

behind where it was twenty-five years ago. Perhaps the entire book project would have been better served if the editors had taken the time to consider why we should care about sexual and gender landscapes in transition and particularly what possibilities exist for interrogation of current ways of seeing gender and sexuality given their recent invention. At least the reader can approach the book this way: as a document of newly hegemonic views and practices of gender and sexuality in countries that are far from done reinventing themselves.

LAURIE ESSIG  
Middlebury College



*Same-Sex Desire and Love in Greco-Roman Antiquity and in the Classical Tradition of the West.* Edited by BEERT C. VERSTRAETE and VERNON PROVENÇAL. Binghamton, N.Y.: Harrington Park Press, 2005. Pp. 505. \$69.95 (cloth); \$49.95 (paper).

This volume contains essays that address understandings of same-sex desire in the ancient world and the persistence and transformation of these understandings in the early modern and modern West. This wide-ranging collection also appeared as a double issue (vol. 49, nos. 3–4) of the *Journal of Homosexuality* in 2005.

After an introduction by the editors, the volume contains six papers on ancient Greece, three on Rome, and then, concluding spaciouly, five papers on the various receptions of antiquity in later articulations of same-sex sexuality from Renaissance Italy to the United States in the 1950s and 1960s. Each of the essays comes with its own notes, bibliography, and introductory summary. The back of the volume features a table of abbreviations, a list of names and terms, an index of ancient passages discussed, and a general index. Of the fourteen papers, men author twelve and women two, a fact the editors acknowledge (xvi).

On the whole, a general audience not expert in the ancient world is the target readership for this book. At times, too, the audience is presumed to be only queers/gays/lesbians (see, for example, 22). The essays relating to Greece and those concerned with the later reception of ancient ideas of same-sex behavior contain much basic information that will help the general reader understand what is at issue. The three essays that treat Rome are less successful in this regard. I find the lopsided representation and inferior contextualization given to Rome regrettable. While ancient Greece is important, there is every reason to regard a nuanced understanding of Roman attitudes to same-sex behavior as worthy of at least the same amount

of care. The Roman state in one form or another was a major geopolitical player in the Mediterranean for over a thousand years, and Rome most assuredly was a greater influence on the early modern states of Europe than was classical Greece. This privileging of Greece is not novel, however. It is a perennial feature of the discipline of classics. I also note here that in many (though not all) of these papers there is less care taken with terms such as *heterosexuality* and *homosexuality* than there ought to be.

After the introduction by the editors, an article entitled "Reconsiderations about Greek Homosexualities" by William Armstrong Percy leads off the volume. Percy covers in canny compression some of the same ground he covered in his 1996 book, *Pederasty and Pedagogy in Archaic Greece*. As the title of this well-documented paper indicates, Percy wants to reevaluate evidence of same-sex eroticism from Greece. The same-sex behavior he mostly means is pederasty, a brief mention of Sappho excepted. In general and ideal terms, pederasty was a sexual relationship between a younger and older partner, the *eromenos*, who was about thirteen to about eighteen (that is to say, from puberty to arrival of the heavy beard), and the *erastes*, who was older (from eighteen to about thirty). The older partner was supposed to be the penetrator of the younger partner. It was also assumed that these relationships would not be merely sexual but that mentoring would take place, too. Percy asserts that the high prevalence of these sorts of connections between young males in ancient Greece started in Crete and Sparta in the seventh century BCE and spread from there. I am uncomfortable with his confident reading of scanty evidence. There is much we don't know for sure. Also, the claims he makes for pederasty are grand, to say the least, seeing the Greek intellectual miracle as connected in a real way to the "erotic spark between man and boy" (48). While I do believe that the homosocial environment certainly helped to move things along intellectually in Athens, if we quite reasonably put even a little credence in the picture that emerges from Plato's dialogues, I still think he overstates his case. But Percy's perspective is a valuable tonic to counter the penetrator/penetrated or dominance/submission model of ancient Greek pederasty that both feminizes the junior partner and has held the field for far too long now.

