The opinions of John Boardman, such as summed up in The History of Greek Vases: Potters, Painters and Pictures (2001), form a striking contrast with those of Michael Vickers, such as those articulated in his seminal article of 1984: “Artful Crafts: The Influence of Metalwork on Athenian Painted Pottery,” and republished in book form, incorporating much scholarly debate, with David Gill as Artful Crafts: Ancient Greek Silverware and Pottery (1994). In reading the most recent statements, it is possible to observe the scars made by years of bitter, pedantic, but very productive quarreling, in the form of sniping, name-calling, wound licking, and bullet holes. Indeed, both parties have made concessions that move, though without seeming to recognize it, toward what I assume were Warren’s insights about the existence of homosexual pornographic silverware, insights that have inspired this paper.

Boardman, the doyen of the field and even now as we write in 2013 still a presence at Oxford, maintains a conventional position established by his mentor John Beazley, the professor who applied Morelli’s methodology to vases, and worked alongside Warren’s lover and assistant John Marshall. Boardman still maintains that the Greeks considered ceramic vases to be extremely valuable objects of art, objects which, due to their intrinsic aesthetic worth, commanded considerable prices when new, despite the low value of their essential materials. Conversely, Vickers, the enfant terrible of the field, and his collaborators have asserted precisely the opposite: that such ceramic vases were no more than cheap and uninspired
"knockoffs," "worthless ballast," "unrecyclable junk," objects offered to the common folk as pale imitations of the status tokens that only the elites could afford. In his view, discerning tastes naturally preferred exquisite original designs rendered in silver or other precious materials, with an accordingly superior price for precious metal vessels; Boardman and Beazley, in this view, mistakenly ascribe this high value to common ceramic ware, even after it was for the most part upstaged by silver in Athens after 470 BCE.

Both of these positions are incomplete and fragmentary: they ignore the influence of politics and economics on a society's arts and crafts, and assume that the values ascribed to certain materials and methods of production remain static, even in the face of significant, fundamental changes, as if the tastes of fashionable society were independent of the vicissitudes of history. It was Warren's particular merit to intuit that some homosexual pornographic vases must have been wrought from silver, despite the absence of any other physical examples, and the absence of such objects in literature about the 5th and 4th centuries. There are numerous references to the use of silver sympotic ware, but none describe its decoration. Like Schliemann—who pursued an intuitive vision of a real, archaeologically verifiable Troy and Mycenae, and who dug until he discovered metallic treasures such as the "Agamemnon Mask"—Warren relentlessly pursued his own vision of a silver cup with homoerotic imagery until he had located and acquired one. In the following, I intend to make a similar leap via intuitive vision, and to posit
that there must have been a change in the materials that elite Athenians had their vases made from after 470 BCE (which corresponds with explicitly homosexual scenes disappearing from ceramic ware).

If significant change regarding the use of homosexual silver symptic ware did occur after 470 BCE (due to the unprecedented prosperity that followed the end of the Persian Wars), then it is possible, by establishing the importance of this date, to synthesize the opinions of Boardman and Vickers along these lines: Boardman is basically correct, although he exaggerates, for the period before 470; Vickers, for the period thereafter. The Athenian elites—followed soon after by the elites of other leading city-states such as Corinth and Syracuse—established a new symptic style, switching over to silver when they became wealthy enough to do so in the 5th century. This theory thus acknowledges the partial truths contained in the theories of both Boardman and Vickers.

A question that has stumped me completely is whether the silverware after 470 continued to portray scenes as specifically homosexual as the ceramic ware had done before that date, or whether the silverware in common use after 470, like the ceramic ware of the same period, was also more modest in portraying sexual acts. Scholars have suggested that, after the democratic takeover, the elites quit displaying their pederastic vices because they were
intimidated. I think not. I believe they arrogantly continued to disregard any possible popular or formal disapproval of their pederastic vices. On the other hand, possibly they were intimidated, or for other reasons were much more indirect with the scenes on the silverware, as was the contemporary ceramic ware. In the latter case, the ceramics after 470 could have imitated the silverware after 470, but in the former case, they could not.

