

# SLAVERY AND HOMOSEXUALITY AT ATHENS

MARK GOLDEN

...There is no problem or practice in any branch of Greek life which was not affected, in some fashion, by the fact that many people in that society, even if not in the specific situation under consideration, were (or had been) slaves.

So M. I. FINLEY IN 1959.<sup>1</sup> In the intervening years, numerous studies have been devoted to the makeup of the slave population, the legal status of the slave, the role of the slave in production or commerce or war. It seems, however, that historians have concentrated on the facts of economic and social life at the expense of less clearly defined, but equally important, areas.<sup>2</sup> In particular, there has been very little recent work on the effects of slavery on the nature and depiction of sexual and emotional relationships among free citizens at Athens. For good reason, perhaps. It is difficult to establish the norms of interpersonal relations in any group in any society, more difficult still to determine attitudes towards those norms, especially when the society in question cannot be observed directly nor its members

An earlier and more fully documented version of this article appeared as a chapter of my Ph.D. dissertation, *Aspects of Childhood in Classical Athens* (Toronto 1981). I would like to thank Jan Bremmer, Anne Carson, Christoph Clairmont, Nancy Demand, David Halperin, Emmet Robbins, Beert Verstraete, and especially Mac Wallace for encouragement and advice (some of which I have followed).

In this article I refer to the following works by authors' names or in an otherwise abbreviated form: J. D. Beazley, *Some Attic Vases in the Cyprus Museum* (London 1947, = *ProcBritAc* 33 [1947] 195–244) = Beazley *Cyprus*; F. Buffière, *Eros adolescents. La pédérastie dans la Grèce antique* (Paris 1980); G. Devereux, "Greek Pseudo-Homosexuality and the 'Greek Miracle'," *SymbOslo* 42 (1967) 69–92; K. J. Dover, "Eros and Nomos (Plato, *Symposium* 182a–185c)," *BICS* 11 (1964) 31–42 = Dover *BICS*; K. J. Dover, *Greek Homosexuality* (Cambridge, Mass. 1978) = Dover *GH*; J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy* (New York and London 1975); H. Patzer, *Die griechischen Knabenliebe* (Wiesbaden 1982, SB. Wiss. Gesell. Goethe. U., Frankfurt, 19.1); A. Seeberg, *Corinthian Komos Vases* (*BICS* Supp. 27, London 1971); J. R. Ungaretti, "Pederasty, Heroism and the Family in Classical Greece," *Journal of Homosexuality* 3 (1978) 291–300; L. P. Wilkinson, "Classical Approaches IV. Homosexuality," *Encounter* 51 (September 1978) 20–31. I have not been able to consult J. Bažant, "Homosexuals on Athenian Vases," *Concilium Eirene* 16 (edd. P. Oliva and A. Frolíková, Prague 1983) 2.31–34.

<sup>1</sup>*Historia* 8 (1959) 162, cf. *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology* (New York 1980) 65.

<sup>2</sup>Among exceptions, I single out J. Vogt, "Human Relationships in Ancient Slavery," in *Ancient Slavery and the Ideal of Man*, tr. T. Wiedemann (London 1972) 103–121; A. W. Gouldner, *The Hellenic World. A Sociological Analysis* (New York 1969) 86–87, and *Enter Plato* (New York 1971) 191–194. (Gouldner's books were first published in 1965 as Parts I and II of *Enter Plato: Classical Greece and the Origins of Social Theory*.)

interviewed. And explanation of norms and attitudes—most difficult of all—can in such circumstances hardly be more than speculation.<sup>3</sup>

What follows, then, is to be read as a hypothesis. I propose to apply Finley's dictum to a branch of Greek life which has been ignored by students of slavery, Athenian male homosexuality.<sup>4</sup> Specifically, I stress that Athenian slaves and boys were often classed and treated similarly, and associated in a wide range of activities; I suggest that in the period from which most of our evidence comes, from about 525 to about 375, Athenian male homosexuality (whatever its origins)<sup>5</sup> was in part an institution of transition from the subordinate and quasi-servile status of boyhood to the status of adult free citizen; and I argue in more detail that certain conventions of Athenian male homosexuality marked the young Athenian male off from the slaves with whom he was otherwise so closely associated.<sup>6</sup>

On the Athenian tendency to group children and slaves I will be brief.<sup>7</sup> *Pais*, a common Greek word for both child and young person (male and female), was also used to denote a slave of any age, as were certain of its derivatives. Children and slaves were felt to share common characteristics, such as intellectual incapacity and exceptional susceptibility to desire, pleasure, pain. More important, both children and slaves were liable in custom and law to physical violence, often in a disciplinary context.<sup>8</sup> Such treatment was a mark of identification, the immediate physical consequence of social inferiority and powerlessness, for slaves and children. It serves to define *pais* in a comment by the chorus in Aristophanes' *Wasps* (1297–1298):

τί δ' ἐστίν, ὦ παῖ; παῖδα γάρ, κὰν ἦ γέρων,  
καλεῖν δίκαιον ὅστις ἄν πληγὰς λάβῃ.

In addition, children spent much of their time, especially in their early years, under the tutelage and supervision of slaves. No Athenian child could

<sup>3</sup>For a very bleak view of the problems involved in discussing the personal relations of slaves and masters and their effects, see Finley, *Ancient Slavery* (above, n. 1) 93–122.

<sup>4</sup>For Rome, see F. Gouffier, "Homosexualité et idéologie esclavagiste chez Cicéron," *DHA* 4 (1978) 219–262; B. Verstraete, "Slavery and the Social Dynamics of Male Homosexual Relations in Ancient Rome," *Journal of Homosexuality* 5 (1980) 227–236.

<sup>5</sup>For speculation on the origins of Greek male homosexuality, see most recently J. Bremmer, "An Enigmatic Indo-European Rite: Paederasty," *Arethusa* 13 (1980) 279–298.

<sup>6</sup>That homosexual conventions distinguished free citizens from slaves has been briefly asserted by R. J. Hoffman in his excellent review of Dover *GH* in *Journal of Homosexuality* 5 (1980) 418–421.

<sup>7</sup>For a fuller discussion, see my "Pais, 'Child' and 'Slave,'" *AC* (forthcoming).

<sup>8</sup>For slaves, see A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens* 1 (Oxford 1968) 168–172. For children, see, e.g., Ar. *Nub.* 1399–1451, *Pax* 123, *Pl. Prt.* 325d, *Lys.* 208e, (discipline by parents), Ar. *Eq.* 1235–1236, *Nub.* 972 (teachers), Xen. *An.* 5.8.18 (parents and teachers).

have escaped some more or less casual contact with slaves. But it is among the wealthy that this contact was closest and most critical for my argument. In the main, we are concerned here with children's associations with the kinds of servant—almost all of them slaves and all doing a slave's work<sup>9</sup>—whose responsibility they were: *titthe*, *trophos* (or *tropheus*), and *paidagogos*.

