

Iris

The Newsletter of the Lambda Classical Caucus
Fall 2012



The first-ever LCC roundtable at a Feminism and Classics conference took place at Fem Con VI at Brock University in May. Organized by Ruby Blondell and Deb Kamen, and featuring presentations by Nancy Rabinowitz, Bruce Frier, and Brett Rogers, the roundtable was a huge success!

Table of Contents

Call for the 2013 Rehak Award	p. 2
Call for the 2013 Grad Student Award	p. 2
LCC at the APA 2013	p. 3
Book Review: William Loader's <i>Sexuality in the New Testament: Understanding the Key Texts</i> .	p. 4
Call for Papers, APA 2014	p. 7
Book Review: Daniel Orrells' <i>Classical Culture and Modern Masculinity</i> .	p. 8

Call for Papers: LCC Paul Rehak Award 2013

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. 2010, 2011, 2012) 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, 2012 to the LCC co-chairs, Deborah Kamen, dkamen@uw.edu, and Bruce Frier, bwfrier@umich.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 2013 WCC-LCC opening night reception at the APA/AIA.

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

Call for Papers: The 2013 LCC Graduate Student Paper Award

Have you seen an amazing graduate student paper addressing queer issues? Please consider nominating!

This award is designed to encourage and reward scholarship by pre-Ph.D. scholars on issues related to the LCC's mission, including, but not limited to: homosocial and homoerotic relationships and environments, ancient sexuality and gender roles, representations of the gendered body, and queer theory.

We ask for nominations of oral papers presented by a pre-Ph.D. scholar at a conference (including, but not limited to the APA/AIA and CAMWS) from July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012 (ca. 20 minutes in length as delivered). To nominate, please email the LCC co-chairs, Deborah Kamen, dkamen@uw.edu, and Bruce Frier, bwfrier@umich.edu, with the presenter's name and email address and the title of the paper. Self-nominations are encouraged; information related to nominations is confidential. Membership in the Caucus is not required to be eligible for these awards. Nominations accepted until October 31, 2012. The winner will be announced at the 2013 WCC-LCC opening night reception at the APA/AIA.

Transgressive Spaces in Classical Antiquity
The 2013 LCC Panel at the APA (Seattle)
Saturday, 8:30-11:00 AM

Organizers:

Sarah Levin-Richardson, University of San Diego
Lauri Reitzammer, University of Colorado, Boulder

Speakers:

Sebastian de Vivo, New York University
The Love of Achilles: Warfare as a Space of Transgression

Kate Gilhuly, Wellesley College
Euripides' *Medea*: Playing the Prostitute in Corinth

M Tong, Yale Divinity School
Wisdom's Main Stage: Queer Spaces and Personified Wisdom in Proverbs

Lauren Curtis, Harvard University
Transgressive Choral Space in Horace, *Odes* 2.5

David Fredrick, University of Arkansas
Walk on the Wild Side: Queer Landscape in the House of Octavius Quartio in Pompeii

Elizabeth Young, Wellesley College
Don't Sext in the Orchard! Transgression and Sensation in the *Carmina Priapea*

What spaces in Greek and Roman antiquity were used for gender and sexual transgression? By what means were everyday spaces transformed into places that welcomed going beyond or challenging normative gender and sexual expectations, and violating gender and sexual boundaries considered fixed and non-negotiable? Is there a spatial topography for individuals who embody non-normative gender roles or sexual practices? In what ways could "deviant" spaces affect or "infect" daily life?

Dramatic spaces in Athens permitted the audience to step beyond the constraints of reality into a realm where, for example, women could stop a war by means of a sex-strike, or where male viewers could temporarily feel emotions not commonly allowed. The wilds of Mt. Cithaeron, at least as imagined by classical Athenians, encouraged ecstatic or enthused participants to cross out of the constraints imposed by the human sphere. The Roman amphitheater lauded male gladiators whose wounds violated norms of impenetrable masculinity, and the triumphal route found soldiers calling attention to the non-normative sexual deeds of their generals.

