

CHAPTER 1

Feminist Theory

Marilyn B. Skinner

Assigning a chapter on feminism to lead off a *Companion to Ancient Sexuality* is a politically generous gesture, for which the editor earns my thanks. Many readers of this volume will recall the “sexuality wars” of the 1990s, which split progressive classicists into two acrimonious factions, with noxious effects on scholarly investigation and, worse, on collegiality. It is conventional to designate the opposing sides “feminist and Foucauldian” and to characterize the debate as a feminist attack on the paradigm of ancient sexuality popularized by Michel Foucault and his followers.¹ However, that depiction is arguably reductionist, for it simplifies positions and overlooks many efforts made by participants to nuance and explain them. While attempting to mediate, I presented a detailed résumé of the basic issues; thus it seems unnecessary to do so again.² In the following chapter, my primary aim is to move beyond last century’s disputes to point to an emerging synthesis of feminist gender analysis and Foucauldian-inspired discursive critique, which is poised to illuminate striking new aspects of Greek and Roman erotic life.

One further consideration should be noted before I leave the subject of the sexuality wars. The controversy has imparted a painful lesson to all concerned about the relative accuracy of Foucault’s own observations on “regimes of truth.” In a 1977 interview—one of the key chapters in *Power/Knowledge*—he speaks of *la vérité* as “a system of ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation and operation of statements” that is “linked in a circular relation with systems of power which produce and sustain it, and to effects of power which it induces and which extend it” (Foucault 1980, 133). A “regime of truth” might be summarily described as a mechanism for weighing and affirming truth values. Classics as a discipline—a “collection of discursive practices” about ancient texts and material culture—fits the rubric perfectly (Hitchcock 2008, 129). Its gatekeeping procedures include mastering two learned languages and achieving rapid reading capacity in at least three modern vernaculars. Aspiring philologists must also demonstrate thorough knowledge of a range of literary texts and other kinds of primary

evidence—inscriptions, papyrological remains, artifacts—that bear upon interpretation. Although less stiff than it once was, the expository prose of classics remains abstract and cerebral, an artificial idiom many students find hard to comprehend, much less manipulate. Most relevant to discussion here, a system of “citational politics” anchors contributions in progress to the past: “The heavily footnoted text upholds the tyranny of the discipline, which is kept in place by referencing a long genealogy of scholarly authority, a trope of homage to the ancestors of the discipline.”³ What is real knowledge, then, is what is cited with attribution; such “truth” has cleared all the hurdles imposed by a scheme of operations designed to screen out unwelcome hypotheses. Whatever the flaws in Foucault’s reading of ancient history, his analysis of how ideas are validated academically was spot-on.

Of course, that is not the whole story: both Foucault’s blueprint for knowledge production and my sketch of how it works in our own field are circumscribed models.⁴ Much seeps through the cracks, as the pervasive impact of feminism on classics itself shows. Accumulation of learning is not always conscious and deliberate. Crucial insights acquired through casual reading and conversation are often subliminally absorbed into a paradigm, without ascription, as the notional background to what is eventually postulated. Feminism, furthermore, has tempered disciplinary protocols, breaking down hierarchy by encouraging collaborative professional activities and by advocating the practice of anonymous peer review. Yet the authoritarian framework of classics blocked out above still runs counter to the egalitarian principles of feminist theory. Hence a chapter purporting to offer the definitive overview of a given field of feminist inquiry, in this case scholarship on ancient sexuality, might appear to be complicit in a Foucauldian “regime of truth.” Dogmatic pronouncements would be understandably resented by fellow feminist scholars, especially those whose contributions had been omitted. Let me stipulate, then, that there are many ways of framing the present narrative; what follows is just one.

