Kate Gilhuly

Cambridge

Cambridge www.cambridge.org/9780521899987

This page intentionally left blank

The Feminine Matrix of Sex and Gender in Classical Athens

In *The Feminine Matrix of Sex and Gender in Classical Athens,* Kate Gilhuly explores the relationship between the prostitute, the wife, and the ritual performer in Athenian literature. She suggests that these three roles formed a symbolic continuum that served as an alternative to a binary conception of gender in classical Athens and provided a framework for assessing both masculine and feminine civic behavior. Grounded in close readings of four texts, "Against Neaira," Plato's *Symposium,* Xenophon's *Symposium,* and Aristophanes' *Lysistrata,* this book draws on observations from gender studies and the history of sexuality in ancient Greece to illuminate the relevance of these representations of women to civic behavior, pederasty, philosophy, and politics. In these original readings, Gilhuly casts a new light on the complexity of the classical Athenian sex/gender system as she demonstrates how various and even opposing strategies worked together to articulate different facets of the Athenian subject.

Kate Gilhuly is an assistant professor in the Department of Classical Studies at Wellesley College.

THE FEMININE MATRIX OF SEX AND GENDER IN CLASSICAL ATHENS

KATE GILHULY

WELLESLEY COLLEGE

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK
Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521899987

© Kate Gilhuly 2009

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provision of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published in print format 2008

ISBN-13 978-0-511-46358-7 eBook (EBL)

ISBN-13 978-0-521-89998-7 hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of urls for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

This book is dedicated to the memory of Katherine Kilby Howard.

Contents

Acknowledgments *page* ix
List of Abbreviations xi

1 Introduction 1
2 Collapsing Order: Typologies of Women in the Speech "Against Neaira" 29
3 Why Is Diotima a Priestess? The Feminine Continuum in Plato's *Symposium* 58
4 Bringing the *Polis* Home: Private Performance and the Civic Gaze in Xenophon's *Symposium* 98
5 Sex and Sacrifice in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* 140
Conclusion 180

Bibliography 189
Index Locorum 199
Subject Index 205

Acknowledgments

This book has been a long time in the making, and Leslie Kurke has been generous with her insight and guidance every step of the way. I owe her special thanks. Carol Dougherty has given me crucial assistance and support in the final stages of writing. She has read many drafts and seemed to know what I was trying to say even when I did not. Mark Griffith commented on some of these chapters in their earliest versions. The Mellon Foundation supported a year of postdoctoral work at Northwestern University. Victoria Wohl and Florence Dore have given me helpful comments and encouragement when I really needed it. Bryan Burns, Carolyn Dewald, Vincent Farenga, Tom Habinek, Amy Richlin, Greg Thalmann, and Phiroze Vasunia contributed to a lively intellectual environment at the University of Southern California in which this book first took shape. Rebecca Jamin helped prepare the manuscript. Anne Gilhuly has read and edited much of this work; all of the jargon that remains is my own. Thanks to Anabel and Aidan Bush for sharing their mother with this project. Finally, I am grateful to Mark Bush, whose love and support helped bring this book into the light of day.

Abbreviations

ABSA	*Annual of the British School at Athens*
Ach.	*Acharnians*
AE	*Archaiologike Ephemeris*
Aes.	Aeschylus
Aeschin.	Aeschines
Ag.	*Agamemnon*
AJAH	*American Journal of Ancient History*
AJP	*American Journal of Philology*
Alc.	*Alcibiades*
Ap.	*Apology*
Ar.	Aristophanes
ARV	J. D. Beazley, *Attic Red Figure Vase-Painting* (Oxford, 1956)
AS	*Ancient Society*
Ath.	*Athenaios*
Ath. *Deipn.*	Athenaios' *Deipnosophistai*
Ath. Pol.	[Aristotle] *Athenaion Politeia*
Av.	*Birds*
Bibl.	*Bibliotheca*
CA	*Classical Antiquity*
CJ	*Classical Journal*
CP	*Classical Philology*
CQ	*Classical Quarterly*
Cr.	*Crito*
CR	*Classical Review*
Cyr.	*Cyropaedia*
Ekkl.	Aristophanes' *Ekklesiazousai*
Eur.	Euripides
Fr.	Aristophanes' *Frogs*
FrGrH	F. Jakoby et al., eds., *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (Berlin, 1923–)
GRBS	*Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*

Hell.	*Hellenica*
Herod.	Herodotus
Hist.	*Histories*
Hom. h. Aphr.	*Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*
HThR	*Harvard Theological Review*
IG	F. H. de Gaertingen et al., eds., *Inscriptiones Graecae,* 2nd ed. (Berlin, 1924–)
Il.	Homer's *Iliad*
Int. of Dreams	*Interpretation of Dreams*
Iph. in Tauris	*Iphigeneia among the Taurians*
JHS	*Journal of Hellenic Studies*
Mem.	*Memorabilia*
Men.	Menander
Nic.	*Nicias*
O.	*Olympian*
Od.	*Odyssey*
Oik.	*Oikonomikos*
Pi.	Pindar
Plut.	Plutarch
Pyth.	*Pythian*
RE	G. Wissowa et al., *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumwissenschaft* (Munich, 1903–78)
Rep.	*Republic*
Rh.	*Rhetorica*
Sch. Ar. *Av.*	Scholia on Aristophanes' *Birds*
Symp.	*Symposium*
TAPA	*Transactions of the American Philological Association*
Theog.	*Theogony*
Thesmo.	*Thesmophoriazousai*
Thuc.	Thucydides
W.D.	*Works and Days*
Xen.	Xenophon
YCS	*Yale Classical Studies*

1. Introduction

THE FEMININE MATRIX

In the closing remarks of pseudo-Demosthenes 59, the speech "Against Neaira," the chief prosecutor, Apollodoros, spells out the civic chaos that will ensue if Neaira, an erstwhile courtesan, is allowed to pass as a citizen's wife:

> *If the law is held in contempt by us with her acquittal, and loses its authority, then undoubtedly it will turn out that the career of prostitutes will fall to the daughters of citizens, as many as cannot be married because of poverty, while the status of free women will fall to* hetairai, *if they are given the right to fearlessly have children as they wish and to take part in the rituals and sacraments and honors of the city. (59.113)*

Apollodoros appeals to a rigid distinction between the identity of the *hetaira* and the citizen wife. It is the prerogative of the wife to procreate and to play an active role in the sacred life of the city, and this is what distinguishes her from the courtesan. The logic of Apollodoros' claim, that daughters of citizens will become prostitutes if an ex-courtesan is allowed to become a wife, is dubious, unless we subscribe to the notion that these roles are defined as radically opposed to one another.[1] Despite the fact that this same speech provides testimony that the wife of a citizen could charge her client a higher fee for sex than an unattached prostitute could ([Dem.] 59.41), Apollodoros here rests his case with an appeal to a clear conceptual distinction between the categories of prostitute and wife.

On the other hand, there is also a strong conceptual link between the prostitute and ritual agent. One characteristic these roles shared was that both were visible in the public sphere.[2] Artemidorus, in his book about dream divination, makes explicit the symbolic association between the two types of women:

1 For a passage that evokes a similar type of logic see Dio Chrysostom, *Euboian Discourse* 7.133–152, discussed by Houser (2002). Translations are my own unless otherwise attributed.

2 On this connection see Faraone (2006: 220); Goff (2005: 153).

"It is good for women and girls who are both free and rich to drive a chariot through a city; it means good priesthoods for them. But for poor women, riding on horseback through the city announces prostitution" (Artemidorus, *Int. of Dreams* 1.57).[3]

How can we understand these two ideas together? How can there be both a deep-seated distinction between the prostitute and the wife as well as an apparent association between the prostitute and the woman, frequently a wife, performing "the rituals and sacraments and honors of the city"? The answer to this question is complicated, and the different strategies that Athenian authors had for representing these relationships will be the subject of this book.

This book started as a study of prostitution in classical Athenian literature. When I noticed that the texts in which there was a sustained depiction of prostitution repeatedly figured the prostitute as a part of a particular spectrum of feminine social roles, the discovery of an indigenous pattern of thought eclipsed my original aims. The prostitute was only one aspect of a more expansive frame of conceiving the feminine – and this frame seemed worth investigating. Indeed, a continuum of femininity has significant implications for various fields of signification that extend beyond what we can learn from prostitutes alone, including gender and sexuality, performance and exchange. The feminine matrix – which configured the relationship between the prostitute, the wife, and the priestess or other ritual agent – was an organizing principle that the Athenians in the classical period used to think and talk about themselves; it was part of the Athenian social imaginary.[4] This structure operates in a variety of texts and genres and was therefore linked to various facets of Athenian identity.

As we will see, the feminine matrix is a fractured and flexible discourse, and its polyvalence lends itself to various representational strategies. The word

3 The inclusion of Artemidorus might seem anachronistic, but here I am following Jack Winkler, who argues that Artemidorus' writings reflect a cultural tradition that reached back to the classical period. Winkler (1990: 43).

4 Alan Sheridan traces the history of the "social imaginary" in a translator's note to Loraux (1986: 328), noting that *l'imaginaire* was made popular by Sartre and then adopted by Lacan. It was adopted by social theory and became the social imaginary. I follow Sheridan's explanation, by using the phrase "in reference to the city's self-image, how it sees itself in fantasy, with a large element of idealization and wish fulfillment."

matrix in my title conveys the sense of an array of possible combinations of meaning and is suggestively derived from the Greek word for mother.[5] Among other things, this model provides a way to depict gender through a model that is not binary – instead of conceiving of the feminine as the opposite of masculinity, it allows for one type of woman to be defined in relation to others.[6] Since gender is a relationship, the multivalent feminine in turn implies a correspondingly destabilized conception of masculinity – that is to say, masculinity is complicated too.[7] Moreover, with the prostitute as anchor, this structure is also inevitably implicated in issues of sexuality. Significantly, while this matrix is essentially heterosexual, it surfaces in those texts that have long been considered central to an understanding of classical Athenian pederasty.

Thus, in the readings that follow, I hope to cast a new light on the complexity and heterogeneity of the classical Athenian sex/gender system. I examine the way that representing the feminine as a continuum of roles acts as one discursive strategy in a constellation of tactics for representing sexuality in different ways. Central to my understanding of the way sexuality is constructed is Foucault's notion of discourse, which he explains as an open field in which tactical elements can circulate in various combinations in the service of diverse strategies. The same element can be used to produce multiple meanings, or to serve opposing strategies. Discourse is inherently unstable. It is both the means and effect of power, but it also can be the starting point of resistance to power.[8]

In what follows we will see the matrix of the prostitute, the wife, and the ritual performer put to work in a variety of strategies. It is used both to regulate civic identity as well as to construct an extra-civic masculinity. Whether conceived of as a hierarchy, triad, or continuum, it is used to intersect with, oppose, or eclipse the binary power differential associated with pederastic relations, as well as the relentless polarization of male and female in Athenian literature. It engages with and provides a counterbalance to the

5 I am grateful to Joel Krieger for his help with the title.

6 For an interesting version of gender as a sliding scale see Clover (1993).

7 DeLauretis (1987: 4).

8 Foucault describes discourse as "tactical elements or blocks operating in the field of force relations; there can exist different and even contradictory discourses within the same strategy; they can, on the contrary, circulate without changing their form from one strategy to another, opposing strategy." Foucault (1980: 101–102).

unstable distinctions that characterize the economically oriented discourse of prostitution, while in relation to concern with the appetites, it can be manipulated to assuage anxieties and to make prescriptions about the role of pleasure and sex in the citizen body.

As should be clear by this point, although the texts that I address in this book all share a polyvalent depiction of the feminine, it would be misleading to suggest that my analysis is wholly focused on femininity. Nor is the significance of this spectrum confined to the realm of sex and gender. For it also configures relationships between various spheres of exchange, with the prostitute eliciting marketplace transactions, the wife signifying exchanges made in the civic sphere, and the ritual agent performing transactions on a cosmic level. Finally, because the prostitute and the ritual agent were not subject to the same representational constraints as a woman in her capacity as wife, this triad was also deployed to define and contain the possibilities for feminine performance in public. Much work has been done recently in all of these areas, and it will be helpful to situate my argument in the context of contemporary scholarship. I will first show in broad strokes how this book draws on and contributes to current discussions about gender and sexuality, and then I will turn to a discussion of scholarship relevant to performance and exchange.

Because I have selected only those texts that include a depiction of a prostitute, wife, and ritual agent in relation to one another, my entry point is indeed through representations of women.[9] In this sense this book owes a debt to those scholars who in the 1970s brought about a "paradigm shift" in terms of disciplinary thinking by developing a methodology for the study of women in classical antiquity.[10] The work of these scholars – and here I am thinking of Sarah Pomeroy, Mary Lefkowitz, and Maureen Fant and the contributors to the 1973 *Arethusa* volume – was generally devoted to making women visible in the classical record.[11] Significantly, they recognized a range of women's

9 Terminology is discussed later in this chapter.

10 The term *paradigm shift* was used to describe the effect of feminism on Classics by Marilyn Skinner (1983: 71). For a historical overview of the history of feminism and the classics see McClure (1997), McManus (1997), Rabinowitz (2004), Rabinowitz and Richlin (1993).

11 Pomeroy (1975); Lefkowitz and Fant's *Women in Greece and Rome* was revised as *Women's Life in Greece and Rome.*

experiences, statuses, and public and private roles: Indeed, Pomeroy cautions against thinking of women as an undifferentiated mass.[12]

As scholars embraced feminist theory, however, they began to grapple with what Amy Richlin has called "the paradox of our discipline" – the problem of the feminist's relation to textual material, which is nearly all written by men.[13] The nature of the relationship between representation and reality is a relentless riddle for the classicist interested in gender. Linked to this, but specific to the study of Greek drama, is a problem that Helene Foley posed: "While women in daily life appear to have been confined to the internal spaces of the household, to public silence, and to non-participation in the political life of Athens, women play an exceptionally prominent role in drama."[14]

Engaging with French structuralism, specifically Vernant's idea that tragedy was a space where the city put its values on trial, and negotiated its conflicts, both Helene Foley and Froma Zeitlin read the powerful women of Greek drama as sophisticated constructs that served in the project of exploring masculine identity.[15] They demonstrated that gender was a potent symbolic field for negotiating complex social relationships such as that between *polis* and *oikos,* Olympian and Chthonic, Greek and barbarian. Around the same time Nicole Loraux demonstrated the centrality of gender to Athenian civic discourse as she analyzed the place of gender in the social imaginary.[16] With these scholars I have found that representations of women are "good to think with,"[17] and that gender is a powerful organizing rubric in Athenian thought.

12 Pomeroy (1975: 60); see also McManus (1997: 18).

13 Richlin (1992: xiii).

14 Foley (1981: 133).

15 "The women of Greek tragedy ... are constructed to argue out problems and expose social contradiction central to the lives of their masculine creators and to a largely exclusive masculine audience." Foley (1992: 134). In a similar vein, Zeitlin says, "Even when female characters struggle with the conflicts generated by the particularities of their subordinate social position, their demands for identity and self-esteem are still designed primarily for exploring the male project of selfhood in the larger world." Zeitlin (1996: 347).

16 Loraux (1993: 11; originally published in French in 1981).

17 Loraux (1986; originally published in French in 1981). Rabinowitz (2004) questions whether this type of reading can be considered feminist.

My work draws on their insight that representations of women (especially in realms from which women are excluded) often speak most volubly about men or other things.[18] But where many of these readings imply that woman serves as the irrational, unstable, multiple Other that renders the masculine self whole, my analysis demands that we understand the incongruities in representations of the feminine as a sign of the incoherence of the masculine self. That is to say, the coexistence of different strategies for representing women – as part of the male–female binary or as part of a triad of feminine roles, for instance – implies that masculinity is not a rationalized whole.[19]

Concomitant with the growing sophistication in gender studies I have traced was a burgeoning interest in understanding pederasty and its relationship (or lack thereof) to contemporary discourses of sexuality. In 1978 K. J. Dover published *Greek Homosexuality,* in which he suggested that Greek pederasty is characterized by a power differential between the pursuer and the pursued or active and submissive sex partner that is underwritten by perceptions of heterosexual sex roles.[20] This gendered conception of Greek homosexuality was later broadcast beyond the field of classics by Michel Foucault in *The Use of Pleasure,* volume 2 of his *History of Sexuality.*[21] He made the claim that Greek sexual identity was less crucially determined by object choice (as is now the case) but rather was concerned with power dynamics, where a normative masculine role is defined by being an actor or penetrator, whereas the feminine role is characterized by passivity and penetration.[22] Foucault argued that the association of gender with sexual roles explains much of the anxiety about men or boys in homosexual couplings who are perceived to be sexually submissive. Because these observations represent Greek sexuality as radically

18 Lardinois and McClure (2001) bring together a variety of approaches to interpreting women's voices in male-authored texts.

19 In this sense my readings converge with psychoanalytic interpretations of gender in classical texts that explicitly identify the unstable feminine as constitutive of the masculine subject, e.g., Loraux (1995) and Wohl (1998).

20 Dover (1989: esp. 100–109).

21 Foucault (1985: 44–45; 221–222). Dover's study is devoted to understanding sexual behavior, whereas Foucault is examining "the historical relationships of power and the discourse on sex." Foucault (1980: 90). The distinction is an important one that is not always acknowledged when the two scholars are considered together.

22 Foucault (1985: 225).

different from our own, they have been crucial to an understanding of sexuality as historically contingent: "the radical difference of Greek sexuality has been presented as one of the most vivid demonstrations of the efficacy of cultural constructions in the field of experience, desire, and subjectivity, and one of the most widely credited."[23]

Although this school of thought has had tremendous influence, it has also met with serious criticism.[24] The most trenchant critique, with regard to the Greek evidence, has been proposed by James Davidson. He suggests that masculinity is crucially concerned with self-mastery, especially regulation of the appetites, as opposed to active and passive sex roles. Taking Timarchus as his example (the poster boy of the penetration thesis), who is accused of being a prostitute hired by numerous men, as well as a man who seduces other men's wives, Davidson argues that Timarchus cannot be understood simply as an adult who takes pleasure in being penetrated. Rather, Davidson proposes that the unifying theme in Aeschines' speech is Timarchus' unbridled appetite – an interpretation that makes sense out of the double accusation of *porneia* and the squandering of his estate.[25] And yet I don't think it negates the implication that when Aeschines refers to Timarchus as the wife of Hegesandros he is evoking the power dynamics of their sexual relationship.[26] Instead of pitting these two conceptions of masculinity in a zero sum competition, we can understand both mastery over one's desires and phallic agency/passivity

23 Davidson (2001: 6).

24 Davidson emphasizes the way the two accounts corroborate one another (2001) and is critical of the penetration model (1997: xxv, 253–256). See also Thornton (1991) and (1997: 193–202); Richlin (1998). Hubbard (1998) suggests that pederasty was associated with elite culture. See also Foxhall (1998) and Cohen (1991). For an overview of scholarship on ancient sexuality see Karras (2000).

25 Davidson (1990: 254).

26 The insinuation is emphasized when Aeschines says that Hegesandros, a man now, used to be Laodamos' wife (Aes. 1.110). Similarly, in his closing remarks, Aeschines compares Timarchus to an unmarried woman who had been seduced and was punished by her father – he walled her up in an empty room with a horse – because she did not guard her ἡλικία (maidenhood) until marriage (1.182). Surely after so much talk of his prostitution, and Timarchus' willingness to have things done to him (1.41), this explicit effeminization, the analogy to a deflowered maiden, communicates a willingness to be penetrated.

as tactical blocks that circulated simultaneously in the discursive field of masculinity.

We see different strategies for representing gender deployed at different times depending on the rhetorical demands of the context. As Foucault has argued, and Davidson has reiterated, the idea of having mastery over oneself and control of one's pleasures is essential to the Athenian notion of masculinity, and this notion is in fact congruous with the idealization of the male citizen as sexual actor.[27] Thus, in the *Laws* an analogy is made between the profligate man and the one who is penetrated: as the Athenian stranger argues against pederasty, he says, "as all men will blame the cowardice of the man who always yields to pleasures and is never able to hold out against them, will they not likewise reproach that man who plays the woman's part with the resemblance he bears to his model?" (836e). Being a slave to one's own desires is comparable to being penetrated in terms of failed masculinity. Gender then is not a unified field – there are different strategies for representing it, and they circulate in a variety of permutations.

However, the scholarship on ancient sexuality tends to be limited to binary conceptual structures, evident in the work of Dover and Foucault as well as that of those arguing against this paradigm, whose critiques tend to be marshaled around the poles of penetration/not penetration.[28] I have found many of these arguments compelling, but the rhetorical shape of this scholarship seems to replicate the phallocentrism of the culture it investigates. Instead, I will argue that the multiplicity and complexity of sexuality that the Athenians themselves recognized demanded a mobile and varied set of representational strategies. In other words, the Athenians had more than one way of thinking and talking about sex and gender; the existence of one strategy does not negate the other. This book argues that a more robust understanding

27 Wohl (2002: 15n.30) asserts that "Davidson presents himself as a critic of Foucault, but the very guiding principles of his book are Foucaultian, not only the emphasis on discourse . . . but also the idea of pleasure as a key element in the struggle for self-mastery within a culture that prized moderation." I would add to this criticism that his use of the term *discourse* is sometimes unsatisfying, e.g., his suggestion that courtesans manipulated the complex economic discourse surrounding their trade for their own interests. Davidson (1997: 125).

28 Davidson (2001) offers an explicit critique of this thesis, but is still focused primarily on the issue of penetration.

of the heterogeneity of discourse offers an escape hatch from the binary structure that has shaped the discussion of ancient sexuality.

In contrast to a sustained interest in pederasty, the history of Athenian heterosexual discourse has received far less attention. In a certain way Greek heterosexuality seems to be treated as somehow less "constructed" than homosexuality. Dover argues that perceptions about ancient heterosexuality informed pederastic practices and then compares Greek homosexual and modern heterosexual pursuit: "No great knowledge of the world is needed to perceive the analogy between classical Athens and heterosexual pursuit in (say) British society in the nineteen-thirties."[29] Although Dover doesn't say this explicitly, there is an implicit assumption that Greek heterosexuality, and the power dynamics that characterized it, were less radically different from our own, less determined by historical factors than homosexuality was. Foucault's reliance on Dover and his famous lack of interest in the feminine subject did little to counteract this association.[30]

However, the recent spate of scholarly interest in ancient prostitution is one avenue through which the representational contours of ancient heterosexuality and its constructedness have become more visible. Leslie Kurke's work on the *porne* and *hetaira* in the archaic period, as well as James Davidson's research on pleasure and consumption in Athens, both characterize representations of prostitution as a privileged site of ideological negotiations. For Kurke, the permeable distinction between the *porne* (streetwalker) and the *hetaira* (courtesan) signifies other fraught and unstable oppositions such as that between coinage and gift exchange, the *agora* and the symposium, and democratic versus elitist ideology. Davidson situates sex for sale in a constellation of consumable pleasures; anxieties about food and sex are the expression of a particularly Athenian concern with appetite and self-mastery. In different ways, both of these interpretations assume that talk about sex is not all about sex; rather, they suggest that any given understanding of "sexuality" is determined by a network of associations peculiar to specific historical circumstances. My work builds on the insights of these scholars. I draw on the notion implicit in these analyses

29 Dover (1989: 89); see also Davidson (2001: 35), who argues that Dover's view of Greek sexuality is informed by a desire to distance Greek homosexuality from our own conceptions of the homosexual and thus to make them "less other to himself."
30 Richlin (1998).

that heterosexuality – like pederasty – is also historically contingent and that the indeterminate identity of the prostitute and the relationship between different status roles (here the *porne* and the *hetaira*) lends itself to the negotiation of power relations and to the definition of different spheres of experience. I extend these observations by situating the discourse of prostitution as it is elaborated in relationship to other feminine roles.

A primary goal of this project is to intervene at the juncture between gender studies and the history of sexuality. For here, as I have outlined above, there is a serious disparity between the complex feminine as elucidated in the lens of gender studies and the largely unexamined discourse of heterosexuality that subtends the discussion of the history of sexuality. The feminine is implicated in the discussion of ancient sexuality but tends to be undertheorized in this emphatically phallocentric inquiry. Insisting on a more nuanced understanding of the feminine produces in turn a richer understanding of the construction of ancient sexuality.[31]

Although feminist work has much to offer the history of sexuality, the contingent and incoherent subject proposed by Foucault and other post-structural theorists has raised significant questions for feminist classicists. In a sense it seems that just as the feminine subject was about to emerge in the classical record, the very notion of subjectivity was called into question. For Amy Richlin the Foucauldian subject has the dangerous effect of obscuring the consistent oppression of women (and other disempowered groups) through time and across cultures.[32] *The Feminine Matrix* does not lose sight of the way gender was manipulated to serve masculine interests, but it also tries to avoid presuming the gendered categories under analysis. With Page duBois I find Foucault's incitement to defamiliarize antiquity compelling enough to think with him despite his significant exclusions.[33] I don't think that a feminist reading is incompatible with the post-modern subject. If only we adopt a slightly modified constructionist position, acknowledging that over time

31 Significantly, Davidson's argument about the construction of sexuality in "Against Timarchus" does embrace a more complex notion of gender in order to refute the predominance of the penetration model. Davidson (2001).

32 Richlin (1992).

33 duBois (1998: 93).

discourses accrete and change (as opposed to superseding one another), we can accommodate the idea that sex has a history, while certain aspects of it remain constant.[34]

SCRIPTING GENDER

Women, Agency, and Foreclosure

Both the prostitute and the ritual agent were women who performed in public. Neither their movement nor their representation was constrained in the same way as the woman in her capacity as wife, and thus in different ways each role allows the possibility for representing a fuller feminine subjectivity.[35] Because they are arenas in which female agency and subjectivity can be explored, both prostitution and ritual have been fertile areas for those scholars who are engaged in recovering the lived experience of ancient Greek women.[36] My analysis, however, focuses on the ideological function these roles played in the social imaginary. Thus, the object of my inquiry is not material reality but the way people imagined their relationship to that reality.

In the texts I consider, "Against Neaira," Plato's *Symposium,* Xenophon's *Symposium,* and Aristophanes' *Lysistrata,* I examine an array of depictions of powerful women: we hear of Neaira supporting a lavish lifestyle for her entire family, we encounter Diotima as she condescends to Socrates, we see a hired girl enact her true love, and we watch Lysistrata rally the women of Greece for a protest against the Peloponnesian War. However, the depiction of feminine subjectivity is present in these texts not as an end in itself but rather to be contained, and regulated – in other words, feminine subjectivity is foreclosed. We might understand this persistent tendency toward containment as testimony to "the female power that may well have inspired this male reaction,"[37] which indeed I do, but it is equally significant that women as powerful public agents

34 This is the argument Sedgwick (1990: 44–48) levels against Halperin and Foucault, and that Halperin absorbs and responds to in Halperin (2002).

35 On the subjectivity of the prostitute, see Gilhuly (2007).

36 Pomeroy (1975); Connelly (2007); Goff (2004) is trying to recuperate lives, but in a way that incorporates a sophisticated understanding of the role of representation.

37 Rabinowitz (1993: 23).

were integral to the project of constructing the masculine self.[38] In much the same way that Victoria Wohl has argued in the case of tragedy, the contradictory impulses evident in Athenian representations of women reveal woman as a locus for reading ideology as it is being negotiated. It wasn't enough for Athenian men to think of their wives and daughters safe from the public eye at home; they needed the idea of women as actors to fully imagine themselves. And this is a tacit acknowledgment of the inadequacy of asymmetrical gender relations from a masculine perspective.

The texts I examine depict feminine roles as they are being calibrated for an audience of men. What we see in these depictions is a negotiation of the public transcript for feminine performance in public – a transcript that had a profound, but mostly unknowable, effect on women's lives.[39] What we can recover through the scripting of roles for women in public, however, is a view of gender hierarchy as it is being constructed from the masculine perspective. As James Scott observes, "The public transcript is, to put it crudely, the *self*-portrait of dominant elites as they would have themselves be seen."[40] While the negotiation of the public transcript for feminine gender roles can only suggest the constraints under which Athenian women lived, it reveals Athenian masculinity as it is being constituted.[41]

The idea of the public transcript also allows us to consider the frame through which women's public presence was interpreted. One advantage to this approach is that the roles described do not necessarily refer to distinct women – wives performed rituals and held ceremonial positions; prostitutes

38 Wohl (2005: 156; 1998).

39 We can perhaps trace the practical effects of the public transcript to a greater degree in the court cases.

40 Scott (1990: 18). Although it is not my purpose in this project to pursue this, Scott's analysis presents intriguing possibilities for the detection of traces of women's resistance to the public transcript. For instance he notes that adaptations to inequalities (such as performing inferiority on demand and acting otherwise outside the gaze of power) "are depicted as natural characteristics of the subordinate group, a move that has, in turn, the great advantage of underlining the innate inferiority of its members when it comes to logic, truth, honesty and reason, and thereby justifying their continued domination by their betters."

41 In this sense my approach bears a resemblance to Zeitlin (1990: 63–96). Victoria Wohl also reads the woman as a "fantasied other who vouchsafes for the man his subject status." Wohl (1998: xxxiv).

were sometimes married and also participated in rituals – legitimately and otherwise.[42] However, the way a woman was perceived in public depended on what role she played.

Recent scholarship, arguing that civic participation was scripted through performative norms, has emphasized the degree to which Athenian democracy was self-regulated through the prominence of spectacle.[43] At the same time, the performative has also come to be an important tool in gender studies; here I am thinking especially of the work of Judith Butler, who describes the performative as "the reiterative and citational practice by which discourse produces the effects that it names."[44] In this way, as I will argue, the prostitute, the wife, and the ritual performer can be understood as a discursive matrix that gave meaning to gendered performance. It provided a spectrum of reference through which various aspects of sex and gender, both male and female, became culturally legible.

Before pressing further, it will be useful to discuss terminology.[45] In the ancient Greek world, prostitution was a diverse, polyvalent category, and there

42 A well-known example of the convergence of ritual and prostitution can be found in the Corinthian prostitutes mentioned by Pindar, *O.13;* see also Athenaios 13.573 and Plutarch *Moralia*. The orator Lysias was said to have initiated Metaneira [Dem.] 59. 21. See Goff (2004: 153–158).

43 Goldhill (1999); Farenga (2005). Stehle (1997) combines an emphasis on both gender and performance. She notes that women's performances of communal poetry served as both "reflection and model" by enacting female subordination. In the following chapters, I explore a similar ambiguity in the status of women as performing subjects to the one she identifies: "according to the construction of gender in Greece, men, not women, had the right to define women's identity, but when women spoke in public about themselves they appeared to be articulating their own identity." The texts I treat, however, were not performed by women, but they represent women as performing subjects.

44 Butler (1993: 2). Butler's notion of the performative is a Derridean revision of J. L. Austin's notion of the performative (different from performance), which describes a type of statement that, when spoken, performs an action. Austin (1962).

45 Our categories of prostitution and ritual each incorporate a variety of titles designating different social functions in the ancient world. The link between these two categories, each of them broadly conceived, cannot therefore be traced on a lexical level, but must become visible as a conceptual pattern. While I might seem guilty of imposing modern categories on discrete ancient data, I think the recurrence of the association in the texts I examine here (and elsewhere) will have to speak for itself.

was no single or generic word such as prostitute to designate any person who engaged in sex trade (which is how I use the term). Rather, a range of status gradations was recognized by a varied vocabulary: there were common prostitutes (*pornai*), concubines (*pallakai*), courtesans (*hetairai*), flute-girls (*auletrides*), and acrobats (*orchestrides*). There were endless periphrases for describing the professions: almost all the nomenclature carried some stigma, so if a man were to describe an event at which he was present, or an occasion he simply did not want to represent in hostile fashion, he was likely to describe a prostitute with a euphemism.[46] The most ideologically charged pairing within this variegated field of terms is the distinction between the *porne* and the *hetaira*.[47] Dover attributes the distinction to the number of different men a woman had contact with:

> *Plainly a woman in a brothel, dealing with a queue of customers every day, was a* porne, *and equally plainly a woman who was kept in luxury by a wealthy man for a year or more, during which time she never (well hardly ever) had intercourse with anyone else, was a* hetaira, *but the dividing line between the two categories could not be sharp. . . . Moreover, whether one applied the term* porne *or* hetaira *to a woman depended on the emotional attitude towards her which one wished to express, or to engender in one's hearers.*[48]

The name *porne* is derived from the verb πέρνημι, which means to export for sale (frequently used in the case of slaves), to sell or be sold.[49] *Hetaira* is formed on analogy with *hetairos*, the word for male companion, and both of these words have strong associations with the aristocratic space of the symposium.[50] James Davidson has argued that we should understand these two categories variously as discursive strategies and symbolic oppositions.[51] He aligns the *porne* with commodity exchange, the *agora*, and the open spaces of Athenian democracy, whereas the *hetaira* is associated with gift exchange, the elite, and the symposium.

46 Kurke (1999: 183). See also Davidson (1997: 106).
47 For a discussion of the ideological investments of this opposition in archaic literature see Kurke (1999: 231–286).
48 Dover (1989: 21).
49 For the association of this verb with the slave trade see Benveniste (1973: 112).
50 For these derivations see Calame (1989: 103).
51 Davidson (1994: 115) and (1998: 73–136).

It is often difficult to identify a prostitute precisely. The fact that a *hetaira* is hard to pin down is essential to the discursive work she is made to perform in the Athenian representational economy. The variegated category of prostitution, the radical alterity the prostitute signifies (ethnicity, gender, and class), together with her oxymoronic status as incorporated outsider, render the broader discourse of prostitution a wide open field of meaning that was especially suited to the depiction of instability, degradation, and conflict. The discourse that surrounds the *hetaira* represents one facet of a promiscuous language that was useful to articulate and contain political and ideological conflicts.[52]

If we understand Greek prostitution as such an unstable, polysemic category of meaning, we must then ask, how does that affect our understanding of the wife and the ritual performer? For in this formation the way we understand each type of woman determines how we will interpret the others. If, as I argue is the case in Xenophon's *Symposium,* the prostitute is used to represent the moral and political valence attached to different ways of making a transaction, then the ritualized woman and the wife will be evoked in these terms of exchange as well. In Plato's *Symposium,* on the other hand, I will show that the prostitute (and therefore the wife and the priestess) signify different facets of presence and absence at the same time as they operate in the text to signify a continuum of gendered roles as opposed to a sexual binary. In the speech "Against Neaira" the ritual performer is collapsed with the prostitute in an argument designed to sway the jury by threatening the integrity of the Athenian wife. And finally, in *Lysistrata,* I argue, the tables are turned, and we see that a ritual mechanism, that is, the logic of sacrifice, determines our understanding of prostitution. In other words, the plasticity of the prostitute infects and is affected by the other categories – revealing that textual depictions of Athenian wives and ritual performers are equally constructed, equally suited, to ideological contests.

Ritual performers comprise a category as broad as prostitution. In this group I include women who are depicted as presiding over sacrifices, those who play ceremonial roles in public ritual, as well as those whose depictions allude to these activities. These are women whose public presence and cultural

52 Kurke (1999: 268).

authority is underwritten by their participation in a religious ritual. This group certainly includes the figure of the priestess, but it also extends beyond her.

In terms of the Athenian priestess per se, there were important distinctions that made this role, like the prostitute's, a prime site for ideological negotiations. Starting from the middle of the fifth century BCE, we find evidence that some priesthoods for women (among those that were imported, newly appointed, or reorganized) began to be selected by allotment out of a preselected group, as opposed to being passed on among family members through inheritance.[53] This development represented an important expansion of democratic practice into Athenian religious practice. Indeed, one visible manifestation of the aristocracy's dominance from the eighth century onward had been their continued tenure in cultic positions,[54] and the transformation in the selection process from inheritance to qualified sortition reflects "the influence of democratic values transferred from the political realm to the religious sector."[55] The figure of the priestess, like that of the prostitute, was thus divided in herself and therefore especially suited to depict the contests arising out of the shifting power relations between elite families and the *demos* that resulted from the evolution of Athenian democracy.

In this book two texts (Xenophon's *Symposium* and "Against Neaira") allude to the marriage of Dionysos. (In fact, all of the texts seem in one way or another to operate under the sign of Dionysos.) In civic cult this myth was enacted at the Anthesteria.[56] Here the wife of the *Archon Basileus,* the *basilinna,* was ceremonially married to Dionysos in what is known as the *hieros gamos,* or sacred marriage. Over the course of the fifth century the selection of this *Archon Basileus* changed from being inherited to being acquired through selective allotment. At the same time, the political significance of the office diminished while its religious prestige increased.[57] The complex interactions between aristocratic and democratic interests and political and ritual influence encoded in

53 Turner (1983: 52–119).

54 "The aristocracy's dominance in the religious sector was perhaps its greatest continuing success." Turner (1983: 29).

55 Turner (1983: 119).

56 Although the literary sources don't say this, a fragmentary calyx-krater depicts what is thought to be the ceremony, identifying the bride as Ariadne, inv. 5439, from Taranto, Beazley ARV^2 1057.97. Simon (1983: 97).

57 Feaver (1957: 143); Farnell (1971: 218); Turner (1983: 69).

the role of *Archon Basileus* (and that of his wife, or *basilinna*) make it a potent symbol for the contests over Athenian democracy. Thus, both the priestess and the *basilinna* were especially suited to ideological negotiations concerning the proper relationship between the *oikos* and *polis* or the elite and *demos*; it is precisely at moments of conflict between these interests where we will see the manipulation of the ritual performer.

Clearly, these different ways of selecting priests and priesthoods, either by elite family inheritance or through civic appointment by lot, could represent distinctions and tensions between the ritual and civic power of elite families and the rule of the *demos*. In this way the figure of the priestess represents a contest in the ritual sphere that resonates with the *porne/hetaira* distinction. In my discussion of *Lysistrata* I argue that Aristophanes plays on this parallel in his depiction of the Athenian women and their allies. Where the discourse of prostitution tends to illuminate the economic aspect of contests between elite and democratic culture, the priestess would seem to be more suited to the struggle for cultural authority and the long-term identity of the Athenian community. The fact that the priestess so frequently turns up in relation to the prostitute might in itself be a democratic strategy for tempering any aristocratic residue that might inhere in the Athenian conception of ritual office.

In contrast to these two ways of being a woman in public, it was essential for a woman in her capacity as a citizen's wife to stay out of the public eye. Her anonymity was essential to her good name. The classic articulation of the imperative for Athenian women to avoid notoriety is found in Pericles' Funeral Oration in Thucydides' *History:*

> *τῆς τε γὰρ ὑπαρχούσης φύσεως μὴ χείροσι γενέσθαι ὑμῖν μεγάλη ἡ δόξα καὶ ἧς ἂν ἐπ' ἐλάχιστον ἀρετῆς πέρι ἢ ψόγου ἐν τοῖς ἄρσεσι κλέος ᾖ.*
>
> *Great is the glory for you not to be worse than your existing nature, and of her whose celebrity for virtue or reproach exists least among males. (Thucydides,* History 2.45)

Indeed, it would seem that many of the daughters and wives of Athenian citizens did achieve the paradoxical glory that Pericles endorses, a total lack of fame, since their lives have scarcely intruded upon the literary record. David Cohen has challenged the idea that Athenian men and women lived in strict

adherence to the social and legal rules determining sexual conduct. He argues from comparative evidence that people relate to normative expectations in complicated and fluid ways. In practice, social and legal expectations are contested, and their incoherencies are exploited and manipulated.[58] We cannot access the extent to which people did or did not actually live in accordance with law and social norms, but as Cohen argues, it was important to *seem* to abide by these expectations. δόξα and κλέος are words that imply a public reputation. In this sense social norms limited the possibilities for married Athenian women in the realm of representation.[59] Legal practice conveys a sense of the extent to which this expectation prevailed – respectable Athenian women were not named in court, but simply identified by their relationship to a man.[60]

It seems worthwhile to note here that the Thucydides passage quoted above represents a moment when Pericles is not only talking about women, but he is also talking to them in public. These women were, of course, the widows of the war dead, and in the context of the public funeral rite, their public presence was condoned. Ritual afforded an escape valve from the expectation that women would live a sequestered life and allowed for circumscribed moments in which they might experience public agency.[61]

Furthermore, in the case of the prostitute and the priestess, the rules were significantly different than they were for wives. Because prostitutes were assumed to be non-Athenians (although I don't believe this was always the case), they were available for representation: they could be talked about publicly in any manner with impunity. On her own, a woman had no legal recourse whatsoever: she couldn't bring a suit in her own name – unless she was a priestess.[62] Women in public cult were honored in inscriptions and

58 Cohen (1991: 70–97).

59 Stroup (2003) argues that the wives in this play were represented as *hetairai* because they were trafficking sex in public.

60 Schaps (1977: 323–331).

61 Goff (2004: 25–77, esp. 76).

62 Ath. 13.594B refers to a suit of the priestess of Demeter against the hierophant; Deinarchos "Against Aristogeiton" 212 makes reference to a suit brought by Aristogeiton against the priestess of Brauronia. Thuc. 7.53.2 suggests that the priestesses of the Eumolpidai testified when Alcibiades was accused of profaning the mysteries.

were publicly praised by the *demos* and the *boule*.[63] Where the prostitute evaded representational constraints because of her lowly social standing, the woman as ritual agent had a special exemption from the representational norms that otherwise applied to her.[64]

Thus, both the prostitute and the ritual agent played a public role and could therefore signify different facets of public feminine performance. Frequently in the texts that I analyze, the textual negotiation between the role of a woman at ritual and that of the prostitute evokes the category of the wife as a lack, simultaneously legitimizing and eroticizing the woman who lives her life anonymously. The negotiation between the image of the prostitute and the ritual performer produces a space in the middle for the wife, somewhere between the immediate personal gratification the prostitute offers and the long-term cosmic negotiations enacted through ritual.

MASCULINITY: PREROGATIVES AND CONSTRAINTS

But what are the ramifications for Athenian masculinity implied by such a mobile and complex structure as the matrix of the prostitute, the wife, and the ritual performer? The traces of gender ideology that remain to us from classical antiquity are (like everything else) fragmentary and are only a segment of the public transcript, which, to paraphrase Scott, was designed to affirm and naturalize male dominance and to conceal or euphemize the dirty linen of their rule.[65] In this context, is there anything a continuum of feminine roles can tell us about Athenian men?

Just as the wife is defined in this formation as the middle term in the feminine continuum, so there was a strong imperative for the Athenian citizen to locate himself in the middle of the citizen body, as a moderate who avoided extremes. Ian Morris has noted the tendency of fourth-century Athens to represent itself as a community of *mesoi* or *metrioi*, middling men. Through this rubric the Athenians conceived of the citizen body as a homogeneous group

63 For example, *CIG* 1052b, 1063.

64 Maurizio 2001 argues persuasively that the Pythias themselves composed and delivered Delphic oracles. For a complete list of the advantages to being a priestess, see Turner 1983: 383–412.

65 Scott (1990: 18).

of like-minded men knit together in relationships of balanced reciprocity. The *metrios* was neither rich nor poor, but lived sufficiently on "a little" money. He was located in his ideal *polis* at the center of a universe that was open to attack on all sides from excluded outsiders. Anyone whose behavior could be thought of as extreme was excluded from the middling category and was thought to be lacking in self-control.[66] The man who risked no extremes finds a counterpart in the anonymous wife, the absent middle term of the feminine triad, as we will see in the next chapter.

Although the construct of the *metrios* was not limited to economics, it was certainly very important for one to present an economic identity that indicated conformity to the middling ideal. This does not mean that a rich man gave up his wealth, but that he displayed his wealth in a way that seemed to have the interests of the community at heart. Thus, a wealthy man stored up symbolic capital through the public display of civic-minded expenditure in the form of liturgies, while he diminished his public stock if ever he seemed to lavish himself with luxuries, like fancy clothes or physical pleasures.[67]

David Halperin has argued that in Athens the democratic ideology of the equality of citizens was predicated on removing the male citizen's body from the realm of economic disparity:

> *The transition to a radical democracy . . . required a series of measures designed to uphold the dignity and autonomy – the social viability, in short – of every (male) citizen, whatever his economic circumstances. Economic disparities could not, of course, be eliminated, nor were serious efforts made to eliminate them. But a limit could be set to the political and social consequences of such inequities, a zone marked out where their influence might not extend. The body of the male citizen constituted that zone.*[68]

Focusing on Aeschines' speech "Against Timarchus," Halperin suggests that the law against the prostitution of citizens was the juridical boundary for the economized male body. I, however, see this law as the extreme pole on a continuum of social aversion to conceptualizing the citizen as involved in economic transactions. In cases of the economized male body that were

66 Morris (1996: 22).
67 See Ober (1989: 199–208).
68 Halperin (1990: 102).

less extreme than Timarchus' prostitution of himself, there were more subtle modes of social regulation. To be seen publicly as an economic agent operating out of self-interest was to invite disapprobation. For example, in his *Characters,* Theophrastos sketches a variety of negative personality types, and strikingly many of their unappealing characteristics are illustrated by the unseemly way they conduct business in the *agora.*[69] The shameless man is negatively characterized by his undiscriminating willingness to trade:

> *δεινὸς δὲ καὶ πανδοκεῦσαι καὶ πορνοβοσκῆσαι καὶ τελωνῆσαι, καὶ μηδεμίαν αἰσχρὰν ἐργασίαν ἀποδοκιμάσαι, ἀλλὰ κηρύττειν, μαγειρεύειν, κυβεύειν.*
>
> *He is skilled at keeping an inn and running a brothel and collecting customs, indeed, there is no work he rejects as shameful, but he is versed as a herald, a butcher, and he knows how to run a gambling house. (Theophrastos,* Characters 6.5)

The lowliness of these occupations has to do with the fact that they facilitate consumption and immediate gratification. While not an offense in itself, a report of a man lavishing luxuries on himself was a *topos* in oratory, frequently mobilized to disparage an opponent.[70] Demosthenes' speech "Against Meidias" famously attacks his opponent's luxuriance: after describing the mansion Meidias built at Eleusis and the ostentatious way that he drove his wife around in a chariot drawn by gray horses from Sikyon, Demosthenes zeroes in for the ad hominem attack:

> *καὶ τρεῖς ἀκολούθους ἢ τέτταρας αὐτὸς ἔχων διὰ τῆς ἀγορᾶς σοβεῖ, κυμβία καὶ ῥυτὰ καὶ φιάλας ὀνομάζων οὕτως ὥστε τοὺς παριόντας ἀκούειν.*
>
> *He struts through the agora with three or four attendants naming his beakers and drinking horns and cups in a way for passers-by to hear. (Demosthenes 21.159)*[71]

Meidias walks and talks pomposity. He embodies extravagance (σοβεῖ), and his loud references to his variety of drinking vessels suggest the image of a

69 von Reden (1995: 107).

70 Ober (1989: 206–208). For the archaic origins of this discourse see Kurke (1992: 102–103). See Lape (2004: 72–83).

71 Demosthenes also criticizes Meidias' use of shawls and goblets (21.133).

bibulous man, one excessively committed to the symposium. Another means of depicting a man as a conspicuous consumer of bodily pleasures was to mention that he went about in public with a *hetaira*. Thus in his speech on behalf of Phormio, Demosthenes harangues Apollodoros for the following offenses against the social code for spending money:

> *χλανίδα φορεῖς, καὶ τὴν μὲν λέλυσαι, τὴν δ' ἐκδέδωκας ἑταίραν, καὶ ταῦτα γυναῖκ' ἔχων ποιεῖς, καὶ τρεῖς παῖδας ἀκολούθους περιάγει, καὶ ζῇς ἀσελγῶς ὥστε καὶ τοὺς ἀπαντῶντας αἰσθανέσθαι.*
>
> *You wear a soft cloak and you've freed one* hetaira *and gave another one in marriage, and you do these things even though you have a wife, and you lead around three slave attendants, and you live licentiously so that even those you run into perceive it. (Demosthenes. 36.45)*

Demosthenes uses a similar strategy to discredit Pytheas, censuring him for keeping two *hetairai* who escort him to death by consumption (φθόη, *Letters* 3.29). To be accompanied by a *hetaira* in public betrays a man's willingness to indulge in private pleasure. In oratory, to attack someone on the charge of inappropriate spending was also to describe him as an extravagant body in public – he was condemned by his walk and clothing, and was associated with courtesans and comestibles.

Democratic ideology, then, placed constraints on the representations of masculinity, especially where trade and consumption were concerned. There was symbolic value to being seen as a man who spent his money and energies for the good of the community, whereas there were symbolic disadvantages to being represented as someone who provided himself with physical comforts. At the same time, the right to assert one's phallic potency always and everywhere seems to have been integral to Athenian masculinity. Thus, our sources are constantly elaborating the numerous possibilities that were available: boys, slaves, flute players, concubines, *hetairai, pornoi,* and wives. The conjunction of the masculine body, economic activity, and pleasure was a problematic nexus for democratic Athens, rife with contradictions. The complex nuances of appropriate behavior for Athenian citizens could be negotiated through projection onto the feminine continuum. The particular indeterminacies that

the prostitute and the ritual agent could signify give room in their representation for meaning to vacillate and allow expression of the contesting forces that were so vital to Athenian democratic identity. The contradictions encoded in these relationships provide a space to imagine the incoherence of the masculine self in an orderly fashion.

Exchange

The feminine matrix, by relating women in different roles – the prostitute, the wife, and the ritual agent – thus lends itself to representing a more complicated taxonomy of masculine behavior. These feminine roles represent a range of civic spheres – the marketplace, government and social institutions, and the religious sector. They involve graduating temporal and moral commitments. Each feminine type symbolizes a realm of masculine identity, and each one of these realms is understood in relation to the others.[72]

The persistent association of the prostitute with the ritualized woman speaks of a variety of issues at the center of Athenian identity: both are public performers, and they share a strong identification with the body and sexuality.[73] Both roles are imbued with temporal, moral, and economic significance. Just as important as the links between the two roles are the distinctions that separate them. The prostitute is associated with a short-term time frame, debased morality, and (more-or-less) disembedded economics. The woman at ritual represents humanity in a long-term time frame; she has cultural authority and conducts transactions with the divine.

These types represent different ends of a spectrum that might be described as a "symbolic world of transactions," to borrow an idea from Jonathan Parry and Maurice Bloch. Based on ethnographic studies, they identify "two related but separate transactional orders: on the one hand transactions concerned with the reproduction of the long-term social or cosmic order; on the other, a 'sphere' of short-term transactions concerned with the arena of individual competition."[74] The long-term transactional order describes those exchanges

72 Along these lines, Catherine Bell has argued that we must see ritual in the context of other social practices, as something that relates to and distinguishes itself in relation to other activities. Bell (1992: 220).

73 For the importance of performance to the identity of the courtesan see McClure (2003: 107–136).

74 Parry and Bloch (1989: 24).

that contribute to maintaining a static and timeless order, whereas short-term transactions are associated with luxury, competition, individual appropriation, sensuality, and youthful exuberance. Parry and Bloch describe a complex relationship between the two spheres: they must be kept separate, while the long-term order depends on the creativity and vitality of the short-term cycle. The connection between the two spheres is dependent on moral evaluation: the long-term order is founded on a moral code; the short-term order is individualistic and undetermined. That which is obtained in the short-term cycle can be positively converted to serve the purposes of the long-term order, while diverting resources of the long-term order to individual purposes is morally reprehensible.[75]

Parry and Bloch's model claims that transactions have both a moral and economic symbolism. This understanding of the meaning of exchange captures an essential aspect of the conceptual work that the feminine matrix is made to perform, and one that I will return to throughout the text. The prostitute, the wife, and the ritual performer could articulate the relationship of these different economic/moral realms to one another, establish the distinctions between them, and assert their interdependence. Now that we have briefly touched on the various facets of behavior and experience that the feminine continuum could describe and prescribe, gender, sex, performance, and exchange, let us turn to the texts in which this formation operates.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE ARGUMENT

My goal in this book is to illuminate a classical Athenian ideological structure, and my approach is unapologetically literary. Thus, each chapter is a close reading of a text. The texts that I consider, "Against Neaira," Xenophon's

75 "While the long-term cycle is always positively associated with the central precepts of morality, the short-term order tends to be morally undetermined since it concerns individual purposes, which are largely irrelevant to the long-term order. If, however, that which is obtained in the short-term individualistic cycle is converted to serve the reproduction of the long term cycle, then it becomes morally positive.... But equally there is always the opposite possibility – and this evokes the strongest censure – the possibility that individual involvement in the short-term cycle will become an end in itself which is no longer subordinated to the reproduction of the larger cycle; or more horrifying still, that grasping individuals will divert the resources of the long-term cycle for their own short-term transactions." Parry and Bloch (1989: 26–27).

Symposium, Plato's *Symposium,* and Aristophanes' *Lysistrata,* may seem like an arbitrary collection at first: three in prose, one in verse; one forensic speech, two prose narratives describing symposia, and a comic drama; two about women, two about men. Whereas issues of generic consideration are always fundamental to literary analysis, in this book they are considered only insofar as they affect the articulation of this discursive formation. Perhaps the absence of any discussion of tragedy might seem conspicuous here, but tragedy's decorum generally excludes the representation of prostitutes and thus cannot explicitly avail itself of this representational tool. What unites these readings is that they all depict the prostitute, the wife, and the ritual agent in relationship to one another and thus provide an avenue by which to approach issues of gender, sexuality, performance, and exchange.

All of these texts have become almost canonical in the study of gender and sexuality – each has a well-known passage that is regularly mined as a nugget that confirms a particular ideology or serves as incontrovertible evidence of a specific practice. I hope the value of a sustained analysis of a complete text becomes evident through these readings because in each case they offer a new way of interpreting these texts and passages. I am not reading new texts, but I am reading them in new ways.

The chapters of this book are arranged nearly in reverse chronological order in an explicit effort to subvert the assumption of a literary evolution and to substantiate my claim that these various texts, produced approximately between 411 and 343, participated in a shared ideology.[76] The next chapter is a reading of pseudo-Demosthenes' speech "Against Neaira," in which Stephanos is accused of living with a prostitute as his wife. Apollodoros begins by stating that the current charge is made in retaliation for Stephanos' efforts to disfranchise him, rendering him *atimos.* In the course of this speech, the prosecution relates much information that is seemingly irrelevant to the charge; there are many inconsistencies within the argument. I account for the lapses in logical argument by suggesting that Apollodoros is using the opposition between *hetaira* and wife to symbolize the difference between Stephanos' *oikos* and his own. By elaborating this opposition, Apollodoros appeals to a

76 I am concerned here only with the classical period, and thus I do not engage with Middle Comedy, which does feature women in these roles, but I think as part of a different conceptual system. See Lape (2004).

communal notion of the moral and temporal frameworks that should inform Athenian exchange, and reveals Stephanos' failure to abide by this code as symbolized by the fact that he has made a prostitute his wife.

But he takes the accusation further: Neaira and her daughter, Phano, seem to merge into a single character in their similar crimes, and then Apollodoros makes the unrelated, unsupported, and shocking claim that Phano actually assumed the role of *basilinna,* performing the sacred marriage rite at the Anthesteria. By this seemingly gratuitous detail he suggests that Stephanos enabled a courtesan to usurp not only the role of wife, but also that of ritual performer. By merging the prostitute with wife and ritual performer, Stephanos has brought the ethics of the marketplace to civic ritual. In this case, then, the feminine triad is used to prescribe an appropriate code of exchange, and its collapse depicts how absolutely Stephanos has ignored that code.

