more likely that her feminine attributes aroused his desire. He was certainly not homosexual only, but bisexual, as shown by his attraction to Isis, and it is just as likely that he performed normal coitus a tergo as coitus per anum. This will also apply to the representations of ordinary couples.

Other examples of intercourse from behind show the woman crouching on the ground or on a bed, or bending with her head touching the ground. An acrobatic performance a tergo is also given by the couple in the Turin papyrus: the woman drives a chariot drawn by two girls, while the man copulates with her.

---

68 P. Chester Beatty I, 6,4f. (ed. Gardiner).
69 de Rachewiltz, op. cit., p. 45 (bottom); R. Anthes, Mit Rahineh 1936, no. 210; and others.
70 Turin erotic papyrus: Omlin, op. cit., pl. IV (right).
71 Ibid., pl. IV (left) and pl. V (right).
ROMAN ATTITUDES TO GREEK LOVE

The easier parts of the story of Rome's Hellenization over the period from Plautus on have been often told: literary genres and philosophy were taken over and a mythology developed. Various arts were copied. Other parts are seldom surveyed. Some day, someone, writing the right book, will crack open the great eggshell still called "Roman civilization" and show us in full the Greco-Roman creature that we all know lies within; and we can then properly study the nature and origins of its hyphenation.

To illustrate the process of Hellenization, we have the younger Scipio's remarks on the novelities he had observed and reports on in 129 B.C. Speaking of the young in the city, he says:

They learn shameful arts. Along with ballet-boys (cinaedi), and carrying their violins and saxophones (sambuca psalteriique), they attend the entertainers' schools; they learn singing — all these things that our ancestors wanted to be judged disgraceful, for freeborn persons. They attend, I repeat, the very dancing schools — unwed girls and freeborn lads among the ballet-boys. Though someone might have reported these doings to me, I could not have taken in the notion of noblemen instructing their own offspring in these things. Yet, when I was conducted to a dancing school, by Jove, there I saw more than fifty lads and maids in the school, one of them a boy (and this caused me the sharpest pain, on our state's behalf), a boy marked out as noble (bullatum), son of a candidate for public office, under twelve years of age, dancing to castanets such a dance as some shameless slave could not decently have performed.¹

Some years earlier Scipio had also described P. Sulpicius Gallus, homo delicatus: "For one whodaily perfumes himself and dresses before a mirror, whose eyebrows are trimmed, who walks abroad with beard plucked out and thighs made smooth, who at banquets, though a young man, has reclined in a long-sleeved tunic ["called 'chirotodae'" , explains our source] on the inner side of the couch with a lover, who is fond not only of wine but of men — does anyone doubt that he does what ballet-boys commonly do?"²

Emphatic passages; reminders, however, that the state contained not only Scipio and his fellow-citizens he thought he was addressing, but a prominent and opposed group living a life in certain respects provocatively at odds with his own. It would be a great mistake, then, to say that 'Romans' had been gradually picking up the new ways. Some Romans had; some, angrily and bitterly, had not. In Scipio's day as in any other, society was divided into more or less encapsulated groups and strata, by no means approving of each other's behavior.

¹ Macrobi. 3.14.7. (And here at the outset I thank G. Williams for helpful comments).
² Aul. Gell. 6.12.2 = ORF 1.127, of 142 B.C.
Some of the questions that exercised him were still being debated two centuries later. Persius describes himself at a leisure moment, giving himself to some serious sun-bathing, when a total stranger attacks him. "And these are your habits indeed!" begins the man; and goes on (in a passage rarely translated, because so uncompromisingly anatomical) to castigate the poet for being so depilated: all the public shrubbery has been trimmed back, each hair on the buttocks has been grubbed out with tweezers. The vocabulary belongs entirely to farming. Evidently the critic of Persius' cosmetic practices is from the country, not up to date with all the fashions of the capital. He expresses his disapproval with ferocity (inspueare is the word used).3

There existed, then, two views on the matter; and, since they can be discovered not only in these scenes but in many another as well, there is no reason to doubt that they were really championed by real people. That much could not be denied even by scholars who see in some of the discussions or portrayals the presence of literary convention. It follows that no one should speak of the Roman attitude toward male homosexuality, in the singular, nor should anyone try to describe perceptions of that subject in the Roman world from a small range of texts.4 The true picture must show all sorts of exceptions, contradictions, and tensions.

The origin of those tensions, if we should try to treat them historically, is not easily discerned. From analogies that it would be useless pedantry to cite, I simply assume that the early Roman population contained some minority of males that preferred sexual relations with other males, and a minority that enjoyed (or, given unchecked opportunity, would have enjoyed) relations with both sexes equally. I do not see any reason to think these proportions changed later, or differed from those among the Greeks themselves. What can it mean,

---


4 Hence I disagree with various obiter dicta (the subject has been barely touched by classical scholars): M.-H.-E. Meier and L.-R. de Pogey-Castries, Histoire de l'amour grec (Paris 1930), p. 178, using only Polyb. 32.11 to show that "la débauche pédérasque était devenue ordinaire à Rome"; P. Veyne, e.g. using Horace, in Annales 1978, p. 51; Festugière, below, n. 51; also J. P. Sullivan, The Satyricon of Petronius (Bloomington 1968), p. 235, believing he can find one over-all "fairly standard ancient view"; and most of all with J. Boswell, Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality (Chicago 1980), e.g. p. 22 n. 42, "Romans were quite open about homosexual feelings and gay relationships were ... generally accepted"; p. 49, "homosexual desire, which everyone apparently considered ... entirely ordinary"; p. 58, "few classicists have doubted that homosexuality occupied a prominent and respected position in most Greek and Roman cities at all levels of society and among a substantial portion of the population"; p. 62 n. 4, "Roman sexuality was virtually untrammeled ... The attitude ... probably typical of Roman males ...: 'Can it matter where or in whom you put it?'"; p. 72, "Nowhere is there any indication that such [homoerotic] passions or acts might be illegal or disapproved, until the time of Juvenal"; and p. 78 n. 84, "Homosexuality per se was not a subject of controversy"(1).
then, to say these preferences were Greek? Yet that is just what Ennius, Cicero, and later sources do say, or imply. Polybius, for one, speaking of Scipio’s coevals, says “some gave themselves up to love affairs with youths... having quickly adopted Greek laxity in this regard, during the war with Perseus.”

But further, there seems to be some confirmation of these statements suggested in three kinds of circumstantial evidence.

