc.).

238 Aristophanes *Clouds* 1083–4, *Wealth* 168, *Thesmophoriazusae* 537–8, Xenophon *Memorabilia* 2.1.5, Lucian *Peregrinus* 9, Catullus 15.19; Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 105–6. However the case is slightly complicated by the fact that it is not simply a matter of rendering the adulterer effeminate and subject to his cuckold, since adulterers were conceived of as effeminate in the first place (we think of Paris at Homer’s *Iliad* 6.321–2, 503–14 and Aegisthus in Aeschylus’s *Agamemnon* at, e.g. 1633–5, 1643–5; Dover op. cit. [n. 8] 106 discusses a Corinthian vase on which a fleeing adulterer is given a white skin, the tone normally reserved for women). They may be conceived of as effeminate in as much as, like women, being spectacularly lacking in sexual self-control (*akrasia*). At any rate, the *raphanidōsis* of the adulterer would appear to symbolically recognise a status already present in the offender, rather than simply punitively transform his status.

239 See Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 133–4. E.g. R177 (Dover’s numeration): Orestes kills Aegisthus with a sword that resembles and covers his penis (cf. on

raphanidōsis above for the punishment of adulterers). R837: a spear prolongs the line of a youth's penis, and is shaped to resemble it at the tip. CW8: an arming man appears to penetrate the rear of a bending man with his spear, and Theseus's spear prolongs the line of his penis as he kills the Minotaur. B588: Iolaus holds his club as if an erect penis (cf. Aristophanes *Birds* 1253–6, where a penis is used as a battering-ram; Dover op. cit. [n. 8] 140). Dover notes that the Greeks particularly preferred straight, pointed penises that resembled swords, and that these indicated a youth's fitness to become a warrior.

240 Cf. Pinney op. cit. (n. 39) 183.

241 On this pot see K. Schauenburg, '*Eurymedōn eimi*', *Ath.Mitt.* 90 (1975) 97–121, with pl. 25, Pinney op. cit. (n. 39).

242 Thus Schauenburg op. cit. (n. 241), Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 105, 204, Winkler op. cit. (n. 11) 51, Golden op. cit. (n. 8) 329. However, a dissenting case has been put by Pinney op. cit. (n. 39). She argues that while 'I stand bent over' must inevitably be spoken by the bending figure, the preceding 'I am Eurymedon' is spoken by the running figure; the words do after all begin at his head: This in itself does not invalidate the Schauenburg/Dover interpretation – it might rather support it if the Greeks identified the river Eurymedon with themselves as victors there, rather than with the Persians as vanquished there. She also objects that the bending figure's attributes, his one-piece suit and *gorytos*, identify him as a Scythian rather than a Persian. But identification is made difficult by the loss (and purely conjectural restoration) of his head-dress, and in any case, Athenian painters did to some extent identify the attributes of Persians and Scythians, as Pinney herself explains.

Pinney further argues that the name Eurymedon, literally 'ruling widely' (*eurys*, *medōn*), should here be taken to mean more pointedly 'lording it over wide-arses', i.e., lording it over *euryproktoi*, excessive pathics. But I am not at all convinced that *eurys* is sufficient in itself to evoke *euryprokτος*. I agree however that the name is being used significantly here – for a kind of pun. I think, with most scholars, that the phrase 'I am Eurymedon' is indeed spoken by the bending figure (there is after all no break between this phrase and 'I stand bent over', which must be spoken by the bending figure). The second element of the name evokes *mēd-ēa*, 'genitals', and therefore suggests a name similar in meaning and perhaps modelled on *euryprokτος*, 'wide-genitalled' – if 'genitals' may be stretched to include 'anus.' (*Mēdēa*, with epsilon, and like it *mēzēa*, are less familiar forms of the common *mēdēa*, with eta. The legend in fact does permit us to read eta, should we wish, since it does not differentiate between eta and epsilon, as can be seen from *hēstēka*, written with two epsilons). The bending figure, eagerly pathic, is therefore saying 'I am wide-genitalled', and this claim is particularly well elucidated by the second phrase, '(because) I stand bent over'.

Curiously the word *kybda*, 'bent over', refers to a fellator at Archilochus F42.2 West.

243 Aristophanes *Frogs* 47–50.

244 Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 188.