Prior to 470 BCE, in a society that was still fairly poor (monetarily, though not culturally), ceramic pots were still relatively valuable, expensive, and cutting-edge _objets d'art_, and many featured the kinds of sexual scenes dear to the hearts of the relatively wealthy who comprised the ranks of the symposiasts, reflecting their tastes, both heterosexual and homosexual.

On the other hand, once the Athenian elite accumulated greater wealth, after 470, they were able to afford silver. Soon afterwards their rich emulators in other leading _poleis_\textsuperscript{25} did so as well, especially Syracuse, which also adopted democracy after the time of Hiero, and Corinth, which did not. Athens's main maritime rival. Hence, silver vessels became, for the first time, standard accoutrements of symposia. Vickers claimed erroneously that precious metals had _always_ been used. Many ceramic objects made subsequent to this date might well have been imitations of the silver vessels then being routinely used by wealthy symposiasts, who, of course, continued

\textsuperscript{25} City states, plural of _polis_.
to serve certain dishes—especially those that came straight from the oven, such as soufflés, casseroles, and fowl—on ceramics.

Boardman based part of his argument regarding the price of decorated ceramic pots on the fact that they were major commercial commodities, noting that a "trade war" between Athens and Corinth emerged in the early 6th century, with "each vying to attract the prime attention of carriers and customers" (Vases, p. 48). Potters and painters from rival cities copied each other in an effort, presumably, to make their products more appealing in their own and foreign markets, with Athenian ware surpassing Corinthian around 550 BCE. If these vases were indeed the expensive commodities Boardman believed them to have been, this must have been because they were beautifully decorated and exquisitely shaped; thus, artistic considerations were clearly given "pride of place" and established the price in those markets. Put simply, they were not, as Vickers has insisted, "worthless ballast" (though, undecorated amphorae did serve as ballast on return voyages).

Consequently, the choice of subject matter must have contributed to a pot's worth; and, for Boardman, the importance given to subject matter—to a painter's choice of a mythological scene and, most important, to his subtle handling of it—suggests that "the clay vase [had] come into its own as a field of really ambitious narrative" by 570 BCE (Vases, p. 53). In his view,
artists would hardly have wasted their time crafting arresting and poignant images on a cheap medium that was held in low esteem. Because of the effort artists expended on them, painted vases could hardly have constituted “unrecyclable junk” (as Vickers labeled them). Instead, some were important artworks used in prestigious social contexts—for example, filled with the finest oil as prizes for the winning athletes at the Panathenaic Games. Hence, an artist such as Exekias, working after the mid-6th century, could be said to “represent archaic art in vase painting coming of age, and aspiring to more than mere decoration and narrative” (Vases, p. 61). Boardman sees the artistic rivalry between vase painters as further evidence for his claims, a thesis that was first proposed by his mentor Beazley, the “connoisseur” who attributed vases to various artists through Morelli’s methods and who grouped works together and named them in accordance with the current location of one of the artist’s famous works (“The Berlin Painter”) or to a famous or frequent subject painted by the artist (“The Niobe Painter”) or to an inscribed name (“Euphronius”).

A convenient summary of Giovanni Morelli’s methods—as applied to Japanese woodblock painters in addition to Greek vase painters—is given in Boardman’s Vases. Morelli looked for and compared small details, such as ears in Japanese prints and ankles in Greek vases, details in which an artist unconsciously reveals his identifying characteristics: “It becomes clear that each
artist can be betrayed by his drawing, just as we may be by our handwriting even to the
satisfaction of the law and our banks” (Vases pp. 133–37).

Boardman attributed “well-known artist” status to these humble workers in clay, the kind of
status possessed by famous Greek painters, architects, and especially sculptors such as Phidias,
and even suggests there was a patronage structure in place reminiscent of that which
encouraged Renaissance figures such as Michelangelo. However, not even a single pot painter
or potter is mentioned in any surviving list or catalog of Classical artists, or indeed in any
literary fragment from Greek or Latin antiquity, in contrast to famous sculptors in metal and
marble, and painters on wood or walls.