This panel explores the roles of space—including ritual space, dramatic space, landscapes, and architectural space—in gender and sexual transgressions. This focus on spatial aspects is intended to bring the analysis of transgression into the realm of lived experience, and to investigate the influence of built and natural environments on daily life and cultural practices.

Don't forget the LCC roundtable, Saturday from 11:30-1: "Sexuality in the Academy: Practical and Pedagogical Concerns."

*Check the APA schedule for the ever-fabulous LCC/WCC/CSWMG opening night party and LCC/WCC grad student/recent Ph.D. cocktail hour.
We hope to see you there!*

William Loader, *Sexuality in the New Testament: Understanding the Key Texts*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2010.

Reviewed by M. Adryael Tong, M.Div., S.T.M. Candidate, Yale Divinity School

William Loader's *Sexuality in the New Testament: Understanding the Key Texts* "seeks to listen to the texts in their own setting, both within their writings and within their world" (1). His aim is "to hear these texts as closely as possible to the way their authors wanted them to be heard" (5). The book is organized by topic beginning with the most controversial topic of homosexuality and then moving on to the issues of marriage, adultery, divorce and celibacy. Loader sets aside questions of ethics and cautions against readers' impatience which tempts them to easy conclusions in service of their own belief systems. Instead, Loader attempts to interpret the text in a historically and hermeneutically objective manner while simultaneously reminding the reader that "historical reconstruction is always a matter of degrees of probability" (5). This methodology, where the meaning of the text is assumed to be the author's intention within her or his historical context, called the "historical-critical method" in the field of biblical studies, is the current standard of interpretation, although other methodologies exist. Loader supports his attempt with an impressive amount of research for a book only 126 pages in length, and although he slips into an authoritative tone every once in a while, Loader's efforts to maintain the persona of dispassionate researcher throughout his presentation is relatively successful.

Loader begins his discussion on sexuality in the New Testament with what is currently the most controversial topic in the Judeo-Christian world: homosexuality. In Chapter 2, entitled "With a man as with a woman," Loader begins by stating that although the New Testament is unequivocally negative on the subject of homosexual acts, "the focus of this chapter is not how we might apply these texts today, but what they meant in their own day." Regardless of his unwillingness to engage in the ethics of Biblical interpretation in this book, Loader does present a thorough historical investigation of the text, with particular attention to Romans 1. He notes that the phraseology of Romans 1 is a rhetorical strategy deployed by Paul: "[Paul] sets up those Christian Jews who would join his condemnation of Gentiles with glee, only to confront them in 2.1-16 with their own sin" (14). However, contra Countryman (2007), Loader sees no indication that Paul excuses the behaviors which were considered stereotypically gentile. Rather, Loader argues, Paul draws a parallel between gentile denial of the True God and gentile denial of their True Sexual Nature (i.e. heterosexuality). In other words, Paul believed that disordered worship, i.e. worshipping the wrong God, led to disordered sexuality, i.e. any sexuality beyond the heterosexual nature designated by God in Genesis (27). Following Brooten (1998), Loader further argues that Paul's denunciation of homosexual acts covered female-female as well as male-male homosexual acts, and thus disagrees with Boswell's claim (1980) that Paul only condemned heterosexuals who participated in homosexual acts contra their heterosexual orientation as well as Scroggs' thesis (1983) that Paul was mainly forbidding pederasty.