First, the vocabulary of homosexuality contains many Greek terms like paedicus, pathicus, catamus, and cinaedus, of which some had to be explained to contemporary readers as novelties. By analogy with familiar modern borrowings from one people by another, these terms should indicate some sort of indebtedness. They blend in to a slightly larger body of loan-words not always transliterated by Latin authors, used in the realms of cosmetics and coquetry. They suggest broad fashions of behavior. Around them lay a still larger matrix of terms for items of luxury: textiles, garments, dainties to eat. These Graecisms testify to a way of life imported as a package, and on occasion repudiated as such. They designate articles only to be sought from the east or practices (or practitioners) with which Romans at home were not at ease and which they therefore wished to refer to within a notional setting that did more naturally accept them. Therefore their Roman users left them untranslated. For the same reason, a generation ago, people aware of prejudices against drinking would offer a wee drap, archly; or, being uncomfortable about some extra-

5 Polyb. 31.25.3, εὐχήσεως and διανόησε. He goes on to show that he means only very rich circles. See also W. Kroll, RE s. v. “Knabenliebe” (1921) col. 905, “to the Romans, pederasty appeared a Greek custom”; and he cites Cic., Tusc. Dis. 5.58, the clearest passage, describing a young man surrounded by lovers more Graeciae; J. P. V. D. Baalsdon, Romans and Aliens (London 1979), p. 225, citing the same work, 4.70, mibi quidem in Graecorvm gymnasiis nata conuenetudo videtur, where also Ennius is cited, flagitu principium est nudare inter civis corpora; and less explicit, Sall., Cat. 11.55ff. with 13.3. Besides, would Plato have written, Symp. 182B, that pederasty was generally held in dishonor in “barbarian” lands, if the opposite had been true in Italy of the time? For later texts, see below, n. 37.


7 For words regarding coiffure and cosmetics, see O. Weise, Die griechischen Wörter im Latein (Leipzig 1882), pp. 187–192, and J. Griffin, JRS 66 (1976), p. 93 n. 94; also Hor., Sat. 1.2.94 (depygi); Lucr. 4.1160–69 (a string of euphemisms and arch paraphrases); Lucilius 17.2 (540–546 Marx), Greek untransliterated as also at 8.1 (303–4 Marx), where the obscenity is thus veiled; Plaut., Asinaria 627 (3.3.37), calamistratus; Mart. 1.875, dimasima; Augustus calling Maecenas μακάκα μοιχαράμ, Macrob. 2.4.12; and a standard good summary in L. R. Palmer, The Latin Language (London 1954), p. 82.

8 In Cato’s pages even the word elegans indicates censure, and he explode almost as violently against Pontian caviar as against catamites. Cf. Aul. Gell. 11.2.1 and Polyb. 31.25.5. Note also Scipio’s revulsion from dancing, cf. n. 24 below.
marital relationship, they referred to it as an *affaire, amour,* or *liaison.* The Scotch, as every Englishman knew, must be forgiven whisky — it was their national vice; the French, their adulteries; the Greeks — many things, all forbidden.

Second, during the period of the Republic the mentions of male homosexual connections that involve Romans also involve Greek-speaking regions in a significant proportion. Scandal touches Romans freshly returned from the east. Young Caesar in the court of the king of Bithynia comes to mind, the depraved youth corrupted by, or forcing his attentions on, his Oriental host.9 A few years later in Rome, in a conversation that Cicero imagines (*de natura deorum* 79), C. Aurelius Cotta is put on the defensive, though very gently and among his own acquaintances, in recalling to them his recent visit to Athens and his survey there of the ephebes at their exercises. “But hardly a single finely formed one could be found,” he says. “I see why you smile, but still, that was the case. And to us who, with the concurrence of the philosophers of old” — meaning, perhaps, Plato, Diogenes, and Zeno — “take our delight in youths, often their very defects are pleasing.” He goes on to quote Alceaus and then verses by Q. Catulus, who loved a youth *pulchrior . . . deo.* The points of reference for the scene and subject are all Greek. Later still, Cicero in his own voice, discrediting a hostile litigant, makes great play with the man’s origins in Pergamon and virtual kidnapping of a handsome young Temnian. “I know his type, his habits, his desires,” he says — all sinister and unmentionable, of course.10 When he himself was in Laodicea, and the young Hortensius turned up, that lad propositioned him, as we would say — offered him sexual relations, to his absolute astonishment. He could hardly be sure that the invitation to meet in Athens (where Hortensius was going to visit) “so that we might go home together,” meant what it seemed to mean.11 Very shocking.

But we must remember that Romans had been taking Greeks home with them for centuries by then, as slaves especially, and by the hundreds of thousands, so that Rome in Cicero’s day had turned into the largest Greek city in the world — at least tied with Alexandria for the honor, if by “Greek” we may mean “inhabited by people whose parents spoke Greek as their first language” (the definition is not an unreasonable one).12 Markets there offered

---

9 Suet., *Julius* 2, the story elsewhere also; or Plut., *Cimon* 1.2ff. of the 70s B.C.
10 *Pro Flacco* 21.51 and 29.70 (Pergamon).
11 *Att.* 6.3.9, the whole behavior *flagiitio et turpiter*, cf. 10.4.6, the lad is corrupted by nature.
12 As Glasgow was at one time the largest Irish city and at another time New York was the largest Jewish city, so Rome was Greek. My (quite unprovable) estimate draws on L. R. Taylor, *AJP* 82 (1961), pp. 113, 118, and 125; P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford 1972), 1 p. 91 and 2 p. 172 n. 358; and P. A. Brunt, *Italian Manpower* (Oxford 1971), p. 383. Dio 79.20.2 (A.D. 217) reports the Roman masses as still bilingual in the third century, with some confirmation in I. Kajanto, *Onomastic Studies* . . . (1963), pp. 57ff.: names on dated Roman epitaphs even after 313 (to A.D. 410) are ca. 30% Greek (earlier, ca. 45%, Tables 13–14).
the buyer whatever he might conceivably desire, for purchase openly or discreetly. Many a rich Roman household took advantage of the opportunity to assemble a very full equipment of articles and agents for whatever might increase the master's pleasures in life.

The same sort of rich owner was likely to spend a good part of the year in another of his houses in the Bay-of-Naples area. The stubbornly Greek character of cities there, above all of Naples itself, was well known, even to the drinking of Aeganean wines (Romans of Rome bought Italian or western). When Tiberius in his sixties and seventies retired to the area, hostile rumor surrounded the old man with schools of little boys like minnows ministering to his most exquisite lusts; and it was in the same area, naturally, that Nero later found it easiest to begin his own Graecizing publicly. To return, then, to the time of the Republic, we should hardly expect the unregenerate differentness of the richer Romans' resort-area to have been itself very Roman, in that earlier age, or that it should not have continued those lessons in the good life that Romans were also receiving in their capital from their staffs of servants.

In the third place, the Greek origin of "Greek love" among the Romans is suggested by its appearance disproportionately in Greek dress in early Roman literature - meaning Plautus above all, who often refers to it, and does so ordinarily in the dramatic setting of Athens. He could say a great deal about foreign places, in the style of the later Lettres Persanes and Rasselas, that he could never say of "real life." The audience laughed as much at the outrageousness of what they saw as at its intrinsic comicality. But there are other writers as well in whom homosexuality is prominent; and indeed a controversy is well known and of long standing over the question whether some Republican poets present homosexual preferences which are their own and their friends' or which enter their pages only through imitation of foreign literary models. The very existence of the debate, whichever side one takes in regard to whichever poet, points to the foreignness of homosexuality talked about and actually practiced, or merely talked about, in Rome. Had open love of male by male been as much at home in Rome as in Greece, one would not expect the expression of it to be sought in such derivative terms.