In the Beginning

In the early 1970s, well before K. J. Dover and Michel Foucault produced their influential works, there was neither ancient sexuality nor gender studies—only “women in antiquity,” and little enough of that. With the first stirrings of second-wave feminism, classicists had begun to examine the evidence for ancient women’s lives and to introduce undergraduate courses on the topic into the curriculum (McManus 1997, 14–15). Before those developments, treatment of sources was relatively unsophisticated; the positivist bent of classical scholarship insured that efforts were largely concerned with the amassing of *Realien* (Sullivan 1973a, 5–6; Blok 1987, 4–6). Now a new methodological self-awareness emerged. In December 1972, at the 104th annual meeting of the American Philological Association, a panel of papers on “Ancient Greek Women and Modern Criticism” chaired by Mary R. Lefkowitz dared to ask whether dismissive scholarly pronouncements on Sappho and epic heroines might be informed by present-day sex prejudice. The answer was a firm “yes.”

Two significant publications, a special issue of *Arethusa* edited by J. P. Sullivan in the spring of 1973 (Sullivan 1973b) and Sarah B. Pomeroy’s groundbreaking social history

Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity (Pomeroy 1975), together established measures for dealing with admittedly lacunose data (McManus 1997, 15–19). This set of procedures increased scholarly sensitivity to atypical phenomena and encouraged closer questioning of documentation. When speaking of ancient women, for example, economic class and other determining factors had to be taken into account; the male-oriented nature of the evidence meant that primary and secondary sources required assessment of bias; dissenting views need not be excluded; cautious extrapolation might compensate for distortions or gaps in the record. “Women in antiquity” was beginning to organize itself as a distinct subfield. Once it had achieved proper methodological rigor and displayed its positivist credentials, it could be incorporated, with relatively few objections, into the discipline, though merely as a subfield. Its marginalized status was a direct consequence of the nineteenth-century historiographic assumption that women, relegated as they were to the domestic and biological spheres, were in a sense outside history (Blok 1987, 6–11).

From the outset, meanwhile, second-wave feminism had taken a keen interest in sexuality. Applying Simone de Beauvoir’s thesis that sex was the distinction that established woman as Other and identified her with biology and the body (de Beauvoir 1974, xix, 3–41), radical feminists defined heterosexual relations, especially within the nuclear family, as a primary locus of oppression, vulnerable to searching critique.⁵ While most scholars working on Greek and Roman women did not associate themselves with a radical feminist position, they accepted the premise that investigation of sexuality was a legitimate part of a feminist approach to classical studies. Consequently such inquiries became one major element in treatments of ancient women. The 1973 special issue of *Arethusa* contained two essays on sexual topics. K. J. Dover’s “Classical Greek Attitudes to Sexual Behavior” (Dover 1973) attempts a basic, though necessarily restricted, explanation of protocols for Athenian citizens, male and female. Dorothea Wender’s “Plato: Misogynist, Paedophile, and Feminist” seeks to resolve apparent paradoxes in Plato’s philosophical attitudes toward women and is particularly interesting for its imaginative, if somewhat misguided, effort to recover the consciousness of a historical male figure presumed to be “homosexual” in orientation. Despite the lack of first-person evidence for women’s private lives, Pomeroy included in her 1975 history not only prescriptions on women’s sexual behavior but plausible speculation about how they might have satisfied their own desires and dealt with prostitution, infanticide, contraception, abortion, and enslaved sexual service as matter-of-fact realities for many women.

Revisiting Pomeroy’s selective bibliography in the *Arethusa* special issue provides more insight into the perceived connection between women and sexuality as research subjects (Pomeroy 1973, 125–57). Classical Greece and Rome are allotted separate bibliographic surveys, each with a short listing of “erotic” materials. In the Greek section, written by David Schaps, three of the four items mentioned are largely concerned with pederasty (138). Even discussions of male homoerotic practices were therefore at home in the field. Pomeroy references only two books on Roman sexual mores, by Otto Kiefer (1934) and Pierre Grimal (1967) respectively. Although each devotes considerable attention to women, she cannot recommend them or other works of their kind without reservations (148). Her scruples are understandable. Popular accounts of Roman sexual life dwell mainly on moralizing or satiric allegations of female misbehavior, happily accepting their

sources' most remarkable claims at face value. One task of the feminist scholar was therefore to debunk that sensationalized picture of the "emancipated" Roman woman.