Loader basically agrees with Robert Gagnon's reading (2001) that Paul's aversion to homosexuality is based on a natural law conception of normative heterosexuality. Loader concludes the chapter with a short discussion on the words *malakoi* and *arsenokoitai*, which appear in the list of sinners in 1 Corinthians 6:9-10 (*arsenokoitai* also appears in 1 Timothy 1:9-11). Loader swiftly recapitulates and evaluates the current scholarly debate surrounding *malakoi* and *arsenokoitai*, slightly favoring the interpretation of the words as referring to practitioners of same-sex acts in general. However, Loader also admits that the lack of clear intertexts, particularly for the word *arsenokoitai*, casts doubt on any certainty regarding the words' meanings. Apart from Romans 1 and the words *malakoi* and *arsenokoitai*, Loader finds no other references to same-sex relations in the New Testament and dismisses any efforts by biblical scholars to find mentions of homosexuality elsewhere either negatively (Jude 6-7, Matthew 7:6, 1 Thessalonians 4:6, etc.) or positively (e.g. Matthew 19:11-12, John, etc.).

Loader has a tendency to obscure his own opinion on the interpretation of the text by providing argumentation from scholars espousing different opinions and pitting them against each other. Keeping in mind Loader's aim to give an overview of the historical interpretation of the New Testament texts on homosexuality in a single chapter, it is likely that he felt that this method was the best way to present as many different positions as possible in the short amount of space available. Nevertheless, Loader's frequent citations of Gagnon may be

worrisome to readers familiar with Gagnon's anti-LGBT activities outside the academic sphere. More worrying, however, is Loader's credulity when considering the appropriateness of reading categories such as "homosexual" or "heterosexual" into an ancient context. He writes,

"[Boswell] claimed [that] Paul would have considered it quite inoffensive if homosexual men were engaging in same-sex acts, which would have been seen as natural for them. Most responses to Boswell include an attempt to refute his assumption that Paul would have been aware of such categories, which only entered the modern discussion in the late nineteenth century. This refutation has required some modification as a result of subsequent research, especially that of Brooten, who shows that there is evidence that many people were aware of men and women whose sexual preferences were directed to people of their own sex, including lifelong orientation...Such discussions are not to be equated, however, with the complex theories of orientation of modern times and are at best rudimentary, but were nevertheless sufficient and sufficiently widely attested to have been within Paul's knowledge" (21).

Although Loader moderates the anachronistic impulse to wholeheartedly impose categories of "homosexuality" and "heterosexuality," it is surprising that he does not cite research from the last decade in his discussion of such methodological concerns, nor does he cite major texts on ancient sexuality from the field of Classics, such as Kenneth Dover's *Greek Homosexuality* or Craig Williams' *Roman Homosexuality* outside of their citations in the works of religious scholars Scroggs and Gagnon, respectively. Although Loader's book is clearly meant to appeal to religious scholars, some further research outside the field would have enhanced the discussion of homosexuality in the New Testament.

Loader next turns his attention to marriage in Chapter 3, "Model marriage and the household"; Chapter 4, "Adultery, attitude and disorder"; and Chapter 5, "Divorce and Remarriage." In these chapters, Loader addresses the related topics of sex in marriage, the role of women in the church, adultery and divorce. In Chapter 3, he argues that much of the New Testament, "see[s] sexual engagement as something positive." He begins by describing standard marital values during the time of the New Testament: monogamy, marriage as symbol of social stability, and the importance of childbearing. He sees these attitudes towards marriage as indicative of first and second century CE Jewish and Christian communities' understanding that sexual enjoyment within marriage was positive. In this way, Loader follows Will Deming's (2004) argument against consensus that Paul advocates for sexual passion within marriage in 1 Corinthians 7. He writes, "at no point does Paul discourage marriage as a place for expression of sexual desire, as though sexual desire were something evil" (46-47), he explains further: "One can read Paul as seeing marriage as a necessary evil, a second best to celibacy...and therefore demeaning of marriage and sexuality...but Paul apparently cannot give up what he knows about creation and so does not condemn either marriage or sexual desire" (47). After a brief aside to address the prohibition of sex with slaves, which Loader believes is implied in the New Testament but does not come down strongly on either side of the argument, he tackles the issue of women's role in the church. After considering the key texts in the Gospels as well as 1 Corinthians 11:2-16, 1 Corinthians 14:33b-36, and 1 Timothy 2:11-15, Loader recognizes a general trajectory in the development of the early Church away from the inclusivity of women towards an ecclesiology more in line with the patriarchal norms of the time.

