

IRIS
THE NEWSLETTER OF THE LAMBDA CLASSICAL CAUCUS
SUMMER 2008

What to Do at the 2009 APA

LCC Panel 2009

**Rethinking Homosexual Behavior in
Antiquity**

Mark Masterson and Steven D. Smith,
Organizers

1. Michael Broder, *The Graduate Center of the City University of New York*
Rethinking Homosexual Behavior in Juvenal's Ninth *Satire* (20 mins.)

2. Hunter Gardner, *University of South Carolina*
A Kiss is Just a Kiss (or Is It?): Fortunata and Scintilla at Dinner (20 mins.)

3. Thomas K. Hubbard, *The University of Texas at Austin*
The Ubiquity of Peer Sexuality in Classical Greece (20 mins.)

4. Gregory Jones, *The George Washington University*
Beyond Pederasty: In Search of Queer Voices from the Ancient World (20 mins.)

5. Zsuzsanna Varhelyi, *Boston University*
Sexual Selves in Play: Homoerotic Poetry in Imperial Rome (20 mins.)

Holt Parker, *University of Cincinnati*
Respondent (20 mins.)

LCC/WCC Party

Watch your email inboxes for details about this year's **theme**. As usual, costumes are strongly encouraged!

LCC/WCC Grad Cocktail Hour

Graduate students and recent PhDs interested in the LCC or WCC are invited to attend the second annual LCC/WCC graduate student cocktail hour! Details forthcoming...

2009 APA / AIA Roundtable

Queer Theory and Classics

This roundtable provides a forum for graduate students and faculty to discuss issues concerning queer theory in Classics. We especially seek students working on, or interested in, queer theory, and faculty who teach or research in queer theory. Topics discussed might include: What is the current state of queer theory in Classics, and how does it relate to other disciplines? What alliances may be forged between queer and feminist scholarship? How can one incorporate queer theory into one's scholarship and/or teaching? Is queer theory marketable? Are there pitfalls in applying it to Classics? Is "too much" queer theory professionally risky?

Organizers:

Sarah Levin-Richardson
LCC Graduate Student Representative
Ph.D. Candidate, Stanford University
sarahlr@stanford.edu

Konstantinos Nikoloutsos
Visiting Assistant Professor of Classics
Florida Atlantic University
nikolout@fau.edu

Lambda Classical Caucus Officers

Co-Chairs

Bryan Burns, bburns@wellesley.edu
Kristina Milnor, kmilnor@barnard.edu

Treasurer

Ruby Blondell, blondell@u.washington.edu

Graduate Student Representative

Sarah Levin-Richardson, sarahlr@stanford.edu

Newsletter Editor

Deborah Kamen, dkamen@u.washington.edu

**Call for Papers:
LCC Panel 2010**
**One Hundred and Twenty Years of
Homosexuality**
Anaheim, January 6-9, 2010

Organizers: Ruby Blondell
(blondell@u.washington.edu) and Kirk
Ormand (Kirk.Ormand@oberlin.edu)

The APA/AIA meeting in January 2010 will mark the twentieth anniversary of the Lambda Classical Caucus (founded at the APA in December 1989). This year will also mark the twentieth anniversary of a pair of enormously influential books: David Halperin's *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality* and Jack Winkler's *Constraints of Desire*. Published in the same year, in the same series (Routledge's New Ancient World), and often reviewed together, these two books introduced many classicists to queer theory for the first time and revolutionized the field of queer classics. If that were not enough, 1990 likewise saw the publication by Princeton of *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*, edited by Halperin, Winkler, and Froma Zeitlin. David Halperin was also—not coincidentally—the founder of the Lambda Classical Caucus (for our history visit <http://www.lambdacc.org/about.html>).

This seems a good moment, then, to celebrate what we have achieved—both as an organization and as an intellectual movement—over the past 20 years, and to look forward to what we may achieve in the next 20, by asking where we have come from, what we have accomplished, and what still remains to be done. While celebrating the past, and the path that brought us here, we also want to consider where we stand now, and how best to go forward. Which methodological tools are still proving useful, which need to be reassessed or sharpened, and which have had their day? What avenues of inquiry, theoretical models, or forms of evidence, have been overlooked or come into recent prominence? How have social and political developments, within or beyond the academy, reconfigured the world of queer

classics, its constraints or opportunities, since 1990?