Feminist classical scholars were also drawn to Roman studies by what they perceived as an unequivocal correlation in Latin literary texts between male hegemony and obscene verbal aggression. That past history "illuminates contemporary problems in relationships between men and women" was one justification Pomeroy used to explain why she had written her book (Pomeroy 1995, xvii). If the historian has a mandate to explore the origins of gender inequality in order to know why discrimination continues to be institutionalized, one place to start is with the discourses that facilitate it. Consequently, several articles appearing at the end of the decade analyzed the power claims implicit in ribald or salacious language.⁶ This approach culminated in Amy Richlin's *The Garden of Priapus* (1983), an in-depth exploration of Roman sexual humor and its function in asserting the superiority of the speaker over targeted individuals or groups.

Richlin's work fully legitimated the study of ancient obscenity and related forms of sexual expression, visual and verbal, as a way of understanding the power dynamics inherent in Greek and Roman culture (Skinner 1986, 253, 257). At the same time it broached the question of how the contemporary feminist researcher is to react when confronted with ancient material distasteful to her. To illustrate the harmful quality of aggressive humor, Richlin cited links between violent sexual fantasies and acts of physical violence postulated in feminist research on pornography (77–80).⁷ Accordingly, she concluded, "Priapus"—that is, the tendentious humor characteristic of the texts she had examined—was no longer funny (213). In this fashion *The Garden of Priapus* helped to establish the convention of frankly "interested" scholarship that sought to change the present through gritty exposure of unpleasant truths about the past (Reckford 1996, 313–14). In Hellenic studies, Eva Keuls' *The Reign of the Phallus* (1985) had a similar aim, using vase paintings, many quite explicit, to substantiate the charge that democratic Athens was a "phallocracy" in which adult citizen males, who constituted the only advantaged group, harshly exploited inferiors, for the most part women. Predictably, certain reviewers were uncomfortable with that abandonment of conventional academic objectivity.⁸ In their polemic stance, however, these books, heavily indebted to feminist theory and terminology, seemed very much the products of their historical moment.

For the first decade of widespread scholarly attention to ancient sexuality, then, the course of development is comparatively linear. Prompted by second-wave feminism, some classicists entering the field during the 1970s began to investigate conditions of life for ancient women, including restrictions upon their own control of their bodies and the notion of woman's nature that authorized such curbs. Others began to trace relationships among sex, language, and power, particularly when manifested in offensive or threatening speech. After that the genealogy, if I may use that word, becomes more convoluted. K. J. Dover's *Greek Homosexuality* was published in 1978, to instant acclaim and widespread acceptance of his dominance–submission paradigm of Athenian sexual relations, which, according to Paul Veyne (1985), fit the Roman evidence equally well. The chapter on Rome in John Boswell's *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality* (1980), though the most extensive English-language treatment of Roman homoeroticism up to that date, was much less influential among classicists due to Boswell's categorical denial of existing legal or social penalties directed at "gay people or their sexuality" (87), an anachronistic statement that, as his critics saw it, begged several methodological

questions.⁹ While both Dover (1978, 171–84, esp. 181) and Boswell (1980, 61–3 with nn. 3 and 4) indicate familiarity with the new work on ancient women, neither adopts a feminist perspective. Each is preoccupied with relations between males, paying only token attention to female homoeroticism.