Loader links chapters 4 and 5 by discussing how adultery is defined in Chapter 4 and examining the New Testament authors' solution to adultery, i.e. divorce, in Chapter 4. Loader begins by observing that the Ancients generally saw adultery as theft or breach of contract rather than emotional wrongdoing, and then stresses that references to adultery in the Gospels, such as the citation about committing adultery "in your heart" (Matthew 5:27-28), are usually more about intentionality in general rather than the prohibition of a sexual sin in particular. He also notes that Paul seems to be more interested in the issue of *porneia*, which might cover adultery but only under a larger rubric of sexual wrongdoings. In Chapter 5, Loader argues that the New Testament essentially forbids divorce, except on the grounds of adultery. However, if adultery does occur, then the union must be dissolved (91). Modern notions of reconciliation are essentially excluded from the minds of the New Testament authors.

In the penultimate Chapter 6, "Has sex a future? The question of celibacy," Loader demonstrates that the New Testament writers assumed that sexuality would be obsolete after the eschaton. He writes, "the explanation

why there is to be no sex in the age to come: the resurrected will no longer be mortal but will live forever...if no one dies, then no one needs to be born. If no one needs to be born, then no one needs to have sex” (100). However, Loader argues that the New Testament is far from clear on the issue of celibacy before the end of the world. He points out that the debate over whether or not Jesus was celibate during his lifetime is far from settled. Following his argumentation over Paul’s attitude towards celibacy in Chapter 3, Loader maintains that although Paul prefers the celibate lifestyle for himself, Paul does not believe that celibacy is necessarily better than sexual desire within marriage. Loader writes that Paul “does, therefore, share with Matthew’s community the assumption that among believers there are two identifiable groups, those called to celibacy and those who marry, both expressions of divine will” (114). Furthermore, Loader sees Paul opposing a pro-celibacy group in 1 Corinthians 7, “who are not just supporting celibacy for some but demanding it for all, or at least for those like themselves” (114). Loader’s final chapter, “Conclusion: ‘sex on the brain? Love and hope,” recaps his interpretations from the previous chapter. He also remarks that while certain aspects of sexuality, such as homosexuality, divorce, and celibacy, can be a contentious topics in the New Testament, “most areas relating to sexuality were not contentious. This accounts for many of the silences, such as on bestiality, rape, abortion, infanticide, castration, public nakedness and pornography, which we can surely assume they would have condemned” (124).

Although this book is meant to be a general overview of the different historical-critical interpretations of Biblical texts on sexuality rather than a developed argument for a particular interpretation, this reviewer believes that when Loader does articulate his own readings, they can be weakly argued. For example, his argument that 1 Corinthians 7 affirms married sexuality rests almost exclusively on Will Deming’s reconstruction of the Stoic-Cynic debate on marriage and its influence on Paul. Given the centrality of Stoic and Cynic philosophy in Loader’s interpretation of Paul’s attitudes toward celibacy and married sexuality, the absence of A. A. Long’s *Hellenistic Philosophy* from the bibliography is rather worrying. In addition, Loader seems to misunderstand Deming’s central aim. Deming writes, “Nowhere does [Paul] make the absolute claim that celibacy...is ‘best.’ Instead, he reasons that while remaining single is ‘better’..., marrying is ‘better’ than being overcome with sexual desire” (Deming 219). Deming’s rhetoric is cautious and does not necessitate an interpretation whereby Paul sees celibacy and marriage as equivalent moral decisions. Loader, however, seems to take Deming’s argument farther than Deming would necessarily go and reads Paul’s marriage concession in 1 Corinthians 7 as an endorsement of married sexuality. From the remark by Deming that Paul does not claim celibacy to be “best,” it does not necessarily follow that Paul endorses married sexuality. It is more likely, as Deming seems to suggest, that while Paul does not condemn marriage, neither does he endorse it.