The next chapter is a reading of the role of women in Plato's *Symposium,* examining its relationship to philosophical pederasty. It begins with a consideration of Plato's portrayal of the *auletris,* the hired musician, arguing that she is confined to and represents the materiality of the symposium. She is banished when the discussion begins. Curiously, when Eryximachos sends the flute-girl out, he says she can play for herself or for the women within. This mention of women inside who could be entertained by a courtesan suggests a "space-off," where women could enjoy their own entertainment, and a feminine space that is outside the reach of philosophical discourse. The courtesan, however, is available for representation; in this instance she serves to gesture toward unspoken feminine realms. Her dismissal reveals a chink in the masculine space of the symposium and suggests that the material presence and discursive absence of women are the unspoken preconditions for the discourse that follows. This combination of presence and absence finds its counterpart in the priestess Diotima, a persona Socrates evokes to explain his system of homoerotics.

Thus, in Plato's *Symposium* the women of Agathon's house are produced as an absence through a negotiation of the prostitute and priestess. The bodily sexuality of the *auletris* must be banished for Socrates to leverage the discursive power of the priestess's authority. At the same time he evokes a conception of woman not as the opposite of man, but as a continuum that gestures toward a world that women and the body have no part in. I argue that the feminine serves in this text not, as Halperin has suggested, to authorize the

notion of sexual reciprocity, but as a manifestation of the process of transcendance. This chapter addresses why Diotima must be a priestess and the extent to which her femininity cannot be separated from the flute-girl or the wives that are occluded from philosophical discourse. All of these feminine positions, I argue, are iterations of the separation of the philosophical voice from (feminine) materiality. The *auletris,* the women inside Agathon's house, and Diotima form a triad that symbolizes ascending degrees of the separation of the material and philosophical worlds. "Woman" becomes the embodiment of the mind–body distinction that lies at the heart of Socrates' metaphysical erotics. Furthermore I argue that by invoking a continuum of feminine roles, Socrates skirts the power binary inscribed in the erotic models of the other symposiasts. It is this tactic that earns him the status of superior encomiast.

The next chapter is a reading of Xenophon's *Symposium,* where again the feminine is used to shape a new vision of pederasty. In this text Xenophon depicts Socrates reconfiguring the relationship between the elite and the *polis,* advocating that the *polis* adopt the erotic and pedagogical practices of the elite and that the symposiasts embrace a distinctly civic formulation of heterosexual reciprocity. The relationship between the elite and the *demos* is negotiated in the realm of performance. The entertainers are hired to perform, which in turn inspires the symposiasts to make a spectacle of themselves. This spectacular symposium, I suggest, is pointedly set against the backdrop of Athenian civic viewing. Xenophon uses sympotic performance as a way to open a discussion of spectacle, and particularly elite spectacle, within the context of Athenian democracy.

This new relationship between the elite and the *polis* that Socrates advocates culminates in a performance in which the hired entertainers dramatize the love between Dionysos and Ariadne. I interpret this pageant as the privatization of civic ritual, specifically the marriage of the *basilinna* to Dionysos in the Anthesteria. Significantly, this sympotic pageant generates what I am arguing is a particularly Athenian formulation of the feminine – the prostitute, the priestess, and the wife. For at the end of the performance, most of the audience members are so excited that they rush home to their wives, or, if they are not yet married, vow to find a wife. In the end there is a comfortable coexistence of a civic sphere of reciprocal homosocial activity, where men exchange amorous looks and emulate one another before the collective gaze of the *polis,* and a private heterosexual realm – the proper place for sexual gratification.

The final chapter considers Aristophanes' *Lysistrata.* Beginning from the observation that the women are represented in both the idiom of the prostitute and the priestess throughout the play, I explore Aristophanes' intentional and extensive assimilation of the sacred and sexual codes in his depiction of women. The discourse of the *hetaira* and the *porne* is superimposed on the relationship between priestess and victim; the two registers in *Lysistrata* are united by the logic of sacrifice.

I note that the women who come from abroad represent Athens' most virulent enemies, Sparta, Boiotia, and Corinth. One is described as a sacrificial victim, another through the metaphor of agriculture, and the third as a sexual object. There are explicit echoes of these characterizations when Diallage is brought on stage: she is divided up like a sacrificial victim, she is described in agricultural metaphors, and she is sexually objectified like a *porne.* Thus, the attributes of Athens' enemies have been projected onto the person of Diallage, who is metaphorically treated as a sacrificial victim. It is only through Aristophanes' conflation of sexuality and sacrifice that the feast at the end of the play can be justified as a reasonable resolution to the sexual frustration experienced by the men of Greece. Once Athenian aggression against her enemies has been ritually expressed, civic order is restored, and the men can be reunited with their wives. In this play Aristophanes produces and affirms the citizen wife's desirability through the convergence of the prostitute and the priestess.

In these four readings, I have tried to respect the differences inherent in the individual texts. My purpose has, in part, been to tease out the thematics and obsessions that distinguish one text from another. While this tactic lays emphasis on the diverse collection brought together here, all the chapters are unified in their analysis of permutations of the triad of the prostitute, wife, and ritual agent. What this book is ultimately about, though, is the complexity of sex and gender in Athenian culture and the multiple meanings that one discursive strategy could produce.

2. Collapsing Order: Typologies of Women in the Speech "Against Neaira"

INTRODUCTION

The pseudo-Demosthenes speech "Against Neaira" is most famous for a statement it contains about the roles of women in the Athenian *polis:* "*Hetairai* we keep for the sake of pleasure, concubines for daily care of the body, and wives for making legitimate children and for faithful guardianship of our household possessions" (59.122). For some scholars, this statement offers valuable information about women's lives in Athens;[1] for others it raises more questions than it answers. Was it impossible to get pleasure, care of the body, legitimate procreation, and guardianship of possessions from one source? How do these rigid categories correlate with what seems to have been a more fluid reality?[2] W. K. Lacey suggests that this list should be read cumulatively, that is, a courtesan can give only pleasure, a concubine can give both pleasure and daily care, whereas a wife offers pleasure, daily care, legitimate offspring, and guardianship of possessions.[3] But if a wife provides all of these things, why bother with other women? Lacey's interpretation renders Apollodoros' statement pointless. J.-P. Vernant calls this "a purely rhetorical distinction that has no meaning in terms of the existing institutions."[4]

In the following reading of [Demosthenes] 59 I will argue that these different typologies of women have less to say about the actual roles of women than they convey about Athenian masculine identity. The subject of this aphorism, the first person plural, refers to Athenian male citizens, and what is at issue is a shared notion of making appropriate transactions.

1 Cantarella (1987: 48–51); Lefkowitz and Fant (2005: 82). Greek text of [Dem] 59 in this chapter is drawn from Rennie's Oxford text.

2 Davidson (1994: 115–123).

3 Lacey (1968: 113).

4 Vernant (1981: 58).

"Against Neaira" is a devious speech.[5] In the beginning Theomnestos explicitly states that he is bringing an indictment against Neaira to take revenge on her companion Stephanos. The prosecution never comes close to proving their primary claim that Neaira is a foreigner living in illegal "marriage" with an Athenian citizen. Instead, they elaborate a somewhat suspect tale of sex, deceit, and greed, making claims that seemingly have nothing to do with the charge. They allege that Neaira's daughter participated in a civic ritual under false pretenses. Then the speech meanders into a flawed historical digression about Pausanias and his tyrannical aspirations. If such a confabulation could parade as persuasion, clearly we must look beneath the surface of the text to find the cultural logic that would render this speech not only coherent but also compelling to a jury of several hundred Athenian men.

A large portion of the prosecution's case focuses on Neaira's career as a *hetaira*, most of which is not directly related to the indictment. Furthermore, the events of Neaira's career that are recounted occurred approximately twenty years before the trial.[6] Cynthia Patterson suggests that perhaps Neaira had settled into a "respectable" domestic life in the intervening years.[7] Why then dredge up Neaira's checkered past to attack Stephanos? What was the effect of saying "your wife is a prostitute" in the mid-fourth century in an Athenian law court? I suggest that by unpacking this single insult it becomes possible to better understand the workings of the entire speech. Further, I will show that the accusation that Neaira is a prostitute is elaborated in the context of the matrix of the prostitute, wife, and ritual agent in such a way as to suggest that Stephanos has violated not only civil law, but divine law as well. The prostitute-as-wife trope is thus extended to signify Stephanos' proclivity to

5 This speech was excluded from the corpus of Demosthenic speeches on stylistic grounds in the late nineteenth century; see Blass (1877: 482). Blass suggests the speech is that of Apollodoros. More recently, based on a systematic application of Blass' law (Demosthenes avoids successions of more than two short syllables), McCabe (1981: 187–198) provides convincing testimony that this speech must not be included in the Demosthenic corpus.

6 Carey (1992: 3) notes that the speech can be confidently dated to the period between 343 and 340 by the reference to the Theoric fund. He infers from the text that the events in Neaira's life that are described probably took place before and during her thirties. A similar time frame is assumed by Patterson (1992: 205–207).

7 Patterson (1992: 207).

make antidemocratic transactions both in the civic realm, and in the cosmic sphere. An investigation of this text will serve to demonstrate one way in which the tripartite discourse of the feminine – the interrelation between the prostitute, the wife, and the ritual agent – could be used to regulate Athenian citizen identity in terms of economic, civic, and ritual transactions.

There is nothing unexpected, of course, in the assertion that an Athenian orator would style his opponent as antidemocratic; the viability of this claim is a precondition to the suit itself. Any legal indictment has the effect of creating a community from which the accused is isolated. Andrew Kelly describes the exaggeration of this social shaping in the Athenian orators. The prosecutor positions himself as a "surrogate" for the jury and emphasizes the otherness of the accused: "The badness of the enemy is unbelievably thorough. Good sportsmanship needs a few bad sports to define itself against; but here the game lies in claiming that the other player is permanently out of bounds."[8]

The rhetorical maneuver of "isolating the opponent completely from the citizen group by depicting him as a renegade whose interests are irreconcilably at odds with the interest of the rest of the citizen population" is a "familiar tactic."[9] In this speech the picture that is drawn of Neaira acts as a mirror reflecting negatively on those around her, especially Stephanos. My reading explores the way Apollodoros uses gender in the juridical maneuver of alliance and isolation. I will show how Apollodoros manipulates the narrative of Neaira as *hetaira* to construct an identity for Stephanos that transgresses the ideological boundaries of Athenian masculinity.

Theomnestos begins the prosecution of Neaira and then hands it over to his more experienced kinsman, Apollodoros. They make no pretense about the fact that the indictment of Neaira is an attack against their political enemy and Neaira's companion, Stephanos. Indeed, they insist that the present suit is a response to Stephanos' prosecution of Apollodoros for having made a proposal to use the Theoric fund for military purposes, carried as a *probouleuma* to the council (4). The Theoric fund was money distributed among Athenians to defray costs of attending dramatic performances during the great festivals (5–6).[10] Theomnestos states that Apollodoros carried this motion with the

8 Kelly (1994: 23).
9 Ober (1989: 211).
10 *Suda*, s.v. θεωρικά.

laws bidding (κελευόντων μὲν τῶν νόμων) that, in times of war, surplus from the administration should be used for military purposes. Although the decree was easily passed, Stephanos successfully indicted Apollodoros on the grounds that he had made this motion as a debtor to the treasury.[11] Stephanos proposed that Apollodoros be fined the exorbitant fee of fifteen talents, with the intent of disfranchising him and ruining his family's prospects. The jury imposed a fine of one talent. Later Stephanos also tried to have Apollodoros exiled for killing a slave, but was unsuccessful.

Theomnestos' description of his speech as an act of revenge juxtaposes the issues at stake in each suit. Stephanos' attempts to deprive Apollodorus of his rights as a citizen are implicitly opposed to Neaira's career as a courtesan. In what way does the case against Neaira answer the indictments about the diversion of the Theoric fund and the murdering of a slave? Stephanos' earlier litigation against Apollodoros and his kin was designed to deprive them of their civic rights:

> *βούλομαι δ' ὑμῖν προδιηγήσασθαι πρῶτον ἃ πεπόνθαμεν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, ἵνα μᾶλλόν μοι συγγνώμην ἔχητε ἀμυνομένῳ, καὶ ὡς εἰς [τοὺς] ἐσχατοὺς κινδύνους κατέστημεν περί τε τῆς πατρίδος καὶ περὶ ἀτιμίας.*
>
> *I wish to recount to you, first what we suffered at his hands and how we were put in severe danger concerning the city and a loss of rights in order that you might have more forbearance for me as I defend myself. (59.1)*

Stephanos tried to penalize Apollodoros with *atimia.* Although there is no one definitive record of what this disability meant, the penalty is frequently described by the orators to mean exclusion from the *agora,* sanctuaries, and political office.[12] Aristotle says of Solon that he made a law in reference to a man who refuses to take sides in civil strife: ἄτιμον εἶναι καὶ τῆς πόλεως μὴ μετέχειν (Let him be *atimos* and have no share of the city; Aristotle *Ath. Pol.* 8.5). Raphael Sealey has argued that the earliest vestiges of the content of

11 Demosthenes 1 *Hyp.* 5 records that it was a crime punishable by death to propose that any of this money be used for military purposes. For a discussion of the contradictions in the sources regarding this law see Hansen (1964: 235–246).

12 For the sources see Hansen (1976: 61–62).

Athenian citizenship are presented in relief in this deprivation – that is to say, citizenship consisted in the right to protection.[13] M. H. Hansen also sees a strong correlation between *atimia* and citizenship: "*atimia* was the penalty *par excellence* which an Athenian might incur in his capacity of a citizen, but not for offenses he had committed as a private individual."[14]

The various articulations of the three realms of civic participation from which the *atimos* was prohibited have provoked some speculation. For if one were excluded from the *agora,* why also mention the courts and council since they were in the *agora*? The assembly originally met there too.[15] Sealey divides references to this disability into two historical strata. The original prohibition was exclusion from the *agora* and sanctuaries. At a later date the meaning of *atimia* came to incorporate more sophisticated "political" disabilities such as the prohibition against taking part in the assembly in any degree, the holding of magistracies or priesthoods, or participation on a Council in an embassy. The *atimos* could not bring a suit, he could not be a juror, and he could give no evidence.[16] Taking *atimia* as the deprivation of civil rights, the fact that various facets of civic participation that overlapped in practice were articulated discretely suggests that the marketplace, political participation, and religious office were conceived of as distinct realms in which the rights of citizens operated.

If we understand *atimia* as an economic, civic, and religious disability, then we will see that, in one way, the case that Apollodoros makes against Neaira is a perfectly calibrated response. For Apollodoros depicts Stephanos exchanging women in ways that defy the codes that govern transactions in each one of these areas. In this speech Stephanos is described as taking a prostitute for his wife, pimping both his wife and daughter, as well as securing a performing role for a prostitute/adulteress in a civic sacrament. Thus, Stephanos' traffic in women confuses the categories of prostitute, wife, and ritual agent. Significantly, these feminine roles correspond exactly to the spheres in which *atimia* operates, for the prostitute is associated with the *agora,* the legally wedded wife

13 Sealey (1987: 97–129).

14 Hansen (1976: 74). He also notes that *atimia* is not the same thing as civil rights, because one didn't need to be a citizen to enter the *agora* or sanctuaries.

15 Sealey (1987: 106–107).

16 Sealey (1987: 107).

corresponds to the civic sphere, and the ritual agent belongs to the realm of religion.

The prosecution chooses language to deemphasize any personal interest in the suit: τούτῳ δὲ δικαίως τὸν αὐτὸν ἔρανον ἐνεχειρήσαμεν ἀποδοῦναι (but as for Stephanos, as is just, we have endeavored to pay him back in his own coin; 59.8). The use of the word *eranos* to describe this suit is significant. The *eranos* was essentially a potluck dinner, which had come to mean money lent between friends in times of need.[17] Paul Millett notes that the term *eranos* is often used to denote service to the community. Elsewhere, Demosthenes describes a citizen's behavior as a contribution to an *eranos:* everything done in obedience to the laws is a contribution to *polis* and the community (25.22). Aristophanes uses the term in a chorus of *Lysistrata,* where the women describe the contribution of sons to the *polis* as their *eranos* (651).[18] The use of the analogy here has a double force: on the one hand, Stephanos' contribution – gratuitous litigation – is singled out as costly and detrimental to the community; on the other hand, Theomnestos and Apollodoros appear to be free from selfish concerns in accusing Neaira. They are merely repaying Stephanos what he is owed. Their reciprocal aggression is as inevitable as the swing of the pendulum, and the description of a retaliatory suit as an *eranos* serves as a way to bring about the "radical evaporation of the accuser."[19] Stephanos indicted Apollodoros out of sheer selfishness, acting for the community's detriment, whereas Theomnestos and Apollodoros are merely carried along on the tide of social obligation.

The juxtaposition of the two lawsuits introduces textual and thematic patterns that are repeated throughout the oration. On the level of the text, Apollodoros demeans Stephanos and the members of his *oikos* in terms like *eranos* that usually have positive connotations in the discourse of Athenian democracy. This rhetorical displacement emphasizes Stephanos' abuse of civic values and privileges, a maneuver that I shall trace further. On the thematic level, the use of the word *eranos* establishes the contrast between proper and improper civic behavior that structures the entire oration.

17 *Eranos* is used in this way to describe Neaira's collection of money to buy her freedom at 31. For an interesting discussion of the use of this analogy in Demosthenes' speech "Against Meidias," see Kelly (1994: 28–29); see also Millett (1991: 153 ff.).

18 Millett (1991: 154).

19 Kelly (1994: 28).

Apollodoros invokes a variety of oppositions – *hetaira* versus wife, adultery versus ritual performance, and tyranny versus loyalty to the Athenian democracy – that, on first glance, seem unrelated to one another and render the oration somewhat disjointed. I suggest that these seemingly disparate concerns are linked by a deeper logic – the cultural poetics that informed transactions of all kinds in classical Athens.

The prosecution uses the exchange of women to invoke a transactional code[20] and to characterize themselves and Stephanos in relation to it. Neaira and her daughter Phano are implicitly compared to two other women mentioned in the oration – Apollodoros' wife and his daughter, who is Theomnestos' wife.[21] In the prologue of the speech, Theomnestos elaborates his connection to Apollodoros. To show his support of the gift of Athenian citizenship to Pasion, Theomnestos' father gave his daughter in marriage to Pasion's son, Apollodoros. In turn, Apollodoros gave his daughter to Theomnestos to marry. This vignette of kinship describes a microcosm of reciprocal gift exchange. As Claude Lévi-Strauss claims, the woman given in marriage is "the supreme gift among those that can only be obtained in the form of reciprocal gifts."[22] One woman given evokes an obligation to offer another, resulting in the infinite series of giving and giving back that constitutes society. Deinias gives to Apollodoros so Apollodoros gives to Theomnestos. The exchange of these women serves as the model for citizen marriage:

> *ψηφισαμένου γὰρ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων Ἀθηναῖον εἶναι Πασίωνα καὶ ἐκγόνους τοὺς ἐκείνου διὰ τὰς εὐεργεσίας τὰς εἰς τὴν πόλιν, ὁμογνώμων καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐγένετο ὁ ἐμὸς τῇ τοῦ δήμου δωρεᾷ, καὶ ἔδωκεν Ἀπολλοδώρῳ τῷ υἱεῖ τῷ ἐκείνου θυγατέρα μὲν αὑτοῦ, ἀδελφὴν δὲ ἐμήν, ἐξ ἧς Ἀπολλοδώρῳ οἱ παῖδές εἰσιν. ὄντος δὲ χρηστοῦ τοῦ Ἀπολλοδώρου περί τε τὴν ἀδελφὴν τὴν ἐμὴν καὶ περὶ ἅπαντας, καὶ ἡγουμένου τῇ ἀληθείᾳ οἰκείους ὄντας κοινωνεῖν πάντων τῶν ὄντων,*

20 I am drawing on the work of Parry and Bloch (1989: 26–27).
21 See also Patterson (1994: 202).
22 Lévi-Strauss (1969: 65).

ἔλαβον καὶ ἐγὼ γυναῖκα Ἀπολλοδώρου μὲν θυγατέρα, ἀδελφιδῆν δ' ἐμαυτοῦ.

When the Athenians voted to grant citizenship to Pasion and his progeny for his service to the city, my father agreed with the gift of the people and gave to the son of Pasion, Apollodoros, his daughter, my sister, in marriage; she is the mother of Apollodoros' children. Since Apollodoros was good to my sister, and to all of us, and since he truly believed that relatives share all that they have, I took in marriage Apollodoros' daughter, my niece. (59.2)

This reciprocal exchange is characterized by goodwill, agreement, and sharing. Pasion's service to the city is rewarded with citizenship, characterized as a gift (τῇ τοῦ δήμου δωρεᾷ). This civil gift is mirrored in the private sphere by the gift of a citizen wife, which provokes the giving of another woman. Significantly, this cycle of reciprocity emanates from the vote of the Athenian people (ψηφισαμένου γὰρ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων).

What is the effect of the juxtaposition of the kinswomen of Stephanos and of Apollodoros? It is not a matter of economics versus social relations, for there is an economy that subtends the institution of marriage. As Pierre Bourdieu has argued, gift-exchange economies rely on the misrecognition (*méconnaisance*) of the economics inherent in gift-giving: "economic activity cannot explicitly recognize the economic ends to which it is objectively oriented."[23] Apollodoros pays for his wife with his daughter. But the economics of this transaction are mystified by the language of giving and goodwill. In contrast, the economics that inform the exchanges of Neaira and her daughter Phano are in the foreground, entirely demystified: they are prostitutes, and their services are available to anyone who will pay.

In terms of Parry and Bloch's model, which accounts for the temporal and moral dimensions of transactions, Stephanos' *oikos* is consistently represented as using the resources of the long-term cycle for immediate gain, while that of Apollodoros is shown to have virtuously earned its position in the long-term order. This opposition is nowhere more clear than in the representation of the different strategies each deploys in the exchange of women. In the case of both families, the women are objects of exchange, but it is the way they are exchanged that is germane to Apollodoros' argument. Neaira and Phano are

23 Bourdieu (1980: 113).

exchanged for momentary pleasures, luxurious living, and immediate financial return. Apollodoros' wife and daughter are exchanged to establish and confirm the endurance of Pasion's citizenship in the lives of his descendants, and to perpetuate the will of the Athenian *polis*.[24] Neaira and Phano are part of the amoral short-term transactional order, whereas Apollodoros' kinswomen operate as counters within the long term.

The exchange of women constitutes the men who make the transaction as subjects. To some extent the type of exchange they conclude defines their subjectivity. It is for this reason, I suggest, that Apollodoros spends so much time describing Neaira's career as a *hetaira,* and elaborating Phano's experiences of having sex for money too. By directing these exchanges, Stephanos is portrayed as utterly dedicated to the short term and as being consistently guilty of assimilating long-term transactions to the conventions of short-term exchanges. The courtesan-as-wife is thus a master trope used to symbolize Stephanos' muddling of transactional orders. Furthermore, not only is Stephanos guilty of mingling his immediate interests with enduring institutions in terms of the relations of kinship, he also confuses these orders in the religious and political spheres. The thrust of the prosecution's argument is that Stephanos disregards the social code ordering Athenian exchange. This social order, I suggest, is symbolized through the relationship between the prostitute, wife, and ritual agent.

Modern scholars have found several aspects of this speech problematic. Why is so much attention focused on the narrative of Neaira as a prostitute, which is really incidental to the charge?[25] Why do the stories concerning Phano contain so many inconsistencies?[26] What relevance does the historical digression about Pausanias and the Plataians have to the rest of the speech, and is it historically accurate?[27] In what follows, I analyze those parts of the speech that have proved most difficult, devoting one section to Neaira, another to the

24 It should also be mentioned that Pasion was enfranchised "because of his benefactions to the city" (διὰ τὰς εὐεργεσίας τὰς εἰς τὴν πόλιν, 59.2). As a wealthy banker, he was able to give lavishly enough to the city to convert his own status from freedman to citizen or, in other words, from the short- to the long-term transactional order.

25 Carey (1992: 14). See also Blass (1877: 480 ff.), who notes logical breakdowns in the speech.

26 Carey (1992: 113 ff.); Cohen (1991: 109); Patterson (1994: 207–208).

27 Carey (1992: 138); Patterson (1994: 210).

stories about Phano, and a third to the narrative about the Plataians. I show that the elements of Apollodoros' speech that have troubled modern scholars contribute to a completely consistent picture of Stephanos and his *oikos* as antidemocratic, and I suggest that the integrity of this representation was strong enough to render the flaws in the oration inconsequential.

NEAIRA

In Apollodoros' speech, Neaira is completely objectified. She is referred to by the use of her bare proper name, rather than the patronymic or husband's name that would identify her as a member of an Athenian household and network of family relations.[28] Apollodoros spends thirty-three chapters describing Neaira's career as a courtesan although, as I have mentioned, prostitution is extrinsic to the charge. She has been accused of being a foreigner living in marriage with an Athenian, not of being a prostitute. Apollodoros' version of Neaira's life begins not with a birth, but with a purchase: Ἑπτὰ γὰρ ταύτας παιδίσκας ἐκ μικρῶν παιδίων ἐκτήσατο Νικαρέτη (Nikarete acquired these seven girls as small children; 59.18). Neaira was not so much born as bought. The issue of geographic origin is displaced onto the realm of economics. It is as though Apollodoros is claiming that Neaira cannot be an Athenian because she has always been a commodity, although this is itself a specious opposition. A prostitute is not necessarily an alien,[29] and this very oration has been cited as evidence that citizenship and prostitution were not mutually exclusive: Neaira was accepted for a long time as a citizen, although she had been a high-profile courtesan in her younger days, and Nikarete charged higher prices for her "daughters" by presenting them as free. Later in her life Apollodoros alleges that Neaira was able to charge higher prices from customers because of the appearance of being married to Stephanos (a citizen): τοὺς δὲ μισθοὺς μείζους ἐπράττετο τοὺς βουλομένους αὐτῇ

28 Schaps (1977: 323–330).

29 Macurdy (1942: 267). Antiphanes' *Water Jar* mentions a *hetaira* who was an *aste*: Kock (II.103). Von Reden (1995: 120) asserts that prostitutes "needed to be slaves or foreigners to practise their trade in Athens." In part, she relies on a misreading of "Against Neaira" 88 for this statement, incorrectly assuming that Neaira had been formally granted Athenian citizenship and subsequently engaged in prostitution; see Von Reden (1995: 93, 120).

πλησιάζειν, ὡς ἐπὶ προσχήματος ἤδη τινὸς οὖσα καὶ ἀνδρὶ συνοικοῦσα (she charged higher fees from those wanting to be near her, under the pretense that she was married and was living with her husband; 59.41).[30] At any rate, it is significant that Neaira's place of birth and parentage, which would seem to be crucial to the prosecution's argument, are never mentioned.

Neaira grew up as a courtesan in Corinth under the auspices of Nikarete. She was expensive, because Nikarete charged the extravagant household expenses to her patrons. Eventually she was sold to Timanoridas and Eukrates for thirty minae. When the two young men were of an age to marry, neither wanted Neaira to continue working in Corinth, so they offered to help her buy her freedom.[31] After fundraising from her other lovers she appealed to Phrynion to contribute the remainder, which he did, and together they bought her freedom. They went to Athens, lived wildly, and Phrynion abused her. She took her things (and some of Phrynion's) and went to Megara, where she fell in with Stephanos. He established her once again in Athens, and she supported the household by her sex trade. When Phrynion learned where Neaira was, he tried to claim her as his property and then brought a suit against Stephanos for asserting Neaira's freedom and receiving the property that she brought from his house. The suit was settled by arbitration: τὴν μὲν ἄνθρώπον ἐλευθέραν εἶναι καὶ αὐτὴν αὑτῆς κυρίαν ([Neaira] was free and mistress of herself; 46), but she had to return Phrynion's possessions and was compelled to live with Stephanos and Phrynion on alternate days, or according to any other agreement the men struck.

Apollodoros's biography of Neaira is the story of a commodity among commodities. Three times he mentions the expense of her lifestyle (36, 42, 50). She has been owned by three different parties, Nikarete, Timanoridas, and Eukrates – and by herself! Even when it was decided through arbitration that she was in possession of herself, she was quantifiable to the extent that she could be split in half. She is indiscriminately available for sale: three times he describes her as available to anyone willing to pay (20, 23, 108). Two of

30 Edward Cohen reasons that "the cultural significance at Athens of 'zero-sum competition' would have further enhanced the market attractiveness of free prostitutes, and especially of youths from established families." Cohen (1997: 40–41).

31 See Pomeroy (1975: 141).

these instances (20, 23) follow fast on the quotation of the *graphe* that Neaira has been accused of breaking. The beginning of the law states:

> *Ἐὰν δὲ ξένος ἀστῇ συνοικῇ τέχνῃ ἢ μηχανῇ ἡτινιοῦν, γραφέσθω πρὸς τοὺς θεσμοθέτας Ἀθηναίων ὁ βουλόμενος οἷς ἔξεστιν.*
>
> *If a foreigner lives in marriage with an Athenian woman by any manner or means whatsoever, let he who wishes of the Athenians for whom it is possible indict him before the Thesmothetai. (59.16)*

The language Apollodoros uses to mark Neaira's availability echoes the letter of the democratic law: he says, ἠργάζετο τῷ σώματι μισθαρνοῦσα τοῖς βουλομένοις αὐτῇ πλησιάζειν (she worked with her body charging a fee to those who wanted to have intercourse with her; 20), and ἐμισθάρνει τῷ βουλομένῳ ἀναλίσκειν (she worked for hire for he who wished to pay; 23). He also mentions that Nikarete had charged top dollar to Neaira's clientele: τοὺς βουλομένους πλησιάζειν (those wanting to have intercourse with her; 19). The most important distinction between types of lawsuits at Athens was that of private versus public.[32] In private actions only the victim could prosecute, whereas anyone who wanted (or sometimes, as here, any Athenian) could bring a public case. ὁ βουλόμενος is the term in the *graphe* that marks this distinction. The transference ὁ βουλόμενος to Neaira's clientele emphasizes the public nature of her intimate commerce. In his oration against Ktesiphon, Aeschines explicitly connects the public case that allows any citizen to speak with democracy. He anticipates that Demosthenes will attack him for infrequent public address and makes the following preemptive remarks:

> *ἐπιτιμᾷς δέ μοι, εἰ μὴ συνεχῶς, ἀλλὰ διαλείπων πρὸς τὸν δῆμον προσέρχομαι, καὶ τὴν ἀξίωσιν ταύτην οἴει λανθάνειν μεταφέρων οὐκ ἐκ δημοκρατίας, ἀλλ᾽ ἐξ ἑτέρας πολιτείας. ἐν μὲν γὰρ ταῖς ὀλιγαρχίαις οὐχ ὁ βουλόμενος, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ δυναστεύων δημηγορεῖ, ἐν δὲ ταῖς δημοκρατίαις ὁ βουλόμενος καὶ ὅταν αὐτῷ δοκῇ.*

32 Carey (1992: 93); Harrison (1971: 195); Ober (1989: 109).

And you blame me if not constantly, but from time to time I approach the demos, *and you think that you escape notice transferring this expectation, that does not arise from democracy, but comes out of another form of government. For in oligarchies, it is not he who wants to speak, but he who has power that addresses the people. In democracies, he who wishes speaks, and whenever he feels like it. (Aeschin. 3.220).*

Taken together with the legislative formula, Aeschines' self-justification indicates that ὁ βουλόμενος is a marked term for an active citizen in the discourse of democracy.[33] Apollodoros' displacement of this term onto the trade of Neaira denigrates her through the uneasy assimilation of the accessibility of her services to participation in the Athenian democracy. The analogy makes Neaira's body into a parody of democracy, one that is available for hire. The charge at hand emphasizes the exclusivity of Athenian citizenship: the open-ended sense implied by ὁ βουλόμενος is countered by the fact that the law is written to keep outsiders out. With respect to Neaira, the only limitation placed on ὁ βουλόμενος resides in one's ability to pay. In the terms of temporal transactions, this juxtaposition between the prostitute and citizenship is not unlike the coupling of Neaira and Phano versus the women in Apollodoros' *oikos* discussed above. Participation in the citizen body belongs to the realm of long-term transactions. The law quoted in this passage is dedicated to maintaining a static, closed order, in which only those who are Athenian born are entitled to a position in the Athenian social structure. Neaira's body, however, is open to the free market. Her relationships are transient and varied, both of which characteristics are hallmarks of short-term transactions.

In Apollodoros' narrative, Neaira has always been a commodity. She is open for business always, to anyone. This is perhaps nowhere more clearly stated than in the Phrynion episode:

Ἀφικόμενος τοίνυν δεῦρο ἔχων αὐτὴν ἀσελγῶς καὶ προπετῶς ἐχρῆτο αὐτῃ, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ δεῖπνα ἔχων αὐτὴν πανταχοῖ ἐπορεύετο ὅπου πίνοι, ἐκώμαζέ τ' ἀεὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ, συνῆν τ' ἐμφανῶς ὁπότε βουληθείη πανταχοῦ, φιλοτιμίαν τὴν ἐξουσίαν πρὸς τοὺς ὁρῶντας ποιούμενος. καὶ ὡς ἄλλους τε πολλοὺς ἐπὶ κῶμον ἔχων ἦλθεν αὐτὴν καὶ ὡς Χαβρίαν τὸν

33 See Bonner (1933: 67 ff.); Finley (1985: 19); Hansen (1987: 91, 216).

> *Αἰξωνέα, ὅτε ἐνίκα ἐπὶ Σωκρατίδου ἄρχοντος τὰ Πύθια τῷ τεθρίππῳ ὃ ἐπρίατο παρὰ τῶν παίδων τῶν Μίτυος τοῦ Ἀργείου, καὶ ἥκων ἐκ Δελφῶν εἱστία τὰ ἐπινίκια ἐπὶ Κωλιάδι. καὶ ἐκεῖ ἄλλοι τε πολλοὶ συνεγίγνοντο αὐτῇ μεθυούσῃ καθεύδοντος τοῦ Φρυνίωνος καὶ οἱ διάκονοι οἱ Χαβρίου τράπεζαν παραθέμενοι.*
>
> *When he [Phrynion] came here with her he treated her outrageously and recklessly and he brought her to dinners wherever he was drinking and she always caroused with him, and he openly made love with her anywhere whenever he wanted, making his lascivious possession a* demonstration of his desire for public honor *to those looking on. He brought her carousing to many people including Chabrias of Aixone, when he won in the Pythian games, when Sokratides was* archon, *with the chariot he bought from the sons of Mitys of Argos, and on his return from Delphi held a victory feast at Kolias. And there many others lay with her while she was drunk, when Phrynion was sleeping, including the servants who had served Chabrias' meal. (59.33–34)*

Again in this passage, Apollodoros uses the language of democracy to describe sex with Neaira. Phrynion's use of Neaira in an obscene sexual display is described as φιλοτιμία. It is Chabrias' victory in the chariot races that we would expect to be described by this term. Indeed, one locus classicus for φιλοτιμία is Alcibiades' political self-promotion citing the entry of seven chariots in the Olympics as evidence of his desire for public honor (Thuc. 6.16). Ober describes *philotimia,* the expenditure of a large fortune toward the public good, as a system "that balanced the various privileges the rich man gained from the private possession of that very property."[34] In a sense, a wealthy man's benefactions to the state linked him to the Athenian *demos* in a relationship of reciprocity. His lavish displays enhanced the city's reputation and entitled the donor to the *charis* of the deme.[35] Through the ideological twist of φιλοτιμία, the very display of economic inequality asserted political equality.

34 Ober (1989: 243).
35 See especially Dem. 18.113–115.

Apollodoros conflates chariot races and prostitution through the displacement of φιλοτιμία. Perhaps the inclusion of the otherwise irrelevant detail that Chabrias purchased his chariot from the sons of Mitys of Argos is meant to align Neaira with the mares who won the Olympic victory.[36] The comparison of the chariot victory to the obscene sexual display of Neaira and Phrynion again emphasizes the relegation of the courtesan to the short-term cycle. Where the Olympic victory confers glory on the city, and enhances its reputation among its competitors, sex in public is just another anecdote about Phrynion's reckless personality, another example that Neaira will do anything for money. As the proliferation of indeterminate adverbs indicates, Neaira is completely indiscriminate about the circumstances under which she will work – she is available whenever (ὁπότε), wherever (ὅπου), everywhere (πανταχοῦ), and always (ἀεί). Neaira soars from high to low, ranging the social gamut: at one moment she is the companion of Phrynion, the equal of a man who could afford the enormous expense of an Olympic chariot; at the next, she is sleeping with Chabrias' household slaves.

The picture of Neaira's life that emerges is that of a *hetaira*: she formed semipermanent relationships with various men of some social standing, she drank with them at symposia and had sex with them in exchange for the maintenance of her household. Apollodorus frequently designates her as a *hetaira*.[37] But Neaira's line of work is also described in other terms, with various forms of ἐργάζεσθαι, to work or trade (frequently together with τῷ σώματι).[38] At times Apollodorus emphasizes that she worked for a wage (μισθαρνέω) from whoever was willing (ὁ βουλόμενος) to pay (20, 23).[39] Indeed, at the conclusion of his speech, Apollodoros urges the jury to cast their vote against Stephanos and Neaira on behalf of their mothers, sisters, and daughters, so

36 Generally, race horses were mares; cf. Herodotus *Hist.* 5.77, 6.103. For an interesting connection between the filly ranging free and a "loose" woman see Gentili (1958: 206 ff.) on Anacreon frr. 71–72.

37 "Against Neaira" 13, 24, 25, 30, 37, 39, 48, 49, 119.

38 "Against Neaira" 20, 22, 26, 36, 41, 49. The house she shares with Stephanos is referred to as an ἐργαστήριον, or brothel; 67.

39 Davidson (1998: 92) claims that *ergasterion* and *ergasia* imply prostitution, while *mistharnein* is an appropriate term for the professional *hetaira* (based on this passage). I am arguing that this term is chosen as a part of Apollodoros' insistence on emphasizing the fact of trafficking in sex as opposed to the more mystified exchanges between friends contracted by the likes of Theodote (Xen. *Mem.* 3.11.4). See Goldhill (1998).

as not to equate their own legitimate women with ταύτῃ τῇ πόρνῃ/this whore here.

If, as I have suggested, we are expected to think of Neaira as an ex-*hetaira*, why is it that in this case the terms that scholars have read as so heavily laden with ideological weight all seem to apply equally to Neaira? How is it that at one moment she is at a symposium celebrating a victory at the Pythian games and at another she is plying her trade publicly (ἐπιφανῶς ἐργαζομένης, 26)? At one point Apollodorus mixes registers in a single phrase: ἠργάζετο τῷ σώματι ὡς ἑταίρα οὖσα (she worked with her body as a *hetaira*). The emphasis on trade and menial labor implied in ἠργάζετο τῷ σώματι subverts any high-cultured and mystified associations the word *hetaira* might elicit. Despite her illustrious and lucrative career, in the end she is nothing more than an indiscriminate *porne* (115).

As a rhetorical strategy to defame a woman, the advantage of describing a hired companion as a common prostitute is obvious. Since both *hetaira* and *porne* exist on the sex-trade continuum, the difference between them is at times subtle and nuanced.[40] The obsessive commodification of Neaira already noted above would effectively serve to traduce any positive associations elicited by the idea of the *hetaira*. Although the purposeful muddling of these distinctions may be at play here, I would suggest that the ideological tensions related to issues of economics, politics, and class encoded in the distinction between the *hetaira* and the *porne* are not crucially at stake in this context – it doesn't really matter if Neaira is one or the other, although it is always worse to be a *porne*.[41] Instead, I am arguing that Apollodorus makes use of another discourse of the feminine, the interrelationship of the prostitute, the wife, and the ritual agent, to figure an explicitly democratic ideological structure and its antagonisms. To see clearly how this triad functions in this text, it is necessary first to consider how the tale of Phano operates in the narrative.

PHANO

Much of Apollodoros' case rests on proving that Neaira and Stephanos tried to pass off their non-Athenian daughter, Phano, as marriage material. The

40 Kurke (1999: 219) notes that this distinction is not always stable but vacillates depending on the speaker's relation to the symposium.

41 For an argument about the specificity of the terms in this context see Miner (2003).

prosecutors note in passing that Phano used to be known as Strybele, offhandedly implying that she has changed her name to fabricate a connection to Stephanos – since Phano clearly derives from his name – and at the same time that she, like so many courtesans, goes by a nickname.[42] Like her mother, Phano is represented as a commodity. When she was married to the working man Phrastor, she was unable to curb her extravagant ways and was eventually sent back to her family. She was then instrumental in a plot of Stephanos': Neaira arranged a tryst between Phano and a longtime associate of hers, Epainetos. When the two were together, Stephanos caught them in "adultery," and then extorted a ransom of thirty minae. In turn, Epainetos indicted Stephanos for false imprisonment, claiming that Stephanos' house was a brothel, and thus he was not an adulterer. Finally, through arbitration, Stephanos and Epainetos reached a settlement whereby Epainetos had the right to use Phano when he was in town, but also had to contribute to her dowry.

There is much about this incident that is suspicious. Christopher Carey notes the significance of the lack of testimony from Epainetos, and the lack of witnesses to his apprehension on charge of *moikheia.* Epainetos could have produced witnesses that Phano was Neaira's daughter, and that she was a prostitute, lending credence to Apollodoros' version of the affair.[43] Furthermore, if Phano were a courtesan, then it seems odd that Epainetos should agree to contribute to her dowry. If she were caught in adultery, she should be expelled. This episode contains the only explicit reference to an unmarried woman involved in *moikheia* in Greek literature. Considering the implausibility of the events in this narrative – that Phano could have been married and scandalously divorced, subject to a civic inquiry into the status of her children, then involved in a fraudulent accusation of adultery, and finally married into an Athenian family that was somehow unaware of her unsavory past – David Cohen suggests that the usage should not be taken seriously.[44] But it is worth noting that the sting that is described here is identical to one that Apollodoros had accused Stephanos and Neaira of carrying out earlier in his speech (41). It seems that Apollodoros has conflated his depiction of Neaira

42 See, e.g., Ath. 13.567c–d, Klepsydra. Glazebrook (2005: 175). Cox (1988: 176–77).

43 Carey (1992: 121).

44 Cohen (1991: 108). Cf. Kapparis (1999: 297).

with that of her daughter, Phano. Since he treats them as commodities, in some sense it follows that their life stories would be fungible. Patterson says that "Apollodoros has created a fictional two-headed monster from the combined personae of Neaira and Phano."[45] In the following I will examine how and why the character of Phano is blurred with that of her mother.

The stories around Phano, perhaps more than any others, rely on slippery rhetoric and evidence that is sometimes inconsistent, sometimes unsubstantiated. Apollodoros claims that Stephanos, with political and financial support, wheedled his way into the good graces of a noble yet poor man, Theogenes, whose lot it was to be the *Basileus.* Stephanos bought the position of assessor from Theogenes and then gave him Phano to marry. Thus Phano assumed the role of the *basilinna,* who in the festival of the Anthesteria was ceremonially given as "bride" to Dionysos, and performed secret rites on behalf of the city.[46] Apollodoros explains the history of these rites, noting that the *basilinna* must be a virgin at the time of marriage and an Athenian citizen. After Phano had performed the ceremony, the Areopagos inquired into her identity and intended to punish Theogenes for marrying Phano and allowing her to be the *basilinna.* Theogenes pleaded that he was not aware of her identity, but had been duped by Stephanos. The Areopagos suspended the trial of Theogenes; he sent Phano from his house and dismissed Stephanos from his assessorship. Apollodoros goes on to produce the law that provides for a woman caught in adultery to be banished from her husband's house and to be barred from entering any temple (87). In the logic of this law, the sanctity of marriage is construed on a spectrum with the sanctity of the gods.

Carey suggests that this whole episode is an invention because of the flimsiness of the argument: Theogenes' deposition makes no mention of the Areopagos; no member of that board is produced as witness, nor is Theogenes' other assessor. No witness to Theogenes and Phano's marriage is produced; in the Epainetos story, Phano was identified not as an adulteress, but a prostitute. There is no witness to testify that Phano really did carry out the religious ceremony, though she would have been seen by many when she was escorted to the Boukouleion to be married to Dionysos. The sacred herald who was

45 Patterson (1994: 208); see also Cohen (1991: 109).

46 Macurdy (1928) argues that *basilinna* is not a sacred title, but a usage that arose in the fourth century to designate the wife of the *Archon Basileus.* Cf. Kapparis (1999: 333).

present in court did not testify that Phano was the *basilinna*. Furthermore, if this incident did occur, it would have been a very serious crime that should have been prosecuted in its own right. In addition, it would have been sufficient grounds on which to prosecute Stephanos for giving a foreigner in marriage to a citizen and for impiety. "Thus," Carey concludes,

> *Apollodoros' account is both unconvincing in itself and unsubstantiated by any of the evidence, which one might have expected. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that the whole Theogenes affair is an invention. It is however important to bear in mind that these flaws, while obvious in the study, will not necessarily have been evident to the jurors as they listened to the narrative.*[47]

I suggest that it is not only the inattentiveness of the jurors, but also the thematic integration of this narrative with the rest of the speech, that would render it comprehensible and plausible to its audience. For the Theogenes affair is consistent with the portrayal of Stephanos and his *oikos* as valuing personal gain at a premium, at the expense of the long-term benefit to the larger community.

In his digression about the history of the Anthesteria, Apollodoros makes a strong connection between the ceremony and the city. The *basileus* is linked to the originary autochthonous Athenians through Theseus, the mythical founder of democracy. The king was elected every year by a show of hands, and the city voted that his wife, the *basilinna*, who performed the ceremony for the city's sake (ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως), must be a virgin of citizen birth at the time of her marriage (75). This decree was written on a stone column. As if to mark a contrast between the ever-available Neaira/Phano character and the sacred rites of the city, Apollodoros mentions that the inscription survived only in faint Attic letters (ἀμυδροῖς γράμμασιν Ἀττικοῖς; 76) and was set up in the "most ancient and holy" (ἅγια καὶ ἀρχαῖα; 76) temple of Dionysos of the Marshes that was opened only once a year (ἅπαξ γὰρ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἀνοίγεται; 76). He continues:

> *μαρτυρίαν ποιούμενος ὁ δῆμος ὑπὲρ τῆς αὑτοῦ*
> *εὐσεβείας πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ παρακαταθήκην*
> *καταλείπων τοῖς ἐπιγιγνομένοις, ὅτι τήν γε θεῷ*

47 Carey (1992: 126–127n.84).

γυναῖκα δοθησομένην καὶ ποιήσουσαν τὰ ἱερὰ τοιαύτην ἀξιοῦμεν εἶναι.

The people made a witness on behalf of their piety to the god and left it as a trust to future generations that we expect the woman who is to be given to the god and who will perform the sacred rites to be of such a sort. (59.76)

Apollodoros situates the virgin *basilinna* in a political lineage that begins with the autochthonous Athenians and reaches through the earliest democracy, which voted to set up the column, to the present (as indicated in ἀξιοῦμεν) and future generations of democratic citizens (τοῖς ἐπιγιγνομένοις). The virginity and citizen status of the *basilinna* is determined by an indefinite trajectory of democratic history that encompasses Apollodoros and his auditors. The ritual marriage is described in terms that emphasize its status as a long-term transaction.

The ceremony that Phano allegedly performed took place in the Boukolion, the oxherd's house in the *agora*, the public center. According to Von Reden, "as the political centre of the democratic *polis*, the Athenian *agora* symbolized the assembly of citizens and the equality of all its members."[48] Although the consummation of the *basilinna's* marriage to Dionysos is not described, it seems to have been symbolized in the ritual performance.[49] If Apollodoros' speech can be construed as alluding to this aspect of the ritual, would this not conjure the earlier description of Neaira having sex in public with Phrynion? This doubling sets up an opposition between reckless sexuality and holy devotion, once again showing Stephanos and his *oikos* to be inappropriately devoted to immediate and self-centered gratification as defined against Apollodoros, the Athenian *demos*, and the cosmic order. Furthermore, it explains the rhetorical need to merge the characters of Phano and Neaira. Phano needs to share her

48 Von Reden (1995: 106–107).

49 Burkert (1985: 240) suggests that the ritual involved simulated sex in public, with the Choes revelers standing around the couch with torches. See also Ar. *Ath. Pol.* 3.5 who says that there was a *summeixis* and *gamos* between Dionysos and the *Basileus'* wife. Hamel (2003: 104) suggests that the marriage may have been consummated symbolically, involving a herm. Avagianou (1991: 177–197) presents the literary and archaeological evidence and concludes that the union was conceptual – the ritual, she claims, "gives legality to eroticism" (193). See also Goff (2004: 38–39); Hamilton (1992) argues that the *hieros gamos* was not part of the Anthesteria. This speech does explicitly say, however, that Phano was given as wife to Dionysos (59.110).

mother's reputation to suggest the shocking image of the *basilinna*-prostitute. While the *basilinna* performs her one-night marriage in public in a highly ritualized context – a ceremony that honors Dionysos and is linked to the inception of Athenian democracy – the Neaira/Phano character has sex in public for the sake of one man's thrills in return for pay, allowing him to make a competitive show of his privilege. In the context of civic ritual, just as in marriage, the house of Stephanos inappropriately applies amoral, self-serving standards to transactions that belong to higher orders. Through his inappropriate transactions with Neaira and her daughter, he has enabled a prostitute to usurp the position of a wife and ritual performer. He has taken economic tactics that are suspect in the realm of the marketplace and applied them to the realms of civic and ritual participation.

STEPHANOS AND THE BATTLE OF PLATAIA

Thus far I have tried to show how every episode concerning the members of Stephanos' *oikos* represents a different facet of the short-term transactional order, exposing a variety of abuses of the code of exchange that was deeply embedded in Athenian culture and was designed to maintain distinctions between the economic, social, and cosmic orders. Apollodoros created this effect through a representation of the women of this *oikos* as commodities. A by-product of this depiction is a fairly detailed sketch of Stephanos as an economic agent. This image, however, is inconsistent. In Apollodoros' speech, Stephanos is both so poor that he will do anything for money, and so rich that he can manipulate Athenian politics.

When Stephanos became Neaira's patron, he set her up in his house. Apollodoros manages to mention that it sold for seven minas and comprised Stephanos' total estate. Stephanos received Neaira for the twofold purpose of having a beautiful mistress at no cost and maintaining his household. Apollodoros incidentally mentions that her trade was Stephanos' only income. Subsequently Neaira and Stephanos developed the staged-adultery scheme to support their household. At this point Stephanos was a sycophant (39), hiring himself to bring indictments and denunciations, and putting his name on other people's proposals. (Not surprisingly, this occupation is associated with profiteering at the expense of the democracy.)[50] Later in the narrative,

50 See Dem. 57.34; Ober (1989: 174).

Stephanos seems to be a much wealthier man: in the Phano episode, he apparently has a country house (64), and enough money to assist Theogenes in becoming *Basileus,* and then to buy the post of assessor from him (72). Carey observes that while Stephanos' alleged poverty corroborates the representation of him as someone who is willing to engage in unscrupulous activities for money, the economic picture that Apollodoros sketches seems to be somewhat askew: the house he owned was near those of wealthy families and therefore may have been worth more than the seven minas that Apollodoros claims. Also, because Stephanos' associates (except Theogenes) seem to be men of property where they can be identified, "it is doubtful that he is the pauper Apollodoros describes."[51]

Ian Morris offers a model that may explain the logical problem of Stephanos being a man who is both rich and poor. He suggests that fourth-century politicians constructed Athens as a community of *mesoi* or *metrioi,* middling men. "The *metrios,"* he says,

> *was contrasted with both the rich and the poor. . . . He was defined through everyday actions – providing well for his family and community, having a strong sense of shame, and above all, keeping his appetites under control. . . . A man judged to stand at any extreme lacked control.*[52]

Implicit in Morris' argument is that orators directed their speeches to a jury consisting of *metrioi.* Because the rich were distrusted as being prone to hubris, whereas the poor were thought to be forced to do undignified things, describing someone as rich or poor was to exclude them from the ideal democratic community. Thus, Apollodoros' depiction of Stephanos excludes him on either side. Because of his poverty, Stephanos was compelled to be a sycophant, bribe foreigners, and pimp Neaira. His excessive wealth corresponds to his hubristic attempts to enfranchise non-Athenians and to purchase a sacred role within the *polis* for the daughter of a prostitute. Although Stephanos' exact economic position never comes into focus, he is distinctly excluded from the ideological category of *metrioi.*[53]

51 Carey (1992: 106).

52 Morris (1996: 22).

53 Perhaps the ultimate aim of the conflicting characterization of Stephanos is to deprive him of the possibility of responding. Kelly (1994: 168 ff.) has argued that silencing

The denouement of the oration, the history of Plataia's devotion to Athens, is meant to amplify the suggestion of Stephanos' hubris. It has been noted that the Plataians' hard-won Athenian citizenship acts as a lofty counter to Stephanos' devious attempts to enable the progeny of Neaira to infiltrate the ranks of citizens and includes a return to the themes of marriage and religion.[54] Although this partially explains the presence of this long and tedious historical digression in the oration, to my knowledge no scholar has explained why Apollodoros takes this opportunity to throw in what seem to be historically inaccurate details linking Pausanias, the Spartan king, to the destruction of Plataia.

After the allied Greek forces were victorious over the Persians at Plataia, Pausanias dedicated a monument to Apollo at Delphi. Apollodoros preserves the inscription:

> *Ἑλλήνων ἀρχηγός, ἐπεὶ στρατὸν ὤλεσε Μήδων,*
> *Παυσανίας Φοίβῳ μνῆμ' ἀνέθηκε τόδε*
> *ὡς αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἔργου ὄντος καὶ τοῦ ἀναθήματος, ἀλλ' οὐ κοινοῦ τῶν συμμάχων.*
>
> *The leader of the Greeks when he destroyed the army of Medes, Pausanias dedicated this monument to Phoibos*
> *as though the deed and the dedication were his own, not of the allies in common.* (59.97)

As a result, he says, the Plataians, on behalf of all the Greeks, brought an action before the Amphictyons for the exorbitant sum of one thousand talents and had the Spartans replace the inscription with the names of all the cities that fought the battle. This sparked a festering enmity between the Spartans and

one's opponent is the goal of ancient forensic oratory. Thomas Habinek interprets an analogous move made by Cicero, when he levels the insult of banditry against Catiline. Cicero uses banditry as "a means to differentiate his opponent from the other members of his audience. . . . The orator aims to deny his opponent standing within the community and to exclude him from the place of reasoned debate by aligning him with the very forces that the community cannot incorporate if it wishes to remain the same community." Habinek (1998: 70–71).

54 Patterson (1994: 210).

Plataians, which manifested itself fifty years later in the brutal destruction of Plataia in 431 through the agency of the Theban Eurymachos.

Although the story of Pausanias' dedication is consonant with Thucydides' version (1.132), his involvement in the Plataian debacle is not recorded anywhere else. According to Thucydides, Sparta reprimanded Pausanias for his behavior and replaced the inscription, there was never hostility between Sparta and Plataia,[55] and the attack on Plataia originated at Thebes and Pausanias was not involved (2.2.3). Although some scholars have argued for the authenticity of Apollodoros' version of events,[56] it is generally agreed that the facts have been changed to emphasize Plataian valor.[57] But Pausanias' role in this account has yet to be explained. I suggest that the oppositions between the individual and the group, and self-interest versus the greater good that I have argued characterize the difference between Stephanos and Apollodoros, are repeated and amplified in the narrative of Pausanias and the Plataian affair. The Plataians, like Apollodoros and his *oikos*, remain loyal to Athens even while they are viciously attacked by their opponents and are accordingly incorporated into the Athenian *demos*. Pausanias, by contrast, is presented as an example of the extreme toward which Stephanos tends. The opposition between αὑτοῦ τοῦ ἔργου ... ἀλλ' οὐ κοινοῦ ... in Apollodoros' comment on the dedication makes the point forcefully and succinctly.