Meanwhile, of course, Michel Foucault was writing his substantial *Histoire de la sexualité*, whose first volume, *La Volonté de savoir*, was published in Paris in 1974, with an English translation (*The History of Sexuality*, vol. 1: *An Introduction*) following in 1978. That preliminary study, dealing with the modern era, scarcely mentions Greeks or Romans. It is important to note, though, that during the interval between the first and the remaining volumes, in which the project underwent a “theoretical shift” in order to be restructured around the self-constitution of the desiring subject in antiquity (Foucault 1986, 6–9), its author was reading not only Dover and Veyne, to whose work he professes himself much indebted, but also Boswell and Pomeroy, both cited in his later bibliographies. By 1984, the year of Foucault’s death and of the French publication of the second and third volumes of the *Histoire* (Foucault 1988), it was no longer possible to regard him as a scholar wholly isolated from contemporary Anglo-American currents of thought in classical studies, including feminist scholarship. It would be absurd to claim that Foucault’s approach to the ancient texts discussed in these two subsequent volumes was anything other than androcentric: the fallacies inherent in his strict concentration upon the idealized male subject of protreptic treatises are amply documented.¹⁰ Yet in tracing the expansion of scholarly interest in Greek and Roman sexual codes from that point forward we cannot posit two entirely separate channels, Foucauldian and feminist; instead we have to take account of “a network of bilateral influences” (Skinner 1996, 112–13). The four pioneering collections of Foucauldian-inspired essays by classicists that appeared simultaneously in a single year, 1990, and thereby marked the establishment of ancient sexuality as an independent topic of inquiry, all professed intellectual indebtedness to feminist theory. Two of them—the volumes with multiple contributors—included authors who openly adopted a feminist stance in order to explore constructions of female desire in literature.¹¹ In the succeeding decades, certain assertions in Foucault’s account of Greco-Roman sexual ethics were to lose their compelling force. With the rise of gender theory and its manifold elaborations by poststructuralists, though, his insights into discursive economies have become axiomatic for many feminist students of antiquity.

Manifestations of Gender

The mid-1980s mark another turning point for intersections between feminism and work on ancient sexuality, because it was just then that gender began to be widely deployed as a category of analysis. At an early stage of second-wave scholarship, feminists had begun using the linguistic term “gender” to designate the social and cultural constructions of masculinity and femininity mapped onto biological sex (West and Zimmerman 1987, 125–6). While that tactic served to repudiate strict biological determinism by calling attention to the arbitrary components of gender roles (“blue for boys, pink for girls,” as I remember telling students), it still linked gender to “natural” sexual difference. Consequently it masked the operations of gender as the representation of

a relation, that is, as the assignment of an individual to one of two groupings within an asymmetrical system (de Lauretis 1987, 1–5; Flax 1990, 23). Historians warned that the use of gender as an analytic tool required awareness that it articulated and legitimated power imbalances (Scott 1988, 41–46). Furthermore, gender was seen to be basic to the constitution of the self, thereby shaping subjective experience (Flax 1990, 25–6). These complicating moves embedded gender even more firmly within linguistic schemes (Elam 2005). Judith Butler finally took the discursive view of gender to the furthest extreme by explaining it as a performance, in other words “a stylized repetition of acts” (1990, 139–41), and, as a follow-up, by theorizing the intelligible material body as a product of the “regulatory ideal” of heterosexuality (1993, 1–2). Since then, larger scale attempts to investigate gender across multiple domains—“cultural systems, normative concepts, social institutions, and subjective identities”—have been undertaken, although they tend to assign it explanatory force by implicating it in discourses that promote reproduction, and thus by anchoring it again to the sexed body (Hawkesworth 2000, 146). No matter how “gender” is conceptualized, its separation from “sex” and consequent problematization are regarded, together, as the single most crucial advance contributed by late twentieth-century feminism to social theory (Flax 1990, 21; Sedgwick 1990, 27–8).