As a whole, Loader seems to be subject to many of the pitfalls occasioned in biblical scholarship such as overdetermining philosophical controversies in the ancient world, e.g. characterizing pro- and anti-marriage stances as Stoic or Cynic “positions,” as well as uneven philological analysis. For example, in his discussion of homosexuality, Loader writes about Romans 1:27 “*Homoiōs*, translated here ‘in the same way,’ which can simply mean ‘likewise’ or ‘similarly,’ ensures that the male and female activities are identified as similar” (19). However, in his discussion on marriage, Loader argues about 1 Peter 3:1-2 “‘In the same way’ [*homoiōs*] should not be pressed, as though wives in relation to husbands are being equated with slaves in relation to masters” (51). While all translation must depend on context to determine meaning, his decision to imply distinctive parallelism in one citation and to downplay it in another without providing argumentation to support his translation choices is somewhat frustrating. Loader also seems uneven in his treatment of silence in the texts. He dismisses interpreters who would see the sin lists in Mark 7:20-21 as referring to homosexuality as “an argument from silence” (34), but insists that the New Testament is uncontroversial in its condemnation of abortion, infanticide, pornography, etc., which might also be characterized as an argument from silence. It is possible, however, that Loader merely means to suggest that such topics are not controversial within the field of New Testament studies, which is more or less accurate.

Nevertheless, for such a short work, *Sexuality in the New Testament* does accomplish its mission to swiftly give an accounting of the historical interpretations of key texts on sexuality in the New Testament. Not only does Loader present almost every Biblical citation which could have a bearing on a discussion of sexuality in the New Testament, he presents numerous citations from extra-canonical texts such as apocrypha, pseudepigrapha, the Dead Sea Scrolls, various Patristic and early Christian texts, contemporary Hellenistic texts and

Rabbinic Literature, although he rarely discusses those citations in detail. The book is particularly helpful not only for scholars needing quick references to primary or secondary literature on sexuality in the New Testament, but also for non-specialists who do not wish to invest the time that would be necessary to study these topics in depth. In particular, this book would be helpful for the teaching of undergraduates either in a New Testament course where the discussion of sexuality is one topic in a more comprehensive syllabus or in a Sexuality in the Ancient World course where the New Testament is one topic in a broader curriculum.

Works Cited

Deming, Will. *Paul on Marriage and Celibacy: The Hellenistic Background of 1 Corinthians 7*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Call for Papers: Stifling Sexuality

Lambda Classical Caucus Panel, American Philological Association, 2014 (Chicago)

Organizers: Bruce Frier (Michigan) and Mark Masterson (Victoria University Wellington, New Zealand)

Although, at least before the later Empire, sexual behavior between individuals of the same biological sex is widely tolerated in Greek and Roman law, expressions of personal or social disapproval are by no means unusual. Setting to one side the often uncertain status of pederasty, we note that many authors react to same-sex sexual conduct with distaste or even disgust, and subliterate attitudes, emerging in papyri or Pompeian graffiti, exhibit similar levels of hostility. A representative example, perhaps, of unofficial attitudes is Clement of Alexandria, who writes in his *Paedagogus* at 3.3.23: "I admire the ancient legislators of the Romans: they detested effeminate conduct and, according to their law of justice, they deemed it worthy of the pit to engage in carnal intercourse as the female, against the law of nature." Clement states that these laws were no longer enforced in Alexandria ca. 200 CE.

How should we evaluate expressions of disdain like Clement's? How effective are they likely to have been, either in conjunction with legal restrictions or independent of them? It is clear, for instance, that social controls are often adopted or relied upon when law is deemed ineffective for one reason or another. An example is ancient attitudes towards rights of authorship, which were fairly vigilant even though copyright itself did not yet exist; outright plagiarism was not remotely so common as one might have anticipated, see Katharina Schickert, *Der Schutz literarischer Urheberchaft im Rom der klassischen Antike* (2005).