A *titthe* was a wet nurse, a *trophos* any person involved more generally in rearing a child.<sup>10</sup> Orestes' nurse, a *trophos* (Aesch. *Cho.* 760), gives us some idea of her duties: answering cries at night (751), providing food and water (756), changing and cleaning swaddling clothes (756, 759–760, cf. Soph. fr. 314.275R.). We hear of other activities elsewhere: carrying the child around to prevent pressure on its tender limbs (Pl. *Leg.* 7.789e, 790d), steadying its first steps (Soph. *Phil.* 701–714, cf. *Aj.* 541–542), singing lullabies (Delos in Ath. 14.618e), telling stories (Pl. *Resp.* 2.377c, *Leg.* 10.887d), wiping noses (cf. Pl. *Resp.* 1.343a), toilet training (Aristoph. fr. 850E. = Phot. s. *σείν*, *Anecd. Bach.* 1.362.31), prechewing food (Ar. *Eq.* 716–718, Theophr. *Char.* 20.5–6, Arist. *Rhet.* 3.1407a8), accompanying the child to religious rites (Theophr. *Char.* 16.12). Of course, this list is not exhaustive; the nurse had in general wide-ranging, unspecialized responsibility for a child's welfare.<sup>11</sup>

The etymology of *paidagogos* (which always describes a male) implies that his original or main job was to accompany his charges on trips outside the house. Thus the Platonic *Axiochus* (366d–e) has the child under the control of *paidagogoi* and *grammatistai* and *paidotribai* from the age of seven. But the *paidagogos* too exercised a more general tutelage.<sup>12</sup> Xenophon says that the Greeks give their children *παιδαγωγούς θεράποντας* as soon as they can understand what is said to them (*Lac.* 2.1). A passage in Euripides' *Heraclidae* suggests that the *paidagogos* might be thought of as actually helping the child to walk (727–729). He might continue to exercise authority well

<sup>9</sup>Poor female relations perhaps helped mothers raise their children. And Euxitheus' mother worked as a wet-nurse (Dem. 57.35). But his opponents could accuse him of being the son of a slave largely on that ground, and (despite the speaker) we may be sure that most nurses were slaves (cf. Pl. *Leg.* 7.790a) or foreigners (like Alcibiades' Spartan nurse Amycla: Plut. *Alc.* 1.2; cf. *Lyc.* 16.3 and the mid-fourth century gravestone for a nurse from Cythera, *IG* 2<sup>2</sup>.9112). The point is that Euxitheus' mother—no matter what her legal position—was playing a slave's role, and would share a slave's social status.

<sup>10</sup>For nurses, see especially H. Herter, "Amme oder Saugflasche," *Mullus. Festschrift Theodor Klauser (JbAntuChr Ergänzungsband 1, Münster 1964)* 168–172 = *Kleine Schriften* (Munich 1975) 620–625, with the references in 624 n. 24.

<sup>11</sup>These duties may have included instruction. There is an early fourth-century gravestone for a nurse named Paideusis (*IG* 2<sup>2</sup>.12387).

<sup>12</sup>For *paidagogoi*, see E. Schuppe, "Paidagogos," in *RE* 18.2 (1942) 2375–2385; F. A. G. Beck, *Greek Education 450–350 B.C.* (London 1964). For depictions in art, see Beck, *Album of Greek Education* (Sydney 1975) index s. "literary and humane education;" *AniK* 23 (1980) 40–43.

into adolescence—until boys grow into *meirakia*, says Xenophon (*Lac.* 3.1) or even later (cf. *Pl. Lys.* 223a).

At majority, the relationship of child and slave suddenly shifted. The male Athenian *pais* became a man. Once the associate and near equal of slaves, he became a member of a society of slaveowners. This change was important to the individual Athenian male and essential to his society. But it might also involve a certain social tension.

For one thing, there was no public system of training or instruction of boys at Athens. There may therefore have been some concern about young Athenians' readiness to fill the citizen's role. For another, the change in status for one dependent group implicitly called into question the position of others: if a boy could regularly pass from *pais* to citizen, why not a slave?<sup>13</sup>

Athenian society reduced this potential for tension by making the transition from boy to man a gradual one. On majority, at least some young citizens took on a special status, that of ephebe, marked by a special uniform, partial citizen rights, limited military duties, and continued formal supervision.<sup>14</sup> In short, ephebes were in transition from child to adult.<sup>15</sup> The ephebate contained elements of preparation for full citizen status, in particular hoplite training (*Ath. Pol.* 42.3). But it also served simply to mark off the Athenian *pais* from the subordinate groups with which he was associated. The purpose of this article is to consider Athenian male homosexuality as a similar institution of transition from subordinate to citizen status.

Recent publications, including major books by Dover and Buffière, and a monograph on Greek homosexuality as an institution of initiation by Patzer, have emphasized the role of homosexual relationships in the acculturation of young male citizens, and I shall say little about this important element of transition here. Instead, I will argue that the specific forms of certain customary aspects of Athenian homosexual attitudes and behaviour serve to distinguish young Athenians from the slaves they so nearly resem-

<sup>13</sup>See J. K. Davies, "Athenian Citizenship: The Descent Group and the Alternatives," *CJ* 73 (1977/8) 105–121 for Athenian concern about who was and was not a citizen.

<sup>14</sup>The date of the introduction of the ephebate and the social status of the ephebes are subjects of debate; see most recently H. Y. McCulloch and H. D. Cameron, *IllClasStud* 5 (1980) 12–14 and the exchanges between P. J. Rhodes and E. Ruschenbusch in *ZPE* 38 (1980) 191–201, 41 (1981) 103–105, 44 (1981) 110–112, 49 (1982) 267–268. Certainty is impossible. I think it is most likely that sons of at least the wealthier Athenian families became ephebes throughout the classical period, and that the ephebate, as an institution of transition, therefore provides a useful analogy to the role I argue below for homosexual relationships among the Athenian elite.

<sup>15</sup>See P. Vidal-Naquet, "The Black Hunter and the Origins of the Athenian Ephebeia," *PCPS* 14 (1968) 49–64; P. G. Maxwell-Stuart, "Remarks on the Black Cloaks of the Ephebes," *PCPS* 16 (1970) 113–116.

bled. As this article, then, does not examine the institution as a whole, I give fairly full references to recent discussions to show that a *communis opinio* exists regarding Athenian homosexuality's main features, and cite ancient sources only selectively.

The ancient evidence falls into three major groups. (1) Artistic depictions of homosexual approaches or activities, on vases of the archaic and earlier classical periods. (2) Casual mentions in Old Comedy. (3) References in the prose works of Plato and Xenophon—writings by and often about members of the Socratic circle.<sup>16</sup> I have tried to cite evidence from each group wherever possible.<sup>17</sup>

Two features are particularly relevant. (1) Homosexual relationships did not involve equals. As Dover puts it (*GH* 84), “. . . homosexual relationships in Greek society are regarded as the product not of the reciprocated sentiments of equals but of the pursuit of those of lower status by those of higher status.” This inequality is basically a function of a disparity in age. Both parties might well be young men and unmarried.<sup>18</sup> But one is normally younger than the other.<sup>19</sup> This junior partner is generally called *pais* (in poetry) or *paidika*, even if he has reached the age of majority. But for convenience I will use Dover's terms *eromenos* and *erastes* for the younger and older parties respectively.