245 Theopompus FGH 115 F225.

246 Cf. Winkler op. cit. (n. 11) 46–7.

247 *Kinaidoi* are the opposite of ideal citizens too: Demosthenes 22.30–1 gives us a law of Solon forbidding citizen-prostitutes to address the people; the vanquished can not be leaders; cf. Winkler op. cit. (n. 11) 55–6, 60.

248 Winkler op. cit. (n. 11) 47–8.

249 Winkler op. cit. (n. 11) 50.

250 Cf. Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 144, Winkler op. cit. (n. 11) 47.

251 Plutarch *Agesilaus* 30.3–4.

252 Plato *Timaeus* 90e. Cf. Winkler op. cit. (n. 11) 47 (and also 61, 225 n. 22). NB Hyperides F215 (only preserved in Latin): 'What then if we were conducting this case with Nature as judge – Nature who has distinguished male and female so that each performs his or her own proper duty and office – and what if I were to show that this man has misused his own body in a feminine way? Surely Nature would be shocked and astonished that any man would not think it a most blessed gift for him to have been born a man and that he had spoiled Nature's kindness to him, hastening to transform himself into a woman?'

253 Arcinus of Miletus *Aethiopsis* F1 (Proclus *Chrestomathia* 2).

254 The Exekias cup is London B 210 ABV 144.7; cf. Keuls op. cit. (n. 152) 44–8 (illustrated p. 48 no. 27), Tyrrell op. cit. (n. 226) 27 with 135 n. 13.

255 Tyrrell op. cit. (n. 226) 78–81, 92; cf. N. Loraux, *Tragic Ways of Killing a Woman* (Harvard, 1987), 37–42, translation of *Façons tragiques de tuer une femme* (Paris, 1985), on the general equivalence between marriage and death for virgins.

256 Loraux op. cit. (n. 255) 37–42, 50–3, 61.

257 Lactantius *Divinae institutiones* 1.20.29–30.

258 Thus Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 193, 202, Cartledge op. cit. (n. 91) 16–7, op. cit. (n. 13) 32 n. 24.

259 Plutarch and Plato as quoted above; Xenophon *Symposium* 8.35 suggests that *erastai* and *erōmenoi* are placed side by side by the Thebans because they do not trust the *erōmenoi* to be brave without the gaze of their *erastai*.

260 Cf. Plutarch's Theban *erastēs*, who asks his enemies to kill him in a certain way for the sake of the image he will present to his *erōmenos*; Aelian *Historia Animalium* 4.1 tells a similar tale of a Cretan *erastēs* who stumbles and asks his enemies to kill him in the breast rather than the back, lest his *erōmenos* judge him a coward; cf. Bremmer op. cit. (n. 2) 287. Cf. also the tombstone of Gnathius (IG i² 920): 'Here a man in love with a boy swore an oath to join in strife and woeful war' (translation: Dover op. cit. [n. 8] 124). Plutarch *Moralia* 761c (on which see above) tells of two *erastai* competing for an *erōmenos*, of which one, Theron of Thessaly, chopped off his thumb and challenged the other to do the same; cf. Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 51 and esp. n. 23 for further similar examples.

261 Cartledge op. cit. (n. 13) 21.

262 Xenophon *Symposium* 8.32–6.

263 Plutarch *Moralia* 761c.

264 Homer *Iliad* 18.333–5; cf. Aeschines 1.145 and esp. Plato *Symposium* 179e–180a; cf. Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 41. As Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 655 observes:

'Achilles without Patroclus would not be Achilles.'

265 Xenophon *Hellenica* 4.8.39; cf. Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 192.

266 Virgil *Aeneid* 9.176–449.

267 Virgil *Aeneid* 9.182: *his amor unus erat, pariterque in bella ruebant*.

268 Inspiration: Virgil *Aeneid* 9.194, cf. 210–8; for Euryalus as a *puer*, see 181, 216, 276; Nisus himself is a *iuuenis* at 235 (cf. 5.331, 361).