For classicists in the last decade of the millennium, one result of incorporating a more informed conception of gender into work on sexuality was an expansion of analytical approaches. Psychoanalytic criticism, which in its strictly Freudian manifestations had fallen into disfavor, enjoyed a striking renaissance, for scholars were beginning to recognize a need to posit a psychic substrate in connection with ancient cultural constructions of the gendered self (Partner 1993, 432 and 442). Those who found Foucault’s descriptive account of sexual discourses inadequate—because it neglected the role played by eroticized fantasy in the configuration of desire,¹² or because it did not explain radical shifts in ideological frameworks and the emergence of male subjectivities that violated prescriptive formulas¹³—turned instead for theoretical guidance to Lacan’s model of ego formation as a process structured through language. Feminist classicists, confronting an overwhelming preponderance of male-authored and male-oriented literary products, applied the principles of the French Lacanians H el ene Cixous, Luce Irigaray, and Julia Kristeva, who collectively denied that female subjectivity could be articulated within a “phallogocentric” western discursive framework. That postulate induced critics to treat the figure of woman represented in ancient texts created by men as a stratagem for authorial self-fashioning.¹⁴ Not all feminist investigators, though, adopted a discursive approach to gender. Reflecting some historians’ objections that poststructuralist analyses obliterate women’s lived experience,¹⁵ Richlin (1992a: xviii–xx) defended the use of essentialist, materialist, and even positivist tenets in writing transhistorical narratives of oppression. Pursuing her interest in theories of the pornographic, she also edited a collection of essays (1992b) in which contributors evaluated ancient literary and visual products, not all of them overtly sexual, in the light of radical feminist Susanne Kappeler’s appraisal of aesthetic images of the female as a mode of objectification.¹⁶ Yet in a subsequent study Richlin (1993a) acknowledged the validity of work on local differences in tandem with “grand theory.” Conceding the import of cultural specificity in patriarchal arrangements promoted interest in the singularity of Roman gender schemes.

Greek and Roman: Contrasts and Consequences

As they delved into the ideological functions of gender, researchers noted that its deployment in Greek cultural poetics was at odds with the part it played in Roman social and political communication. Treatments of myth, ritual, and symbolism undertaken by structuralists based at the *École pratique des hautes études* in Paris during the 1970s presented classical Greek thought as organized according to polarities, in which “male” and “female” were one of nine other pairs subsumed beneath the overarching frame of the “limited” and the “unlimited.”¹⁷ Ontological opposition gave rise to secondary antitheses in the social sphere, such as *nomos* vs. *phusis* or civilization vs. barbarism. Any of those dyads could be metonymically aligned with gender, allowing cultural disruption to be portrayed as gender slippage. Thus, on the level of metaphor as well as on that of everyday life, the distinction between male and female was arguably the vital determining principle in Greek culture (Foxhall 1998, 136). Despite that essential polarization, anomaly might be tolerated in the short term—as it was in Athenian drama, where sophisticated explorations of masculine psychological and social concerns were achieved by mimetically entering the feminine mode, that is, by “playing the other” (Zeitlin 1996, 363–4). Since the antithesis of male and female was metaphysically grounded, however, the restoration of polarity inevitably imposed closure. A fundamental elasticity in the system had managed to relieve the original stress.

In the Roman *mentalité*, conversely, there was no ontological gap between genders. Because elite women as well as men played a role in the public world, participating directly in wide-ranging patronage networks and indirectly furthering the interests of natal and marital kin, their confinement to the household sphere was only notional. As they extended the reputation and influence of their male relatives, women were imagined as “same” as well as “other”: they might be openly praised for displaying male *virtus* (e.g., Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 147; Sen. *Dial.* 12.16.5) or they might perpetuate specific excellences of their fathers (e.g., Hortensia’s hereditary eloquence, Val. Max. 8.3.3).¹⁸ Gender was a more fluid, ambiguous construct than in the Greek world and was therefore ideal for troping aristocratic unease. Power, status, and male identity were constantly being renegotiated under the republic as great families competed for honors, exposing individual players to the vagaries of popular opinion; in the imperial age, attempts by the weakened nobility to maintain prestige and self-esteem in the face of an often capricious autocracy triggered even more radical anxieties. Implicated as it was in contingent issues of autonomy and hegemony, Roman masculinity could be considered an “achieved state, radically underdetermined by anatomical sex” (Gleason 1995, 59). Hence the perception of inferiority, whether in birth, wealth, or other forms of symbolic and moral capital, translated into loss of virility for the subject, to be in turn projected as effeminacy onto abject categories of persons. What distinguishes this metonymic use of gender from classical Greek instances of the trope is the permanence of gender failure. Once compromised, as in Catullus 63 or Horace *Odes* 3.6, the masculine principles of rationality and patriotic duty cannot reassert themselves.