According to common Greek views on the relationship between men of different ages, the younger man would normally be thought of as subordinate to the older.<sup>20</sup> To quote Dover again, “The virtues admired in an erom-

<sup>16</sup>We have also a few references in tragedy and satyr-play (e.g., Aesch. fr. 64, 65L.-J., Soph. fr. 153R., 345R., 488R., Eur. fr. 840N<sup>2</sup>, *Cycl.* 581–584, perhaps *Med.* 249) and a fourth-century speech by Aeschines [1] *In Tim.*) devoted in part to Timarchus' homosexual activities, which is discussed in detail in Dover *GH*.

<sup>17</sup>Dover's *Greek Homosexuality* includes a valuable list of the vases he cites. But not all of his vases are directly related to homosexuality at Athens; many of those so related are not illustrated. And Dover's desire to demonstrate the variety of homosexual activity and iconography has led him to illustrate a number of unrepresentative vases (see, for example Beazley, *Cyprus* 23 on Dover's B16, and 26 on his B538). I have accordingly drawn also from other sources. Vases are cited by their number in the list printed at the end of this article.

<sup>18</sup>A number of passages describe older partners and *νεανίαι* (e.g., Pl. *Amat.* 132c), *νεανίσκοι* (e.g., Pl. *Euthd.* 273a, *Chrm.* 154a; here the partners may be coevals), *μειράκια* (e.g., Pl. *Amat.* 132a, *Com. Adesp.* 103gE. = Page *GLP* 316, Theopompus 29E. = Schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 2.78a). The *erastes* in red-figure “is more often a youth, not a man” (Beazley *Cyprus* 27). This is already so in late black-figure; according to Beazley *Cyprus* 11, the earliest example is a black-figure lekythos, Villa Giulia 50653, by the Taleides P., 550–525. For red-figure examples, see vases 20, 21, 30, 47.

<sup>19</sup>See the endnote.

<sup>20</sup>For the authority of age, see, e.g., *Il.* 1.259, 9.160–161, 15.180–182, Soph. *OC* 1422–23, Xen. *Cyr.* 4.5.32, Pl. *Leg.* 1.634e, Isoc. 11.23, Arist. *Pol.* 7.1332b36. First-born males at Athens had certain (limited) privileges, *presbeia*; see Dem. 36.34, 39.27, 29; and cf. Harrison (above, n. 8) 131–132. For an Attic grave stele which may have been reserved exclusively for a family's first-born males, see R. Garland, *ABSA* 77 (1982) 130, 142.

enos are the virtues which the ruling element in a society (in the case of Greek society, adult male citizens) approves in the ruled (women and children)" (*GH* 84). And the roles of the partners in sexual activity emphasize the subordination of the younger man: he plays the passive role.<sup>21</sup>

(2) Nevertheless, certain of the conventions of Athenian homosexuality deny the subordinate status of the younger party. *Aidos* and *sophrosyne*, both virtues appropriate to subordinate status,<sup>22</sup> were valued in the young.<sup>23</sup> But the *eromenos* had virtues suited to a dominant as well as a subordinate role. Xenophon's Socrates praises the strength and steadfastness and manliness (*ῥώμην τε καὶ καρτερίαν καὶ ἀνδρείαν*, *Symp.* 8.8) of Callias' *eromenos* Autolycus as well as his *sophrosyne*. The author of the *Erotikos* ascribed to Demosthenes also joins *sophrosyne* and *andreia* (ps.-Dem. 61.8, 13) and comments on the union of contradictory qualities displayed by the young subject of his panegyric (14). Such a mix is of course unsurprising in a transitional stage. That the transition is towards full enjoyment of citizen status is perhaps implied by Xenophon's comment that those inspired by love look very much like free men (*τὰ σχήματα εἰς τὸ ἐλευθεριώτερον ἄγουσιν*, *Symp.* 1.10).<sup>24</sup>

It is especially instructive to compare vase paintings showing homosexual acts with those depicting other groupings. Women on the vases often appear to enjoy sex.<sup>25</sup> But passive homosexual partners show no sign of pleasure; they have no erection and usually stare straight ahead during intercourse.<sup>26</sup> The Greeks often spoke of sex as an overpowering force.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>21</sup>See Dover *GH* 16, 52, Ungaretti 293, J. Henderson, *CW* 72 (1979) 434. The clearest evidence is from art: Beazley *Cyprus* 24–27, 29–31 gives a catalogue. See, e.g., vases 3, 4, 8, 9, 39, 46.

Passive homosexuality among older males was a cause for comment and concern (Arist. *EN* 7.1148b15 ff., *Pr.* 4.26, 27 [879a35 ff.]). See below for Aristophanes' hostility.

<sup>22</sup>Cf. H. North, *Sophrosyne* (Ithaca 1966) 131 n. 24: "Whatever else it may become, *sophrosyne* throughout Greek literature is always the virtue proper to the young and of course to women—i.e., to all those members of society of whom obedience is required."

<sup>23</sup>*Sophrosyne* and youth: Ar. *Nub.* 962, 1006, Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.26, *Cyr.* 1.2.8–9, Isoc. 7.48, 9.22. *Aidos* and youth: Ar. *Nub.* 995, Xen. *Symp.* 1.8, *Lac.* 2.2, 10, Isoc. 7.48. *Aidos* and the *eromenos*: Lycophronides 843P., Arist. *fr.* 96 Rose (both in *Ath.* 13.564b).

<sup>24</sup>*Erastai* might help *eromenoi* learn to act like free citizens. See Xen. *Symp.* 4.15: handsome *erastai* influence those interested in love to be freer with their money (*ἐλευθεριωτέρους μὲν*). . . *εἰς χρήματα* as well as *αἰδεμονεστέρους* and more self-controlled. The tyrannicides Harmodius and Aristogeiton provided examples of love of liberty and of good citizenship motivated by homosexual eros; see especially Pl. *Symp.* 181bc, Aeschines 1.132. There were other similar stories; see Plut. *Mor.* 760bc and cf. Arist. *Pol.* 5.1314b25, *Ath.* 13.602d; Buffière 107–121. And a fifth-century inscription found on the Acropolis reads, "Lysitheos says he loves Mikion especially of those in the city because he is brave" (*ἀνδρεῖος*: *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 1266; cf. *IG* 1<sup>2</sup>.920).

<sup>25</sup>For vases showing women's enjoyment of intercourse, see, e.g., vases 2, 42, 43, 47, 49.