While we are especially interested in the methods and concerns of Halperin and Winkler (comparative anthropology, the application of queer theory to classics, Foucault's formulation of "sexuality" as a peculiarly modern form of knowledge, the articulation of pre-modern sexual identities), and their influence upon the field, we are open to submissions exploring any aspect of the current state and future directions of queer classics. Abstracts might address such topics as our understanding of "active" and "passive" roles in Greece and Rome, ancient notions of sexual subjectivity, categories of sexual behavior, shame and honor, the practice of paederasty, the intersection(s) of gender and sexual identity, questions of evidence, and/or the periodicity of particular sexual categories, values, or identities. In keeping with Lambda traditions, we welcome submissions that deal with material culture as well as those focussing on texts and/or other forms of evidence.

Abstracts should be sent as Word attachments to Joy Connolly (joyc@nyu.edu) by **February 5, 2009**. (Do not send them to the organizers.) Personal identifying information should not appear on the abstract itself. Abstracts should be no more than one page and should follow the instructions for individual abstracts on p. 6 of the APA Program Guide: <http://www.apaclassics.org/Newsletter/2007newsletter/100>

**Call for Papers:
LCC Paul Rehak Award 2009**

Nominations are now being received for the Lambda Classical Caucus's annual prize, named in memory of Paul Rehak, Classics professor and former LCC co-chair. The Rehak award honors the excellence of a publication relating to the LCC's mission, including, but not limited to, homosocial and homoerotic relationships and environments, ancient sexuality and gender roles, and

representation of the gendered body. The range of eligible work covers the breadth of ancient Mediterranean society, from prehistory to late antiquity, and the various approaches of classicists drawing on textual and material culture.

Articles and book chapters from monographs or edited volumes, published in the past three years (i.e 2006, 2007, 2008) are eligible. Self-nominations are welcome; the nomination and selection process is confidential. Membership in the Caucus is not required, nor is any specific rank or affiliation. Nominations should be made by **October 31, 2008** to LCC co-chair, Bryan Burns, **bburns@wellesley.edu**. Please provide full bibliographic information, a copy of the text, and/or contact information for the nominee. The award will be announced at the opening night reception of the APA/AIA meeting in Philadelphia. To honor Paul's memory, the LCC has established a fund that supports the continued existence of these awards. Please send donations to:

Ruby Blondell (LCC Rehak Fund)
Dept. of Classics, Box 353110
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195

Paul Rehak, 1954-2004

An ardent support of the Lambda Classical Caucus, Paul Rehak died on June 5, 2004 due to complications from a heart attack and his HIV-status. At the time of his death, Paul was an Associate Professor of Classics at the University of Kansas. He received his B.A. from the University of Michigan, his graduate degrees from Bryn Mawr College, and taught at Loyola University of Chicago and Duke University, before moving to Kansas in 2001. Paul's research covered a broad range of subjects, from prehistoric Greek painting to Roman sculpture, including several works on gender and sexuality. He served as co-chair of the Lambda Classical Caucus with his partner John Younger from 1994-1998.

For more on Paul's career accomplishments, please see his homepage:
<http://people.ku.edu/~%7Ejyounger/prehak/>

Call for Papers: 2009 Winkler Prize

The John J. Winkler Memorial Trust invites all undergraduate and graduate students in North America (plus those currently unenrolled who have not as yet received a doctorate and who have never held a regular academic appointment) to enter the fifteenth competition for the John J. Winkler memorial prize. This year the Prize will be a cash award of \$2000, which may be split if more than one winner is chosen.

The Prize is intended to honor the memory of John J. ("Jack") Winkler, a classical scholar, teacher, and political activist for radical causes both within and outside the academy, who died of AIDS in 1990 at the age of 46. Jack believed that the profession as a whole discourages young scholars from exploring neglected or disreputable topics, and from applying unconventional or innovative methods to their scholarship. He wished to be remembered by means of an annual Prize that would encourage such efforts. In accordance with his wishes, the John J. Winkler Memorial trust awards a cash prize each year to the author of the best undergraduate or graduate essay in any risky or marginal field of classical studies. Topics include (but are not limited to) those that Jack himself explored: the ancient novel, the sex/gender systems of antiquity, the social meanings of Greek drama, and ancient Mediterranean culture and society. Approaches include (but are not limited to) those that Jack's own work exemplified: feminism, anthropology, narratology, semiotics, cultural studies, ethnic studies, and lesbian/gay studies.

