

PART VI:
500-460—THE AGE OF PINDAR AND AESCHYLUS

After the triumphs over the Persians at Marathon in 490, and again in 480-479, when the Athenians and their allies liberated their compatriots in the north and began to free those on the Aegean islands and the Anatolian coast, the Greeks, and especially the Athenians, triumphantly re-affirmed their own culture, society, and liberties with a self-confident creativity, as the Florentines had when they defeated the tyrant of Milan just after 1400, precipitating the Italian Renaissance, and as the English did after the defeat of the Armada in 1588, enriching their literature and beginning their empire and rise to preeminence. Thus began the golden age of classical Greece, which saw an unparalleled burst of creativity in the arts, literature, and thought, together with untold wealth especially in Athens through trade and empire.

Between 480 and 460 Cimon expanded the Delian League, for which Themistocles (ostracized in 479) had laid the foundations, and on which the first assessments of tribute were established by Aristides the Just, said to have been Themistocles' rival for a boy's love as well as for political leadership according to Plutarch (*Life of Themistocles* 3). Declining to participate in the annual naval attacks that liberated the Greeks of Asia Minor, the Spartans, resting on their laurels, returned home to oversee their ever restive Helots, *perioikoi*, and league. Athenians gained not only in booty but also in trading partners and new members, who often chose to pay dues rather than contributing ships to the Delian fleet.

Cimon's favorite sculptor Myron (fl. 470-440) perfected the Severe style, excelling in bronze male nudes that he carefully proportioned (Pliny *N.H.*, 34, 58). His *Discobolos* (Discus Thrower), one of the finest statues of any age, incomparably captured arrested motion, muscles taut like a loaded spring. Copies of his *Marsyas* and some of his other athletes show his admiration for the male body. In sculpture, symbolism decreased and the male nude shown in naturalistic action expressed grace and gravity as well as a greater sensuality than in the earlier 5th century depiction of the tyrannicides or the Critias boy.⁵¹ *Sophrosyne* (self-restraint) characterized sculpture, whether in bronze as in the Zeus from Artemesium (460-50 BCE) and the Riace Statues (450 BCE), or the marble sculptures on the pediments of Zeus's temple at Olympia (470-456 BCE), which exemplify the Severe style, and combine elements of idealism and realism, a realism that "was to disappear in the

second half of the century under the influence of Phidian sculpture" (Biers, 1996, p. 219).

Both Pindar and Aeschylus developed homosexual themes. Aeschylus makes explicit the sexual nature of the relationship between Achilles and Patroclus in his *Myrmidons*: "You abjured the holy sacrament of the thighs! You spurned a profusion of kisses!"⁵² Pindar pointed to his own innovations preferring to substitute a pederastic for a cannibalistic theme in *Olympian Ode 1*, wherein Poseidon falls in love with Pelops, explicitly paralleling the love of Zeus for Ganymede.⁵³

Dover, who relied so heavily on pederastic vase scenes for his thesis, never ventured to explain why such scenes suddenly began to appear on vases around 550 and virtually stopped after 470. Hubbard, in a 1998 article, suggested that the gradual democratization of Athens during the early and mid-fifth century forced the aristocrats to stop so publicly advertising their "vice," presuming that the good old boys in those days were as homophobic as today's plebeians. But I would like to suggest a more material cause for this mysterious disappearance.

Michael Vickers and David Gill claim that the aristocratic Greeks always supped and ate from silver and that ceramics were considered as bourgeois commodities made for common people with little taste by artisans with little talent; the homoerotic painted vases (so prized since the eighteenth century for *connoisseurs* who were 'that way' from Lord Hamilton to Ned Warren and beyond to Beazley and others), like all pottery, were merely "saleable ballast" (Vickers & Gill, 1994, p. 90) exported to such places as Etruria, where most of the unbroken ones were found in graves, unpilfered by robbers because until the late 18th century they were of little value. No specimens of such silver service survive before the Hellenistic period, and then only one is explicitly homoerotic, the famous cup for which Warren had so long and diligently searched that he dubbed it the 'Holy Grail' when he found it. Boardman, on the other hand, contends that upper class Greeks only began to use silver and gold service beginning toward the end of the 4th century with the vast riches that Alexander brought to Greece.