Thucydides describes Pausanias as a deceitful would-be tyrant. Pretending to join in a struggle against Persia, he took naval forces to the Hellespont without being authorized by the Spartan government. His intention was to collude with Xerxes and become the ruler of Hellas. Xerxes welcomed his advances, and Pausanias began to live extravagantly, in the Persian style. He wore Persian clothes, threw lavish banquets, and was attended by a bodyguard of Persians and Egyptians.

Pausanias' adaptation of Persian ways correlates with his dream of empire. In the beginning of his *history*, Thucydides says that Sparta was the first Greek state to move away from a luxurious lifestyle:

> *μετρίᾳ δ' αὖ ἐσθῆτι καὶ ἐς τὸν νῦν τρόπον πρῶτοι Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἐχρήσαντο καὶ ἐς τὰ ἄλλα πρὸς τοὺς*

55 In Thucydides *Hist.* 3.53–59, the Plataians represent themselves as consistent allies of the Spartans in the period leading up to the Peloponnesian War.

56 Bonner and Smith (1943: 2); Parke and Wormell (1956: 182); Trevett (1990: 409 ff.).

57 E.g., Carey (1992: 134–135n.98); Fornara (1967: 291–529); Gernet (1960: 101n.1).

πολλοὺς οἱ τὰ μείζω κεκτημένοι ἰσοδίαιτοι μάλιστα κατέστησαν.

Moreover, the Spartans were the first to use moderate dress, in the current fashion, and in other respects, those who were more wealthy represented themselves as having the same lifestyle as the majority. (1.6.4–5)

Thucydides figures the display of luxury in opposition to the majority and represents Sparta in the forefront of apparent economic conformity. Leslie Kurke argues that the fifth century saw a move away from luxury, stemming from political trends toward ἰσονομία, and from antipathy toward Eastern ways resulting from the Persian Wars.[58] The negative, antisocial connotations of Pausanias' Easternizing would have seemed all the more intense to Apollodoros' audience since he broke ranks with Spartan austerity to adopt this lifestyle, in the midst of the Persian War, no less.

Although Apollodoros' historical digression sounds a note of discord when compared to other seemingly more reliable historical documents,[59] this narrative is completely consonant with the oppositions that organize the entire oration. Pausanias' hubris parallels the representation of Stephanos, and the Plataian devotion corresponds to the idealized citizen that has been consistently opposed to Stephanos. By weaving Pausanias into the narrative of the destruction of Plataia, Apollodoros adds to his depiction of Stephanos as a litigious, petty politician-blackmailer-sycophant-pimp the specter of a serious threat to democracy. Stephanos can reasonably be said to have tried to dower a courtesan's progeny onto the rolls of Athenian citizenship, and the connection to Pausanias further takes the anxiety this representation suggests to an extreme. It locates Stephanos' alleged abuse of Athenian democratic institutions on a continuum with tyranny. The tyrant is the ultimate short-term negotiator: he usurps the long-term political order for his own glory and pleasure. His desire for personal gain drives him beyond the bounds of the established political order to the apex of the social hierarchy: at the top, there are no equals with whom to exchange, no order that he is subject to.[60]

58 Kurke (1992: 102–103).

59 Apollodoros' version of Plataian valor is also at odds with Herodotus' record of the same events. Cf. [Dem.] 59.95 and Herod. 7.222 and 8.1.1.

60 For this picture of the tyrant see Theognis 39–52 and Plato *Rep.* 9.2.b ff. On the powerful signification of the tyrant in the Athenian imaginary see Wohl (2002: 216–259).

The thematic link of Stephanos to Pausanias not only excludes Stephanos from the *metrioi,* it represents him in diametric opposition to the democratic community.

CONCLUSION

We have seen that the line of argument in this oration does not exactly cohere to the charge that Apollodoros proffers. There are serious holes in the argument: Neaira's place of birth is never proven, nor is Phano's father explicitly identified; no testimony proves that she was married or actually performed a sacred marriage. The prosecution fails to discuss Phano's brothers, whose exact citizen status would be easy to establish (there would be records of their introduction into the deme) and would provide clear evidence of Stephanos' fraudulence. Furthermore, there is much in the oration that is extrinsic to the charge, like the vivid description of Neaira's career as a courtesan. The historical digression at the denouement of the speech seems to take serious liberties with the truth. I have tried to suggest that the gaps and contradictions in Apollodoros' argumentation, the fissures in his logic, are subsumed by a consistent representation of Stephanos. This depiction relies not on fact, sworn testimony, and cold logic, but on what David Halperin calls the "cultural poetics of Athenian manhood."[61]

Thus Apollodoros has depicted Stephanos as someone who makes inappropriate transactions and therefore does not belong to the democratic community. In the terms of Parry and Bloch, he has collapsed transactional orders. These orders are more complex than mere economic structures – they simultaneously articulate morality, a temporal frame, and social usefulness. Stephanos has brought the amoral, short-sighted, pleasure-seeking framework of the short-term cycle to the realm of marriage, citizenship, and ritual.

If we read [Demosthenes] 59 from within the cultural architecture of transactional orders, considering the exchange of women as constitutive of male subjectivity, then the prosecution of Neaira effectively becomes an attack against Stephanos. The narrative of her errant behavior represents Stephanos' refusal to abide by the transactional code that informs Athenian culture. With this interpretation in mind, let us return to Apollodoros' assertion about the

61 Halperin (1989: 103).

categories and uses of women, with which I began: "*Hetairai* we keep for the sake of pleasure, concubines for daily care of the body, and wives for making legitimate children and for faithful guardianship of our household possessions" (59.122).

Now we can read this statement as a reflection of a code of exchange. These categories describe increasing levels of temporal and moral commitment, or graduating transactional orders. Apollodoros begins with the *hetaira* who belongs conceptually to the realm of pleasure, and involves a short-term exchange that is unhampered by morality. He then moves to concubinage, a more permanent relationship that entails more responsibility on the part of the man, and endures over a long period of time. He concludes with marriage, a long-term transaction, deeply embedded in the politics, economy, and morality of Athenian society. It is a system of reciprocal exchange designed to "ensure, through strict rules governing marriage, the permanence of the city itself through constant reproduction."[62]

Thus we see that *hetairai,* concubines, and wives symbolize different temporal and moral dimensions of male sexuality. These typologies of women relate to sexuality, culminating in the production of legitimate offspring. We can read the impulse, evident in this passage, to categorize the other as a way to organize the self as a local example of the larger argument of this book. The feminine is constructed as a multiplicity to construct relationships between different facets of masculinity.

In his closing argument, Apollodoros evokes the mothers, wives, and daughters of the jurymen sitting at home, waiting for news of the courtroom. By contrast to the notoriety and independence of Neaira and Phano, these women are anonymous and unanimous. In defense of these good women, Apollodoros contextualizes marriage as an exchange related to the interests of the city on a cosmic level, and shows how the adherence to a transactional code constitutes civic order:

> *νῦν μὲν γάρ, κἂν ἀπορηθῇ τις, ἱκανὴν προῖκ᾽ αὐτῇ ὁ νόμος συμβάλλεται, ἂν καὶ ὁπωστιοῦν μετρίαν ἡ φύσις ὄψιν ἀποδῷ· προπηλακισθέντος δὲ τοῦ νόμου ὑφ᾽ ὑμῶν ἀποφυγούσης ταύτης, καὶ ἀκύρου*

62 Vernant (1981: 60).

γενομένου, παντελῶς ἤδη ἡ μὲν τῶν πορνῶν ἐργασία ἥξει εἰς τὰς τῶν πολιτῶν θυγατέρας, δι' ἀπορίαν ὅσαι ἂν μὴ δύνωνται ἐκδοθῆωναι, τὸ δὲ τῶν ἐλευθέρων γυναικῶν ἀξίωμα εἰς τὰς ἑταίρας, ἂν ἄδειαν λάβωσι τοῦ ἐξεῖναι αὑταῖς παιδοποιεῖσθαι ὡς ἂν βούλωνται καὶ τελετῶν καὶ ἱερῶν καὶ τιμῶν μετέχειν τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει.

For as it is now, even if someone is without resources, the law contributes sufficient dowry for her if nature gives her moderate good looks in any way whatsoever; if the law is held in contempt by you with her acquittal, and loses its authority, then undoubtedly it will turn out that the career of prostitutes will fall to the daughters of citizens, as many as cannot be married because of poverty, while the status of free women will fall to hetairai*, if they are given the right to fearlessly have children as they wish and to take part in the rituals and sacraments and honors of the city. (59.113)*

Once again, Apollodoros displaces the discourse of democracy onto a woman's body: if nature gives a poor woman passable looks (μετρία ὄψις), the city takes care of her. The use of ἀποδίδωμι to describe nature's gift implies a relationship of reciprocity between nature and the woman, which then extends to the city.[63] Athens becomes a father, dowering his daughters with the citizenship of their offspring. Once again, in the long-term transaction of reproducing citizens and perpetuating the city-state, the *polis* and the individual are linked in a relation of reciprocity. Where Neaira's body was described with terms that refer to the contested extremes of democracy, the law courts, and the liturgies of the wealthy, here the female citizen is described by the term that connotes the idealized democratic citizen. The woman possessing a μετρία ὄψις engenders the *metrios*. In his closing words, Apollodoros naturalizes the image of the woman's body as democracy (φύσις provides the middling looks) and draws her into the center of Athenian democracy (μετρίαν, 113). The feminine body is figured as the site that engenders masculine civic identity. Now the bare fact of Neaira's exceptional appearance proves that she and her kin exist outside the realm of the *metrios*.

63 Significantly, ἀποδίδωμι is the verb Theomnestos uses when he describes his suit as an *eranos* returned; see the discussion earlier.

The reproduction of the city is intimately linked to citizen marriage and is invested in defining the parameters of this institution. If transactions with courtesans are not kept completely separate from the institution of marriage, then society will be inverted: *hetairai* will be free women performing the city's sacraments, and the daughters of citizens will be prostitutes. The hierarchical distinctions between the prostitute and the wife, in both her civic and ritual roles, will disappear. If there is no longer any distinction between the extreme poles of the feminine, that is, if *hetairai* perform public rituals, there will no longer be room for the category of the *metrios.* The point of Apollodoros' aphorism is that the knowledge of and ability to abide by the codes appropriate to each transactional order is constitutive of Athenian masculine identity. It is Stephanos' failure to distinguish these realms that is at issue in this oration.

In "Against Neaira," the feminine continuum of the prostitute, wife, and ritual performer evokes a shared code of transactions. The corruption of Stephanos is encapsulated in the image of the prostitute/ritual performer. The power of this image depends to some degree on associations between the two roles. Both share an element of public performance and eroticism. When these categories are collapsed, the position of the citizen's wives (daughters and mothers) is threatened. Maintaining distinctions between one type of erotic performance and another produces a space – an absence for the Athenian wife to inhabit – from which to produce the *metrios.* In the next chapter we will see the feminine continuum used again in the construction of masculine identity, but it will not promote a heterosexual agenda, nor will it serve civic interests.

3. Why Is Diotima a Priestess? The Feminine Continuum in Plato's *Symposium*

INTRODUCTION: SYMPOSIA HIGH AND LOW

In the previous chapter we saw how one orator construed the proper ordering of the prostitute, wife, and priestess as a structure used to symbolize civic order, reflecting different temporal and moral dimensions of civic participation. The collapse of the differences between these identities figured a threat to the ethical and economic distinctions governing citizen behavior. To show that this construction of the feminine was not merely one orator's conception, but rather a pliable discourse that could operate in a variety of spheres, we must see it at work in a different context. In the following two chapters, I examine how the discursive formation of the prostitute, the wife, and the ritual agent operates in two versions of Socratic pederasty. First I will read Plato's *Symposium*, then Xenophon's. Both of these authors, I will argue, use this feminine hierarchy as a way to configure and justify particular elite practices.

From one vantage point, these two texts have diametrically opposing strategies in terms of their treatment of gender, and in particular the representation of women. For this reason an analysis of the feminine hierarchy in each text will show how the same discursive structure can be made to serve differing ends. Perhaps it is the primacy of bodily spectacle that has inspired the observation from so many commentators that Xenophon's *Symposium* is a work of realism. Implicitly and explicitly compared to Plato's text by the same name, Xenophon's *Symposium* is thought to compensate for its failure to represent the sublimity of Socratic abstraction by preserving for posterity a slice of elite classical Athenian life. Indeed, it would seem that the persistent representation of the material world has earned Xenophon's *Symposium* second rank in a class of two. O. J. Todd articulates a representative comparison of these texts:

> *As might well have been expected, we do not reach in Xenophon the same exalted level of inspiration and poetical feeling that we do in Plato's representation of the banqueters' discussion of Love, but we feel rather the atmosphere of actual, ordinary*

> *disputation among men not keyed up to any high pitch of fervour; we do not have so well-developed or so formal or so long-sustained philosophical debate, but we enjoy a feeling of reality in the evening's event, of seeing more vividly than in Plato just how an Athenian banquet was conducted.*[1]

Although I think it is reductive at best to read Xenophon's *Symposium* only in terms of Plato's, it would be a mistake not to consider their relationship.[2] Xenophon explicitly invites the reader to think of the two in dialogue with one another when he incorporates a reference to Pausanias' erotic distinctions between "pandemian" and "ouranian" love from Plato's text into his own (8.9). The passing reference that Xenophon's Socrates makes to the two types of *eros* has an interesting bearing on the balance between the transcendent and the material in the two texts. Where Xenophon's text depicts the hired entertainers as they interact with the symposiasts, the *auletris,* or hired aulos-player, is sent out in Plato's *Symposium* before the discussion of Eros begins. Diotima, a priestess, has a significant and authoritative role in Plato's text, while there is a more minimal glance toward the idea of the feminine as transcendent in

1 Todd (1992: 533). In the introduction to his edition of Xenophon's *Symposium* Ollier (1961: 9) notes that it is due to Xenophon more so than Plato that we have an image of a "veritable banquet . . . nous pouvons nous représenter avec exactitude ce qu'était à Athènes une réunion de ce genre, du moins entre gens bien élevés. L'intérêt historique est considérable à cet égard." For an interpretation of Xenophon as a pioneer of the biographical form, see Momigliano (1971). Strauss (1972: 145) reveals that he has been seduced by Xenophon's "realism" in his interpretation of Philip the buffoon's unsought presence at the banquet: "One cannot exclude the possibility that his apparently unplanned appearance was arranged beforehand between him and Kallias." Although I think this extra-textual reading goes too far in presupposing a real historicity informing the text, nonetheless I do agree with Strauss that a familiarity with the characters' biographies between the narrative date of the *Symposium* and its publication is crucial to an understanding of the text.

2 Gray (1992: 58–75) has challenged the validity of reading Xenophon only in light of Plato, arguing persuasively that although Xenophon's *Symposium* is indebted to that of Plato, the sources of influence must be acknowledged to extend beyond that text, even into the domain of poetry. She makes the interesting argument that Xenophon is interpreting an anecdote about the poet Simonides discussing the silent guest through the person of Socrates.

Xenophon's *Symposium,* when the dancing girl enacts the role of Dionysos's wife.

Hermogenes, who wrote in the second century CE, identifies the inclusion of the talk of entertainers as indicative of the level of style:

> *Συμπόσια γοῦν ἀμφοτέροις ἐστὶ γεγραμμένα, ἀλλ' ὃ μὲν καὶ ὀρχηστρίδων εἰσόδους καὶ ὀρχημάτων εἴδη τινὰ καὶ φιλήματα καὶ πολλὰ τοιαῦτα λέγειν μεθ' ἡδονῆς οὐ παραιτεῖται, ὃ δὲ ταῦτα ὑφεὶς ταῖς γυναιξίν, ὡς αὐτός φησιν, ἐπὶ τὸ σεμνότερον ἄγει τὴν ἀφέλειαν τῶν πραγμάτων.*
>
> *For symposia have been written by both of them. Xenophon does not avoid mentioning the entrances of the dancing girls, and certain types of dances and kisses and many other such things, but he does it with pleasure, while Plato leaves such things to the women, as he himself says, making the simplicity of the affair into something more solemn. (Hermogenes,* On Style 392*)*[3]

It is significant that Hermogenes links the exclusion of the hired entertainers with a greater degree of solemnity, as if there is a mutual exclusion between the inclusion of the holy and the absence of physical indulgence, or between the dancers and Diotima. In the following chapter, I will argue that the inclusion of libidinal entertainment and the lived-texture produced by this element in Xenophon's *Symposium* is intentional, part of an apologetic agenda, and not necessarily the inevitable product of a duller wit.

In this chapter I analyze Plato's *Symposium* through the matrix of the prostitute, the wife, and the priestess. Diotima's role in the text has already received a good deal of attention. David Halperin, who was one of the first to think seriously about gender in the *Symposium,* has argued that Plato invented Diotima to avoid participation in and to create an alternative to the asymmetrical power dynamics that at times seem to have troubled the Athenian conception of pederastic relationships.[4] In this model woman is a "figure of

3 Rabe (1913).

4 Halperin (1990). There is obviously a vast amount of scholarship on the *Symposium,* and I have drawn on only that small part that is pertinent to my argument.

male speech";[5] female "difference" is a screen onto which to project male identity:

> *But if Diotima is not a woman but a "woman," it no longer makes any sense to inquire into her gender. . . . For "woman" too, turns out to be a trope: in the representational economy of Plato's text (as elsewhere) "woman" is always a sign of something else – of a spurious sexual "difference" that men (as they see themselves) at once lack and possess.*[6]

With Halperin, I think that "woman" signifies a spurious difference, but I want to enrich and extend Halperin's argument by noting that, in this text, "woman" is not a unified sign. Male identity is not only written against Diotima, but also the *auletris* and the "women within." Furthermore, I think two distinct versions of female "difference" circulate in this text – one that is structured in a binary relation to male, and another that is evoked as a continuum – *auletris,* wife, priestess. Attention to the nuances of female difference in the *Symposium* will allow a more complex view of the masculine identity that is structured against it. For it is not simply the feminine that allows Plato an escape valve from binarism, it is, in particular, the notion of the feminine as a continuum that provides him an alternative model.

Throughout the *Symposium,* Plato gradually elaborates a hierarchy of gender and the feminine through various personae that must inform our interpretation of Diotima and her teaching. With this in mind, I begin my analysis with a consideration of the women who Plato says are present (and not present) at Agathon's victory party. Then I track the problematic mapping of sexuality and gender difference through all the symposiasts' speeches, which has received surprisingly little attention, despite the interest in the text for the understanding of gender in classical Athens.[7] The general incoherence of sex and gender in the speeches presents a problem that Socrates' erotics resolve by casting the feminine in a continuum, instead of in a binary opposition to

5 Halperin (1990: 296).
6 Halperin (1990: 297).
7 See Finkelberg (1997); Saxonhouse (1984, 1994).

masculinity. I argue that Plato deploys a model of the feminine in a dialectical relationship with a model of pederasty (both of which have been established in the text), to gesture toward a new kind of erotic identity. Finally, I conclude with an assessment of how Alcibiades' story of his love for Socrates both confirms and complicates this reading.

SHE'S NOT THERE

The first woman we encounter in Plato's text is the *auletris* or aulos-player.[8] At Agathon's house the presence of the *auletris* is, in a sense, consonant with the materiality of the symposium. When she is there at the beginning, the guests are entering the building, arranging themselves on *klinai*, eating and drinking. When she returns at the end,[9] she is propping up a drunken Alcibiades dressed in the image of Dionysos, wearing a garland of ivy, violets, and fillets (212e), with the intention of crowning Agathon for his tragic victory. The noise he makes in the courtyard is heard by those inside (212d), thus recalling the physical surroundings of the event. As Alcibiades sits down he calls for a beaker, then settles for a cooling jar (213e); he assimilates Socrates to a clay image of a Silenos, and then to the Satyr Marsyas. Significantly Alcibiades expatiates on this analogy, describing the power of Marsyas' songs by saying that they are able to enchant the listener whether they are played by a good flutist, ἀγαθὸς αὐλητής or a lowly flute-girl (φαύλη αὐλητρίς, 215c4). Here Alcibiades assigns a moral/social debasement to the *auletris* with the use of the modifier φαύλη. When the *auletris* reenters Plato's text, so do the images of bodiliness and material culture associated with the symposium, and these are now tinged with disapproval. As an objectified person, the *auletris* has a seamless association with the world of objects.

Her banishment from the gathering is the necessary precondition for the philosophical discussion that forms the bulk of the dialogue. When the guests decide that they will not drink to excess, but rather entertain one another

8 On *aulos*-players and other hired entertainers at symposia see Plato, *Prot.* 347c–d. Later I will discuss the *auletris,* more generally.

9 Are we meant to think this is the same *auletris*? A different one? Whether the *auletris* is singular or multiple in this text does not affect my argument, which is that her role in the text is schematic. They are completely interchangeable.

with discussion, the symposiarch, Eryximachus, suggests that the nameless entertainer be dismissed:

> *"Ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν," φάναι τὸν Ἐρυξίμαχον, 'τοῦτο μὲν δέδοκται, πίνειν ὅσον ἂν ἕκαστος βούληται, ἐπάναγκες δὲ μηδὲν εἶναι, τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο εἰσηγοῦμαι τὴν μὲν ἄρτι εἰσελθοῦσαν αὐλητρίδα χαίρειν ἐᾶν, αὐλοῦσαν ἑαυτῇ ἤ, ἂν βούληται, ταῖς γυναιξὶ ταῖς ἔνδον, ἡμᾶς δὲ διὰ λόγων ἀλλήλοις συνεῖναι τὸ τήμερον.*
>
> *Therefore, said Eryximachos, since this has been decided, each man is to drink as much as he wants to, and there is to be no compulsion about it, I next propose to dismiss the* aulos*-girl who just came in and to let her play for herself, or, if she wants, for the women inside, while we consort with each other through speeches today.* (176e)[10]

Why did Plato introduce the *aulos*-player only to send her out of the room?[11] The dismissal of the *auletris,* followed by the thought that she might play for the women in the house, makes the tantalizing suggestion of an other space outside of this male-dominated discourse where a different, feminine perspective may be expressed. This "other" space is circumscribed, hermetically sealed as an "inside" (ἔνδον). This offhand remark offers the possibility of what Teresa de Lauretis describes as "a view from elsewhere . . . it is the elsewhere of discourse here and now, the blind spots, or the space-off, of its representations. I think of it as spaces in the margins of hegemonic discourses, social spaces carved in the interstices of institutions and in the chinks and cracks of the power-knowledge apparati [*sic*]."[12]

10 Greek text follows Dover (1980).

11 In the process of discussing the importance of creating space for cultural differences within feminist discourse, Lugones and Spellman (1983: 579) point out that the content of a given discourse is circumscribed by the experience and positionality of its participants: "How and what we think about does depend in large part on who is there – not to mention who is expected or encouraged to speak. (Recall the boys in the *Symposium* sending the flute-girls out.) Conversations and criticism take place in particular circumstances. Turf matters. So does the fact of who if anyone already has set up the terms of the conversations." For an interesting discussion of gender, space, and participation in antiquity, see Winkler (1990: 162–187, esp. 164 ff.).

12 de Lauretis (1987: 25).

This mention of women inside who could be entertained by a courtesan suggests a "space-off," where women could participate in their own symposia, and a feminine space that is identified as a space other than the one appropriate for philosophical discourse. The *auletris* is present at the symposium in part to allow for the articulation of the separation of the feminine and philosophical discourse. This gesture toward a site outside the boundary of this representation calls attention to the status of the symposium recounted here as mimesis; we encounter the text as a circumscribed entity – merely an image that in fact lacks the very material plenitude that the *auletris* signifies.[13]

The *auletris*, in contrast to the women within, is eminently suitable for representation; in this instance, she serves to gesture toward extra-philosophic feminine realms. Her dismissal unveils the exclusions that constitute the masculine space of the symposium and suggests that the material absence and discursive presence of women are necessary preconditions to the discussion that follows. This combination of presence and absence finds its counterpart in the priestess Diotima, a persona Socrates evokes to explain his system of homoerotics. Diotima's language is crucially derived from the role of the legitimate wife – that is, woman as mother. The various present absences are iterations of the separation of the philosophical voice from (feminine) materiality. Although the men are depicted as being present and speaking at Agathon's house, this combination is denied in three different ways to the women at the house. The *auletris*, the women within, and the priestess form a triad that insists on the separation of the material and philosophical worlds. "Woman" thus comes to signify the separation between mind and body. And it is precisely this distinction that lies at the heart of Socrates' metaphysical erotics.

Before delving into my argument, though, I should address the particular way that Plato evokes the feminine continuum, for there are questions that bedevil the precise identification of all of these female characters. The *aulos*-player is often lumped together in the same category as the *hetaira*, but she did have a distinct identity. She was trained to play the *aulos*, an instrument something like a double recorder or an oboe, notwithstanding the entrenched

13 In this way Plato's use of gender resonates with the elaborate framing of the narrative that places a heavy emphasis on the distance of the representation of the symposium from the actual event.

convention of translating *auletris* as flute-girl.[14] *Aulos*-playing accompanied a variety of activities from bread making to military expeditions to the carousing *komos*.[15] One comic fragment makes a distinction between sympotic and non-sympotic *auletrides*.[16] On vases, *aulos*-players are normally clothed, but sometimes not. Indeed, there is one image on a vase attributed to Euphronius that depicts a nude *auletris* playing for an audience of naked women.[17] In the *Protagoras* Socrates claims that *aulos*-players are hired by commonplace men at symposia to drown out their dull conversation, but the *kaloikagathoi* are satisfied with discussion (347c–d). Davidson considers the *auletris* one step up from a *porne* (street walker), noting that *auletris* in some cases is a synonym for *porne* and is used in contrast to the more upscale *hetaira*.[18] Starr, emphasizing their education and regulated pay, suggests that economically, at least, *auletris* was the highest level that a woman could expect to attain on her own in Athens.

It seems probable that, at times, these musical entertainers performed sexual favors as the night went on – Athenaios quotes an author who says that at the end of a party the girl could be auctioned off and sent home with the highest bidder (13.607). In Aristophanes' *Wasps* Philocleon arrives with a naked flute-girl whom he snatched away from a symposium just as she was about to fellate the guests (1335–81).[19] An implicit association of flute-playing with fellatio might explain Alcibiades' refusal to play the instrument as something beneath the dignity of a free citizen (Plutarch *Alcibiades* 2).

Ultimately, the status of the *auletris* is low, but ambiguous: as a prostitute, the *auletris* falls somewhere between a *porne* and a *hetaira*, but she is also a legitimate musical entertainer.[20] In this way she is especially suited to euphemism – Plato can introduce the *auletris* without explicitly invoking anything sexual at all – the symposiasts send her out so they can talk, favoring dialogue over music, not dialogue over sex. However, as a character in a text devoted to eros, the erotic dimension of the *aulos*-player's identity is implicitly evoked.

14 Incidentally, the training may have involved learning to read. Starr (1978: 404).
15 See West (1994: 28 ff.).
16 K-A *Adespota* 1007 1.34.
17 Boardman (1975 no. 27).
18 Men. *Perikeiromene* 337 ff.; Phylarchus *FrGr* 81F42. Davidson (1998: 82), Starr (1978: 407).
19 Henderson (1975: 81) suggests that fellatio was part of the *auletris*' repertoire. Ath. 13.591 preserves a similar association. See also McClure (2003: 21).
20 The ambiguous status of this figure is conveyed by McClure (2003: 21–22).

Precise classification of the women inside Agathon's house whom Eryximachos mentions (ταῖς γυναιξὶ ταῖς ἔνδον, 176e) also eludes identification: Deborah Nails suggests that these must be Agathon's mother and/or sisters.[21] There is no record of Agathon having a wife, but it certainly isn't impossible that he did. All Plato really tells us is that these are the women inside his house, and we are left to assume the rest. In contrast to the *auletris,* these women were never included in this gathering. It was the general practice of elites to sequester respectable women, that is, mothers, wives, sisters, daughters, from the eyes of men outside the family. In *Laws* Plato mentions that Athenians make their women guardians of the house (805e).[22] Xenophon also articulates the explicit gendering of the inside of the house as a feminine space versus the masculine outdoors: "For it is better for a woman to remain indoors than to go outside, and it is more disgraceful for a man to remain inside than to take care of the work outside" (*Oik.* 7.30).[23] As David Cohen has described it, "the house is seen as sheltering the private sphere, including the sexual purity and reputation of the women on whom the honor of a family in significant part depends."[24] He goes on to argue that the strictures protecting women from intrusion by the community were in practice less rigid than the expression of this ideal leads us to believe, citing "Plato's accounts of male gatherings from which modesty required free women to absent themselves" as the basis of what he claims is an overly schematic notion of the degree to which free women were actually sequestered.[25] Curiously, toward the end of this text, Alcibiades claims that Socrates' words are spellbinding to audiences of women, men, and children. In the Socratic world that Plato depicts, however, free honorable women are not present at male gatherings.[26] The offhand mention of the women within the house serves precisely to introduce a category of woman apart from the hired musician – that is, the kind of women who must remain aloof from the goings-on in the *andron*. In Plato's context,

21 Nails (2002: 8).

22 See also Xenophon *Oik.* 7.30–31 for the gendering of inside versus outside.

23 Trans. from Lefkowitz and Fant (2005: 200).

24 Cohen (1991: 83).

25 Cohen (1991: 87). It is interesting to note that some later ancient writers record that Socrates did in fact have female students. Diogenes Laertius (3rd c. CE) names Lasthenia of Mantinea and Axiothea of Phlius (3.46). See also Themistius Orations 295e and Oxyrhynchus papyrus 3656.G.

26 Kurke (2006: 28); see also Halperin (1992: 115–117).

this refers to the wives or potential wives of Athenian citizens. The wife, as the embodiment of legitimate reproduction, is the most glaring absent presence in the text – while both the *auletris* and Diotima participate in some way, these women are only mentioned to be excluded.

In keeping with the ambiguous identities of the other women in the text, it is not at all clear who Diotima is supposed to be. The only definitive things Socrates tells us about her is that she is from Mantinea, she is a wise woman, σοφή, a teacher of τὰ ἐρωτικά, and she was able to intercede on behalf of the Athenians when they were making a sacrifice, with the result that the plague came ten years later than originally scheduled (201d1–5).[27]

Diotima is never actually named a priestess, although she uses the language of initiation when describing the revelation of beauty.[28] The religious idiom she uses combined with the detail that she could influence the outcome of a sacrifice certainly characterize her as a woman of ritual authority. Furthermore, in comparison to the other women under discussion she has a different relationship to men. She is Socrates' teacher – an authority on love – and occupies a role that he can use to gain prestige for his version of philosophic erotics. Since Diotima is a female authority with a public role, Athenian culture gives us scarcely any other option than to assume that her status is founded on her role in ritual. We will come back to the riddle of Diotima's identity. As Gerald Press has observed, Diotima's role in the *Symposium* raises far more questions than it resolves.[29] For now, we can say that like the *auletris* and the women within, she is only elusively characterized. One facet of her characterization that is stable, though, is how she stands in relation to the other women present (or not) at Agathon's symposium. My argument will address the way this triad of femininity influences our interpretation of the text.

GENDER ASYMMETRY AND PEDERASTY

Through language that relates directly to the realm of the feminine sexual and procreative experience, Socrates recounts how Diotima explained to him that the aim of *eros* is to procreate in the beautiful. Although not present

27 I discuss the implications of her influence on the plague later in this chapter.

28 *Symp.* 210a. Clinton (2003: 59); Cornford (1971: 128); Finkelberg (1997: 258–261); Morgan (1992: 233–235).

29 Press (2000: 147–159).

at this *Symposium,* Diotima explicitly refers to the speeches of the symposiasts who spoke before Socrates, developing her speech in response to theirs. Thus, before we can fully appreciate the significance of the interplay of the presence and absence of the feminine in the text, and how that informs our understanding of Diotima, we need to unpack various positions regarding gender and pederasty as they are cumulatively articulated in the symposiasts' speeches. Plato's strategy of laying the groundwork for Socrates'/Diotima's eros through the speeches of the other guests has been compared to an erotic tease:

> *As each solution is presented in ways which are at once plausible and ridiculous – containing and recombining elements from a number of different poetic and philosophical discourses – we are invited to partially accept it, then reject it, only to eventually accept it again in transmuted, sublimated form in Socrates and Diotima's revelation of the True Nature of Eros.*[30]

In a way, this tactic demands that we respect the organic quality of the text, reading it in order. Thus what follows is a brief consideration of how the other celebrants invoke gender, especially as it is related to their conception of sexuality.

When the symposiasts have come to agreement on the topic of their discussion, Eryximakhos suggests that Phaedrus be the first to speak. He quotes Euripides' lost play *Melanippe* to justify his suggestion with a small but telling adjustment: he says that Phaedrus should be the first to speak because he was the πάτηρ τοῦ λόγου (father of the story; 177d5). The relevant fragment of the *Melanippe* is preserved as saying οὐκ ἐμός ὁ μῦθος ἀλλὰ τῆς μητρὸς πάρα (the story is not mine, but it is from my mother; fr. 484). In the immediate context the gender change of mother to father is appropriate and has provoked little comment. As I will argue in this chapter, however, this is a hint of a theme – the male appropriation of the maternal – that pervades the text.

The first two speakers, Phaedrus and Pausanias, are at pains to negotiate the asymmetry of the pederastic relationship between the lover (*erastes*)

30 Carnes (1998: 108). I would add, with Nussbaum (1986), that we then need to revise our understanding again in terms of Alcibiades' speech.

and beloved (*eromenos* or *paidika*). Although neither one of them evokes gender explicitly, my analysis will demonstrate that gender as a binary is crucially implicated in both these versions of pederasty. While no version of *eros* in this text represents a normative version of love, these two accounts seem to wrestle especially against the notion that gender roles and their hierarchy inform the construction of pederastic love. Eryximakhos' account suggests through implicit allusion that *eros* is identified with gender difference. All three of these early speeches depict *eros* in relation to a binary notion of gender. By contrast, Aristophanes, Agathon, and Socrates deploy three different strategies to evoke a nonbinary discourse of gender.[31] Finally, I suggest that Socrates' speech achieves the most successful (and only culturally authorized) evasion of the gender binary by evoking the feminine as a continuum through the introduction of Diotima. Plato's deployment of the feminine hierarchy, in and out of Socrates' speech, reinforces the description of philosophic pederasty as a gradual erotic ascent.

The first account of eros, offered by Phaedrus, is driven by the question: whom do the gods love more, the lover or the beloved? Implicit in this query is the assertion that the roles are asymmetrical. Phaedrus wants to argue that the gods love the *eromenos* who is willing to die for his *erastes*. But to make this point he must make use of a devious kind of logic, because the devotion of the *eromenos* to his *erastes* was a touchy subject. For, if an *eromenos* were physically devoted to his *erastes*, he risked the reputation of the *pornos*.[32] In an effort to justify his claim, Phaedrus appeals to unconventional images of heterosexuality, while asserting the superiority of the male.

Avoiding the unsavory implication that the gods love an *eromenos* who gratifies his *erastes*, Phaedrus evaluates love on the basis of one's willingness to die for love. He begins with the assertion that pederasty is the ultimate instigation to make men better citizens:

> *εἰ οὖν μηχανή τις γένοιτο ὥστε πόλιν γενέσθαι ἢ στρατόπεδον ἐραστῶν τε καὶ παιδικῶν, οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως ἄν ἄμεινον οἰκήσειαν τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἢ ἀπεχόμενοι πάντων τῶν αἰσχρῶν καὶ*

31 Cf. Most (2005: 34), who reads the speeches as paired and complementary.
32 Dover (1989: 52); Foucault (1980: 219); Halperin (1990: 88–112).

φιλοτιμούμενοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους, καὶ μαχόμενοι γ᾽ ἂν μετ᾽ ἀλλήλων οἱ τοιοῦτοι νικῷεν ἂν ὀλίγοι ὄντες ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν πάντας ἀνθρώπους.

If only there were some way that the city or army could be composed of lovers and their beloveds, there is no better way for them to manage their city, since they would refrain from everything shameful and compete for honor with one another, and if they were fighting together, just a few of this type would defeat, as they say, all mankind. (178e3–179a2)

Phaedrus obviously has in mind a city or army of men. However, he does not entirely exclude women from his praise of Eros. He mentions that the gods honored Alkestis for her willingness to die on behalf of her husband, Admetos, by sending her up from Hades back to life. But we would be mistaken to believe that Alkestis is a model of feminine virtue. Rather, it was Alkestis' masculine qualities that earned her honor among gods and men. Alkestis is a wife. Yet significantly she has no association with childbearing: "Phaedrus has love change this woman from a life-giver to a death-seeker. To earn his praise, the female must become male."[33] Like the women inside the house, here again, woman as the embodiment of legitimate reproduction is elided from the text.

Phaedrus depicts Alkestis in masculine terms when he contrasts her to Orpheus. Orpheus was only shown a phantom of Eurydice, because he seemed soft (ὅτι μαλθακίζεσθαι ἐδόκει) and lacked the daring (τολμᾶν) of Alkestis. As punishment for his shortcoming, Orpheus died at the hands of women (179d8). He goes on to assert that Achilles received greater honor from the gods than Alkestis, because they sent him to the isle of the Blest. They did this because he valued Patroklos, his *erastes,* over his own life. Phaedrus then claims that the *erastes* is more divine than the *eromenos*:

ἀλλὰ γὰρ τῷ ὄντι μάλιστα μὲν ταύτην τὴν ἀρετὴν οἱ θεοὶ τιμῶσιν τὴν περὶ τὸν ἔρωτα, μᾶλλον μέντοι θαυμάζουσιν καὶ ἄγανται καὶ εὖ ποιοῦσιν ὅταν ὁ ἐρώμενος τὸν ἐραστὴν ἀγαπᾷ ἢ ὅταν ὁ ἐραστὴς τὰ παιδικά. θειότερον γὰρ ἐραστὴς παιδικῶν· ἔνθεος γάρ ἐστι. διὰ ταῦτα καὶ τὸν Ἀχιλλέα τῆς

33 Saxonhouse (1994: 14). See also Murnaghan (1988).

Ἀλκήστιδος μᾶλλον ἐτίμησαν, εἰς μακάρων νήσους ἀποπέμψαντες.

For although the gods truly value this virtue concerning love, they wonder at, marvel about, and reward it when an eromenos *adores his* erastes *more than when an erastes* adores *his beloved* (paidika). *For the* erastes *is more divine than his beloved; he has the god within. This is why they honored Achilles more than Alkestis and sent him off to the Isle of the Blest. (180a7–180b5)*

If Orpheus was less deserving of honor than Alkestis because he was "soft" and played the lyre, that is, effeminate, then how does Alkestis fit into this scheme?[34] It would seem, according to Halperin's argument, that, as a woman, she would be the subordinate member in her relationship to Orpheus, for *paidika* can refer to a female.[35] But that clearly is not how Phaedrus is construing the relationship here (180b3) – in his scheme Alkestis is an *erastes*. Dover suggests that we are meant to understand that Alkestis loves Admetos, but that he does not return her affection.[36] Although Phaedrus does not explicitly correlate Alkestis with either pederastic role,[37] when he contrasts Alkestis to Achilles he implicitly characterizes her as an *erastes*.

Thus to assert the superiority of the devoted *eromenos*, Phaedrus has marshaled as evidence two non-normative heterosexuals. Orpheus, whose story is otherwise paradigmatic of romantic heterosexual love, here becomes a womanly man in his desire for Eurydice, while Alkestis is the *erastes* of her husband.[38] To justify the somewhat problematic valorization of a beloved's love for his lover, he describes a scheme in which the object of one's love determines one's worth: Orpheus dies ignobly because he loves a woman; Alkestis

34 For the gendering of a luxurious lifestyle, which involves lyre playing and cultivating a soft aesthetic, see Kurke (1992). See also Dover (1980: 94).

35 Kratinos 258, Eupolis 327. Dover suggests that both of these instances could be thought of as humorous and therefore should not be taken as normative. See also *Symp.* 193b5, where *paidika* refers to both male and female beloved.

36 Dover (1980: 93).

37 Plato does, however, describe women as ἐρῶντες at 179b4.

38 Edmonds (2000) and Finkelberg (1997) both note a persistence of role reversals in the text and identify this as a theme that resonates with the depiction of Socrates in the text and with Diotima's erotics.

is better than Orpheus because she loves a man; but Achilles is best since he is a man who loves what is more divine, a man who loves a man – the *erastes*.

Thus, Phaedrus has used examples of deviant gender identification to justify his praise of the *eromenos* devoted to his *erastes*. To reevaluate pederastic roles, he appeals to the superiority of the male through examples of figures who don't conform to gender norms (as he tells their stories). And yet his version of pederastic eros still depends on a normative gender hierarchy. Furthermore, by devaluing the feminine, Phaedrus has excluded the possibility of procreation from his erotic world – his fantasy of a city of lovers and beloveds proves to be founded on a strong association between eros and death, for lovers are assessed in terms of their willingness to die.

Pausanias' speech is next, and in it he draws more extreme distinctions between men and women, elaborating negative associations with the feminine that will adhere throughout the text. He notes that there are two Aphrodites and therefore there must be two Erotes. One is Ouranian, and the other is Pandemian. Pandemian Aphrodite was born of a woman, the child of Zeus and Dione, and thus this type of eros is common, promiscuous, bodily, and makes no distinction between the love of women and boys:

> *καὶ οὗτός ἐστιν ὃν οἱ φαῦλοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐρῶσιν. ἐρῶσι δὲ οἱ τοιοῦτοι πρῶτον μὲν οὐχ ἧττον γυναικῶν ἢ παίδων, ἔπειτα ὧν καὶ ἐρῶσι τῶν σωμάτων μᾶλλον ἢ τῶν ψυχῶν, ἔπειτα ὡς ἂν δύνωνται ἀνοητοτάτων, πρὸς τὸ διαπράξασθαι μόνον βλέποντες, ἀμελοῦντες δὲ τοῦ καλῶς ἢ μή . . .*

> *This is the (Eros) whom common men love. This sort desires first of all women no less than boys, secondly they love the bodies more than souls of the people they love, and furthermore they love the most foolish one possible, looking only toward getting the deed done, indifferent as to whether they do it nobly or not. (181b1–181b6)*

Ouranian love, in contrast, is born from the male only, and is disposed toward what is male, since it is stronger and more sensible (181c6).[39] He

39 Significantly, Pausanias suppresses the detail that she is the product of her father's castration (Hesiod, *Theogony* 176–200).

continues this line of argument, suggesting that the entire category of pederasty might be thought of as originating from this type of eros:

> *καί τις ἂν γνοίη καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ παιδεραστίᾳ τοὺς εἰλικρινῶς ὑπὸ τούτου τοῦ ἔρωτος ὡρμημένους· οὐ γὰρ ἐρῶσι παίδων, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὰν ἤδη ἄρχωνται νοῦν ἴσχειν, τοῦτο δὲ πλησιάζει τῷ γενειάσκειν.*
>
> *And someone might perceive in pederasty itself those who have been roused purely by this love. For they do not love boys, but just when they begin to be sensible, and this is near to when they start to grow a beard. (181c7–d3)*

The assertion that pederasty might be considered Ouranian casts the relative values of male and female in stark relief: that which is purely male is heavenly, and that which has any share of the female is vulgar, because it is bodily and mindless. Thus he layers the binary of spiritual/worldly over that of male/female.

According to Pausanias, devotees of Ouranian love desire boys only, and only for virtuous reasons – they desire the souls of boys and want a long-term relationship. This kind of love is not compatible with tyranny:

> *τοῖς γὰρ βαρβάροις διὰ τὰς τυραννίδας αἰσχρὸν τοῦτό γε, καὶ ἥ γε φιλοσοφία καὶ ἡ φιλογυμναστία. οὐ γὰρ οἶμαι συμφέρει τοῖς ἄρχουσι φρονήματα μεγάλα ἐγγίγνεσθαι τῶν ἀρχομένων, οὐδὲ φιλίας ἰσχυρὰς καὶ κοινωνίας· ὃ δὴ μάλιστα φιλεῖ τά τε ἄλλα πάντα καὶ ὁ ἔρως ἐμποιεῖν.*
>
> *Among barbarians this (love) is shameful, as well as philosophy and the love of gymnastics, for I think it is not convenient for the rulers to engender lofty thoughts in their subjects, nor strong friendships nor associations, which love and these other things are especially wont to engender. (182b7–182c4)*

Ouranian love inspires both the *erastes* and *eromenos* to virtue, and this is beneficial to the city and to private individuals alike (185b5–6). Thus, in Pausanias' scheme women are associated with a senseless physicality, promiscuity, and the kind of eros that is not useful to the city. The female role in procreation is denigrated – this is precisely what renders Pandemian Eros lesser than Ouranian. Pausanias' dichotomy between two kinds of love, one of the body and

the other of the spirit, corresponds to the association of the feminine with the material world that was seen earlier in the depiction of the *aulos*-player.

Careful scrutiny of Ouranian love, however, renders the distinction Pausanias tries to establish between the two types of love less clear. Even in its exalted form, the asymmetry of pederasty still obtains: the boy seeks education while the lover wants to make love to the boy because of his attractive soul. Pausanias notes that there are complex regulations regarding pederasty in Athens (187a7–b1). While the behavior of the *erastes* is condoned and encouraged, *eromenoi* are not explicitly encouraged to gratify this behavior. However, if the boy perceives virtue in his lover, then in Pausanias' scheme, even if he is misguided in this perception, there is no shame in gratifying his lover for this reason. If the boy thinks his lover is virtuous, then he can gratify him with the satisfaction that is exactly the same as what the unvirtuous, or Pandemian, lover desires.

The relationship, as Pausanias describes it, is an asymmetrical exchange, and Pausanias never explains why a lover of the Ouranian type would need physical gratification. Early in his speech he implied that the complicated *nomos* concerning pederasty in Athens is viable because Athenians are good at speaking (182b5–6). What leers behind Pausanias' speech is a fast-talking lover who can convince his beloved that he offers some virtue in return for sex.[40]

Just as in Phaedrus' speech, the distinctions that Pausanias tries to draw are not stable. In the end, it is not clear what makes the Ouranian lover better than his Pandemian counterpart, if both achieve the same ends. The only stable hierarchical distinction that inheres in Pausanias' scheme is that male is superordinate to female. This hierarchy allows Pausanias to envision a purely homosocial order that is conducive to education, emulation, grand thoughts, friendships, and associations – an order that is clearly in the interest of the city, except that crucially, it comes at a high cost: an inability to reproduce itself.

Eryximakhos mentions neither women nor the *polis* in his description of eros.[41] But he is integral to the "narrative tease" of the text in that he paves the way for Diotima's eros, which transcends the political and is drawn toward

40 Bloom and Benardete (2001: 92) characterize the boy's role as that of a prostitute: "Some prostitutes do it for money, some do it to get ahead, and others do it for wisdom."

41 Rhodes (2003: 226–242) argues that Eryximakhos has been infected with a tyrannical *eros*. He likens the control over Eros that the doctor claims to a form of Titanism.

abstract good. He also anticipates her in his claim that the mantic art is the demiurge of the friendship between men and gods, since it has expertise about human erotics insofar as they have bearing on what is right and holy (188c6–d2). Although he appropriates Pausanias' notion of a double eros, he maintains that both the Pandemian and Ouranian must be kept in balance.[42]

However, one might infer that there is a place for gender in Eryximakhos' scheme as two opposing forces that need to be kept in harmony. Indeed, he speaks in a scientific idiom where the interdependence of the masculine and feminine was more likely to be expressed. He makes direct reference to Herakleitos' idea of the unity of opposites when he mentions the harmony of the bow and the lyre. For Herakleitos these opposites included male and female: "Aristotle records that Herakleitos criticizes the poet who said, 'Would that strife might perish from among gods and men,' for there would not be harmony without high and low notes, nor living things without female and male, which are opposites."[43] Where Herakleitos makes an explicit articulation of a more balanced view of the relationship between male and female, Eryximakhos remains silent. Here again as in the two preceding speeches the issue of reproduction is elided.

Until this point all of the hymns to Eros have exhibited either a disregard for or outright denigration of women. These accounts seem to suggest that eros is a binary power relationship, and both Phaedrus and Pausanius struggle with the implicit asymmetry of power in pederasty. The political sphere has been constructed as a hypermasculine realm in which women have no role and that tends to inspire fantasies of a purely homosocial order. The first three symposiasts dream of a world without women,[44] but they are haunted by the specter of gender as a dominant paradigm that permeates the way they understand the dynamics of power. For these three, the feminine is something to be ignored, derided, or excluded. In contrast, the second triad of speakers, Aristophanes, Agathon, and Socrates, embraces and includes the feminine in different ways. Furthermore they eschew a construction of gender as a binary – thus enabling themselves to envision eros as something other than a zero-sum power struggle.

42 Saxonhouse (1984: 15–16).
43 Diels and Kranz (1951: 22a22).
44 I am borrowing this formulation from Arthur (1983).

This first triad of speakers has mapped out a trajectory that conforms to a conventional notion of human progress.[45] Phaedrus began with mythical imagery, Pausanius focused on civic institutions – government and the military – and Eryximakhos concludes with images of balance and harmony in the register of science. In the second triad of speakers, we will also watch for a conceptual development in terms of content and form as each speaker takes his turn.

BEYOND THE BINARY: RECONSTRUCTING GENDER

While the first three speakers present conventional accounts of Eros, the second triad, Aristophanes, Agathon, and Socrates, offers distinctly innovative versions. These final three contributions all evoke gender as something other than a binary. Aristophanes, who gave up his turn to speak after Pausanias because of a bout of hiccups, is the first of the final three. He deflates some of the erudition and abstract scientism of Eryximakhos' speech by appropriating the terms of the doctor's encomium to describe how his hiccups stopped when he sneezed. If Eryximakhos tried to suppress the body and the feminine in his hymn to eros, they explode back onto the scene when Aristophanes takes his turn. His contribution is introduced by a symphony of bodily eruptions, and in it he allows the feminine a greater role than any of his predecessors.

Plato attributes to Aristophanes an imaginative account of eros that belongs to a different order than any other encountered thus far in the *Symposium.* He tells a story of a time when people were different, before eros. Human beings were the composite of two people, with round bodies, one head, and eight limbs. There were three sexes: one was all male, one was pure female, and the third, the androgyne, was a mixture of the two. They were strong and had grand plans, so they made an attempt to conquer Mount Olympus. As penalty Zeus ordered that they be cut in half. *Eros* is a punishment for hubris, to pine away with desire for our other half and a memory of our former wholeness.

Many scholars have concluded that Plato is showcasing his ability to construct a comic narrative through this speech.[46] But Dover maintains that the

45 This idea comes from Leslie Kurke, who notes in conversation that the *Oresteia* also preserves a parallel progression from myth to civic institutions to science.

46 See Clay (1975: 238–261); Reckford (1974: 41–69).

story, with its "once-upon-a-time" introduction, its naiveté, moral injunction, and well-wishing at the end, would make it recognizable as a tale told in the Aesopic genre.[47] Plato might have considered this type of folktale to be a prose cousin to comedy. Both share a propensity to tell stories through mundane objects and vulgar bodies, and to devote a significant amount of attention to the feminine.[48] Plato has translated comedy into a genre that has an established relationship to the wisdom tradition in which the philosopher participates, thus inviting one-to-one comparisons to be made: Aristophanes speaks in a way that is subversive, low, and bodily, while the philosopher speaks in a way that is wise, elevated, and ethereal.[49]

Significantly, Socrates also briefly evokes the conventions of fable in his own speech when he recounts Diotima's story about the birth of Eros from *Poros* and *Penia*. If we think of this segment of Socrates' speech in competition with Aristophanes', we see that Aristophanes' tale depicts a threat to the Olympian order, while Socrates/Diotima's fable is set at a divine celebration – Aphrodite's birthday. Through Diotima, Socrates' fable is spoken by a woman, as though to a child. Indeed, when Socrates asks her what sort of person loves wisdom, Diotima responds that "even a child would have realized" that it is those who are between ignorance and knowledge (204b). The fable genre is perfectly suited to the kinds of stories that mothers tell their children, much more so than it is an acceptable mode of communication among elite men. Comparing fable to fable, Socrates' version is more elevated and more appropriate than Aristophanes'. At the same time, comparing their speeches in toto, we encounter Aristophanes' hymn in a register in which it can easily be compared to Diotima's brand of *Sophia*, pitting her striving spirituality against Aristophanes' bathetic etiology.[50] Thus again we see Plato enacting the process of transcendence on the level of genre.

47 Dover (1966: 41–50).

48 Dover characterizes these stories as "wives-tales."

49 Kurke (2006) provides a brilliant analysis of Plato's complex manipulation of the Aesopic through appropriation and distancing that results in the transcendence of philosophy.

50 Socrates introduced Diotima as σοφή (201d3); as I noted above, he calls her σοφωτάτη (208b8) and then says, perhaps menacingly, that she speaks in the manner of a sophist (208c1). On Diotima as a sophist see Krell (1988).

In conformity with the associations of femininity established earlier in the dialogue, both in Plato's depiction of the *aulos*-player and in the celebrants' evaluation of gender in eros, the content of Aristophanes' myth is emphatically material, bodily and incorporative of the feminine. People are assimilated to flatfish (191d4), as well as sorb apples and eggs (190d6–e1). The bodies and movement of Aristophanes' round people are described in their original state, rolling spheres with eight limbs (189e5–190a8), and then, in the process of their rearrangement, they are worked like shoemaker's leather (190e7–191a3). This is the only place in the text where we actually get a description of sexual mechanics: the original means of reproduction for the round people was like that of cicadas, in the earth (191c1–2). The transposition of their genitals and a revised mechanics of human reproduction are also described (1915a–c6). Even the spiritual longings of these people are depicted in concrete terms: Hephaistos, holding his tools (192d3), suggests that what they desire is to be forged together like metal (191d9–e4). If they persist in their hubris, Zeus threatens to divide humans in half again, and they will be split down the nostrils and look like partial busts on *stelai*, like half-dice (193a5–8).