Should we posit something similar for same-sex behavior? How did social views interact with legal restrictions? Were social controls successful in deterring at least public displays of same-sex conduct? Did social controls modulate displays in certain respects, or lead to the expression of same-sex desire in oblique ways?

Papers are invited on the widest possible basis consistent with this general theme. They may examine norms (alone or in conjunction with law), or look more closely at particular authors or particular forms of sexual conduct, including not just sexual intercourse but also behavior or dress identified with sexual minorities. We also welcome papers that consider connections between these norms and expectations of gender performance conforming to roles for women or men. The general aim of the panel will be to focus closely on this topic of informal modes of control and resultant expression, and so to encourage the development of scholarship concerning them.

Submissions should be anonymous, and otherwise adhere to APA guidelines for the formatting of abstracts. Please do not send abstracts to panel organizers; e-mail them as word documents to Ruby Blondell (Blondell@uw.edu). Questions may be addressed to the panel organizers: bwfrier@umich.edu or Mark.Master-son@vuw.ac.nz. Deadline for abstract submissions is Friday, February 8, 2013.

Reviewed by Mark Masterson, Lecturer of Classics, Victoria University of Wellington

In this excellent book, Daniel Orrells reveals the interestingly complex and interconnected discourses that investigations into Greek pederasty occasioned in Germany and Britain in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. A sense of a scene with recurring questions, concerns, and desires complicates assertions of the commencement of homosexuality somewhat over a century ago. While there is no doubt a Rubicon of a sort was crossed toward the end of the nineteenth century in the matter of male same-sex desire in the west, its drama has perhaps been overplayed and there also appear to have been more moving parts involved: race and relations with women also played a role.

For most of the book, Orrells traces the complex, paradoxical, and protean connections between masculinity and the ever metamorphosing reception of the coincidence of *paiderastia* and education in the corpus of Plato. The dates of the sources considered stretch from 1750 to 1930. The book begins with German explications of pederasty in the eighteenth century. Orrells then considers ways a number of important English intellectuals/writers (starting with Jowett and concluding with Forster) understood the connection between pederasty and education/masculine enculturation. Orrells concludes with consideration of Freud, focusing in particular on Freud's historical biography of Leonardo DaVinci. This chapter lacks the close focus of the other chapters on the fascination generated by Plato's texts. For all that, though, there are discernible connections with thematics present in the rest of the book: what are the possible relations of the past to the present? Is an idealized and reflective manhood always already Greek and, if so, Greek how? An additional strength of the book is that Orrells contextualizes the foregoing with men's concurrent relations with women and with western feelings of racial superiority (a key aspect to British imperial self-conception), the latter of which is connected to the frequent idealization, in Orrells' eighteenth- and nineteenth-century sources, of the racially pure and aggressive Dorians.

In the book's introduction, "Knowledge and Desire, Ancient and Modern," Orrells makes the case that serious engagement with Plato's text will raise the issue of the connection between eroticism and education. The *Symposium*, as Orrells rightfully underscores, features the spectacle of male pregnancy at the site of the transfer of knowledge; what kind of body does a man have to have to practice philosophy, to be civilized, and to teach? As Plato knew, sublimation was never an easy affair. Logically, decorporealizing Athenian pederastic education is a difficult thing to do and thoughtful readers wrestled with it throughout the time period Orrells surveys.