With this basic distinction drawn, some corollary postulates have lately undergone reconsideration (Skinner 1997; Fredrick 2002a). Practical effects of the sex/gender system were not homogeneous throughout the Greek and Roman worlds. Behaviors

possessed different ethical and legal valances: while idealized boy love was an integral part of civic life in archaic and fifth-century Athens, in Rome the seduction of freeborn youths was liable to prosecution as a criminal sexual offense, *stuprum*. Historically, the Roman matron of good family could show herself in public with impunity, and even bring credit to her relations while doing so, whereas etiquette prohibited public recognition for her classical Greek counterpart; only in the Hellenistic period, with the decline of older forms of social cohesion, could prominent women begin to receive civic honors. Dover's and Foucault's "isonomic" dominance–submission model, in which the asymmetrical relationship between partners, inserting and receptive, mirrors the supremacy of the adult citizen male over all other social groups—wives, boys, non-citizens, slaves, and passive adult males—once seemed an obvious instance of the tight linkage posited by feminists between gender structures and organized economies of power.¹⁹ However, that model is now being challenged vigorously by those who regard it as overly simplistic.²⁰ Furthermore, what was formulated with nominally democratic Athens in mind may not work at all for Rome, where hierarchical configurations of space encroached upon the social self, increasing the liability to physical discomfort in a manner analogous to that of non-sexual “penetration” (Fredrick 2002b, 237).²¹ There degrees of status were so tempered by other considerations, including material circumstances, that no single vector, not even gender, unequivocally prevailed at all times and for all grades of society.

Finally, the unqualified binarism of ancient sex–gender systems as well as their hierarchy is no longer taken for granted. In accordance with the anthropological observation that gender is an emic taxonomy, specific to a single culture, and that in given cultures multiple genders are not unusual (Parker 2001, 320–4), some classicists entertain the hypothesis that a dualistic gender system common to the ancient Mediterranean world is a reductionist notion (Montserrat 2000; Golden and Toohey 2003). The conceptual, if not actual, existence of kinds of gender deviants—for example the Greek *kinaidos* and the Roman *cinaedus* and *tribas*—qualifies the polar opposition of male and female, verging (on the Roman side) upon the prospect of discrete third-gender forms (Winkler 1990, 45–70; Hallett 1997; Richlin 1993b; Williams 1999, 175–8, 209–15). Current research also interests itself in the cultural meanings of liminal figures like the eunuch and the hermaphrodite and in the symptomatic fascination with monstrosity in late republican and imperial Rome.²² New work on cross-dressing as a literary and iconographic motif has expanded the symbolic implications of transvestitism well beyond its place in initiatory rites: while boundary-crossing behavior in ritual reinforces traditional sex roles, in art it may serve to undermine perceptions of a coherently gendered self (Gold 1998, 18; cf. Loreaux 1990 and Lee 2006). Attention to deviancy is an offshoot of a more general interest in exploring ancient constructions of manhood. To some extent men have replaced women as the primary object of theoretically oriented gender research, especially in Roman studies, where social historians focus upon technologies of elite masculine self-fashioning.²³ Because authentic masculinity was determined by external scrutiny, its perfect realization was impossible and its very stability as a concept was impaired. What counted as true manliness, *virtus*, changed from republic to empire and altered once more with the transition from paganism to Christianity (Kuefler 2001, 4–5; McDonnell 2006, 4–10). Since gender is relational, conceptions of womanhood shifted as well.

Enumerating at this point all the current intersections of ancient sexuality and feminism risks becoming superfluous. The emergence of queer theory as a new prism through which to view the evidence will be recounted in a separate chapter. Body history, another field tangential to gender studies, likewise requires no preliminary comment here, nor is it necessary to list the substantial contributions of feminist scholars to topics such as prostitution, female homoeroticism, or cult and religion, all of which will be treated in other chapters. On the other hand, the ideological confluence of eroticism and power deserves singling out as the most persistent focus of current feminist cultural analysis. In fifth-century Athens, as Wohl 2002 demonstrates, psychic investment in the democracy triggered a hankering for empire, and even fantasies of submission to the rapacious tyrant. Under the Roman Empire sex was “a way to talk about *imperium*” (Vuot 2007, 5): by musing upon the emperor’s intimate relationships, subjects might be induced to assimilate him to divinity. Parallel case studies examine Greek use of the courtesan as icon or metaphor (Kurke 1999; McClure 2003; Gilhuly 2008) and Roman glorifications of maternal chastity (Milnor 2005; Langlands 2006). Finally, Gaca 2003 has continued Foucault’s genealogical project by tracing the roots of Christian abhorrence of the flesh back to its pre-Christian sources. As scholarship on ancient sexuality enters its third full decade, a sophisticated fusion of psychoanalytic, discursive, and gender-oriented approaches is shedding light on aspects of antiquity previously uncharted, with intriguing and often disquieting results.