The following account testifies that painters did become famous in antiquity. Aristides of
Thebes (floruit ca. 350 BCE) received 1,000 minae for a painting of a scene of the Persian Wars
containing 100 figures, the agreed-upon wage being 10 minae per figure (Pliny, Natural History,
XXV, 98–100). The central group of his most famous picture represented a mother dying of a
wound, and holding back her infant, who is creeping to her bosom, that it may not drink blood
instead of milk. No such testimony exists for pot painters.
A group of painters working at the end of the 6th and beginning of the 5th centuries, a cluster dubbed by Beazley "The Pioneers," seem to have formed a "real artistic coterie" competing to produce the most exquisitely painted vases. Boardman implied that it would be illogical for such an effort to be expended on worthless pots: "In the Pioneers' apparently conscious pride and rivalry we perhaps for the first time come close to a recognition by the painters that what they practice can be more than a craft"—and discriminating thus, connoisseurs must have prized the consummate craftsmanship that had turned mere clay into objets d'art (Vases, pp. 53–83), a prizing which facilitated the fact that Greek vases were indeed traded throughout the Mediterranean basin.

As a result, Boardman glorified the individual inspiration—indeed, the genius—that he discerned in such consummate craftsmen, even claiming Greek potters and painters took "precious little" account of their markets while choosing shapes and decorations. He believed they were more concerned with expressing themselves artistically than with appealing to consumers, even though "Pots were expensive enough and travelled in sufficient numbers to have been taken seriously by merchants" (Vases, 166). Following Beazley's lead, Boardman and other subsequent scholars have likewise employed the analytic techniques delineated by Morelli in works such as Italian Painters: Critical Studies of Their Works (translated into English in 1892) to recognize, on multiple vases, the styles of individual artists—those unique subject
choices and identifying stylistic quirks which allow those vases to be properly grouped and subsequently attributed to a single artist or school of painters.

“This suggests,” asserted Boardman, “that for the most part the choice of subject lay with the painter, and the subjects involved do not indicate that they were chosen to serve any special demand in either the home or the export market.” This amounts to being a claim that Greek "vaaases," especially Athenian, were held in such high esteem that market pressures had no real impact upon the artists, and that the artistic value of these vases generated market value, just as high prices would later be commanded by the works of the Italian or Dutch masters (Vases, 153, 156, 226). This respect for the artist and his personal vision echoes the fin de siècle philosophy of “l’art pour l’art” (or “art for art’s sake”), an attitude popularized in the Anglo-American world through Walter Pater’s The Renaissance: Studies in Art and Poetry (1873), an argument that Bernard Berenson, a disciple of both Pater and Morelli, successfully applied to Renaissance painters who truly did become recognized geniuses during their lifetimes—unlike the Greek potters or pottery painters who make no appearance in the historical record. (About the influence of Pater on Warren and Berenson, see Kaylor, “Introduction,” Defence, c; ciii–cv; especially ciii, footnote 2. See also Waynes Dynes, on Pater, Morelli, Warren, Berenson, Beazley and others: http://dyneslines.blogspot.co.uk/2009/07/morelli-wolfflin-beazley.html
Against the commonsense notion that clay is the cheapest and commonest of raw materials, Boardman counterintuitively saw a special value attached to clay, claiming that its unique plasticity “gives it a special place in the hierarchy of artists’ materials” (Vases, p. 269)—one, however, that is neither recognized by Pliny the Elder in his encyclopedia nor considered as such in any other textual survey of Classical origin. Although it is far more logical, from an economic point of view, to place a higher value on works crafted from precious materials such as silver, Boardman has insisted on “the extraordinary qualities of clay, which can present itself as liquid or hard as rock, can be handled with full plasticity but also molded or carved, and provides an essential tool in the preliminary stages of other crafts such as metalwork and sculpture” (ibid.). Boardman’s veritable “Paean to Clay” even includes references to the Judeo-Christian god creating man from the dust of the earth and to other myths, leaving us to interpolate that Mediterranean merchants must have pondered long the spiritual and other aspects of such tales before pricing vases, and that the ease with which a craftsman’s genius could manipulate and decorate raw clay for his wares must have contributed decisively to the market value of his pottery. In what amounts to an “enthusiasm for mud,” Boardman even attempted to place this pottery in the same artistic realm as great chryselephantine26 marble sculptures, such as Phidias’s Athena Parthenos and Zeus Olympios, and monumental, architectural marvels such as the Parthenon. While many scholars have noted that some vase

26 Chryselephantine: overlaid with gold and ivory.
painters imitated the Parthenon's frieze, Boardman goes as far as to suggest that "it is a question of a shared idiom and shared principles of composition" (Vases, 269–73).