<sup>26</sup>On the *eromenos*' lack of enjoyment of sex, see Xen. *Symp.* 8.21, Pl. *Phdr.* 240d. For vase depictions of the passive partner, see especially vases 52 (youth stares straight ahead), 39

A few sources refer to love as a master and to lovers as slaves of desire.<sup>28</sup> The implication of these vase paintings is that the passive partner, despite his subordinate sexual role, is *not* overcome or enslaved by pleasure or any other emotion.<sup>29</sup>

Another comparison: women in vase paintings are depicted in a wide variety of sexual postures<sup>30</sup> and are often shown being penetrated from behind.<sup>31</sup> Women are sometimes shown leaning on or supported by their male lovers,<sup>32</sup> physically dependent on them. They are presumably hetaerae or slaves, so their capacity to resist participation is limited; sometimes they are even shown under constraint.<sup>33</sup> Passive males, however, regularly face their partners.<sup>34</sup> They are upright; it is the active partner who bends his knees and

---

(note flaccid penis). But on other vases the *eromenos* is more animated. So, e.g., on vase 46; but here the boy's pleasure—like his gaze—seems directed at the hare his lover has brought him. Compare a number of scenes in which matters have not developed so far: vases 15 (a man fondles a boy who hangs from his neck and looks up into his face); 30 (a youth embraces a boy, who looks up into his face; but note that the youth's hand seems to be under the boy's chin); 20, 21 (much the same); 35 (a man fondles a boy and prepares for inter-cural copulation; the boy touches his head and looks into his face). Dover (*GH* addenda) mentions two passages in Aristophanes which suggest that the *eromenos* might enjoy intercourse from behind (*Ach.* 591–592, *Eq.* 963–964). But I think they are more likely to express threats of domination: forcible entry from the rear will be coupled with manhandling the penis. Compare n. 34 below.

<sup>27</sup>See e.g., *Soph. Ant.* 781–799, *Trach.* 441–442, *Eur. Med.* 627–634, *Hipp.* 525–534, *Pl. Resp.* 1.329c, *Symp.* 196d, *Isaeus* 2.19, cf. *Lys.* 3.4, 31, *Dem.* 40.51, *Hyp.* 3.3 Colin, and J. De Romilly, "L'excuse de l'invincible amour dans la tragédie grecque," in *Miscellanea Tragica in honorem J. C. Kamerbeek* (Amsterdam 1976) 309–322.

<sup>28</sup>For classical Greek examples, see *Pl. Phdr.* 238e, 265c, *Men.* fr. 658, *Misoumenos* fr. 2 Sandbach, and the discussions of F. O. Copley, *TAPA* 78 (1947) 285–288 and R. O. A. M. Lyne, *CQ* 29 (1979) 118–120. Note too the red-figure aryballos by Douris (vase 41) showing Eros chasing a youth with a whip, and his cup (38) showing Eros threatening a youth with a sandal.

<sup>29</sup>Resistance to sexual desire, like other forms of self-control, was considered a virtue. See, e.g., *Xen. Ages.* 5.1–4, *Mem.* 4.5.9, *Oec.* 12.11–14, and compare K. J. Dover, *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1975) 205–209.

<sup>30</sup>See, e.g., vases 2, 18, 45, 47, 48, 50, 52.

<sup>31</sup>See, e.g., vases 3, 23, 28, 36, 37, 40, 52.

<sup>32</sup>See, e.g., vase 43.

<sup>33</sup>See, e.g., vases 23, 34, 36, 45. Compare the cup by Douris (vase 40) which shows a man and a woman with the inscription *ἔχε ἡσυχος* (?).

<sup>34</sup>Men might enjoy anal stimulation. See, e.g., vase 13 (a bearded man puts a finger to his anus and masturbates). Compare Dover's BB24 (Berlin 3364, Boeotian) and CW12 (Wurzburg, Etruscan black-figure).

But Dover mentions only three Attic vases showing homosexual copulation from behind. One (R1127) involves a group of satyrs: a satyr lies on his back with his feet in the air, so that, although penetration is technically from behind, he is still facing his active partner. Another (vase 12) also involves a group scene. The third is vase 51, the unusual piece mentioned in the endnote. We may add a b.f. Tyrrhenian amphora, 570–560, attributed

(often) his head.<sup>35</sup> And there are no elements of constraint.<sup>36</sup> The passive male is thus portrayed as subordinate neither to sexual pleasure nor to a specific sexual partner.

There are other conventions which underline the paradoxical dominance of the younger partner. The older was not only the sexually active partner; he was also the aggressor. As such he was forced to court, to approach boys, his social inferiors, as a suppliant. So we find vase paintings which show older men—they are bearded—reaching out to touch a younger male's chin in the classic gesture of supplication.<sup>37</sup>

---

to the Timiades P., on which a bearded man dances, a second bends over, and a third approaches the second from behind with penis erect (E. Simon, *The Kurashiki Ninagawa Museum* [Mainz 1982] no. 22). This, like other Tyrrhenian amphoras, was made in an Attic workshop presumably for export to Etruria, and may reflect Etruscan taste and convention (or at least ignore Athenian ones), in sexual as in other matters; see T. H. Carpenter, "The Tyrrhenian Group: Problems of Provenance," *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 3 (1984) 45–56. Finally, O. Koch-Harnack, *Knabenliebe und Tiergeschenke* (Berlin 1983) 62 n. 202, reports that a sixth-century *kalpis* which appeared suddenly on the Swiss art market shows an exceptional scene of anal intercourse with a boy; she provides no further details.

These representations have little similarity to the conventional depictions of *erastes* and *eromenos*, in which illustrations of anal copulation, or even of acts which might imply anal copulation, are unknown. The reason for the conventional depiction is probably that anal penetration carried with it connotations of dominance. So an adulterer might be punished by *rhapanismos*; the cuckold could force a large radish up his anus (Ar. *Nub.* 1083–1084, cf. Lucian *Peregr.* 9). So a Persian depicted on an oinochoe dated about 460 (R1155) says "I am Eurymedon. I stand bent over" (Εὐρυμέδων εἰμι κυβάδε ἑστήκα) while a Greek approaches with his penis in his hand; the vase celebrates the Athenian victory at the Eurymedon River in the early 460s. (See K. Schauenburg, "Eurymedon eimi," *AthMitt* 90 [1975] 97–121 and plate 25, and for the erect penis as a symbol of protection for the city, W. Burkert, *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual* [Berkeley and Los Angeles 1979] 40–41.) A number of vases show similar though less explicit scenes: 1, 25, 29, 44, cf. 14, 17. The comic poets, who are generally hostile towards passive partners, are more willing to refer to anal intercourse; see, e.g., Ar. *Eq.* 639, *Vesp.* 1068–1070, *Nub.* 1085–1104, *Thesm.* 1118–1124, *Plut.* 153–154, Eubulus 120E. (= Ath. 1.25c), cf. Eupolis 77E. (= Erotian 103.13 Nachmanson, cf. Ath. 4.183 f.); I say more on their attitude in general below.

<sup>35</sup>See Dover *GH* 101 and of vases showing intercourse, e.g., vases 8, 9, 10, 52, 53. The *erastes'* knees are normally bent when he approaches or fondles as well. See Beazley *Cyprus* 6 and, e.g., vases 5, 6, 7, 38, 39.

<sup>36</sup>J. Boardman has assembled a short catalogue of vases bearing depictions of one person threatening another with a sandal in an erotic context (*AA* 1976, 286–287). One shows Eros brandishing a sandal at a boy (a reference to the power of love), another a youth threatening a piper, presumably a slave. In five scenes, men threaten women; in one a woman threatens a man. There are no scenes showing citizen homosexuals (unless Boardman's no. 5, vase 16 is erotic).