I believe that the elite in Athens, who set the style there and in many other cities, became rich enough after 470 to begin the transition to the use of silver vessels for their symposia, and that these silver dishes may well have continued to have the explicit homosexual and pederastic scenes that were hardly ever thereafter found on pottery. Plutarch (*Alc.* 4.5) indicates that Alcibiades and his hosts were using silver at their symposia; bad-boy Alcibiades, as the story goes, stole half of the silver and gold cups from the tables of Anytus, one of his lovers. Athenians

opened their lucrative silver mines at Laurium in the late 490s and became much richer in the decades after the defeat of the Persians by raiding and liberating wealthy Ionian cities in the Aegean and along the coasts of Ionia (which also granted them trade concessions). Thus, having a natural supply of silver and an influx of wealth, Athenian aristocrats probably switched more and more away from earthen to silver tableware. Like most of the large-scale bronze statues, and all of the chryselephantine ones, from the Archaic or Classical periods, such silverware would have been melted down long ago. The lack of silver vases or cups from the latter two-thirds of the 5th century (when explicit homosexual scenes disappeared from pots), does not prove that they did not exist.

**PART VII:
460-429—THE AGE OF PERICLES**

Influential already after the ostracism of Cimon (462), Pericles dominated Athens from the 440s until his death in 429. During his last two decades he was elected general (*strategos*) every year in succession and brought Athens to its zenith. He surrounded himself with the stars of the intellectual and artistic worlds. In fact he and his close associate Phidias were tried for embezzlement together. They were acquitted, but another of Pericles' associates, Anaxagoras, didn't fare as well when he was tried for atheism, a charge similar to one that Socrates would later face. Even Pericles' mistress, Aspasia, was famous for her learning and cultivation; the comic poets joked that she, in fact, was the ruler of Athens and not Pericles (Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 515ff). Pericles, who moved the League's treasury from Delos to Athens, began dipping into it to ornament the Acropolis with the Parthenon. His extensive building program, as a lasting monument to him, brought him criticism from such as Thucydides.

Pericles, who may have been a Kinsey "0" since we do not hear of even a single *erastes* or an *eromenos* (and ancient authors were never reluctant to discuss such affairs), seems to have had a favorable view of the value of pederasty. In the funeral speech ascribed to him by Thucydides, he urges the citizens of Athens "to gaze, day after day, upon the power of the city and become her lovers (*erastai*)" (2.43.1).⁵⁴ Monoson, in a 1994 article, analyzes the implications of denoting the citizens as pederastic lovers of their *polis*. The metaphor "suggests a way of thinking about the relationship between citizen and

city” (p. 253). To understand how Pericles wanted the Athenians to picture that relationship we must “realize that the metaphor alludes to the highly formalized and valorized erotic relations between adult, citizen males (*erastai*) and adolescent, free-born boys (*eromenoi*) that were common among Athenians” (Monoson, 1994, p. 253). In conclusion, Monoson stated that the speech urged “them actively to guide the city in the exercise of its own powers and to help frame its conception of its best interests and aspiration. The metaphor also suggests that democratic citizenship demands that obviously unequal parties—the city and each individual citizen—struggle to forge a relationship of mutuality and reciprocity” (p. 271). If she is correct in her analysis, then Pericles’ speech provides tremendous proof that the ordinary Athenian male citizen would construe a pederastic relationship, at least at its best, as one of mutual exchange wherein the *eromenos* benefited from the *erastes* and in ways that spurred the development of an honorable character. Even if we deny the authenticity of the speech, we are still left with the fact that Thucydides believed that the reader, both the Athenian and posterity, would be able to decode the metaphor in the appropriate way.

In these years Sophocles perfected tragedy. His *Niobe* and *The Colchian Women* incorporated pederastic themes. In the former play, for instance, he says that Ganymede “lit the fire of tyrant Zeus with his thighs” (Athenaeus 13.602).⁵⁵ In addition, we have several amusing anecdotes about Sophocles’ own passion for boys (Athenaeus 13.603f.; *HGR* 2.21). Seemingly he knew a thing or two about the fire a boy’s thighs could arouse. Even his own may have aroused a few men in his youth; “the sixteen-year old Sophocles, his naked body gleaming with oil, led the victory parade in Athens after the battle of Marathon” (Crompton, 2003, p. 10).