13 Livy 35.16.3; Tac., Ann. 15.33, and Griffin, pp. 92ff., excellent pages. On the wine-drinking, see C. Panella, Dial. di arch. 7 (1963), p. 344; and note the ratio of freed or slave to freeborn, in categories of Puteolan inscriptions: 16, 10, or 7 to 1, in J. P. D'Arms, JRS 64 (1974), p. 112 n. 7. On Tiberius in the Bay area, see Tac., Ann. 6.1, Suet., Tib. 43ff., Dio 58.22.1, and Balsdon, p. 227 (like other scholars, rightly dismissing the picture as fiction); on Nero, speaking Greek and applauded in the Greek manner, see Suet., Nero 20.2.


15 Plautine passages such as Asinaria 703, with others in Kroll, "Knabenliebe" cit. above at n. 5; Q. Lutatius Catulus in Aul. Gell. 19.9.14, see G. Williams, JRS 52 (1962), p. 40; the three veteres poetae, i. e. of the 2nd cent. B. C., in Aul. Gell. 19.9.10–14; and the controversy recently renewed by Griffin, pp. 87ff.
But once more (asking a second time what we only appear to have discussed): What can it mean to say these preferences are Greek? No one really supposes Roman men and boys had to read Greek sex manuals or receive coaching in the approved Spartan or Athenian positions. I think rather that sources mean little more than to point to a different attitude toward homosexuality, just as one might say today that public displays of grief are foreign (and we whose native language is English would not have to be taught to weep at the graves of our loved ones; only we pride ourselves on suppressing certain feelings).

What that Greek attitude was, is well known, and recently surveyed by Kenneth Dover. For its continuation into the period of my discussion, it is enough to recall Plutarch’s account of a conversation in which his father took part, about the same time that Persius was being attacked by his puritanical countryman. Plutarch’s scene gives us the full range of strong, even violent feelings for and against male homosexuality;[16] the same can be found again in the Pseudo-Lucianic (?third-century) dialogues on the same subject;[17] and both sources recall and extend the traditions of Plato’s Symposium. What is evident in them, however, and marks them as belonging to a civilization different from Rome’s, is the open, unashamed quality of the debate.

In contrast, our own sources assume that Romans in mid-Republican days would have thought it a disgrace to the community and an outrage on nature for an older man to press himself undesired on a younger man, even a slave.[18] It was almost as bad to solicit intercourse without violence; and offering it freely was beyond the pale, too.[19] In the second century, we have reference to a youth defamed as promiscuous;[20] we have another Roman, evidently acquainted with what the Greeks had to say in defense of Greek love, who still condemned at least its open practice. That was Cato, complicated and

---

[16] Plut., Moral. (Amatorius) 751B, παρὰ φύσιν contrasted with ἔρως τῆς φύσεως; 751D, anal copulation is νόμω τεταράδος, παρὰ φύσιν, and ungraceful; it merely “pretends friendship…” (752A, Loeb trans.); or contrariwise, it is pronounced rather the best form of love (750C-E); Pisias’ rejoinder, 752B.

[17] Amores 21, the debate ending at § 52.

[18] Livy 8.28 (326 B.C.), Val. Max. 6.1.9 adding that the senate defended Romans’ pudicitia with a law and a jail sentence; similar and early, Dion. Hal. 16.4 (292/290 B.C.), an attempted seduction, then force attempted by an officer on a young contubernalis. The δίκαιος is seen as κοινον Δίκαιος τῆς πόλεως and the ἔρως offered παρὰ φύσιν is punished with death.

[19] Val. Max. 6.1.7 (later 3rd cent. B.C.), quod filium suum de stupro appellasset; also in Plut., Marcellus 2.3ff. Kroll (loc. cit. above, n. 5) defends the historicity of the tale. Its usefulness for my purposes is not tied to the true date or purport of the Lex. The same solicitation earlier (312 or 292/290 B.C.) is described in the same words and meets equally sharp condemnation: universae plebis sententia crimine impudicitiae damnatus, Val. Max. 6.1.11.

[20] Famosa, in a woman’s role, in ca. 170 B.C., see Cic., De orat. 2.277.
interesting man of his times. And from Scipio the Younger we have already heard (above, p. 484). In a speech of 124 B.C., Gaius Gracchus prides himself that there had been “no very lovely boys standing about in his quaestor’s headquarters” and that “your sons [that is, young Romans of all sorts] were treated with more decorum than in a general’s tent... If any prostitute entered my home or anyone else’s slave-boy was sought on my behalf, consider me the lowest and vilest of mankind.”

The story does not quite confute Balsdon: “it is hard to believe that there was not a great deal of homosexuality in the army;” but it certainly indicates what values were acceptable.

Arriving now on the edge of the last century of the era, and reviewing the various glimpses we have had of earlier scenes, we seem to see isolated but less and less uncommon instances of men of the officer-class and aristocracy being detected in or suspected of homosexual desires; and, while these desires are ordinarily vented on slaves, even so, if they are not to draw criticism, they must be kept private. Which leaves everyone else in this society opposed to homosexual practices of any sort. Had that not been the case, of course, critics would have had no audience to appeal to in their highly-colored attacks on homosexuality, using such words as “filthy”, “vile”, “vice”, “incontinence”, and so forth.

Across a full thirty years of partisan oratory, Cicero offered his listeners or readers many illustrations of these perceptions: enemies like Piso, that “beast”, “filth”, “the vilest of men”, or Gabinius “who could not fend off the foulishness of men from the most sacred parts of his body,” or “the public prostitute” Clodius, not to mention Verres, Catiline, and Antony – Antony above all – were bound to be addicts of homosexuality. It would be

21 His saying that “the soul of the man who loves dwells in the soul of the man beloved” is a thought I cannot suppose arose in Cato’s mind spontaneously (Plut., Moral. 759C; slightly differently in Cato Maior 9.5). It is pure Greek, cf. e.g. Plato, Symp. 183E. He is also recorded protesting against buying boy-slaves, Polyb. 31.25.5 – only on account of the extravagance? So A. E. Astin, Cato the Censor (Oxford 1978), p. 173 n. 46, Veyne, p. 50, and Boswell, p. 72. But why then should his lieutenant commit suicide when discovered buying (on the battlefield, surely for pennies) three boy captives, παιδεῖα (Plut., Cato Maior 10.5)? And why should Cato often reprobat L. Cornelius Scipio for (the mere possession of) a hired catamite, Livy 39.42.9? The same boy induced from his lover an act of barbarous cruelty (ibid. and Plut., Flamininus 18.3ff.), which many persons besides Cato reprobat.

22 Aul. Gell. 15.12.2ff. = ORF 1.181; see also Plut., C. Gracchus 4.4, he pours contempt on a man διαβεβλημένος for μαλακία, explained as intercourse with men; and capital punishment awaiting the young soldier who prostituted himself, Polyb. 6.37.9.

23 Balsdon, p. 226, citing also Plut., Marius 14.3ff., the story of the young Marius also in Val. Max. 6.1.12 and Cic., Pro Milone 4.9. Notice also Cic., Phil. 3.31, and Tac., Hist. 3.33, pillaging troops carry off both girls and boys; and [Caes.], Bell. Hisp. 33, an officer with contaminatus on campaign.