<sup>37</sup>For this gesture, see T. J. McNiven, *Gestures in Attic Vase Painting: Use and Meaning, 550–450 B. C.* (diss., Michigan 1982) 90, Beazley *Cyprus* 6 and, e.g., vases 5, 6, 7, 9, 24. There seem to be no red-figure examples. Beazley also cites five vases which bear scenes showing the *pais* touching the man's beard.



Greek idiom points the same way. *Χαρίζεσθαι*, “to oblige,” is often found in sexual contexts with the meaning “to grant sexual favours.” It is often used of the *eromenos*; so Pausanias in his speech in Plato’s *Symposium* refers to some who call it a disgrace to grant favours to suitors (ὡς αἰσχρὸν χαρίζεσθαι ἐρασταῖς, 182a).<sup>38</sup> It seems that it is the *eromenos* who is in control. *Eromenoi* might even flaunt their power: spoilt beauties, says Socrates, act like despots (*τυραννεύοντες*) when they are in bloom (Pl. *Meno* 76b).

And a number of texts assert that the *erastes*, aggressive and older though he may be, is no better than a slave of the *eromenos*. In Plato’s *Symposium* Pausanias characterizes the attitude of *erastai* to their young boy friends, τὰ παιδικά, as that of men “wishing to undergo slavery as no slave would” (καὶ ἐθέλοντες δουλείας δουλεύειν οἷας οὐδ’ ἂν δούλος οὐδεὶς, 183a).<sup>39</sup> Socrates in the *Phaedrus* speaks of the lover’s soul as neglectful of all other concerns, “ready to be a slave (*δουλεύειν*) and to sleep wherever it is allowed, as near as possible to the beloved” (252a). Xenophon’s Socrates says that a man like Critobulus, who has dared to kiss Alcibiades’ beautiful son, is likely to become a slave straight away instead of a free man (αὐτίκα μάλα δούλος μὲν εἶναι ἀντ’ ἐλευθέρου, *Mem.* 1.3.11). His Critobulus would sooner be slave than free if Cleinias would be his master (ἥδιον δ’ ἂν δουλεύοιμι ἢ ἐλεύθερος εἶην εἴ μου Κλεινίας ἄρχειν ἐθέλοι, *Symp.* 4.14).

Again according to Xenophon’s Socrates, physical consummation, as opposed to spiritual communion, is servile (*ἀνελεύθερος*, Xen. *Symp.* 8.23–24, cf. Pl. *Phdr.* 258e). The *erastes* who cares for the body and not the soul asks to be treated like a beggar; he follows his favourite about beseeching a kiss or some other favour. In turn, the *eromenos* who uses his physical attraction may rule (*ἄρξει*) the *erastes* (8.26). Finally, Aristotle—not an Athenian, but long resident at Athens—contrasts the pleasure of the lover in looking at his partner and the beloved in being served (*θεραπεύμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐραστοῦ*, *EN* 8.1157a7).

I have been arguing that certain conventions of Athenian homosexuality were meant to de-emphasize or deny the subordination of the passive partner, normally a young Athenian near the age of majority, and so help distinguish him from slaves. But some of the evidence might fit as well with a different view. It is from women that young *eromenoi* on the vases are

<sup>38</sup>The word occurs frequently in Pausanias’ speech (*Symp.* 182b, 182b, c, 183d, 184a, b, 184d, e, 185a, b), perhaps as a touch of characterization. See also, e.g., Xen. *Mem.* 3.11.13, Pl. *Phdr.* 233d, e, 234b. For a similar use of *ὑπουργεῖν*, “do a service for,” see, e.g., Xen. *Hier.* 1.37, Pl. *Symp.* 184d (where it is used of both *erastes* and *eromenos*).

<sup>39</sup>Cf. Pl. *Symp.* 184c, 210d, 219e (where in ironic reversal the young *erastes* Alcibiades is said to be enslaved by his older quarry Socrates).

According to Plutarch, Apollo was Admetus’ *erastes* when he did his year’s service at Pherae (*Mor.* 761e, cf. Tib. 2.3.11–14 and, for *erastai* in general as *douloi*, *Mor.* 762e).

distinguished. *Χαρίζεσθαι* (and other such words) often have a heterosexual reference (e.g., the metaphorical use at Ar. *Eq.* 517). The conventions I have outlined here may be seen also as a means of distinguishing *eromenoi* from women.<sup>40</sup> All subordinate groups at Athens—women, slaves, foreigners, minors, the elderly—tended to be assimilated to each other in contrast with the dominant social group, adult male citizens before retirement. The *eromenos* was therefore not marked off only from women, or only from slaves. Majority involved a break with a whole interrelated complex of persons of lower status. Three factors, however, persuade me that the distinction between *eromenos* and slave is indeed especially important.

First, the double meaning of the word *pais* suggests that the identification of child and slave was more complete than that of child and woman. Second, this identification was potentially more subversive to Athenian society. The change from boy to man, and so citizen, called into question the essential division between dominant and subordinate status simply because there was no readily identifiable reason why a *pais*, “child,” should become a citizen when a *pais*, “slave,” could not. By contrast, the separate statuses of men and women could easily be justified by an appeal to obvious biological differences. Third—and most telling—there is other evidence, from Athenian law, which attests to the connection between sexual activity and citizen status at Athens.<sup>41</sup>

No Athenian citizen could take money or any other form of payment for sexual favours. This was prostitution—an occupation fit for a slave or an alien—and the penalty was loss of citizen rights (Aeschines 1.29–32).<sup>42</sup> This law testifies to a general link between sexual activity and status. Two others, more directly related to the argument, distinguish the sexual activities of free men and slaves. Aeschines cites a law forbidding slaves to enter palaestrae (1.138).<sup>43</sup> Places of exercise were favourite meeting-places for young citizens and their admirers;<sup>44</sup> the implication is that slaves were discouraged from participating in their courting rituals. A second law quoted by Aeschines (1.139) is more explicit: it prohibits slaves from using free

<sup>40</sup>Sigmund Freud long ago suggested the Greeks thought the *eromenos* resembled a woman; see *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality* (1905) in *The Pelican Freud Library* 7: *On Sexuality*, ed. A. Richards (Harmondsworth 1977) 55–56. On the conventions, see especially Dover *GH* 84, 101–105; T. W. Africa, “Homosexuals in Greek History,” *Journal of Psychohistory* 9 (1982) 401–420, at 409.

<sup>41</sup>Cf. Hoffman (above, n. 6) 420.

<sup>42</sup>This law was in effect as early as 425/4 (Ar. *Eq.* 876–880).

<sup>43</sup>Δούλον μὴ γυμνάζεσθαι μηδὲ ξηραλοιφεῖν ἐν ταῖς παλαίστραῖς. There was a similar law on Crete (Arist. *Pol.* 2.1264a21–22).