269 Virgil *Aeneid* 9.219–21, 430.

270 Virgil *Aeneid* 9.427: *in me convertite ferrum*.

271 Virgil *Aeneid* 5.294–361.

272 For a review of the scholarship on this episode, see P.G. Lennox, 'Virgil's Night-episode Re-examined (*Aeneid* ix, 176–449)', *Hermes* 105 (1977), 331–42. NB particularly the remarks of B. Otis, Review of F. Klinger, *Virgil* (1967) at *Gnomon* 41 (1969), 554–74 on the futility and recklessness of the action of Nisus and Euryalus.

273 Neanthes of Cyzicus FGH 84 F1. Cf. Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 191, Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 117–8.

274 Plutarch *Cleomenes* 37.

275 Thucydides 6.54–9.

276 Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 51.

277 The selfish, isolationist tendency of Greek homosexuality also becomes clear in its association with marginalisation into the outlying rural areas, as in the Cretan rite and the ephebes (indeed in some respects homosexuality is paradoxically associated with the completely solitary life of the hunter; cf. Bremmer op. cit. [n. 2] 285, Schnapp op. cit. [n. 84]).

278 It was a commonplace of Greek historical writing, and, so far as we can tell, Greek culture itself, that tyrants should be assassinated by one or both partners of a loving couple; in this context, interestingly, homosexuality is strongly associated with liberty and the seizing of control over one's own destiny, and not at all with subjection: cf. Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 119, 107–21, 345–6. See Plato *Symposium* 182c, Aristotle *Politics* 1311ab, and Plutarch *Moralia* 768f for lists of tyrants assassinated by loving pairs.

279 Cf. Winkler op. cit. (n. 11) 48 for the importance of hoplites protecting each other all alike in battle.

280 See Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 1, 62. It was however true, as Dover notes, that the Greeks could sometimes see some people as *more* homosexually inclined than others (e.g. Plato *Symposium* 189c–193d).

281 Cartledge op. cit. (n. 13) 28–9.

282 Plutarch *Lycurgus* 25, Xenophon *Lac. Pol.* 4.

283 Cf. Pritchett op. cit. (n. 49) ii 221–4.

284 Diodorus 12.70.1.

285 Diodorus 11.76.2.

286 Diodorus 12.75.7, 12.79.1, 4, 12.80.2–3, Thucydides 5.67.2.

287 Diodorus 15.62.2, 67.2, Xenophon *Hellenica* 7.4.22, 33–4, 5.3.

288 Xenophon *Hellenica* 7.4.13, 16, 31.

289 See Cartledge 1981:24–5 and Bremmer 1980:280–1, with references. For a review of anthropological work on homosexual warrior initiation in Papua New Guinea see Gilbert H. Herdt *Guardians of the Flutes: Idioms of*

Masculinity (second edn, NY 1987) xvii [second edn only], 15, 318, and the works cited there.

290 Herdt 1987: see xvii (second edn only) for further work by Herdt and others on this subject. The society has now been captured in a BBC2 documentary, *Under the Sun: Guardians of the Flutes*, broadcast Sunday 17 July 1994 10.00–10.50 pm. Herdt's work is referred to by D. Cohen, *Law, Sexuality and Society* (Cambridge, 1991), but he does not make very specific use of it.

291 See M. Detienne, *The Gardens of Adonis* (Sussex, 1977), translation of *Les jardins d'Adonis* (Paris, 1972).

292 See C. Calame, *Les choeurs de jeunes filles en Grèce archaïque* (2 vols, Rome 1977), i 350–7 and P. Cartledge, 'Spartan Wives: Liberation or Licence?' *CQ* 31 (1981), 84–105 at 101.

293 Cf. W. Den Boer, *Laconian Studies* (Amsterdam, 1954), 216–8 and Cartledge op. cit. (n. 292) 89, 94–6 and 102–3.

294 See E. Bethe, 'Die dorisische Knabenliebe', *RhM* 62 (1907), 438–75, Cartledge op. cit. (n. 13) 23–5, 31 n. 18, E. Bourguet, *Le dialecte laconien* (Paris, 1927), 151–2, A. Ruppertsberg, 'Eispnēlas', *Philologus* 70 (1911), 151–4, Bremmer op. cit. (n. 2) 280–3, 293, K.J. Dover, 'Eros and Nomos', *BICS* 11 (1964), 31–42 at 42 n. 35, op. cit. (n. 8) 189 n. 12, 193, 202, Jeanmaire op. cit. (n. 85) 456–8, Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 56–7, 70 with n. 20.