In "The Dispersion of Pederasty and the Athletic Revolution in Sixth-Century BC Greece" Thomas F. Scanlon delineates a close relationship between the rise of athletic nudity in the seventh century BCE and pederasty. Scanlon sees this nudity as deriving from Spartan customs and ultimately becoming established through the fact that it "attested at once to the self-sufficiency of individuals and the freedom of a civilization easily distinguished from 'the barbarians'" (83). This athletic nudity also constituted "a persistently erotic incentive that reinforce[d] hegemonic maleness and advertise[d] the individual's virtuous exercise of restraint" (63). And so this elaboration of a self-congratulatory Hellenic identity accompanied and indeed intensified male homoeroticism. I find persuasive

Scanlon's situating of pederastic desire within the high-status system of Greek athletic competition.

Vernon Provencal's "*Glukus Himeros*: Pederastic Influence on the Myth of Ganymede" follows. Taking as his subject the myth of Ganymede, the young Trojan prince whom Zeus abducted, Provencal looks at the various meanings this famous story had through antiquity. Provencal makes a number of interesting observations about the development of this perennially popular myth, among which is the structural dissonance between this myth and any pedagogical role we may want to see in pederasty: Ganymede, of course, never grows up and becomes a man. Whatever else he is doing, Zeus is not guiding Ganymede into a virtuous manly maturity. Still, since the addition of glorious Ganymede to heaven benefits both Ganymede and heaven, he becomes "an emblem of institutional pederasty as an *ennobling love*, expressing a heroic *eros* [love] for *kallos* [beauty] that confers *time* [honor] upon *erastes* and *eromenos*" (107). In addition to following the myth itself from the eighth down to the fourth century BCE (Homer to Plato), he also pays particular attention to the phrase *glukus himeros* (sweet desire). The analysis based on the phrase is less convincing, but in the end it vitiates neither the force of his argument nor the impression of sensitivity to the changing understandings of this important myth.

Thomas Hubbard's "Pindar's *Tenth Olympian* and Athlete-Trainer Pederasty" returns the reader to athletics. This learned paper argues from literary and visual evidence and includes a number of images. Echoing a theme already heard in this volume, Hubbard asserts that pedagogy and pederasty were not separated in the way that they are in our postmodern world. He advocates that we envision the ancient Greek relationship between athlete and trainer as one in which sex and expertise are exchanged and athlete and trainer each get something different (though equally rewarding) from the relationship. His discussions of the equivalencies to be seen in pederastic courtship and athletic training scenes in the visual representations of both Douris (151–52) and the Calliope Painter (147–49), both fifth-century BCE, are persuasive. Hubbard's article makes quite clear the need for us to see past our preconceptions of the proper spheres for sexual and pedagogical activities when we consider ancient evidence.

Two less interesting papers follow. In the first, "Boeotian Swine: Homosexuality in Boeotia," Charles Hupperts explores the contention in various ancient sources that the Boeotians/Thebans were shameless in their pursuit of pederasty. While it is useful to see all of these sources together, and Hupperts does make good use of vase paintings, in the end he comes to the uninteresting conclusion that ancient negative evaluations of Theban sexual practices were penned by non-Thebans who were interested in making themselves look better. Hupperts also seems unaware that his use of the word "homosexuality" will strike many readers as controversial. In the second paper ("Sleeping in the Bosom of a Tender Companion': Homoerotic Attachments in Sappho")

Anne L. Klink is but the latest scholar to try to wrest meaning from the evocative and yet ultimately opaque fragments of Sappho. Her conclusion that the desiring speaking voice in the fragments is older than the objects of desire *could* be correct, but not necessarily. Her readings are overly confident. With perhaps overgenerous quotation of Greek, albeit translated, this article will be tough going for nonclassicists.