Although it is true that everyday objects are appropriate to lower genres like comedy and folk tales, my point is that Aristophanes' speech operates in an arena in which the attributes of this style have already been inflected with a negative tinge. Female bodies and the material world have been denigrated and opposed to the lofty discourses of the intelligent men at this symposium. When read in light of the hierarchy of gender thus far established in this text and the association of the female with bodily experience, reproduction, and the material world, no matter how delightful Aristophanes' speech may be, it is firmly anchored to the lower stratum of human experience. Furthermore the movement of this eros is downward: humans have been demoted from their earlier strength and closeness to the gods, their relationship to the divine is characterized by fear (193a2), and their eros culminates in a desire for death (193e3–4).[51]

Aristophanes' version of the origin of love can be understood as a cautionary tale about the dangers of political *eros*. Aristophanes' speech is "the dialogue's most important statement on *eros* from the limited viewpoint of the

51 Saxonhouse (1984: 17).

purely political."[52] This eros is political because it is the result of making an attempt on Olympus, an action that is represented as the natural consequence of having physical strength and big thoughts (190b5–6).[53] Aristophanes vividly brings his tale into the scheme of contemporary politics when he likens the divided humans to the Arcadians: καὶ πρὸ τοῦ, ὥσπερ λέγω, ἓν ἦμεν, νυνὶ δὲ διὰ τὴν ἀδικίαν διῳκίσθημεν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, καθάπερ Ἀρκάδες ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων/And before this, as I say, we were one, but now, on account of our injustice we have been dispersed by Zeus, just like the Arcadians were by the Spartans; 193a1–3). Aristophanes is most likely referring to a recent event (in fact, after the symposium was said to have taken place) when the Spartans dispersed an Arcadian town, Mantinea (Diotima's hometown), into four settlements because of its pro-Athenian stance in the Peloponnesian War.[54]

The punishment Zeus devises for the political *eros* in human nature brings not only desire into being, but also gender and sexual orientation. The schism of the original people produces three sexual dispositions: men who love men, women who love women, and men who love women. In terms of this eros, each person exists with an inherited disposition toward either women or men:

> *ὅσοι μὲν οὖν τῶν ἀνδρῶν τοῦ κοινοῦ τμῆμά εἰσιν, ὃ δὴ τότε ἀνδρόγυνον ἐκαλεῖτο, φιλογύναικές τε εἰσὶ καὶ οἱ πολλοί τῶν μοιχῶν ἐκ τούτου τοῦ γένους γεγόνασιν, καὶ ὅσαι αὖ γυναῖκες φίλανδροί τε καὶ μοιχεύτριαι ἐκ τούτου τοῦ γένους γιγνόνται. ὅσαι δὲ τῶν γυναικῶν γυναικὸς τμῆμά εἰσιν, οὐ πάνυ αὗται τοῖς ἀνδράσι τὸν νοῦν προσέχουσιν, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον πρὸς τὰς γυναῖκας τετραμμέναι εἰσί, καὶ αἱ ἑταιρίστριαι ἐκ τούτου τοῦ γένους γίγνονται. ὅσοι*

52 Ludwig (2002: 23).

53 Xenophanes says that talk that describes threats to the Olympian order is inappropriate to the symposium: "There is no good in speaking of the battles of the Titans or the Giants, nor any fights of the Centaurs, the fictions of them before us, or their violent factions. But it is always good to have consideration for the gods" (Fragment B1 West). I have argued elsewhere (Gilhuly 2004) that Plato's depiction of Aristophanes is meant to be disparaging – perhaps the description of an attack on Olympus is another component of this unflattering depiction.

54 Dover (1980: 119).

δὲ ἄρρενος τμῆμά εἰσι, τὰ ἄρρενα διώκουσι, καὶ τέως μὲν ἂν παῖδες ὦσιν, ἅτε τεμάχια ὄντα τοῦ ἄρρενος, φιλοῦσι τοὺς ἄνδρας καὶ χαίρουσι συγκατακείμενοι καὶ συμπεπλεγμένοι τοῖς ἀνδράσι, καί εἰσιν οὗτοι βέλτιστοι τῶν παίδων καὶ μειρακίων, ἅτε ἀνδρειότατοι ὄντες φύσει. φασὶ δὲ δή τινες αὐτοὺς ἀναισχύντους εἶναι, ψευδόμενοι· οὐ γὰρ ὑπ' ἀναισχυντίας τοῦτο δρῶσιν ἀλλ' ὑπὸ θάρρους καὶ ἀνδρείας καὶ ἀρρενωπίας, τὸ ὅμοιον αὐτοῖς ἀσπαζόμενοι. μέγα δὲ τεκμήριον· καὶ γὰρ τελεωθέντες μόνοι ἀποβαίνουσιν εἰς τὰ πολιτικὰ ἄνδρες οἱ τοιοῦτοι.

As many men as are cutlets of the shared kind, which in fact at that time was called the androgyne, they love women and many adulterers have been born from this breed, and as many as are women love men, and adulteresses come from this line. As many women as have been cut from the female (sphere), these pay no attention to men, but rather are attracted to women, and hetairistriai *come from this breed. As many as are cuts of the male pursue masculine things, and as long as they are boys, since they are cutlets of the male, they love men and they enjoy lying with and embracing men. And these are the best of boys and youths, because they are the most manly by nature. In fact, some say that these men are shameless, but they are lying. For they do not do this out of shamelessness, rather it is out of boldness and manliness and masculinity that they admire what is similar to themselves. And there is great evidence of this: for when they come of age, this sort alone enters into politics. (191d6–192a6)*

The mode in which Aristophanes describes Eros allows for oversimplification in his description of sexualities, and the result is a world filled with sex-crazy people.[55] The heterosexuals are characterized only insofar as they disregard the law; they are adulterers and adulteresses. The very fact that he mentions *hetairistriai* at all is transgressive.[56] Female homosexuality is not represented in the plays of the real Aristophanes, or any other comic playwright, and on this basis Dover suggests that it was a taboo topic. It might be argued

55 See Carnes (1998: 109–110).

56 I have discussed the anomalous use of this word and Lucian's gloss of it in Gilhuly (2006).

that general textual silence on this subject is due to a climate of ignorance of and indifference to the lives of women. However, in other respects, Plato represents Aristophanes as transgressive and overly concerned with women's bodies. Thus it seems compelling to understand this mention of women who love women as an intentionally unflattering element of Plato's characterization of Aristophanes.

The account of eros that Aristophanes offers represents all people as excessively desirous. This results in what would seem a very physicalized and eroticized vision of the *eromenos* as those boys who φιλοῦσι τοὺς ἄνδρας καὶ χαίρουσι συγκατακείμενοι καὶ συμπεπλεγμένοι τοῖς ἀνδράσι (love men and enjoy lying down together with men and embracing them; 191e8). This picture of the young, desirous boy would have seemed shocking if the ideal were anything like that of Xenophon's Socrates, when he characterizes the boy's perception of his lover:

> *οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁ παῖς τῷ ἀνδρὶ ὥσπερ γυνὴ κοινωνεῖ τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἀφροδισίοις εὐφροσυνῶν, ἀλλὰ νήφων μεθύοντα ὑπὸ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης θεᾶται.*
>
> *For unlike the woman, a boy does not share in the delights of sexual love with a man, but sober, he looks on a man drunk under the influence of Aphrodite. (Xen. Symp. 8.22)*

Even in comparison to Pausanias' version of the *eromenos,* who must put his lover's character to the test before gratifying him (184a4), Aristophanes' *eromenoi* are pure lust.

What Aristophanes' version of eros does have in common with Phaedrus' and Pausanias', though, is the notion that politics and pederasty go together. The tallies of the original all male being desire that which is the same as themselves (*to homoion,* 192a). Their masculinity is emphasized in Aristophanes' enumeration of the qualities that motivate their love. They are drawn to men out of boldness, braveness, and masculinity: ὑπὸ θάρρους καὶ ἀνδρείας καὶ ἀρρενωπίας (192a4). These are the men who participate in politics: "the political realm, according to Aristophanes, subdues what is different, and in Aristophanes' speech it is the female who is different (it could as easily be the slave or the barbarian), but his political world has no room for those who

introduce the element of diversity."[57] The lust of the *eromenos,* the depiction of pederasts as a divided whole who want nothing more than eternal physical union, and the description of pederasts as lovers of the same all contribute to paint a picture of a political world in which politicians are the *euruproktoi* that Aristophanes calls them in *Clouds*.[58]

But, diverging from those who spoke before him, Aristophanes' treatment of sexual orientation is based on a kind of gender equity: women and men can desire or be desired by women or men. In this way, his vision of *eros* contrasts especially with the sex systems sketched out by Phaedrus and Pausanias. For these the only worthy love object is male. But perhaps the most fascinating and distinct facet of Aristophanes' myth is that he conceives of a world that has three genders – the all-male, all-female, and the mixed – where gender functions as a sort of proto-sexual orientation. This vision troubles the notion of gender as a binary by adding a third term, at the same time that it allows Aristophanes to imagine an erotic attachment that is not hierarchical. Both of these elements will be picked up by Socrates/Diotima and incorporated in a speech that strives to disengage itself from everything that has been identified as low in terms of gender and genre.

After Aristophanes, Agathon, a perennial *eromenos,* eulogizes Eros in his own image. Agathon renders Eros forever young, pretty, and delicate. He is gentle, brings peace, and transforms lovers into poets. In this speech the narcissism of the earlier speakers is developed to full effect. The flowery Eros that Agathon proposes is an image of the universal desired. The gender of this love is hard to decipher. On the one hand he embodies many emphatically feminine characteristics:

> *ἁπτόμενον οὖν ἀεὶ καὶ ποσὶν καὶ πάντῃ ἐν μαλακωτάτοις τῶν μαλακωτάτων, ἁπαλώτατον ἀνάγκη εἶναι. νεώτατος μὲν δή ἐστι καὶ ἁπαλώτατος, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ὑγρὸς τὸ εἶδος.*
>
> *Since he is always touching in every way with his feet the softest of the softest, he is necessarily the most gentle. And while he is the youngest and the gentlest, he is, in addition, fluid in form. (195e7–106a2).*

57 Saxonhouse (1984: 17).
58 Carnes (1998: 111).

On the other hand, Agathon's Eros is the embodiment of masculine virtues: he is just, moderate, and brave (196d3–4). Because Ares is possessed by Eros, Agathon claims, Eros is dominant over him and thus the bravest. τοῦ δ'ἀνδρειοτάτου τῶν ἄλλων κρατῶν πάντων ἂν ἀνδρειότατος εἴη. (Because he dominates the most manly of all others, he must be the most manly of all; 196d2–3).

Agathon isn't worried about conventional perceptions of gender. His Eros is at once extremely masculine and feminine. His indifference is emblematized by the quotation of Homer he adduces as testimony to Eros' softness:

> *τῆς μέν θ' ἁπαλοὶ πόδες· οὐ γὰρ ἐπ' οὔδεος*
> *πίλναται, ἀλλ' ἄρα ἥ γε κατ' ἀνδρῶν κράατα βαίνει.*

> *Her feet are soft: for she does not approach the threshold,*
> *But she walks on the heads of men. (195d4–5)*

While this quote refers to *Ate*, Agathon suggests that it is equally applicable to Eros. His citation demonstrates a disregard not only for the gender of his subject, but also for anything but the most superficial linguistic effect. For the *Ate* that Homer describes is the destructive madness that possessed Agamemnon to strip Achilles of his spear-prize, Briseis. Agathon substitutes flowery, pretty, creative, just Eros for destructive, rash, death-dealing *Ate*. His appropriation of Homer's description of *Ate* for Eros exemplifies the promiscuity with which Agathon appropriates qualities he finds appealing without regard for the structures that give them meaning.

Agathon's lack of discrimination and his gender bending are entirely consistent with Aristophanes' depiction of him in *Thesmophoriazousai*.[59] Here Euripides' kinsman is dumbfounded by Agathon's performance of gender:

> *ποδαπὸς ὁ γύννις; τίς πάτρα; τίς ἡ στολή;*
> *τίς ἡ τάραξις τοῦ βίου; τί βάρβιτος*
> *λαλεῖ κροκωτῷ; τί δὲ λύρα κεκρυφάλῳ;*
> *τί λήκυθος καὶ στρόφιον; ὡς οὐ ξύμφορον.*
> *τίς δαί κατόπτρου καὶ ξίφους κοινωνία;*

59 Zeitlin (1996: 95).

> *Where did this womanish man come from? What fatherland? What its cloak? What this confusion of lifestyle? What does the lute have to chat about with the party dress? Or the lyre with the hairnet? Wrestling oil and a bra?! Since they don't go together! And what's shared between the mirror and sword?* (Thesmo. 135–40)

Mnesilochus is unable to read the playwright's gender because his self-presentation combines the accoutrements of both femininity and masculinity. Agathon responds to the kinsman's confusion with a slippery rationale. First he says that he is trying to get in touch with his poetic subject matter, so he is wearing women's clothing to match his composition. He must seek qualities he doesn't have through mimicry (*Thesmo.* 176). Next, he justifies his effeminacy by aligning himself with lyric poets, Ibykos, Anakreon, and Alkaios, who cultivated Ionian ways (*Thesmo.* 179–181). Finally, he says that a poet writes according to his nature (*Thesmo.* 185).

Agathon has successively characterized his gender as a perfomance (a mimesis of what isn't innate), as a style – his choice is influenced by the poetic lineage he wishes to construct for himself, and finally as nature. He then proceeds to undermine this assertion by claiming that when he understood that a poet is what he writes, he "doctored himself" (*Thesmo.* 189).[60] Agathon has altered his nature to affect his poetry. For Agathon, appearances determine everything, and style makes the man.

As in the *Symposium*, the Agathon we encounter in the *Thesmophoriazousai* is all surface, and no depth. The comic Agathon offers a theory that might explain his narcissistic depiction of Eros in the *Symposium* – the playwright writes himself into his compositions, and thus he fashions Eros in his own image.[61] His body is one that indiscriminately signifies in the register of male or female without concern for the disorderly implications of such a performance. In Plato's text the same promiscuity of meaning finds an emblem in an Eros that is interchangeable with *Ate*. Like the man himself, Agathon's words are pretty and meaningless, because they don't respect the context that imparts meaning to the attributes/citations he appropriates. Agathon eludes the notion of

60 Zeitlin (1996: 383–388).

61 When Agathon is done, he is applauded for giving a speech as appropriate to himself as to the god (198a2–3).

gender as a binary by confounding the distinction between male and female, masculine and feminine.

Socrates admits the beauty of Agathon's account, but doubts its truth value. He responds to Agathon with another reference to Homer:

> *καὶ γάρ με Γοργίου ὁ λόγος ἀνεμίμνῃσκεν, ὥστε ἀτεχνῶς τὸ τοῦ Ὁμήρου ἐπεπόνθη· ἐφοβούμην μή μοι τελευτῶν ὁ Ἀγάθων Γοργίου κεφαλὴν δεινοῦ λέγειν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ ἐπὶ τὸν ἐμὸν λόγον πέμψας αὐτόν με λίθον τῇ ἀφωνίᾳ ποιήσειεν.*
>
> *For the speech reminded me of Gorgias, so simply did I suffer the experience Homer described: I feared that Agathon in his speech, when he was finishing would send the head of Gorgias the clever speaker against my speeches and turn me into stone in my speechlessness. (198c1–5)*

Socrates' allusion to Homer repeats Agathon's citation with a gender substitution, by likening Gorgias to Homer's Gorgon (*Od.* 11.632). By this move Socrates associates Agathon's paranomic gender play with his Gorgianic style. Where Plato cast Aristophanes in his prose symposium in the Aesopic mode, Agathon translates into prose as a sophist, and both of these modes pale in comparison to the mantic truth-speaking style of the philosopher. By thus assimilating the comic playwright, the tragedian, and the philosopher to various rhetorical styles, Plato creates yet another hierarchy – this one of level of style that reinforces the image of the philosopher as transcendent.

These levels of style have been implicated with different strategies for constructing gender. Aristophanes can discuss pederasty without invoking a binary gender system by treating each sexual orientation as its own gender. This move, however, comes at the cost of perhaps the uncouth reference to the *hetairistria* and in the articulation of his contribution in a decidedly low literary register. Agathon's solution to the problem of sexual hierarchies and their relation to gender, or in his case, how to remain an *eromenos* forever, is to recruit the beguiling power of florid sophistry to paper over significant distinctions between male and female (and masculinity and femininity). Agathon's gender blurring is symptomatic of the dissociation of his words from the truth.

Socrates will distinguish himself from the other guests by introducing the feminine in a more distinguished form – in the persona of Diotima. Socrates does not merely describe a wise woman possessed of special knowledge of erotics and the divine – he goes so far as to play the woman's part. In the following section we will analyze what advantage Socrates gains for his philosophic eros by speaking through Diotima.

SOCRATES AND THE FEMININE CONTINUUM

Socrates frames his speech as the retelling of the teachings of Diotima. As much as we wonder why it is that Diotima is a woman, we must also ask, what kind of woman is Diotima?[62] As noted earlier, we understand Diotima in large part through difference: although her social role is only vaguely described, it affords her a different mode of participation at the symposium than is appropriate for the other women described as present/absent at the event. To the extent that Diotima is defined in relation to these women, the hired entertainer/sex worker and the women who are sequestered in the house, we can see Plato appropriating a contemporary matrix of the feminine – the prostitute, the wife, and the ritual agent – and applying it to a philosophical agenda. All these women are characterized by simultaneous presence and absence, and in the section that follows I will argue that Plato consciously manipulates the absent presence of the feminine in the service of describing the philosopher's erotic ascent.

Socrates begins his encomium to Eros by engaging Agathon in a dialogue. After a few questions he continues by himself, saying that he once answered his teacher of erotics, Diotima of Manitineia, in much the same way that Agathon had answered him. Thus the teacher and student positions are doubled, and rendered somewhat ambiguous: there is Diotima/Socrates who

62 Halperin raises the possibility that Diotima is a stand-in for Aspasia because Aeschines of Sphettos also wrote a lost dialogue espousing Socratic erotic doctrine named after the courtesan: "in the course of taking over and transforming Aeschines' erotic doctrine, he also displaced and replaced Aspasia with Diotima." Halperin (1990: 123–124). The notion of the interchangeability of courtesan and priestess, which is manifest in the strong association of Diotima and Aspasia in the later tradition (see Halperin 1990: 123 n.80), is the product of this discursive triad in which the courtesan and priestess are extreme positions of femininity.

educates Socrates/Agathon.[63] In addition to Socrates' retelling of Diotima's wisdom, the fact that Diotima's account of eros engages not only with Agathon, but with the all the encomiasts who have preceded Socrates blurs the distinction between the philosopher and the priestess, presence and absence.

After Diotima gets Socrates to agree that *eros* is the bringing to birth in beauty both in terms of the body and in terms of the soul, she alludes to Pausanias' two types of love: she teaches that those who are pregnant in terms of the body turn to women and get immortality for themselves through children, while those who are pregnant in terms of the soul conceive things appropriate to the soul (208e1–209a8). It is through procreation that mortal nature is capable of immortality, and this in fact is what *eros* is the desire of (206e7–8). By applying this notion to animals and their progressive regeneration of the body through time, she posits a dialectic that denies Eryximachos' science of a double *eros* (207d2–e5). By attributing desire for immortality to the motivation of those who died on behalf of their lovers (208d), she also revises Phaedros' claim that lovers die for one another.

Thus the earlier arguments are appropriated and revised as stages toward the ultimate goal of *eros* – love in the transcendent. This can be seen as analogous to Diotima's prescription for the correct practice of pederasty: at first a man is drawn to give birth in the beautiful through his perception of the beautiful in one body, then in bodies in general; he then moves on to the beauty of souls, then the beauty of pursuits and laws, then science, and finally on to philosophy until he can perceive the completely static, immortal essence of the beautiful.

Where Aristophanes and Agathon seemed to be impeded by their efforts to incorporate the feminine, Socrates successfully embraces it by speaking through Diotima and uses her to exceed the realm of the feminine. Indeed, he depicts even the most masculine pursuits in terms of pregnancy and birth. Both the erotic language Socrates uses and the impersonation of a female have been linked to the ritual practice of the Eleusinian mysteries.[64] By thus evoking a culturally prestigious version of femininity, Socrates situates feminine sexuality in a dialectical role with pederasty to create a third term that transcends regeneration, that is, the philosopher who engages in the contemplation

63 Brown (1994: 162).
64 Finkelberg (1997: 256).

of virtue. This dialectic strives toward that which has no share in the body and does not participate at all in reproduction, or in the city. The feminine provides Socrates not only with childbirth imagery, but also with the vertical matrix that he needs to describe the ascending steps (211b) of the philosopher, which paradoxically leads away from the material world that is under the sign of the feminine.[65] In the formulation of Adriana Caverero, Socrates' manipulation of the theme of male maternity is "an act of expropriation carried out through a woman's voice, namely the voice of someone against whom the expropriation is committed."[66]

Diotima's explicit references to the speeches that preceded Socrates' have elicited the reading that Diotima is a discursive mask that Socrates employs that allows and validates the depiction of Eros that he wants to construct.[67] The first and most explicit indication that Diotima is a fictional position from which Socrates speaks occurs when Diotima refutes Aristophanes' speech by denying that *eros* is of the other half and asserting that there is nothing that human beings love other than the good.[68]

Halperin has compellingly argued that by positing a female instructor of erotics, Socrates has the purchase of the female sexual experience. Through her he can wield the imagery of birth-giving with authority. "'Diotima' is a trope for 'Socrates.'"[69] As opposed to the power and pleasure imbalance that was thought to adhere in pederastic *eros*, heterosexual relations, he claims, were conceived of as being at least as enjoyable for women as for men.[70] Socrates wants to appropriate reciprocal enjoyment for love between men, and the notion of immortality attendant on procreation, for the process of acceding toward the forms.[71]

65 Most (2005: 43): "it seems almost as though Plato wished men alone to take on the sexual functions of both sexes so that women would at last become altogether dispensable and men would finally be able to live on, alone and happily, in a world without women."

66 Caverero (1995: 101).

67 Halperin (1990: 256–308).

68 "And there is a certain account, she said, according to which those who seek their own halves are lovers"; 205e1–2.

69 Halperin (1990: 297).

70 See also Halperin (1986).

71 Reciprocity is an essential aspect of the pederasty described in the *Phaedrus*, as Halperin (1986) argues, but the model presented in the *Symposium* is different.

I want to complicate this assessment of the significance of Diotima and the way the feminine is evoked in Socrates' speech. First of all, although heterosexual love was thought to be mutually enjoyable to both partners, it is Halperin who has suggested that it is precisely the power differential imputed to this relationship as projected onto pederasty that Socrates is trying to evade. That is to say the *eromenos* is a problematic role for a young man to identify with because it demands that he assume what was conceived as a female and therefore subordinate role in sex. Second, the love that Diotima espouses (as well as that which Socrates practices) has nothing to do with reciprocity; it is an individual's ascent. The experience of the other is of no consequence in Diotima's teachings of "correct pederasty." And, indeed, the text tells us that Socrates' interactions with Alcibiades are characterized by awkwardness, misunderstanding, and rejection. This love would most accurately be characterized as unrequited (at least from Alcibiades' perspective), not reciprocal.

The conceptual advantage that Diotima offers Socrates' eros has nothing to do with reciprocity. Diotima occupies the apex of a vertical axis: her relation to the other women (not) present at the symposium is superordinate, but they are all located on a trajectory of embodiment, which the philosopher is trying to supersede:

> *ὃς γάρ ἂν μέχρι ἐνταῦθα πρὸς τὰ ἐρωτικὰ παιδαγωγηθῇ, θεώμενος ἐφεξῆς τε καὶ ὀρθῶς τὰ καλά, πρὸς τέλος ἤδη ἰὼν τῶν ἐρωτικῶν ἐξαίφνης κατόψεταί τι θαυμαστὸν τὴν φύσιν καλόν, τοῦτο ἐκεῖνο, ὦ Σώκρατες, οὗ δὴ ἕνεκεν καὶ οἱ ἔμπροσθεν πάντες πόνοι ἦσαν, πρῶτον μὲν ἀεὶ ὂν καὶ οὔτε γιγνόμενον οὔτε ἀπολλύμενον, οὔτε αὐξανόμενον οὔτε φθίνον, ἔπειτα οὐ τῇ μὲν καλόν, τῇ δ'αἰσχρόν, οὐδὲ τοτὲ μέν, τοτὲ δὲ οὔ, οὐδὲ πρὸς μὲν τὸ καλόν, πρὸς δὲ τὸ αἰσχρόν, οὐδ' ἔνθα μὲν καλόν, ἔνθα δὲ αἰσχρόν, ὡς τισὶ μὲν ὂν καλόν, τισὶ δὲ αἰσχρόν· οὐδ αὖ φαντασθήσεται αὐτῷ τὸ καλὸν οἷον πρόσωπόν τι οὐδὲ χεῖρες οὐδὲ ἄλλο οὐδὲν ὧν σῶμα μετέχει, οὐδέ τις λόγος οὐδέ τις ἐπιστήμη, οὐδέ που ὂν ἐν ἑτέρῳ τινί, οἷον ἐν ζώῳ ἢ ἐν γῇ ἢ ἐν οὐρανῷ ἢ ἔν τῳ ἄλλῳ, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ καθ' αὑτὸ μεθ' αὑτοῦ μονοειδὲς ἀεὶ ὄν, τὰ δὲ ἄλλα πάντα καλὰ ἐκείνου*

> *μετέχοντα τρόπον τινὰ τοιοῦτον, οἷον γιγνομένων τε τῶν ἄλλων καὶ ἀπολλυμένων μηδὲν ἐκεῖνο μήτε τι πλέον μήτε ἔλαττον γίγνεσθαι μηδὲ πάσχειν μηδέν.*
>
> *Whoever has been educated up until this point in regard to erotics, beholding consecutively and correctly the beautiful things, going now toward the end shall suddenly see something marvelously beautiful in its nature, and this thing is that for the sake of which, Socrates, all the earlier labors were. First of all it always exists and never is born and dies, nor does it wax and wane, nor secondly it is not in some way beautiful but in some way ugly, nor at one time one way and at another time another way, either in respect to the beautiful or the ugly, like something that is beautiful to some but ugly to others; moreover the beautiful shall not appear to him like a face, nor hands, and it will have nothing other of which the body takes part, nor will it be speech or knowledge, or something being in something else, such as in an animal or in the earth or in the heaven or in anything else, but itself by itself with itself, singular, immortal. All other beautiful things have a share in this in some such way that while other things are born and perish, this becomes neither more nor less, nor does it suffer anything. (210e2–211b5)*

The construction of women as an ascending hierarchy echoes Plato's depiction of philosophic eros as transcendence away from the material toward the metaphysical. The movement from *auletris* to wife to Diotima reinforces the upward motion away from the bodily toward a metaphysical realm. In Plato's text, woman – as depicted inside and outside of Socrates' speech – serves both to represent the process of transcendence and also to mediate between the physical world and the realm the beautiful inhabits. The various roles of women discussed here map out an ascent toward the exalted. Diotima's disembodied presence is especially suited to be a conduit of the Forms: like Diotima, the beauty that she describes is immanent but elusive. We can't see her, but we believe she exists.

Twice in the description of the beautiful, Socrates mentions that it has no part in generation: πρῶτον μὲν ἀεὶ ὂν καὶ οὔτε γιγνόμενον οὔτε ἀπολλύμενον (First of all, it always exists and never is born and dies), and οἷον γιγνομένων τε τῶν ἄλλων καὶ ἀπολλυμένων μηδὲν ἐκεῖνο (While other things are born and perish this does not). The vertical ascent of the philosopher is radically linked to the utter abandonment of that which has been

placed under the sign of the body and the female. The movement from the *aulos*-player to the women within to Diotima represents the gradual suppression of the (female) body in favor of the abstract. Diotima is both an advocate for the philosopher's ascent and part of a discursive structure that (literally) embodies it.[72]

Plato's production of "woman" in the *Symposium* has three forms that are closely related to one another: the first and lowest is material presence and discursive absence as embodied in the *auletris*; the second and more elevated is material and discursive absence that exists to gesture beyond the reach of representation, as suggested by the women within; and finally, the third and most lofty term is discursive presence and material absence as in the case of Diotima.

The fragmented feminine allows Plato to represent an ascending hierarchy that culminates in the disembodied Diotima, but also gestures beyond her. By invoking woman as an absent presence, Plato can embrace the material and reproductive capacity of the feminine – the body, birth, and regeneration – to found his metaphysics on the exclusion of the feminine. While woman in the figure of Diotima mediates between the material world and the metaphysical, the pure presence that she describes, to which the philosopher aspires, exists beyond the realm of the feminine. It always exists and never is born, it does not appear like a face, or hands, and it has nothing of which the body takes part.

THE CITY AND THE PHILOSOPHER

Plato's appropriation of the feminine for philosophical eros has implications for the Athenian *polis.* In the previous chapter I argued that in "Against Neaira" the triad of prostitute, wife, and priestess is explicitly related to civic identity (this will be the case in Xenophon's *Symposium* as well as Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*). In all these texts the proper relationship between these three roles

72 Perhaps we are meant to see Diotima as a nonreproductive woman in her capacity as a ritual actor – indeed, the closest the text comes to associating her with maternity is when she demeans Socrates, her student, as less perceptive than a child (204b). Virginity and abstinence were requirements of some, though by no means all, ritual offices. Goff (2004: 146–151) examines the evidence.

signifies civic order and operates in the *polis'* self-contextualization in a long-term temporal frame. In "Against Neaira" the implication is that the conventional understanding of this hierarchy is to promote heterosexuality as it was aligned with social and civic reproduction. As I will argue in what follows, Plato's manipulation of this discursive form would seem to have a drastically different implication for the Athenian *polis.*

In the process of articulating philosophic *eros,* Socrates/Diotima has situated cultural reproduction – the work of the poets and the lawmakers – somewhat low down on the erotic ascent, squarely in the bodily realm. By using Diotima as a mouthpiece, Plato emphasizes the fact that mimesis itself is dependent on embodiment. Even these immortal children are the product of the world of bodies, hands, and faces. Although Diotima's own embodiment is metaphorical, the sexualization of human production in all spheres serves to emphasize the dependence of worldly pursuits on the body and their inextricable link to the feminine. Even though Diotima is august, she is a woman and therefore is implicated in a social hierarchy in which (to an Athenian mind) she was subordinate. Thus there is a relative denigration here of political and cultural reproduction.

On a very local level, the text seems to confirm the indifference of the priestess/philosopher to the fate of the city. For, when Socrates introduces Diotima, he derives her prestige from the fact that she instructed the Athenians how to sacrifice in order to delay the plague for ten years (201d).[73] This authority might seem suspect from a civic point of view, since the plague had such disastrous effects precisely because it struck during the Peloponnesian War, when the people of the countryside had crowded into the city walls (Thuc. 2.52).[74] In her ability to affect the course of political events, Diotima is an intermediary between the city and the gods. But, based on this anecdote, it seems evident that she is not explicitly motivated by the city's best interest. Her divine knowledge seems in this sense powerful over yet indifferent to the fate of the *polis.*

73 The identification of Diotima as a priestess is bolstered by the fact that she uses the language of initiation in her teaching, and she is said to be from Mantinea, which conjures the Greek word for seer, *mantis.* Carnes (1998: 116).

74 Saxonhouse (1984: 20). On the other hand, the pro-Athenian role Mantinea played in the Peloponnesian War and the consequences they endured because of it were referred to in Aristophanes' speech (193a1–3).

The uneasy fit between Diotima's doctrine and the demands of political life are most powerfully felt in the narrative of Socrates' encounter with Alcibiades. Alcibiades' contribution to the evening is his story of a failed love for Socrates in which he could not engage the philosopher in any form of pederastic exchange. Since we are aware of Diotima's dialectic model of pederasty, which serves to divest the older partner of his responsibility for his beloved's behavior, we understand that Alcibiades is trapped in the asymmetric binary that characterized conventional thinking about pederasty. In this way, the failure of Socrates' and Alcibiades' relationship confirms Diotima's innovative model – the two men are at different points on their ascent. At the same time, Diotima's position plays into an apologetic agenda, addressing specifically Socrates' role in corrupting Alcibiades.[75] As we learn in Alcibiades' erotic *logos,* Socrates rejects the asymmetrical exchange of wisdom for sex as a crass devaluation of philosophical knowledge – a transaction that he compares to "gold for bronze" (219a). Instead he opts for no exchange at all. Socrates never assumed responsibility for inspiring Alcibiades to virtue, and at the same time, Alcibiades was unable to absorb his teaching because he could not resist the "honor from the many" (216b5).[76]

If we consider that Socrates and Alcibiades are on different points of an erotic continuum, then a consideration of these two men in terms of the feminine continuum might be in order. We have already noted the close association between Socrates and Diotima. The suggestion that Diotima is a fiction created for the purpose of the dialogue has prompted inquiry into the significance of her name, which means Zeus-honor.[77] Nussbaum has noticed that the name "Diotima" finds a counterpart in "Timandra," the name of a famous courtesan with whom Alcibiades was associated.[78] Timandra means man-honor. If we assume that Diotima was a kenning on Timandra, then Socrates stands in relation to Alcibiades as Diotima, the priestess, relates to a courtesan.

In the narrative of Alcibiades' death that Plutarch preserves, shortly before Alcibiades was killed, he dreamed he was wearing Timandra's clothes, that she

75 See Gribble (1999: 243).
76 Gribble (1999: 243).
77 Carnes (1998: 116).
78 Nussbaum (1979: 145; 1986: 177).

held his head and put makeup on his face (*Alc.* 39). Socrates' interaction with Diotima has been conceived of as analogous to this type of association: "Here, then Socrates too, takes a mistress: a priestess instead of a courtesan, a woman who prefers the intercourse of the pure mind to the pleasures of the body, who honors (or is honored by) the divine rather than the merely human."[79] The alignment of Alcibiades with physical lust is emblematized by the fact that when he interrupts the symposium, he comes supported by a flute-girl (212d6).

When Alcibades realizes that Socrates is at Agathon's house, he launches into a narrative about their relationship. Alcibades' account is modeled on the satyr play, a form that has been described as a negotiation between comedy and tragedy.[80] Alcibiades projects an image of Socrates that is filled with concrete details and paints a picture of a particular individual.[81] Socrates' uniqueness demands that he describe him through images (215a5): First he compares him to a sculpture of a Silenus – a woodland demigod that was part human and part beast, often drunk. These sculptures opened up and had fascinating images of gods inside them. Then he compares him to Marsyas, a satyr, another liminal figure who played the flute. He likens his music to the Sirens' song. He then describes Socrates wrestling with him, fighting beside him, and fighting together on a military expedition. This Socrates could endure deprivation as well as he could enjoy a feast. He could drink as much as anyone, without getting drunk. Alcibiades' description "shows us what Diotima could only abstractly tell: what a human life starts to look like as one makes the ascent."[82]

Alcibiades' relationship with this more tangible Socrates was clearly a failure. When Alcibiades' beauty did not seduce Socrates, Alcibiades took on the role of lover, tried to lure Socrates into a physical pederastic relationship, and was again rebuffed. Since Alcibiades' primary erotic engagement is with the Athenian people (in a paranomic relationship that blurs the boundary between *eromenos* and *erastes*),[83] he cannot find his way out of the power dynamics of the pederastic relationship. He is capable of recognizing the appeal of

79 Nussbaum (1986: 177).

80 Griffith (2003).

81 See Nussbaum (1986: esp. 187–191), who argues that Alcibiades' *eros* offers a competitive counter-argument to Socrates' antiseptic, impersonal love.

82 Nussbaum (1986: 184).

83 On Alcibiades' *paranomia* see Wohl (2002: 124–170).

philosophic wisdom, but unable to make the ascent toward the Forms. He is attracted by the glimpse he has had of philosophy, yet it troubles and confuses him, because of his unwillingness to give up the asymmetrical erotic dynamics that bind him to the *demos*:[84]

> ἐγὼ δὲ τοῦτον μόνον αἰσχύνομαι. σύνοιδα γὰρ ἐμαυτῷ ἀντιλέγειν μὲν οὐ δυναμένῳ ὡς οὐ δεῖ ποιεῖν ἃ οὗτος κελεύει, ἐπειδὰν δὲ ἀπέλθω, ἡττημένῳ τῆς τιμῆς τῆς ὑπὸ τῶν πολλῶν. δραπετεύω οὖν αὐτὸν καὶ φεύγω, καὶ ὅταν ἴδω, αἰσχύνομαι τὰ ὡμολογημένα. καὶ πολλάκις μὲν ἡδέως ἂν ἴδοιμι αὐτὸν μὴ ὄντα ἐν ἀνθρώποις· εἰ δ'αὖ τοῦτο γένοιτο, εὖ οἶδα ὅτι πολὺ μεῖζον ἂν ἀχθοίμην, ὥστε οὐκ ἔχω ὅτι χρήσωμαι τούτῳ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ.
>
> *I feel shame before this man alone. For I know that I cannot contradict him, (saying) that I should not do what he commands, but when I go away, I am overcome by honor from the people. Therefore I am a runaway slave and I flee him, and when I see him I feel shame about the things we have agreed upon. Frequently I would gladly see him not existing among men. But, if this were the case, I know that I would feel much more pain, so that I do not know how to deal with this man. (216b2–c3)*

The presence of the *auletris*, the material emphasis in Alcibiades' speech, the way his entrance brings the physical context of the symposium back to the fore of the narrative, all combine to depict Alcibiades as stuck at the beginning of philosophical eros. In other terms, he is unable to move from a horizontal to a vertical model of eros.

The colorful, loud, drunken interruption of Alcibiades and his entourage provides Plato the opportunity to portray an embodied experience of Eros.

84 Nussbaum has argued that the spate of interest in this symposium has to do with Alcibiades. In 404 when Theramenes' oligarchy was on the verge of collapse and the more extreme Thirty were poised to take over, the disempowered democratic majority experienced a swell of longing for Alcibiades as their only possible champion. Nussbaum thus posits that the conversation between Apollodorus and Glaukon is "set very shortly before the murder of Alcibiades, between a neutral or sympathetic person and one who may be linked with his murderers." The written version, though, is the one repeated two days later to the anonymous interlocutor. Perhaps in the interval, Nussbaum suggests, Alcibiades has been murdered in Phrygia. Nussbaum (1986: 170).

Alcibiades depicts himself confused at the beginning of philosophical *eros* and Socrates making his way upward. Clearly, though, neither has obtained the goal of immortality. Earlier I said that Socrates could be associated with the priestess and Alcibiades with the courtesan in terms of the scheme of women in the text. But this schematization is too neat, for everything Alcibiades says about Socrates locates him in an intermediate position. He is embodied, but also contemplative. He drinks but doesn't get drunk. He is associated with an array of demigods, male and female, liminal creatures, and needs to be described in the idiom of a mediating literary genre. And Alcibiades also cannot categorically be associated with the physical world, since the promise of Socrates' teaching has made him so unhappy. He can conceptualize a world that transcends his own, but he can't begin to inhabit it.

The thick texture of Alcibiades' story suggests that the neat hierarchy and distinctions that the *Symposium* constructs are imposed on a reality that is less clearly defined. Alcibiades' own pain comes from his awareness of a world beyond love of the *demos,* beyond the power dynamics between *erastai* and *eromenoi.* The complexity of his subjective knowledge distinguishes him from the simple material associations that have accreted around the *auletris.* Similarly, Socrates does not stand in the position of Diotima; rather, he is somewhere between Agathon and the priestess. Through Alcibiades' contribution, we confront both the possibilities and limitations of this structural model. The stable distinctions signified by the feminine prove too rigid for identification. However, the neat distinctions inherent in the model serve to throw into relief the particular and subjective nature of each man's individual ascent. Because neither Socrates nor Alcibiades conforms to this rigid matrix, each man comes to life in a more robust and vivid way. The absent presence of the feminine produces an image of men as real, present, alive, and actively engaged in an individual erotic pursuit. We are left to perceive that the philosopher is more highly evolved than the politician, but is in no way responsible for the politician's erotic struggle.[85]

In this chapter I have argued that Plato manipulates the hierarchy of the feminine, the prostitute, the wife, and the priestess, as an alternate

85 Wohl (2002: 161–169) also sees the depiction of Alcibiades in relation to Socratic *orthos eros* as designed to acquit Socrates of responsibility for Alcibiades' treacherous political behavior.

construction to the binary that constrains the sex/gender system, both in the conception of male/female relations as well as in terms of pederasty (*erastes/eromenos*). The feminine continuum allows Plato to offer a distinct version of philosophic pederasty, one that, as we see through the failed love of Socrates and Alcibiades, does not conform to normative views of pederasty, or to the political eros that engages a politician with the city. The feminine continuum, represented by the *auletris,* the women within, and Diotima, is posited as something that one must aspire to transcend. The lover's goal is to ascend into a realm beyond embodiment, beyond reproduction, and ultimately beyond the *polis.* For Plato to establish a dialectic between pederasty and the feminine that the philosopher transcends, at the same time that he secures the binary of male and female, it has been necessary to radically exclude the wife as the embodiment of legitimate reproduction. In the next chapter we will see how Xenophon depicts Socrates manipulating the triad of prostitute, wife, and ritual agent in a very different way, in a symposium that ends with the celebrants running home to their wives.

4. Bringing the *Polis* Home: Private Performance and the Civic Gaze in Xenophon's *Symposium*

INTRODUCTION

Xenophon's *Symposium* depicts an evening in 421/0 BCE on which Kallias hosts a group of illustrious Athenian men. The text portrays the entertainment he provided and the discussion it provoked among his guests, intertwining a narrative of the spoken with a narrative of the seen. The group that Kallias hosts is somewhat incompatible – sophists and Socratics, businessmen and philosophers, with entertainers to distract them. The evening proceeds in growing waves of tension that Socrates busily works to dispel. His success at managing the evening's difficulties is manifest in the way he transforms the evening's entertainment: the symposium begins with a static tableau and ends with an arousing performance in which the performers and spectators are mutually engaged.

The *Symposium* is concerned with elite exchange – the exchange of love, bodies, sex, friendship, education, and performance; exchange made for money or for *charis*;[1] exchanges among the elite, and perhaps most important, those between the elite and the *demos*. The text depicts Socrates reconfiguring the relationship between the elite and the *polis,* advocating that the *demos* adopt the erotic and paedogogical practices of the elite and that the symposiasts embrace a distinctly civic formulation of heterosexual reciprocity. This new relationship culminates in a performance in which the hired entertainers dramatize the love between Dionysos and Ariadne. Significantly, Socrates' prescription for an improved relationship between the *demos* and the elite is grounded in spectacle engaging (among other things) a spectrum of scripts for feminine performance. A move from the idiom of the prostitute to that of the ritual performer serves as both analogy and backdrop for Socrates' model of erotic reciprocity between the *demos* and the elite.

1 On the role of *charis* in Xenophon in general, see Azoulay (2004).

In this text issues of exchange are negotiated in the realm of performance. The entertainers are hired to perform, and at the same time, the symposiasts make a spectacle of themselves. This spectacular symposium, I suggest, is pointedly set against the backdrop of Athenian civic viewing.[2] Xenophon uses sympotic performance as a way to open a discussion of spectacle, and particularly elite spectacle, within the context of Athenian democracy.[3] The hired performance provides a forum for Socrates to present his ideas about the role of spectacle in the *polis.* He criticizes the marvelous yet meaningless feats of the performers in favor of a spectacle that engages and affects its audience. As the performers prepare to incorporate Socrates' suggestions into their final act, he applies this model of the reciprocal gaze to the elite practice of pederasty and, on a broader scale, to the relationship between the *polis* and the elite. He concludes by aligning himself with the *polis,* looking on the displays of the elite with the amatory gaze of a lover. In the following, I argue that the improved paradigm for spectacle that Socrates offers serves both to justify the civic usefulness of the elite symposium and to present a defense for Socrates' ideas about pederasty and the *polis.*

If the *aulos*-player's banishment in Plato's *Symposium* is radically related to Socrates' notion of transcendence in that text, as I discussed in the previous chapter, perhaps the presence of the hired entertainers throughout Xenophon's *Symposium* marks an effort to make Socrates seem more conventional and material than Plato's version.[4] In this text Xenophon presents his most bodily and humanized Socrates – he is physically described, he is ignored by the company, and he is even mocked by the leader of the hired troupe of entertainers. Moreover, he is presented as just one man among a group of Athenians – he only slightly dominates the narrative. This down-to-earth representation, I suggest, is part of Xenophon's strategy to offer an apology for Socrates, inviting the reader to look on him as one man among others, seeing, as I will argue, through the eyes of the classical Athenian *demos.*

2 See "Programme Notes" in Goldhill and Osborne (1999: 1–32).

3 For a discussion of Xenophon's politics as emanating from an elite tradition see Anderson (1974: 41–45).

4 Huss (1999: 402) describes this Socrates as "practical, straightforward and sometimes quite bourgeois."

THE SPECTACLE OF THE SYMPOSIUM

Xenophon constructs his symposium as something to be seen; the Athenian culture of civic viewing is very emphatically evoked as the background for this elite spectacle. In this section I will lay the groundwork for the argument that Xenophon figures elite masculinity as a performance that integrates the conventions of public and private spectacle – that is, the Athenian culture of civic viewing and the sympotic performances depicted in the text.

In his introduction to the *Symposium*, Xenophon constructs the reader as an outsider looking in:

> *Ἀλλ᾽ ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ τῶν καλῶν κἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν ἔργα*
> *οὐ μόνον τὰ μετὰ σπουδῆς πραττόμενα*
> *ἀξιομνημόνευτα εἶναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἐν ταῖς παιδιαῖς.*
> *οἷς δὲ παραγενόμενος ταῦτα γιγνώσκω δηλῶσαι*
> *βούλομαι.*
>
> *But it seems to me that not only the deeds of elite men that are done seriously but also those done in the spirit of play are worth remembering. I want to present an experience of mine that gives me this conviction. (1.1)*[5]

Xenophon introduces the *Symposium* with visual language: δηλῶσαι is notable in that its primary meaning is to show – it pertains to the visible world, not the discursive realm. This is not to say that it is limited to the visual, but when applied to discourse it connotes more than just to tell; it means to prove. In this sense it is a word frequently employed in the courtroom. If we allow the forensic nuance of δηλόω, then it follows that there is a rhetorical motivation underlying his text. The reader is invoked not as a passive recipient of a narrative, but is invited to assume a judgmental posture. This is the first, albeit faint, suggestion that Xenophon constructs his symposium as an elite event that is a spectacle for the *polis* to view. Both shades of meanings of δηλόω are apposite here, for Xenophon's text seeks to prove something, or present a case for judgment through a representation of the visible world.

From here, the text goes on to portray the rambling conversation of a group of distinguished Athenian symposiasts intertwined with descriptions

5 Citations refer to Xenophon's *Symposium*, ed. E. C. Marchant (1971) by chapter and number, unless otherwise noted.

of a variety of performances. The seemingly loose-knit conversation develops in response to the narration of the entertainment, which thereby lends structure to the text. As ballast for the free-floating discussion, the performances occupy a position of central importance. The variety of shows in the *Symposium* at times give it the feel of a three-ring circus: not only does this text depict acrobats and an old man dancing, but it also contains a physical description of Socrates in the staging of a male beauty contest.[6] Each performance seems to inspire a new vein of discourse that is either directly or tangentially related to the act it follows. Before I turn to the spectacles in Xenophon's *Symposium,* it will be useful to take stock of the characters in the text.

The narration begins by introducing Kallias as the ἐρῶν of Autolykos the παῖς. Each of them is associated with a contest in the Panathenaic games: Autolykos had won the Pankration, and in celebration of his victory, Kallias had taken him and his father to see the horse races. The Pankration, which can be translated as the "total strength contest," was an aggressive event that combined the violence of boxing and wrestling, in which the only tactics prohibited were biting and gouging. The game ended when a competitor signaled defeat by raising his index finger.[7] Although ancient opinion on the relationship between athletic and military prowess is varied, there does seem to be a particular link between skill in the Pankration and military excellence.[8] Autolykos' victory in this competition defines him as aggressive, strong, and capable of violence. His masculinity is further emphasized when Socrates compliments Kallias for his choice of Autolykos as beloved:

> *ὁρῶ σε ἐρῶντα οὐχ ἁβρότητι χλιδαινομένου οὐδὲ μαλακίᾳ θρυπτομένου, ἀλλὰ πᾶσιν ἐπιδεικνυμένου ῥώμην τε καὶ καρτερίαν καὶ ἀνδρείαν καὶ σωφροσύνην.*

6 Bergquist (1990: 37–65) makes an interesting proposition, based on archaeological remains of *andrones,* that it may have been customary to divide sympotic space into segments to create subgroups among the company. Envisioning a number of areas for the performances depicted in this text helps give a slightly less chaotic picture of the overall event.

7 This event finds its modern counterpart in ultimate fighting, which also prohibits only biting and gouging. In this sport players signal defeat by tapping their finger on the mat.

8 Poliakoff (1987: 98–99). See also Ferrari (2002: 141).

> *I see that you love not someone who revels in luxury nor is spoilt by effeminacy but who displays to all his strength, fortitutde, manliness, and moderation.* (8.8)

In this description Autolykos is depicted as the embodiment of *andreia*.[9] Dover notes that this unambiguously male depiction of the *eromenos* is an essential component of a positive representation of pederastic desire.[10] Socrates emphasizes Autolykos' masculinity by contrasting him with a negative image of a feminized man. His use of the word ἁβρότης in this passage marks a rare occurrence in Attic prose.[11] Kurke has analyzed the changing significance of this word family from the archaic to the classical period,[12] interpreting it as a hallmark of an elite poetic discourse. She notes that a particular aesthetic of luxurious living characterized by long hair, flowing robes, perfume, and generally cultivating Eastern ways was celebrated by archaic poets in songs performed for elite audiences. This poetry was frequently produced by and for the sympotic culture. The beginning of the sixth century, which saw a political inclination toward *isonomia* (most notably in Athens), was also characterized by a move away from the external trappings of a luxurious lifestyle. Kurke argues for a connection between these two trends. She suggests that this elite aesthetic, with its Easternizing tendency, was associated with tyranny and therefore had a political significance that conflicted with a move toward egalitarian government. With the change in political climate, words connoting the cultivation of Eastern luxury became terms of derision, taking on a derogatory association with effeminacy. In this context Socrates' praise of Autolykos for avoiding luxury and softness has a double function. It contributes to a positive representation of Autloykos' masculinity, at the same time that it distances Socrates from the elite culture of the symposium. This statement creates an interesting juxtaposition between discourse and context: in archaic poetry the symposium was the space especially marked out for espousing the cultivation of ἁβροσύνη; here it has become a forum to denounce the trappings of elite ostentation.

Kallias, on the other hand, is characterized through an association with horse racing. In the first place, involvement in these games is an indication of

9 Cartledge (1993: 70) describes *andreia* as the "peculiar virtue and emotion of war."

10 See Dover (1989: 73–81).

11 It is also found in Xen. *Cyr.* 8.8.15 and Pl. *Alc.* 1.122.

12 Kurke (1992: 97–120).

extreme wealth.[13] Herodotus notes that Kallias' eponymous grandfather gained recognition among the Greeks for his enormous expenditure on horse races (Herod. 6.125.1), and Davies argues that he used this outlay to gain the political power base that Kallias inherited. Second, it is the only ancient athletic contest in which contestants didn't participate; they merely provided the large sums of money to raise and train the teams.[14] This event separated the extremely rich from the rest of the Athenian populace and amounted to a hyperbolic display of wealth and style.

When Kallias invites Socrates and his companions to his house, his language characterizes him as pretentious, extravagant, and perhaps somewhat snide:

> *οἶμαι οὖν πολὺ ἂν τὴν κατασκευήν μοι λαμπροτέραν φανῆναι εἰ ἀνδράσιν ἐκκεκαθαρμένοις τὰς ψυχὰς ὥσπερ ὑμῖν ὁ ἀνδρὼν κεκοσμημένος εἴη μᾶλλον ἢ εἰ στρατηγοῖς καὶ ἱππάρχοις καὶ σπουδαρχίαις.*
>
> *I think therefore that my preparation would seem much more brilliant if the dining room should be adorned with men whose souls have been purified like yourselves rather than it would with generals, cavalry leaders, and office-seekers. (1.4)*

His invitation seems to be intended as a witty display of his sophistry: it includes a pun between ἄνδρες and ἀνδρῶν, and the attenuated alliteration of κατασκευήν, ἐκκεκαθαρμένοις, and κεκοσμημένος. Since all three of these words have religious undertones, Kallias is flattering the philosophers by implying they will add a transcendent aura to his dining room. In another way, he objectifies Socrates and his cohorts – he wants them at his symposium as ornaments for his dining room (ὁ ἀνδρὼν κεκοσμημένος εἴη), not because he has any real interest in what they will say. His wording also implies a polemical background for the gathering. Another meaning for κατασκευή is military preparation, and κοσμέω can mean to draw up into battle array; and the marked address of Socrates and those with him as ἄνδρες might

13 For a discussion of the extraordinary expense of entering a chariot in the games see Davies (1981: 99 ff).

14 For an expression of chariot racing as an event limited to the extremely wealthy see Isokrates *Peri Zeugous,* 32–35; cf. Alcibiades' incredible set of victories at the Olympic games in 416 (Thuc. 6.16.2).

even seem a somewhat aggressive invitation.[15] Kallias' invitation not only represents the host as ostentatious and overly concerned with display but also suggests suppressed hostilities among the celebrants that Kallias hosts at his house.

Socrates' response to Kallias' invitation reveals the source of tension underlying the interaction of these two groups:

> *Ἀεὶ σὺ ἐπισκώπτεις ἡμᾶς καταφρονῶν ὅτι σὺ μὲν Πρωταγόρᾳ τε πολὺ ἀργύριον δέδωκας ἐπὶ σοφίᾳ καὶ Γοργίᾳ καὶ Προδίκῳ καὶ ἄλλοις πολλοῖς, ἡμᾶς δ' ὁρᾷς αὐτουργούς τινας τῆς φιλοσοφίας ὄντας.*
>
> *You always mock us, looking down at us because while you have given a lot of money to Protagoras and Gorgias and Prodikos and many others for wisdom, you see that we, in contrast, are some kind of self-employed philosophy workers. (1.5)*

Socrates projects condescension onto Kallias, because he has paid for his wisdom, where his group has pursued philosophy on their own. Indeed, Kallias was said to have spent more money on sophists than everyone else combined.[16]

Difference of opinion about the role of economics in education, however, is not the only issue that contributes to a hostile undercurrent to this celebratory event. The real time that elapsed between the date the banquet is set, 421 BCE,[17] and the publication of its representation approximately forty years later[18] revealed a number of fatal enmities among the guests: Lykon was among those who accused Socrates[19] and condemned him to death; both Autolykos[20] and Nikeratos[21] were killed by the Thirty, in whose number,

15 For all of these connotations see L.S.J., s. v. In the assertion that ἀνήρ alone always means a man in the prime of his life, especially a warrior, Xenophon's *Symposium* (4.17) is specifically cited.

16 Pl. *Ap.* 20a; cf. Pl. *Cr.* 391b.

17 Todd (1992: 531).

18 Ath. *Deipn.* v.216d–217b.

19 Plato's *Ap.*

20 Higgins (1977: 17).

21 Nikeratos is introduced as an associate of Kallias', who was tagging along (συνείπετο) after the horse races.

Kharmides, another guest, was counted.[22] At such a prickly party, it seems a good thing that Kallias hired entertainers, for it is the watching of the show that provides these antagonists with common ground. The entertainment is the sine qua non of the discussion narrated in Xenophon's *Symposium.*

Indeed, the interaction of the guests depends on the entertainment, for, if left to their own devices, they might never have said anything. When they first gathered at Kallias' house they sat together in silence:

> *Εὐθὺς μὲν οὖν ἐννοήσας τις[23] τὰ γιγνόμενα ἡγήσατ' ἂν φύσει βασιλικόν τι τὸ κάλλος εἶναι, ἄλλως τε καὶ ἂν μετ' αἰδοῦς καὶ σωφροσύνης, καθάπερ Αὐτόλυκος τότε, κεκτῆταί τις αὐτό. πρῶτον μὲν γάρ, ὥσπερ ὅταν φέγγος τι ἐν νυκτὶ φανῇ, πάντων προσάγεται τὰ ὄμματα, οὕτω καὶ τότε τοῦ Αὐτολύκου τὸ κάλλος πάντων εἷλκε τὰς ὄψεις πρὸς αὐτόν. ἔπειτα τῶν ὁρώντων οὐδεὶς οὐκ ἔπασχέ τι τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπ' ἐκείνου. οἱ μέν γε σιωπηρότεροι ἐγίγνοντο, οἱ δὲ καὶ ἐσχηματίζοντό πως. πάντες μὲν οὖν οἱ ἐκ θεῶν του κατεχόμενοι ἀξιοθέατοι δοκοῦσιν εἶναι· ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν ἐξ ἄλλων πρὸς τὸ γοργότεροί τε ὁρᾶσθαι καὶ φοβερώτερον φθέγγεσθαι καὶ σφοδρότεροι εἶναι φέρονται, οἱ δ' ὑπὸ τοῦ σώφρονος ἔρωτος ἔνθεοι τά τε ὄμματα φιλοφρονεστέρως ἔχουσι καὶ τὴν φωνὴν πρᾳοτέραν ποιοῦνται καὶ τὰ σχήματα εἰς τὸ ἐλευθεριώτατον ἄγουσιν. ἃ δὴ καὶ Καλλίας τότε διὰ τὸν ἔρωτα πράττων ἀξιοθέατος ἦν τοῖς τετελεσμένοις τούτῳ τῷ θεῷ.*
>
> *Right away then, someone who perceived the situation would have realized that beauty is naturally a kingly thing, especially when someone possesses it together with modesty and moderation, as Autolykos did at that time. First, just as when a light appears in*

22 Xenophon, *Hell.,* 2.3.2; 2.3.39; 2.4.19. See also Huss (1999) who contends that this genial event is a part of the construction of the *Aurea Aetas Socratica*. He also sees this text as apologetic.