The winner of the 2009 Prize will be selected from among the contestants by a jury of four, as yet to be determined.

The deadline for submissions is **March 1, 2009**. Essays should not exceed the length of 30 pages, including notes but excluding bibliography and illustrations or figures. Text should be double-spaced; notes may be single-spaced. Electronic submission is required. Essays may be submitted in any version of

MS Word, PDF, or plain text format. Please include an email with your essay in which you provide the following information: your college/university, your department or program of study, whether you are a graduate or undergraduate, your email and regular mail addresses, a phone number where you can be reached in May of 2009, and the title of your work. Please note: Essays containing quotations in original Greek must be sent in PDF format, due to difficulties reading different Greek fonts and keyboarding programs.

The Prize is intended to encourage new work rather than to recognize scholarship that has already proven itself in more traditional venues. Essays submitted for the prize should not, therefore, be previously published or accepted for publication. Exceptions to this rule may be made in the case of the publication of conference proceedings, at the discretion of the prize administrator. The Trust reserves the right not to confer the Prize in any year in which the essays submitted to the competition are judged insufficiently prizeworthy.

Contestants may send their essays and address any inquiries to:

Kirk Ormand
Dept. of Classics
Oberlin College
kirk.ormand@oberlin.edu

John J. Winkler Trust

The John J. Winkler Memorial Trust was established as an independent, charitable foundation on June 1, 1990. Its purpose is to honor Jack Winkler's memory and to promote both his scholarly and his political ideals. Inquiries about the Prize, tax-deductible gifts to the Trust, and general correspondence may be addressed to:

Kirk Ormand
John J. Winkler Memorial Trust
Dept. of Classics
Oberlin College
Oberlin, OH 44074

2008 Winkler Prize Winners

I am pleased to announce the winners of the 2008 John J. Winkler Memorial Prize competition. This year's essays were judged by a panel of four: David Fredrick (University of Arkansas); Tamara Chin (University of Chicago); Jay Reed (University of Michigan), and Elizabeth Manwell (Kalamazoo College). The judges were unanimous in selecting both an undergraduate and graduate winner, and join me in congratulating the authors for their innovative and outstanding work.

The graduate winner is **Danielle Meinrath**, a Ph.D. candidate at Princeton University, for "A Narrative of Enslavement? Re-reading Photis in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*." Ms. Meinrath has been invited to give the Winkler Memorial Lecture at Oberlin College this fall.

The undergraduate winner is **Alison Fields**, a Classical Civilization major at NYU, for "Lucian's Megilla/us: Rethinking Gender, Agency, and Same-Sex Relationships."

Kirk Ormand
John J. Winkler Memorial Trust

Book Review

Shadi Bartsch, *The Mirror of the Self: Sexuality, Self-Knowledge, and the Gaze in the Early Roman Empire*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006

Michael Broder

Shadi Bartsch contends that the discourses of vision, sexuality, and self-knowledge converged on a space in which the ancients could conceptualize selfhood; and further, that tracing the interaction of these three discourses over time can provide the contemporary reader with insights into how the Greeks and Romans understood "what it meant to be a person" (1). While this project sounds sweeping—and in some ways it is—B.'s exploration of Greek sources forms a kind of backdrop and her focus ultimately narrows to the early principate and Stoic

conceptions of the self, particularly as represented in the writings of the younger Seneca. Perhaps her most striking thesis emerges in the opening of her final chapter, where she states that Seneca's work represents the emergence of "a new and more reflexive concept of the self" (230) than had hitherto been seen in ancient Greek and Roman sources, a self that is not quite Cartesian, but is in some ways comparable.

Chapter 1, "The Mirror of Philosophy," is about actual mirrors, those objects that fascinated the ancients not only as visual curiosities but also because of their rarity and expense relative to common household items. Of the ancient mirror B. notes, "It was the subject of optical theorizing, magic beliefs, and most of all, of moralizing discourses that either praised it for its ability to render back an accurate reflection or damned it as a luxury and a tool of vanity" (17). The main idea of this chapter is the double valence of mirrors and "self-speculation" as represented in Greek and Roman texts. On the one hand, we see negative associations with luxury, effeminacy, and immoderate self-admiration; on the other, positive associations with self-improvement: the beautiful person was urged to match his moral virtue to his physical perfection, while the ugly person was encouraged to overcome his physical limitations through public display of admirable character. Alongside these discussions of the ancient mirror as an incentive to virtue and an index of vanity, B. explores mirroring as a technique of self-knowledge in Platonic philosophy; in particular, through a reading of the *Alcibiades* I, "in which the mirrored gaze becomes not a reflection of the judgment of the other, but a metaphor for our ability to see the divine in ourselves by seeing the divine in others" (3).