24 In Pisonem 1.1, belus; 6.13, caemum; and 29.72, homo turpissimus, etc., consort of illa salatrix tonsa, Gabinius 8.18, cf. 36.89, tuis teneris saluatoribus, consorting with certain formosi
extraordinary if so seasoned and successful a combatant as Cicero in the courts and senate should have routinely appealed to prejudices that simply did not exist; but, beyond common sense, there is some refutation of that possibility in Suetonius, biography of Caesar (§49), where we are told that “except for [Caesar’s] lying with Nicomedes [the king of Bithynia], nothing hurt his repute for chastity – but that was a heavy and lasting reproach and exposed him to insult from everybody.” It seems safe to conclude that “the man in the street,” or at least the man in the forum and law courts who constituted the ordinary audience for political statements, could be assumed to be the foe of male homosexuality.

The last great release, or whipping up, of popular feelings about sexual conduct occurred during young Octavian’s rise. Even his friends conceded his many acts of adultery, which offered a handle to attack by Antony in a more or less public and certainly very well publicized letter to him.25

But attack turned also to more tender areas. As Cicero says (this time defending a client), lovely lads must just expect some slander; and Octavian was a natural target by age, looks, and range of serious enemies. So for a while he was accused of submitting to his uncle, and of being the passive partner to other males too.26 Such reports commonly punctuated those most ungentlemanly shouting-matches in which Roman competitors for office or for revenge engaged, partly because so much might be at stake, partly because explicit abuse of every kind was thought to be quite tolerable. That fact should not dull our ears. *Maledicta* that Octavian endured were not mere slights or insults. The word meant “foul abuse”, and if you could think of nothing worse to call your enemy, surely it follows that whatever you did include in your *maledicta* were acts correspondingly abhorrent to your audience.

Evidently least so was the sexually active role with a boy-slave (slaves as instruments of pleasure being seen almost as non-beings, whether male or female); the same role with a free-born boy was in the second degree generally

*fratres; Post reditum in sen. 5.11 (quoted, on Gabinius); De domo sua 19.49 and Pro Milone 55, on Clodius; Plut., Cic. 7.5, on Verres’ son; Cic., Cat. 1.4.7, 2.2.4, 2.4.8, and 4.6.12; and, on Antony’s homosexuality, many passages, e. g. *Phil.* 2.77 and 2.18.44ff. Even the wretched Rullus is pictured *cum suis formosis finitoribus* or succumbing to an *adulescens bene capillis*, *Leg. agr. 2.53* and 59. Lost verses by Gallus evidently presented Cicero himself as the lover of Tiro (*Plin., Ep.* 7.4.3 and 6) – possible, but see A. N. Sherwin-White, (Oxford 1966) ad loc.


disapproved; in the third degree, the same role with a grown male, slave or free; in a passive role, as a youth, to an older freeborn man, fourth; for gain, or to a social inferior, fifth and sixth; and even lower, other homosexual acts besides anal copulation. While there is no dispute about the prevalent condemnation of acts at the bad end of the scale, it has been fairly asked whether anyone objected to homosexual pleasure in itself, at the higher end of the scale. The answer is clearly Yes. The man who accepted or requested, even without coercion, submission to his sexual wishes was vulnerable to heavy reproach: Gaius Gracchus, if he had used slave-boys; Piso and Clodius with their hired catamites; Catiline’s followers, corruptor and corrupted equally abhorrent; Cicero’s adversary in court, above; and so to the poor prince Gaius whom the senate was willing to condemn to death for no other crime than his love-affairs with youths. In many other scenes, for instance, of Tiberius’ orgies (n. 13), someone who is plainly (but perhaps not in so many words) held up for detestation is ministered to by boy-slaves.

It is true that the opinion expected of contemporaries, whether witnesses or readers of accounts, is not specified by ancient authors. But why should it be? Authors then or today need not designate murder, incest, or cannibalism as reprehensible. In consequence, many hints or scenes of homosexual activity in our sources are presented to us without being clearly characterized, indeed in deliberately vague language, from which it is possible though in my view quite perverse to argue that the subject was held to be ethically neutral. I would rather infer that the subject was very gingerly addressed because it was a hot one, arousing strong feelings of condemnation, shame, and embarrassment—arousing also fierce storms of scholarly debate that toss about the euphemisms, the intentional obscurities and double-entendres of the Latin or the Greek.

That it seemed no exaggeration to assign homosexual acts to the company of murder, incest, or cannibalism, can be shown not only from Aristotle’s doing exactly that (Nic. Ethics 7.5.7) but from a further consideration: the middle range or degree of disapproval, discussed just above, was taken very seriously

27 I offer here a mechanically schematized ranking drawn from a good deal of modern discussion, perhaps most clearly worked out by K. Dover, Greek Homosexuality (Cambridge 1978), chap. II. The ultimate in shame was irrumatio, that is, compelled fellatio, cf. e.g. Suet., Nero 35.4, or Catullus 16, and discussion, e.g. by A. Richlin, CP 76 (1981), p. 42, or by Jocelyn, art. cit. (above, n. 6), pp. 19ff.; but to be a fellator was very low also, clearly in an aggrieved soldier’s gibe at Scipio, Lucilius 398ff. Marx, or in Cicero’s description of Gabinius, above at n. 24, and later in Mart. 3.82.33 and Dio 62.13.4 and 64.5.2.

28 See above, nn. 22, 24, and 11; Cic., Cat. 2.7 and 22ff.; and Tac., Ann. 5.3ff., amores iuvenum. Passages at nn. 1–2 and elsewhere, above, or Aul. Gell. 9.10.1, res operienda; Athen. 11.506C, “what [Plato] said about Alcibiades in the Symposium ought not to be brought up in any discussion”; Quint. 1.3.17, pudet dicere the probrā he is discussing; and the result, perplexity among the learned today, in certain of whose pages the authors are reduced to “silliness”, as Jocelyn has the courage to say, AJP 101 (1980), p. 424.
indeed. Rather than undergo anal copulation unwillingly, even an ex-slave would die — still more, a free man;\textsuperscript{30} or he might properly kill the person attempting force.\textsuperscript{31} Where life itself was thus outweighed by fear of disgrace, that disgrace can only have reflected very strong condemnation at the bar of public opinion. It seems reasonable to attribute much strength, a little less or a little more, to the adjacent degrees of disapproval as well.

What of a last consideration? Homoeroticism that excluded physical acts, especially if it arose between social equals,\textsuperscript{32} may have been quite all right; disapproval may have been saved for loveless acts. A possibility. But, first, no Roman (as opposed to lots of Greeks) makes the distinction now or later. In the second place, there are no declarations of homosexual love on stone (now or later, as opposed to lots that are heterosexual). Tibullus and Catullus could speak more freely because they could better define their audience. It has been called a “coterie dependent on the intimate acquaintance of individuals and [their poetry is] primarily addressed to them rather than to the world at large.”\textsuperscript{33} And in the third place, total silence about any pair of lovers in some casual episode, case at law, oration, essay, letter, or history of any period (as opposed to what is easily found in Greek literature) is not easily explained save by assuming that such love was given no chance to emerge before the public eye.