23 ἐννοήσας τις comes from Aristeides' text, going against manuscripts that read just ἐννοήσας.

> *the night, it draws the eyes of all, so even then the beauty of Autolykos drew the eyes of everyone toward him. Next, no one of those looking did not experience something in his soul because of him: some became very quiet, while others assumed some kind of a pose. Now, all of those who are possessed by a god seem worth looking at; but those who are possessed by other gods look more fierce and sound more frightening and have a very violent bearing, while those who are inspired by chaste Eros have a friendly look in their eyes and make their voice very gentle and carry themselves in the most liberal way. Since Kallias was doing these things because of Eros, he was a sight to be seen for those initiated by this god. (1.8–10)*

The text confronts the reader with a static tableau of homoerotic desire. Autolykos is emphatically represented as an object to be seen. The comparison of the young man to the light in the sky constructs him almost too obviously as a spectacle, at the same time that it suggests the ephemeral quality of youthful beauty. As a socially correct object of the pederastic gaze, Autolykos does not return the look, but modestly casts his eyes down, increasing his erotic allure and reinforcing his own status as object. As Deborah Steiner says, "within the realm of visual representation, depicting a body in a manner that emphasizes its 'to-be-looked-at-ness,' which codes its appearance for strong visual and erotic impact, turns that body from subject into spectacle, and constructs it as the passive and powerless object of the unseen viewer's gaze."[24] Autolykos' role as the object of his admirers' desire is reinforced by the dynamics of the gaze.

As Xenophon depicts it, the effect of Autolykos' beauty is more complex than merely creating a subject/object relationship between the viewer and the spectacle. Whoever looks upon the beauty of Autolykos finds himself in the thrall of a chaste Eros, who functions in the manner of a kindly gorgon.[25] Each onlooker is suspended in an atmosphere of aesthetic admiration and himself

24 Steiner (1998: 123–149). Sartre (1963: 49) articulates the power relations between spectator and the bearer of the gaze in a story about Jean Genet when he was caught by an adult who calls him a thief, as he stands with his hand in a drawer: "Pinned by a look, a butterfly pinned to a cork, he is naked, everyone can see him and spit at him. The gaze of the adults is a *constituent* power which has transformed him into a *constituted* nature." See also Jay's explication of Sartre's phenomenology of vision. Jay (1993: 287–298) to whom I owe this quote.

25 Xenophon plants the notion of the gorgon in his use of the word γοργότεροι to describe the effect of gods other than Eros on a person's appearance. Later Socrates

becomes an object to behold. Thus, the erotic gaze is depicted as regressively objectifying. The guests grow quiet; some assume poses (ἐσχηματίζοντό). Under the aegis of Eros, even the *erastes* Kallias is worth looking at (ἀξιοθέατος).[26] If we accept Aristeides' reading of the text, an outsider, τις, has to be imagined to posit a vantage point from which to have a subjective perspective on the situation. This indeterminate subject position creates an opportunity for the reader to become a spectator. Meanwhile, the symposiasts sit silently objectified, for they are subsumed by the spectacle of pederastic desire.

The opening scene puts the banqueters on view and thus previews the emphasis this text places on the gaze and spectacle. It signals a mimetic relationship between the diners and the entertainment. The symposiasts' interaction with the spectacle that Kallias has prepared for them provides a model for understanding the text. Moreover, the occasion for the event is another spectacle: the Great Panathenaic Games. Kallias throws a symposium to celebrate Autolykos' victory in the Pankration. In the earlier part of the day, he had taken the boy, his father, and Nikeratos to see the horse races. Kallias' symposium, then, is presented as the extension of a day of civic spectacles.

The layering of these two spectacles, the symposium and the Panathenaic Games, inscribes a homology between the athletic victor and the *eromenos*, in the person of Autolykos.[27] The coalescence of these two roles – the shared identity of athletic victor and object of elite male desire – results in the alignment of the gaze of the aristocracy with that of the larger civic community. There is, however, a tension that arises from the practices of the elite within their larger political context. Indeed, the politics of the appreciation of Autolykos' beauty become evident when they are described as a kingly thing: βασιλικόν τι τὸ κάλλος εἶναι. The incompatibility of the autocratic erotics of the symposium and of the Athenian civic culture of viewing results, as we shall see, in a petrified party of Athens' first men.

compares Kharmides' erotic stare at Kleinias with that of those who look at gorgons (4.24). For a discussion of gorgons and their iconography see Frontisi-DuCroix (1989: 151–165).

26 It is interesting that the visual focus in this passage begins with Autolykos and ends with Kallias. I will return to this passage in a discussion of Socrates' *paideia,* offering an interpretation of the description of Kallias as ἀξιοθέατος.

27 The recurrent cultural identification of these two roles has been established and discussed recently by Steiner (1998).

The factors that determine this totally static *eros* reside in the overdetermined objectification of Autolykos. As a young man on the verge of becoming a member of a *polis* that puts a premium on self-mastery, but also practices pederasty, Autolykos finds himself in the grip of a double bind. As a would-be citizen of Athens, Autolykos must identify himself as an actor, speaker, and master, and his athletic victory underscores the depiction of him as intensely active and manly, but pederastic practices assign him a role that is receptive, silent, and subjective.[28] Modesty demands that he not return the look of his admirers. The *eros* of the symposiasts must not be reciprocated. Like admiration for a king, these erotics move in one direction only. Men admire him, but propriety demands that he not return the gaze. The two forces that pull Autolykos in different directions, the *polis,* and the pederastic institution as embodied in the symposium, are represented by the two corporate gazes that converge on him. In the following I will return to the politics of elite *eros* as they are raised in the text.

In a discussion of the *Memorabilia,* Simon Goldhill has noted the political implications of spectacle in classical Athens. The *ekklesia* and *boule* both required that the citizens gather as spectators and then reach a collective judgment based on debate. Goldhill suggests that this judgmental citizen gaze extended into the cultural realm in the institutions of the theater,[29] athletic events, and the imperial architectural program. He concludes that

> *The democratic city of Athens – its institutions and practices – constituted a particular culture of viewing, in which the roles, statuses, positions of the democratic actors were constantly being structured in and through the gaze of citizens. This collective, participatory audience is a fundamental element of the democratic polis – a fundamental aspect of what constitutes public life.*[30]

The emphasis Xenophon places on spectacle in his *Symposium* serves to extend the dynamics at work in the homology of victor and *eromenos* discussed above. The elite gathering of the symposium is presented on a continuum with the

28 Some of the most influential discussions of this cultural construct can be found in the following: Dover (1989: 102–103); Foucault (1990: 220–225); Golden (1984: 308–324, esp. pp. 313–315); Halperin (1989: 88–12); Winkler (1990: 171–210).

29 For a formulation of the tragic theater as a place where the democratic city puts itself on trial see Vernant and Vidal-Naquet (1969: 107–108).

30 Goldhill (1998: 108).

civic "culture of viewing." The analogy that is thereby made between democratic and elite culture draws attention to a tension central to the institution of the symposium in a democratic context. As Oswyn Murray has noted, the symposium served as an anti-city, a place where a homogeneous elite group could gather and consolidate their views and power.[31] By presenting the symposium as something to be seen, Xenophon situates this institution within the democratic culture of viewing, which he does, as I will argue shortly, to divest the elite gathering of its problematic, anti-civic associations.

A number of scholars have remarked on the importance of the spectacle in Xenophon's writings.[32] Indeed, the technique of assimilating two terms that Athenian culture construed in a clearly oppositional relationship by means of the metaphor of public spectacle has been noted elsewhere in the Xenophontic corpus: Sheila Murnaghan has argued that Xenophon's *Oikonomikos* is structured around an assimilation of *oikos* and *polis* achieved in part through the metaphors of civic performance.[33] She suggests that Xenophon attempts to dissolve the tension between the egalitarian city and private property by assimilating the ideal household to the ideal city. Xenophon's merging of these opposing terms, she suggests, is a response to a developing awareness of conflicting interests between the public and private spheres. A by-product of this analogy is that Ischomachos' wife, whose domain is the *oikos*, becomes closely identified with her husband, who is versed in civic arts. In the *Oikonomikos*, then, the feminine and private property – two problematic terms of oppositions that occupied a central place in the Athenian cultural imagination – lose their charge when the distinction between them and their better half is obliterated. To depict the aristocratic household and its attributes as open, its contents visible, Xenophon repeatedly compares the affairs of the house with performances and spectacles.[34] In his description of the household, he invokes a circular chorus (8.20), comedy (3.7), a public trial (11.22–25), and athletic contests and horse racing (7.9) as points of comparison and analogy.[35]

31 See Murray (1990: 7, 149–161); cf. Schmitt-Pantell (1990: 14–33).

32 Goldhill (1998: 108n.35); Johnstone (1994: 227) has also noted that the hunt in the *Kynegetikos* is presented as an elite activity. See also Vilatte (1986: 274).

33 Murnaghan (1988: 9–22).

34 Murnaghan (1988: 21–22).

35 One interesting aspect of these agonistic metaphors is that Ischomachos' household is victorious by virtue of a complete lack of rivals.

Murnaghan's suggestion that these analogies diffuse the distrust of wealth by looking at private property through the lens of civic performance is convincing, but she doesn't press the political implications of her argument. Xenophon asserts the political ramifications of οἰκονομία when Socrates likens the rule of a city to the rule of a myriad of houses (*Oik.* 21.2).[36] If an elite household can be compared to an ideal city, then it follows that property owners like Ischomachos are most suited to run the *polis*.

Thus far the evocation of civic viewing as a background for the spectacle of the symposium has served to highlight the problems involved in integrating the symposium into democratic culture. The problem is figured through the competing gazes that Autolykos bears and is reflected in the paralysis that grips the symposium. Finally, Philip the buffoon interrupts this stagnant tableau giving the guests something to talk about. The entertainers in their turn provide Socrates with a platform from which to offer a correction to this stultifying pederasty and to offer a political model that not only validates, but even eroticizes the presence of the elite within the *polis*. In the next section I will consider the entertainers' performance.

ENTERTAINMENT

As I suggested above, the entertainment that Kallias has hired provides a much-needed diversion for his guests. The performances serve to raise issues that are refracted and reflected, imitated and rejected by the elite spectacle of the symposium. In this section the hired performances bring to the table the notion of monetary exchange, which provokes a discussion of the role of money in the construction of elite masculine identity. The entertainers also come to figure relationships that are more abstractly present among the symposiasts.

Xenophon introduces the entertainers by means of a euphemistic circumlocution:

> *ἔρχεται αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ κῶμον Συρακόσιός τις ἄνθρωπος, ἔχων τε αὐλητρίδα ἀγαθὴν καὶ*

36 See also *Mem.* 3.4.12, 3.6.14, 3.9.10–11. For a discussion of the rule of the household as it relates to rule of the state see Stevens (1994: 209).

ὀρχηστρίδα τῶν τὰ θαύματα δυναμένων ποιεῖν, καὶ παῖδα πάνυ γε ὡραῖον καὶ πάνυ καλῶς κιθαρίζοντα καὶ ὀρχούμενον. ταῦτα δὲ καὶ ἐπιδεικνὺς ὡς ἐν θαύματι ἀργύριον ἐλάμβανεν.

There came to them for entertainment a certain Syracusan man having a fine auletris and a dancing girl, one of those capable of performing marvelous feats, and a very handsome boy who was excellent at playing the cithara and dancing. The Syracusan made money by displaying these performances for a spectacle. (2.1)

With characteristic politesse, Xenophon does not call these performers prostitutes, but he does say that they are hired, and he represents them as making a significant contribution to the libidinal charge of the evening. "Xenophon is often coy about such things, but it seems clear [the Syracusan] is a *pornoboskos* or something close to it."[37]

Only the sexual desirability of the boy is made explicit in the text (4.53). As discussed in the previous chapter, the occupation of flute-girl does have an association with sex-trade, and this status is ambiguous.[38] In his discussion of the status of various types of sex workers, Davidson has made the compelling suggestion that to some extent space determines the nature of a commodity. Public spaces like the streets, brothels, and the *agora* were associated with short-term money transactions. Thus, prostitutes in public spaces are spatially defined as *pornai.* Their counterparts, *hetairai,* inhabit the private space of the *oikos,* a place for love affairs, gift exchange, and long-term involvement.[39]

In Xenophon's text we encounter the entertainers in Kallias' house, a private aristocratic space. Furthermore, their performance is distinguished in terms that assimilate them to the aristocratic milieu of the symposium: the boy performs πάνυ καλῶς, while the girl is described as ἀγαθὴν. Almost at the same time that they are collectively associated with the hallmark of elitism, *kalokagathia,* they are characterized by a marketplace transaction – the exchange of cold cash, ἀργύριον. (ταῦτα δὲ καὶ ἐπιδεικνὺς ὡς ἐν θαύματι

37 Davidson (1998: 96).

38 Starr (1978: 408–409) notes an association between flute-girls and fellatio. See also Aristophanes, *Wasps* 1335–1381, and Henderson (1975: 81, 167).

39 Davidson (1998: 112). The corresponding terminology for the boy, *pornos* and *hetairos,* clearly have a different valence than the feminized terms. I discuss this issue later in this chapter.

ἀργύριον ἐλάμβανεν /The Syracusan made money by exhibiting these (performances) as a spectacle; 2.1.) The explicit articulation that Kallias paid for these entertainers is a significant intrusion of the marketplace into the symposium, striking a discordant note that is repeatedly echoed throughout the text. The result is that Xenophon's production of prostitution is ambiguous. He avoids identifying these entertainers strictly with the marketplace, or with the aristocratic household. When they are introduced in the text, they are ushered into a discursive gray area, an area that falls somewhere between the *agora* and the symposium.

In the following reading of the *Symposium,* I will suggest that Xenophon manipulates the ideological oppositions that accrete around the distinction between *hetaira* and the *porne.* Toward the end of the text, the taint of the marketplace recedes while the entertainers' identification with the other symposiasts is developed. Furthermore, at the very moment when Xenophon characterizes the entertainers most emphatically in terms of reciprocity and closely identifies them with the other symposiasts, precisely where we would expect a rejection of the public sphere, Xenophon evokes the ritual practice of the *polis.*[40] This appropriation, an inversion of the typical sympotic strategy, results in the assimilation and absorption of the *polis* into the elite world of the symposium.[41] In my reading I will suggest that the entertainers figure the

40 My understanding of the way ritual can be manipulated and operated through reciprocal consent depends on Connor (1987, 40–50).

41 Kurke (1990: 268) describes a sympotic strategy of identification and difference with the *hetaira/porne:*

> The opposition of *hetaira* and *porne* operates within a complex network of social, economic, and political differentiation of middling and elitist traditions, whereby the aristocratic symposium invents the *hetaira* to shield itself from the public sphere, which it figures and traduces through the obscenity of the *porne.* Egalitarian discourse, in contrast (at least by the fourth century), can embrace precisely what the aristocratic texts revile, celebrating the universal availability of *pornai* as an emblem and badge of democracy. Yet even within the elitist construction, the representational category of the *hetaira* seems to involve its makers in an ideological double bind. Her sexual role at the symposium depends on difference and pulls against her complete assimilation to the male symposiasts. And if the category is created originally to constitute a pristine sympotic space, the pressures and anxieties of male participants occasionally refashion her as *porne,* with all the disembedded economics attendant on that category. Of necessity then, the trafficking of the

Athenian people; they are represented at first in the terms of the *porne,* and then in the discourse of the *hetaira.* For Xenophon to invite the *polis* into his symposium, he effects a third transition, which is to represent the *hetaira* in the idiom of civic ritual.

The first performance begins after the postprandial libation and hymn. The Syracusan arrives with his troupe. The act is a song – the performance of which ultimately provokes a discussion of gender and class. Immediately after the number is finished and Socrates compliments Kallias on the meal and the show, Kallias, intending to provide his guest with an extravaganza for the senses, suggests that perfume be brought in to extend the pleasure. He thus situates the entertainers on a continuum of sensual consumer goods, somewhere between food and bottled scents – products procured at the marketplace that provide short-term pleasure. The trajectory on which Kallias locates the entertainers puts them squarely in the discursive category of *pornoi,* while it simultaneously contributes to the association of Kallias with short-term, cash transactions.

Socrates objects strongly to Kallias' suggestion. He opposes the introduction of perfume first because it is the province of women. He goes on to denounce its use altogether. Young brides don't need perfume, he says, because they are naturally redolent of a sweet smell. Among men, perfume blurs class distinctions:

> *καὶ γὰρ δὴ μύρῳ μὲν ὁ ἀλειψάμενος καὶ δοῦλος καὶ ἐλεύθερος εὐθὺς ἅπας ὅμοιον ὄζει· αἱ δ' ἀπὸ τῶν ἐλευθερίων μόχθων ὀσμαὶ ἐπιτηδευμάτων τε πρῶτον χρηστῶν καὶ χρόνου πολλοῦ δέονται, εἰ μέλλουσιν ἡδεῖαί τε καὶ ἐλευθέριοι ἔσεσθαι.*
>
> *For indeed, when a man has anointed himself with perfume, straightaway both slave and free man smell entirely the same, but those smells from a free man's toils primarily demand fine pursuits and those undertaken over a long time, if they are to be sweet and redolent of freedom. (2.4)*

agora infiltrates the symposium, as the celebrants struggle desperately to distinguish themselves from the women they have introduced, now become bearers of difference.

It is this strategy that Xenophon is inverting in this text.

For Socrates, each person is so deeply imbricated in his or her social position that the aroma of gender and status emanates from the individual's pores. In a rejection of perfume's artifice, Socrates suggests that people are naturally redolent of social position and gender: without perfume women smell like women, men smell like men, and slaves smell like slaves. The categories he evokes describe three possible degrees of civic involvement for Athenians: free men were full participants, women were involved in the production of citizens, but did not participate directly in the *polis,* while slaves were totally excluded.

Moving on from the assumption of the natural cathexis of individual with social role, the conversation goes on to address the aspects of masculinity and class that can be taught. In response to Socrates' assertion that the sweetest body odor comes from socially appropriate activities, Lykon, Autolykos' father, inquires how he should smell, since he is beyond the age when it is appropriate to exercise in the gymnasia. Socrates responds:

> — καλοκἀγαθίας νὴ Δί', ἔφη ὁ Σωκράτης.
> — καὶ πόθεν ἄν τις τοῦτο τὸ χρῖμα λάβοι;
> — οὐ μὰ Δί', ἔφη, οὐ παρὰ τῶν μυροπωλῶν.
> — ἀλλὰ πόθεν δή;
> — ὁ μὲν Θέογνις ἔφη,
> Ἐσθλῶν μὲν γὰρ ἀπ' ἐσθλὰ διδάξεαι· ἢν δὲ κακοῖσι
> συμμίσγῃς, ἀπολεῖς καὶ τὸν ἐόντα νόον.
>
> — *"Of* kalokagathia, *by Zeus!" said Socrates.*
> —*"And from where might someone get this lotion?"*
> —*"Certainly not from the perfume sellers"*
> —*"Well from where then?"*
> —*"As Theognis said:*
> *You will learn noble things from noble men, but if*
> *you mingle with base ones, you will destroy even your existing sense." (2.4)*

This response contrasts a marketplace purchase with the symbolic benefit derived from keeping elite company. The allusion to Theognis' poetry supports Socrates' implicit argument that the marketplace should be disassociated from the education of the elite, which is a socially embedded long-term transaction. For, in the poetry of Theognis, the *kakoi* are those born into a lowly estate who, according to Veda Cobb-Stevens, are motivated by a desire for

personal gain and "in periods of social and economic upheaval were able to acquire great wealth, status, and ultimately political power." Their accumulation of wealth and power led to an erosion of the social order under which the good (*agathoi, kaloi, esthloi*) were rich and the bad (*kakoi*) were poor.[42] In Socrates' scheme, however, status symbols that can be bought, like perfume or education, confuse not class distinctions as in the Theognidean corpus, but the gender and class distinctions that define civic participation.

Although Socrates' assertion that *kalokagathia* cannot be bought from a merchant is a joke, it points to a less trivial issue – the tension between the Sophists and the Socratics. This tension is broadly thematized throughout the text by persistent and somewhat incongruous allusions to monetary value. What is at stake here is what is the role of economics in pedegogy and pederasty. Socrates' response to Kallias' call for perfume constitutes a subtle case against the sale of education. Objects that can be bought, like perfume, can wreak havoc with the social order. The market creates a kind of social randomness: it allows an old man to smell like a young bride, and perhaps by analogy, Kallias to think that he is wise.[43]

Thus far in the text, the celebrants' discussion has addressed the question of whether or not *kalokagathia* is something that can be taught, an issue that (an extremely congenial) Socrates suggests they reserve for later, since it is a debatable (ἀμφίλογον) matter. The next act follows. The female acrobat juggles twelve hoops in the air to the accompaniment of the flute. This feat prompts Socrates to remark:

> *ἡ γυναικεία φύσις οὐδὲν χείρων τῆς τοῦ ἀνδρὸς οὖσα τυγχάνει, γνώμης δὲ καὶ ἰσχύος δεῖται. ὥστε εἴ τις ὑμῶν γυναῖκα ἔχει, θαρρῶν διδασκέτω ὅ τι βούλοιτ᾽ ἂν αὐτῇ ἐπισταμένῃ χρῆσθαι.*
>
> *Woman's nature is not at all worse than man's, except what it lacks in judgment and strength. So, if any of you has a wife, let him confidently teach her whatever he would like to make use of her knowing.* (2.9)

42 Cobb-Stevens (1985: 197–223). See also Kurke (1989).

43 Although it is *kalokagathia* explicitly at issue here and not a sophistic education, the comparison of perfume to a sophistic education, portraying both as a falsifying mist, will be fully justified when the symposiasts speak and those who are sophist-trained expose the substance of their knowledge.

After establishing the near-equivalence of woman's nature to man's, Antisthenes objects that Socrates has failed to educate his wife Xanthippe, who is the worst woman of all time. Socrates responds with an analogy to horse-rearing. By practicing on the high spirited, the rest are easily managed: ῥᾳδίως τοῖς γε ἄλλοις ἵπποις χρήσεσθαι (2.10). At the same time that Socrates has asserted the natural near-parity of the genders, he presumes an essential inferiority of women – they stand in the same relation to men as horses do; they exist to be used by men (ὅ τι βούλοιτ' ἂν αὐτῇ ἐπισταμένῃ χρῆσθαι). Socrates' exceptions, then, regarding women's equality, γνώμη and ἰσχύς, must lie at the crux of what elevates men.

The show continues and so does the lesson on the teachability of *kalokagathia*. The gymnast flips in and out of hoops set with upright swords for an audience rapt with anxiety for her safety. When she has finished, Socrates remarks that her feat proved that *andreia* can be taught: ἡ ἀνδρεία διδακτόν (2.12). Manliness itself can be taught to a woman. The female gymnast's entertainment serves as a backdrop against which Socrates can display the lineaments of masculinity – that which is constructed (almost everything), and that which is inherent and justifies an a priori superiority, namely, judgment and strength. It would seem, however, that strength is not constitutive of *kalokagathia*, since in the perfume discussion Socrates had assigned *kalokagathia* as the scent appropriate for those who no longer trained in the gymnasia. γνώμη remains alone as the quality that elevates men within the human race and makes them candidates for Socrates' brand of *kalokagathia*. According to Aristotle, γνώμη is the faculty with which a juror casts judgment in court.[44] It is the interpretive mechanism through which one relates to civic and other spectacles. In Socrates' scheme it is both the product and the sign of civic status.

The *Symposium*, with its interplay of spectacle and discourse, creates a forum in which to see what Socrates and the others present see, and learn how they judge it. It exposes the process of judgment in response to a spectacle among a diverse and even opposed group of men – a group the author has brought together under the rubric of *kaloi kagathoi* (1.1). The various judgments of the spectacles within the text reveal different ways of being *kaloi kagathoi*. Socrates' brand of *kalokagathia* is made most explicit and is depicted in contrast to the other guests'. As I suggested above, the narrator constructs his reader as an

44 Ar. *Rh* 1375a29.

assessor of this elite group. Judgment of this symposium is demanded by its presentation as a spectacle, and if judgment does indeed define a *kalos kagathos*, then the ability to interpret the text properly includes the reader among the elite.[45]

In the next round of entertainment the hired boy performs a dance that prompts Socrates to remark on the way movement enhances the boy's beauty and how dance involves the entire body. When he tells the Syracusan that he would like to learn to dance these forms, the incongruity of the homely Socrates in the role of the beautiful young dancer makes everybody laugh. He justifies his desire to dance by its healthful benefits, the symmetrical physique it produces, and the fact that he can dance alone, in private without a partner. He mentions that Kharmides saw him dancing that morning. Kharmides confirms this report, saying that he thought Socrates had gone mad until he heard his justification. Convinced by Socrates' response, he went home and practiced shadow boxing, the closest thing to dancing he knew how to do. Philip the buffoon, inspired by this discussion, performs for the symposiasts a ridiculous burlesque of the dances of the girl and boy. The text mentions that he imitates a hoop, because the girl did (2.19).

This interlude draws a comparison between Socrates and Philip. In response to the performance, we are presented with images of each one of them dancing, both of which provoke laughter. But Socrates' dancing isn't embodied in the text as Philip's is; it is merely hearsay, discursive dancing. Some degree of the impropriety of a man dancing at a symposium is reflected in Herodotus' story about Kleisthenes of Sikyon, when he selects a husband for his daughter. Hippokleides, the Athenian, is the favored of a large group of illustrious suitors until he gets drunk and performs a series of dances at a symposium. The public dancing puts Kleisthenes off:

> *Κλεισθένης δὲ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα καὶ τὰ δεύτερα*
> *ὀρχεομένου, ἀποστυγέων γαμβρὸν ἄν οἱ ἔτι*
> *γενέσθαι Ἱπποκλείδεα διά τήν τε ὄρχησιν καὶ τὴν*
> *ἀναιδείην, κατεῖχε ἑωυτόν, οὐ βουλόμενος*
> *ἐκραγῆναι ἐς αὐτόν· ὡς δὲ εἶδε τοῖσι σκέλεσι*

45 Hobden (2005) argues that Xenophon's purpose here is to create a dramatic narrative that will stimulate readers to deliberative reflection.

> *χειρονομήσαντα, οὐκέτι κατέχειν δυνάμενος εἶπε· ὦ παῖ Τεισάνδρου, ἀπορχήσαό γε μὲν τὸν γάμον. ὁ δὲ Ἱπποκλείδης ὑπολαβὼν εἶπε· Οὐ φροντὶς Ἱπποκλείδῃ.*
>
> *Kleisthenes had repudiated having Hippokleides as a son-in-law when he performed the first and second numbers, because of his dancing and his shamelessness, but he restrained himself, since he did not want to scold him. But when he saw him gesticulating with his legs, no longer able to restrain himself he said: "O son of Tisander, you have danced away your marriage." In a come-back Hippokleides replied, "Hippokleides doesn't care." (Hist. 6.129)*

Kleisthenes is disapproving of any kind of dancing at the symposium, believing it to be beneath the dignity of his daughter's future husband. His leg waggling is shocking not only because he would have been exposing himself,[46] but also because it shows how an elite performance can degenerate into the behavior appropriate to a buffoon lacking φροντίς. Socrates is identified with Philip in this text because they both dance, but he is distinguished from him in that he does it in private. The effect is to produce a bodily Socrates only in the abstract, as distinguished from the vulgar embodiment elicited by Philip's improper physicality. Where Philip dances to get a laugh, Socrates gets the laugh without having to stoop to Philip's foolishness, and in addition he draws a lesson from watching the dance. His justification for dancing alone has already proved successful since it inspired Kharmides to pursue his own symmetrical suppleness. For Philip, the dance is merely entertainment, and his interpretation of the dance is nothing more than a ridiculous mimesis (μιμούμενος... τὴν ὄρχησιν, 2.21).

Throughout the text Philip's entertainment acts as a counterbalance to that of the Syracusan. As Robert Bartlett notes, there is a complementarity in the fact that the Syracusan is unnamed but invited while Philip is named but uninvited.[47] In contrast to the Syracusan's troupe, Philip is not paid for the entertainment he provides. Rather, he secures his invitations to dinners

46 Fehr (1990: 190) and plate 15a, which depicts a dancer displaying his phallus with legs spread wide open.

47 See Bartlett (1996: 176).

through reciprocal exchange (1.14). He furnishes laughter in return for food. Thus, the serious differences that exist between Kallias and Socrates in terms of exchange are reflected at the lowest level of sympotic entertainment. Kallias is associated with monetary exchange, like the Syracusan and his troupe, while Socrates and Philip are associated with reciprocity. Thus, the presence of the performers has raised complex economic issues that the symposiasts will pursue throughout their gathering, where disembedded exchanges of all sorts (erotic, performative, etc.) are pitted against reciprocal giving. At this point in the narrative, Socrates invites his fellow spectators, the symposiasts, to put on a show. He denotes a hierarchy of realms of spectacle when he says that although the hired troupe is capable of entertaining the guests,

> *ἡμεῖς δὲ τούτων οἶδ' ὅτι πολὺ βελτίονες οἰόμεθα εἶναι. οὐκ αἰσχρὸν οὖν εἰ μηδ' ἐπιχειρήσομεν συνόντες ὠφελεῖν τι ἢ εὐφραίνειν ἀλλήλους;*
>
> *I know that we think we are much better than these people are. Is it not then a shame if we do not try to render some service or to delight one another while we are together? (3.2)*

The hired entertainment is parallel to, but lower than, the exhibition of the symposium. In the next section I will discuss elite display, showing how it picks up and develops the economic issues raised by the presence of the hired performers.

ELITE DISPLAY

When Socrates asks Kallias to redeem the promise he made when he invited the Socratics to his house – to make a display of his wisdom – Kallias replies that he will do this if all of the guests join him. Since the terms of the discussion seem to be shifting, it is important to read the articulation of the symposiasts' pastime closely. Kallias says: καὶ ἐπιδείξω γε, ἔφη, ἐὰν καὶ ὑμεῖς ἅπαντες εἰς μέσον φέρητε ὅ τι ἕκαστος ἐπίστασθε ἀγαθόν (I will make a display if you all will bring into the middle what each one of you knows that is good; 3.3). In his use of εἰς μέσον, Kallias introduces elite displays of wisdom couched in language freighted with political significance, once again making

the uneasy alignment of the *polis* with the institution of the symposium.[48] Furthermore, his description of these elite performances with the verb ἐπιδείξω has interesting resonances. Epideictic speeches refer to public funeral orations,[49] as well as to private speeches written as examples of oratorical eloquence intended to be read silently or to a small elite audience.[50] Generally speaking they are concerned with praise or blame. In the following speeches, Xenophon seems to be evoking the full potential of the genre; each man intends his speech to redound to his own glory, yet each exposes his fallibility in the process, thus evoking the genre's capacity for both encomium and invective. Although Kallias uses the word ἐπιδείξω ostensibly to denote a display of eloquence, its association with the funeral oration serves as a reminder of the political deaths so many of the participants had suffered when the text was written.

Socrates responds to Kallias with a slight rephrasing of his suggestion, saying that no one would object to saying ὅ τι ἕκαστος ἡγεῖται πλείστου ἄξιον ἐπίστασθαι (what each one thinks he knows that is most valuable, 3.3). Kallias says that he is able to make men better (3.4), which becomes a standard for judging each man's ability. When asked to explain he replies:

> *Ἐπειδὰν τοίνυν καὶ ὑμῶν ἕκαστος εἴπῃ ὅ τι ὠφέλιμον ἔχει, τότε κἀγὼ οὐ φθονήσω εἰπεῖν τὴν τέχνην δι' ἧς τοῦτο ἀπεργάζομαι.*
>
> *Well then, when each of you says what beneficial skill he knows, then I shall not begrudge to say the skill through which I get this result. (3.5)*

The knowledge Kallias and Socrates originally spoke of has now become a skill, and the standard is that it be ὠφέλιμον. In a discussion of the verb to which this adjective is related (ὠφελεῖσθαι), John Stevens says it is "a neutral

48 I am not suggesting that εἰς μέσον is a by-word for democracy, rather that in Athens in the fifth century the word had a legible association with egalitarian discourse. Morris (1996: 19–48).

49 For the particularly Athenian character of the funeral oration, see Loraux (1986: 1 ff.). See also Burgess (1902).

50 Ober (1989: 47). According to Aristotle these speeches were addressed to spectators concerned with the speaker's facility in demonstrating that which is honorable or disgraceful. The genre has subdivisions: panegyric, encomium, invective, and funeral oration. Ar. *Rh.* 1358b2 ff. See also Kennedy (1963: 152–202).

term that can apply to things or to people. When used to describe how one benefits from a thing it refers to profit and when used of benefit to people it refers to good service."[51] Goldhill argues that Xenophon uses ὠφέλιμος to mean useful to the city in particular.[52]

The question is changed again as it is put to other guests, becoming ἐπὶ ποίᾳ ἐπιστήμῃ μέγα φρονεῖς (of what knowledge are you most proud?; 3.5) in the case of Nikeratos. It is put to Kritoboulos, Antisthenes, Kharmides, Socrates, Lykon, and Autolykos as ἐπὶ τίνι μέγα/μέγιστον φρονεῖς (of what are you most proud?; 3.7–12). Finally Nikeratos asks the somber Hermogenes ἐπὶ τίνι μάλιστα ἀγάλλῃ (on what do you stake your reputation?; 3.14).

The exact question put to each participant changes. Moreover, the symposiasts' responses indicate a variety of interpretations at play. Although everyone addresses themselves to the issue of value, some are far more concerned with profit than political service, and only Socrates, Nikeratos, and Kallias seem to be responding to the question "of what art (that can make men better) are you proud?"[53] The significantly divergent question that Nikeratos puts to Hermogenes, "in what do you set store?" is perhaps an acknowledgment of Hermogenes' role at this symposium as wet blanket, for ἀγάλλομαι is a strongly moral word.

In a discussion of the sources of the priamel, Anne Pippin Burnett refers to a traditional sympotic game that was popular in the archaic period:

> *A speaker was challenged to name the best, the first, the strongest, the sweetest item in a given category, and he responded with an ordered sequence that showed off his command of erudite information. . . . The final term had to be given a special epithet in order to fix and enhance its value, but even so these first comparative lists could be made by almost any dolt, and so they were replaced in sophisticated circles by a sharper game. With this, the true priamel, a witty man could distinguish himself, for, by breaking out of the category or shifting the grounds of evaluation he might establish an unexpected item in the final seat of superiority.*

51 Stevens (1994: 230).

52 He notes that "the demonstration of Socrates' usefulness is a central plank of Xenophon's Apologetics." Goldhill (1998: 109–111).

53 Strauss (1972: 165).

The competition of rhetorical display among Xenophon's symposiasts shares many elements with the sympotic game Burnett describes.[54] They set as their topic the notion of value itself. Although no judgment is made on the speeches, the atmosphere is thick with competition. The challenge to violate category seems to be operative, since each symposiast's speech tries to broaden the spectrum of value that is described. In the following I will show how, picking up on the economic parameters described in the narrative involving the hired entertainers, value comes to be described through the oppositions of private and civic value, and real and symbolic capital.

There is one immediate difference between the game that Burnett describes and the one played here that must be considered: the symposiasts themselves don't make lists. We can, however, think of Xenophon's representation of the symposiasts' discourses as the prose equivalent of the priamel.[55] Through the ten participants in the sympotic discourse he presents an expanded and developed, even embodied, list of evaluations in which the final participant, Socrates, shifts the paradigm of meaning, revising and exceeding everyone who has gone before him.[56]

Each symposiast tries to confound expectations through an unconventional depiction of wealth. Kallias says he has the ability to make men more just by giving them money: having the necessities provided, they are not tempted to resort to crime (4.1–2).[57] Kallias' τέχνη of turning money into justice allows him to display his wealth while representing himself as the consummate Athenian gentleman: he couches the undemocratic notion that his value is his money in a way that reinforces the security of the *polis*. Nikeratos claims as his skill that he has learned Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* by heart. On the surface Nikeratos seems to claim that he has acquired some sort of symbolic wealth in

54 Burnett (1983: 281 ff.).

55 Burnett (1983: 282) describes the relevance of the priamel form to philosophic inquiry: "The search for superlatives encouraged abstract speculation about the nature of qualities such as strength or purity, and even about the nature of the superlative itself, and in consequnce the priamel soon recommended itself to men whose minds took a philosophic turn."

56 The same paradigm could be said to structure Plato's *Symposium.*

57 Kallias' skill elicits the same ethic that the old Kephalos appeals to (*Rep.* 331b) when he claims that wealth makes him more just to others, thus making a similar equation between wealth and virtue.

the form of cultural capital. But later on in the conversation Nikeratos admits that what he really learned from Homer is a delight in counting, which in turn makes him yearn for vast riches.

Kritoboulos, who is proud of his beauty, takes his turn next. Appealing to an idealized version of pederastic discourse that figures this erotic relationship as the exchange of enjoyment of the *eromenos*' beauty for the *erastes*' wisdom, he argues that his beauty can influence men toward virtue.[58] His pride in his looks prompts Socrates to call for a beauty contest between Kritoboulos and Socrates where Socrates proves that although his ugly features are more serviceable, they are not more beautiful. Finally he emphasizes Kritoboulos' mercenary employment of his beauty when he describes it as money (τὸ σὸν ἀργύριον).[59] Kharmides ironically stakes his value on his poverty, a claim that Antisthenes then inverts, saying he is proud of his wealth, though as it turns out, he has given up his possessions to consort freely with Socrates.

Next, Hermogenes explains the basis for his pride: Επὶ φίλων . . . ἀρετῇ καὶ δυνάμει, καὶ ὅτι τοιοῦτοι ὄντες ἐμοῦ ἐπιμέλονται (contained by the excellence and power of my friends, and that being such they look after me; 3.14). When he defends his claim (4.46–49), it turns out that his friends are the gods, whom he cultivates with thrifty services (εὐτελῶς). Like Antisthenes, Hermogenes uses the tactic of casting the value he places in the symbolic realm in language that conforms to the economic standard of value set by the host.

Both Philip and the Syracusan are brought into the discussion (4.50–55). Philip says he is proud of being a jester, since people want him around only when they are happy, and the Syracusan says he bases his pride on the fools who come to see his entertainment. Neither makes any attempt to disguise the fact that his pride is linked to his own profit.

Autolykos' and his father Lykon's reciprocal pride in one another needs no explaining. Their silence is interesting: the love between a father and son is beyond the realm of evaluation. Its usefulness to the city goes without saying. Through this depiction it occupies the position of the ultimate symbolic capital – so valuable it need not be quantified. Despite the reticence of his

58 Cf. Phaedrus' speech in Plato's *Symposium* 178b–180b.

59 Socrates directly expresses the problem with trafficking in beauty in his final monologue – there is no reciprocity between lover and beloved; instead it is the unaffected relationship of the marketplace buyer and seller (8.21).

guests, however, Kallias feels no qualms about putting a price on this father-son relationship. When Autolykos announces his pride in his father, Kallias proclaims that Lykon is the richest of men: ἀλλὰ λανθάνει σε ὅτι οὐκ ἂν δέξαιο τὰ βασιλέως χρήματα ἀντὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ; (Don't you know that you would not exchange the wealth of the king in return for your son?; 3.13). This question adds to the characterization of Kallias as oriented toward real capital: he ascribes a money value to a type of symbolic capital that everyone else agrees exceeds economic evaluation.

It remains for Socrates to defend his pride that he claims is laid in the skill of *mastropeia.* When he originally announced his pride in this trade, all the other guests laughed, to which Socrates responded that he could make a lot of money by pursuing this disreputable profession. Although Socrates will explain his claim in his own terms, the common understanding of the term – to make one person sexually attractive to another – has immediate significance in regard to the reputations of the host and his beloved that would develop between the fictive setting of the text and its publication date. Both Kallias and Autolykos were mocked by their contemporaries for their engagement in prostitution. Kallias had a reputation for debauchery that the comic poets and the scholiasts preserve: Aristophanes designates Kallias with the patronymic Ἱπποβίνου (the son of horse fucker; *Frogs* 429) In *Birds* (284) he is depicted as a bird plucked by prosecutors and women. A scholiast explains this line, saying that Kallias was known for his whoremongering, πορνοκοπίαν, and the amount of money he spent on adultery.[60] He is derided for throwing his inheritance away (*Ekkl.* 810),[61] and a scholiast comments,

> *Καλλίας τις ἐγένετο πλούσιος ὅς εἰς πόρνας τὴν ἑαυτοῦ οὐσίαν κατηνάλωσεν καὶ λοιπὸν πένης ἐγένετο.*
>
> *Kallias was a man born rich who squandered his wealth on prostitutes and lived for the rest of his life in poverty. (Sch. Ar. Ekkl. 810)*

Eupolis' play *Kolakes,* or *Flatterers,* was set at the house of Kallias, indicating that he was as ready to sell affection as he was to buy it. Autolykos seems

60 Sch. Ar. *Av.* 286.
61 Cf. Plato's *Rep.* 330b.

to have had enough of a reputation for sexual license to merit some comic mention: Athenaios records that in the archonship of Aristion (421/420 BCE) Eupolis satirized (χλευάζει) the victory of Autolykos. Pollux cites the use of πορνευέσθαι in the same comedy, perhaps referring to the behavior of the boy whom Xenophon represents here as modest and chaste.[62] The *Etymologicum Magnum* makes reference to the *Autolykos* in an entry for the word εὐτρήσιος, which comes from the verb τετρῆσθαι, meaning to be bored through, in the obscene sense, noting that Eupolis applied it to Autolykos. Dover interprets Eutresios as meaning "easily penetrated," and speculates on the wide disparity between Xenophon's depiction of Kallias and Autolykos' relationship and the way it is represented in comedy:

> *Whether the alleged homosexual prostitution of Autolykos to Kallias was a central motif of the play, we do not know; the political relationships involving Kallias and Lykon, affected by the public adulation accorded to athletic success, may well have been more important, but so far as the evidence goes it shows that the same homosexual love affair could be looked at in different ways.*[63]

Perhaps Socrates' profession of pride in the skill of *mastropeia* is meant in part to make humorous reference to the comic reputation of Kallias and Autolykos. The way Socrates refashions *mastropeia* in this text might be an effort to defend whatever role he may have had in the relationship of Kallias and Autolykos – a role that feasibly could have played a factor in his eventual condemnation at the hands of Lykon, among others. This text makes clear that to hold Socrates responsible for the prostitution of Autolykos to Kallias is to misunderstand Socrates and to be a poor judge of the spectacle Xenophon writes for his reader.

In a sense, Socrates' τέχνη, that of pander, embraces and exceeds the standards of evaluation that informed the other symposiasts' speeches. Like the Sophists, Kallias, and Nikeratos, he actually claims a skill for himself, and like the other Socratics, Kharmides, Antisthenes, and Hermogenes, he casts the value he places in the nonmaterial realm in the crassest of chrematistic terms. His profession of his skill as procurer transgresses an implicit boundary

62 The fragments of a satyr play titled *Autolykos* are also ascribed to Euripides, the largest fragment of which is a tirade against athletes, because of their uselessness to the city: Nauck (1989: fr. 282).

63 Dover (1989: 147).

that circumscribes the speeches of the other symposiasts – he locates himself absolutely outside of the company of the elite when he claims for himself a money-making trade. Socrates' pride in *mastropeia* is an absurd and humorous continuation of the persistent and uncomfortable intrusion of the marketplace into this private event that we have traced throughout the text – and that has presented itself as the problem that needs to be corrected. According to Burnett's description of this sympotic game, by radically shifting the terms of the discussion, Socrates earns the position of superiority. Ironically, he has done this by professing a socially inferior trade.

In an effort to justify this transgressive occupation, Socrates questions the other guests to come to a mutual understanding of the function of the pander. He begins by asking if it is his job to render his client attractive to his or her associates. All the guests respond πάνυ μὲν οὖν (Certainly; 4.56) and repeat this answer to the following questions. When Socrates asks if the better procurer would be the one who makes his client attractive to just one person or to many people, the response is divided. Some just continue to say "certainly," while others say "the one who makes his client attractive to many." Strauss argues that the reason for this split is that some of those present did not want to assent to this "unpopular alternative,"[64] while Higgins suggests that some of the participants have simply stopped paying attention.[65] Both readings have merit for, thinking outside of the text, and somewhat cynically, Socrates' success at pandering is played out in the comic narrative of Autolykos as prostitute – he has become attractive to everyone. Within the text, though, the suggestion that people are not paying attention contributes to Xenophon's portrayal of Socrates as one man among others, genial in the face of his own vulnerability, trying to keep a volatile group of men on an even keel for the duration of an evening.

THE *POLIS* AND THE GAZE

The beauty contest between Kritoboulos and Socrates, which begins after the symposiasts' displays, gestures toward a competition at the Panathenaia – the

64 Strauss (1972: 164).

65 Higgins (1977: 19 n98). Donald Morrison notes that Socrates "condemned to death by a popular court, was thus a failure as a procurer, namely at applying his art to himself." Morrison (1994: 181–208).

euandria, in which contestants, entered through their tribes, were judged on beauty, size, and strength.[66] Goldhill understands the *euandria* as "an iconic event for Athenian culture . . . exemplary of the way Athenian democracy creates and promotes a particular culture of viewing."[67] Once again the symposium is cast in light of Athenian public theatrics.

Socrates loses the beauty contest, which is judged by the Syracusan's girl and boy (they will award a kiss to the winner). Socrates complains that Kritoboulos has corrupted (διαφθείρειν) the judges. He thus calls to mind the real-life trial in which Socrates also came up a loser. The casting of hired entertainers as judges makes an edgy comment about the judgment of Socrates – the Athenian populace is characterized as a group of prostitutes, literally kissing up to whomever they find most attractive. Their decision against Socrates is based on purely superficial grounds. The representation of the Athenian people as hired entertainers is further developed when the leader of the hired performers, the Syracusan, gives voice to the historical accusations leveled against Socrates that ultimately led to his conviction. He accuses Socrates of having the most useless (ἀνωφελέστατος) thoughts about the gods (6.7); he makes reference to Aristophanes' ridiculous characterization of Socrates in the *Clouds* (6.8); when Kharmides wonders if the Syracusan places his pride in the young man, he denies it, alluding to perhaps the most damning accusation against Socrates, saying the boy is a source of anxiety because he worries that certain people are plotting to corrupt him (διαφθεῖραι, 4.52). Perhaps Xenophon's choice of Syracusan as the nationality to represent the Athenians resonates with Thucydides' belief that the Syracusans were closest in nature and constitution to the Athenians.[68]

Thus, the beauty contest invokes the *euandria* and at the same time implicitly refers to the Athenian juridical process that condemned Socrates. It allows for a derogatory representation of the Athenian populace as prostitutes, whom elite demagogues buy with superficial appeal. This negative characterization

66 Crowther (1985: 288).

67 Goldhill (1998: 108).

68 Thucydides 8.96.5: ἔδειξαν δὲ οἱ Συρακόσιοι μάλιστα γὰρ ὁμοιότροποι γενόμενοι ἄριστα καὶ προσεπολέμησαν (The Syracusans showed them this: they fought best against them because they were the most similar to them). Plutarch's assertion (*Glory of the Athenians* 345e) that Themistogenes of Syracuse was Xenophon's pseudonym (*Hell.* 3.1.2) would also support this argument.

sets the stage for Socrates' construction of an idealized relationship between the Athenian people and the elite. In what follows I will show how Socrates manifests his own defense and an improved version of the Athenian political order through an aesthetic correction he offers to the Syracusan and in his final monologue on pederasty.

After Socrates' confrontation with the Syracusan is mirrored within the elite society in a confrontation with Hermogenes for his unpleasantness, a potter's wheel is brought in on which the dancing girl is going to read and write (7.2). Socrates interrupts the performance, suggesting that the entertainment is not appropriate to a symposium (ὃ συμποσίῳ οὐδὲν προσήκει, 7.3), because it doesn't promote the same object as wine, which is pleasure (ἡδονή). He suggests that if the performers would dance figures depicting the Kharites, Horai, or Nymphs, they would be less exhausted and the symposium would be more charming (τὸ συμπόσιον πολὺ ἐπιχαριτώτερον εἶναι, 7.5).

What is it about a hired girl spinning on a potter's wheel that Socrates objects to? How does he judge spectacle? The language in his proposal provides a clue regarding his criterion for good entertainment – there is an emphasis placed on χάρις in the naming of the Kharites and in the description of the improved symposium as ἐπιχαριτώτερον. If we understand χάρις as "a willing and precious reciprocal exchange,"[69] then it is indeed lacking from the Syracusan's show. The grouping of the Kharites together with the Horai and the Nymphs evokes an erotic context.[70] Erotic reciprocity has been completely absent from the troupe's performances; the girl spinning on the wheel is so completely unengaging in this way that Socrates puts a stop to it in mid-show. The Syracusan's production in which his performers imitate objects, like the hoop or the pot on the wheel, Socrates asserts, merely offers the audience an opportunity to marvel in a way similar to what they might feel when confronted with everyday objects, like a lamp, a mirror, or olive oil and water. Through this analogy, Socrates emphasizes the objectifying effect of this entertainment. Instead of involving the audience in a transformative process, the girl's feat of reading and writing and leaping on the potter's wheel

69 Kurke (1991: 67).

70 For the congregation of the Graces and Horai in the erotic sphere see Steiner (1998: 140). See also MacLachlan (1993: 56–72) and Redfield (1982: 181–201).

is the culmination of a series of performances that emphasize the separation between the spectators and performers. For, in this feat, mimesis closes in on itself. The girl enacts the process by which she is objectified, becoming the vessel that depicts her presence at a symposium. She is the material of her own representation – the clay and the pot and the knives and the image and the word. The real and representational realms collapse on each other in meaningless mimesis, and there is nothing for the spectators to do but marvel.

In a theoretical discussion of drama, Bernard Beckerman divides theatrical activity into two categories: mimetic, or natural activities, and artificial activities. Interestingly, he specifically mentions dance, music, and acrobatics, three of the performances described in this text, in an explication of artificial theatrical activity. These activities are determined by their own logic; their rules do not emerge from natural events. These activities involve extraordinary skill and aim to produce wonder and delight. His analysis of gymnastic performances gets to the heart of Socrates' problem with the Syracusan's show:

> *In a vague way, the spectator may carry over the excitement of acrobatic performance into his own life, but by and large, the experience is non-evocative. That is, the high-wire act is self-justified. It exists for itself and does not produce emotional overtones in the individual. Rather than relate the spectator to other experiences, it isolates him in the thrill of the moment. For one thing, this activity exists wholly on the surface. It has no inner life. And without an inner life it is restricted in its capacity to project generalized meaning. For another thing, the activity is actual. What the acrobat purports to be doing, he is actually doing. He is not pretending to be skillful; he is skillful. He is not pretending that danger exists; danger does exist, unless, of course, the activity is mere hoax.*[71]

Thus far, all of the sympotic performances have existed purely on the surface. Whether they be music or dance, death-defying acrobatic stunts, or the imitation of a hoop or a drinking cup, the entertainment has provided a momentary pleasure or thrill that fades with the passing of the act. Each performance has been discrete, and totally artificial, forging no connections between the actors and the audience.

71 Beckerman (1970: 16–17).

Without elaboration, the Syracusan understands Socrates' critique and promises to return with a spectacle that will delight him. It is an enactment of the marriage of Ariadne and Dionysos in which little acting is necessary – the physical desire of the actors for one another is a perfect fit for the divine roles they play:

> *εὐθὺς μὲν γὰρ ἡ Ἀριάδνη ἀκούσασα τοιοῦτόν τι ἐποίησεν ὡς πᾶς ἂν ἔγνω ὅτι ἀσμένη ἤκουσε: καὶ ὑπήντησε μὲν οὒ οὐδὲ ἀνέστη, δήλη δ᾽ ἦν μόλις ἠρεμοῦσα. ἐπεί γε μὴν κατεῖδεν αὐτὴν ὁ Διόνυσος, ἐπιχορεύσας ὥσπερ ἂν εἴ τις φιλικώτατα ἐκαθέζετο ἐπὶ τῶν γονάτων, καὶ περιλαβὼν ἐφίλησεν αὐτήν. ἡ δ᾽ αἰδουμένῃ μὲν ἐῴκει, ὅμως δὲ φιλικῶς ἀντιπεριελάμβανεν. οἱ δὲ συμπόται ὁρῶντες ἅμα μὲν ἐκρότουν, ἅμα δὲ ἐβόων αὖθις. ὡς δὲ ὁ Διόνυσος ἀνιστάμενος συνανέστησε μεθ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ τὴν Ἀριάδνην, ἐκ τούτου δὴ φιλούντων τε καὶ ἀσπαζομένων ἀλλήλους σχήματα παρῆν θεάσασθαι. οἱ δ᾽ ὁρῶντες ὄντως καλὸν μὲν τὸν Διόνυσον, ὡραίαν δὲ τὴν Ἀριάδνην, οὐ σκώπτοντας δὲ ἀλλ᾽ ἀληθινῶς τοῖς στόμασι φιλοῦντας, πάντες ἀνεπτερωμένοι ἐθεῶντο. καὶ γὰρ ἤκουον τοῦ Διονύσου μὲν ἐπερωτῶντος αὐτὴν εἰ φιλεῖ αὐτόν, τῆς δὲ οὕτως ἐπομνυούσης ὥστε μὴ μόνον τὸν Διόνυσον ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς παρόντας ἅπαντας συνομόσαι ἂν ἦ μὴν τὸν παῖδα καὶ τὴν παῖδα ὑπ᾽ ἀλλήλων φιλεῖσθαι. ἐῴκεσαν γὰρ οὐ δεδιδαγμένοις τὰ σχήματα ἀλλ᾽ ἐφειμένοις πράττειν ἃ πάλαι ἐπεθύμουν. τέλος δὲ οἱ συμπόται ἰδόντες περιβεβληκότας τε ἀλλήλους καὶ ὡς εἰς εὐνὴν ἀπιόντας, οἱ μὲν ἄγαμοι γαμεῖν ἐπώμνυσαν, οἱ δὲ γεγαμηκότες ἀναβάντες ἐπὶ τοὺς ἵππους ἀπήλαυνον πρὸς τὰς ἑαυτῶν γυναῖκας, ὅπως τούτων τύχοιεν. Σωκράτης δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων οἱ ὑπομείναντες πρὸς Λύκωνα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν σὺν Καλλίᾳ περιπατήσοντες ἀπῆλθον.*

> *Right away, when Ariadne heard (the music) she acted so that everyone might know that she was delighted to hear it. And although she stayed seated, and did not stand up, it was clear that she sat still with difficulty. Then, when Dionysos looked at her, he danced toward her and in a most loving way sat on her lap, embraced and kissed her. She seemed like a modest maiden, but nevertheless returned his embrace lovingly. As the symposiasts watched, they clapped and cried out "Again." After Dionysos stood up and helped Ariadne up with him there was presented the pose of lovers kissing and caressing one another. The audience saw a truly beautiful Dionysos and beautiful Ariadne not pretending but truly kissing with their mouths, and everyone watching was lifted aloft on wings. Then they heard Dionysos asking her if she loved him, and she promised that she did in such a way that not only Dionysos but also all those present would swear that the boy and the girl were in love. For they seemed not as if they had been taught the poses, but as if they were allowed to do what they had long desired. Finally, as the symposiasts looked on them embracing one another and going off as if to the marriage bed, those who were unmarried swore that they would get married, and those who were married mounted their horses and rode off toward their wives, so that they might chance upon them. As for Socrates and the others who stayed behind, they went out to take a walk with Kallias joining Lykon and his son.* (9.3–7)

This final performance gives full play to the erotics of the gaze. The audience perceives the desire of the actors as they look at each other from within the position of their roles: Dionysos approaches Ariadne as if he were her lover (ὥσπερ ἂν εἴ τις) and she is like a modest maiden (ἡ δ᾽αἰδουμένῃ μὲν ἐῴκει). When the pretense of performance dissolves in their standing embrace, and they finally act on their mutual desire, the symposiasts witness an epiphany of Dionysos. There is a total cathexis of the actors and their roles that completely engages the audience. When Dionysos asks Ariadne if she loves him, the audience perceives the love of the actors (ἡ παῖς and ὁ παῖς). The complementarity of physical attraction and its divine representation is an erotically motivating sight for the symposiasts. They all desire to live the representation and go home to their wives, or if they don't have one, swear to get one. Thus, the subject–object dynamics implied by spectacle are diminished – the show seems to depict subject positions the audience members desire to, or already, inhabit.