While Chapter 2, "The Eye of the Lover," is ultimately about the role of vision in desire as represented in texts of the early principate, B. begins with an overview of ancient optical theories and the two critical concepts that distinguished them: intromission and extramission. Extramission, the idea that sight is accomplished via rays emitted from the

eyes, was influenced by the views of Empedocles and the Pythagoreans and found its way into explanations of sight offered by Plato and Aristotle as well as by the Stoics. Intromission, which holds that objects emit tiny particles (*eidola* in Greek or *simulacra* in Latin) that impress themselves on the surface of the eye, is associated with the atomists Leucippus and Democritus. The theory was developed by Epicurus and is most famously recounted by Lucretius in book 4 of the *De rerum natura*.

The section on optical theory may feel overly detailed, but B. considers it an important background for her subsequent line of argument, in which the tactility of sight in the ancient imagination reemerges in association with erotic penetration and sexual arousal. B. notes echoes of intromission theory in the language of Achilles Tatius' *Clitophon and Leucippe*, when Clitophon describes the look of love in the eyes of Melite (*C&L* 5.13.4); in the *Aethiopica* of Heliodorus, in which Calasiris' "theory of love focuses on the intromissive workings of the vision of the beloved" (69); and in Plutarch, particularly at *Table-Talk* 5.7.680c-683b, where eros relies on a "double process of ocular emission and ocular penetration" (70) and at *Amatorius* 766e, where the *eidola* flowing off beautiful boys and women lead to sexual arousal and ejaculation. B. then explores how ideas and imagery from Plato's *Phaedrus*—in particular, the "trio of eros, self-speculation, and philosophical self-knowledge" (72)—influenced texts of the late republic and early principate; namely, Lucretius's *De rerum naturae*, the tale of Narcissus in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 3.339-510, and the description of the sexual profligate Hostius Quadra in Seneca's *Quaestiones Naturales* 1.16.

In her final three chapters B. turns to an examination of how vision, ethics, and sexuality were implicated in "the new ethical questions being posed by Roman Stoicism under Nero" (114). Chapter 3, "Scopic Paradigms at Rome," explores the Roman culture of exemplarity and its dependence on public display of virtue. As with the twin uses of the mirror in Chapter 1, here too we see a

kind of polarity of a good gaze and a bad gaze, a positive gaze and a negative gaze, or what B. refers to as the paradigms of “elite self-display and penetrative viewing” (152). In a colorful series of oppositions, B. contrasts the emulatory eye with the evil eye; exemplary seeing with aggressive seeing; the admiring gaze with the hostile gaze. Her section on “The Penetrating Gaze” includes a fascinating discussion of apotropaic visual representations of the evil eye and methods used to avert it, which often included phallic protectors and a “menagerie of attackers” (139) that might include snakes, scorpions, leopards, bulls, goats, dogs, centipedes, crows, owls, and lions. In a similar vein, B. discusses the *fascinum* or *bulla*, a phallic amulet that was hung around the necks of young boys to ward off the evil eye (it could also be attached to the underside of a general’s chariot during a triumphal procession to protect him from the invidious glances of the crowd).

B. follows this with a section called “Senatorial Safeguards,” in which she ponders what she perceives as a puzzling paradox; namely, that the admiring gaze and the hostile gaze did not merge during the republic. Why was appearing onstage considered emasculating for the actor, for example, while appearing at the rostrum was considered admirable for the orator? “Why,” B. asks, “do we hear nothing of orators and officeholders threatened by the evil eye despite their enviable rank and status?” (152). She then proceeds to describe how an elaborate system of ideological and regulatory apparatuses maintained the inviolability of the elite Roman male subject from the aggressive eye of the crowd. What I find dissonant, however, is B.’s insistence on an “absence of anxiety about one’s exposed stance at the rostra” (164) and her failure to recognize that the very existence of the institutional safeguards she discusses testifies to the prevalence of anxiety about potential slippage between elite and infamous subjectivity.