<sup>44</sup>See Ar. *Vesp.* 1023–1028, *Pax* 762–764, *Av.* 139–142, Aeschines 1.135, Pl. *Chrm.* 153a, 154a, c, *Euthd.* 272e–273a, *Lys.* 206e, *Symp.* 217c, *Leg.* 1.636a, c, cf. Plut. *Mor.* 751 f. A number of vases show *erastes* and *eromenos* meeting in the palaestra; see Beazley *Cyprus* 27 and, e.g., vases 20, 21, 30, 47.

boys as sexual partners at all.<sup>45</sup> Plutarch ascribes both laws to Solon (*Solon* 1.3, cf. *Mor.* 152d, *Herm. in Phdr.* 231e) and makes the significant addition that he did not bar slaves from sex with free women (*Mor.* 751b).<sup>46</sup>

What could be the purposes and effects of these laws? Principally, I think, to guarantee the special status of the homosexual relationship between free Athenians and to help mark this relationship off as a transitional institution. Let us look at the relationship from the perspectives of the two men involved.

The younger man, the *eromenos*, has moved, or is about to move, from the company of slaves to the companionship of the free. He takes on a subordinate role, one more suited to the slaves with whom he has been associated. But the law ensures that he cannot play the role of a slave's subordinate and so have less than a slave's status—only a free man can play the dominant sexual role towards him. And, as we have seen, conventions keep aspects of subordination in that relationship to a minimum.

As for the *erastes*, he is further removed in age and social status from the status of slave. The law therefore puts a more positive mark on his status; a man who plays the dominant sexual role in regard to an Athenian must himself be free.

We can summarize the transition from child to adult citizen in the following scheme. *Stage 1*: the child is a member of a subordinate group—a *pais* among *paides*, children and slaves. *Stage 2*: the young Athenian, though not necessarily a minor,<sup>47</sup> is still termed *pais* in the context of a homosexual

<sup>45</sup> Δούλον ἐλευθέρου παιδὸς μήτ' ἐρᾶν μήτ' ἐπακολουθεῖν, ἢ τύπτεσθαι τῇ δημοσίᾳ μάστιγι πενήκοντα πληγᾶς.

<sup>46</sup> The Greeks liked to lend Solon's authority to later laws (see E. Ruschenbusch, *Solonos Nomoi* [Wiesbaden 1966] 53–58); we cannot be sure these laws were his. But Solon's poetry reveals a lively interest in homosexual love (fr. 25W. = *Plut. Mor.* 751b, cf. 751e). And the abolition of hectemorage and the recall of Athenians sold abroad suggest that, for Solon, Athenian citizenship meant freedom from servile or quasi-servile constraints. This is consistent both with Solon's authorship of the law and with the account of it given in the text.

<sup>47</sup> No law forbade liaisons with very young boys, though Plato's Pausanias wished for one (*Symp.* 181d–e). But in general we may think of passive partners as ranging in age from mid-teens to early twenties; see Buffière 605–617. *Eromenoi* are variously called μειράκιον (*Xen. An.* 2.6.28, *Pl. Chrm.* 154b), μειρακίσκος (*Pl. Phdr.* 237b: παῖς μᾶλλον δέ μειρακίσκος), νεανίσκος (*Dem.* 61.2) as well as *pais*. These are words which describe no very precise age: see T. Hopfner, *Das Sexualleben der Griechen und Römer* 1 (Prague 1938) 225–237; Gomme-Sandbach on *Men. Dysk.* 27; J. F. Kindstrand, *Bion of Borysthenes* (Uppsala 1976) on *Bion* fr. 60. Episthenes of Amphipolis is moved by the beauty of a *pais* just reaching maturity (*Xen. An.* 7.4.7: παῖδα καλὸν ἡβάσκοντα ἄρτι). This might be as young as 14: Greek writers from Solon to Galen regard 14 as a turning point, the beginning of a new stage of life (see A. Schmidt, *Handbuch der griechischen Chronologie* [Jena 1888] 315–316; Hopfner, *ibid.*, 225–232). As for the upper age limit, Bion of Borysthenes says that the *eromenos*' beard frees the *erastes* from his domination (fr. 56K. = *Plut. Mor.* 770b–c, cf. *Laurea, Anth. Pal.* 12.26); a number of other sources say a boy is most beautiful before his beard is fully grown (*Il.* 24.347–348, *Od.* 10.278–279 [quoted in *Pl. Prt.*

relationship. His lover is a free man, probably a citizen, certainly not a slave. In this role too the *pais* has a subordinate status; but elements of subordination are counteracted by the conventions which characterize Athenian homosexuality. *Stage 3*: the young Athenian is older. He is a *pais* neither in age nor in status, but now the active partner in homosexual activity between citizens. His role is analogous to that of a master. But his "slave" also dominates him. *Stage 4*: the young adult marries.<sup>48</sup> His status changes. He has not necessarily given up homosexual activities—he may continue to play the role of *erastes* throughout his life. Nor does his marriage necessarily bring his first heterosexual experience—young men enjoyed sex with slave girls and prostitutes, and adultery was not unknown. The crucial difference is that sexual relations with other full Athenian citizens are no longer carried on as a *pais* or with a *pais*. The young husband begins to produce *paides*, as well as to control *paides* as a master, and his separation from that subordinate group is complete.

Of course, these stages are merely constructs. They have no juridical or even institutional standing. No ceremony marked the move from *eromenos* to *erastes*.<sup>49</sup> Nevertheless, I feel that this analysis, schematic and tentative as it is, may be considered an economical hypothesis. It accounts for the forms of a specific institution by reference to features which certainly mark this society as a whole, divisions according to status and age.

And it helps to clarify a contradiction in our sources. The comic dramatists exhibit a very different attitude from Plato,<sup>50</sup> in whose dialogues

---

309b], cf. Pl. *Symp.* 180a, 181d, Xen. *Symp.* 4.23, and the references cited by D. L. Page, *The Epigrams of Rufinus* [Cambridge 1978] on Rufinus 10.) And Attic vases never show the *eromenos* bearded. The Greeks generally thought of the beard as growing by 21 (see F. Boll, *NJbb* 31 [1913] 116 n. 3). *Eromenoi* might be older, however. Agathon is Pausanias' *eromenos* in Plato's *Protagoras* (315e) and *Symposium* (193b, cf. Xen. *Symp.* 8.32). The dramatic date of the *Protagoras* is about 430, of the *Symposium*—where Agathon is an established tragic poet—416 (and cf. Plut. *Mor.* 770c, Ael. *VH* 2.21).

For the incompatibility of marriage with the role of *eromenos*, see Pl. *Phdr.* 240a.

<sup>48</sup>Thirty is probably close to the normal age of marriage for Athenian men of prosperous families; for the evidence, see *Phoenix* 35 (1981) 322 n. 21.

<sup>49</sup>However, there is evidence for similar stages from other cultures. At least some Cretans practiced a socially accepted form of homosexual courtship and marriage in the mid-fourth century (Ephorus, *FGrHist* 70 F 149.21 = Strabo 10.483–484). The Keraki of New Guinea passed through stages of passive and active homosexual activity before they achieved full social status. Australian Aranda youth went through a stage of homosexual marriage with an older man, who later broke away to find a wife (D. J. West, *Homosexuality* [Harmondsworth 1968] 19–20).