The perfection of sculpture came in these years, as well. The aging Myron and his slightly later contemporaries, Phidias and Polyclitus, breathed life and grandeur into their sculpture, the beautiful male body always predominating. With his bronze spearbearer (the *Doryphorus*), the Argive Polyclitus developed a new canon for the muscular male youth, describing in a treatise the precise proportions that a statue of the male form should have to be most beautiful (Pliny *N.H.*, 34, 55). Lithe and poised for motion, this statue proved the standard for the future. Phidias, on the other hand, was more famous for his treatment of gods than of youths. His chryselephantine masterpieces of Zeus at Olympia and Athena in the Parthenon depicted their majestic power. Paid for by Pericles, his patron, the friezes and metopes that he had sculpted or directed by assistants on the Parthenon (447-432) narrated the exaltation

of Athens and ordinary Athenians, who find their place on the friezes where normally only gods, heroes, or other mythological beings stood. Here, in these most expensive and most public of adorations of the male nude body, there was never a hint of lasciviousness.

**PART VIII:
429-399—THE AGE OF SOCRATES
AND THE 'LOST GENERATION'**

Pericles died in 429. In devastated Athens, without Pericles' leadership, blockaded by the Spartans and ravaged by war and plague, Athenians began to question their system. This was the perfect atmosphere for the Sophists, who found a ready audience among the disillusioned youth. Just two short years after Pericles' death, they were mesmerized by the speeches and performances of Gorgias. Traveling throughout Hellas, but concentrating in Athens, the Sophists lectured for a fee to the public. They specialized in rhetoric foremost, but thought, taught and talked on nearly every subject imaginable. Hippias and Protagoras claimed grammar, semantics, and literary criticism as their specialties. Conservatives criticized them for subverting morals and religion with their relativism, but elite youths flocked to them for help in their legal and political careers and possibly *because* of the subversive element as well. (Concerning what the Sophists may or may not have said about pederasty and other forms of homosexuality we are not informed.)

Despite the distinctions that Plato later drew, it is likely that the average Athenian did not find the teachings and activities of Socrates that different from those of the Sophists. In his *Clouds* Aristophanes satirized Socrates in his work by making him the embodiment of Sophistic thought with parodies of some Ionian physics thrown in for good measure.⁵⁶ At one point in the play (889-1104) two characters—one might rather say two personifications—come on stage to praise the old, conservative method of education against the new style, and vice versa. These characters, 'Better/Stronger Speech (*logos*)'⁵⁷ and 'Worse/Weaker Speech,' personify arguments going on in Athens that were provoked by the teachings of the Sophists, most especially those dealing with nature (*phusis*) versus culture (*nomos*). These two Speeches each attempt to persuade the youth Pheidippides to accept the type of education he's peddling.

Dover (1989) mentions this passage in his *Greek Homosexuality* only to discuss lines dealing with Better Speech's obvious fascination with

boys' genitals (p. 124f.).⁵⁸ He completely misses, or ignores, the implications that this passage has for our understanding of pedagogical pederasty; the debate or competition (*agon*) here in the *Clouds* is, after all, about educating the young: "everything is now at stake for higher education's sake" (953f.).⁵⁹ The Better Speech, "who crowned the men of old with solid traits of character" (959f.), represents the old school, where pederasty instilled virtue and manliness into the boy by very Spartan-like activities. Through all his bluster about how he raised the men of Marathon and how well-behaved the youth used to be, Better Speech keeps letting slip (Freudian perhaps?) mentions of boys' thighs and genitals, and these slips become more pronounced as he proceeds:

When in gym-class, all the boys would cross their legs when sitting down, so they'd not expose to the grownups anything provocative. When they rose again, they'd have to smooth the sand they'd sat upon, careful not to leave behind the marks of their manhood for lovers to see. No boy then would dare anoint himself below the belly-button: thus their genitals were dewy and downy, like a succulent peach. (983-994)

He ends his speech with a peroration on how the effect of his training will make the young boy look:

Follow up on my suggestions,
give them serious consideration,
then you'll be in proud possession
of a chest that ripples, skin that gleams,
shoulders humongous, tongue petite,
buttocks of iron, prick discreet. (1009-14)⁶⁰

Worse Speech, in turn, makes his case for an education that will teach the boy how to do whatever he naturally desires and how to argue his way out of any consequences that may result:⁶¹

Just look, young man, at all the toil the virtuous life consists of, and look at all the fun you stand to lose, if you pursue it: young boys, young women, games of chance, good eating, drink and laughter. Why live a life at all if you're deprived of all these pleasures? OK, then, let's proceed to look at the necessities of nature. Let's say you've messed up, fallen in love, been taken in adultery. You're screwed if you can't talk your way out of trouble. Come

with me, though, you'll indulge your instincts, leap and laugh, consider nothing shameful. (1076-91)

In the end, Worst Speech persuades even his opponent that he's right; Better Speech agrees that there's nothing wrong with having a "gaping asshole" (1086ff.). Deserting to the other side, Better Speech takes off and hands over his cloak, signifying, as it were, the dropping of the pretence that his pederasty has the virtue of the boy at heart and not the creamy young thighs.