In any event, B. notes that, “in the early empire, Roman senators and equestrians seem to have lost a sense of precisely these ‘natural’ safeguards against the violation of their status

and persons at the same time that they lost their sense of providing a model to their peers” (164). Paving the way for her discussion of elite subjectivity under Nero, B. concludes Chapter 4 by examining the degraded image of the philosopher in the early principate (for example, in the epigrams of Martial and in Juvenal’s second satire, in which philosophers are represented as pathetic *cinaedi*), which B. connects with “the ideological underpinnings of Roman Stoicism” (171) and slippage between the philosophical notion of *patientia* as brave endurance of adversity and its more sinister connotation of effeminate submission to sexual penetration.

The final two chapters focus more exclusively on Seneca. Chapter 4, “The Self on Display,” examines Senecan notions of the self against a backdrop of the changing power dynamics of the early principate, an environment B. characterizes with the phrase “corrupted surveillance” (207), a type of gaze that represents a collapse of the senatorial safeguards against aggressive seeing discussed in Chapter 3. B. explores the ethical force of the internalized gaze in Seneca; Seneca’s model of the performance of selfhood, characterized by subjection to a gaze, dialogue with the self, and role playing; and the changing notion of *persona* from that of a public role that is consistent with the true self to that of a social mask that is false and conceals a true self beneath it.

Chapter 5, “Models of Personhood,” treats the relationship between Senecan drama and Seneca’s conception of the self. Successive sections consider the dialogic nature of the Senecan self and the role of reflexivity in Seneca’s model of self-knowledge. B. describes Seneca’s dialogic model of the self in terms of what philosopher Harry Frankfurt (b. 1929) calls “second-order” volitions; that is, desires about one’s desires. The classic example is that of the drug addict who has a first-order desire to shoot up, but may have a second-order desire not to want to want to shoot up or, alternatively, may have a second-order desire to indulge his drug cravings with abandon. In Greek mythology, Medea has a

first-order desire to murder her children in revenge against her philandering Jason. In her final pages, B. offers a reading of Seneca's *Medea* as a dramatization of a dialogic self torn mightily between conflicting second-order desires, and of the disastrous consequences of alignment between first-order and second-order selves when the second-order self rejects traditional community standards of virtue and vice. B. concludes that Seneca nowhere solves "the basic problem of a philosophy that claims to have an answer to human passions, but so precariously places its trust in the mirror of the self" (281).

Book Review

Andrew Scholtz, *Concordia Discors: Eros and Dialogue in Classical Athenian Literature*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007

Nikolai Endres

Andrew Scholtz, Ph.D. in classics from Yale University in 1997, is an associate professor at SUNY Binghamton and specializes in classical Greek drama, prose, and cultural history, and Greek and Latin rhetoric and historiography. In *Concordia Discors: Eros and Dialogue in Classical Athenian Literature* (published in the Hellenistic Studies Series, number 24), Scholtz argues that when classical Athenian literature addresses politics in the idiom of sexual desire, it uses a "discordant harmony" as an aesthetic principle.

In the Introduction, Scholtz sets out his methodology. He proffers a post-structuralist and psychoanalytic "symptomatic reading," looking out for instabilities, anomalies, and incoherencies. Soon, though, he (and the reader) gets lost in Althusserian interpellations and Bakhtinian heteroglossia: "I argue that texts, as aesthetic artifacts, can register contextual instability as *concordia discors*, by which I mean an ideologically charged polyphony constitutive of a text's *Sturm und Drang* on the analogy of musical dissonance in tonal harmony" (4). This theoretical feast is augmented by Valentin Vološinov, J. L. Austin, Karl Bühler, Antonio Gramsci, and,

needless to say, Jacques Derrida. Being trained in comparative literature, where this critical jargon was retired at least a decade ago, I find all this amusing. Also, how does this polyphony figure into Scholtz's later chapters, unless in the most banal way? Quoting Vološinov, for example, he establishes: "Speech represents, therefore, a fundamentally *social* phenomenon" (84, his italics). This is supplemented by Bakhtinian "dialogical" theory that all texts record a response. Indeed.