GUIDE TO FURTHER READING

Confirmation that the field of ancient sexuality has come of age is provided by two recent overviews aimed at students and the general reader. Skinner 2005 (revised second edition forthcoming in 2013) was designed for use in the undergraduate classroom, while Ormand 2009 should appeal to graduate students and researchers in other disciplines. McManus 1997 is an excellent history of feminist work in classical studies, summarizing both theoretical and practical findings. Case studies of feminist theoretical approaches to classical materials are contained in Rabinowitz and Richlin 1993. Halperin 1990 applies a Foucauldian perspective to aspects of classical Athenian culture while also tracing the development of modern notions of homosexual orientation. Winkler 1990 adds an anthropological dimension to Foucault’s model of Greek sexual protocols. Richlin 1983 (revised second edition in 1992) is arguably the most influential feminist contribution to the study of Roman sexuality. Essays in Hallett and Skinner 1997 seek to differentiate specific aspects of Roman sexual mores from those prescribed by Greek culture. Williams 1999 (revised second edition in 2010) is a comprehensive study of ancient Roman ideologies of masculinity and their relationship to constructions of male homoerotic behaviors.

NOTES

- 1 As do duBois 1998, 88–90 and Ormand 2009, 13–14.
- 2 Skinner 1996, conveniently on-line at <http://www.stoa.org/hopper/text.jsp?doc=Stoa:text:2002.01.0006>.
- 3 Quotation from Hitchcock 2008, 129. I borrow the phrase “citational politics” from Butler 1993, 21, who uses it in a far different sense; its aptness, however, should make up for any momentary confusion. “Citational politics” that appropriated feminist thought but suppressed