The arguments and evidence above constitute what is now the "standard view," even among contemporary scholars, curators, connoisseurs, and collectors. Ever since the days of Hamilton and d'Hancarville Greek painted vases have been considered intrinsically valuable as works of art, both to the society that produced them and to our own. This has given them an astounding prominence and price since the 18th century, when they first appeared on the market in large quantities because of the excavations at Pompeii and Herculaneum, and, after 1828, from tombs in Etruria. This does not represent, however, the entire scholarly opinion on this matter: some scholars dissent from and even denounce this standard view.

After considering Boardman's rhapsodic appraisal of the remarkable glories of clay, let us turn to Greek attitudes toward precious metals, because the question of the essential value of an object was very important to the Greeks. However exquisite or shoddy its former decorated state, when melted down, a silver vase was still worth its weight in silver, whereas clay potsherds could not even be recycled into new pots (The canvas and frame of an Old Master painting could be recycled, but the commercial value would of course be slim indeed compared to the value of the painting itself). Hence, a clay pot had no essential value beyond the grace of...
its shape and the appeal of its designs—the sort of value that can evaporate as fashions change. How much value did the Greeks put on precious metals? And in what forms and under what social circumstances were such metal objects exchanged?

The Greek word customarily rendered as “treasure” is keimelion [e.g., Odyssey IV, 560], literally something that can be laid away. In the epics treasure was of bronze, iron, or gold, less often of silver or fine cloth, and usually it was shaped into goblets, tripods, or cauldrons. Such objects had some direct use value, and they could provide aesthetic satisfaction, too . . . but neither function was of real moment compared to their value as symbolic wealth or prestige wealth. The twin uses of treasure were in possessing it and in giving it away. (Moses Finley, World of Odysseus [1999], 60–61)

In Artful Crafts (1994), Vickers claimed that the Greek ceramics Boardman and modern collectors find so valuable were not held in such high esteem by the Greeks who made or used them. By citing period references to metals and ceramics, to their prices, and to the manufacture that produced and the trade that circulated them, Vickers has drawn into question the claims of Boardman and others who still follow the fashion set in the 18th century by Hamilton and d’Hancarville. Against that tradition, Vickers deploys the scientific analysis of
such ceramics and surviving silver, asserting that the exported pots, especially those sent to Etruria, were considered, in the period of their making, "worthless ballast." Vickers ended the book with a definitive pronouncement: "There is no evidence to suggest that ceramic was ever regarded as a serious artistic medium in antiquity." After Boardman's earlier glorification of the artistic possibilities of clay, the poignant use of the word "ever" by Vickers has a devastating, metallic ring. If ceramics were not considered valuable because of their artistry, those works must have been worth very little, inasmuch as clay is a cheap material with little if any intrinsic worth, even the fine red clay of Attica. Nevertheless, "other explanations need to be found to account for the high standards consistently achieved by potters and pot-painters." The provocative explanation offered by Vickers is that potters and pottery painters were busy copying the products of smiths working with silver, bronze, even gold, copper, and ivory, and that they were familiar with such examples, thus could readily use them as models (Artful Crafts, 1994, p. 191).

Nonetheless, more than literary evidence is required to make a convincing statement about the standing of such artifacts in an ancient society: the archaeological record must also be considered. If it is to be concluded that the Greek ceramics of this period derived from silver originals, Vickers needs to demonstrate how the shape and composition of Greek silverware influenced the works of the corresponding potters. Although he cited a number of ceramic
vases that are obviously based on specific silver originals that have been recovered and identified, the bulk of his evidence focuses on the controversial claim that the colors found on ceramics were meant to evoke or mimic the metallic tones present on their metallic counterparts. To this end, a subtle scheme of equivalences is contrived, equating the metallic tones in metalwork with the colored glazes used in ceramics. This scheme is then deployed in an attempt to prove that the materials and techniques chosen by potters and pottery painters directly imitated those used by metalsmiths.

