

the rôle of *andreaia* in action: the image of the Stoic is as important to *andreaia* as the arguments of the Stoic.

The book covers many topics, from medicine (Ralph Rosen and Manfred Horstmanshoff) to athletics (Onno van Nijf) to banking (Edward Cohen, on his favourite topic, though he regrettably resists the temptation to compare modern constructions of banking and masculinity with ancient models). However, in rather too many chapters I found the analyses of particular passages lacking in sophistication or depth even in the more detailed treatments. Consider the single use of *andreaia* in Sophocles. Electra is trying to persuade Chrysothemis to take up weapons and take revenge on their mother and Aegisthus. She imagines how the citizens will celebrate their success in feasts and songs, and praise the two of them for their *andreaia*. Bassi argues that this shows the ‘absence of masculinity in its traditional or normative form’ and the ‘emergence of a manliness that is no longer *anêr* specific’. But what is most striking, first, is that Electra is imagining herself and Chrysothemis as the tyrannicides, a cultic and privileged image of *andreaia*. It is not clear to me that this is the emergence of an *andreaia* ‘no longer *anêr* specific’ so much as a transgressive self-representation of the wild and dangerous Electra. It must at least be discussed how shocking Electra’s claim of *andreaia* is.

Like many such collections, this is a mixed bag: but it is a topic which goes to the heart of current interests in ancient culture, and opens the philology of cultural history to a searching set of questions.

*King’s College, Cambridge*

SIMON GOLDHILL

## A SOURCEBOOK FOR HOMOSEXUALITY

T. K. HUBBARD (ed.): *Homosexuality in Greece and Rome. A Sourcebook of Basic Documents*. Pp. xvii + 558, ill. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 2003. Paper, US\$34.95/£24.95 (Cased, US\$75/£52). ISBN: 0-520-23430-8 (0-520-22381-0 hbk).

In this book, Hubbard collects ‘in as complete a form as is possible’ (p. xv) translated excerpts from the literary and documentary evidence concerning ‘homosexuality’ in Greece and Rome, from the archaic Greek to the Greco-Roman period, excluding texts written under Christian influence. Introductions to each section, as well as extensive footnotes aimed at the general reader and very thorough bibliographical surveys for each period, make this volume an accessible and invaluable resource, which should be in every university library.

However, it is a volume which has to be used with caution (as is the case with many collections of translated texts). H.’s curious readers ‘not immersed in the cultural history of Greece and Rome’ (p. xv) may well find themselves bewildered; ‘the more experienced students of antiquity’ will probably find themselves (as I did) returning frequently to the original Greek and Latin sources, to check on the words translated as ‘fag’, ‘queer’, ‘faggotry’, ‘homosexual inclinations’, ‘pervert’, ‘boy’, ‘youth’, ‘slutting around’, ‘mixed grill of boys’, ‘inborn qualities’, ‘sex-drive’, ‘males beyond nature’, ‘boy-toy’, ‘hairy-arsed queens’, ‘over-aged male hustlers’, ‘wanton lesbianism’, and so on.

H. makes it clear that he has collected these texts from a particular ideological perspective on gender, sex, and sexuality, which shapes his interpretation of same-sex

relations in antiquity. In his preface, he refers to ‘same-gender relations’ or ‘same-gender eroticism’ (p. xv); later he uses the terms ‘same-sex relations or same-sex behaviour’ (p. 447). Clearly, H. does not endorse the careful distinction made between sex and gender in much feminist and gender theory, emanating from scholars who would adopt the constructionist rather than the essentialist perspective on human sexuality. However, H. does not adopt the term ‘homosexuality’ because he believes that sexual identity is transhistorical, but ‘as a convenient shorthand linking together a range of different phenomena involving same-gender love and/or sexual activity’ (p. 1). In addition, he strongly believes that analysis of a range of ancient texts suggests that ‘some forms of sexual preference were, in fact, considered a distinguishing characteristic of individuals’ (p. 2).

Furthermore, believing that Greek and Roman sexual behaviour cannot be reduced to any single paradigm, H. rejects the ‘age-differential’ model of male same-sex relationships and the active-passive polarity inherent in it because, he believes, there is enough textual evidence of ‘age-equal activity’ to subvert any interpretation rooted in ‘victim categories’ (p. 11). Although H. never clarifies what fundamental premises of Dover, Boswell, Foucault, and Halperin he disagrees with (p. xvi), he presumably refers to the ‘older–younger’/‘active–passive’ model which underpins these scholars’ well-known interpretations of Greek male same-sex relations.

However, the evidence collected for ‘age-equal relationships’ is so rare (and problematic) that much of it is not evidence at all, and one is left suspecting that the exception simply proves the ‘age-differential’ rule (for which the evidence in H.’s collection is overwhelming).

For example, in one of Theognis’ poems (excerpt 1.65, p. 44), the editor believes that the fact that other boys find Cynrus sexually attractive ‘makes it clear that youths were attracted to and slept with other youths of the same age’ (p. 5). However, the Greek (unlike the English translation) clearly distinguishes between the *παῖς* (Cynrus), all the other youths (*νέοι*) and the man (*ἀνήρ*), the fictive speaker whose desire is presumably unreciprocated. I fail to see what this poem has to do with age-equal *relationships*; what is at issue is lack of mutuality in an *age-unequal* relationship (a familiar topos).