Aristophanes, in a highly subtle and yet not-so-subtle way, is calling into question the true motives of Socrates and others who claim to be pedagogically motivated pederasts.⁶² Regardless of whether we think him right in his final analysis, it remains that Aristophanes is highlighting a tension in Athenian society between those who see pederasty as beneficial to youths and those who see it as purely sexual, the same types of pederasty this paper is attempting to explore. It is worth noting that the gross reference to pederastic and other forms of homosexual sex appear in the Old Comedy only a generation after such scenes disappear on the vases which are replaced with decorous and comely nude youths who can be gazed at admiringly by the viewer but with no explicit or vulgar sex display.

Leaving behind Aristophanes now, but not Socrates, a word should be said about the 'love affair' between Socrates, considered one of the ugliest men of his time, and Alcibiades, by all accounts the most beautiful youth. The most famous account of this is given at the end of the *Symposium* (212c-223b), and one can easily imagine that Plato, for dramatic and philosophical purposes, made up what must have seemed like a bizarre coupling to the Greeks. However, Plato is not the first to write of this affair. In fact, the relationship of Socrates and Alcibiades became quite a common topic within the genre of Socratic dialogues.⁶³ The *Alcibiades* of Aeschines of Sphettus is likely prior to Plato's dialogue, and so can be said to have been the first to tell of their love:

[Socrates]: And I, through the love I had for Alcibiades, felt just as the Bacchants do. For whenever they are inspired they draw honey and milk where others cannot even draw water. And I, knowing no lesson through which I could benefit a man by teaching, nevertheless believed that by being together with this man I could make him better through love.⁶⁴

At least three other Socratics wrote dialogues on the same topic (Phaedo of Elis, Euclides of Megara, and Antisthenes, the founder of Cynicism), none of which survives however. Xenophon, on the other hand, distances Socrates from Alcibiades in his *Memorabilia*, which actually may lend credence to the more intimate portrayal found in Plato and others since Xenophon was at pains to show how unjust the Athenians were for condemning Socrates—possibly with Alcibiades in mind—on the count of corrupting the youth of the city, and thus has motives for diminishing the extent of their involvement with each other.

The rigid prohibition of new music in Sparta came, I think, by 500. Plato's condemnation of the wrong sort of new music as pernicious, morally and politically (*The Laws* 397-424), seems to imply that it was lewd. Aristophanes has the music as well as other tastes of the younger generations shock their elders as has been the case in the 20th century in the Western countries with wild, sensual, sexy song and dance. Singing as well as dancing often became lewd and homoerotically so, not just in choruses and satyrs or in extemporaneous performances at symposia, but even in mimes and other less organized and even amateur revels of the common people. Youths normally express their rebellion in song and dance as well as dress and hairstyle and the homosexually inclined and/or effeminate of all ages and societies are likely by nature to take the lead in shocking their elders, with histrionics and bizarre costumes. This "new music" was routinely chastised by moralists ever since Aristophanes. By the time of Menander music like drama became saccharine.

**PART IX:
399-359—THE AGE OF PLATO, XENOPHON,
AND THE 'SACRED BAND'**

With the defeat of Athens by Sparta in 404, the status of power seemed to shift to Sparta, but, as Sealey (1976, p. 378) points out, this was "illusory," for Sparta now had to fear her former allies, Corinth and Thebes, and for this reason decided against the destruction of Athens, although Sparta did insist that Athens destroy the long walls and renounce her empire. Athens, though diminished, remained a major player in the Greek world, and even allied with Thebes against Sparta in 395. In addition, Conon began reconstructing parts of the Delian League and restored some prosperity to Athens after his victory at Cnidus in 394. With the surprisingly quick recovery of Athens, and

threats from Thebes and Corinth, Sparta was unable to solidify the ascendancy she had briefly enjoyed.