James L. Butrica's "Some Myths and Anomalies in the Study of Roman Sexuality" leads off the three papers concerned with things Roman. The general reader will likely feel a degree of disorientation, as this lengthy article assumes a great deal of familiarity with a number of vexed topics, and background is mostly lacking. Indeed, this paper, which lacks a unifying thesis, could have done with a narrowing of focus. Butrica's often sharp tone when he disagrees with other scholars grows tiresome in its repetitiousness. For all that, however, he makes sensible observations on the assertion that a freedman was obligated to give his former master sex (he probably was not); on the notion that *cinaedi* (men who were passive to other men in sex and possibly gender deviant) were perforce disposed to give cunnilingus (they probably were not); on the argument that Romans thought sex between women was monstrous (they probably did not—they were bemused). Not so good in the discussion of female-to-female sex (and elsewhere in the article) is Butrica's careless use of terminology. For example, he talks of "heterosexual" Roman women (240) and men (256). I can see that this term *might* be able to be used in a Roman context, but anyone wanting to use it will have to show some awareness of its limitations, especially in the case of ancient men.

John R. Clarke analyzes depictions of gender nonconformist men and a number of males being penetrated anally in "Representations of the *Cinaedus* in Roman Art: Evidence of 'Gay' Subculture?" He logically divides the article into two sections; the first concerns representations that are lighter in tone. Among these representations (which are beautifully reproduced in the book), we have one in which two men who appear to be effeminate are shown disrespect by a barmaid and others that contain various depictions of group sex. There is much to admire about his vivid and often convincing readings of these images. We are to assume on his say-so, however, that gender deviance is more or less the same thing as sexual deviance, since he applies the name *cinaedus* (which appears in none of his evidence) to the effeminate men in the one representation and to the penetrated men in the others. In the second section, which contains analyses of the Warren Cup and the Leiden gemstone, he provides a judicious discussion of these depictions of male-to-male sex. His final claim that "the visual record complements the hints in the literature and indicates the existence of gay subcultures in ancient Rome" (297) is not supported by the evidence he has presented (nor in my judgment by other evidence that we have about Rome). If the *cinaedi* are a subculture of some kind that was based on

gender nonconformity, then nearly all the representations he has brought to bear here don't fit this schema (unless he wants to argue that the mere act of being penetrated is gender nonconformist). If, on the other hand, the key determinant is sexual nonconformity, then what are we to make of the group sex scenes, where everyone joins with everyone sexually?

The final paper on Rome, "The Originality of Tibullus' Marathus Elegies" by Beert C. Verstraete, considers poems treating the relationship of the speaking voice to a young man in the output of Tibullus, a first-century BCE elegist. In this subtle paper on subtle poetry, Verstraete analyzes some works of an author who, surprisingly, does not come up more often in discussion of Roman male same-sex sexual behavior. The paper focuses in particular on one elegy (1.8) and the poignant scene of the speaker arranging the heterosexual experience his boy desires. One of the interesting points of this elegy is that the boy actually speaks. Displayed here are a mutuality and a complexity that we will not see again for centuries.

Focusing on Ficino's *De Amore* (1484) and Trevisani's later *L'impresa* (1569), Armando Maggi, in his "On Kissing and Sighing: Renaissance Homoerotic Love from Ficino's *De Amore* and *Sopra Lo Amore* to Cesare Trevisani's *L'impresa* (1569)," provides a stimulating look at the reception in the writing of Italian Neoplatonists of Plato's ideas about sublimation (which, notoriously, have their origin in homoerotic desire) and the further development of these ideas in a climate officially inhospitable to same-sex sexual intimacies. The realities of the Platonic text and the official stance against any carnal homosexual behavior led to intolerable tensions in the texts Maggi analyzes. For example, Ficino officially rejected carnal expression of same-sex desire and yet all the same attributes great power to homoerotic attraction. Maggi quotes an eye-opening passage from the final pages of the *De Amore*: "Women, of course, catch men easily, and even more easily women who display a certain masculine character. Men catch men still more easily, since they are more like men than women are" (321–22). In his ensuing discussion Maggi remarks that, as far as Ficino was concerned, "to love women is 'of course' natural, but to love men is even more natural" (322). In this masterful paper Maggi dexterously reveals repeatedly the ways in which these Italians were sensitive to the homoeroticism in the various Platonic works (*Symposium* and *Phaedrus* most of all) and indeed to the homoerotic/homosexual possibilities in their own time—the perception of the latter was without a doubt strengthened by their interaction with the former.

The second paper to look at the later reception of ideas about same-sex desire, Wayne R. Dynes's "Light in Hellas: How German Classical Philology Engendered Gay Scholarship," moves us forward to the era of the Enlightenment. Dynes describes the development of German scholarship on pederasty in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, providing a useful chronological discussion of the various German scholars (both professional

and amateur) who engaged in this generations-long effort, the end result of which was the compilation of sources on ancient pederasty that was about as complete as that which we have available to us today. Furthermore, this body of scholarship—which, of course, held that an educating and sublimating pederasty is much better than one whose telos is physical consummation—granted through this very hierarchy that much gross physical activity was occurring, since all never quite equals the ideal. Dynes correctly notes that a subversive reading of those sources all but jumps off the pages (346)—and indeed did. This body of scholarship in turn nourished first Karl Heinrich Ulrichs's efforts on behalf of homosexual emancipation in the late nineteenth century and then Magnus Hirschfeld's in the early twentieth, as Dynes further notes.

John Lauritsen's article, "Hellenism and Homoeroticism in Shelley and His Circle," follows. Lauritsen is interested in reading through the whitewashing activities of heirs and previous biographers to the probable homosexual activities of Shelley, Byron, and their friends. There is considerable smoke, and there could be widespread fire. To take but one example, Lauritsen's analysis of Shelley's "Julian and Maddalo" compellingly suggests that homoeroticism is an important issue in this poem (366–67). Indeed, Lauritsen brings many choice passages of this sort to the reader's attention throughout the paper. The paper is marred, however, by a tendency to go overboard at times and come to conclusions that are not warranted. Citing John Addington Symonds's rapturous experience upon reading the *Symposium* in the 1850s does not make a compelling argument about how Shelley may have felt when he studied it decades earlier as a schoolboy (364–65). In addition, references to pain and horror are not necessarily about anal sex, nor is an involuntary shuddering of orgasm inevitably suggestive of frottage (365).

D. H. Mader discusses a large number of British and American poets active from about 1880 to 1930 who have come to be known as the Uranians in "The Greek Mirror: The Uranians and Their Use of Greece." Mader identifies in their poetry the use of ancient Greek motifs and also a prizing of homosexual relationships that are asymmetrical in nature, that is, often entailing age discrepancy (as was the case in ancient Greek pederasty, of course) but also emerging through class difference. The poets, upper class and cultivated, wrote of coming together sexually with unfinished (and usually younger) men of the lower classes whom they would educate and raise up. As Mader writes: "The equality of virtue or excellence which the two socially unequal partners shared would, in the presence of the masculine, pedagogic Eros, provide the basis for a democratizing solution that would raise the younger or socially subordinate partner to equality" (403). Musing on these ideas as found in these poets and contemplating the codification of consent laws that made pederastic relations nearly unthinkable in the modern West, Mader wonders whether the egalitarian model of proper erotic relations starting from equality

ought to be questioned; he makes an observation worth consideration when he says that “relations now must be ‘democratic’—between equals—and not, as the Uranians argued, democratizing. When we look at *our* Greek mirror, we see *our* concern: abuse” (411).

Amy Richlin, in “Eros Underground: Greece and Rome in Gay Print Culture, 1953–65,” tracks the uses to which antiquity was put in the U.S. gay press of the 1950s and 1960s. Her primary focus is on the California publication *ONE*, published from 1953 to 1969. She discovers a marked preference for an idealized Greece and a distaste for a Rome often depicted as decadent. Her detailed and yet broadly conceived essay also considers the groundbreaking teaching of “gay history” at the *ONE* Institute in Los Angeles at this time and what was being published in gay periodicals in Europe. Richlin also reveals that there was a crucial (though declining throughout this period) use of the ancient world to bolster feelings of self-worth in gays and lesbians. She persuasively attributes this decline to the general anti-intellectualism that often crops up in the United States and to a decreased need for external sources of validation as conditions slowly improved for gays and lesbians.

I should note here that a final paper for the collection by Bruce Rind, entitled “Pederasty: An Integration of Cross-Cultural, Cross-Species, and Empirical Data,” was omitted amid some controversy. For readers interested in learning more about this controversy, which raises serious issues about scholarly (self-)censorship, I refer them to Dean Durber’s “Haworth’s End to the Pederasty Debate” (*Sexualities* 9, no. 4 [2006]: 487–92). Given the frequent focus in this volume on pederasty, I suspect that this paper would have fit well. This focus brings me to final comments about the volume. The title speaks about same-sex desire and love in the ancient world. On the evidence of this volume, one might believe that it amounts to pederasty most of the time (although Clarke does show us something different in his remarks on the Warren Cup and the Leiden gemstone). It is understandable, of course, that we wind up in this spot; it is where much of the evidence leads us, after all. That said, however, we should be open to other possibilities that still remain in ancient material. For example, intimations of non-age-discrepant sexual relations between men are to be found in Plato’s *Symposium* and in the Emperor Julian’s fourth oration. Anyone who is of a sexual minority or who knows someone who is of a sexual minority will know that the range of erotic possibilities is greater than what appears to be available or what is allowed. The other observation I have is about the word “love” in the title. I suspect it was meant as a bit of defiance to accepted Foucauldian orthodoxy that wants to make ancient sexuality completely different from anything we are experiencing now. Still, I would have liked to have understood what was meant by the word in this context. It was not an issue addressed at length within any of the essays included, so perhaps it

remains an open question to future scholars of homoeroticism in antiquity: What was meant by love?

MARK MASTERSON

*Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand*



*The Freedom of the Streets: Work, Citizenship, and Sexuality in a Gilded Age City.* By SHARON E. WOOD. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005. Pp. 344. \$59.95 (cloth); \$22.50 (paper).

Nineteenth-century city streets were no doubt contested terrain for American women. In an intriguing study of prostitution in Davenport, Iowa, Sharon E. Wood examines the complex world of gender, sexuality, and public life in this midwestern riverfront city. Importantly, the author views prostitution from the perspective of paid employment, which is a pleasant addition to the typical focus on public morality that dominates similar studies.

The choice of Davenport may raise some eyebrows, but Wood makes a strong case for the value of smaller cities to scholars. Most Americans resided in such communities, and their smaller size, she argues, permits scholars to re-create a more detailed portrait of a community that might be lost in the vastness of cities like Chicago and New York. Such depth likewise allows the reader to visualize not just the broad strokes but also the fine hairs of the historian's brush. Wood's masterful touch provides intriguing glimpses into the daily lives of Davenport prostitutes and their interaction with customers and public officials.

*The Freedom of the Streets* begins with the struggle of Davenport's women to carve out independent lives as working women. A handful of mostly self-employed working women organized the Lend a Hand Club to promote opportunities and access for women who "embraced the idea of self-support for women" (66). Led by local physician Jennie McCowen, the club included teachers, seamstresses, clerks, and even a few domestic servants on its roster. Working women, however, lived within a community that largely equated women who ventured outside the home to work with prostitutes. Realizing that their livelihoods hinged on access to the streets, working women pressed city leaders to hire a female police matron to confront the growing number of young women selling their bodies in the downtown district. Removing prostitutes from the streets, working women believed, would help eliminate the stigma associated with laboring in the public sphere.

For the remainder of the book Wood shifts her attention to the complicated world of commercial sex. One of the strengths of her study is that she rejects the typical and often simplistic binary approach to public