<sup>50</sup>Plato's attitude in the *Laws* (1.636b, e, 8.835d–842a) is very different from that in the earlier Socratic dialogues; see most recently Buffière 409–434. In his earlier work, Plato is concerned to describe a facet of social life in a contemporary or near contemporary milieu and to use it for his own philosophical purposes. But the *Laws* is a prescriptive, not a persuasive, piece of work. Plato need no longer make use of what he does not like: he simply rejects it.

homosexuality is idealized for its contribution to the process of education.<sup>51</sup> Aristophanes' characters may enjoy sex with a pretty *pais*, but this is a casual physical pleasure. And sex between men and women—virtually absent from the world of Plato's dialogues—is a much more important theme.

Dover ascribes this difference in attitude to a real difference in sexual *mores*: "The difference between Aristophanes and Plato, between homosexual acts as a peripheral luxury and homosexual *ἔρως* as central and emotionally absorbing, is a difference between the way of life of middle-aged peasants and the way of life of rich young men" (*BICS* 38). It was the Athenian elite who institutionalized homosexuality and formed and followed its conventions. Social antagonism goes a long way towards explaining the hostility of comedy.<sup>52</sup> But it is not simply homosexuality which is the target; it is the passive partner—the man who plays the subordinate role—who is ridiculed.<sup>53</sup>

I think the reason is the prevalence of slavery in Athenian society. The Athenian who did not belong to the elite is less likely to have been raised with or by slaves, less likely to own slaves. And he may have to work alongside the slave or slaves he does own. He makes a less dramatic leap from subordinate to dominant status; for him, a mediating institution has little relevance. And in fact such an institution, involving as it does some elements of quasi-servile subordination, may threaten his position. The ordinary Athenian may have felt himself too close to slaves, especially in material and economic matters, to risk blurring the lines between them.

UNIVERSITY OF WINNIPEG

<sup>51</sup>See especially Henderson, 58, 76, 94–95, 208–215; Dover *BICS* 34–40, *GH* 135–153; R. Eisner, "A Case of Poetic Justice: Aristophanes' Speech in the *Symposium*," *CW* 72 (1979) 417–419; Buffière 179–193. For the hostility of other comic writers, see, e.g., Eupolis 56E. (421/0) and the next note. Nothing is known of Aristophanes' *Paiderastes* or Diphilus' *Paiderastai*.

<sup>52</sup>See, e.g., Ar. *Eq.* 876–880, *Vesp.* 1068–1070, *Nub.* 1085–1104, esp. 1093–1095 (and cf. Pl. *Symp.* 191e–192a), Pl. *Com.* 186E., Apollodorus 13E. (= Stob. *Flor.* 46.15), *Com. Adesp.* 12E. (1.956) (=Synesius *Ep.* 104.244a), perhaps *Crates* 1E. (=Ath. 9.396d), and Dover *BICS* 38–40, *GH* 149–151, Henderson 216–219.

<sup>53</sup>See Dover *GH* 137–148.

ENDNOTE: AGE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN *ERASTAI* AND *EROMENOI*

Dover concludes that "it was shocking if an erastes was younger than his eromenos . . . . One could be erastes and eromenos at the same stage of one's life, but not both in relation to the same person."<sup>1</sup> Some particularly clear passages are Plato *Phdr.* 240c–d and Xenophon *Symp.* 4.23–24; in Xenophon *An.* 2.6.21–28 Menon the Thessalian did have a bearded *paidika* when he was still beardless and was someone else's *paidika*, and it is clear (as Diogenes Laertius suggests, 2.50) that this bit of gossip is meant to highlight Xenophon's portrait of him as a morally dubious character. Similarly, Aeschines' tirade against Timarchus includes the charge that he went off with Misgolas, who was his own age (1.40 ff., 70, 76).

Henderson accepts that the "central relationship" was between "older (aggressive) *erastai* and younger (passive) *eromenoi*" but suggests that reciprocal and equal relationships between parties belonging to the same age-category were not unknown.<sup>2</sup> He adduces the relationship of Agathon and Pausanias as shown in Plato *Prt.* 315d–e. But that passage tells us nothing about their respective ages, and in Plato's *Symposium* Pausanias is made to assume that one partner in a homosexual relationship is older than the other (181c–d).

The basic catalogue of the vases depicting *erastes* and *eromenos*, Beazley *Cyprus* 6–31, lists 103 black-figure and 11 red-figure vases. In all except one (vase 32; see below), the pair are of different ages. The additional material in more recent discussions has not changed the situation appreciably;<sup>3</sup> only vases 19, 27, 31, 32 (as mentioned), 33, and 51 may show homosexual activity between youths of the same age.

On vase 51, for example, a boy with an erect penis sits on a chair while another prepares to sit on his lap. This is perhaps intentionally a shocker. As von Blanckenhagen remarks, ". . . the validity of the specific distinction between Erastes and Eromenos, traditional in pederastic scenes of earlier times, is being questioned. What is shown is no longer the courting of a boy by a man but a sexual encounter of boys of the same age capable of exchanging roles, performed not in the privacy of a room . . . but in public."<sup>4</sup> These vases merely confirm what was never really in question, that youths

<sup>1</sup>GH 87; see too Ungaretti 292, Wilkinson 24.

<sup>2</sup>J. Henderson, review of Dover GH in CW 72 (1979) 434. The possibility is allowed by Dover (GH 86).

<sup>3</sup>E.g., J. Frel, "Griechischer Eros," *ListyFil* 11 (1963) 60–64; K. Schauenburg, "Erastes und Eromenos auf einer Schale des Sokles," AA 1965.849–867; J. M. Hemelrijk, "Youth and Bashful Boy," in *Miscellanea Tragica in honorem J. C. Kamerbeek*, eds. J. M. Bremer, S. L. Radt, C. J. Ruijgh (Amsterdam 1976) 147–156; H. A. Shapiro, "Courtship Scenes in Attic Vase-painting," *AJA* 85 (1981) 133–143.

<sup>4</sup>P. H. von Blanckenhagen, "Puerilia," in *In memoriam Otto J. Brendel*, eds. L. Bonfante and H. von Heintze (Mainz 1976) 37–41, at 40 n. 20.

might perform homosexual acts with each other. The point is that these acts are so rarely depicted: the vases listed here are exceptions which emphasize the startlingly conventional nature of the great majority of homosexual scenes on Attic vases.

Our literary sources assure us that the depictions on Attic vases reflect conventions of sexual behaviour as well as of iconography. We cannot be so sure in the case of art from other areas.<sup>5</sup> But it is interesting to note that the iconography at least is similar elsewhere. The distinction between bearded and beardless is generally not significant on Corinthian komos vases. Whether men are shown bearded or not "depends on the habit of each artist, habits to which most remain faithful" (Seeberg 72). But scenes of homosexual courtship and contact regularly pair bearded men with beardless (74).<sup>6</sup>

### *Index of Vases Cited*

In this article I refer to the following Attic vases by number; for convenience, I have identified them in this index according to their numbers in the list of vases in Dover *GH* (e.g., B16, R27) as well as giving the standard references to J. D. Beazley, *Attic Black-Figure Vase Painters* (Oxford 1956) = *ABV*; *Attic Red-Figure Vase Painters*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford 1963) = *ARV*; and *Paralipomena* (Oxford 1972) = *Para*. References to other publications are given only for vases not illustrated by Dover. These publications are referred to by authors' names or in an otherwise abbreviated form as follows: J. Boardman, *Athenian Black Figure Vases: A Handbook* (London 1974) = *ABVH*; J. Boardman, *Athenian Red Figure Vases: The Archaic Period—A Handbook* (London 1975) = *ARVH*; J. Boardman and E. La Rocca, *Eros in Greece* (London 1978) = *EG*; C. H. E. Haspels, *Attic Black-Figured Lekythoi* (Paris 1936); G. M. A. Richter and L. F. Hall, *Red-Figured Attic Vases in the Metropolitan Museum of Art* (New Haven and London 1936) = *R.-H.*; E. Vermeule, "Some Erotica in Boston," *AntK* 12 (1969) 9–15.