Unlike the girl's previous performance in which she represented what Socrates implied was the dull fact of materiality, a hoop or a clay pot, here, in

the person of Ariadne, Dionysos' bride, she moves toward the divine realm. She makes this ascent by acting out her emotions – the performance is a representation of the truth. Socrates' injection of χάρις into the scene of the hired entertainers dispels the objectification of the performers, replacing it with a vision of perfect reciprocity. The axis of heterosexual erotics that is thus inscribed in the sequence of the performances moves from the material world through heterosexual reciprocity toward immortality.

The language of this scene lays heavy emphasis on mutuality. Indeed, forms of ἀλλήλων, a pronoun that encapsulates the notion of reciprocity, occur three times. The girl responds in kind to the boy's advances (ἀντιπεριελάμβανεν), and her actions reflect his (ἀνιστάμενος συνανέστησε). The mutual feelings they share emanate outward to the audience; when the girl swears her love (ἐπομνυούσης), the audience swears that their love is real (συνομόσαι). This performance lacks any suggestion of artifice (ἐῴκεσαν γὰρ οὐ δεδιδαγμένοις τὰ σχήματα ἀλλ' ἐφειμένοις πράττειν ἃ πάλαι ἐπεθύμουν) (For they seemed not as if they had been taught all the poses, but as if they were allowed to do what they had long desired); it seems just the opposite of Beckerman's constructed activity.

By incorporating Socrates' suggestions into their performance, the troupe has migrated from the realm of the short-term, artificial, moneyed transaction to the elite world of reciprocal exchange. At the end of the *Symposium,* the entertainers of ambiguous status that Kallias hired for his banquet, with the help of Socrates' teaching, have graduated to the discursive level of courtesanship. They are described unambiguously in the language of *charis;* their status has risen to the level of a long-term erotic, reciprocal engagement that befits the private elite symposium.

Earlier in the evening the girl was characterized as a hired worker who performed a service with immediate and short-lived consequences. Although she was never called a *porne,* she was associated with the marketplace and cash transactions. Now she is characterized by *charis,* and her sexuality is located on a longer-term temporal continuum. Significantly, the same move that elevates her to the status of *hetaira,* thus refashioning her in a way more appropriate to the elite sympotic context, casts her in a distinctly civic role. Entertainer's enactment of the marriage of Dionysos and Ariadne certainly evokes the ritual marriage between Dionysos and the wife of the Archon *Basileus,* discussed in Chapter 1, that was performed at the Athenian Anthesteria, a fertility festival

celebrating the arrival of spring.[72] [Dem.] describes this ritual-marriage as an ancient and holy rite that took place in the Boukolion, the oxherd's house in the agora.[73] Participation in the festival consolidated the Athenian community: "the Athenian becomes conscious of his Athenian-ness by the fact that he participates in the Anthesteria celebrations."[74] It was required that the woman who played this ritual role was a virgin of citizen birth at the time of her marriage. At the moment that Xenophon reconfigures the hired entertainer unambiguously as a *hetaira,* she simultaneously is playing the role of chaste wife and goddess. By having the prostitute play the role of Ariadne, he locates her in an explicitly civic formation of the feminine. The *agora* is evoked in Kallias' *andron.* In this image there is a seamless superimposition of elite and civic discourse.

At this juncture in the text, the gender of the performers is significant. For, if in a sense, the *pornai* have become *hetairai,* the *pornos* becomes a *hetairos.* The women are still prostitutes of one kind or another, but what of the young man? Assuming the role of Dionysos, he becomes the ultimate symposiast. As the other celebrants watch him come on to the girl, there is little to distinguish him from this elite company. Recalling the suggestion that this troupe represents the Athenian people, it becomes clear that Socrates' involvement in this symposium has had a double effect. For not only has he introduced the language of the *polis* into the sympotic scene, he has also refashioned the Athenian people as the companions, *hetairai* and *hetairoi,* of the elite. By figuring the Athenian people through the lens of prostitution, though, these "companions" are ushered in through the back door. The male *hetairos* is constructed on analogy with the *hetaira,* instead of the other way around.[75] At the same time that Socrates' system raises the Athenian people to a level where they can make exchanges with the elite, the extent of their social elevation is limited

72 "Dionysos and Ariadne can be seen as a reflection of this ritual. We get the 'king' of Athens, Theseus who retires and leaves Ariadne to Dionysos." Aviagnou (1991: 181). See Chapter 1 of this book.

73 Part of the festival's aetiology cites Orestes' arrival at Athens and Pandion's reception of him (Eur. *Iph. in Tauris* 947–960). It memorializes the democracy's dynastic past ([Dem.] 59. 75). Burkert (1985: 239–241).

74 Burkert (1985: 241). Alkiphron 4.18; 10 ff.; Callimachus fr. 178.

75 Cf. Davidson (2006), who argues that etymologically *hetairos* is the masculine form of *hetaira,* instead of the other way around.

by their association with female entertainers, whether they be prostitutes or courtesans.

Thus, the epiphany of Dionysos has dissolved oppositions. In the mingling of the two lovers, there is a melding of actor and audience, real and represented, human and divine. In their final performance the entertainers rise to the representational level of the symposiasts themselves. The complete mutuality of this tableau stands in direct contrast to the other erotic scene in the text – the pederastic spectacle that began the symposium. When all eyes were on Autolykos, he was characterized as a sudden light appearing in the night sky (ὥσπερ ὅταν φέγγος τι ἐν νυκτὶ φανῇ, πάντων προσάγεται τὰ ὄμματα, οὕτω καὶ τότε τοῦ Αὐτόλυκου τὸ κάλλος πάντων εἷλκε τάς ὄψεις πρὸς αὐτόν) (Just as when a light appears in the night, it draws the eyes of all, so even the beauty of Autolykos drew the eyes of everyone toward him; 1.8), an analogy that aligns Autolykos with the girl who performed her own objectification. Socrates criticized her entertainment on the basis that she was merely representing material objects, like a lamp or a flame. He admitted that these were θαύματα, but commented that they did not promote the object of the Symposium, that is, reciprocity.[76] So Autolykos in his beauty is depicted as a light, a stunning and ephemeral one at that, but an object to marvel at nonetheless. As I suggested above, the levels of spectacle depicted in the *Symposium* are interrelated. The issues played out through the course of the Syracusan's performance were picked up and accommodated by the elite spectacle of the symposium. Indeed, the lesson of mutuality that Socrates imparts to the Syracusan has its counterpart in the realm of the symposiasts. For, in Socrates' final disquisition (which actually comes before the final performance), he constructs a system of homoerotic reciprocity.

In the beginning of the *Symposium*, Autolykos is depicted as an exalted object of male desire. Showing the proper measure of shame, and not returning the communal gaze directed at him, makes his beauty an even more erotically charged sight. Yet, as I mentioned above, his objectification is paralyzing and nearly suspends the entire symposium in one-way admiration. As Michel Foucault has argued, there was no dishonor for a man to desire a boy; indeed, the *eromenos* was an honorable erotic conquest, but there was also a great deal of

76 Interestingly, Socrates is also linked to these human *thaumata* through the association with light. Kritoboulos demanded that a light be turned on Socrates during the beauty contest to illuminate his looks.

anxiety regarding the boy as object of desire "insofar as he would have to become the master in the pleasure that was enjoyed with others and in the power that was exercised over oneself."[77] David Halperin has shown how this self-mastery is linked to political inclusion.[78] In his final monologue (8.1–8.42), Socrates addresses the problem of the nascent citizen as object. Just as his critique of the hired entertainment effects a move away from objectification in that sphere, so in the realm of pederasty he offers a construction of homoerotic desire that circumvents homoerotic objectification.

To create a system of reciprocal masculine erotics, Socrates invokes the gaze of the *eromenos* and the spectacle of Athenian politics. First, he describes the components of a mutual love: trust, sympathy, and joy in the face of good fortune and health, solicitousness in the face of bad. Notably, he begins this list with a reciprocal gaze: (πῶς οὐκ ἀνάγκη τούτους ἡδέως μὲν προσορᾶν ἀλλήλους/How is it not necessary that they look sweetly toward one another . . . ?; 8.18) His idealized relationship is contrasted to the emphatically not reciprocal sex between an *erastes* and his object: οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁ παῖς τῷ ἀνδρὶ ὥσπερ γυνὴ κοινωνεῖ τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἀφροδισίοις εὐφροσυνῶν, ἀλλὰ νήφων μεθύοντα ὑπὸ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης θεᾶται (For unlike the woman, a boy does not share in the delights of sexual love with a man, but sober he looks on a man drunk under the influence of Aphrodite; 8.21). In this construction the erotic object assumes the subject position through the attribution of the gaze. It should be stressed that granting subjectivity to the *eromenos* is a radical departure from the conventions of representation. By making the *eromenos* a subject, in the midst of the sexual act, Socrates refuses to gloss over the contradiction at the heart of pederasty. In his use of θεᾶται, which invokes the semantic field of civic spectatorship, the role of erotic object and civic participant coalesce in the person of the παῖς.

Instead of taking part in this unequal exchange, Socrates advises Kallias to become a model of civic excellence for his beloved. He compliments Kallias for loving Autolykos, who is in a position to develop his athletic prowess into civic virtue:

> *εἰ δὲ οἴοιτο μὴ μόνον ἑαυτὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα*
> *κοσμήσειν, ἀλλ᾽ ἱκανὸς γενήσεσθαι δι᾽ ἀνδραγαθίαν*

77 Foucault (1985: 225).
78 Halperin (1989: 88–12).

> *καὶ φίλους εὖ ποιεῖν καὶ τὴν πατρίδα αὔξειν*
> *τροπαῖα τῶν πολεμίων ἱστάμενος, καὶ διὰ ταῦτα*
> *περίβλεπτός τε καὶ ὀνομαστὸς ἔσεσθαι καὶ ἐν*
> *Ἕλλησι καὶ ἐν βαρβάροις, πῶς οὐκ οἴει αὐτόν,*
> *ὅντιν' ἡγοῖτο εἰς ταῦτα συνεργὸν εἶναι κράτιστον,*
> *τοῦτον ταῖς μεγίσταις ἂν τιμαῖς περιέπειν;*

> *And if you believe that he intends not only to decorate himself and his father, but also to be capable through his courageous virtue to do well for his friends and to augment his fatherland by setting up trophies against his enemies, and because of this to be conspicuous and famous among both the Greeks and the barbarians, don't you think that he would hold in the highest honor whomever he thought would be the most powerful accomplice toward these ends?* (8.38)

The next stage for the athletic victor is civic service, and again the motivation is to occupy the limelight – military victories will make Autolykos conspicuous in the arena of international politics. Socrates prescribes a future for Autolykos in which his allegiance to his father is transferred to the city and his athletic prowess combines with *arete* to become civic virtue. He goes on to exhort Kallias to consider what qualities characterized the heroes of Athenian democracy – Perikles, Themistokles, and Solon. But this process of discovery will involve a new kind of looking – he uses the words σκεπτέον, ἀθρητέον ἐρευνητέον – that is, the contemplative consideration of philosophy.

Socrates' monologue concludes with an apology for such serious discourse at a symposium, which he justifies by saying: ἀγαθῶν γὰρ φύσει καὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς φιλοτίμως ἐφιεμένων ἀεί ποτε τῇ πόλει συνεραστὴς ὢν διατελῶ (For I have always been a *sunerastes* together with the city of men who are good in nature and desire virtue vigorously; 8.41). In his final statement, Socrates has aligned himself with the city as the desiring subject whose objects of desire are elite citizens who make a display of their civic excellence. By factoring the city as a third term in the sphere of elite homoerotics, the *erastes* and the *eromenos* are mutually cast as performers of elite citizenship. The addition of the *polis* into the pederastic equation establishes a dialectic that allows for the simultaneous subjectivity of the *erastes* and *eromenos*. Now cast with Socrates as an *erastes* of elite culture, the *polis* has been absorbed by sympotic culture. The text has redirected the civic gaze from one that exists in contrast to the elite erotic gaze to one that is assimilated to elite

culture.[79] This movement parallels the transformation that has occurred on the level of the sympotic performance. Moreover, Socrates' speech enacts the erotic dynamics he has configured, for the philosopher's advice is addressed to both Kallias and Autolykos. Just as they are both the objects of the civic erotic gaze, so they are both the recipients of Socrates' *paideia*.[80] The philosopher is given pride of place in this homosocial order as the model toward which Kallias strives and as the adviser to the civic elite.

When Socrates finishes his speech, his dialectic reciprocity is immediately put into practice by Autolykos and Kallias:

> *οἱ μὲν δὴ ἄλλοι περὶ τῶν ῥηθέντων διελέγοντο, ὁ δ' Αὐτόλυκος κατεθεᾶτο τὸν Καλλίαν. καὶ ὁ Καλλίας δὲ παρορῶν εἰς ἐκεῖνον εἶπεν· Οὐκοῦν σύ με, ὦ Σώκρατες, μαστροπεύσεις πρὸς τὴν πόλιν, ὅπως πράττω τὰ πολιτικὰ καὶ ἀεὶ ἀρεστὸς ὦ αὐτῇ;*
>
> *The others were talking about the things that had been said, but Autolykos was looking at Kallias. And Kallias looked sideways at him and said, "Therefore, Socrates, will you procure me for the city so that I may participate in politics and always be pleasing to the* polis?" (8.42)

At last Autolykos and Kallias can look into one another's eyes, because Socrates has constructed a system where elite homoerotics are pleasing to the city.

The tableau of pederasty presented at the beginning of the text depicted an erotic dynamic that was a one-way street. Xenophon offers a political characterization of the admiration of Autolykos when he says that an onlooker would have thought that beauty is a kingly thing (βασιλικόν τι τὸ κάλλος εἶναι, 1.8). In contrast, his new erotics are characterized by reciprocity between the man and boy and between the *polis* and the elite. In a sense Socrates' correction to homoerotic objectification has commuted the political model for pederasty from an autocracy to a *polis* that not only supports an elite microculture but validates it through an erotic cathexis modeled along the lines of sympotic pederasty. With the *polis* as the lover of the elite, their ascendancy is not only valorized, it is fetishized.

79 On the shift from public to private see Azoulay (2004: 392).

80 The coalescence of the *eromenos* and *erastes* as objects of desire and recipients of Socratic *paideia* was forecast in the first erotic scene when the gaze broadens its focus to take in Kallias (and the other symposiasts) as well as Autolykos.

For the purposes of my analysis, I have taken the text out of order. But Xenophon does not end his *Symposium* with an affirmation of homoerotics. The company disbands after watching the enactment of the marriage of Dionysos to Ariadne, inspired by the desire to go home to their wives, or if they don't have one, to get one. Although there are no wives present at this symposium, a nearly universal desire for wives is produced when the prostitute plays the part of the legitimate wife as she performs ritual. Through this superimposition, the role of wife is both eroticized and legitimized. This symposium ends in a kind of anti-*komos,* where the chaotic destruction of the return homeward has been transformed into an affirmation of marriage.[81]

Pederasty has become specular and asexual, and the sympotic sphere has been refashioned on a civic model of ritual heterosexuality. Attributes of the elite and the *demos* have been redistributed to neutralize any threat or difference the symposium represented to the *polis.* Socrates has corrected the tense relationship between the city and the symposium that has troubled this banquet by introducing a transformed paradigm of exchange. The emblem of this transformation is the recasting of the prostitute in the image of a role of Ariadne – an allusion to the sacred marriage performed at the Anthesteria. Under Socrates' direction we move from homoerotic politics to a tableau that suggests the most normative of civic values – a celebration of heterosexual marriage that signifies the fertility of the land, the fertility of the people, and a lasting relationship between the human and the divine. This is Xenophon's apology – if we know how to interpret performance with our γνώμη, we understand that Socrates was committed to the civic good.

When the show is over, Kallias and Socrates go out to join Autolykos and his father on their walk.[82] In the end there is a comfortable coexistence of a civic sphere of reciprocal homosocial activity, where men exchange amorous looks and emulate one another before the collective gaze of the *polis,* and a private heterosexual realm – the rightful place for sexual gratification. This

81 In Dem. 54. 7–9, "The Speech against Konon," Ariston describes himself as the victim of drunken carousing. See also 54.14 for the violent behavior of the Ithyphalloi and the Autolekythoi.

82 The father and son left just before the sex scene (9.1). Wohl (2004: 356) similarly argues that this move allows Xenophon to have it both ways: he encourages the heterosexuality of the *polis,* while advocating a chaste pederasty to his followers, including Kallias and Autolykos.

new order is constituted by applying pederastic practice to political life and incorporating the heterosexual ideology as expressed by civic ritual into the erotics of the symposium.

In his final monologue and the final performance, Socrates brings together all the disparate terms raised in the course of the narrative: he unites the performers with one another; he relates their spectacle to the symposium; he makes Kallias attractive to Autolykos; he establishes a relationship between elite display and the Athenian culture of viewing. His concept of reciprocity applies to both the issues of spectacle and economics. Socrates is the consummate procurer, and it is his skill in this disreputable art that makes him useful to the city.

In Xenophon's *Symposium* the reformation of the prostitute in the image of a ritual performer stokes marital desire. As director of this transformation, Socrates is depicted as nurturing a kind of heterosexual *eros* that serves the city's interest. Far from inventing new gods, he traffics in the semantics of civic ritual. He advocates a sexless pederasty that challenges the elites to ever grander heights of civic virtue. Through his engagement with the protocols of feminine performance in public, we encounter a Socrates who is a champion of Athenian civic interest and can integrate the elite within the *demos.* In their depictions of symposia, both Plato and Xenophon evoke a continuum of feminine roles, starting with a hired entertainer and culminating in a sacred marriage to construct an erotic hierarchy, but they do so with diametrically different effect. Plato uses a ranking of women to gesture beyond itself, whereas Xenophon manipulates the relationship between the prostitute and ritual performer to celebrate the middle term – to eroticize the wife, to revel in the here and now (albeit nostalgically), and to demonstrate Socrates' commitment to Athenian interests. Ultimately Xenophon's evocation of the feminine continuum has more in common with the speech "Against Neaira" than it does with Plato's *Symposium,* because they share a commitment to civic health, whereas Plato's concerns lie elsewhere. In both of these texts, there is a valorization of reciprocity and civic reproduction: the proper regulation of the taxonomy of women is the outward sign of a well-ordered *polis*. In the next chapter we will see the havoc that war can wreak on the order of women.

5. Sex and Sacrifice in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*

INTRODUCTION

The previous chapters have illuminated the way that a variety of Athenian authors construct femininity through a negotiation of various public roles for women. In this chapter, moving backward in time, I will show how this polyvalent discourse was at play on the comic stage. I will suggest that in *Lysistrata,* Aristophanes represents the women of Greece by combining the idiom of the prostitute with that of the priestess and ultimately subjects the prostitute to the process of ritualization. In a sense this analysis provides a counterpoint to the dynamics explored in "Against Neaira": there we saw the threat posed by a prostitute who trespassed into the realm of civic ritual; in this chapter we will encounter the mechanism by which ritual could contain the potential disorder posed by the prostitute.

By elaborating the relationship between the sacred and sexual in his depiction of women, Aristophanes avails himself of a rich spectrum of juxtapositions and unexpected associations for the sake of his comedy. The image of the prostitute is superimposed over that of the priestess, resulting in humorous associations of sex and food, the sacred and the profane, the bedroom and the temple.[1] In addition to providing fodder for humor, the conflation of sex and ritual also imparts a violent undertone to the play.

Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* was produced in 411 BCE and was performed at the Lenaia, a festival in honor of Dionysos, to an audience composed exclusively of Athenians.[2] It was just two years after the disastrous Athenian expedition to Sicily, which resulted in extensive casualties. When the play was performed, the Spartans were securely garrisoned at Deceleia, trade routes were cut off, and Athenian allies were ready to revolt. Alcibiades was advising the Spartans,

1 Faraone (2004) also traces these roles in the representation of the women in the play. I will discuss his conclusions further.

2 On dating see Henderson (1987: xv); Sommerstein (1977: 112–126). At *Ach.* 504–506, Aristophanes describes the Lenaia as a domestic festival with no strangers or allies present. On the festival see Pickard-Cambridge (1988: 24–42).

and the Persians were backing them with financial support. Despite this dire predicament, however, the Athenians remained bellicose – they had appointed an extraordinary body, the *Probouloi,* to expedite the handling of wartime fiscal and policy decisions. They had been able to build and man new ships and had forced the retreat of a Peloponnesian naval force into a Corinthian harbor.[3]

Given this grim political context, the *Lysistrata* has been interpreted as a fantasy. The play, in which the women of Greece take over the Akropolis and foreswear sex with their husbands until the warring factions come to terms with one another, has generally been seen as one that emphasizes peace, fertility, and marriage. Jeffrey Henderson calls it "a triumph of wish fulfillment over reality."[4] According to Douglas MacDowell, "The audience is left with more favorable thoughts about Sparta than are to be found in any other play of Aristophanes."[5]

On the surface *Lysistrata* is a peace play, but as I argue here, the peace plot is undermined by deliberate but coded expressions of aggression toward Athens' enemies. Indeed, a reconciliation fantasy seems a suspiciously simplistic political message to attribute to Aristophanes. There can be no doubt that the battered yet still feisty Athenians in the audience were war-weary. However, as Thucydides has it, in spite of the odds they faced, and the major setbacks they had suffered, the Athenians remained intensely hostile toward the Spartans.[6]

If we keep in mind that the Athenians were still actively pursuing war with the Spartans, and were having some degree of success in this endeavor, it becomes difficult to see the humor in an all-out pro-Spartan peace fantasy. While the desire for an end to the war would have been entirely reasonable, the idea of giving up and making friends with the Spartans just isn't that funny. It seems implausible that the Athenians, engaged in conflict in this second phase of the Peloponnesian War almost continuously for twenty years, would

3 These events are narrated in Thucydides, Bk. 8. See also Dover (1972: 158); Henderson (1987: xv–xxv).

4 Henderson (1987: xxix); Dillon (1987: 97–104) sees the play as a post-Deceleian peace play, with women symbolizing fertility. Dover suggests that the ending of the play is a reminder that sexual love, festivals, dancing, and poetry are more pleasurable than war. See also Newiger (1996: 143–161).

5 MacDowell (1995: 246).

6 Thuc. 7.28.3.

suddenly start seeing the good side of Sparta. The advantage of reading the peace fantasy as ambivalent is that it accommodates a broader spectrum of the political positions probably represented by the audience of this play. Because the means by which peace is obtained in *Lysistrata* are so ridiculous in their context – women on top, old women warriors, sex-starved men – it seems appropriate that we carefully scrutinize the nature of this peace.

Through a close consideration of the construction of femininity in *Lysistrata* I will suggest that the women of Greece are not simply the collaborative peaceniks they claim to be. There is a dark side of their peace plot. This violent subtext is represented in the language and practice of sacrifice and gives expression to an underlying current of Athenian hostility toward Sparta and its allies. To understand this play we need to be able to see double.

Thus, the essential ambivalence of this play becomes apparent when we consider the prism through which femininity is projected and how the action of the play engages with Aristophanes' characterization of the women of Greece. It should be noted that Aristophanes' manipulation of the parallelism and overlap of the scripts for the ritual agent and prostitute is exuberant. Not every permutation of the convergence of sex and ritual that he presents furthers the plot, nor are they all integrated into a perfectly cohesive whole. However, at times the way Aristophanes simultaneously evokes the sphere of ritual and of prostitution is crucial to understanding the message of the play. In the next two sections I will explore how the depiction of the women in the play evokes generally cultic and erotic scripts for women in public. Then I will describe how the simultaneous reading of these different registers shapes our understanding of the play.

RITUAL AND EROTICS

Thus far, this study has traced perceived similarities between women's cultic and erotic presence in the public sphere as well as the cultural imperative to maintain distinctions between women as sexual agents and ritual practitioners. The danger of the assimilation of women's cultic and erotic agency stems from their overlap – each one of these roles affords a woman a certain degree of public agency, and each embraces feminine sexuality.[7] Perhaps the most

7 Scholia to Lucian, *Dialogues of the Courtesans* 2.1 and 7.4, describe the proceedings at the Thesmophoria and Haloa, which involved ribald language and genitals made out

purely erotic (i.e., without implication of reproduction) articulation of feminine sexuality in the cultic realm is associated with the worship of Adonis. In *Lysistrata* the confluence of the imagery of the sexual and the cultic is reinforced by allusions to many aspects of the myths and rites associated with this young god. Indeed, *Adoniazousai* is one of *Lysistrata's* alternate ancient titles.[8]

The name Myrrhine is deliberately chosen. It derives from Myrrha, which is the name of Adonis' mother; Adonis was born of an incestuous union between Myrrha and her father. At the time of Adonis' birth, Myrrha had been transformed into a tree. When he was born, Aphrodite fell in love with him, hid him in a chest, and handed him over to Persephone, who also fell in love with him and refused to give him back. Zeus arbitrated between the two, arranging that Adonis would spend part of each year with Persephone and the other part with Aphrodite. When he reached his prime, he was gored to death by a wild boar.[9]

Aspects of Myrrhine's characterization seem to draw on the connection to Myrrha: when Myrrhine is sexually teasing Kinesias, he calls her a pet name, Myrrhion (906), which could be a diminutive for Myrrha; both women are seductresses associated with erotic perfume; as if to reinforce the significance of her name, Myrrhine and Kinesias argue over perfume, in a dispute that involves a volley of words related to τὸ μύρον (938, 940, 942, 946); Detienne notes the resemblance between Myrrhine and Myrrha, pointing out that in one of the versions of the myth of Adonis, his mother is changed not into a myrrh tree but a sprig of myrtle.[10]

The Adonia were celebrated in private homes, were marginal to civic life, and didn't interrupt its quotidian routine. One element of these rites involved women forcing potted gardens to grow at the height of summer. They moved

of dough and other sexual symbols. For the texts and the problems posed by their interpretation see Lowe (1998).

8 The scholiast rejects this title. It was also referred to as *Diallagai,* according to a scholiast's note on 1114. Adonis and his worship provided material for other comic poets: we have attestations of seven plays entitled *Adonis* or *Adoniazousai.* Winkler (1990: 190). Fragments are preserved of an *Adonis* by Plato Comicus and an *Adoniazousai* by Philippides; Diphilus Fr. 43; 39–41, Kock, II 554.

9 The most complete source for this myth is Panyassis *ap.* [Apollodoros] *Bibl.* 4.14.4. In other versions Adonis' death is either engineered by Artemis or carried out by Apollo, who appears as the boar.

10 Detienne (1977: 62).

the gardens around from place to place, and they ultimately brought them up to the rooftop where the festival was celebrated.[11] There is a reference to this aspect of the festival when the old women say that they are watering the old men so that they will sprout (ἄρδω σ' ὅπως ἀναβλαστανεῖς, 384).[12]

The festival was celebrated by men and women; it condoned licentious behavior and involved fancy clothes and feasting.[13] All of these elements figure in the play. The rite seems to have involved statues of Adonis over which women mourned.[14] This facet of the ritual is echoed when the women joke about preparing the Proboulos' corpse (610–614). At some point in the celebration of the Adonia, the women would let out a lament for the beautiful boy lost in his prime. In *Lysistrata* the Proboulos mentions the festival, juxtaposing its disruptive feminine ritual language with the serious deliberations of the *ekklesia:*

> *ἆρ' ἐξέλαμψε τῶν γυναικῶν ἡ τρυφὴ*
> *χὠ τυμπανισμὸς χοἰ πυκνοὶ Σαβάζιοι,*
> *ὅ οὗ τ' Ἀδωνιασμὸς οὑτος οὑπὶ τῶν τεγῶν,*
> *οὗ 'γώ ποτ' ὢν ἤκουον ἐν τἠκκλησίᾳ;*
> *ἔλεγεν ὁ μὴ ὥρασι μὲν Δημόστρατος*
> *πλεῖν εἰς Σικελίαν, ἡ γυνὴ δ' ὀρχουμένη*
> *'αἰαῖ Ἄδωνιν' φησίν. ὁ δὲ Δημόστρατος*
> *ἔλεγεν ὁπλίτας καταλέγειν Ζακυνθίων,*
> *ἡ δ' ὑποπεπωκυῖ' ἡ γυνὴ 'πὶ τοῦ τέγους*
> *'κόπτεσθ' Ἄδωνιν' φησίν. ὁ δ' ἐβιάζετο,*
> *ὁ θεοῖσιν ἐχθρὸς καὶ μιαρὸς Χολοζύγης.*
> *τοιαῦτ' ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἐστιν ἀκολοστήματα.*

> *The hedonism of the wives was clear as day – There was tambourine playing and the cries of Sabazios were thick and fast. There was a celebration of Adonis on the roofs, which I heard when I was in the assembly. Demostratos was saying "May you sail with good fortune to Sicily," while his wife said "Woe for Adonis" as she danced. But Demostratos told us to gather the hoplites from the Zacynthians, while his wife,*

11 Sources (Detienne 1977: 170n.39). Criticized by Reed (1995).

12 Greek text follows Henderson (1987).

13 Philippides (20).

14 Alkiphron, *Letters of the Courtesans* 4.14.

already quite drunk on the roof, said, "Beat your breast for Adonis." But he persisted in pressing his agenda, the foul maniac, hated by the gods. Such is the incontinence of these women. (387–399)

The Proboulos' assessment of the licentious behavior of the Athenian wives would have seemed clearly benighted to the audience, who were painfully aware of the disastrous consequences of the Sicilian expedition. Far from being the irrational, excessive interruption he narrates, Demostratos' wife's lamentation for Adonis dead in his prime was prophetic of the decimation the Athenian forces were to suffer in Sicily. The ritual mourning of Adonis foreshadows the grief so many Athenian women will feel for sons and husbands killed in Sicily.

Plutarch preserves another perspective on the departure of the expedition during the celebration and the sense of foreboding this festival may have created:

Not a few also were somewhat disconcerted by the character of the days in the midst of which they dispatched their armament. The women were celebrating at that time the festival of Adonis, and in many places throughout the city little images of the god were laid out for burial, and funeral rites were held about them, with wailing cries of women, so that those who cared anything for such matters were distressed, and feared lest that powerful armament, with all the splendor and vigor which were so manifest in it, should speedily wither away and come to naught. (Nic. 13.7 *trans. Perrin*)[15]

The loss and deprivation the women endured because of Athenian lust for empire is famously and poignantly articulated elsewhere in the play: the women claim the right to advise the city because they contribute sons to the city, ἄνδρας εἰσφέρω (651), they lose them, and they are denied the possibility of enjoying their own sexual prime (588–597).

If we think of the Adonia as rites in which Athenian women played the role of Aphrodite – activating her power both in its sexual and sacred aspect, mourning the loss of her young son/lover – we might consider this rite as paradigmatic for the play as a whole, and as a sufficient explanation for the depiction of women in the image of the priestess and prostitute. Indeed,

15 Cf. also *Alc.* 18.

Detienne has argued for a strong association of courtesans with the Adonia.[16] Winkler has diagnosed this reading as a symptom of Detienne's patriarchalism, pointing out that although courtesans might have been included in the rites, the evidence does not support the notion that it was their special province.[17] Indeed, the allusion to the festival in *Lysistrata* seems to suggest that the rite was celebrated by wives, and that it gave expression to a facet of feminine sexuality that was threatening to masculine civic ideology.[18]

But as the scholarship on the play from the scholiasts to the present attests, ritual allusions far exceed any one practice, or the worship of any one god or goddess.[19] The takeover of the Akropolis has been thought to evoke the Amazons.[20] The sex-strike plot has been explained through reference to the Lemnian women and the rites associated with them, as well as the Thesmophoria. The treatment of the Proboulos as woman and corpse has also been interpreted as an echo of the disappearance of King Thoas in the Lemnian story, whom his daughter Hypsiple either dressed up as a woman or hid in a coffin so that he could escape the murderous wrath of the Lemnian women. Allusion to the New Fire rite on Lemnos can also explain the play's emphasis on the olfactory and the role of fire and water in the exchanges between the old men and women.[21]

Nicole Loraux reads *Lysistrata* as using the sacred civic space of the Akropolis to mediate between the contradictory dictates of Athena and Aphrodite for Athenian femininity.[22] Lysistrata's weaving metaphor (572–586), her explicit association with her father (τοὺς δ' ἐκ πατρός τε καὶ

16 Detienne (1977: 65–66).

17 Winkler (1990: 199–209).

18 This reading supports Winkler's suggestion that the evidence that remains of this ritual may provide a way to detect the possibility of Greek women resisting patriarchal standards, perhaps even dramatizing "a small gleam of misandric humor about men's sexuality as a thing which disappears so suddenly." Winkler (1990: 205–206).

19 Sfyroeras (2004) demonstrates that sacrifice and feast are thematic elements consistently present in Athenian comedy in sequential order.

20 Bowie (1993: 184).

21 The language of odors is used at 615–619, 661–663, 686–687, and 940–946. For a discussion of these as allusion to the Lemnian rites see Martin (1987: 98–90), who calls this play "one of the most odiferous comedies of the poet" (89). See also Bowie (1993: 184–195).

22 Loraux (1993: 147–183).

γεραιτέρων λόγους/πολλοὺς ἀκούσασ' οὐ μεμούσωμαι κακῶς Listening to the many speeches of my father and older men, I have not been badly educated; 1126–1127), her masculinity (χαῖρ' ὦ πασῶν ἀνδρειοτάτη, 1108), and the setting of the play on the Akropolis characterize the heroine in a way that bears a striking resemblance to Athena herself.[23] Aristophanes' play is thus richly allusive of a range of women's roles in ritual.[24] Indeed, the old women claim as their authority to advise the city their own evolving participation in a variety of civic rituals:

> *ἡμεῖς γάρ, ὦ πάντες ἀστοί, λόγων*
> *κατάρχομεν τῇ πόλει χρησίμων·*
> *εἰκότως, ἐπεὶ χλιδῶσαν ἀγλαῶς ἔθρεψέ με·*
> *ἑπτὰ μὲν ἔτη γεγῶσ' εὐθὺς ἠρρηφόρουν·*
> *εἶτ' ἀλετρὶς ἦ δεκέτις οὖσα τἀρχηγέτι,*
> *καὶ χέουσα τόν κροκωτὸν ἄρκτος ἦ Βραυρωνίοις·*
> *κἀκανηφόρουν ποτ' οὖσα παῖς καλὴ 'χουσ'*
> *ἰσχάδων ὁρμαθόν.*
>
> *O, city dwellers, we begin a speech useful to the polis: reasonably so, since it raised me gloriously enrobed. When I turned seven, I was immediately an* arrephoros. *Then when I was ten I was a corn-grinder for our leader, and I was a bear in the* Brauronia *shedding my yellow dress. Then I carried the basket when I was a beautiful young girl, wearing the necklace of figs.* (638–646)

This passage has been much discussed for the way it preserves the course of an elite young woman's ritual development, prior to sexual maturity. It has been frequently noted that this trajectory could not have applied to many Athenian women, but rather the chorus is drawing on the civic prestige of women in their role as ritual practitioners.[25] The women refer to a range of cultic offices and identify themselves in relation to a variety of rituals. Here it will not be my purpose to consider the relationship of the action or particular references

23 Foley (1982: 9); Loraux (1980–1981: 119–120).

24 Bowie (1993: 178–204) surveys the play's many allusions to myth and ritual. He reads the action as situated between the contradictions inherent in Athenian male views of women and their social roles as they are embodied by the Thesmophoria and Adonia.

25 Bowie (1993: 180); Goff (2004: 361); Henderson (1987: 154–155); Sourvinou-Inwood (1988: 137).

to a specific cult practice.[26] Rather, I will approach ritual participation in a general way, somewhat as the old women do in the passage cited above, as a lens through which women become visible as participants in the political life of the city. Thus, I will consider the representation of women as both courtesans and ritual agents as it relates to ritual conceived in broad terms, with a view toward deciphering the possible political implication of feminine ritual practice on the comic stage.

Aristophanes' depiction of the Proboulos represents men as blind to the meaning of women's rituals; the significance of these rites becomes clear only when considered in a longer temporal frame. In my reading the passage about the Adonia does not serve as a key to unlock a deeper occult reading of the play, but perhaps provides a paradigm for how we should interpret ritual generally in this play. Appearances can be misleading, and women's rituals can have political significance.

THE PRIESTESS

In this context – richly evocative of women's ritual – some of the characterizations of the women seem to make more explicit cultic references. In the late 1940s I. Papademetriou made the controversial suggestion that the name of Myrrhine, the woman who teases her already horny husband Kinesias, referred explicitly to the Priestess of Athena Nike in 411 BCE.[27] D. M. Lewis added the suggestion that Lysistrata's name is a thinly veiled reference to Lysimache, who was the priestess of Athena Polias – the highest cultic position a woman could hold in Athens – at the time of the production of play.[28] She held this office by virtue of being a member of the aristocratic Eteoboutadai *genos*. Lewis' case is supported by Lysistrata's prayer to Aphrodite when she actually invokes the name of Lysimache:

ἀλλ᾽ ἥνπερ ὅ <τε> γλυκύθυμος Ἔρως χἠ
Κυπρογένει᾽ Ἀφροδίτη

26 Although I do think this approach has produced interesting results: thus, Bowie (1993), Martin (1987).

27 Papademetriou (1948–1949: 146–153). Henderson (1987) is skeptical about this association, as is Sommerstein (1990: 5n.31).

28 Lewis (1955: 1–12). Lysistrata means dissolver of the army, and Lysimache means dissolver of battle. Interestingly, Hesychius records that στρατά, στρατή could mean πόρνη.

ἵμερον ἡμῶν κατὰ τῶν κόλπων καὶ τῶν μηρῶν
καταπνεύσῃ,
κᾆτ᾽ ἐντέξῃ τέτανον τερπνὸν τοῖς ἀνδράσι καὶ
ῥοπαλισμούς,
οἶμαί ποτε Λυσιμάχας ἡμᾶς ἐν τοῖς Ἕλλησι καλεῖσθαι.

But if sweetheart Eros and Cyprian-born Aphrodite breathe joy upon our bosoms and thighs, and so engender tense delight and woody-itis, then I think that among the Greeks, we shall be called Lysimaches. (551–554)[29]

Here the association between Lysistrata and Lysimache is patent. At the same time, this explicit link would seem to support Papademetriou's suggestion that the name Myrrhine was meant to refer to a historical woman, the priestess of Athena Nike. An inscription is preserved stating that Myrrhine, daughter of Kallimachos, was the first to tend the temple of Athena Nike.[30] Significantly the cult of Athena Nike inaugurated the practice of selecting candidates for ritual office by lot. Myrrhine is commemorated as the first selected by this means. Her epitaph reads as follows:

Καλλιμάχο θυγατρός τηλαυγές μνῆμα <τόδ᾽ ἐστιν>
ἣ πρώτη Νίκης ἀμφεπόλευσε νεών.
εὐλογίαι δ᾽ ὄνομ᾽ ἔσχε συνέμπορον, ὡς ἀπὸ θείας
Μυρρίν[η ἐ]κλήθη συντυχίας ἐτύμως;
πρώτε Ἀθηναίας Νίκες ἕδος ἀμφεπόλευσεν
ἐκ πάντων κλήρωι Μυρρίνη εὐτυχίαι.

This is the conspicuous monument of the daughter of Kallimachos, who was the first to attend the temple of Athena Nike. She had a name that was a partner to her glory, as if from divine chance she was rightly called Myrrhine. She was the first to tend the statue of Athena Nike, Myrrhine, selected by lot out of everyone in good fortune.[31]

Myrrhine's epitaph states that she was chosen for her position as guardian of the ἕδος of Athena Nike "selected by lot out of everyone." As discussed in the Introduction,[32] election by sortition out of all the Athenians reflects a shift

29 The name Lysimache is also associated with peacemaking at *Peace* 991–992. Henderson (1987: xxxix).

30 *CEG* 93 = *IG* i^3 1330.

31 Greek text is from Lewis (1955: 1).

32 See Introduction.

in the Athenian method of appointment to the priesthood that took place over the course of the fifth century. Beginning around midcentury, inscriptions start to appear indicating that certain ritual offices were appointed by lot out of all citizens, as opposed to the traditional means of selection through inheritance or qualified allotment.[33] The idea of universal eligibility of all Athenians has been seen as radically democratic – the transition in selection for sacerdotal positions has been interpreted as a reflection of the encroachment of democratic practices even into the religious sector, which had traditionally been dominated by aristocratic families. While the most prestigious priesthoods remained in possession of noble clans, and were passed along through inheritance, rituals that were new, reorganized, or imported trended toward the use of qualified or, as here, unqualified allotment as a method of selection.[34]

The epitaph announces that the choice of Myrrhine was sanctioned by divine *suntuchia* because of Myrrhine's name. It is not clear what exactly this coincidence of meaning was: it has been suggested that Myrrhine's name derives from μύρτος, and that there was a strong association of myrtle to Athena because crowns of myrtle were awarded to *archons* and Athenian generals.[35] Another thesis proposes that Myrrhine's name seemed appropriate because of the crowns made out of myrtle that priestly women wore.[36] Without resolving this disagreement, I would emphasize that the epitaph definitively states that there was an obvious connection between Myrrhine's name and her service to Athena Nike. This fact alone is germane to my argument.

Jeffrey Henderson has convincingly argued that because Athena's temple was completed in the 420s and the appointment was chosen by lot annually, it is unlikely that Myrrhine was the actual priestess when the play was performed at the Lenaia in 411. He continues:

> *The Myrrhine in our play is a typical housewife with a farcical role. It is impossible to discern any contribution to her characterization that a connection with Athena Nike would provide. Furthermore, Myrrhine is one of the most common Athenian*

33 Qualified selection means that the group out of which the selection was made had been narrowed down before the sortition as in the case of the selection of *archons* described in *Ath. Pol.* 4.3. Turner (1983: 74). Feaver (1957: 136) argues that ancestral priesthoods may also have used sortition as a method of selection within the *genos*.

34 Turner (1983: 69). See also Goff (2004: 183–184).

35 Papademetriou (1948–1949: 148); cf. Chantraine (1933).

36 Turner (1983: 95).

> *names and was evidently chosen (like Kinesias) for its sexual connotations. . . . If it suggested any cult it was Aphrodite's, not Athena's.*[37]

While I agree with Henderson that Myrrhine is not meant to be understood as identical with the contemporary priestess of Athena Nike, I think it is important that her name elicit the image of the kind of person who could occupy a sacerdotal position at the temple of Athena, as well as someone versed in the rites of love. Based on problems with the chronology – the cult was established in the 440s, and it seems probable that Myrrhine held her post after the completion of the temple in the 420s – Henderson suggests that Myrrhine was not the priestess but held a lower-echelon post.[38] This hypothesis is compatible with my argument, but I would stress that by virtue of being the *first* attendant at the temple, when a new selection process was implemented, Myrrhine's name could have a sustained association with the temple, and as we saw, the epitaph to Myrrhine noticed the divine coincidence between her name and her cultic position. In addition to this allusion, Myrrhine's name has a patent sexual connotation – the name Myrrhine was derived from the name for myrtle, which was a metaphor for female genitalia.[39] It is my contention that by means of the multiple identifications, both the sacred and the sexual are clearly and often simultaneously legible in her role and in the depiction of women in the play in general.

The impulse to deny Myrrhine's association with Athena because she has an obvious association with Aphrodite is symptomatic of modern interpretations of Greek culture. Our own strategies for schematizing women tend to infect our understanding of the way the Greeks represented the feminine, and the result is a reluctance to identify the priestess as a sexual woman. Yet, if attending Athena Nike's temple was an office awarded by allotment, then it makes sense for Myrrhine to be depicted as "a typical housewife," and none of this is inconsistent with having a sexual relationship with her husband. As MacDowell argues,

> *A priestess had the duty of performing certain rituals for a goddess, but that was not a full-time activity; a particular ritual would be due only on certain days, in some cases only one day each year. For the rest of the time she would live the same kind of*

37 Henderson (1987: xli).
38 Henderson (1987: xl–xli).
39 Henderson (1987: 174).

> *life as other women, probably with a husband and children. Thus the fact that the women in the play have domestic lives and an interest in sex is in no way incompatible with the view that they are priestesses.*[40]

Frequently there were constraints regarding sexual activity and cultic service, but these varied according to the nature of the divinity being served.[41] Myrrhine bears an association with Aphrodite and Athena, and there is no reason to assume that these connections are incompatible.[42]

In contrast to the democratically appointed ritual office that the name Myrrhine is associated with, Lysistrata, through her link to Lysimache, is associated with the most prestigious inherited sacerdotal office for a woman in Athens, the priestess of Athena Polias. This was a lifelong office that could only be occupied by an appropriate member of the elite Eteoboutadai clan. Social status is encoded in the cultic positions evoked by the names of the characters in the play. Returning to Parry and Bloch's model, we might say that Lysistrata and Myrrhine are associated with sacerdotal positions that correspond to the long- and short-term transactional orders. The priestess of Athena Polias was elite and had a lifelong tenure while Myrrhine is associated with the short-term position of an attendant that was assigned through a radically democratic procedure – unqualified allotment out of all Athenians. As Turner says, "Unqualified allotment (ἐκ πάντων) of priestly women in the Athenian cult of Athena Nike takes on special importance because other examples of allotted female priesthoods are less demonstrably 'unqualified' or 'from all.'"[43] Later I will suggest that Aristophanes uses the relationship between these two women to prescribe the proper relationship between the *demos* and the elite, when I consider Myrrhine's seduction of Kinesias.

40 MacDowell (1995: 241), where he also notes the importance of contrasting ancient priestesses to Christian nuns.

41 Goff (2004: 146–159).

42 As Helene Foley argued years ago (1982: 8), in this play the relationship between *oikos* and *polis*, as they are mapped onto the register of gender, can be understood as one of "mutually defining terms." The intricacy of this interdependence becomes even richer if we see the figure of the prostitute actively informing the depiction of women in *Lysistrata.* Where the priestess is a wife in her specialized circumscribed public role, the prostitute is the public woman performing a private service. That is to say, she makes physical intimacy a publicly traded commodity.

43 Turner (1983: 96).

The relationship of Myrrhine and Lysimache to historical women invites speculation about the Spartan Lampito. Her name was popular in Sparta and was in fact the name of the mother of King Agis II, who was besieging Athens from Deceleia when the play was produced.[44] In many ways her characterization seems to conform to the image of an elite Spartan woman. On stage her social status is similar to that of Lysistrata. Lampito's desire for peace, like Lysistrata's, outweighs her devotion to sex; she is the first willing partner to agree to the sex-strike, and she is confident in her ability to persuade the other Spartan women at home to join her (168–169). She is known to all the characters on stage and is addressed without reference to a man.[45] Unlike the other women in the play, however, she doesn't have a stage name.

To summarize the issue of names connected with historical women, then, we can say that Lysistrata is a translation of Lysimache, therefore establishing a respectful distance between the character and the priestess.[46] The association of Myrrhine with the woman memorialized in the grave inscription as the attendant at the temple of Athena Nike is suggestive of a "democratic" priesthood, but indefinite. Thus, in both cases these Athenian characters' naming conforms to Henderson's contention that constraints governing naming respectable women were the same in comedy as in oratory: that is, to call a woman by her own name was to characterize her as disreputable.[47] In contrast, Lampito is not the recipient of Aristophanes' politesse. She has the same name as the mother of the Spartan king, who at the time of the production of *Lysistrata* was responsible for the seriously disruptive and burdensome garrison at Deceleia. In Aristophanes' name-game, the identification of Lampito with her historical counterpart is singular in this play, and I think it was intended to be derogatory.

As a member of the Spartan royal family, it is probable that Lampito would have had a prominent cultic role, and as I will argue below, her representation

44 Bowie (1993: 192) translates her name as "Lady of the Lamp" in loose association with the Lemnian theme that he elaborates.

45 Foley (1982: 8–9).

46 This view is shared by MacDowell (1995: 242).

47 For other types of comic censorship, see scholiast on *Acharnians* 378; *Wasps* 1284–1291, Henderson (1990: 287–289).

on stage evokes a ritual context.[48] Through allusion to historical women, Aristophanes invites us to consider the women in *Lysistrata* through the lens of cultic performance. However, this evocation of women as ritual practitioners is not exclusive; there is another representational category through which these characters are made legible – for they are also presented in the idiom of the prostitute.

PROSTITUTES

Lysistrata is filled with women circulating in the public sphere, talking about sex. Inevitably, the eroticized woman in public evokes the image of the prostitute. Sarah Stroup has made the important observation that the women in this play are depicted as *hetairai.* Focusing on the swearing of the oath, the seduction scene between Myrrhine and Kinesias, and the division of Diallage, she notes an assimilation of the wives with *hetairai* and a degeneration of this image as the play progresses. The wives are seductive women who are outfitted with the props of the symposium, while Diallage is the *porne,* who is divisible and accessible to all. By depicting wives as *hetairai,* Aristophanes depicts a topsy-turvy world in which the sympotic becomes civic and the wife in public represents the social and sexual disorder caused by war.[49] In a similar vein, Christopher Faraone has argued that the young women are represented in terms of the language of the *hetaira* and that Lysistrata in particular can be seen as a madam and a priestess. He suggests that Aristophanes elaborates the similarities between the priestess and procuress, because they were both images of powerful women in public.[50]

With Faraone and Stroup I agree that the sexuality of the young women is represented in the idiom of the *hetaira,* and my reading of this play is indebted to their illuminating analyses. In what follows I would like to explore the implication of these observations somewhat further, diverging from their readings in my assessment of what is at stake in the assimilation of *hetaira* to wife or madam to priestess. Stroup's interpretation, I think, relies on a distinction

48 Nagy (1990: 347–348) argues that members of the royal family were afforded a preeminent position in choral performance. On stage Lampito's vigor attests to her participation in races that would have had a cultic dimension. Pomeroy (1975: 25).

49 Stroup (2003).

50 Faraone (2006).

between public and private that is overly schematic. Because she assumes that the only way to talk about women in public is to describe them in the language of the courtesan, she misses the relation of the courtesan to the priestess. Faraone elaborates the assimilation of priestess and courtesan, suggesting that the two are thematically united by being "the only two kinds of women who could . . . assume roles of leadership in their communities."[51] This reading makes sense of the characterization of Lysistrata, to some degree, but doesn't integrate these two images of feminine leadership into a sustained reading of the play.

OATH SACRIFICE

In this section I will be tracing the way sacrificial and sexual imagery in the play are intertwined. I will elucidate the ways the text provides clues that what was performed on stage does not always seem to conform to what the characters say they are doing – that is to say, while the women talk about peace their actions are not exactly conciliatory. *Lysistrata* begins with the protagonist raising the specter of women's religious activity of the more ecstatic, and less somber kind:

> *ἀλλ᾽ εἴ τις εἰς βακχεῖον αὐτὰς ἐκάλεσαν*
> *ἢ 'ς Πανὸς ἢ 'πὶ Κωλιάδ᾽ ἢ 'ς Γενετυλλίδος,*
> *οὐδ᾽ ἂν διελθεῖν ἦν ἂν ὑπὸ τῶν τυμπάνων.*
>
> *But if someone had called them to a Bacchic revelry or to the Grotto of Pan or to Kolias or Genetyllis' shrine, it would have been impossible to get through for the tambourines. (1–3)*

Lysistrata is contrasting her gathering with unofficial rites associated with drinking, dancing, and sexuality, but it is not yet clear what kind of assembly she has called. If her name is meant to call to mind the priestess of Athena, the most prestigious cultic position an Athenian woman could occupy, it seems logical to assume that she is contrasting newer, wilder rituals with more traditional and staid celebrations.[52] Lysistrata then reveals that she has

51 Faraone (2006: 222).

52 This was the first of his "women" plays. Both Foley and Henderson suggest that Lysistrata is the first female protagonist. Aristophanes tends to depict women's action in the context of cult (Foley 1982: 12n.27).

summoned the women to take counsel over a serious matter. The fact that Lysistrata has a political agenda does not negate the ritual aura; it was customary for political gatherings to begin with a sacrifice.[53]

After some cajoling, Lysistrata gets the women to agree to her twofold plan – that is, for the young women to starve their husbands of sex and the older women to seize the Akropolis.[54] The older women can avoid suspicion on the Akropolis by going there under the pretext of making a sacrifice:

> *ταῖς πρεσβυτάταις γὰρ προστέτακται τοῦτο δρᾶν,*
> *ἕως ἂν ἡμεῖς ταῦτα συντιθώμεθα,*
> *θύειν δοκούσαις καταλαβεῖν τὴν ἀκρόπολιν.*
>
> *The old women have been assigned to do this, to seize the Akropolis under the guise of making a sacrifice, while we arrange these things. (177–179)*

The old women can use their role in civic ritual as a pretense for going out in public and taking control of the symbolic and economic stronghold of the city.[55] Although the Akropolis was no longer host to Athens' political gatherings, it did still house the treasury.[56]

53 At the beginning of an assembly, *peristiarchoi* would carry piglets around the area where the proceedings would take place, cut their throats, and cause the blood to spray on the seats: Sch. Ar. *Ekkl.* 128. Then they would cut off the piglets' genitals and dispose of them. Burkert (1985: 81). Jacoby *FrGrHist* 334; Demosthenes 54.39; *RE* XIX 859.

54 Vaio (1973) analyzes the thematic integration of the two strands of the double plot.

55 Lauren Taafe reads the play through the lens of performance practice and metatheater. She describes Lysistrata's plan as a play in which women enact the roles of men by playing the parts of "women," and men enact the roles of women by playing the parts of "men." "This play is resolved when the middle, role-playing, level of character is eliminated and the super-feminine women reunite with their super-masculine men and recreate ideal marriages" (Taafe 1993: 52). This assessment is not incompatible with my reading, although I am emphasizing the nuances created by the assumption of the roles of priestess and prostitute, and their interrelation. I think that the performative aspect of both the priestess and the courtesan are emphasized in the play. Taafe does not consider the metatheatrics of the old women seeming to sacrifice, but the use of δράω and δοκέω might suggest such a reading here.

56 The treasury is referred to in the play, e.g., 488. See MacDowell (1995: 232–235). On the symbolic importance of the Akropolis see Loraux (1993: 147–183).