According to this scheme, the “black gloss” used on a group of ceramics known as “Arethusa Cups” was meant “to evoke not simply the form, but the surface appearance of silverware” (Artful Crafts, 1994, p. 124). Likewise, it is claimed that the “red” in the red figures of certain Greek clay vases—a color commonly thought to be natural to the clay itself, but very rarely a separate slip—was employed to imitate the gold plating of the gold figures on silver specimens.27 Vickers offers a full list of such substitutions: black figures for silver figures, purple for copper, and a background of white slip for ivory (since the rich had lekythoi28 made of real ivory, of course.) (ibid., pp. 149–51). They consider this evidence as indicating that the makers

---

27 The “red” is a property of naturally occurring ferric oxide i.e. the color of rusty iron. As for “a separate slip”, a slip is a suspension in water of clay and/or other materials used in the production of ceramic ware.

28 Plural of lekythos. This was an oil flask used at baths and gymnasia, and for funerary offerings. The flask has a long, cylindrical body gracefully tapered to the base, and a narrow neck with a loop-shaped handle.
of fine Greek ceramics followed standards set by contemporary silversmiths (*ibid.*, summarizing pp. 117–51).

“It has been argued that the fine ceramic vessels made in archaic and Classical Greece, the black-figure, red-figure, and white-ground wares which fill museums from Stockholm to Sydney, and Mykonos to Malibu, are the products of highly skilled craftsmen whose special expertise lay in evoking both the shapes and decorative schemes of vessels made in more precious materials: silver, gold, bronze, copper, and ivory” (*ibid.*, p. 153). Boardman’s independent potters—with their sensitive hands taking advantage of the uniquely yielding plasticity of clay, and their artistic sensibilities gloriously free to paint their finished vases with whatever scenes they pleased, for their own artistic fulfillment or even mere amusement—have become instead Vickers’s “slaves to fashion,” keeping an ever-watchful eye on the local metalworkers, and snatching up from these superior craftsmen every detail of form, design, and color they can, in order to please a public that judges works of ceramic by the conventions of fashionable metalworking.

As a result, Boardman found it convenient (“Silver,” p. 294) to taunt Vickers for being a Midas, incapable of caring for anything save precious metals. He snidely claims that “Midas’ touch was not his only disability,” but that swipe, clearly directed at Vickers, is vague. What exactly is
Boardman implying? Vickers would be justified in retorting in a similar fashion that Boardman resembles the ugly old hag Poverty in Aristophanes' *Wealth*: he never knew a Greek born before the time of Alexander who had not dined from humble clay.

Vickers' theory runs into trouble when the scope of inquiry is narrowed to specifically sympotic vessels, and extended backwards to before 480 BCE. If the elites were, as Vickers claimed, busy using silver at that time, then who were the individuals using all that fine clay sympotic ware that still survives in impressive quantities? Since symposia were expensive, such elegant parties could only have been hosted by the wealthy. Because many of the surviving homoerotic clay vessels depict scenes from such symposia, wealthy individuals must have been their intended purchasers and audience.

If Vickers' theory was correct and applicable to sympotic vessels before 470 BCE, then clay vessels must have been used by individuals far down the social strata, such as knights or even hoplites: the sufficiently wealthy would have been using silver instead. This novel notion also requires that we imagine large numbers of knights possessing wealth sufficient to host symposia, including the great luxury of having a special "men's dining room," the space where such gatherings traditionally took place. We say "large numbers" because, judging by the considerable remnant of Greek ceramic vases that has survived, the original output of ceramic
materials for such symposia—as we are supposing for the moment—must have been considerable.

Despite the unorthodox nature of his theory, however, Vickers provided no evidence that such a degree of wealth, as well as interest in symposia, ever existed among the equestrian population, or that of the hoplites. Although Vickers emphasized that such pottery was relatively inexpensive, putting it within reach of the average knight, he failed to emphasize that ceramic tableware represented only a small portion of the cost of a symposium, which also required plentiful food and wine, entertainers and servants, not to mention spacious facilities.

Of course, it is not impossible that knights and hoplites simply did their drinking in imitative, "down-market" symposia, in which the proper sympotic features were scaled down to fit within their limited budgets: clay vessels instead of silver, cheaper wines and simpler foods, fewer dancing girls or none, all held within rented taverns, etc. But, can such events, events unconcerned with and uninfluenced by the perpetuation of aristocratic traditions, actually be labeled, even formally, symposia?