Such were the degrees and focus of disapproval during the Republic. What underlay that disapproval was loyalty to an entire cultural inheritance, explaining the not always rational rejection of Greek clothes as well,\textsuperscript{34} which by Varro’s day had also supplied a name for Plautus’ plays, palliatae; the rejection of dancing (above, p. 484); also of caviar (n. 8). Greek gourmandizing was bad, not only in itself — it wasted money, and heavy drinking and vomiting were not pretty — but it also led on naturally to sexual promiscuity. The connection was a cliché, in scenes featuring “men who bathe in hot water, eat prepared delicacies, drink unmixed wine, anoint themselves with myrrh, lie on soft couches and sleep with boys for bedfellows — boys past their prime at

\textsuperscript{30} Examples from the Empire: Dio 64.10.1 (Sporus), Quint. 4.2.69, and Tac., Ann. 13.17 (the death of Britannicus, stupro pollutus, was “none too soon, nor cruel”); earlier, above, n. 23, and most generally in Dig. 4.2.8.2 (Paulus), sexual defilement, ne stuprum patiatur, “good men must fear more than death.”

\textsuperscript{31} Above, n. 23; Dig. 48.8.1.4 (Hadrian).

\textsuperscript{32} Worse, if it demeans the well-born, see e.g. Cic., Att. 1.16.5 and Pro Rab. Post. 10.26; Dio 58.22.1; and Tac., Ann. 13.25.

\textsuperscript{33} G. Williams, Figures of Thought in Roman Poetry (New Haven 1980), p. 216.

\textsuperscript{34} Cicero on cloaks and sandals, Pro Rab. Post. 10.26 and Phil. 2.76; Vergil deriding tunics, Aul. Gell. 6.26.6 on Aen. 9.616ff.; Augustus rebuking men who wear laetacemae, Suet., Aug. 40.5; Tac., Ann. 14.21, and Suet., Nero 25.1, an emperor in the capital wearing a chlamys, horridus! — and again, Domit. 4.4.
that.” There was even some feeling against Romans speaking Greek, or at least against citizens not being at home in Latin; and as late as the mid-first century A.D. thoughtful Romans could reflect on “ancestral customs radically subverted by imported indulgences,” dissolving into gymnasia et otia et turpes amores. “Imported” of course meant “from Greece,” and the connection between gymnasia and vile love affairs of course pointed to male homosexuality—ever at that late date, not truly Roman.

But disapproval singled out homosexuality as alien not only to inherited culture, but to an order above nations: to nature itself. So people would strike out at a man who “dressed and acted to the foids of his costume with great elegance, great care and art; and because his hands during his speech were too much in motion and waving about, he was tossed upon the, reproachful and libelous talk.” They would ridicule the man who stood out by reason of his “dress, his walk, his woman’s jewelry.” A man should instead look and talk like other men! As to the man that “took a woman’s part” (or the like phrase) in sexual intercourse, he was seen as an even harsher violation of nature—παρδά φίον, a freak for public display, monstruous. Accordingly, Roman parents wished their boys untouched by the love of older males and took precautions

35 Dio 62.6.4 (Loeb trans.), the more interesting because it is a description of Romans put into the mouth of a British queen. Compare a fuller scene in Philo, De vita contemplatione 50-53, or Mart. 3.82.8ff., and other passages in L. Malten, Hermes 53 (1918), pp. 165ff., esp. Cic., De fin. 2.53.

36 Dio 57.15.2, the word emblema outlawed; 60.17.4, Claudius and citizenship.


38 Aul. Gell. 1.5.3, ridicule in a court scene in 62 B.C.; Tac., Hist. 1.30, ridicule aimed at Otho, implying he had risen in the world by serving as a catamite, cf. also Ann. 4.1 (Sejanus); and Musonius Rufus, Discourses 21 p. 128 Lutz, men γυναικοδος in various respects. Kroll, Kultur cit., p. 58, cites other evidence that “it was thought, too, that cinesid betrayed themselves by their feminine walk” (not to mention many reff. to excessive jewelry, perfume, etc.). Boswell, pp. 24, 67, and 339-341, still insists that “homosexuality was not associated with effeminacy.”

39 The phrase παρδά φίον in Plut. and Dion Hal., above, nn. 16 and 18; but see also Muson. Ruf., Discourses 12 p. 86 Lutz; Plut., Moral. 990D and F and 991A; Dio Chrysos, Or. 7.135 (heterosexual union is παρδά φίον — cf. Max. Tyr., n. 51 below) and 7.149; Epict. 3.1.25, the man who wants to be a woman is to be advertised to the public for a show; Suet., Caligula 16.1 (spinaeae monstrarum libidinum); Mart. 9.7(8).6, boy prostitutes are monstrae; Juv. 2.121ff., a priest is needed to exorcize homosexual nuptials, monstra, which may be compared to “a woman giving birth to a calf, or an ox to a lamb;” and female homoeroticism in Ov., Met. 9.727 and 736, prodiipsae and monstrae. Veyne, op. cit. pp. 52 and 62 n. 6, denies the whole notion of “l’amour contre-nature” in antiquity; still more emphatically, Boswell, pp. 11-16, 21 n. 40 (having to translate ἄρανος “unseemly”, though it is applied to things like cannibalism!), 109-113 and elsewhere denying any perception of homosexuality as unnatural. He does not mention the probative words in the very lines he has cited for other purposes, e.g. pp. 58 (Plut.), 63 (Dion. Hal.), 66 and 82 (Juv.), 67 (Mart.), 77 (Epict.), and 152 (Ovid).
accordingly. 40 They also supported laws that protected boys against seduction and rape; and they protected decent citizens (as they would have called themselves) against finding a known homosexual sitting next to them in public gatherings. 41 This last measure we find in Caesar’s model charter. It was meant for the use of Italian townships generally and must have responded to their preferences, thus affording us an almost unique glimpse of values outside of Rome. Its significance is confirmed and extended by the rule of law (Dig. 3.1.5) forbidding men who had “used their bodies in woman’s fashion” to act as advocates in Roman courts, anywhere.

But inside the capital in the same period and on to the early second century, we have the series of Catullus, Tibullus, Persius, Martial, and Juvenal all referring openly to homosexual relations, sometimes relations that involved themselves, sometimes other named persons including the emperor Domitian. We have rife and open homosexuality in the Satyricon. Beyond doubt, then, in ways and on a scale familiar to everyone acquainted with Latin literature, the choicest circles of writers and readers shared a perfect tolerance of homoeroticism and themselves seem fully to have enjoyed relations with both sexes.

In court circles we have Sejanus playing favorite to a nobleman, we have Claudius’ son-in-law dying while in bed with a boy favorite, Vespasian’s right-hand man notorious for unchastity and his own son likewise. 42 But that is just a sampling. And we have an almost unbroken series of emperors bisexual in their preferences, including the egregious Nero who actually went through the full marriage ceremony with his favorite Sporus (surgically tinkered with to fit him for his duties).

40 Nepos, Praef. 4ff., is typical (compare various passages above) in contrasting Roman and Greek views on the desirability of a boy having amatores (which are among things infamia, humilia, and ab honestate remotia); cf. Hor., Sat. 1.6.81ff., guarded against both obprobrium and turpe at school; Quint. 1.2.2 and 4 and 1.3.17; and Plin., Ep. 3.3.4.