The suggestion of sacrifice then persists throughout the oath-swearing scene of the younger women:[57] Lysistrata begins the ceremony by calling for a shield and asking for the τόμια or cuttings from the victims (184–185; τόμιον reappears at line 192). τόμια are appropriate to oath-sacrifices,[58] and usually indicate the genitals of a male victim.[59] Burkert distinguished the oath-sacrifice from normal animal sacrifice in that it emphasizes "the aspect of terror and destruction":

> *The blood is made to first flow into a vessel and then the hands are plunged into the gore. Essential is the dismemberment of the victim: the person swearing the oath treads with his foot on the "severed parts," namely on the sexual organs of the male victim; bloodshed is compounded with the horror of castration. This is accompanied by an act of self-cursing.*[60]

Lysistrata's ritual intentions seem to surprise the other women: when Kalonike wonders what kind of oath Lysistrata intends she responds that she wants to slaughter sheep: μηλοσφαγοῦσας (189). Kalonike then suggests a white horse for a victim. Their actual "sacrifice" is, of course, bloodless and would more properly be described in the language of libation. Yet images of slaughter persist: In the end Lysistrata decides to slay a jar of Thasian wine, again using the term μηλοσφαγέω (196). She calls the *stamnion* a boar (202) and calls on Mistress Peitho and lovely Kulix to receive the sacrificial offerings (τὰ σφάγια, 203–204). Kalonike responds that the coloring is good and the blood spurts out well: εὔχρων γε θαἶμα κἀποπυτίζει καλῶς (205).[61] When the

57 Casabona (1966: 323–326) discusses the prevalence of sacrificial language in this passage.

58 Plato *Laws* 753d; Dem. 23.68 describes the oath sacrifice required of a man bringing a homicide accusation to the Areopagus. He must stand upon the *tomia* of a boar, a ram, and a bull.

59 Henderson (1987: 91). Cf. Casabona (1966: 220).

60 Burkert (1985: 251). Generally in oath sacrifice, the victim was not eaten. See, e.g., Homer *Iliad* 19.252–268; Pausanius *Description of Greece* 5.24.9–11. Van Straten (1995: 106) identifies Lysistrata's sacrifice with σφαγία on the battlefied, performed for the purposes of divination. She identifies an image on the tondo of an Attic Red Figure kylix as depicting this type of sacrifice, notably one of the few representations of sacrifice that depict the knife, and here it is being driven through the victim's neck (Van Straten's figure 112).

61 Henderson (1987: 93) suggests that *stamnion* might be a pun on the Homeric ἀμνίον, a bowl for catching a victim's blood.

oath is complete, Lampito says she hears an *ololuge* (239), which, among other things could mark the successful completion of a sacrifice. The ceremony is consistent with the language and procedure of blood sacrifice.[62] As Burkert notes, wine libations play a role in animal sacrifice, but in a sense they stand in opposition to the shedding of blood: "The *sphagia* open hostilities, the *spondai* end hostilities."[63] In Lysistrata's oath, however, the spilling of the wine is assimilated to the shedding of blood. Sacrificial codes are mingled as are the representational codes for the depiction of women: the effect is that there is a convergence between the association of the *hetaira* with wine and the priestess with blood. In this scene the depiction of the women as bibulous and sexy is set against a backdrop of sacrificial violence.

Before considering the implication of the sacrificial inflection to the sex-strike oath, it is important to note that this passage is also where the women are first characterized as courtesans. Extrapolating from the evidence of vase-painting, Stroup notes that the *kylix* (the personified receptacle that Lysistrata evokes at 203) had a strong association with the symposium, as opposed to the domestic *skyphos.* The wives' plan to dress seductively in luxurious, exotic clothing depicts them outfitting themselves in a way that is designed to be appealing to the male gaze in the manner of a courtesan.[64] Finally the descriptions of the sexual positions – legs in the air and lioness on a cheesegrater – belong to the rhetoric of prostitution,[65] not legitimate marriage.

RITUAL HIERARCHIES

Generally speaking *Lysistrata* stages a world upside down by depicting men as subject to the power of women. This gender dichotomy then reverberates in the play with more divisions among the women: they are explicitly divided into young and old; the older women are honorable and easily succeed in their task. The young women, on the other hand, are shown to be bibulous and incontinent.[66] It is these women also who are depicted in the idiom of public

62 Henderson (1987: 93).

63 Burkert (1985: 71).

64 Lucian, *Dialogues of the Courtesans* 11; Ath. 13.588c.

65 Henderson (1987: 96); Faraone (2004); Stroup (2003).

66 For the importance of the differences between the young an old women see Faraone (2004).

female actors, the prostitute and the priestess. Each one of these schisms can be read as a division of a group between its more moderate, self-controlled, transcendent element and its more bodily, vital, incontinent counterpart.

The splitting of the self into a vital and transcendental aspect has been identified as a common element in ritual practice. Maurice Bloch has described a core ritual process, in which identification with the transcendental element is enacted, which then conquers the vital through violence to a surrogate. In this way sacred violence can be used to legitimize political aggression.[67] I suggest that the plot of the *Lysistrata* works according to a similar logic. Women are presented fluidly in terms of various hierarchies; the most vital bodily aspect of femininity accretes various negative associations and in the end all that has been associated with that which is lower is stabilized in a relationship of subordination to that which is transcendent. In the next two sections I will show how Aristophanes deploys this ritual dynamic of dividing and conquering in terms of the relationship of elite to *demos* and Athens to her enemies – Sparta and her allies.

Madam Is to Courtesan as Elite Is to *Demos*

Earlier I suggested that the play represents two tiers of ritual agents, one with a strong association to the elite (represented by Lysistrata) and another closely linked to democratic practice (Myrrhine). One instance in which the distinction between types of priestesses seems to operate is the scene in which Lysistrata brokers an encounter between Myrrhine and her husband Kinesias. This scene dramatizes the relationship of Lysistrata and Myrrhine most fully. If we read the interaction of these two characters in this scene as representing a relationship between elite and democratic practice, we might see in this exchange Aristophanes' prescription for political order.

Prior to Myrrhine's teasing tryst with Kinesias, Lysistrata had been struggling to keep the young women on the Akropolis from sneaking off to satisfy their lust with their husbands: ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν αὐτὰς ἀποσχεῖν οὐκέτι οἵα τ' ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνδρῶν· διαδιδράσκουσι γάρ (I can no longer hold them back from their men; they are shirking their duty; 718–719). The use of διαδιδράσκω here has political resonance, for both Herodotus and Thucydides use it to describe Athenians evading the consequences of their military

67 Bloch (1992: 1–7). See also Geertz (1968).

actions (Herod. 7.85; Thuc. 8.75). Lysistrata is trying to control her army of women but has little success when she tries to restrain their libido. In the following scene, however, when Lysistrata uses the *eros* of Myrrhine to her advantage, she achieves her desired end.

In this scene Lysistrata seems to take on the role of a madam, hiring out the services of Myrrhine to her client, Kinesias. In response to Kinesias' demand to see his wife, Lyistrata asks, τί οὖν; δώσεις τί μοι; (What then? What will you give me?; 861). "Lysistrata treats Kinesias as if he were a customer in a brothel; now that he has settled on a girl the bawd begins to discuss the price."[68] The end result of Myrrhine's teasing of her husband is, of course, the reconciliation between the Spartans and Athenians.

In this scene we have seen how the mapping of sex and ritual onto one another allows for fluid cross-fertilization of numerous associations. By superimposing the image of the priestess on the prostitute, Aristophanes invites us to see hierarchies within the priesthood – the inherited positions in relation to the democratically elected ones – as parallel to the relation of a madam to her girl. By playing on these hierarchies, Aristophanes seems to encode a political message humorously. When the elite (as represented by Lysistrata the gentile priestess/madam) are able to harness the skittish *eros* of the *demos* (as represented by Myrrhine, the democratically selected temple attendant/prostitute), the two together are politically effective. The sex-strike plot succeeds when the elite direct the *demos,* just as the courtesan is successful when she heeds the advice of her madam.

Coincidentally, if we read this passage as a political prescription as I have suggested, and consider it together with Lysistrata's wool-working metaphor (567–586) in which she argues that the city incorporate all people, citizens, metics, and friends, then the political stance in this play seems to conform neatly to the position espoused in the parabasis of *Frogs* (687–737). There, in the epirrhema, the poet suggests that all those citizens who did not support the democracy under the regime of the Four Hundred and those who have been disenfranchised as debtors or for other reasons should have their rights restored. There he goes beyond his advice in *Lysistrata* to say that anyone willing to fight in the navy, including slaves and foreigners, should enjoy

68 Henderson (1987: 176); Faraone (2004).

the rights of citizenship. But this civic inclusiveness is tempered in the antepirrhema by the famous analogy of citizens to Athenian coinage, where Aristophanes complains that the Athenians "use" foreign red-haired rascals born of rascals, instead of the traditionally educated members of elite Athenian families.[69] Between these two plays, there emerges a consistent, evolving political stance advocating a liberal extension of civic rights under the auspices of elite leadership.[70] It is salient for my reading that this political message is conveyed through a wool-working analogy, for wool-working was a kind of women's work that found representation in ritual,[71] in the domestic sphere, and in the iconography of prostitution and even in the archaeological remains of brothels.[72]

Priestess/Victim: *hetaira/porne*

There is yet another strand of association between ritual and sex traffic that I think is crucial to the thematics and plot of the play. It is the overlapping of the priestess and her victim with the shifting discourse of the *hetaira* and *porne*. Insofar as this correspondence overlays the imagery of the cultic on that of the sexual, it is a similar kind of play to the one I analyzed in the previous section, but there the relationship related to intra-Athenian relationships, while in this section I will suggest that it is mapped onto Athens' relationships to her enemies. This complex game of cross-identifications becomes legible by a consideration of the treatment of Lampito when she first arrives on stage. When the foreign delegates arrive from Sparta, Boiotia, and Corinth, the association of the sexual and sacrificial is made explicit:

> *Μυ. ἠδὶ δὲ καὶ δὴ Λαμπιτὼ προσέρχεται.*
> *Λυ. ὦ φιλτάτη Λάκαινα, χαῖρε, Λαμπιτοῖ.*

69 MacDowell (1995: 284–286). See also Dover (1993: 278–281) for the political content of *Frogs'* parabasis.

70 MacDowell (1995: 235–236) also notices the similarity of the political views expressed in the wool-working metaphor and the epirrhema of the *Frogs'* parabasis.

71 Wool-working played a role in the cult of Athena, most notably in relationship to the *peplos* woven and presented at the Panathenaia.

72 For the spinning *hetairai* see Keuls 258–259; Reinsberg (1988: 122–125); Williams (1983: 94–97).

οἷον τὸ κάλλος, ὦ γλυκυτάτη, φαίνεται.
ὡς δ᾽ εὐχροεῖς, ὡς δὲ σφριγᾷ τὸ σῶμά σου.
κἂν ταῦρον ἄγχοις.
Λα.   μάλα γ᾽ οἰῶ, ναὶ τὼ σιώ.
γυμνάδδομαί γα καὶ ποτὶ πυγὰν ἅλλομαι.
Κα. ὡς δὴ καλὸν τὸ χρῆμα τῶν τιτθῶν ἔχεις.
Λα. ᾇπερ ἱαρεῖόν τοι μ᾽ ὑποψαλάσσετε.
Λυ. ἡδὶ δὲ ποδαπή ᾽σθ᾽ ἡ νεᾶνις ἡτέρα;
Λα. πρέσβειρά τοι ναὶ τὼ σιὼ Βοιωτία ἵκει ποθ᾽ ὑμέ.
Μυ.   νὴ Δί᾽ ὡς Βοιωτία
καλόν γ᾽ ἔχουσα τὸ πεδίον
Κα.   καὶ νὴ Δία
κομψότατα τὴν βληχώ γε παρατετιλμένη.
Λυ. τίς δ᾽ ἡτέρα παῖς;
Λα.   χαΐα ναὶ τὼ σιώ,
Κορινθία δ᾽αὖ.
Κα. χαΐα νὴ τόν Δία δήλη ᾽στιν οὖσα ταυταγὶ κἀντευθενί.

Myr.: And, in fact, here comes Lampito.
Lys.: Oh, dear Spartan, hello, Lampito.
How beautiful you look, sweetie.
Your coloring looks good, your body is vigorous.
You could even strangle a bull.
Lam.: Yes, I think so, by the gods, for I exercise and I kick
toward my buttocks.
Kal.: What a beautiful set of tits you have.
Lam.: Don't feel me up like a sacrificial victim.
Lys.: And from where is this other young girl?
Lam.: Indeed, your Boiotian ambassador has arrived to you.
Myr.: By Zeus, how Boiotia has a beautiful plain!
Kal.: Yes, by the gods, and her bush is neatly plucked.
Lys.: And who is this other girl?
Lam.: A fine one by the gods, and Corinthian likewise.
Kal.: She's clearly fine here in front and there behind. (76–91)

When Lampito arrives on stage, she is addressed with a pet name (77).[73] Her body is admired in a way that seems to objectify it sexually: she has a nice figure, she is in good shape, healthy, and strong looking. When Lysistrata comments that she looks as if she could strangle a bull, if we are thinking of Lampito in sacerdotal terms, then we might understand this comment to mean that she would be an effective actor in a sacrifice. But then the word used to describe her vigorous body – σφριγᾷ – applies equally to women's breasts as it does to an animal's body. If her status might seem to have changed from actor to object with this remark, this slippage is clearly articulated in her response when she refers to herself being groped like a sacrificial victim: – ἱαρεῖόν (84).

Lysistrata moves on to consider some of the other envoys who have arrived with Lampito. A woman from Boiotia is ogled in a slightly different manner. She is admired in the idiom of woman-as-land,[74] with her pubic hair described as pennyroyal,[75] an important wildflower in Boiotia.[76] The last woman, a Corinthian, is sexually assessed through her ethnic identity. The scholiast on this passage describes her as *porne,* an assessment that is probably made merely because of her association with Corinth. The verb form derived from the name Corinth, κορινθιάζομαι, means to play the part of a prostitute.[77] Some have thought this identification reflexive on the scholiast's part – Corinthian equals prostitute – and inappropriate to the context, [78] but I think there may be good reason to accept the reading of the Corinthian as a prostitute.

In these women we have representatives of Athens' three most potent Greek enemies. The enmity between the Spartans and Athenians has already been discussed; Thucydides locates the Corinthians at the crux of the beginning

73 Schwyzer (1939–1953: i.478–479) identifies the suffix used in Lampito's name as appropriate to Kosenamen. Henderson cites this section of Schwyzer, saying that the suffix connotes sacerdotal privileges, but this assertion is not supported there.

74 For a discussion of the assimilation of the woman with the earth see DuBois (1988). See also Dougherty (1993: 61–80). Monty Python's Flying Circus seems to have tapped into the same vein of humor as Aristophanes (with an upward displacement) in the description of a woman's "huge tracts of land" in *Monty Python and the Holy Grail.*

75 For this metaphor see Henderson (1975: 135).

76 Henderson (1987: 78).

77 Henderson (1987: 78).

78 See also Suda s.v.

of the current conflict in his discussion of Corcyra's appeal for an Athenian alliance against Corinth, although Corcyra was a Corinthian colony.[79] He also identifies the Boiotians as instigators of the current hostilities, for it was they (specifically the Thebans) who attacked Plataea because of its loyalty to Athens in 431, instigating the first military engagement of the war.

Thus, the mother of Athens' most powerful and oppressive enemy is not only singled out by being named on stage, she is also depicted as a sacrificial victim. Furthermore, Lampito has close (textual) ties to her Boiotian and Corinthian colleagues. The oath sacrifice scene discussed above immediately follows. The sacrificial violence we noted in that passage is directed against Sparta and its allies. This violent undercurrent is what makes the peace fantasy of the play not only viable, but also funny to an Athenian audience.

THE SURROGATE

The themes identified in the scene in which Lampito is introduced recur but are transmogrified in the "reconciliation scene." To make sense of the reconciliation between Athens and Sparta, it is necessary to take stock of the political atmosphere in which it is set, because Athens' history with Sparta is explicitly described here. While Lysistrata has the undivided attention of the Spartan and Athenian ambassadors because of their urgent need for sexual relief, she launches into a lecture, chiding the representatives for fighting among themselves while the Persian threat looms (1133–1134). This reference to Persia has been considered topical and fraught, because at the time of the play Persia was vacillating in its alliance to Sparta and perhaps had recently made overtures to the Athenians.[80] Lysistrata reminds the ambassadors of past cooperation between Sparta and Athens, emphasizing their mutual participation in panhellenic rituals (1131). But the instances she chooses to demonstrate the compatibility of the two cities cannot bear scrutiny and have generated much critical discussion and attempts at explanation.

She begins by reminding the Spartan ambassador of the time when Perikliedas was sent to ask for Athenian aid in 464, when Sparta was staring down

79 Thuc. 1.23–68.
80 Dover (1972: 170); Henderson (1987: xxv).

a revolt of the helots in the aftermath of an earthquake. Kimon persuaded the Athenians to send aid and then led a disastrous expedition that resulted in his ostracism. Thucydides describes these events as "the occasion of the first open quarrel between Athens and Sparta."[81] Lysistrata then reminds the Athenians of Spartan aid in deposing Hippias. But Sparta had supported the rule of the Alkmaeonidai before this and returned to Athens a couple years later to obstruct the formation of democracy. "Thus neither case is a good instance of Athenian and Spartan cooperation," comments MacDowell.[82] He suggests that Diallage is a sexy distraction and provides a humorous counterpoint that overrides the problems created by Lysistrata's revisionist history. Carroll Moulton says, "the achievement of the last scenes is essentially a poetic vision, rather than a historical one, and Aristophanes' aim is to transform history, rather than to descry it analytically; the end of *Lysistrata* is another illustration of the metamorphosis of political reality through poetic techniques."[83]

I agree with Moulton that what we see at work here is poetic technique, but I think the suggestion that Aristophanes is wistfully recasting the painful events of the recent past doesn't do justice to Aristophanes' scathing wit. There is an explicit desire for peace in the play, but only as a reconciliation in which the Athenians are on top. The sacrificial subtext allows for hostility toward the Spartans to be expressed while the Athenians join in a peace that enacts their superiority.[84]

This reading of the Diallage scene makes sense of both the text and subtext of Lysistrata's ambiguous evocation of episodes of Spartan-Athenian relations. The ambassadors are contrite and cooperative because their attention is focused on Diallage's attractive and accessible body. After Lysistrata mentions the Athenian aid sent to the Spartans, the Spartan agrees that they are wrong: ἀδικίομες; ἀλλ' ὁ πρωκτὸς ἄφατον ὡς καλός (We are in the wrong; but how unspeakably fine is her ass!; 1148). The reminder of Spartan benefaction to the Athenians elicits the same kind of response, in which the Spartan favors

81 Thuc. 1.102.3.

82 MacDowell (1995: 245).

83 Moulton (1981: 75).

84 For the polysemic nature of comic narratives see Kolek (1985).

her behind and the Athenian her frontside. To Lysistrata's prompting that the two groups reconcile (διηλλάγητε 1161), the following exchange ensues:

Πρ.$^{\lambda}$ ἁμές γα λῶμες, αἴ τις ἁμὶν τὤγκυκλον
λῇ τοῦτ' ἀποδόμεν.
Λυ. *ποῖον ὦ τᾶν*
Πρ.$^{\lambda}$ *τὰν Πύλον,*
τᾶσπερ πάλαι δεόμεθα καὶ βλιμάδδομες.
Πρ.$^{\alpha}$μὰ τόν Ποσειδῶ τοῦτο μέν γ' οὐ δράσετε.
Λυ. ἄφετ', ὦγάθ', αὐτοῖς.
Πρ.$^{\alpha}$ *κᾆτα τίνα κινήσομεν;*
Λυ. ἕτερόν γ' ἀπαιτεῖτ' ἀντὶ τούτου χωρίον.
Πρ.$^{\alpha}$ τὸ δεῖνα τοίνυν, παράδοθ' ἡμῖν τουτονὶ
πρώτιστα τὸν Ἐχινοῦντα καὶ τὸν Μηλιᾶ
κόλπον τὸν ὄπισθεν καὶ τὰ Μεγαρικὰ σκέλη.
Πρ.$^{\lambda}$ οὐ τὼ σιώ, οὐχὶ πάντα γ', ὦ λισσάνιε.
Λυ. ἐᾶτε, μηδὲν διαφέρου περὶ σκελοῖν.
Πρ.$^{\alpha}$ ἤδη γεωργεῖν γυμνὸς ἀποδὺς βούλομαι.
Πρ.$^{\lambda}$ ἐγὼν δὲ κοπραγωγῆν γα {πρῶτα} ναὶ τὼ σιώ.
Λυ. ἐπὴν διαλλαγῆτε, ταῦτα δράσετε
ἀλλ' εἰ δοκεῖ δρᾶν ταῦτα, βουλεύσασθε καὶ
τοῖς ξυμμάχοις ἐλθόντες ἀνακοινώσατε.
Πρ.$^{\alpha}$ ποίοισιν, ὦ τᾶν, ξυμμάχοις; ἐστύκαμεν.
οὐ ταὐτὰ δόξει τοῖσι συμμάχοισι νῷν,
βινεῖν, ἅπασιν;
Πρ.$^{\lambda}$ *τοῖσι γῶν ναὶ τὼ σιὼ ἁμοῖσι.*
Πρ.$^{\alpha}$ καὶ γὰρ ναὶ μὰ Δία Καρυστίοις.
Λυ. καλῶς λέγετε. νῦν οὖν ὅπως ἁγνεύσετε,
ὅπως ἂν αἱ γυναῖκες ὑμᾶς ἐν πόλει
ξενίσωμεν ὧν ἐν ταῖσι κίσταις εἴχομεν.
ὅρκους δ' ἐκεῖ καὶ πίστιν ἀλλήλοις δότε.
κἄπειτα τὴν αὑτοῦ γυναῖχ' ὑμῶν λαβὼν
ἄπεισ ' ἕκαστος.

Spartan Ambassador: We must demand this promontory here return to us.
Lysistrata: Which one?
Spartan Ambassador: This one in back:

we are asking for it for a long time, we can almost feel it.
Athenian Ambassador: By the God of Earthquakes, that you'll never get!
Lysistrata: Give it to them, good man.
Athenian Ambassador: What do we get, then?
Lysistrata: You'll ask for other land in return for this.
Athenian Ambassador: Let's see now, I know, hand over to us first of all Echinos here, the Malian gulf that runs behind it, also the two Megarian legs.
Spartan Ambassador: My dear ambassador, you're not getting it all.
Lysistrata: You'll give it. Don't quibble over legs.
Athenian Ambassador: I want to strip and plough naked!
Spartan Ambassador: Me first: I want to spread the manure.
Lysistrata: When peace is made you'll both do all you want. For now, are all these items to your liking?
If so, you'd best confer with all your allies.
Athenian Ambassador: Confer with allies? Come back and take your share. Too hard up for that. They'll go along with us. I'm sure they're just as anxious to start fucking.
Spartan Ambassador: Also ours, is certain.
Athenian Ambassador: Every Greek likes to fuck.
Lysistrata: You argue well. And now for ratification.
The women on the citadel will host
the banquet, for we brought our picnic baskets.
You'll swear your oaths and give your pledges there.
And then let each man take his wife
and go home. (1162–1187)

Diallage's body becomes a map of Greece, and the Athenians and Spartans busily set about dividing it up, assimilating the sexually attractive parts of her anatomy to geographical sites, most of which were hotly contested in the Peloponnesian War.[85] Her body is apportioned and distributed among the participants, and in a crowning conflation of sex and women at sacrifice, Lysistrata announces that the women will produce a feast out of their *kistai,* or picnic baskets. Not surprisingly, these baskets have a sexual as well

85 The Athenians captured and fortified Pylos in a major victory; see Thuc. 4.2–41. King Agis had campaigned in the Malian Gulf (Thuc. 8.3). For the destruction of the Megarian walls, see Thuc. 4.109.1. See also Henderson (1987: 204–205).

as religious connotation.[86] Burkert calls this sexual use of the *kiste* "almost over-obvious."[87] The extent of the assimilation of food and sex in this comedy is what makes sense out of the play's end – a communal banquet that serves as a peaceful and satisfying resolution to the panhellenic hard-on caused by the women's sex-strike.[88]

Diallage is a sacrificial victim whose body is divided, distributed, and consumed among the parties being reconciled. As such, she is a substitute for Lampito, who complained of being fondled like a ἱαρεῖόν (84). When her body is treated as a map, she stands in for the Boiotian woman whose anatomy was praised through the register of agricultural land (85–88). Insofar as she clearly is meant to represent a naked woman in public available for indiscriminate male consumption, she can be, and has been read as, a prostitute,[89] and thus we can think of her as a surrogate for the Corinthian representative of the earlier scene. It seems relevant here that the word *diallage* basically means both change and exchange. The abstract noun related to it, *diallagema,* can mean surrogate. Diallage is a sacrificial surrogate – she takes the place of the women who came as envoys from Athens' enemies.

Because she is a mute nude female, a sexual and topographical commodity that can be divided, Diallage has been read as the *porne,* as opposed to the sexualized representation of all the women earlier in the play, who are represented in the idiom of *hetairai.* Because Diallage is divisible, Sarah Stroup argues that she becomes "a politically compelling means of transforming the earlier hetairizations of the citizen wives into an undiluted embodiment of eroticized, and newly attainable, democratic impulse."[90] Here Stroup is relying on Leslie Kurke's analysis that describes a process whereby the elite *hetairos* or symposiast identifies with the *hetaira,* but also occasionally refashions her as

86 Aristophanes uses the image in a similar way at *Peace* 666. For its relation to κύσθος see Henderson (1991: 130). For its use in ritual see Elderkin (1940: 395).

87 Burkert (1983: 271) enumerates various sexually charged uses of these baskets in ritual practices, commenting that "intercourse as a mystery is a common metaphor, or more than a metaphor."

88 Dover (1972: 153) says that the men have forgotten their sexual need, "since its immediate satisfaction would be irreconcilable with the way Aristophanes wants the play to end." Of course, many comedies end with a feast.

89 Faraone (2004); Stroup (2003).

90 Stroup (2003: 25).

a *porne* thus expelling her from the symposium.[91] In his conflation of sex and sacrifice, Aristophanes assimilates the mechanics of the *porne/hetaira* discourse to the logic of sacrifice.

In *Lysistrata,* as elsewhere, a move from identification to alienation is represented through the transformation of the *hetaira* into a *porne.* The *hetaira* is the superior aspect of the prostitute whose engagement in all the lurid aspects of sex-trade is mystified; the *porne* is the vital, chaotic embodiment of prostitution. In Aristophanes' comic world, the *hetaira* is a ritual substitute for the wife. The women identify with this "other" so that they can ritually expunge the degraded aspect of themselves (*pornai*), but only after this lowly element of the feminine has been imprinted with the civic identity of Athens' enemies.

When we consider the sacrificial dynamics in this scene, the politics behind Aristophanes' vision of peace become more evident. Diallage is represented through the same images that were used to figure the first meeting of Lysistrata and her neighbors with the women from Sparta, Corinth, and Boiotia, but in a different constellation, or more accurately, in a different embodiment. For just like Sparta and her allies, Diallage is a victim, she is land, and she is a prostitute. The simple hierarchical structure of god over man and man over beast and land affirmed in sacrifice is here invested with additional nuances. The brutish reassertion of male dominance over the prostitute is intertwined in this ritual equation, which has in turn come to signify Athens' dominance over her enemies.

WOMEN AS ANIMALS

If we see now the way that the ritual dynamics of the play are intertwined with the language of prostitution, many of Aristophanes' jokes become more intelligible. Just as above we saw the overlay of the priestess on prostitute, another locus where the cultic and sex traffic converge is in the depiction of woman as animal.

91 On the possibility that Diallage, a mute nude female figure on stage, was played by a *hetaira,* see Stone (1981: 147–150); Zweig (1992). Taafe (1993: 171n.42) thinks that this type of character was played by a male actor in a body suit; see also Henderson (1987: 195).

Although the assimilation of women to animals is by no means uncommon in Greek literature, and provides the comic poet with numerous opportunities for (sexual) humor, the accumulation of instances in *Lysistrata* in which people, especially women, are assimilated to animals is thematically significant. This theme begins with the arrival of Lampito, as discussed above, and continues throughout.[92] Of course, it was traditional in Greek culture to liken women to animals: the entire text of Semonides' *Catalogue of Women* elaborates this trope. One member of the chorus, an old woman, who calls herself a bitch (by implication) (363), evokes a traditional association: Hesiod's myth of the invention of race of women describes Pandora as having the mind of a bitch: ἐν δὲ θέμεν κύνεόν τε νόον καὶ ἐπίκλοπον ἦθος /Ἑρμείην ἤνωγε (And [Zeus] bid Hermes to put a bitch's mind in her and a thievish nature; (*W. D.* 67–68). In Homer's *Iliad,* Helen of Troy refers to herself as dog-eyed (κυνῶπις, *Il.* 3.180). Generally speaking, in Greek literature, there is a "network of imagery and metaphor which associates women in their role in sex and marriage with animals, especially the taming, yoking and breaking in of animals, and with agriculture."[93]

In *Lysistrata* women are assimilated to a multitude of animals.[94] Most of these cases are either explicitly sexual, or at least nod to the sexual.[95] At the same time the assimilation of women to animals also contributes to the theme

92 I will discuss this passage later in this chapter.

93 Gould (1980: 53).

94 Women are generally bestial, κνωδάλιον (476) and θήριον (468). One likens herself to a flatfish ψῆττα (115), promising to cut herself in half, and a woman from Boiotia is referred to as an eel. In her made-up oracle, Lysistrata refers to women as χελιδόνες (771). They are described as specifically wild animals like the shameless leopard πόρδαλις (1015) and the lion λέαινα (231), as well as domestic: they promise to live ἀταυρώτη (217) in their oath, that is, as a cow without a bull; they are described as being pastured by their husbands (260). Women are also like colts (1307–1308). The sow is used as a metaphor for women's anger ὗς (683); it symbolizes their pubic hair (824) and is a slang term for genitals (1001).

95 The swallow, χελιδών, was slang for female genitals. Both the leopard and the lioness are associated with Aphrodite – in the Homeric hymn, when Aphrodite goes to Anchises on Mount Ida she is accompanied by a pack of wild animals: fawning wolves, lions, bears, and leopards (*Hom. h. Aphr.* 71). These animals yielded nicknames that were popular with *hetairai;* see Henderson (1987: 96), also Athenaios on Leaina and Pollux 7.201–202.

of sacrifice in the play. Here I will consider a few examples that show how animal imagery in *Lysistrata* supports the development of these two themes.

The Heifer

When the women are swearing off sex in their oath sacrifice, they express their promise to be chaste by saying that they will live without a bull, ἀταυρώτη (217/218). Henderson suggests that this adjective (perhaps sophistically transformed from two termination to three) recalls the characterization of Iphigeneia on the verge of sacrifice in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*:

> *Κρόκου βαφὰς δ᾽ ἐς πέδον χέουσα*
> *ἔβαλλ᾽ ἕκαστον θυτή-*
> *ρων ἀπ᾽ ὄμματος βέλει φιλοίκτωι,*
> *πρέπουσά θ᾽ ὡς ἐν γραφαῖς, προσεννέπειν*
> *θέλουσ᾽, ἐπεὶ πολλάκις*
> *πατρὸς κατ᾽ ἀνδρῶνας εὐτραπέζους*
> *ἔμελψεν, ἁγνᾶι δ᾽ ἀταύρωτος αὐδᾶι πατρὸς*
> *φίλου τριτόσπονδον εὔποτμον παι-*
> *ῶνα φίλως ἐτίμα.*

> *And pouring to the ground her garments dipped in saffron*
> *She pelted each of the sacrificers with piteous arrows from her eyes, like those in paintings, wanting to address them,*
> *As many times she sang in the gracious men's room of her beloved father with pure voice, a chaste maiden she honored the song of good omen when the third libation was poured. (Ag. 239–247)*

In this passage as well we can identify the mingling of ritual practice, that of *sponde* with *sphagia*, for as Iphigeneia is about to be sacrificed, her participation in the peacetime ritual of the sympotic libation is evoked. Victoria Wohl has interpreted this scene as "a perverted marriage,"[96] noting that Iphigeneia is dressed as a bride, and the possibility that we are meant to imagine Iphigeneia's dress falling to the ground,[97] at the same time that she is

96 Wohl (1998: 72).
97 See Henderson (1987: 156).

emphatically characterized as both chaste and pure. Although she is compelled to be silent at the sacrifice, her lack of speech is contrasted with her songs at her father's symposia – a strange image since in contemporary Athenian practice, respectable women were banned from the symposium, and participation at dinner parties would have been relegated to the *hetaira*.[98] Wohl also notes that here Iphigeneia's desire to address her sacrificers is reminiscent of Helen, who did in fact call upon all the Greek men who hid in the Trojan horse by name (*Od.* Bk. 4).[99]

Wohl's reading emphasizes the ambiguity of the text and shows where Aeschylus' text is susceptible to a comic reinterpretation. In *Lysistrata,* when the women promise to be ἀταυρώτη they evoke the image of Iphigeneia as victim, emphasizing the erotic potential of the human sacrifice. Aristophanes' reference presents the mirror image of the Aeschylean scene – in the comic version sexuality is in the foreground and sacrifice is the allusion.

The Eel

Aristophanes also finds material that conjoins the sexual with the sacrificial in other quarters of the animal kingdom. James Davidson has discussed the Athenian passion for fish and the strong association of fish with seduction, noting that "the practice of comparing women to mouth-watering fish and fish to women" seems to have been rather widespread. He describes the eel-as-beautiful-woman as a familiar trope.[100] Aristophanes uses it in *Acharnians.* When Dikaiopolis comes upon a merchant from Boiotia carrying eels from Lake Copais, he begs to be introduced to the maidens and addresses one as his beloved: ὦ φιλτάτη σὺ καὶ πάλαι ποθουμένη (You most beloved and long-desired; *Ach.* 885). The same association, somewhat more attenuated, is at work in *Lysistrata* when the chorus of old women criticizes the men for their decrees, including the prohibition of imports from Boiotia:

98 Fraenkel (1950 ad 245 ff.) notes that Iphigeneia's presence at such an event "would hardly be conceivable within the limits of Athenian custom," but argues that this divergence from Athenian practice together with the emphasis on Iphigeneia's purity at precisely this point was purposefully Homericizing.

99 Wohl (1998: 71–82).

100 Davidson (1998: 10).

ὥστε κἀχθὲς θἠκάτῃ ποιοῦσα παιγνίαν ἐγὼ
ταῖσι παισὶ τὴν ἑταίραν ἐκάλεσ' ἐκ τῶν γειτόνων
παῖδα χρηστὴν κἀγαπητὴν ἐκ Βοιωτῶν ἔγχελυν,
οἱ δέ πέμψειν οὐκ ἔφασκον διὰ τὰ σὰ ψηφισμάτα.

So that just yesterday I was planning some entertainment in honor of Hekate, I invited my companion from the neighbors, a young thing, beautiful and lovely, an eel from Boiotia, but they refused to send her on account of your decrees. (700–703)

The word *hetaira* in this passage is generally interpreted to mean merely "friend," as opposed to courtesan.[101] I think this meaning is appropriate at the start of the sentence, but when we find that this invitation was addressed to a Boiotian eel, the subtext of courtesan underneath the image of the woman is raised, only to degenerate simultaneously into seafood. Here we see a collocation of woman as ritual practitioner, sexual object, and food. It was not common to sacrifice fish in Greece,[102] but the historian Apollodorus (fl. 140 BCE) notes that red mullet (τρίγλη) was sacrificed to Hekate, and that fish were also considered appropriate offerings to Poseidon.[103] There is indeed some later evidence that the Boiotians actually sacrificed eels:

Agatharchides, in the sixth book of his History of Europe*, says that the Boiotians sacrifice gigantic Kopaic eels to the gods, garlanding them in the manner of a sacrificial victim, saying prayers over them and casting barley corns on them. To the stranger who is at a loss regarding this unexpected custom and inquiring about it, the Boiotian declared that he knew only one thing to say, that it was necessary to preserve ancestral traditions, and that it was not appropriate to make a defense on their behalf to others. (Ath. 297d)*

If it was indeed, as Athenaios says that Agatharchides attests, a strange-but-true custom of the Boiotians to sacrifice eels, then the woman's complaint about inconvenient decrees repeats precisely the conflation of sex and sacrifice that I have been tracing. On the cultic side, women are both ritual practitioners and sacrificial victims. It is significant that the eel has a political identity – the

101 Henderson (1987: 162).
102 Davidson (1998: 12).
103 *FrGrH,* 244F 109. See also Ath. 325b–d. Burkert (1983: 204).

victim is Boiotian, one of Athens' most vigorous enemies at the time, beside Sparta. This pattern of identifying women who are from hostile *poleis* (Sparta, Boiotia, and Corinth) as sacrificial victims was also noted in the characterization of Lampito. Here again, the women seem to be united in their effort to stop the war, while the language that describes this process allows for the expression of Athens' political animus. This double strategy enables the peace theme to progress while exorcising political tensions through the subtextual theme of sacrifice.

In the register of prostitution, there is a shift here from characterizing the friend as a *hetaira* to a common marketplace commodity – the essence of the *porne*. The Athenian woman says that she invites a *hetaira* to join her in celebrating Hekate. The word *hetaira* (the only time it occurs in the play) is significant here and bears the associations of the elite discourse associated with the symposium, as opposed to the disembedded economics of the *porne*.[104] It establishes a social parity between the two women, which is then denigrated when the friend is characterized as an eel. The eel, though a delicacy, had strong associations with the marketplace. This connection is evident in both instances cited above: in *Acharnians* the eels are explicitly identified as Boiotian wares, and in *Lysistrata* (703) the decree the woman complains of is one that focuses on trade, sanctioning Boiotian imports. In the unexpected characterization of her friend as an eel, the imagery of woman as *porne* and woman as sacrificial victim converges.

The White Horse

In the play's exit hymn, the Spartan ambassador sings a song about filly-maidens led in a dance by Helen. In this distinctly Spartan context, situated among references to the Tyndaridai (1300), Mt. Taygetus, Athena of the bronze house, Amyclae, and the Eurotas River (1301, 1308), the maidens are identified as the Leukippides.[105] These maidens figure in a cluster of mythic narratives associated with Tyndareus and his line, and they may help to explain a puzzling aspect of the women's oath scene. The two daughters of Leukippos (whose name means white horse), Hileira and Phoibe, were abducted by Castor and Polydeuces, Tyndareus' twin sons, whom Pindar describes as

104 See the Introduction to this study.
105 Calame (1997: 192); Henderson (1987: 221).

riding white horses (*Pyth.* 1.66). The dance narrated in this song was ritually institutionalized in well-known theriomorphic choral dances performed by Spartan maidens.[106]

There is yet another horse associated with the Tyndarid family: Pausanias records that on the road between Sparta and Arcadia there is a temple called the Tomb of the Horse:

> *For Tyndareus, having sacrificed a horse here, administered an oath to the suitors of Helen, making them stand upon the pieces of the horse. The oath was to defend Helen and him who might be chosen to marry her if ever they should be wronged. When he had sworn the suitors he buried the horse here. (Pausanias 3.20.9 trans. Jones and Ormerod)*

Perhaps an allusion to this sacrifice was intended when Kalonike offered her suggestion for how the women of Greece could seal their oath:

> *Κα. εἰ λευκόν ποθεν*
> *ἵππον λαβοῦσαι τόμιον ἐντεμοίμεθα;*
> *Λυ. ποῖ λευκόν ἵππον;*

> *Kalonike: What if we got a white stallion from somewhere and cut off a slice of him?*
> *Lysistrata: Where can we get a white horse? (191–193)*

The reference seemed obscure in antiquity, since to the Greeks horse sacrifice occurred in legend, among barbarians and under extraordinary circumstances. The scholiasts conjecture that the white horse is a double entendre for penis and refers to Amazonian sacrificial custom. I think that the Spartan myth is germane here, especially since the white horse is mentioned shortly after an allusion to Agamemnon's first encounter with Helen's "apples" (155). In the myth and the ritual related to it, the women dance in the place of the horses, shaking back their hair. They are thought to represent the Leukippides, Hileira and Phoibe. They also have a strong association with *all* the horses in this cluster of narratives, and that would link them to the white horse whose sacrifice guarantees the honorable conduct of Helen's suitors. Lysistrata's question ποῖ λευκόν ἵππον is a joke because the white horse had a strong ritual association with Spartan women, who were to be found

106 Pi. *Fr.* 112; Eur. *Helen* 1465–1468; Calame (1997: 185–206); Henderson (1987: 221).

right by Lysistrata's side. Here again, the woman-as-animal trope is invested with local significance rendering the enemies of Athens as sacrificial victims.

MEN AS WOMEN

After the apportionment of Diallage, the women, even Lysistrata, recede from the stage. Perhaps the women's disappearance is less puzzling if we think of Diallage as a surrogate who takes on the vital qualities that have been used to characterize the women. In the person of Diallage the female comes to be entirely bodily. The men then come into focus, now that the play has effected their symbolic domination of all that has been associated with the female body on stage (Sparta and allies). As the men take control, we see that the original schism between men and women is no longer operative. Thus from a wide-angle view the women in this play have served as the ritual surrogate for men in this play, useful in their capacity to project the vital (animal/*porne*) aspects of human nature, as well as the morally superior elements (priestess/*hetaira*).

The men come out from their feasting completely inebriated, the Athenian celebrating drunkenness as the preferred state for interactions with the Spartans (1228–1240). Although communal drinking is common in comedy, here it also recalls the behavior of the women when they were swearing their oath. Indeed, the play's plot has forced the men to be defined by stereotypes that usually apply to women on and off the comic stage: the old men are physically inferior to the old women who control the Akropolis; they are incomplete without their women and lacking in self-sufficiency. The Proboulos is dressed in women's clothes. In the interaction between Kinesias and Myrrhine, we see a man sexually dominated by his wife, and by the time the Spartan ambassador meets with Kinesias, all the ambassadors want nothing more than to have sex, a lack of self-control that has strong associations with the feminine. In addition, men are also implicated in the women-as-animals trope: when the women call themselves *ataurote* the counterpart of the male as bull is implied. When Lysistrata instructs Diallage to lead the Spartan and Athenian toward her, she tells her to lead them by the tail (1119), a euphemism for penis. Male sexuality is as animal as female.

Aristophanes projects masculine concerns onto female characters in *Lysistrata*. After all, waging war and controlling sexuality were the business of

Athenian men.[107] The women in this play are ritual substitutes for men in this Dionysiac rite produced for the men of Athens. Aristophanes uses the feminine as schematized through ritual and sexuality (and multiple related permutations) to imagine the only kind of peace that would be desirable to the Athenians in 411 BCE, that is, a victory.

Thus *Lysistrata* gives expression to the incompatible urges of the masculine Athenian subject to whom the play was addressed.[108] Throughout the play we have seen these conflicts represented through what was interpreted as a ritual model of dualism. This pattern persists until the end of the play, where we encounter a flurry of doublings that dramatize Athenian ambivalence toward Sparta. When the Athenian ambassador emerges from the banquet he describes the symposiasts as σοφώτατοι, a marked term for those who speak in the code of a *hetaireia*, the riddling language used at symposia to distinguish an inner circle.[109] We might then interrogate the final songs for the meaning they encode.

After the Athenian ambassador praises the virtues of drunkenness for communicating with the Spartans, it is as though we see Spartan culture through a drunken double vision. The Spartan ambassador sings two songs, and in the second one especially, there are myriad images of doubleness. The Spartan singer refers to the naval success at Artemision and the heroic stand of Leonidas and his Spartan warriors against the Persian foe at Thermopylae. In this battle the Spartans were killed to a man, but their fortitude and bravery were legend (Herod. 7.175–178). Moulton describes the assimilation of the Spartans to boars (1255) as a Homeric allusion.[110] Allusions to these battles are unproblematic in that they are examples of cooperation between Sparta and Athens, but they provide a setup for the less straightforward image of Sparta projected in the second song.

107 Bowie (1993: 201).

108 In a very different context, writing on psychoanalysis and the sublime, Neil Hertz has identified a literary pattern that bears striking similarities to Bloch's ritual model. He traces the presence of characters who stand as surrogates for the author, setting the stage for a doubling of figures and images. The woman as double and as victim is a way to expel the instability of these conflicting desires, or even to effect a momentary fixity between them. Hertz (1985: 217–240).

109 Nagy (1985).

110 Moulton (1981: 76–77).

Here, the doubling becomes more marked: the Spartan sings of Helen leading the Leukippides in a dance. Calame notes the similarity of this passage to the choral song in Euripides' *Helen* (1465 ff.) that envisions Helen's return home.[111] In *Lysistrata* Helen is depicted in her cultic role, as maiden-goddess choral leader. Can we expect the Athenians to have thought of her in this singular identity, or would her name have conjured a double image, eliciting also her reputation as the cause of the Trojan War, especially since Homer's influence is marked in the earlier Spartan song?

The Tyndaridae, the twin sons of Zeus, and the two Leukippides whom they carried off are two more sets of doubles in the final Spartan song.[112] Athena of the Brazen House is mentioned twice in the exodos (1299, 1321). She is the counterpart to Athena Polias – goddess of the citadel. Because of Athena's close association with Lysistrata, and the setting of the action on the Akropolis, this reference has been interpreted as an appropriate seal of the rapprochement brought about by the women. But there is also another significant association with the Goddess of the Brazen House that was a symbol of conflict at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War. According to Thucydides, after Sparta and its allies had resolved to engage in war, they began to set the stage with various demands, one being that the Athenians should drive out the curse of Kylon (which, conveniently, would have driven Perikles out of office). In response, the Athenians demanded, among other things, that the Spartans drive out the curse of the Goddess of the Brazen House. The Spartans

111 Calame (1997: 192). Here also Helen dances with a chorus of girls beside the Eurotas in front of the temple Athena Khalkioikos. We should recall that in this play, produced in Athens only a year earlier, Euripides expressed the ambiguous character of Helen by asserting that she actually had a doppelganger. It was this double who ran off with Paris and ignited the Trojan War. It is fascinating that this surrogate Helen is once referred to as διάλλαγημα (Eur. *Helen* 586).

112 Calame (1997: 221); see also Nagy (1990: 348). Alcman fragment 1 *PMG* names two Spartan dancers, Agido and a female choregos. Calame speculated that the name Agido is related to the Agiadai, one of the two dynastic families of Sparta (recall the King Agis besieging Athens from Deceleia). Greg Nagy has argued that the names Agido and Hagesichora are generic identifications for the priestesses of the Leukippides, real women, likely from Spartan royal families, who play the Leukipiddes in the dance. He suggests that the chorus is a microcosm of the social hierarchy that enacts and ritually authorizes the Spartan political order, with its double dynasty. Nagy (1990: 345–349).

incurred this curse when they starved Pausanius to the point of death, blockaded in Athena's temple, removing him only in time to expire.

The aggregation of ambiguous references in an ostensibly celebratory closing hymn does not seem satisfactorily explained as a recasting of history, nor does it seem appropriate to the dynamics of comedy to suggest that a figure like Helen or Athena Chalkioikos should be limited to one aspect of her signification. The foregoing interpretation has suggested that *Lysistrata* can be fully understood only by an audience willing to see double – the priestess as a prostitute, the libation as a sacrifice, the prostitute as a sacrificial victim, the peace process as the violent enactment of Athenian supremacy. The double vision of Sparta that concludes the play corresponds with this theme – there are two Spartas in this play, one with which Athens makes peace, and another that is ridiculed, victimized, and sacrificed. Aristophanes can imagine reconciliation between Athens and Sparta, just as long as the peace process declares Athens the victor.

Conclusion

Although I have focused only on a small collection of texts in this book, I hope that readers will recognize the interplay of the categories of prostitute, wife, and ritual agent elsewhere as well. By way of an epilogue, I would like to offer one more example in which these roles define the parameters for representing the feminine. In the story of Hypereides' defense of Phryne, we find a beautiful and famous courtesan in the middle of the fourth century BCE who was accused of impiety because she allegedly reveled in the Lyceum, introduced a new divinity, and formed illicit *thiasoi,* or bands, of men and women.[1] The tradition memorializing this case bears traces of being shaped by the discursive matrix that defines the prostitute against the wife, while assimilating her to the ritual agent. Athenaios preserves a fragment from Hermippos (ca. 200 BCE), who adapted a story from Idomeneus (ca. 300 BCE), describing the trial:

> *ὁδὲ Ὑπερείδης συναγορεύων τῇ Φρύνῃ, ὡς οὐδὲν ἤνυε λέγων ἐπίδοξοί τε ἦσαν οἱ δικασταὶ καταψηφιούμενοι, παραγαγὼν αὐτὴν εἰς τοὐμφανὲς καὶ περιρρήξας τοὺς χιτωνίσκους γυμνά τε τὰ στέρνα ποιήσας τοὺς ἐπιλογικοὺς οἴκτους ἐκ τῆς ὄψεως αὐτῆς ἐπερρητόρευσεν δεισιδαιμονῆσαί τε ἐποίησεν τοὺς δικαστὰς καὶ ὑποφῆτιν καὶ ζάκορον Ἀφροδίτης ἐλέῳ χαρισαμένους μὴ ἀποκτεῖναι.*

> *Hypereides, while he was defending Phryne, since he was accomplishing nothing by speaking, and the judges were likely going to vote against her, he led her into the open, and ripping off her clothing he made her chest bare. He broke into an epilogue made piteous from the sight of her and caused the jurors to fear as a deity this interpreter and ministrant of Aphrodite, and, indulging their compassion, they did not put her to death. (Hermippus F68=Athenaios 590e)*

1 Cooper (1995: 307n.10).

This fragment, and one other found in ps-Plutarch, are the only versions of this frequently repeated vignette that explicitly give Phryne's beautiful nakedness a persuasive role in her defense.[2] In other accounts the rending of her clothes conforms more to the social conventions of supplication, depicting her more humbly, and, indeed, many scholars believe that the original version described Phryne trying to evoke pity, not the fear of god.[3]

The shaping of the story has been ascribed to the influence of stock invective against orators, describing them as sexually immoderate: "The evidence, then, indicates the disrobing scene was invented by Idomeneus, perhaps to parody and ridicule the courtroom displays of Athenian demagogues."[4] Phryne's own biographical tradition is also thought to be influential. Famous for her beauty, she was said to be even more spectacular in the parts unseen (Ath. 590f.). Although she wore a *chiton* and didn't frequent public baths, she was seen disrobing at the Eleusinia and the Poseidonia (590f.), and there is a tradition that she was Praxiteles' model for his Knidian Aphrodite – a sculpture of the goddess bathing. Phryne's claim to fame was that she was a beautiful nude. With this in mind, it is easy to understand how the rending of her garments in supplication was transformed into a display of her naked body.[5]

In addition to these biographical traditions, I see precisely the same constellation of roles that we've seen operating in the texts of [Demosthenes], Plato, Xenophon, and Aristophanes. When Phryne's naked chest is dramatically revealed to sway the jurors in her favor – the drama of her exposure is informed, in part, by our understanding that it was shameful for a citizen's wife even to be named in this venue. Phryne's nakedness in court is only

2 There are numerous accounts of this scene, [Plutarch] *Hypereides* 849e; Harpocration s.v. "Euthias; Alciphron *Letters of the Courtesans* 3–5 (130–132); Anon. *De sublimitate* 34.3; Quintilian mentions that translating Hypereides' defense of Phryne into Latin was a common rhetorical exercise 10.5.2; see also Davidson (2006: 29–30); McClure (2003: 132–136); Cooper (1991). Phryne's story has also been memorialized in painting. The image of the courtesan before the law court is perhaps most well known from Jean-Léon Gérôme's 1861 painting *Phryne devant le tribunal.*

3 Posidippus *Ephesia* F13KA=Ath. 591e–f describes Phryne taking the hand of each juror in supplication, crying and pleading for her life. Cooper (1991: 314); McClure (2003: 134).

4 Cooper (1995: 315); Davidson (2006: 29) calls the trial "docu-fictional."

5 McClure (2003: 126–132).

possible because nudity was the stock in trade of the prostitute (and Phryne's specialty). In contrast to a wife who is concealed by her clothes and hidden in the midst of a man's property, the prostitute is exposed, naked in public places. Indeed, her nakedness advertises her social alienation.[6] And yet, here Phryne's exposed body communicated something quite different. For, when the jurors looked upon Phryne, they thought she was the *hupophetis* (interpreter) and *zakoros* (honorific term for temple attendant) of Aphrodite.

In the court setting, erotic feminine display is not understood in terms of the marketplace – an advertisement of the prostitute's availability. Rather, in the civic space of the law court, Phryne's naked body is translated into the language of ritual, the other Athenian idiom that could accommodate feminine eroticism. When given legitimacy, the naked prostitute is transformed into the interpreter and attendant of Aphrodite. It is as though the transgressive display of the courtesan in court – her silent testimony – has the effect of ceremonial *aporrheta*, rites so solemn they cannot be named, and, indeed, here the exposure of Phryne's body comes close to a divine epiphany (δεισιδαιμονῆσαί).

While the reinterpretation of the naked prostitute as divine attendant asserts a distinction between the marketplace and civic institutions, it also points to a marked association between the erotic and the ritual sphere. The perils of this link were tempered by an insistence on the distinction between the prostitute and the wife; civic legitimacy formed a nearly impenetrable barrier between the two identities. The similarities between sex and ritual were elaborated through a conceptual association between the public performance of the prostitute and the ritual agent. In Phryne's story we see the law court transform the naked courtesan into a divine attendant. The image of her exposed body before the tribunal is so compelling because it aligns two different scripts prescribing the performance of femininity in public, one prosaic

6 In an elegant formulation of the meaning of nakedness in relation to class, Tim Clarke says, "Class is a name ... for that complex and determinate place we are given in the social body; it is the name for everything which signifies that a certain history lives us, lends us our individuality. By nakedness I mean those signs – that broken indeterminable circuit – which says that we are nowhere but in a body, constructed by it, by the way it incorporates the signs of other people." Clarke (1984: 146). For an example of the alienation of the prostitute naked in public, see Philemon fr. 3 in Kassel and Austin (1983).

the other sublime. At the same time, it demonstrates the power of context to determine meaning.

Indeed, Phryne's story makes the most sense if we read it through the discursive strategy that structures the feminine through the interplay of public roles: the prostitute is defined against the wife, but aligned with the ritual agent. If the erotic woman in public is not going to be seen as a prostitute, then there is a preexisting cultural inclination to see her in the role of ritual agent, a reflex that is structured around the idea of the legitimate wife as absence.

In the previous four chapters we have seen this feminine matrix operating in a variety of seemingly unrelated projects: in the speech "Against Neaira" it is an index against which to calibrate masculine morality and economic behavior; in Plato's *Symposium* it is used to symbolize philosophical transcendence; in Xenophon's *Symposium* it demonstrates a new politics of viewing that integrates the elite and *demos* through the mediation of the philosopher; and in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* it serves as a vehicle to express Athenian ambivalence about the Peloponnesian War. Yet in all four of these texts the feminine continuum reflects and negotiates the intricacies and conflicts at play in the masculine subject, while providing testimony that images of powerful women were integral to Athenian conceptions of masculine subjectivity.