The first chapter, "*Paiderastia* and the Contexts of German Historicism," presents the varied reception of pederasty in Germany. Orrells focuses first on Johann Matthias Gesner, who took up a position in 1734 as the first professor of poetry and rhetoric at the University of Göttingen. Noting that Gesner was interested in the role education could play in making men out of boys, Orrells details Gesner's complex reception of pederasty. Gesner ultimately sees pederasty as exemplary, as something which could happen again, and this would be worth welcoming (though he is concerned about male/male eroticism which he sees as an ever-present possibility). In contrast (and in the next generation), Christoph Meiners (in an essay from 1775, "Die Männerliebe der Griechen") felt that the ancient Greeks had an irreducible cultural specificity. This specificity meant that realizing pederasty in the present day would be more or less impossible; that was then, this is now. Karl Otfried Müller (in his *The History and Antiquities of the Doric Race* from 1824 [translated into English in 1839]) thought that the institution of pederasty in Sparta was of central importance, but also that it was something about which very little could be said. Moritz Hermann Eduard Meier (writing about pederasty in the *Allgemeine Encyclopädie der Wissenschaften und Kunst* in 1837) provided the most detailed account of all the Germans of pederasty at nearly the same time. Interestingly, Meier both insists on the historical particularity of Greek pederasty (that it is something very different from, say, the institutions of nineteenth-century Germany) and yet, at the same time, he figures it as something that looks a lot like romance.

These German representations and investigations display a tension between both the possible exemplary and educative function (*Bildung*) that pederasty did (and perhaps could again perform) and the ambition of science/knowledge (*Wissenschaft*) to reveal specific historical realities. In all these scholars, concerns with both

of these (education and knowledge) raise questions about the possible connection of pederasty to society in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (and indeed beyond): does ancient, embodied education have something to teach us now about the creation of worthy persons, or is it an historical curiosity?

The book next moves to nineteenth-century Britain in the second chapter, called “Translating the Love of Philosophy: Jowett and Pater on Plato.” Suggesting that the German scholarship surveyed in the first chapter influenced developments across the channel, Orrells painstakingly tracks the way the numerous aporias, evident in the German writers, continue in England.

Benjamin Jowett placed Plato in the middle of the classics curriculum at Oxford and he “sought to prove that reading Plato made the man ready for duty [to] the British Empire, as [Jowett’s] reforms on Oxford syllabi were accompanied by constant interventions in the development of the civil-service tests” (39). Ultimately, though, Jowett’s understanding of the relation between pedagogy and pederasty in Plato is a contradictory affair. He sees these works proposing the possibility of male friendship that will be exemplary in every way, and yet the historical facts of carnality (and the Victorian taboo on carnal male/male relations) mean that exemplarity is always challenged by the insistent ancient historical specificity of the Greeks. Jowett does not surmount his problems and Orrells expertly charts Jowett’s effortful contortions for the reader. Walter Pater saw Plato’s texts as both summations of ancient philosophy (an historical document, as it were) and provocations to change in the present moment through their powerful ideas. The one who approaches Plato’s text could both learn of ancient philosophy itself and, at the same time, discover something that would transform her or, especially, his life (and this included the possibility of male/male carnality). Another important point Orrells makes about Pater’s discussion of the making of Greek men in Plato was the way in which Pater relies on the notion that Plato was thinking in terms of a Dorian ideal. This ideal, which features enslavement of defeated others and rigid hierarchies, played to the racialized feeling of superiority that characterized the attitude of the British Empire to much of the world in the nineteenth century.

In the third chapter of the book, “The Case of John Addington Symonds,” we read first of Symonds’ *Memoirs*. Although he was married, Symonds was most certainly attracted to other men and to boys. Orrells shows how at times Symonds sees himself as a pederast looking for a boy to love and, at other times, as a man who is looking to love another man. There is a tension, therefore, between what were known as Ionian and Dorian modes of love between males (157; 159). “Ionian” designated the age-discrepant pederasty that has been most famous in recent decades of scholarship. “Dorian,” on the other hand, was associated with love between mature men who were more than likely warriors. Symonds also was never quite certain whether it was his nature that made him understand Plato, or whether it was Plato who told him what his nature was: “Is it Symonds’s sexuality that permits him special access into the ancient text; does his sexuality create the ancient text? Or was it Platonic textuality that told, and explained to him, his sexuality” (155)? There is also an interesting discussion of Symonds’ *A Problem in Greek Ethics*, in which Orrells shows once again that a tension is present between the urge to document Greece and the belief that the example of the Greeks provides a potentially transformative model for modern men.