In 371 the Spartans fell before the Theban Sacred Band at Leuctra and again at Mantinea in 362 and never fully recovered their losses of territory, slaves, or influence.⁶⁵ Thus effectively ended the 'mystique' of the Spartan military as invincible in the Peloponnese, and with it came a decrease in the admiration other states held, even if often begrudgingly and critically, for the Spartan system. That system—reliant as it was on the Helots' ability to provide surplus food for Spartiates so that they could devote all their time to the art of war—had been founded both on the servitude of the Helots and on Spartan fear of them. Consequently, with the loss of land and slaves, the Spartans had to undergo drastic changes and much of what has been called the Spartan 'mirage' began in this period as the Spartans reinterpreted and exalted their gloried past.

Thebes, on the other hand, reached its zenith with these triumphs, and mainly as a result of the effectiveness of their elite infantry unit comprised of 150 pairs of lovers.⁶⁶ It has long been debated whether this 'Sacred Band' was created (probably in 379 by Gorgidas) before Plato wrote the *Symposium*, in which he has Phaedrus theorize an army of lovers. In any case, these men were rightly considered the finest fighting force in Greece, and Philip of Macedon, as we shall soon see, was much impressed with this formation and Theban tactics in general; he would use a modified Theban model for his own forces when he became king.

Recently, however, the existence of such a band of heroic lovers has come into question. Citing Xenophon's surprising failure to mention it in his work the *Hellenica*—a political and military history of the first part of the 4th century—as one damning piece of evidence, Leitao (2002) argues that "the historicity of an erotic Sacred Band rests on the most precarious of foundations" (p. 143).⁶⁷ Although he believes there wasn't any such Band of Lovers, he states that his "goal in problematizing the truthfulness of this tradition is not ultimately to offer decisive proof that Thebes never had an erotically constituted fighting force . . . but rather to redirect our attention to the discursive conditions that made it possible for an erotic Sacred Band, based on however small a kernel of historical truth, to take its first steps onto the scene of history" (p. 143). While skepticism is a good thing in the pursuit of truth in history, it must be admitted that the Sacred Band rests on authority less shaky than many things accepted from ancient historiography. Furthermore, it should be noted that Leitao's project is not to dismiss the historicity altogether of an elite Band in Thebes at this time, but rather to put into

doubt that it consisted of couples who were current *erastai* and *eromenoi*. He admits that many armies, not just at Thebes, involved beloveds or former beloveds in the battle in some form, even if only standing by to provide inspiration: “occasionally *paidika* are described as being present during battle itself, but when our sources are specific about what they are doing there it often turns out that they are not actively engaged in fighting” (Leitao, 2002, p. 144).

Xenophon, a well-seasoned soldier himself, gives us some insight into ‘gays’ in the military of his time.⁶⁸ Brawls and bragging over desirable boys seem to have been not at all uncommon. When Agesilaus, one of the two kings of Sparta, hears of the death of his co-ruler, Agesipolis, he weeps, mourning his companion, and reminiscing over the fun they had in their shared tent talking about “youthful days, hunting exploits, horses, and love affairs [*paidika*]” (*Hell.* 5.3.20). *Paidika*, which the Loeb translator so delicately phrases as “love affairs,” refers specifically to boy beloveds. Soldiers fighting over a boy cannot have been unknown since Xenophon, when accused of hitting another soldier, in denying the charge, lists coming to blows over a beloved boy (*paidika*) as one of several possible, but rejected, motives he could have had (*Anabasis* 5.8.4). Later, on the same expedition (*Anabasis* 7.4.7-11), Xenophon intercedes on behalf of a fellow soldier by the name of Episthenes—a boy-lover (*paiderastes*) as Xenophon tells us—who wants the life of a beautiful lad spared by Seuthes II, a local Thracian ruler who had captured the boy in battle. Xenophon, to win the release of the boy, tells Seuthes about how Episthenes had previously put together a company of soldiers with their beauty as the sole criterion, and that, when they fought side by side, Episthenes had proved himself a very brave man. The story ends happily with the boy and Episthenes embracing and Seuthes II laughing at them both.

