

age as a man. The artillery is largely provided by literary texts, whose *tendenz* is largely ignored and whose age terminology is interpreted as if technical. F. has little difficulty showing that youths who are coming of age are shown on vases as the appropriate receivers, and also givers, of amorous attention. But when other pots show 'men accosting boys', F. insists that such scenes should not be taken at face value as they show only 'an obsession with, and a degree of tolerance for, the fantasy of sex with a minor'. Once we accept that the nature of acceptable sexual relations between males was subject to debate, discussion of both texts and images needs to pay rather more attention to context, and to change over time. Once more, there is an unproductive mechanicity to the discussion here.

The final chapters return to women. Chapter 7 is concerned with whether there are initiations for girls comparable to those for men, and inevitably turns on *Lysistrata* 641–7 and the *krateriskoi* from Brauron. F., who in the introduction denied any clear distinction between 'myth' and 'genre scenes', argues that the images of naked girls running, found on some *krateriskoi*, are not images of ritual at Brauron but allusions to the mythical past. The final chapter re-examines the literary evidence for the stages of marriage, seeing in the word *engue* an 'image of laying valuables in store in a vault'. F. insists both that marriage was an initiation which did not leave indelible marks on the women involved and that concubinage was widely practised, but that the wife had a particular rôle in reproducing the citizenry. The various strands of this discussion are neither unravelled nor tied up by the closing quotation from Plato *Laws*.

It is sad to report that Chicago University Press here presents readers with, among other things, Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* (p. 75), Isocrates' *Aeropagiticus* (p. 152), Achilles's (twice) Mirmidons (p. 158), Thucydides and Thucidides (p. 157), and *hedna* as a singular (p. 180).

King's College, Cambridge

ROBIN OSBORNE

MASCULINITY

R. M. ROSEN, I. SLUITER (edd.): *Andreia. Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*. (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 238.) Pp. vi + 359, ills. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2003. Cased, €80/US\$93. ISBN: 90-04-11995-7.

Masculinity is like air in classical antiquity: it is necessary, constantly around, but becomes something to fight about primarily when there is not enough of it or it is somehow polluted. It is perhaps, then, no surprise that after thirty years of investigation of all aspects of the female in the ancient world, led by feminist studies, and a brief sojourn with gender, led by gender studies, masculinity is now the new black (as it were). This is not—or should not be—merely business as usual: live white males communing with dead white males. Those thirty years have made a huge difference, and while the trend-setting Foucault has been widely criticized for offering too restricted a view of the masculine from the normative world of didactic texts, more recent explorations have shown how a sophisticated modern methodology can change the way we can appreciate so central a category of ancient life—as can be seen, for example, from Maud Gleason's *Making Men* or from Anthony Corbeill's close look into the Roman mouth, or from the collections of Foxhall and Salmon, *When Men were Men* and *Thinking Men*.

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

Andreia, which is translated in this volume both as ‘courage’ and as ‘manliness’, is a fascinating test-case. At one level, it appears to define an essence of what it is to be male. It has an evident etymology from *aner*, and this etymology can be tellingly activated, as with Artemisia in Herodotus. Herodotus calls her *andreia* a ‘wonder’ (*thoma*), and her success in battle prompts Xerxes to declare that his men have become women, his women men. ‘Manliness’ is most commonly attached to behaviour in battle, since soldiering is basic to any definition of citizenship (and masculinity). A woman with *andreia* can only be a *thoma* and, with the customary polarization of ancient thinking on gender, such a phenomenon must also make men womanly. At another level, however, *andreia* becomes in the philosophical tradition a term which is associated with ‘moral knowledge’, and applicable, like the English word ‘courage’, to any human. (I remember being firmly told in the Cambridge Philosophy Seminar that *andreia* had no gender implications in Aristotle.) The word ‘and’ in this collection’s subtitle, ‘studies in manliness and courage’, marks a hugely contested space. Does the use of the term *andreia* indicate that Greek moral terms can never escape the gendering that is typical of Greek social expectation? Or does it show that whatever the etymology of the word, it would be a misplaced modern concern to see a gender stereotype every time *andreia* occurs? These questions go to the heart not just of how we are to understand the ancient rhetoric of sexuality, but also of how we practice the philology necessary to our semantic studies of such rhetoric.

Ralph Rosen and Ineke Sluiter have produced, then, a timely collection of essays, a joint venture from Holland and America. Their introduction shows how promising the topic is. It neatly combines their individual interests. It begins with the semantic question (starting from the heated discussions about ‘courage’ in the aftermath of 9/11), and notes how *andreia* is a term of persuasive definition rather than a denotation of essence. It is a word that is contested, paraded, and appropriated, and usually enters discourse to stress that masculinity has become an issue. This is then demonstrated with a surprising but telling case: Aristophanes’ self-representation. How the comic poet uses the vocabulary of the soldiering male gives an insightful example of how masculinity as a concern can spread into any area of ancient culture, dragging stereotypes, buzzwords, and semantic hooliganism behind it.

These general questions are picked up well by several of the following chapters, which deal primarily with the classical polis (though the final five of the fifteen chapters turn to empire culture and its new constructions of Greek masculinity under Rome). The most stimulating chapters are those that are prepared to take the scope and interdisciplinarity of the project on board. Karen Bassi, for example, writes on the semantics of manliness, Joy Connolly on *andreia* and *paideia* in empire culture, and both offer a broad overview where the broadness adequately justifies the lack of detailed analyses. Several chapters, however, remain too restricted in focus, and their detailed arguments do not reach out to the broader case. Marguerite Deslauriers, for example, discusses why Aristotle excludes women, slaves and children from the possibility of true *andreia*, but does so from a narrowly conceived philosophical agenda which does not really discuss gender at all, though it must be tempting to think that whatever Aristotle’s explicit arguments are, such exclusions are made at least in part because women, slaves, and children are debarred from citizenship, the army, and other aspects of adult masculinity. The closed tradition of philosophy here would have benefited from making more of the opportunity offered by such an interdisciplinary project. The same is true of Helen Cullyer on Stoic ‘manly courage’. How philosophy interacted with society—and not just with other philosophical writings—is integral to

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