The next chapter, “Trying Greek Love: Oscar Wilde and E. M. Forster’s *Maurice*,” features discussion of these two authors. Wilde, who has been seen in some quarters in recent years embodying the emergence of homosexuality as an identity, and, in still other quarters, as the first queer, turns out in Orrells’ analysis to have a persona greater than the conflicted sexual politics to which we may wish to connect him now. In addition to noble male love, which Wilde both outrageously avowed at one of his trials, and, yet, which he never seemed to have supported enough, there is a profound Christian coloration to his self-presentation that coexists with an assertion of his own wholeness that he contrasts to the degeneration he declared was present in his boyfriend, Bosie. In his novel *Maurice* (written 1913-1914, but published in 1971), Forster contrasts two men: Maurice, who is carnally liberated, and Clive, who ultimately sets aside his same-sex interests for pursuit of sexual fulfillment with his wife. Orrells shows how the same educative system plausibly produces both men.

“Freud and the History of Masculinity: Between Oedipus and Narcissus” (chapter five) seems misplaced in the context of this book. While the chapter surely recalls the German contexts surveyed earlier through shared nationality, Sigmund Freud’s positing the formation of masculine subjectivity in both opposite- and same-sex cathexes in early childhood is a formative dynamic emphatically prior to any conceivable educative pederastic

context (to say nothing of what “Dorian” warriors might have gotten up to). The chapter, therefore, substantially departs from the concerns of the book up to this point. It is not that this chapter is irrelevant to the rest of the book, however; the emphasis on relations with the mother and on race do provide some connections. It is just that the argumentation and evidence in this chapter is of a different kind and Greece is pretty far away through most of it.

In addition to wrapping up the book, the conclusion (“The Truth of *Erōs* and the *Erōs* for Truth”) also includes a brief intriguing engagement with Michel Foucault. Orrells suggests that Foucault’s project of trying to understand the coercive and limiting forces of current discourse through recourse to an image of self-fashioning Greeks (featured especially in the second volume of *The History of Sexuality*) recalls tensions seen elsewhere in Orrells’ book: the Greeks both are different from Foucault and yet provide a model for Foucault’s efforts to demystify and historicize sexuality.

I conclude this review with some general observations. While the title speaks of modern masculinity and classical culture, the focus (with the exception of the chapter on Freud) is substantially on masculine same-sex desire throughout. The occasional reader may be surprised by this. I, however, am not; explorations of masculinity need to take account of desire between men because prohibitions and norms against such desire don’t suggest that true manhood doesn’t have a relation to same-sex desire, but rather that it does. A further lesson that should be taken from this book is that viewing same-sex desire in teleological terms with same-sex desire prior to the 1890s regarded either as homosexuality by another name (a highly unfashionable position), or as a sort of sodomy waiting to toddle off the stage, is mistaken; these lives were considerably more complicated than that. This book is also worth reading alongside Linda Dowland’s *Hellenism & Homosexuality* (1995), which is more teleological in its assumptions but adroit, and still has much to offer—especially in terms of its highlighting of transformations to Victorian manhood generated by the French revolution and its aftermath. Orrells’ book is a rich one and the challenge and delight of it is that it reads together sources, often internally contradictory and also often at cross-purposes with each other, to present a dense discursive structure full of cues, evasions, and surprising confessions (see, e.g., pg. 119 for Jowett’s “discrete tolerance of passionate friendships between married men”). This is a non-naïve analysis of sources that are likewise non-naïve.

If you have an idea for an article or the name of a book which should be reviewed, please contact Keely Lake (klake@wayland.org).