There are other examples of pushing flimsy evidence too far. The entrance of the glamorous Charmides into the palaestra attracts the admiring gazes of the younger boys (5.4, p. 172) but lustfully admiring gazes from one’s contemporaries do not make for ‘intimate male attachments, even among age-equals’ (p. 163). Similarly, I cannot see how Meleager’s poem about the delicate Diodorus who casts a ‘flame upon his young age-mates’ (6.40, pp. 294–5) appears to explore an age-equal relationship ‘in which roles become readily reversible’ (p. 271). The Strato poem, about a threesome, to which the editor also refers (p. 271), has no reference to age at all (6.76, p. 303); the other Strato poem cited (6.84, pp. 304–5) is indeed about reciprocal sexual rôle-playing amongst youths, but it is about brute sex (hence the imagery), not ‘age-equal relationships’.

With regards to awareness of sexual preferences and characterizing people on the basis of this, I cannot believe that this begins with Archilochus (p. 2), especially as ‘man’s nature *is not the same*’ (1.1, p. 25) is largely editorial conjecture. A nascent awareness of innate preferences certainly seems to underlie Aristophanes’ famous myth in Plato’s *Symposium* (p. 3), but there is no real evidence to suggest that this was a ‘widespread perception’ (amongst whom precisely?). In fact, the very use of ‘sexual preferences’ and ‘characterizing individuals’ conjures up the thorny issue of identity and its relationship to sexuality (or rather, the discourse around sexuality), a postmodern rather than a pre-modern concern.

Even in the later Roman period, I am not sure that there could have been a

'homosexual subculture', with its specific fashions, speech, and cruising spots: subcultures of this kind flourish only in environments where the dominant form of masculinity is overtly hostile to penetrative sex between men, as Williams has effectively demonstrated (*Roman Homosexuality* [Oxford, 1999], pp. 220–4). Effeminate 'cinaedi' are indeed the butt of savage satire in Juvenal, Martial, Petronius, and Apuleius (all included in H.'s sourcebook), but these are men who publicly parade their enjoyment of passivity in such a way that it undermines the prevailing code of masculine values. One can presumably engage in active and passive sex with men without ever being labelled a 'cinaedus', or ever identifying oneself as one, as the flamboyant queens do in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* (10.15; p. 476).

If a collection of source material in translation is to work effectively, the editor has to be very careful about the translations used. H. notes that he and his team of translators attempted to 'strike the delicate balance between fidelity to the original and felicity of English expression, further complicated by [his] demands for uniformity within the volume on certain semantic issues' (p. xvii). These 'semantic issues' are never clarified, but presumably one such issue is the translation of 'cinaedus' for which H. reluctantly adopts 'pervert' in many passages, as he believes that the range of the word's uses 'seems potentially to include anyone who is perceived as sexually excessive or deviant' (p. 7). Yet how is a Latinless reader, interested in understanding Roman attitudes to sexuality, rather than the attitudes of various translators, to cope with the fact that 'cinaedus' is also translated in this collection as 'faggot' (7.40, p. 327), 'fag' (9.25, p. 425; 9.28, p. 426), 'fairy' (9.38, p. 431), 'queer' (9.39, p. 438), and 'queen' (10.15, p. 475)? H. usually indicates (and this is essential) when 'cinaedus' is translated as 'pervert', but there should be explanatory comments on all of these.

Some of the translations do not quite attain H.'s 'delicate balance' (e.g. Daryl Hine's version of Theocritus, *Idyll* 23, pp. 285–7, and the editor's translation of Statius, *Silvae* 2.6.21–57, pp. 427–8), but the majority are largely accurate and lively. The editor often indicates (in footnotes) the Greek (transliterated) and Latin for important concepts (e.g. the Greek for 'friendship, desire and erotic desire', p. 254 n. 148), but this practice should have been used more consistently, especially if the sourcebook is to be used for any penetrating analysis of love, desire, and same-sex relationships in antiquity.

For the general reader, the notes are, on the whole, exceptionally helpful. A few are not: the Kerameikos is a little more than the northwest part of Athens (p. 61 n. 7; cf. p. 471 n. 65); n. 23 on p. 65 makes little sense; in Rufinus' poem (H. 6.52, p. 297), in which the poet-lover claims that he is no longer boy-crazy, but is now mad for women, and his discus is now a rattle (clearly a sexual reference), rattle (*κρόταλον*) is glossed with: 'the *sistrum* was a musical instrument used in the worship of the goddess Isis . . . .' (n. 71). There are very few misprints: I noticed Lambert and Szesnat (1984)—the date should be 1994; Euripid (p. 71 n. 34); Praetorium (p. 377 n. 79).

University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg

M. LAMBERT

## A SOURCEBOOK ON MAGIC

D. OGDEN: *Magic, Witchcraft, and Ghosts in the Greek and Roman Worlds. A Sourcebook*. Pp. x + 353, ills. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002. Cased, £55. ISBN: 0-19-513575-X (0-19-515123-2 pbk).

Daniel Ogden here presents a new collection of sources relating to magic and ghosts in the ancient world, a fine companion to his own *Greek and Roman Necromancy*

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved