

als was from being shipped to the eastern front, where acute suffering if not certain death awaited them, not only to the *Strafbataillonen* (penal units) but to regular ones that had to have replacements. The army continued to avoid arresting soldiers as it had in the pre-Hitler era, in spite of Himmler's orders to avoid amnesty and prosecute homosexual offenders (only a handful of executions in the military is known). Many officers, some inadvertently owing to their natural homophobia, disproportionately selected homosexuals from the misfits under their command for the ever more frequent replacements demanded from other units for service at the front. So to the figures in Plant, which play into the hands of homophobic apologists who would belittle the size and extent of the persecution of homosexuals, must be added not only those exterminated in the death camps outside of German soil but also: (1) those killed by random homophobic violence both inside Germany and outside it; (2) those sent to the eastern front; (3) those persecuted and killed by collaborationist governments; (4) those who ended their own lives by suicide. The overall figures, especially if one counts those who fell into two categories such as homosexual Jews or homosexual members of other persecuted groups, would be not five thousand but many times that, and would include all nationalities, not merely subjects of the Reich.

Scandalously, a world which protested the persecution of the Jews in the Third Reich and was horrified by its other crimes against humanity remained indifferent to the treatment of homosexuals by Hitler, denied compensation to survivors, and refused to allow the pink triangle to be inscribed on monuments to victims of inhumanity. Many of these historians and commentators, silent about the persecution of homosexuals, lose no opportunity to insult and defame the German people for their unwillingness to resist Hitler's policies, even though they were living in a country where everyone

was at the mercy of the Gestapo and the rest of the Nazi terror apparatus. Such contrasts are a measure of the continuing dishonesty and hypocrisy of the Judeo-Christian world and of the liberals within Western society on the subject of homosexuality—actions that effectively give the lie to apologists who would claim that the Church and Synagogue were no more than “innocent bystanders,” powerless to prevent the injustice which they saw and deplored. Indeed, if Hitler had only killed homosexuals, these exemplars of self-righteousness might still be applauding him for having done just that.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Jean Boisson, *Le triangle rose: La déportation des homosexuels (1933–1945)*, Paris: Editions Robert Laffont, 1988; Rüdiger Lautmann, “The Pink Triangle: The Persecution of the Homosexual Male in Nazi Germany,” *Journal of Homosexuality*, 6 (1980–81), 141–60; Richard Plant, *The Pink Triangle: The Nazi War Against Homosexuals*, New York: Holt, 1986.

Warren Johansson and  
William A. Percy

## HOMER

Greek epic poet. Most Greeks believed that Homer was a blind bard from Chios or Smyrna (which the predominance of the Ionic dialect supports) who, at a date which they variously placed from the Trojan War (ca. 1200 B.C.) to the beginning of literacy (700 B.C.), composed both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Although dramatically dated to Mycenaean times, the late second millennium B.C., the epics sometimes refer to things that cannot predate 650 or even 570, because interpolations existed in one form or another when seventh-century poets cited the epics.

Although the poems may have evolved over centuries orally, the final version suggests a unifying hand, even if the view of some Alexandrian critics that each poem was composed by a separate bard—the *Odyssey* forty years after the *Iliad*—has not been abandoned by all. The

contrasts between the two have been explained by aging of the author and differences in topics: war and peace, the siege of Troy and the wanderings of Ulysses on his return voyage. In any event, the author or authors owed much to tradition.

It is difficult to detect all interpolations and changes, especially additions of Attic terms as high culture became increasingly centered in Athens, where the Peisistratids in the mid-sixth century had the epics recited annually at a festival, and many believe the first texts written well over a century after the latest possible date for Homer's death. A definitive text resulted only from the efforts of second-century editors in Alexandria. These texts became almost sacred to the Greeks, whose education was based on them even until the fall of Constantinople to the Turks in 1453.

Like Hesiod and all other poets and artists through the time of Archilochus (floruit ca. 660) and even later Tyrtaeus (floruit ca. 630), Homer failed to depict institutionalized pederasty, to which almost all subsequent writers referred, many making it central. Though poets and artists around 600 B.C. make the earliest unmistakable references to institutionalized pederasty, Homer mentioned **Ganymede** twice, "the loveliest born of the race of mortals, and therefore the gods caught him away to themselves, to be Zeus' wine-pourer, for the sake of his beauty, so he might be among the immortals" (*Iliad*, 20, 233–35) and Zeus' giving Tros, Ganymede's father, "the finest of all horses beneath the sun and the daybreak" (*Iliad*, 5, 265ff.) as compensation for his son. Sir Moses Finley concluded that "the text of the poems offers no directly affirmative evidence at any point; even the two references to the elevation of Ganymede to Olympus speak only of his becoming cup-bearer to Zeus." Sir Kenneth Dover denied that these passages implied pederasty: "It should not be impossible for us . . . to imagine that the gods on Olympus, like the souls of men in the

Muslim paradise . . . simply rejoiced in the beauty of their servants as one ingredient of felicity." However, the **Abrahamic religions'** taboo on homosexuality did not exist in Hellenic and Etruscan antiquity. Societies that had the formula "eat, drink, and be merry" held that banquets should fittingly issue in sexual revelry. Anachronisms such as those of Finley and Dover should therefore be dismissed, even though Homer's allusions to Ganymede may be pederastic interpolations like those ordered by the Peisistratids—successors of Solon, who introduced institutionalized pederasty into Athens—to antedate the cultural prominence of Athens.

Besides the love between Achilles and Patroclus, two episodes from the *Iliad* not involving Ganymede have been incorrectly related to pederasty. After Patroclus' death Achilles associated very closely with Nestor's son Antilochus, who thus may have replaced Patroclus as lover or, rather, perhaps as beloved now that Achilles had fully matured. Both relationships, however, really involved coevals. Second, later poets interpreted the close friendship between the Cretan king Idomeneus and his charioteer Meriones as pederastic, perhaps because of Crete's reputation as the birthplace of pederasty.

Achilles and Patroclus grew up together, the latter slightly older. Later authors, believing a pederastic relationship to have existed between the two, were in a quandary as to which must have been the older, as after 600 there was customarily a ten-year difference. Some assigned the role of mentor to Achilles, others to Patroclus, to impose the disparity essential to pederastic liaisons in their own time. Of course the fact that Homer implied that they were approximately the same age, adolescent companions, does not exclude their having been physically intimate when younger, but it shows their relationship not to have been the institutionalized pederasty of later centuries. The plot of the *Iliad*, with Achilles' boundless grief and dreadful revenge on the Trojans

for killing Patroclus, is homophile, as is the language in which the hero addresses the dead Patroclus and Patroclus' spirit requests that their ashes be united in the same urn forever.

So if Homer (or the bards whose work is preserved under his name) did not anticipate the pederasty of the Golden Age, he created an imperishable monument of male love and fidelity on the battlefield that is one of the earliest, yet enduring classics of world literature.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. D. S. Barrett, "The Friendship of Achilles and Patroclus," *Classical Bulletin*, 57 (1981), 87-93; W. M. Clarke, "Achilles and Patroclus in Love," *Hermes*, 106 (1978), 381-96; Sir Kenneth Dover, *Greek Homosexuality*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978; Sir Moses Finley, *The World of Odysseus*, 2nd ed., London: Penguin, 1962; Hans Licht, "Homöerotik in den homerischen Gedichten," *Anthropophyteia*, 9 (1912), 291-300.

William A. Percy

## HOMOPHILE

A modern coinage from the Greek, etymologically the term means "loving the same." *Homophile* is, theoretically at least, broader in scope than *homosexual*, in that it includes nongenital as well as genital relations, but less broad than *homosocial*, which comprises all significant relations between members of the same sex. Although the term had some circulation in Germany in the 1920s (e.g., as *Homophilie* in the writings of the astrophysically inclined Karl-Günther Heimsoth), it was first used systematically in the Dutch homosexual rights movement after World War II. It was internationally diffused through the advocacy of the International Committee for Sexual Equality (Amsterdam) in the early 1950s. In the following decade the word homophile was adopted as a self-designation by a number of middle-class organizations in the United States, and it seemed for a time that it might prevail. Homophile had the advantage of clearly including affectional, nonsexual

relations as well as sexual ones, thereby deemphasizing the perceived genital emphasis of the term *homosexual*.

The new militant trend that arose in the wake of the 1969 *Stonewall Rebellion* rejected the word *homophile* as a euphemism, preferring *gay*. Histories of the *gay movement* sometimes refer to the years 1950-69, when the word was in vogue, as the "homophile period." This phase stands in contrast with the more radical one that ensued.

## HOMOPHILE MOVEMENT

See *Movement, Homosexual*.

## HOMOPHOBIA

Although precise definitions vary, this term usually refers to negative attitudes toward homosexual persons and homosexuality. Characterizing antihomosexual prejudice as a *phobia* has been criticized for several reasons, including the implication that such prejudice is an irrational fear and a manifestation of individual pathology rather than of cultural norms. Despite its limitations, "homophobia" is likely to enjoy increasingly widespread use in American English until a more suitable term is introduced. Care should be taken, therefore, to identify homophobia as a prejudice, comparable to racism and anti-semitism, rather than an irrational fear similar to claustrophobia or agoraphobia.

*Institutional Homophobia.* At the institutional and individual levels, homophobia can be observed both through explicit hostility toward lesbians and gay men and through failure to recognize the existence of gay people or the legitimacy of their concerns. Institutional homophobia manifests itself in part through anti-gay laws, policies, and pronouncements from legislatures, courts, organized religion, and other groups within society. It also is evident in the social processes that reinforce the general invisibility of lesbians and gay men in society (e.g., in mass media, through