There is a world of difference, after all, between the balls held in the 19th century by the celebrated "First Four Hundred" (the most elegant families of New York City) and the gatherings of their middle-class compatriots who came together to "have a ball." Future
cultural historians will doubtless write about the cultural significance of the varieties of plastic bowls used for "chips & dip" at Super Bowl parties held by American football fans in the late 20th and early 21st centuries. And, indeed, the attitude of many a football fan, as he sits before his television watching a game, mirrors that displayed in the conclusion to Cimonides' misogynistic "Females of the Species":

Just when a man most wishes to enjoy himself at home, through the dispensation of a god or the kindness of a man, she finds a way of finding fault with him and lifts her crest for battle. Yes, where there is a woman, men cannot even give hearty entertainment to a guest who has come to the house. (Hugh Lloyd-Jones's trans., p. 54)

Non-elite people of the Classical period, such as the man described by Cimonides above, could only envy those who, like the gods, were able to entertain their guests at proper symposia: in spaces reserved for gentlemen, where tables abounded in gold and silver plate holding exquisite wines and exotic dishes, where entertainment and conversation were equally plentiful, and where the body, the soul, and the mind could feast at leisure, in luxury. Not only was the presence of women not allowed, their ensured separation from the men required supervision. It would take at least three house slaves to sequester women: a man and two
females, one to draw water, wash clothes, keep house, and another to cook. How many could afford this?

Another problem Vickers does not resolve is space. Before the Persian invasion, Athens’ walls were insignificant and the population sparse. After the erection of the spectacular walls by Themistocles and the exponential increase in the population, space for houses within the city walls became alarmingly expensive. In such circumstances, even the reputable equestrians could hardly have afforded a capacious dining room designed for symposia, whether for 7 or 11 couches arranged along 4 walls to accommodate 14 or 22 symposiasts (12ft x 12ft or 18ft x 18ft), and with the space of one couch-length left empty, to allow for the comings and goings of guests, servants, and entertainers. (See Bergquist, “Symptic Space,” for further details.) Unlike in Rome, where walls were not vital in the period between the defeat of Hannibal at Zama (202 BCE) and the reign of Emperor Aurelius (271–276 CE), Athenian town houses always remained small. Only the very wealthy could afford rooms for symposia, though some of the more gentrified knights, those who could afford a fine warhorse, did have rooms into which their womenfolk could be sequestered for the duration of symposia. This was a luxury beyond the means of the hoplites—those men who fought in standard heavy armor, that is, who had land and oxen but no warhorse—and was an expense probably beyond that of many knights.
While Vickers provided no explanation as to why the production of explicitly homoerotic ceramic pots became extremely rare and may actually have ceased after 470 BCE, the above reading does. Drawing on the known facts about the financial resources of the equestrian and hoplite classes, it suggests that, since only the elites could afford sumptuous symposia and only they had domestic spaces enabling them to sequester away their women, only they could continue to buy or commission the homoerotic tableware that "only men should see," tableware they now preferred to have cast in silver rather than molded from clay. On the other hand, the non-elites, with their womenfolk in the same rooms, seem to have eschewed the sexually explicit tableware that the elites no longer sought or valued. Put another way: before 470, only a few among the richest of the oldest families would have had any silver; but that was not particularly problematic, since the aristocrats of that period saw their values reflected not in homoerotic cups made of silver, but of clay. Meanwhile the equestrians, the hoplites, and the common folk drank out of the sort of undecorated ceramic cups that museums do not particularly prize or exhibit. After 470, aristocrats could afford silver homoerotic cups designed to mirror their values, and commoners could afford decorated pots, if they chose to buy them. Nonetheless, despite this increase in spending potential, the commoners still never possessed wealth sufficient to afford the private spaces necessary for the holding of symposia or other exclusively masculine activities—like the man in Cimonides' diatribe, they had no way to keep
the women out, or to retain, as private possessions for private use, the erotic cups that had always been a staple of such symposia.