More to the point is Scholtz's definition of *erôs* as "desire" for just about anything, including sex. In a civic context, the term facilitates a discourse about politics, a grid that charges political discourse with intense desire. In other words, (sexual) *erôs*, as a shared consciousness, provides a common denominator for the grounding of political rhetoric. Through *isêgoria* (equality of speech), a consensus is established, but what if democracy operates as a herd mentality, where everyone speaks alike? Consensus, this indefinable point where varying viewpoints only *seem* to coalesce into one, thus represents a dynamic state, a *concordia discors*, a contest between communitarianism and individualism.

Chapter 2: "Lovers of It?: Erotic Ambiguity in the Periclean Funeral Oration." Thucydides' Pericles, to the backdrop of a controversial war policy, exhorts his listeners to become *erastai* of the city. But what exactly does the city stand for, a civic entity or its power? By becoming *erastai*, the people merge with the heroes they are mourning and ascend to a privileged discourse community, where flashy *erôs* must supplement mundane *logos*. In Greek oratory (unique in its use of erotic vocabulary in a non-sexual way), loving things thus becomes a sublime act with sometimes risky consequences. Funerals, Scholtz establishes, though solemn events, could border on the carnivalesque, where the epideictic of commemorative speeches could succumb to the dithyrambic. Pericles thus attempts to unite the discordant voices by having his audience conceptualize the kind of Athens all of them identify with: "He

transforms the *dēmos*; he lifts it up and out from its deliberative function and brings it into contact with another speech-community, the honored dead, whose implicitly *erōs*-driven logic of self-sacrifice will make eminent good sense to city-lovers among the living” (40).

Chapter 3: “He Loves You, He Loves You Not: Demophilic Courtship in Aristophanes’ *Knights*.” In the *Knights*, we recall, the Sausage-Seller vies with the slave Paphlagon to win the attention of Demos (The People). Both pursue Demos with specious affection or *kolakeia*, which is at odds with being a legitimate *erastēs* and reverses the usual pederastic paradigm, for flatterers were seen as a debased class and inferior to their victims: “The lover-as-flatterer thus presents us with the paradox of a senior lover subordinating himself to his junior” (56). (However, especially in archaic poetry and not only there, we find a lot of *erastai* using flattery, but I guess it is a matter of degree.) Scholtz analyzes Aristophanes’ demophilic discourse, that is, the use of seductive speeches in court or the assembly, an essentially sexual courtship of the audience that blurs the line between legitimate flattery and obsequious cajolery bordering on political prostitution. Whether reflective of reality in classical Athens or not (and I would say it is, for we find it in both allegedly anti-democratic writers such as Aristophanes and Thucydides and in pro-democratic ones such as Lysias and Demosthenes), this love-talk aroused great suspicion, an insidious attempt that undermines the beloved’s autonomy. Moreover, the play complicates demagoguery, for various policies favoring the *dēmos* (such as the increase in remuneration for jurors) dangerously verge on *kolakeia*, and a disgraceful and vulgar rogue such as the Sausage-Seller is hailed as a savior. The inviolable (patriarchal) sovereignty of the *dēmos* is here undermined, and *erōs* becomes a metaphor for aggressive *stasis*, where the city’s leaders “become as much potential buggers and benefactors” (67), where power can be obtained through subservience, where surrender may result in dominance, where the play’s three protagonists dance a “tango of desire, deception, and manipulation” (67).

Chapter 4: “Forgive and Forget: *Concordia discors* in Aristophanes’ *Assemblywomen* and *Lysistrata*.” *Assemblywomen* presents a city in crisis and looking for *sôtēria* (salvation), a crisis so drastic that the men have agreed to share their power, property, family... with women. No one, though, seems to agree on what exactly the crisis is. Clashing values, especially between male and female (the world’s oldest *concordia discors*)? Praxagora’s gynaeocratic program radically provides for equal distribution of property while paradoxically abolishing two of the main venues of democracy: the court and the assembly. In the earlier *Lysistrata*, as is well known, the women threaten to withhold sex and money from their husbands until they cease fighting, hence its nickname “peace play.” However, in their dream of a harmonious civic order (*homonoia*), *logos* fails to bridge the deep ideological gender divides and needs to be heightened by sexy words and soothing wine. *Assemblywomen*’s Praxagora, therefore, appeals to the male Athenians’ baser appetites rather than simple *logos* and does achieve *koinōnia* through synoecism, a civic community and new *polis* of love: “Democracy will henceforth equate with a big party” (100). Scholtz links this theatrical revolution to the Amnesty of 403, where Athenians wishing to rejoin the restored democracy had to swear “not to remember wrong,” but any attempt at forgetting of course entails a kind of remembering, just as any collective act of oblivion fosters a “tyranny of consensus” (108).