41 The purport of the Lex Scantinia not clear in Cic., Ad fam. 8.12.3; Juv. 2.43ff.; and Suet., Domit. 8. For penalties inflicted on sufragatores through private suits, see Quint. 4.2.69 and 7.4.41ff.; Dig. 47.10.9.4 (Ulpian); 47.11.1.2 (Paul); 48.5.6pr. (Papinian); 48.6.3.4 (Marcian); Paulli Sent. 2.27.12, against rape, and § 13, heavy fines for voluntary participation; compare Tab. Herac. lines 122–3, qui corpora quaestum fecit fecerit, with 134 and 138ff., forbidding such men (evidently not slaves) even to sit in public side by side with town leaders; further, Kroll, Kultur, p. 57; and entirely obscure reff. to a νόμος (or an act παράνομος) in Muson. loc. cit. and Sext. Emp., Pyrr. hyp. 1.152. Mart. 9.5(6), and 9.7(8) show Domitian issuing decrees against prostituting boys below a fixed age, and against castration (which Hadrian legislated against also). Boswell, p. 69, taking Cic., Pro Plancio 12.30, to mean homosexuality “is not a crime,” mis-translates “is no (mere) reproach, crimen, but a maledictum”; so the text reveals nothing about legality (though indeed something about current attitudes). For a sound view on the actual effect of such laws, see Griffin, art. cit. p. 100.

42 Dio 57.19.5 (Sejanus); Suet., Claud. 29.2 (Gn. Pompeius); idem, Vesp. 13 (Licinius Mucianus, evidently pathicus); Domit. 1.1 (D. as a boy promises a nobleman a night); and other figures like Val. Aelianus, Tac., Ann. 11.2.2, and L. Pedanius Secundus, praef. urbi A.D. 61, with a vast household, ibid. 14.42.
But we should recall our proper point of focus: attitudes toward homosexuality. Evaluation of them may allow us to gain some feel for Roman society as a whole, in order to explain Nero, rather than the other way around. For it is plain that, just as society could not tolerate on the throne a matricide nor an idol of the stage, so it could not bear the spouse of Sporus, and threw him off. 43 Far from representing what could be accepted, he represents what could not be. Similarly with the Satyricon and other works of literature: we cannot take them as representative — we cannot know what they represented — until we have gained some sense of their whole setting.

That sense may be gained from a passage in Seneca (Ep. 123.7ff.) in which he warns of the dangers of trying to keep up with other people. “Everyone,” he grants, has chrysal goblets; “everyone” has other luxuries. “Everyone’s retinue of slaves is carried along, their faces made up to keep their delicate skins from harm by sun or cold. It is something to be ashamed of if there is a slave in your following of boys whose healthy complexion needs no cosmetics” — else the more stylish folk around you may say in disbelief, “‘Have you no girl-favorite, no boy to rouse her envy?’ . . . These are the voices of ‘everyone’ that you must flee. These are the men who pass vice around and communicate it from one place to another.”

We have Epictetus, too. He is accustomed to address an audience of all ages but generally of the aristocracy; and he reminds them that it is up to them whether they aim at popularity and the reputation of a good companion, or whether they respect themselves (4.2.7–10). One can go clear to the extreme, he says, joining the ballet-boys and adulterers and cheering the burlesquedancers, or instead one can decently enjoy oneself — with both sexes. 44

Finally, Quintilian saying (Inst. 1.2.8) that we corrupt our own children ourselves when they see “our girls, our boys,” nostras amicas, nostros concubinos.

From these three commentators we gain a clear sense of various pressures to conform, and counter-pressures which obliged people to conceal a part of themselves from many of their acquaintance, even from their own children.

43 Dio 63.22.4, for Nero’s relationship with Sporus seen as a cause for revolution. The general reception of Nero’s acts is evident across the record of his reign; but, as a sampling, notice Tac., Ann. 13.25, foeda domi lascivia, with men as well as women; 15.37.8ff., he marries unus ex illo contaminatorum grege; and Suet., Nero 29.1, “after defiling almost every part of his body, he went so far in violating his own chastity as to devise a new game,” a second homosexual ‘marriage’; Boswell’s views (pp. 69 and 82ff.) on this and similar unions seem to me very strange.

44 I count in Epictetus 18 passages listing an entirely heterosexual society (1.6.8; 1.11.1–3; 1.11.17; 1.16.9–14; 2.8.15; 2.20.27; 2.20.37; 2.22.11; 2.22.32; 2.23.38; 3.2.8; 3.5.19; 3.12.12; 3.25.6; 4.1.22; 4.9.3; 4.9.5; and 4.9.6); nine passages listing a bisexual society (2.1.28; 2.10.17; 2.16.29; 2.18.15; 3.12.12f.; 3.3.14; 3.7.21; 4.1.15; and 4.1.35–6). He sees the boy participants as slaves (that is morally neutral, evidently) or χίναυδοι (who pay a heavy price, themselves — 2.10.17). Even a freed boy-slave who “earns a living by his body suffers terrible things,” 4.1.35.
Their children must be brought up in other beliefs. Interesting glimpses: “value dissonance,” in scientific parlance. We see quite plainly where the conflicts begin, in an upper class some of whose members made manifest a high degree of tolerance for homosexual relationships with slaves. Leaders in tolerance were men of fantastic wealth. Pedanius (n. 42), for example, had a household of four hundred, and Nero— who knows how many thousands? Among such masters it was en vogue to live à la Grecque; and to that civilization entire some gave themselves with taste and abandonment (like Mæcenas), some with abandonment only, some with misgivings that required the ministrations of a Stoic chaplain (Greek, perhaps, and a slave—one could buy even one’s conscience in Rome). He might, like Epictetus (2.10.17), let slip the opinion that the homosexual lover as well as the beloved was no man; he might (like Juvenal 2.82–126) warn against circles within circles “yet more foul”, to which aspirants in debauch might be gradually admitted. There always remained, however, even in these elevated social strata (themselves, we should remember, not amounting to a fiftieth part of the city’s whole society), a majority of the “old view”, as we may call it: dead set against the passive role for any freeborn male, repelled by the parade of instruments for the active lover, and, at the least, upset by the sight of caresses bestowed by an older man on a younger.45

That the changes we see at work within the Roman upper class need not have touched all circles equally is easily believed, if we may trust analogy. For illustration: on May 15, 1776, two men could be seen standing together in a London house, guests toward the end of a dinner party. One “held a candle to show a fine print of a beautiful female figure which hung in the room, and pointed out the elegant contour of the bosom with the finger of an arch connoisseur.” It is the notorious profligate John Wilkes instructing the adamant moralist Samuel Johnson, while James Boswell looks on delighted. No more than a scene, proving nothing—but every large city in every decade presents such pairs of men of more or less the same class, means, and pursuits or professions, even sharing many of the same haunts and friends and tastes, who yet live out lives utterly incompatible in certain keenly felt respects. That was what made the London scene so exquisitely piquant to Boswell; that was what enabled old-Roman and new-Greek to rub elbows in the forum and the senate, hardly sensing how different they were until reminded by some

45 Censure of the pathicus is clear in, e.g. Tac., Ann. 11.2.2, and Suet., Vitellius 3.2; 4.1; and censure of flaunted expense on boy-slaves, in Sen., loc. cit.; of caresses in public, Acta Alexandrinorum p. 25 Musurillo, where a speech apparently in a court at Rome under Trajan blackens the accused (that is, takes for granted that the court will more readily find against the accused) for fondling an adolescent at semi-public banquets. See, for the setting, H. A. Musurillo, The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs (Oxford 1954), pp. 152ff. Boswell, p. 30, quite misreads the text, partly through mistaking the nature of the document, which he knows only as POxy. 471.
accident—by entering a new circle, perhaps, like some of Epictetus' or Juvenal's listeners, or by catching a glimpse of their neighbors' children in the latest finishing school, like Scipio.