Others have argued that images of pederasty merely became taboo after 470 BCE. One of the individuals who advocates this position is my friend Thomas Hubbard, whose conclusions in this regard are influenced by several German scholars as well as by Philip Elliot Slater’s *The Glory of Hera: Greek Mythology and the Greek Family* (1992). This idea is mentioned in his article on Laius, “History’s First Child Molester: Euripides’ Chrysippus and the Marginalization of Pederasty in Athenian Democratic Discourse” (2006), and more recently serves as part of his spectacular reviews of Andrew Lear and Eva Cantarella’s *Images of Ancient Greek Pederasty: Boys Were Their Gods* (2008) and of James Davidson’s *The Greeks and Greek Love: A Bold New Exploration of the Ancient World* (2009), a volume which makes the preposterous, unsupported claim—designed to please the Puritans of today—that Greek *erastai* waited for their beloved young *eromenoi* to turn 18 before engaging in sexual intercourse with them.

Hubbard warmly praises Lear’s sound conclusion that some of the *erastai* were only after sex (Kenneth Dover had earlier insisted that all were), while others wished primarily to improve the character and learning of their younger beloveds. Lear also published, as an appendix, Keith DeVries’s long-awaited list of vases, many of which show same-age couples. Hubbard claimed
that after the Persian Wars the ascendency of the middle class during the flourishing of democracy resulted in increasing prudery and a distaste for pederasty, or jealousy of the gilded youths. Democracy led to a "privileging of middle class taste," evident in "the decline of erotically-based pedagogy and the marginalization of explicit sexuality in art" (Hubbard, "Review of Lear & Cantarella"). From this perspective, some forms of sexuality in general—and homosexuality in particular—as well as their depiction in art, had become socially unacceptable. Athenian society must indeed have become fearsomely intolerant and the middle class remarkably influential if they could shame aristocrats into censoring images that had been present on their tableware for centuries.

As this paper has argued at length, a more plausible explanation is that the production of pederastic tableware continued uninterrupted through the democratic period, though it did so in silver rather than in ceramics. Middle-class Greeks, on the other hand, dining in the presence of their wives and daughters, simply had no interest in having explicitly homoerotic scenes on their dinner tables, especially since, for them, it would likely have constituted a display of "pure erotica" rather than a display of their own participation in the traditions and practices of pederastic pedagogy, which had always been the reserve of elite society. Athenians of this period were far from homophobic; in fact, they may have been quite jealous of their betters' "trophy boys," as Hubbard acknowledges ("Review of Lear").
A similar phenomenon was at work in Europe in the 17th century: Dutch artists painted scenes of middle-class life for middle-class patrons, consciously avoiding the mythological and religious subjects—often heteroerotic or homoerotic—that were prized by Renaissance and Baroque elites in Italy, France, and England. The Dutch middle class constituted a very different market, with very different expectations, than those of the Italian elites. A still life by Michelangelo, or a Sistine Chapel ceiling by Brueghel, would be equally comical: different venues and audiences require different techniques, media, and themes, which was also true in Ancient Greece.

The wishy-washy *Cambridge Economic History of the Greco Roman World* (2008) offers two alternative explanations, both of them ludicrous, about symposia and sympotic ware, but is more accurate about the money supply:

Despite restrictions put on individuals, per capita consumption of wine was probably significantly higher than, for example, in mediaeval times. To judge from the numbers of drinking cups and transport amphoras found in excavations, the consumption and trade of wine reached an unprecedented scale in the late archaic and early classical period. Most wine was marketed and consumed locally, but for connoisseurs it was shipped over long distances (see
above, Chapter 13). Two explanations have been proposed for the increase in consumption. The first is that increasing democratization changed the symposium from an exclusive aristocratic gathering to a form of hospitality practiced by a wider group of citizens. Painted pottery replaced silver and gold containers, and its mass production in Athens in the late sixth and fifth centuries reflected the opening of the symposium and gymnasium to poorer people who emulated the former elite’s symbolic behavior. The second is that the symposium remained largely aristocratic, while ordinary people frequented public taverns (kapeleia) that seem to have been abundant in cities and villages. Whatever theory is more valid, by the fifth century there was an extensive drinking culture supplied by shops, local markets, and foreign trade. It is worth noting that ordinary wine was called after the measure in which it was sold, so it was largely regarded as a commodity rather than a subsistence food.

However, we can also identify ways in which the Classical period saw increases in money supply. One was via plunder from warfare out of region, the most substantial being the gains made at the expense of the Persian empire between 480 and 450. A second source was mercenary service out of region.