Xenophon, of course, is one of our main sources for Socrates and his circle of friends. As in Plato, they are shown to have an intense interest in youths. Socrates, in Xenophon, however, takes a rather harsh view of sexual activity, even kissing, between lover and beloved: “Socrates advised that one abstain resolutely from sex with beautiful boys; for he said it was not easy for a man who engaged in such things to behave moderately.” Xenophon, by way of illustration, proceeds to tell about a conversation he had with Socrates wherein Socrates tries to warn him away from boys by likening the kiss from a beautiful boy to the bite of a tarantula, both poisonous, but the kiss actually more dangerous (*Memorabilia* 1.3.8-14; *HGR* 5.2). Yet, Xenophon records his own disagree-

ment with Socrates over the matter, since in this same passage Xenophon replies that he would happily be considered a fool if that meant being able to kiss Alcibiades' son, "a boy with a beautiful face and right in the bloom of boyhood." Perhaps Xenophon, on one hand, admired the noble sentiments and almost inhuman self-control Socrates taught and practiced, but he was, on the other hand, enough of a practical man to see that such idealism was not always either practicable nor even constructive. Self-control (*enkrateia*) was certainly important to Xenophon, and understandable given his military background, but it was only part of larger context.⁶⁹ As Clifford Hindley (1994) argues,

opportunities for homoerotic pleasure available to Greek armies and their commanders in the field must have been many, and the resulting relationships complex. . . . Xenophon recognised that such relationships might well be honourable, and motivate men to valour in battle. But experience also taught him that situations could well arise where to indulge in *eros* was fraught with military or political danger. In such situations, he had no doubt that the welfare of the city should take precedence over individual impulse, and for him the ability to resist erotic desire *where necessary* ranked high among the qualities required by a military leader. (356f; italics added)

Plato's Socrates, although certainly no hedonistic pursuer of boys, takes a more constructive view of boy-love. Volumes have been written about *eros* in Plato's philosophy, and so it is unnecessary here to go into all that has been said. However, I do want to point out a couple of features that highlight matters at issue in this article by focusing on three speeches in the first half of the *Phaedrus*.

In the *Phaedrus*, Socrates follows Phaedrus outside the city walls, drawn by what the young beauty is holding in his left hand under his cloak (228d), which turns out to be the scroll of a speech by Lysias, the most famous orator of the day. This mixture of eroticism and learning that Plato playfully joins together here will be important throughout the dialogue, which in many ways is about the erotic pull of philosophy. Lysias' speech purports to be that of a man who, though not in love with the youth, attempts to persuade him to give him his favors. Against the common scholarly view of this speech, Martha Nussbaum (2002) argues, I think correctly, that Lysias' speech is to be taken seriously within the dialogue, and for the reason that it raises important issues about the institution of pederasty: the speech "is indeed a brilliantly

clever response to a young man's dilemma" (p. 66). The 'dilemma' Nussbaum refers to is how does a boy choose the man that will actually benefit him, and not simply one who wants sex.

Lysias' argument is that the non-lover will benefit the boy more for several reasons. Most importantly, the lover is more interested in the physical aspects of the boy; as the non-lover points out, "lovers generally start to desire your body before they know your character. . . . Non-lovers, on the other hand, are friends with you even before they achieve their goal . . . you can expect to become a better person if you are won over by me [the non-lover], rather than by a lover" (232e-233a). At the end of Phaedrus' recitation of Lysias' speech Socrates says that he is in ecstasy from having watched Phaedrus' face while he read. Socrates, however, says that he could do better than Lysias and proceeds to give his own version of a plea by a non-lover for the favors of a boy. In his speech, Socrates says that we are all led by two principles: "one is our inborn desire for pleasures, the other is our acquired judgment that pursues what is best. Sometimes these two are in agreement; but there are times when they quarrel inside us" (237d-e). The lover, according to Socrates, will act to maximize his own pleasure, which will result in the boy remaining ignorant and becoming inferior in body and soul.

However, no sooner has Socrates finished his own speech than he feels that he has been impious by speaking ill of *Eros*, a god and the son of Aphrodite. So he then launches into a third and final speech, but this time in defense of the lover. The speech is a *tour de force*, containing vivid imagery and lyrical language as well as philosophical argument. In the final part of the speech, the soul is likened to a charioteer with two horses, one horse a lover of honor and self-control and modesty, the other without modesty, full of boasts and indecency. If the lover-beloved couple is able to master the bad horse and

the victory goes to the better elements in their minds, which lead them to follow the assigned regimen of philosophy, their life here below is one of bliss and shared understanding. They are modest and fully in control of themselves now that they have enslaved the part that brought trouble into the soul and set free the part that gave it virtue. After death, when they have grown wings and become weightless, they have won the first of three rounds in these, the true Olympic Contests. There is no greater good than this that either human self-control or divine madness can offer a man. If, on the other hand, they adopt a lower way of living, with ambition in