There are of course also the grand divisions between rich and poor that affect sexual values. Kenneth Dover rightly notes that "the reader who turns from Plato to comedy is struck...by its [homosexuality's] displacement from the centre to the periphery of Athenian sexual life; for comedy is fundamentally heterosexual." The explanation he finds in the way of life natural, indeed inevitable, among the less well-to-do, to whom comedy spoke. Homosexuality was for the rich. Differences in sexual customs according to wealth existed also in the city and period we are considering. "You rich," a not-rich litigant is imagined saying in a Roman court, "don't marry, you only have those toys of yours, those boy-slaves that play woman for you." The rest of us, the litigant continues, get married and raise a family. Some of the circumstances that Dover uses to interpret the Athenian scene—a less cloistered day for girls and women and less money and leisure for pursuit of boys, among ordinary folk than could be found among the very wealthy—explain the Roman lawyer's statement just quoted. It would have been still more easily illustrated in the little-Hellenized sections of Italy and the west.

We cannot penetrate further into the customs of the ordinary nine-tenths or more of the population. There is no evidence whatsoever that I am aware of. I discount all sorts of crowd reactions to the likes of Sporus or Nero since our descriptions do not indicate exactly what is condemned and for what reason. I also discount the graffiti of Pompeii, in which too much has been read. Among them, intercourse of male with male and cumnilinctus are mentioned with about equal frequency, fellatio as often as heterosexual intercourse. From these statistics I do not conclude that the common man in Pompeii most enjoyed the least attested (and, in other sources, the most sharply rejected) forms of sexual indulgence. Rather, I suppose that the graffiti, like their equivalent today, were inscribed for the pleasure they gave to the inscriber: the pleasure of speaking the unspeakable, of violating all the rules of decent (and irksome) society. I

44 Dover, p. 148, with further discussion, pp. 61 and 149ff. Boswell, p. 49, misreads one of the more significant texts, Ar., Clouds 1075–82, through supposing that it is the playwright that speaks rather than "the immoralist Wrong" (Dover's phrase), and through not noticing the change in subject of the speech, from "pleasures" (including boys) to ἡγάζειν, "harsh necessities" (not "needs" in the sense of "desires").

45 Ps. Quint., Decl. 337 p. 329 Ritter: ills ministeria, ills imitas feminas pueri. Der Kleine Pauly s. v. Quinillian hesitantly suggests a date in the time of Quintilian himself.

46 See the index to CIL 4 s. v. pedico (4.2210, etc.) in 17 inscriptions, (cumni-)lingit in 14, fello (fellare) in 40, futo in 40 (and 7 times showing sex of partner, female, hence always heterosexual, one may assume). Without going into details, Boswell, p. 57, sees in the graffiti proof of homosexuality being very common. For suggestive parallels, see the tesserae lusoriae in C. Huelsen, RM 11 (1918), pp. 227–37, esp. the lists. pp. 233ff.
would compare the ivory game-pieces found in Pompeii, Rome, and other
cities. They have any one of a dozen or so words written on them: *cinaedus,*
*ebriose,* *moice,* *inpudes.* The most popular are "bird" (*pernex,* "avaricious"
(*arpax,* "idiot" (*fatue,* "drunk" (*ebriose* and *vinose,* "catamite" (*patice,*
"greedy" (*gumia* and *gulo.* No one would look among them for a true profile
of human types prevailing in the world. It was release and titillation that
decided what people *wrote* on both these game-pieces and Pompeian walls.
About what they *did,* this evidence tells us nothing.

In Hadrian's commemoration of the drowned Antinous by the founding of
a new city in the youth's honor, we approach the end of the history of Roman
homosexuality.49 His two successors by their own example turned their faces
against it. At the very summit of fashion, fashion thus changed. Still later
homo- or bi-sexual emperors did little to enhance its repute. The worst in the
series, Elagabalus, was the most fantastically addicted, whereas a good
emperor would consider legislation against it, or actually ban male prostitu-
tion. It continued illegally. Of relevant Latin literature nothing has remained
since Hadrian's day save the third-century Nemesisian, chirping in his fourth
*Bucolic,* "O cruel boy!" (etc., etc.).

As a sort of epilogue, however, we should glance at 'Greek love' among the
Greeks of the empire. We can only consider the aristocracy of eastern cities;
but in them, youths who had many men hanging about them or who rejected
brutal advances were equally honored.50 Greek love poems like the hundreds

49 Dio 69.11 and SHA *Had.* 14.5ff. are almost the only sources. Both hesitate about any
homosexual connection between Hadrian and Antinous; but the modern consensus assumes it, no
doubt rightly. For the next two emperors, see M. Aurel., *Medit.* 1.16.3 (Ant. Pius, see also Pius' *pudicitia* praised by Fronto, *Fer. Alis.* 3.5, Loeb ed. 2 p. 8), 1.17.2, and 3.16; on Commodus, Dio
74.5.4 and SHA *Commod.* 10.1 and 8ff. and 19.2 (*imperior Nerone*); similar discredit, διαβολή,
for Plautianus' various abhorred practices of bed and board, Dio 76.15.7; on male prostitution
banned in the 240s (but not heterosexual), see A. Chastagnol, *Bonner-Historia-Augusta-

50 In speaking of "Epictetus' world," Veyne, p. 50, includes the evidence of *PTeb.* 104; but the
text dates to 92 B.C., not A. D. Moreover, in specifying that the husband shall not introduce μηδὲ
παλαιὰς μηδὲ παιδικὰς*, the marriage contract may reflect special customs of the parties, both
"Persians of the Succession" (the term mysterious to the editors of other documents; see Fraser,
pp. 58ff.); and further, one should not assume prevailing bisexuality from the clause, any more
than trisexuality in the cult regulations against intercourse with women, dogs, or donkeys, seen in
the prohibition against pederasty as διαβολὴ in Lucian, *Alex.* 41. As to seeing in Plut., *Moral.*
99Dff., proof that all classes shared the same practices (Boswell, p. 58), Plutarch actually
contrasts the "no-accounts" only with figures of myth, the scene not being on the human level at
all. For youths being sought after, see Dio Chrysos., *Or.* 36.8; defending their sexual honor or
choice, Philost., *Vita Apollon.* 7.42; hostility to prostitution of boys or to seduction or pursuit of
them if they are "honorable", Lucian, *Alex.* 5 and 41, and Dio Chrysos., *Or.* 7.135, 139, and
149-151; respect for boys' repute and protecting them against διαβολή, Menander Rhetor p. 132
Russell-Wilson.
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by Strato, Hadrian's contemporary, went on being composed by males to males just as they had been in Hellenistic times. Greek novels continued to be written and to include heroes alternately in love with lovely men and lovely women.\(^{31}\) On the other hand (since as we have seen both extremes of view were openly, violently expressed), the Stoic teaching of Zeno that had once recommended sexual relations with boys on equal terms with the heterosexual was, by Sextus Empiricus (Pyrr. hyp. 3.245), dismissed as having nothing to do with real choices in the real world, no more than intercourse with one's mother. In the same decade or so as this author, Tatian, a Christian, declared with venomous humor that "pederasty . . . among the Romans merits special rights of pasturage, and they try to collect herds of boys like grazing horses." But he here uses against his preferred target, the Romans, a gibe originally aimed at Greeks and applied by his teacher to male prostitution in the empire everywhere.\(^{32}\) His statement thus fits quite easily with those non-Christian passages known from Seneca or the accounts of Elagabalus, or from another Greek observer, Herodian (1.17.3). Herodian refers to the fashion among rich Roman fops or voluptuaries of having naked little boys idling about the rooms of their houses.