1. neck amphora, Nettos Painter, 625–600, *Para* 2 no. 6 = *ABVH* no. 5
2. neck amphora, Tyrrhenian Group, 565–550, *ABV* 102 no. 98 = *EG* 76, B49
3. neck amphora, Tyrrhenian Group, 565–550, *ABV* 102 no. 99 = B51
4. neck amphora, Tyrrhenian Group, 565–550, *ABV* 102 no. 101 = B53

<sup>5</sup>I have made no search for depictions of homosexual activities in other mediums. J. Boardman notes that the motif is rare on archaic gems and suggests that his one illustrated example is probably indebted to a vase (*Archaic Greek Gems* [London 1968] 106 no. 311, pl. XXI). Beazley (*Cyprus* 16–17) mentions a scene showing five pairs of courting youths on a Clazomenian sarcophagus in Berlin (inv. 30.030).

<sup>6</sup>See Seeberg's no. 209 = H. Payne, *Necrocorinthia* (Oxford 1931, hereafter *NC*) no. 805, pl. 31.7, 8, middle Corinthian; 240 = *NC* 1359, pl. 38.1, 5, late Corinthian; 210 = *NC* 1159, pl. 34.2, middle Corinthian; 224 = *AJA* 65 (1961) pl. 12b, 13c, early/middle Corinthian; 212 = *NC* 1004, *AK* 6 (1963) pl. 22.6, middle Corinthian. But note that some of these scenes are not very clear.

5. amphora, Lydos, 560–540, *ABV* 109 no. 28 = B65
6. amphora, Group E, 550–525, *ABV* 134 no. 30 = B76
7. amphora, Painter of Cambridge 47, 550–525, *ABV* 315 no. 3 = B271
8. lekythos, Taleides Painter, 540–530, *Para* 73 no. 12 *bis* = B114
9. amphora, Painter of Berlin 1686, 540–530, *ABV* 297 no. 16(A) = B250
10. amphora, Painter of Berlin 1686, 540–530, *ABV* 297 no. 16(B) = *EG* 79, B250
11. lekythos, Vienna 753, 530 = Haspels pl. 16.1b
12. kantharos, Nikosthenes (potter), 530, *ARV* 132 = R223
13. cup, Amasis Painter, 530–520, *ABV* 157 no. 86 = *EG* 82, B90
14. cup, NW Painter, 530–520, *ABV* 223 no. 65 = *ABVH* no. 151
15. kantharos, Boston 08.292, 520 = B598
16. pelike, Euphronios, 520–505, *ARV* 15 no. 11 = *ARVH* no. 30
17. cup, Thalia Painter, 520–500, *ARV* 113 no. 4 = R189
18. cup, Thalia Painter, 520–500, *ARV* 113 no. 7, 1626 = *ARVH* no. 112, R192
19. cup, cf. manner of Epileios Painter, 515–500, *ARV* 150 no. 35, 1628 = R243
20. amphora, Dikaio Painter, 510, *ARV* 31 no. 4 = R59
21. cup, Peithinos, 510, *ARV* 115 no. 2, 1626 = R196
22. cup, Kiss Painter, 510, *ARV* 177 no. 1 = R303
23. pelike, akin to Nikoxenos Painter, 510, *ARV* 224 no. 7 = *EG* 107, R361
24. cup, cf. Painter of the Nicosia Olpe, 510, *ABV* 454 no. 1 = B342
25. skyphos, Theseus Painter, 510–500, *Para* 257 = *ABVH* no. 245
26. lekythos, Theseus Painter, 510–500, *ABV* 518 = Haspels pl. 43.1a
27. cup, Epidromos Painter, 510–500, *ARV* 118 no. 11 = R200
28. skyphos, near Eleusis Painter, about 500, *ARV* 315 no. 2 = *ARVH* no. 219, R434
29. pelike, Acheloos Painter, about 500, *ABV* 384 no. 19 = *ABVH* no. 210
30. Gotha cup, 500, *ARV* 20 = R27
31. cup-skyphos, Boston 61, 110, late 6th century = Vermeule no. 9, pl. 8.2
32. lekythos, Athens 1121, late 6th century = *AA* 1965 855 ff., fig. 6, B696
33. cup, Group of Courting Cups, late 6th century, *Para* 83 no. 17 = *ABVH* no. 183.1, 2
34. cup, Brygos Painter, 500–475, *ARV* 372 no. 31 = *EG* 97–98, R518
35. cup, Brygos Painter, 500–475, *ARV* 378 no. 137 = R520
36. Cup, Briseis painter, 500–475, *ARV* 408 no. 36 = R543
37. cup, Briseis Painter, 500–475, *ARV* 408 no. 37 = R545
38. cup, Douris, 500–470, *ARV* 428 no. 13 = *Die Antike* 6 (1930) pl. 15a
39. cup, Douris, 500–470, *ARV* 443 no. 224 = R573
40. cup, Douris, 500–470, *ARV* 444 no. 241 = R577
41. aryballos, Douris, 500–470, *ARV* 447 no. 274 = *Deltion* 11 (1927/28) 94, 95 pls. 4, 5
42. cup, Makron, 490–475, *ARV* 467 no. 118 = R.-H. no. 53, pl. 54
43. cup, Makron, 490–475, *ARV* 468 no. 146, 1654 = R.-H. 52, pl. 52, R628
44. lekythos, Beldam Painter, 490–465 = Haspels pl. 50, lc, d
45. cup, Antiphon Painter, 480, *ARV* 339 no. 55 = *ARVH* no. 241, R490



46. pelike, Triptolemos Painter, 480–470, *ARV* 362 no. 21 = R502
47. cup, Triptolemos Painter, 480–470, *ARV* 367 no. 93 = *EG* 114, R506
48. cup, Triptolemos Painter, 480–470, *ARV* 367 no. 94 = *ARVH* no. 302, R507
49. stamnos, Polygnotos, 445–430, *ARV* 1029 no. 16 = *EG* 126–127, R898
50. oinochoe, Shuvalov Painter, 440–420, *ARV* 1208 no. 41, 1704 = R970
51. bell-krater, Dinos Painter, 425–400, *ARV* 1154 no. 35 = R954
52. band-cup, Berlin 1798 = B634
53. Sèvres, Musée Céramique 6405 = B486