Chapter 5: “Satyr, Lover, Teacher, Pimp: Socrates and His Many Masks.” Most commentaries on Socrates (Scholtz singles out Aeschines Socraticus’ *Alcibiades*, Plato’s *Gorgias*, and Xenophon’s *Symposium*) agree on his all-encompassing *erōs*, ranging from *philia* to *sôphrosunê*. There is also a consensus on Socrates’ ugly physique and his beautiful yet mysterious interior. Scholtz asks whether Socrates, in his questioning of his audience, can be outwardly a sophist and still retain his inner philosophy. Outwardly, that is a straightforward question, but Scholtz’ interior reasoning soon moves off track: “Socrates the *Gestalt* as a term (Socrates) within the binary (Socrates ~ Not-Socrates) expressing Socrates

the *Gestalt*’ (114). How does Socratic education function? Socrates has a method named after him, yet he himself is so rigid, so uncompromising, so resistant that the Greeks thought him *atopos*, where “the pluralistic discourses of free debate” are yoked into “the normative discourses of philosophical idealism” (119). Moreover, since all Socrates famously knows is that he knows nothing, how can he be certain that his knowledge does not corrupt his pupils, that they indeed benefit from him? This is the janus-face of Socratic *erôs*: “on the one hand, the absence of any vulgar or impure motivation; on the other hand, a commitment so complete as to rule out any chance at dialogue” (134).

A general observation: *erôs* gets kind of lost in the second half of Scholtz’ book. Especially for chapter 5, I would have looked at Socrates’ startling admission in the *Phaedrus* that he knows nothing about anything except *ta erôtika*; therefore, he is ideally qualified to impart erotic knowledge. Or how about the *Symposium*, where dialogue is erotic itself, where Plato’s one-upmanship replicates the homoerotically charged atmosphere of the banquet, where varying viewpoints seem to coalesce into Diotima’s great encomium on Eros—only to dragged back to the real world of gastric and phallic appetites by Alcibiades. I would see all that as *concordia discors*.

Conclusions: “In closing, I consider the methodological implications of my findings, and their relevance for today’s world” (20). A tall order indeed—and impossible in a page and a half. That Mikhail Bakhtin’s aesthetics is a reaction to Stalinism surprises no one. That scholarship is driven not only by theory but also by ideology is hardly breaking news. Really, any notion of pure, non-coercive dialogue is just naive, especially in the publish-or-perish world of academic tenure. Rather, I was expecting an analysis of, say, the current war rhetoric and how the failure of *logos* (weapons of mass destruction) gave way to

various fears and desires, culminating in the exhortation to become *erastai* of the country (that is, of course, its power embodied by the executive). Or the notion of democracy as a pseudo-tyranny—“So long as *everyone* was tyrant, then *no one* was, and all was well” (14, his emphases)—seems like a great starting point for current economic inequality. Finally, is not the supposedly consensual declaration “The people have resolved” (*edoxe tōi dêmōi*) paralleled in this most elusive term of political discourse, “the American people”?

A massive bibliography, including a Polish dissertation of 1836, concludes the volume. Throughout the tome, we find even more voluminous footnotes (a total of 503, if I counted right), fairly uncommon in mature works of scholarship. There are some great ideas in this book, but they would have benefited from two improvements: purging the jargon and establishing the relevance of *concordia discors* as a political/erotic/aesthetic nexus for today’s world.

New Books of Interest

Andrew Lear and Eva Cantarella would like to announce the publication of their book *Images of Ancient Greek Pederasty: Boys Were Their Gods*. Illustrated with over 100 vases, our book is a general introduction to pederastic scenes and inscriptions in Athenian vase-painting. It focuses on iconographic analysis and comparison between the portrayal of the custom in visual and literary media. It also includes a list of 700 pederastic scenes compiled by the late Prof. Keith DeVries.

If you have any news or would like to review a book, please email the Newsletter Editor, Deborah Kamen (dkamen@u.washington.edu).