A century later, we gain a last look at the Greek world and its attitudes, afforded by a small handful of writers. Responding to the distress of the leading families in Antioch at the loss of their sons to a monastic life — "To whom, you ask, should you leave your fields, houses, slaves, and gold?" — John Chrysostom dilates on the rewards of that choice. One reward is the removal of the youths from homosexual temptation. It is, he says, "a hideous

---

\(^{31}\) A. J. Festugière, Antioche païenne et chrétienne (Paris 1959), pp. 197–8, cites Xen. Ephes. and Achilles Tatius (and in addition only the Amores and Hor., Serm. 2.3.325) to support the view that "in the literature of the empire the two species of love are seen exactly on a level, one taken to be fully as normal as the other." Among Greek writers of the second century, no doubt more could be found, e. g. Ael. Arist., Or. 45 p. 146 Dindorf, pederasty casually mentioned on a par with heterosexuality, but cf. 33.20 p. 232 Keil (paired with various tasteless indulgences); and Max. Tyr., Dist. 24(8).2, 25(9).4ff., and 26(10).9, says very roundly, no physical contact between males, "change your pleasures to nature's," ἔξι τὴν φύσιν.

\(^{32}\) Tat., Ad Graecos 28ff., παύεσθαι . . . προομητής . . . ἑξήστασι, drawing on Just., 1 Apol. 27 (PG 6.369B); and behind this lies Aristides in his Apol. 13 p. 109 Harris-Robinson, specifying "Greeks". Justin addresses alternately the emperor, e. g. here and at § 12; inhabitants of Rome (§ 26); and people of the Hellenic tradition (§ 21–22). Boswell, p. 68, seems not to know where the gibe originated and to mis-read the Greek, thinking it shows "pederasty was held in preeminent esteem by the Romans." He also asserts, ibid., of another Christian source, "Minucius Felix says that homosexual relations were 'the Roman religion' (Octavius 28)," but I find no such statement in that author, nor does Minucius make mention of "ceremonial fellatio" (Boswell, p. 131). He does reject as lies the accusation against Christians of phallic worship accorded to priests (§ 28.9) and accuses pagans of fellatio — which of course he sees (§ 28.10) as thoroughly repulsive.
disease,” so ripe that “the female sex may even prove superfluous”(!). His contemporary, Gregory of Nyssa, paints and condemns a trite scene of the very rich with their varied attendants, “dancers, . . . boys like girls with long hair, and licentious girls.” On the pagan side, Julian cannot resist a swing at the monks for homosexual aggression, but he also uses exactly the same vocabulary as Gregory on another target, the degenerate Antiochenes. Libanius’ Twenty-fifth Oration rather confirms Julian: in Antioch the older man hanging about his beloved boy and heaping him with presents, to his own humiliation (§ 26), is a familiar sight; but he is indulged by his friends since most of them, too, have felt the same desires (§ 27). And the Fifty-third Oration rather confirms Chrysostom, like Chrysostom speaking of homoeroticism as a disease (§ 10) and remarking on its prevalence “in these days.” Only, Libanius has no intention of seeking its cure.

In rich Antiochene society (the rest being hidden from us), from the 360s to the 380s, the range of view and the distinctions drawn regarding the active and passive role display a familiar inconsistency. They differ not a whit from those discoverable three centuries earlier. Time has stood still — or one may say, the Greeks are still Greek. Elaborate all-male banquets go on, fathers worry about their sons at school, there is sharp censure aimed at tasteless, bought indulgence; and yet, and yet — the infatuation of a man for a boy, so embarrassing, is so common a thing and so overwhelming, too, that it must somehow be forgiven. Not by a Christian. There was a different attitude. It was to be imposed more sharply on Rome in A. D. 390 through the renewal, after nearly a century and a half, of the ban on male prostitution — this time, more decisively enforced.

Over the course of five hundred years, a perception of homosexual urges and acts that was relatively very tolerant and open had appeared on the edges of Roman consciousness, where it touched the Greek, and that perception

53 Joh. Chrysos., Adv. oppugnatores vitae monasticae 3.16 (PG 47.377). See elsewhere, e. g. 3.7 (47.360), on the wealth of the class in question; 3.9 (47.360) on the extreme delicacy and shamefulness of the subject, νόσµια χαλάµην, etc.; notice at 3.8 (47.361) that it is the active role that is being discussed (exclusively? — δροµεús ἐν δροµείῳ τῆς διπλωµατίας κατεργάζοντα), and “in the very midst of your cities” (cities, plu.); and, making use of the text on its prevalence, at 3.8 (47.361), Boswell (p. 55) paraphrases without reserve, “Chrysostom suggests very strongly that in fourth century Antioch heterosexual persons were in a small minority”(!). One further Antiochene, Ammianus (31.9.5), shows harsh prejudice against homosexuality. For condemnation of luxurious, licentious households, see Greg. Nyss., PG 46.468B, and, in the 370s A. D., Basil, Ep. 188 can. 7, and 217 can. 62–3, condemning copulation with males or animals. Homosexuality was also cause for διαβολή against a teacher in Constantinople, Eunap., Vit. soph. 495.

54 Or. 7.224A, taking τοῖς ἔξοις σεσσαρα, cf. Stephanus s.v., citing Euripides.

55 Miuopag. 346A and 350D.

56 Mos. et Rom. leg. coll. 5.3 (FIRA 2.557), posted in A. D. 390, on which see O. Seeck, Gesch. des Untergangs der antiken Welt 5 (Stuttgart 1913), pp. 531f.
gradually penetrated past the edges. The resistance it met tells us that all other parts of the citizen body, notably those who were neither rich nor lived elbow-to-elbow with neighbors of Greek descent, were little affected. Minucius Felix (28.10) offers a useful reminder: he accuses Romans of tolerating all sexual license as urbanitas. But of course “elegance” or “sophistication” was something that did not concern most people very much. It did concern those of wealth and leisure who felt themselves beyond the reach of common censure, who were caught up in the effort to be en vogue, to be imitated—and who enjoyed it (for no one supposes that the Romans at any time did not number any males among them who felt naturally drawn to other males). The story can then be traced in different social circles, all in the city of Rome. It ends obscurely, in the final rejection of ‘Greek love’ (meaning, to repeat, an attitude), with what rapidity, at what period, and in what circles, the sources do not allow us to say. The turning point seems to lie in the death of Hadrian.

But surely the most interesting yield of this story is the glimpse it affords of cultural transfer at work on various layers or sets in Roman high society. Perhaps other tests may allow us to gain a better picture of those sets, so as to say that the same people who wrote eclogues (or whatever) were also active in commerce (or whatever). So our knowledge of the Hellenizing process might be gradually refined.