place of philosophy, then pretty soon when they are careless because they have been drinking or for some other reason, the pair's undisciplined horses will catch their souls off guard and together bring them to commit that act which ordinary people would take to be the happiest choice of all; and when they have consummated it once, they go on doing this for the rest of their lives, but sparingly, since they have not approved of what they are doing with their whole minds. So these two also live in mutual friendship (though weaker than that of the philosophical pair). . . . In death they are wingless when they leave the body, but their wings are bursting to sprout, so the prize they have won from the madness of love is considerable . . . their lives are bright and happy as they travel together, and thanks to their love they will grow wings when the time comes. (256a-e)⁷⁰

In all three speeches, the tension between sexual love and a more character-driven love becomes a central focus. Despite the differences among the speeches, a common theme is that love that has only the (sexual) interests of the lover at heart is to be shunned, while more mutual loves that strive for the enrichment of both sides, but especially the beloved, have great value. Hupperts (2000, 2002) has recently argued that Plato and Xenophon virtually invented the idea of pederastic pedagogy. In doing so he ignores evidence against his contention, including Aristophanes' attacks on those pederasts who claim to have pedagogical intentions, the corpus of Theognis, and what we know about the role of pederasty in the Spartan educational system, among other things. Without a doubt we find, in Plato, the first systematic investigation into pederasty's role in the state and its claim to character formation, but that is different from originating that claim. Plato builds on the ideas common in the Athenian discourse of his day, using them as a foundation to lead the reader towards a greater and deeper sense of true reality, as he sees it; this is the essence of the dialectical form he gives to his philosophy.

A good illustration of this method comes from Diotima in Socrates' speech in the *Symposium* as she erects a stairway to the ultimate vision of true Beauty starting from the erotic impulse felt by a man in the presence of an individual youth's beauty.⁷¹ This impulse would be the one most familiar and most immediate to the Athenian reader, and from familiarity he would be led by the dialectical process to new experiences that could not have been achieved in any other manner. This method we saw as well in the three speeches from the *Phaedrus*; the third speech,

while moving beyond the previous two speeches, does so only by incorporating their truths into it.

Returning from the ethereal realms of Platonic thought, a few words should be said here about sculpture. Sculptors tended to imitate Polyclitus rather than Phidias, although the Parthenon frieze did influence other such works. Many *poleis* were too poor to finance great buildings and ornamental sculpture in this period. Paeonius, at work in the late 5th century and early 4th, was one of Phidias' successors in Athens. He is famous for his Nike, which made creative use of drapery and was the first partially nude female divinity in Classical Greek art. This statue introduced the flamboyant or 'Rich' style, which presaged the Hellenistic in its ornate decoration and outward-flowing focus. His greatest effort seems to have been spent on female figures. They all lessened the emphasis on the ideal male body to portray the "subjective and the theoretical" under the influence of the Sophists.⁷² The frieze from Apollo's temple at Bassai in Arcadia, now in the British Museum, is dated a little after 400. Although smaller and less perfect than the slightly earlier Parthenon frieze, it still emphasizes the rugged large-headed but squat male nude, now in more strenuous, even twisted and contorted, action.

Although flourishing into the next generation, two sculptors introduced important innovation. The Athenian Praxiteles revolutionized Greek sculpture, creating the first life-sized fully nude female: the famous Aphrodite of Cnidus. His male nudes, such as his Hermes, were softer than those of his predecessors, and though magnificent, they did not outdo those of Polyclitus. They were more coy, sometimes almost effeminate, and for the tastes of some, more sensual. His contemporary Scopas (fl. 370-330) concentrated on young gods, male as well as female, and depicted passion and suffering (*pathos*) as seen in the male nude from the Mausoleum frieze. One can see the same mixture of the erotic and pathetic in the Pergamon statues of the Dying Gaul and the Gaul Killing Himself. Scopas greatly influenced the so-called 'baroque-style' of Hellenistic sculpture.

The Middle Comedy had far fewer ribald references to scat, farting, and other anal preoccupations than did the Old Comedy. Grotesque phalluses along with the foul language disappeared from it. This was a trend away from the old gay aristocratic unconcern with propriety and to what we might call bourgeois taste. This was an age of anxiety—one that lacked exuberance and with less wealth and self-confidence.