The feminine continuum offers an alternative to an asymmetrical power model for conceptualizing the self. As opposed to a zero-sum relationship, where male is dominant and active and female is subordinate and passive, this tripartite conception of gender juxtaposes different feminine roles in order to relate different types of public performance, and all their associations. The prostitute, the wife, and the ritual agent symbolize a cultural spectrum that provides a rubric for interpreting people, their actions, and contexts. In each context we are asked to interpret how one role relates to the others. To adapt a formulation of Catherine Bell's, feminine performance "must be understood within a semantic framework whereby the significance of an action is dependent upon its place and relationship within a context of all other ways of acting; what it echoes, what it inverts, what it alludes to, what it denies."[7]

My readings have insisted on the absent presences, the echoes, inversions, allusions, and assimilations that characterize representations of women. Time

7 Bell (1992: 220).

and again we have seen that each position on the spectrum is given a value as it relates to the others. Thus, the social inversion that Neaira and Phano come to signify – the outrageous image of the prostitute-*basilinna* – depends on the echoing life story of mother and daughter and the resonance between the erotics of ritual and marketplace sexuality.

In Plato's *Symposium,* all the women are constructed as both absent and present in different degrees, always with an insistence on excluding the female body from the realm of philosophical discourse. Diotima's disembodied voice is all the more singular and powerful when considered in contrast to the silent *auletris.* The semi-inclusion of these extreme positions on the feminine spectrum facilitates Plato's deft sleight-of-hand by which he excludes woman as symbol of legitimate reproduction at the same time that he appropriates the power of maternity for his philosophical project. But this feminine spectrum provides Plato with a necessary alternative to the conventional active–passive model of pederasty, a model based on perceptions about male and female sex roles. The feminine spectrum allows him (perhaps ironically) to depict all lovers as agents and to depict a hierarchy of realms of erotic experience, now linked explicitly to the feminine, for the philosopher to transcend.

Plato's ambivalent embrace of femininity finds a counterpoint in Xenophon's *Symposium,* where the entertainment structures the text. Here the ritual agent is evoked only allusively, through the performance of the marriage of Dionysos. The superimposition of hired dancer and ritual wife produces longing for marital love – a similar triangulation of roles as we saw in "Against Neaira," but with drastically different implications. In both of these texts the graduating order of prostitute, wife, and priestess symbolizes civic reproduction, while women out of order portends sterility – in Xenophon this is represented by the undynamic performance of amazing feats, and in "Against Neaira" the barren city is represented by the image of citizen wives forced into prostitution.

The characterization of the women in *Lysistrata,* on the other hand, as prostitutes and ritual agents is completely allusive – the text is written against the cultural association of ritual practice and prostitution and must be decoded like a palimpsest. Once this subtext is made explicit, however, the play has more coherence. The number of permutations on the association between the registers of sex and sacrifice that Aristophanes incorporates in his play is stunning – the priestess as madam, the temple as bedroom, women as animals, the

prostitute as ritual surrogate. All of these testify not only to his comic genius but also to the richness of the vein he is tapping, this matrix of feminine roles.

While I hope the cumulative evidence compiled in these chapters convinces readers that femininity could be constructed as a multivalent and fragmented category through the negotiation of various public scripts for female behavior, it is not possible to point to "evidence" that would irrefutably confirm my argument. It is discursive practice that aligns these different faces of woman, and it is because this book is concerned with discourse that I can't point to any succinct and explicit articulation of the feminine as tripartite. It has to be pieced together by compiling glimpses that show now the prostitute in opposition to the wife, now the ritual agent assimilated to the prostitute, now the wife elicited as absence through the superimposition of the priestess and prostitute. Even these categories seem to divide or transform from text to text, even passage to passage: the *hetaira*, the *porne*, the *auletris* are no more identical than the *basilinna*, the priestess, and the temple attendant. We are constantly seeing the prostitute contextualized by her difference from the wife, and yet there is an insistence on the continuity between the performance of the prostitute and that of the ritual agent. There is a compulsion to differentiate the *hetaira* from the wife, the *porne* from the priestess. To do this they must be understood in relation to one another, which in turn begs their assimilation, and the collapse of these categories can only mean crisis.

The analyses in this book have illuminated the way discourse functions, and this has never been a straightforward affair. We have seen the feminine matrix evoked on its own terms, as a model for organizing behavior. Thus, in the speech "Against Neaira," the threat Stephanos posed to Athenian democracy was depicted by the degree to which he did not respect distinctions between the prostitute, the wife, and the ritual agent. Norms for appropriate exchange became visible in the negative relief of his outrageous transgressions.

At the same time, this model has been shown to coexist with other paradigms for describing sex, gender, performance, and exchange. The feminine continuum provides an alternative to a range of binary structures: active/passive, male/female, *polis*/elite, *porne*/*hetaira*, sometimes colluding with these discursive structures, at other times subverting them. Thus in Xenophon's *Symposium* this matrix was deployed to advocate for reciprocity as opposed to alienated exchange in terms of erotics, performance, and education. In this text the feminine continuum worked together with the discourse

of the *porne/hetaira* in order to forge a relationship between the *polis* and elite Athenians.

In Plato's *Symposium,* however, we saw the feminine continuum at work in a different semantic field. There it underpinned a reconfiguration of conventional notions of pederasty. It allowed a conception of erotics based not on male–female sex roles, but rather on different degrees and contexts of erotic agency. In the course of this text two different discursive strategies for talking about sex were juxtaposed. The penetration model informed some of the symposiasts' conception of eros but was then shown to be inadequate for others. Nonetheless, both of these models imply that gender is implicated in sexuality and valorizes my earlier claim that an accurate history of sexuality demands a serious engagement with gender as a complex category.

In my reading of *Lysistrata,* I suggested that Aristophanes exploited the instability of the subject–object relation in his representation of women. Thus, he evoked the image of the prostitute to configure women as both sexual agents and sexual objects, and he manipulated the semantics of ritual to depict women as simultaneously sacrificial agents and victims. This strategy played on the analogies between prostitutes and women at ritual, at the same time that it exposed the tensions inherent in this homology. By superimposing the image of the prostitute over that of the priestess, Aristophanes' text suggested that the dynamic that recasts the *hetaira* as a *porne* is a ritual logic akin to the process of identification and destruction between a sacrificial agent and victim. At the same time this analogy served another purpose, for the potentially threatening and powerful image of the priestess, as characterized by Lysistrata, is both undermined and contained by her implied relationship to the prostitute.

These analyses have argued that the feminine continuum is one strategy among others that the Athenians used to describe and prescribe behavior. By allowing the possibility that one discursive formation can serve even opposing interests, and that different strategies for describing and regulating identity coexisted without necessarily being reconciled, my readings point toward a radical incoherence of the masculine subject.[8] Although I haven't made claims about the effect that this discourse of femininity had on the lives of Athenian women, I think the implications that this argument has about the relationship

8 Sedgwick (1990: 47).

of gender to subjectivity apply to any kind of person. Furthermore, these readings have shown that the Athenians did not imagine themselves without recourse to notions of feminine agency – erotic, economic, and performative – alongside other notions that can't be reconciled with these. For ancient women then too, there was an incoherence in the public transcript for their behavior and identity, which in turn suggests the possibility of contest and negotiation.

This study has insisted on the multiplicity and polyvalence of the matrix of the prostitute, the wife, and the ritual agent. I have tried to capture the way discourse functions and have found, as have others, that there is a fuzziness in practice that is lost in theory. Functioning social taxonomies are always dynamic and therefore constantly recombining, while methodical analysis of these systems imposes a forced coherence upon them. What Bourdieu says about the Kabyle calendar applies equally well to scholarship on sex and gender in the ancient world: "There is a great temptation to amass and collate these different productions in order to construct a lacuna-free, contradiction free whole, a sort of unwritten score of which all the calendars derived from informants are then regarded as imperfect, impoverished *performances*."[9] If we have not yet found a perfect, incontrovertible expression of the feminine continuum, or explanation of its meaning, or acknowledgment of its source, perhaps it is because, as Bourdieu puts it, "what goes without saying comes without saying."[10]

9 Bourdieu (1977: 98).
10 Bourdieu (1977: 167).

Bibliography

Anderson, J. K. (1974) *Xenophon*. New York.

Arthur, M. (1983) "The Dream of a World without Women: Poetics and the Circles of Order in the *Theogony* Prooemium," *Arethusa* 16.1–2: 97–116.

Aviagnou, A. (1991) *Sacred Marriage in the Rituals of Greek Religion*. Bern.

Azoulay, V. (2004) *Xénophon et les grâces du pouvoir: de la charis au charisme*. Paris.

Banton, M. (1968) *Anthropological Approaches to the Study of Religion*. London.

Bartlett, R. (1996) *Xenophon: The Shorter Socratic Writings*. Ithaca, NY.

Bartsch, S., and T. Bartscherer (2005) *Erotikon: Essays on Eros Ancient and Modern*. Chicago.

Bäumlein, W. (1861) *Untersuchungen über griechische Partikeln*. Stuttgart.

Beckerman, B. (1970) *The Dynamics of Drama*. New York.

Bell, C. (1992) *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*. Oxford.

Benjamin, A. (1988) *Post-structuralist Classics*. London.

Benveniste, E. (1973) *Indo-European Language and Society*. London.

Bérard, C. (1989) *A City of Images: Iconography in Ancient Greece*. Trans. D. Lyons. Princeton, NJ.

Bergquist, B. (1990) "Sympotic Space: A Functional Aspect of Greek Dining-Rooms." In Murray 1990: 37–65.

Bergren, A. L. T. (1983) "Language and the Female in Early Greek Thought." *Arethusa* 16: 69–95.

Berthiaume, G. (1982) *Les roles du Mageiros: études sur la boucherie la cuisine et le sacrifice dans la Grèce ancienne*. Leiden.

Blass, F. (1877) *Attische Beredsamkeit*. Leipzig.

Bloch, M. (1992) *Prey into Hunter: The Politics of Religious Experience*. Cambridge.

Bloom, A. D., and S. Benardete (2001) *Plato's Symposium*. Chicago.

Blundell, S., and M. Williamson (1998) *The Sacred and the Feminine in Ancient Greece*. London.

Boardman J. (1975) *Athenian Red Figure Vases: The Archaic Period: A Handbook*. London.

Boegehold, A., and A. Scafuro (1994). *Athenian Identity and Civic Ideology*. Baltimore.

Bonner, R. J. (1933) *Aspects of Athenian Democracy*. Berkeley, CA.

Bonner, R. J., and G. Smith (1943) "Administration of Justice in the Delphic Amphictyony." *CP* 38: 1–111.

Bourdieu, P. (1977) *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge.

Bourdieu, P. (1980) *The Logic of Practice*. Berkeley, CA.

Bowie, A. M. (1993) *Aristophanes: Myth, Ritual, and Comedy*. Cambridge.

Brown, W. (1994) "Supposing Truth Were a Woman . . . : Plato's Subversion of Masculine Discourse." In Tuana 1994: 157–180.

Burgess, T. C. (1902) *Epideictic Literature*. Chicago.

Burkert, W. (1983) *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*. Berkeley, CA.

Burkert, W. (1985) *Greek Religion*. Cambridge, MA.

Bushnell, R. (2005) *A Companion to Tragedy*. Oxford.

Cairns. D. L. (2004) *Law, Rhetoric and Comedy in Classical Athens*. London.

Calame, C. (1989) "Entre rapports de parenté et relations civiques: Aphrodite l'hétaïre au banquet politique des hétairoi." In *Aux sources de la puissance: sociabilité et parenté*. Rouen.

Calame, C., et al. (1997) *Choruses of Young Women in Ancient Greece: Their Morphology, Religious Role, and Social Function*. Lanham, MD.

Cameron, A., and A. Kuhrt (1983) *Images of Women in Antiquity*. Detroit.

Cantarella, E. (1987) *Pandora's Daughters: The Role and Status of Women in Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Trans. M. Fant. Baltimore.

Canto, M. (1994) "The Politics of Women's Bodies: Reflections on Plato." In Tuana 1994: 49–66.

Carey, C. (1992) *Apollodoros against Neaira (Demosthenes) 59*. Warminster.

Carnes, J. (1998) "This Myth Which Is Not One: Construction of Discourse in Plato's *Symposium*." In Larmour et al. 1998: 104–121.

Carson, A. (1990) "Putting Her in Her Place: Woman, Dirt, and Desire." In Halperin et al. 1990: 135–169.

Cartledge, P. (1993) *The Greeks: A Portrait of Self and Others*. Oxford.

Casabona, J. (1966) *Recherches sur le vocabulaire des sacrifices en grec, des origines à la fin de l'époque classique*. Aix-en-Provence.

Cavarero A. (1995) *In Spite of Plato: A Feminist Rewriting of Ancient Philosophy*. New York.

Chantraine, P. (1933) *La formation des noms en gree ancien*. Paris.

Clarke, T. (1984) *The Painting of Modern Life: Paris in the Art of Manet and His Followers*. Princeton, NJ.

Clay, D. (1975) "The Tragic and Comic Poet of the *Symposium*." *Arion* n.s. 2: 238–261.

Clinton, K. (2003) "Stages of Initiation in the Eleusinian and Samothracian Mysteries." In Cosmopoulos 2003: 50–78.

Clover, C. (1993) "Regardless of Sex: Men, Women, and Power in Early Northern Europe. *Speculum* 68.2: 363–387.

Cobb-Stevens, V. (1985) "The Unsettled World of Theognis." In *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis*, ed. T. J. Figueira and G. Nagy. Baltimore, 159–175.

Cohen, D. (1991). *Law, Sexuality, and Society: The Enforcement of Morals in Classical Athens*. Cambridge.

Cohen, E. E. (1997) "Prostitution in Fourth-Century Athens: Sexual Economics or Erotic Politics?" Unpublished paper.

Connelly, J. B. (2007) *Portrait of a Priestess: Women and Ritual in Ancient Greece*. Princeton, NJ.

Connor, W. R. (1987) "Tribes, Festivals and Processions: Civic Ceremonial and Political Manipulation in Ancient Greece." *JHS* 107: 40–50.

Cooper, C. (1995) "Hyperides and the Trial of Phryne." *Phoenix* 49.4: 303–318.

Cornford, F. M. (1971) "The Doctrine of Eros in Plato's *Symposium*." In Vlastos 1971: 2: 126–128.

Cosmopoulos, M. (2003) *Greek Mysteries: The Archaeology and Ritual of Ancient Greek Secret Cults*. London.

Cox, C. (1998) *Household Interests: Property, Marriage Strategies, and Family Dynamics in Ancient Athens*. Princeton, NJ.

Crowther, N. B. (1985) "Male Beauty Contests in Greece: The Euandria and Euexia." *CA* 54: 285–291.

Davidson, J. (1994) *Consuming Passions: Appetite, Addiction and Spending in Classical Athens.* Ph.D. dissertation. Oxford.

Davidson, J. (1998) *Courtesans & Fishcakes: The Consuming Passions of Classical Athens*. New York.

Davidson, J. (2001) "Dover, Foucault and Greek Homosexuality: Penetration and the Truth of Sex." *Past and Present* 170: 3–51.

Davidson, J. (2006) "Making a Spectacle of Her(self): The Greek Courtesan and the Art of the Present." In Feldman and Gordon 2006: 29–51.

Davies, J. K. (1981) *Wealth and the Power of Wealth in Classical Athens*. New York.

De Lauretis, T. (1987) *Technologies of Gender*. Bloomington, IN.

Demosthenes. (1931) *Orationes*. Edited by W. Rennie. Oxford.

Denniston, J. D. (1970) *The Greek Particles*. Oxford.

Derrida, J. (1976) *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore.

Detienne, M. (1977) *The Gardens of Adonis: Spices in Greek Mythology*. London.

Detienne, M., and J. P. Vernant (1989) *The Cuisine of Sacrifice among the Greeks*. Chicago.

Diels, H., and W. Kranz (1951) *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker, griechisch und deutsch*. Berlin.

Dillon, M. (1987) "The *Lysistrata* as a Post-Deceleian Peace Play." *TAPA* 117: 97–104.

Dougherty, C. (1993) The Poetics of Colonization: From City to Text in Archaic Greece. New York.

Douglas, M. (1967) "The Meaning of Myth, with Special Reference to 'La Geste d'Asdiwal.' " In Leach 1967: 49–71.

Dover, K. J. (1966) "Aristophanes' Speech in Plato's *Symposium*." *JHS* 86: 41–50.

Dover, K. J. (1972) *Aristophanic Comedy*. Berkeley, CA.

Dover, K. J. (1989) *Greek Homosexuality*. Cambridge.

Dover, K. J., and American Council of Learned Societies (1974) *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle*. Oxford.

Dover, K. J., ed. (1980) *Plato: Symposium*. Cambridge.

Dover, K. J., ed. (1993) *Aristophanes: Frogs*. Oxford.

DuBois, P. (1988) *Sowing the Body: Psychoanalysis and Ancient Representations of Women*. Chicago.

DuBois, P. (1998) "The Subject in Antiquity After Foucault." in Larmour, Miller, and Platter 1998: 85–103.

Edmonds, R. G., III (2000) "Socrates the Beautiful: Role Reversal and Midwifery in Plato's *Symposium*." *TAPA* 130: 261–285.

Elderkin, G. W. (1940) "Aphrodite and Athena in the *Lysistrata* of Aristophanes." *CP* 35: 387–396.

Faraone, C. A. (2004) "Lysistrata the Priestess or the Courtesan? Female Stereotypes in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*." In Faraone and McClure 2006: 207–223.

Faraone, C. A., and L. McClure (2006) *Prostitutes and Courtesans in the Ancient World*. Madison, WI.

Farnell, L. R. (1971) *Cults of the Greek States V*. Chicago.

Feaver, D. D. (1957) "Historical Developments of the Priesthoods at Athens." *YCS*: 123–158.
Fehr, B. (1990) "Entertainers at the Symposion: The Akletoi in the Archaic Period." In Murray 1990: 185–195.
Feldman, M., and B. Gordon (2006) *The Courtesan's Arts: Cross-cultural Perspectives*. New York.
Ferrari, G. (2002) *Figures of Speech: Men and Maidens in Ancient Greece*. Chicago.
Finkelberg, M. (1997) "Plato's Language of Love and the Female." *HThR* 90: 231–261.
Finley, M. (1985) *Democracy Ancient and Modern*. New Brunswick, NJ.
Foley, H. (1982) "The 'Female Intruder' Reconsidered: Women in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* and *Ecclesiazousae*." *CP* 77: 1–21.
Foley, H. (1992) "*Anodos* Drama: Euripides' *Alcestis* and *Helen*." In Hexter and Selden 1992: 133–160.
Fornara, C. W. (1967) "Two Notes on Thucydides." *Philologus* 111: 291–295.
Foucault, M. (1980) *The History of Sexuality. Volume I: An Introduction*. New York.
Foucault, M. (1985). *The History of Sexuality Volume 2: The Use of Pleasure*. New York.
Foxhall, L. (1998) "Pandora Unbound: A Feminist Critique of Foucault's *History of Sexuality*." In Larmour, Miller, and Platter 1998: 122–137.
Fraenkel, E. (1950) *Aeschylus: Agamemnon*. Oxford.
Frontisi-DuCroix, F. (1989) "In the Mirror of the Mask." In Bérard 1989: 151–165.
Geertz, C. (1968) "Religion as a Cultural System." In Banton 1968: 1–46.
Gentili, B., ed. (1958) *Anacreon*. Rome.
Gernet, L. (1960) *Démosthène Plaidoyers Civils IV*. Paris.
Gilhuly, K. (2006) "The Phallic Lesbian: Philosophy, Comedy and Social Inversion in Lucian's *Dialogues of the Courtesan*." In Faraone and McClure 2006: 274–291.
Gilhuly, K. (2007) "Bronze for Gold: Subjectivity in Lucian's *Dialogues of the Courtesans*." *AJP* 128.1: 59–94.
Glazebrook, A. (2005) "The Making of a Prostitute: Apollodoros' Portrait of Neaira." *Arethusa* 38: 161–187.
Goff, B. (2004) *Citizen Bacchae: Women's Rtual Practice in Ancient Greece*. Berkeley, CA.
Golden, M. (1984) "Slavery and Homosexuality at Athens." *Phoenix* 38: 308–324.
Goldhill, S. (1998) "The Seduction of the Gaze: Socrates and His Girlfriends." In *Kosmos: Essays in Order, Conflict and Community in Classical Athens*, ed. P. Cartledge, P. Millett, and S. Von Reden. Cambridge, 105–124.
Goldhill, S., and R. Osborne (1999) *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*. Cambridge.
Gordon. R. L., ed. (1984) *Myth, Religion and Society*. Cambridge.
Gould, J. (1980) "Law, Custom and Myth: Aspects of the Social Position of Women in Classical Athens." *JHS* 100: 38–59.
Gray, V. (1992) "Xenophon's *Symposion*: The Display of Wisdom." *Hermes* 120: 58–75.
Gribble, D. (1999) *Alcibiades and Athens: A Study in Literary Presentation*. Oxford.
Griffith, M. (2002) "Slaves of Dionysos: Satyrs, Audience and the Ends of the *Oresteia*." *CA* 21.2: 195–258.
Habinek, T. (1998) *The Politics of Latin Literature: Writing, Identity, and Empire in Ancient Rome*. Princeton, NJ.

Halperin, D. (1985) "Platonic Eros and What Men Call Love." *Ancient Philosophy* 5: 161–204.

Halperin, D. (1986) "Plato and Erotic Reciprocity." *Classical Antiquity* 5.1: 60–80.

Halperin, D., ed. (1989) *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality and Other Essays on Greek Love*. New York.

Halperin, D. (1990) "Why Is Diotima a Woman?" in Halperin et al. 1990: 257–308.

Halperin, D. (2002) *How to Do the History of Homosexuality*. Chicago.

Halperin, D. (2005) "Love's Irony: Six Remarks on Platonic Eros." In Bartsch and Bartscherer 2005: 48–58.

Halperin, D., J. J. Winkler, and F. Zeitlin (1990) *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World.* Princeton, NJ.

Hamel, D. (2003) *Trying Neaira: The True Story of a Courtesan's Scandalous Life in Ancient Greece*. New Haven, CT.

Hamilton, R. (1992) *The Choes and Anthesteria: Athenian Iconography and Ritual.* Ann Arbor, MI.

Hansen, M. H. (1964) "The Theoric Fund and the *Graphe Paranomon* against Apollodoros." *CR* 78: 235–246.

Hansen, M. H. (1976) *Apagoge, Endeixis and Ephegesis against Kakourgoi, Atimoi and Pheugontes: A Study in the Athenian Administration of Justice in the Fourth Century B.C.* Odense.

Hansen, M. H. (1987) *The Athenian Assembly in the Age of Demosthenes*. New York.

Harrison, A. R. W. (1971) *The Law of Athens*. London.

Henderson, J. (1975) *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*. New Haven, CT.

Henderson, J. (1987) *Aristophanes'* Lysistrata. Oxford.

Henderson, J. (1990) "The *Demos* and the Comic Competition." In Winkler and Zeitlin 1990: 271–313.

Herter, H. (1960) Die Soziologie der antiken Prostitution im Lichte des heidnischen und christlichen Schrifttums." *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 3: 70–11.

Hertz, N. (1985) *The End of the Line: Essays on Psychoanalysis and the Sublime*. New York.

Hexter, R., and D. Selden (1992) *Innovations of Antiquity*. London.

Higgins, W. E. (1977) *Xenophon the Athenian: The Problem of the Individual and the Society of the Polis.* Albany, NY.

Hobden, F. (2004) "Reading Xenophon's *Symposium.*" *Ramus*: 34.2: 93–111.

Houser, J. S. (2002) "Eros and Aphrodisia in the Works of Dio Chrysostom." In Nussbaum and Sihvola 2002: 327–353.

Hubbard, T. K (1998) "Popular Perceptions of Elite Homosexuality in Classical Athens." *Arion* 3rd ser. 6: 48–78.

Humphreys, S. C. (1978) *Anthropology and the Greeks*. Boston.

Huss, B. (1999) "Dancing Sokrates and Laughing Xenophon, or the Other 'Symposium.'" *AJP* 120: 380–409.

Jay, M. (1993) *With Downcast Eyes: The Denigration of Vision in Twentieth Century Thought*. Berkeley, CA.

Johnstone, S. (1994) "Virtuous Toil, Vicious Work: Xenophon on Aristocratic Style." *CP* 89: 221–252.

Kagan, D. (2003). *The Peloponnesian War*. New York.

Kapparis, K. (1999) *Apollodoros against Neiara [D. 59].* Berlin.

Karras, R. M. (2000) "Active/Passive, Acts Passions: Greek and Roman Sexualities." *American Historical Review* 105: 1250–1265.

Kassel, R., and C. Austin (1983). *Poetae Comici Graeci (PCG)*. Berlin.

Kelly, A. (1994) *Damaging Voice*. Ph.D. dissertation. Berkeley, CA.

Kennedy, G. A. (1963) *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*. Princeton, NJ.

Keuls, E. C. (1985) *The Reign of the Phallus: Sexual Politics in Ancient Athens*. New York.

Kolek, L. S. (1985) "Towards a Poetics of Comic Narratives: Notes on the Semiotic Structure of Jokes." *Semiotica* 53: 145–163.

Kraut, R., ed. (1992) *The Cambridge Companion to Plato*. Cambridge.

Krell. D. F. (1988). " 'Knowledge Is Remembrance': Diotima's Instruction." In Benjamin 1988: 160–172.

Kurke, L. (1989) "ΚΑΠΗΛΕΙΑ and Deceit: Theognis 59–60." *AJP* 110: 535–544.

Kurke, L. (1991) *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*. Ithaca, NY.

Kurke, L. (1992) "The Politics of ἁβροσύνη in Archaic Greece." *CA* 11: 97–120.

Kurke, L. (1999) *Coins, Bodies, Games, and Gold: The Politics of Meaning in Archaic Greece*. Princeton, NJ.

Kurke, L. (2006) "Plato, Aesop, and the Beginnings of Mimetic Prose." *Representations* 94: 6–52.

Lacey, W. K. (1968) *The Family in Classical Greece*. Ithaca, NY.

Lape, S. (2004) *Reproducing Athens: Menander's Comedy, Democratic Athens and the Hellenistic City.* Princeton, NJ.

Lardinois, A., and L. McClure (2001) *Making Silence Speak: Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society*. Princeton, NJ.

Larmour, D., P. A. Miller, and C. Platter (1998) *Rethinking Sexuality: Foucault and Classical Antiquity*. Princeton, NJ.

Leach E. (1967) *The Structural Study of Myth and Totemism*. London.

Lefkowitz, M., and M. Fant (2005) *Women's Life in Greece and Rome: A Source Book in Translation*. London.

Lévi-Strauss, C. (1969) *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*. Boston.

Levine, D. B. (1985) "Symposium and the *Polis*." In *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis*, ed. T. J. Figueira and G. Nagy. Baltimore, 176–196.

Lewis, D. M. (1955) "Notes on Attic Inscriptions (II)." *ABSA* 50: 1–12.

Loraux, N. (1980–1981) "L'acropole comique." *AS* 11/12: 119–150.

Loraux, N. (1986) *The Invention of Athens: The Funeral Oration in the Classical City*. Cambridge, MA.

Loraux, N. (1993) *The Children of Athena: Athenian Ideas about Citizenship and the Division between the Sexes*. Princeton, NJ.

Loraux, N. (1995) *The Experience of Tiresias: The Feminine and the Greek Man*. Princeton, NJ.

Lowe, N. (1998) "Thesmophoria and Haloa: Myth, Physics and Mysteries." In Blundell and Williamson 1998: 149–173.

Ludwig, P. W. (2002) *Eros and Polis: Desire and Community in Greek Political Theory*. Cambridge.

Lugones, M., and E. V. Spellman (1983) "Have We Got a Theory for You! Feminist Theory, Cultural Imperialism and the Demand for the Woman's Voice." *Women's Studies International Forum* 6.6: 573–582.

MacDowell, D. M. (1995) *Aristophanes and Athens: An Introduction to the Plays*. Oxford.

MacLachlan, B. (1993) *The Age of Grace: Charis in Early Greek Poetry*. Princeton, NJ.

Macurdy, G. H. (1940). *The Quality of Mercy; the Gentler Virtues in Greek Literature*. New Haven, CT.

Macurdy, G. H. (1942) "Apollodorus and the Speech against Neaera (Pseudo-Dem. LIX)." *AJP* 63: 257–271.

Marchant, E. C., ed. (1971) *Xenophon's Symposium*. Oxford.

Martin, R. P. (1987) "Fire on the Mountain: *Lysistrata* and the Lemnian Women." *CA* 6: 77–105.

Maurizio, L. (2001) "The Voice at the Center of the World: The Pythia's Ambiguity and Authority." In Lardinois and McClure 2001: 38–54.

McCabe, D. F. (1981) *The Prose Rhythm of Demosthenes*. New York.

McClure, L. (1997) *Teaching a Course on Gender in the Classical World. CJ* 92.3: 259–270.

McClure, L. (2003). *Courtesans at Table: Gender and Greek Literary Culture in Athenaeus*. London.

McManus, B. (1997) *Classics and Feminism: Gendering the Classics*. New York.

Millett, P. (1991) *Lending and Borrowing in Ancient Athens*. Cambridge.

Miner, J. (2003) "Courtesan, Concubine, Whore: Apollodorus' Deliberate Use of Terms for Prostitutes." *AJP* 124: 19–37.

Momigliano, A. (1971) *The Development of Greek Biography*. Cambridge.

Morgan, M. (1992) "Plato and Greek Religion." In Kraut 1992: 233–235.

Morris, I. (1996) "The Strong Principle of Equality and the Archaic Origins of Greek Democracy." In Ober and Hedrick 1996: 19–48.

Morris, I. (1998) "Remaining Invisible." In Murnaghan and Joshel 1998: 194–218.

Morrison, D. R. (1994) "Xenophon's Socrates as Teacher." In Vander Waerdt 1994: 181–208.

Most, G. (2005) "Six Remarks on Platonic Eros." In Bartsch and Bartscherer 2005: 33–47.

Moulton, C. (1981). *Aristophanic Poetry*. Göttingen.

Murnaghan, S. (1988) "How a Woman Can Be More Like a Man: The Dialogue between Ischomachus and His Wife in Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*." *Helios* 15: 9–22.

Murnaghan, S., and S. R. Joshel (1998) *Slaves and Women in Greco-Roman Culture: Differential Equations*. New York.

Murray, O. (1990) *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion*. Oxford.

Murray, P., and P. Wilson (2004). *Music and the Muses*. Oxford.

Nagy, G. (1985) "Theognis and Megara: A Poet's Vision of his City." In Nagy and Figueira 1985: 22–81.

Nagy, G. (1990) *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*. Baltimore.

Nagy, G., and T. J. Figueira (1985) *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis*. Baltimore.

Nails, D. (2002) *The People of Plato: A Prosopography of Plato and Other Socratics*. Indianapolis, IN.

Nauck, A., and B. Snell (1989) *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta, Recensuit Augustus Nauck. Supplementum Continens Nova Fragmenta Euripidea et Adespota apud Scriptores Veteres Reperta*. Hildesheim.

Newiger, H. (1996) "War and Peace in the Comedy of Aristophanes." In Segal 1996: 143–161.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1979) "The Speech of Alcibiades: A Reading of Plato's *Symposium*." *Philosophy and Literature* 3.2: 131–172.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1986) *The Fragility of Goodness: Luck and Ethics in Greek Tragedy and Philosophy*. Cambridge.

Nussbaum, M. C., and Juha Sihvola (2002) *The Sleep of Reason: Erotic Experience and Sexual Ethics in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Chicago.

Ober, J. (1989) *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens: Rhetoric, Ideology and the Power of the People*. Princeton, NJ.

Ober, J., and C. W. Hedrick (1996) *Demokratia: a Conversation on Democracies, Ancient and Modern*. Princeton, NJ.

Ollier, F. (1961) *Banquet, Apologie de Socrate*. Paris.

Papademetriou, I. (1948–1949). "ATTIKA I." *AE* 86–87:146–153.

Parke, H. W., and D. E. W. Wormell (1956) *The Delphic Oracle*. Oxford.

Parry, J., and M. Bloch (1989) *Money and the Morality of Exchange*. New York.

Patterson, C. (1985) "Not Worth the Rearing." *TAPA*: 103–123.

Patterson, C. (1986) "Hai Attikai." *Helios* 13: 49–86.

Patterson, C. (1990) "Those Athenian Bastards." *CA* 9: 40–73.

Patterson, C. (1994) "The Case against Neaira and the Public Ideology of the Athenian Family." In Boegehold and Scafuro 1994: 199–216.

Pickard-Cambridge, A. W., et al. (1988) *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*. Oxford.

Pippin Burnett, A. (1983) *Three Archaic Poets: Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho*. London.

Poliakoff, M. (1987) *Combat Sports in the Ancient World: Competition, Violence and Culture*. New Haven, CT.

Pomeroy, S. (1975) *Goddesses, Whores, Wives and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity*. New York.

Press, G. (2000) *Who Speaks for Plato*. Lanham, MD.

Pucci, P. (1977) *Hesiod and the Language of Poetry*. Baltimore.

Rabe, H., ed. (1913) *Hermogenes: Opera*. Leipzig.

Rabinowitz, N. S. (1993) *Anxiety Veiled: Euripides and the Traffic in Women*. Ithaca, NY.

Rabinowitz, N. S. (2004) "Changing Lenses: The Politics and Discourse of Feminism in Classics. Women: Good to Think With?" www.stoa.org.

Rabinowitz, N. S., and A. Richlin (1993) *Feminist Theory and the Classics*. New York.

Reckford, K. J. (1974) "Desire with Hope: Aristophanes and the Comic Catharsis." *Ramus* 3: 41–69.

Redfield, J. (1982) "Notes on a Greek Wedding." *Arethusa* 15: 181–201.

Redfield, J. (1994) *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: The Tragedy of Hektor*. Chapel Hill, NC.

Reed, J. (1995) "The Sexuality of Adonis." *CA* 142: 317–347.

Reinsberg, C. (1989) *Ehe, Hetarentum und Knabenliebe im antiken Griechenland*. Munich.

Rhodes, J. (2003) *Eros, Wisdom and Science*. St. Louis, MO.

Richlin, A. (1991) "Zeus and Metis: Foucault, Feminism, Classics." *Helios* 18: 160–180.

Richlin, A. (1992) *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*. Oxford.

Richlin A. (1998) "Foucault's History of Sexuality: A Useful Theory for Women?" In Larmour et al. 1998: 138–170.

Sartre, J. P. (1963) *Saint Genet: Actor and Martyr*. New York.

Saxonhouse, A. (1984) "Eros and the Female in Greek Political Thought: An Interpretation of Plato's Symposium." *Political Theory* 12: 5–27.

Saxonhouse, A. (1994) "The Philosopher and the Female in the Political Thought of Plato." In Tuana 1994: 67–86.
Schaps, D. (1977) "The Woman Least Mentioned: Etiquette and Women's Names." *CQ* 27: 323–331.
Schmitt-Pantel, P. (1990) "Sacrificial Meal and Symposion: Two Models of Civic Institutions in the Archaic City?" In Murray 1990: 14–33.
Schwyzer, E. (1939) *Griechische Grammatik*. Munich.
Sealey, R. (1987) "How Citizenship and the City Began in Athens." *AJAH* 8(2): 97–129.
Sedgwick, E. (1990) *The Epistemology of the Closet*. Berkeley, CA.
Segal, E. (1996) *Oxford Readings in Aristophanes*. Oxford.
Sfyoeras, P. (2004) "From Sacrifice to Feast: A Ritual Pattern in Aristophanic Comedy." In Cairns 2004: 251–268.
Singleton, C. S. (1969) *Interpretation: Theory and Practice*. Baltimore.
Skinner, M. (1987) "Des bonnes dames et mechantes." *CJ* 83: 69–74.
Sommerstein, A. H. (1977) "Aristophanes and the Events of 411." *JHS* 97: 112–126.
Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (1988) *Studies in Girls' Transitions: Aspects of the Arkteia and Age Representation in Attic Iconography*. Athens.
Starr, C. (1978) "An Evening with the Flute-girls." *La Parola del Passato–Rivista di Studi Antichi* 183: 401–410.
Stehle, E. (1997) *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece: Nondramatic Poetry in Its Setting*. Princeton, NJ.
Steiner, D. (1998) "Moving Images: Fifth Century Victory Monuments and the Athlete's Allure." *CA* 17.1: 123–149.
Stevens, J. A. (1994) "Friendship and Profit in Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*." In Vander Waerdt 1994: 209–237.
Stone, L. (1981) *The Costumes of Aristophanic Drama*. New York.
Strauss, B. (1993) *Fathers and Sons in Athens: Ideology and Society in the Era of the Peloponnesian War*. Princeton, NJ.
Strauss, L. (1972) *Xenophon's Socrates*. Ithaca, NY.
Stroup, S. (2003). "Designing Women: Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* and the Hetairization of the Greek Wife." *Arethusa*. 37.1: 37–73.
Taafe, L. K. (1993) *Aristophanes and Women*. New York.
Thornton, B. (1991) "Constructionism and Ancient Greek Sex." *Helios* 18.2: 181–193.
Thornton, B. (1997) *Eros: The Myth of Ancient Greek Sexuality.* Boulder, CO.
Todd, O. J. (1992) *Xenophon IV*. Cambridge, MA.
Tuana, N. (1994) *Feminist Interpretations of Plato*. University Park, PA.
Turner, J. A. (1983) *Hiereiai: Acquisition of Priesthoods in Ancient Greece*. Ph.D. dissertation. Berkeley, CA.
Vaio, J. (1973) "The Manipulation of Theme and Action in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*." *GRBS* 14: 369–380.
Van Straten, F. T. (1995) *Hiera Kala: Images of Animal Sacrifice in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Leiden.

Vander Waerdt, P. (1994) *The Socratic Movement*. Ithaca, NY.
Vernant, J. P. (1981) "The Myth of Prometheus in Hesiod." In Gordon 1984: 43–56.
Vernant, J. P. (1981) "Sacrificial and Alimentary Codes in Hesiod's Myth of Prometheus." In Gordon 1984: 57–79.
Vernant, J. P., and P. Vidal-Naquet (1969) "Tensions and Ambiguities in Greek Tragedy." In Singleton 1969: 105–121.
Vilatte, S. (1986) "La femme, l'esclave, le cheval, et le chien: les emblèmes du kalòs kagathós Ischomaque." *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 12: 271–294.
Vlastos, G. (1971) *Plato: a Collection of Critical Essays*. 2 vols. Garden City, NY.
Von Reden, S. (1995) *Exchange in Ancient Greece*. London.
West, M. L. (1994) *Ancient Greek Music*. Oxford.
Wilkins, J. (2000) *The Boastful Chef: The Discourse of Food in Ancient Greek Comedy*. Oxford.
Williams, D. (1983) "Women on Athenian Vases." In Cameron and Kuhrt 1983: 92–106.
Winkler, J. J. (1990). *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece*. New York.
Winkler, J. J. (1990) "Laying Down the Law." In Halperin et al. 1990: 71–210.
Winkler, J. J., and F. I. Zeitlin (1990) *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in Its Social Context*. Princeton, NJ.
Wohl, V. (1998) *Intimate Commerce: Exchange, Gender, and Subjectivity in Greek Tragedy*. Austin, TX.
Wohl, V. (2002) *Love among the Ruins: The Erotics of Democracy in Classical Athens*. Princeton, NJ.
Wohl, V. (2004) "Dirty Dancing: Xenophon's *Symposium*." In Murray and Wilson 2004: 337–363.
Wohl, V. (2005) "Tragedy and Feminism." In Bushnell 2005: 145–160.
Zeitlin, F. (1990) "Playing the Other: Theatre, Theatricality, and the Feminine in Greek Drama." In Winkler and Zeitlin 1990: 63–96.
Zeitlin, F. (1996) *Playing the Other: Gender and Society in Classical Greek Literature*. Chicago.
Zweig, B. (1992) "The Mute, Nude Female Characters in Aristophanes' Plays." In Richlin 1992: 73–89.

Index Locorum

Aeschines
1.41 7
1.82 7
1.110 7
3.216ff 41

Aeschylus
Agamemnon
238–247 171

Alkiphron
Letters of the Courtesans
3–5 (130–132) 181
4.14 144
4.18 133
10ff 133

Anon.
De sublimitate 34.3 181

Apollodorus
Bibliotheca 4.14.4 143
Fr.Gr.Hist. 244F 109 173

Aristophanes
Acharnians
504–506 140, 178
885 172
Birds
284 124
sch. 286 124
Ekklesiazousai
Sch. 810 124
Frogs
429 124
Lysistrata
1–3 155
76–91 162
77 163
84 163, 168
85–88 168
115 170
155 175
168–169 153
177–179 143
184–185 157
189 157
191–193 175
192 157
202 157
203 158
204–205 157
205 157
217–218 170, 171
231 170
239 158
260 170
363 170
384 144
387–399 145
468 170
476 170
551–554 149
567–586 160
572–586 146
588–597 145
610–614 144
615–619 146
638–646 147
651 34, 145

Aristophanes (*cont.*)

661–663 146
683 170
686–687 146
687–737 160
700–703 173, 174
718–719 159
771 170
824 170
861 160
938 143
940 143
940–946 146
942 143
946 143
1001 170
1015 170
1108 147
1119 176
1114 143
1126–1127 147
1131 164
1133–1134 164
1148 165
1161 166
1162–1187 166–167
1228–1240 176
1255 177
1299 178
1301 174
1307–1308 170
1308 174
1321 178
Peace
666 168
Thesmo.
135–140 84
176 84
179–181 84
185 84
189 84
Wasps
1335–1381 65, 111

Aristotle
Ath. Pol.
8.5 32
Rhetoric
1375a29 116
1358b2ff 120

Artemidorus
13.573 13
13.594B 18

Athenaios
Deipnosophistae
201–202 170
297d 173
325b–d 173
588c 158
590d–f 180, 181
591e–f 181
607 65

Callimachus
fr. 178 133

Deinarchos
Against Aristogeiton
212 18

Demosthenes
1 *hyp.*5 32
18.113–115 42
21.133 21
21.159 21
23.68 157
25.22 34
36.45 22
54.7–9 138
54.14 138
59.1 32

59.2 36, 37
59.4 29
59.5–6 31
59.8 34
59.16 40
59.18 38
59.19 40
59.20 40
59.21 13
59.23 40
59.26 44
59.33–34 42
59.39 49
59.41 1, 39, 45
59.46 39
59.64 50
59.67 43
59.72 50
59.75 47, 133
59.76 47, 48
59.87 46
59.95 53
59.97 51
59.113 1, 56
59.115 44
59.122 29, 55
Letters
3.29 22

Euripides
Helen
1465 178
1465–1468 175
Iphigeneia Among the Taurians
947–960 133
Melanippe
fr.484 68

Hermogenes
On Style
392 60

Herodotus
Histories
5.77 43
6.103 43
6.125.1 103
6.129 118
7.85 160
7.175–178 177
7.222 53
8.1.1 53

Hesiod
Theogony
67–68 170
176–200 72

Homer
Odyssey
11.632 91
Iliad
3.180 170
Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite
71 170

Isocrates
Peri Zeugous
32–35 103

Lucian
Dialogues of the Courtesans
sch. 2.1 142
sch. 7.4 142
11 158

Menander
Perikeiromene 337ff 65

Oxyrhynchus Papyrus
3656G 66

Pausanias
3.20.9 175

Pindar
Fr.112 175
O. 13 13
Pyth. 1.66 175

Philippides
fr. 20 144

Phylarchus
Fr.Gr.Hist 81F42 65

Plato
Apology
20a 104
Crito
391b 104
Laws
753d 157
805e 66
836e 8
Protagoras
347c–d 62, 65
Republic
9.571b–576c 53
330b 124
Symposium
176e 63, 66
177d5 68
178b–180b 123
178e3–179a2 70
179b4 71
179d8 70
180a7–b5 71
180b3 71
181b1–b6 72
181c6 72
181c7–d3 73
182b5–6 74
182b7–c4 73
184a4 81
185b5–6 73
187a7–b1 74
188c6–d2 75
189e5–190a8 78
190b5–6 79
190d6–e1 78
190e7–191a3 78
191a5–c6 78
191c1–2 78
191d4 78
191d6–192a6 79–80
191d9–e4 78
191e8 81
192a 81
192a4 81
192d3 78
193a1–3 79, 92
193a2 78
193a5–8 78
193b5 71
193e3–4 78
195d4–5 83
195e7–196a2 82
196d2–3 83
196d3–4 83
198a2–3 79
198c1–5 85
201d 92
201d1–5 67, 77
201d3 77
204b 77, 91
205e1–2 88
206e7–8 87
207d2–e5 87
208b8 77
208c1 77
208d 87
208e1–209a8 87
210a 67
210e2–211b5 89–90
211b 88
212e 62
212d 62
212d6 94

213e 62
215a5 94
215c4 62
216b2–c3 95
216b5 93, 95
219a 93

Plutarch
Alcibiades
1.122 102
2 65
18 145
39 94
Glory of the Athenians
345e 127
Hypereides
849e 181
Nicias
13.7 145

Quintilian
10.5.2 181

Theognis
39–52 53

Theophrastus
Characters
6.6 21

Themistius
Orations 295e 66

Thucydides
1.23–68 164
1.32 52
1.6.4–5.1 53
1.102.3 165
2.2.3 52
2.45 17
2.52 92
3.53–59 52
4.2–41 167
4.109.1 167
6.16 42
6.16.2 103
7.28.3 141
7.53.2 18
8.3 167
8.75 160
8.96.5 127

Xenophanes
Fr.B1 West 79

Xenophon
Cyropaedia
8.8.15 102
Hellenica
2.3.2 105
2.3.39 105
2.4.19 105
3.1.2 127
Oikonomikos
7.30 66
3.7 109
7.9 109
8.20 109
11.22–25 109
21.2 110
Memorabilia
3.4.12 110
3.6.14 110
3.9.10–11 110
Symposium
1.1 100, 116
1.4 103
1.5 104
1.8 134, 137
1.14 119
1.8–10 105–106
2.1 111, 112
2.4 113, 114
2.9 115

2.10 116
2.12 116
2.19 117
2.21 118
3.1 124
3.2 119
3.3 119, 120
3.4 120
3.5 120, 121
3.7–12 121
3.14 121, 123
4.1–2 122
4.24 107
4.46–49 123
4.50–55 123
4.52 127
4.53 111
4.56 126
6.7 127
6.8 127
7.2 128
7.3 128
7.5 128
8.1–8.42 135
8.21 123, 135
8.8 102
8.9 59
8.18 135
8.22 105–106
8.38 136
8.41 136
8.42 137
9.1 138
9.3–7 130–131

Subject Index

Adonia, 143–146, 148
Adoniazousai, 143
Adonis, 143
adultery, 45
Aesop/fable, 77, 85, 87
Agathon, 60–61, 82–85, 87; as sophist, 85, 87
Akropolis, 156, 176, 178
Alcibiades, 59, 62, 65, 93–96, 140; erotic attachment to *demos,* 86, 94–97
Amazons, 146
andreia, 116
Anthesteria, 26, 27, 46, 47–48, 133–135, 138
Antisthenes, 123
Aphrodite, 145, 149, 181
Apollodoros, 1, 25, 31, 35–36
aporrheta, 182
Archon Basileus, 16–17, 46, 47–49, 135–137
Ariadne, 27, 98, 130–133
Aristophanes (in Plato's *Symposium*), 76–82, 87
Artemesion, 177
ataurote, 171, 176
Ate, 83–86, 87, 91
Athena Chalkiokis, 174, 178, 179
Athena Polias, 178
atimia, 32–34
Autolykos, 101–102, 104, 106–107, 123, 124–125, 132, 134, 135–137, 138

basilinna, 16–17, 26, 27, 46–49, 184, 185
Beckerman, Bernard, 129
Bell, Catherine, 183
Bloch, Maurice, 23, 159
Boiotia(ns), 161, 163, 164, 168, 171–172
boulomenos, ho, 40–41, 43
Brauronia, 147
brothel, 161
Burkert, Walter, 157, 158
Burnett, Anne Pippin, 120, 121
Butler, Judith, 13

Calame, Claude, 178
Carey, Christopher, 34–46, 49, 50
charis, 98, 128–130, 132–134
Cohen, David, 16–17, 45, 66
Corcyra, 164
Corinth(ians), 161, 168; as prostitute(s), 163, 169
cultural reproduction, 92

dance, 117–118
Davidson, James, 7, 9–10, 65, 111, 172
Deceleia, 140
deLauretis, Teresa, 63
democracy
  discourse of, 56
  woman's body as, 56
Diallage, 28, 143, 165, 167–169, 176
diallagema, 168
Dikaiopolis, 172
Dionysos, 16, 27, 37–43, 48, 60–61, 62, 98, 128–130, 132–134, 140, 177
Diotima, 26–27, 59, 60–61, 67, 68, 83–85, 86, 91, 184
  and the Athenian *polis,* 92
  as fiction, 93–94
discourse, 3, 9
Dover, K. J., 6, 14, 125

eels (Boiotian), 172–173
Eleusinian Mysteries, 87, 181
Epainetos, 45

epideictic speeches, 120, 121
eranos, 34, 56
erastes, 68, 69–72, 136
ergazesthai, 43
eromenos, 69–72, 81, 102, 132, 134, 136
  as athletic victor, 108
  subjectivity of, 133, 135
Eros, 72–74, 84–86
  ouranian, 59
  pandemian, 59
erotics
  autocratic, 107
  reciprocal, 128
Eryximakhos, 74–75
euandria, 101, 125–127
eutresios, 125
exchange, 98. (*see also* women)

Faraone, Christopher, 140, 154–155
feminine, 9–10
  and the body, 76, 78, 91, 92
  as continuum, 2, 61, 69; related to civic identity, 91
  and material world, 88
  matrix of, defined, 2–6, 8
feminism (in classics), 10–11
Foley, Helene, 5, 152, 155
Foucault, Michel, 3, 6–7, 132–134

gaze, 27, 99, 108, 131
gender, 68
  -bending and Agathon 83–85, 86
  as binary, 61, 69, 93–97
Goldhill, Simon, 108, 127
Gorgias, 85, 87

Habinek, Thomas, 51
habrosune, habrotes, 102, 132
Haloa, 142
Halperin, David, 20, 54, 60–61, 86, 88–89, 96–135
hedone, 128

Helen of Troy, 170, 172, 174, 178, 179
Henderson, Jeffrey, 141, 149–150, 155, 171
Hermogenes, 123
hetaireia, 13–15
hetairistria, 80, 85
heterosexuality, 9–10, 80, 132–134, 138, 139
hieros gamos, 16–17, 48, 138
Hileira and Phoibe (daughters of Leukippos), 174
Hippias, 165
Hippokleides, 117
homoerotic desire, 106, 133–135
horse-races, 37–43, 48, 102–104, 107
horse, white, as sacrificial victim, 157, 175–176

Iphigeneia, 171

Kallias, 98, 101, 102–104, 119–120, 122, 124, 135–137, 138
kalokagathia, 115–117
Kalonike, 157
Kelly, Andrew, 31
Kharmides, 105, 117, 123
Kimon, 165
Kinesias, 148, 159–160, 176
King Thoas, 146
kiste, 167
Kleisthenes of Sicyon, 117
korinthiazomai, 163
Kritoboulos, 123
kulix, 158
Kurke, Leslie, 9–10, 102, 112
Kylon, 178

Lacey, W. K., 29
Lampito, 153, 161, 163, 168, 170
Lemnian Women, 146
Lenaia, 140
Leonidas, 177
Leukippides, 174, 178
Lewis, D. M., 148
Loraux, Nicole, 2, 5, 146

Lykon, 102–104, 123, 125–127
Lysimache, 148, 149

MacDowell, Douglas, 141, 151, 165
marriage, 55; of Dionysos and Ariadne, 138, 184
masculinity, 6, 62; and economic agency, 21–22
mastropeia, 124, 125–126, 139
metrios, 19–20, 50, 56
mistharneo, 43
moikheia, 45
Morris, Ian, 19, 50
Moulton, Carroll, 165, 177
Mount Taygetus, 174
Murnaghan, Sheila, 109
Myrrha, 143
Myrrhine, 143, 148, 149–160, 176

Nagy, Greg, 178
Neaira, 1, 26, 31, 184
  career as *hetaira,* 37, 38–39, 43–44
  as commodity, 39, 41, 54
  as *porne,* 44
New Fire Rite, 146
Nikeratos, 104, 122
Nussbaum, Martha, 93–95, 96

oath-sacrifice, 157
oath-swearing, 156
Ober, Josiah, 42

Panathenaiac Games, 107
Pandora, 170
Pankration, 107
Papademetriou, I., 148, 149
Parry, Jonathan, 23; and Maurice Bloch, *see* transactional orders
Patterson, Cynthia, 30, 46
Pausanius, 51–54, 72–74
pederasty, 6, 85, 87, 99, 139
  binary model of, 93–96, 97
  see also penetration
Peloponnesian War, 167
penetration, 6–8, 186
pennyroyal, 163
performance, 13, 19, 98
perfume, 113–115
Perikleidas, 164
Phaedrus, 69–72
Phano, 26, 37, 44, 45, 184
Philip the buffoon, 110, 123; and Socrates 117–119
philotimia, 42–43
Phryne, 180–183
Phrastor, 45
Phrynion, 39, 42–43
Plataia, 51–52, 164
politics
  and *eros,* 78, 94–97, 160
  and pederasty 81
pornoboskos, 111
Posidonia, 181
potter's wheel, 128–129
Praxiteles, 181
priestess, 16, 18, 60–61
  of Athena Nike, 148, 149–150; appointment by sortition, 152
  of Athena Polias, 148, 152
Probouloi, 141, 144–145, 146, 148, 176,
prostitutes, 11, 18
  auletris, 14, 26–27, 59, 62–65, 91, 93–95, 96–97, 111, 184
  hetaira, 14, 55, 113, 132–135, 172, 173, 185; and democratic ideology, 22; spinning, 161
  names of, 45
  orchestris, 14, 111
  pallake, 14, 37–43, 48
  porne, 14, 28, 113, 132–134, 168–169, 174, 185
prostitution, 9; discourse of *porne/hetaira,* 9, 13–15, 28, 44, 112, 133, 161, 168–169, 176, 185, 186
public transcript, 12–13, 19

reciprocity, 98
Richlin, Amy, 5
ritual
  agent, 11, 15–17
  civic, 113, 139

sacrifice
  tomia, 157
  victim, 28, 163, 168, 186
Scott, James, 12, 19
sexuality, history of, 10
  feminine, 87
  masculine, 54–55
  sexual orientation, 82
Sicily, 140; Sicilian expedition, 145
skyphos, 158
social imaginary, 2
Socrates, 26–27, 87, 104, 117, 122, 124, 135–137, 138, 139
  as Marsyas, 94–97
  and Philip the buffoon, 117–119
  as Silenus, 94–97
Sparta(ns), 140, 142, 161, 163, 165, 176
spectacle, 58
sphagia, 158
sponde, 158, 171
Stehle, Eva, 13
Steiner, Deborah, 106
Stephanos, 25–26, 31–55, 185; as economic agent, 49–50
Stroup, Sarah, 154–155, 158, 168–169
Strybele, 45
subjectivity, 37, 183, 186
sunerastes, 136
Syracusan, 113, 117, 118, 123, 127, 130

temple attendant, 185
Theogenes, 46, 50
Theomnestos, 31, 35–36
Theoric Fund, 31, 32
Thermopylae, 177
Thesmophoria, 142, 146
Timandra, 93–97
Timarchus, 7–8
transactional orders, 23–24, 35, 36, 47–49, 54–55, 57, 152
  long-term transactions, 23, 41
  short-term transactions, 23, 41, 113; and the tyrant, 53
Tyndaridai, 174, 175, 178

Vernant, Jean-Pierre, 5
Von Reden, Sitta, 38

wife, 19, 55, 138
Winkler, J. J., 146
Wohl, Victoria, 8, 12, 138, 171–172
women, exchange of, 37–43, 48
  within (Agathon's house), 66–67, 91

Xanthippe, 116

Zeitlin, Froma, 5