295 Callimachus F68 Pf.

296 [Theocritus] 12.12–4. Eustathius on Homer *Iliad* 9.5 also tells that *eispnēlos* is a Spartan word.

297 Scholiast [Theocritus] 12.12b, Choeroboscus on Theodosius 166.33 Hilg. (*ispnēl-ēs/-os*), Eustathius on Homer *Odyssey* 4.361 and *Iliad* 9.5, *Etymologicum magnum* s.v. *aitēs*.

298 Eustathius on Homer *Iliad* 9.5, *Etymologicum magnum* s.v. *eispnēlēs*. See A.S.F. Gow, *Theocritus* (2 vols, Cambridge, 1950) ad 12.13, R. Pfeiffer *Callimachus* (Oxford, 1949–53) ad F68.

299 See P. Chantraine *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (4 vols, 1968–80, Paris) s.v.

300 Scholiast [Theocritus] 12.12c.

301 Aelian *Varia Historia* 3.12, scholiast [Theocritus] 12.12d.

302 Thus Xenophon *Symposium* 4.15, scholiast [Theocritus] argument and 12.12bc, *Etymologicum magnum* s.v. *aitēs*, Eustathius on Homer *Odyssey* 4.361.

303 Aelian *Varia Historia* 3.12.

304 Hesychius s.v. *empnei mou*, scholiast [Theocritus] 12.12d.

305 Eustathius on Homer *Iliad* 9.5.

306 At Plutarch *Cleomenes* 2 *empneisthai* could be either.

307 *Etymologicum magnum* s.vv. *aitēs* and *eispnēlēs*.

308 Scholiast [Theocritus] 12 argument.

309 Aristophanes F738, [Theocritus] 12.14, with scholiast and argument, *Etymologicum magnum* s.v. *aitēs*, Eustathius on Homer *Odyssey* 4.361 etc.

310 [Theocritus] 12.12–4.

311 Alcman F34 Page, with scholiast [Theocritus] 12 argument.

312 Cartledge op. cit. (n. 13) 31 n. 18 takes it as 'listener'; cf. Chantraine op. cit. (n. 299) s.v. *aētās*.

- 313 Scholiast [Theocritus] 12 argument, Eustathius on Homer *Odyssey* 4.361 and *Iliad* 9.5; Homer *Iliad* 15.252.
- 314 e.g. Homer *Iliad* 20.110 and *Odyssey* 9.381.
- 315 See Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 70 n. 20.
- 316 Antipater at *Palatine Anthology* 9.266: *empnein* [sc. *aulois*].
- 317 Plutarch *Pelopidas* 19.
- 318 Plutarch *Lycurgus* 15.12.
- 319 Critias DK 88 F32, Xenophon *Lac.Pol.* 1.3, Plutarch *Lycurgus* 15.12–13.
- 320 Plutarch *Lysander* 30.7.
- 321 Herodotus 6.67–9.
- 322 Xenophon *Lac.Pol.* 1.7–9, Polybius 12.6b; cf. Plutarch *Lycurgus* 7, 15.
- 323 Plutarch *Lysander* 30.7.
- 324 Xenophon *Lac.Pol.* 9.5, Plutarch *Agesilaos* 30.4.
- 325 Herodotus 7.3, with the important discussion of P. Carlier, *La royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre* (Strasbourg, 1984), 240–7. See in general Den Boer op. cit. (n. 293) 216–8, Cartledge op. cit. (n. 292) 89, 94–6, 102–3, MacDowell op. cit. (n. 82) 45, 73–4, 76–7, 85–7.
- 326 Scholiast [Theocritus] argument, quoting Alcman F34 Page; cf. Calame op. cit. (n. 292) i 433–6, Buffière op. cit. (n. 2) 74–5, Dover op. cit. (n. 8) 193, 202.
- 327 Plutarch *Lycurgus* 18.
- 328 Hagnon of Tarsus apud Athenaeus 602d; cf. Cartledge op. cit. (n. 292) 104, MacDowell op. cit. (n. 82) 87.
- 329 Xenophon *Lac.Pol.* 1, Polybius 12.6b, Plutarch *Lycurgus* 15.