- credit for it was precisely the objection leveled by Richlin 1991 against Halperin 1990 and Winkler 1990.
- 4 On the epistemological limitations of a Nietzschean analysis that excludes the possibility of a truth outside power, see Taylor 1984, 175–80.
 - 5 Early studies of the oppressive features of heterosexual institutions were Millett 1970, 23–58 and Firestone 1970. On the specific issues under attack, see Shulman 1980, 23–7.
 - 6 For example Hallett 1977; Skinner 1979; Richlin 1981.
 - 7 Specifically, articles by Griffin 1980 and Morgan 1980. Throughout Richlin’s study the figure of Priapus, who threatens intruders into his garden with oral, anal, and vaginal assault, connects ancient symbolic structures with the present by subliminally recalling Morgan’s slogan “Pornography is the theory and rape the practice.”
 - 8 See Kay’s 1985 review of Richlin and Shapiro’s 1986 evaluation of Keuls. Kay asserts that Richlin’s “essential preoccupation with moral judgement” renders her approach “inapplicable” to classical philology (309), while Shapiro deplores Keuls’ tone of “strident feminism” (363). Each pronouncement insinuates that the author in question has violated a basic rule of decorum. On appeals to taste and propriety as strategies of dismissal, see Halperin 1995, 131–3.
 - 9 Boswell 1980, 61–87. The use of the term “homosexuality” in the title reflects the assumption, still current when the book was published, that ancient and modern sexual orientations were identical. Subsequently Boswell became a strong defender of that “essentialist” position against poststructuralist arguments that contemporary homosexuality is a discursive construct; e.g. Boswell 1990. For representative critiques of Boswell’s ideas, see Halperin 1990, 18–19, 29, 46 and Goldhill 1995, 110.
 - 10 Cohen and Saller 1994; Greene 1996; duBois 1998, 86–8; Richlin 1991, 1992a, xiv, 1998, and elsewhere; Foxhall 1998. Cf. de Lauretis 1987, 14–15 and 34–8, who notes that even sexuality as discussed in Foucault’s volumes is exclusively male.
 - 11 The four collections are those of Halperin 1990; Halperin, Winkler, and Zeitlin 1990; Konstan and Nussbaum 1990; and Winkler 1990. Representative chapters articulating a feminist perspective and employing gender as an analytic tool are Carson and Zeitlin in the Halperin, Winkler, and Zeitlin volume and Nugent and Stehle in the Konstan and Nussbaum special issue.
 - 12 See Black 1998, 57–60; cf. Fox 1998, 18: “Foucault’s methodology expressly excludes what the historian of gender is after: the sense of a self driven to expressing itself.”
 - 13 See the works of Janan 1994 and 2001 and of Miller 1998 and 2004.
 - 14 Major studies include duBois 1988 on Greek metaphors for “woman”; Halperin 1990, 113–51 on Plato’s Diotima; Nugent 1990 on the Ovidian hermaphrodite; and Gold 1993 on the place of “Cynthia” in the elegies of Propertius.
 - 15 As argued by Gordon 1986 and Poovey 1988; also compare the philosophical and epistemological critique of “gender-skepticism” by Bordo 1990. For a useful comparison between the assumptions of historians of women and those of historians of gender, with an attempt to reconcile the two approaches, see Newman 1991.
 - 16 Kappeler’s position on the representation of women in art (1986, 1–10) curiously dovetails with Halperin’s observation (2002, 20) that the scholarly act of historical interpretation is itself a one-sided cultural appropriation and an expression of privilege.
 - 17 Significant essays by this school of classicists are collected in Gordon 1981. For the fundamental role of polarity in Greek thought, see Lloyd 1966. The Pythagorean table of contraries described by Aristotle (*Arist. Met.* 986^a22–986^b1) is cited as exemplary for the place of gender in this conceptual system: see Vidal-Naquet 1981, 174–5.
 - 18 Hallett 1989, 61–9 provides many further examples. On the implications of *virtus* when predicated of women, see McDonnell 2006, 161–5.

- 19 See especially the correlations traced by Halperin 1990, 24–38.
- 20 In contrast to the claim that pederasty was fully accepted, Hubbard 1998 and 2000 regards it as a social practice restricted to elites and finds evidence that the masses were hostile to it. Davidson 1997, 174–6 and 253–4, 2001, and 2007, 101–66 attacks current scholarly concentration upon the exploitative aspects of pederasty, arguing that the practice embraced a wide spectrum of erotic conduct, including egalitarian relations.
- 21 Compare Walters 1997, who outlines a conception of Roman male integrity “based on the notion of the invasion of the boundaries of the body, and in particular on the idea of the inviolability of personal space including and surrounding the body as marker of superior status” (41). Manhood is degraded not just by sexual submission but by any mode of physical encroachment.
- 22 For the eunuch, see Kuefler 2001, esp. 31–6, 96–102, and Ringrose 2003. In the popular mind the castrated male might stand outside the categories of gender (e.g. Val. Max. 7.7.6, where he is alleged to be “neither male nor female”). Hermaphrodites, subject to destruction as prodigies in earlier times, were recognized as persons under the empire; their condition was discussed by jurists (*Dig.* 1.5.10; 22.5.15.1 [Paulus]; 28.2.6.2 [Ulp.]) and by scientists (Plin. *HN* 7.3.34; 11.109.262). Gardner 1998 considers the legal capacity of physiologically inadequate males, noting problems created by the fact that the law itself admitted of no third sex (138). On the artistic preoccupation with grotesque entities—a preoccupation seen as a compensatory mechanism for Roman anxieties—consult Barton (1993, 85–175); for the employment of outlandishness as a coherent ingredient in the rhetorical and ideological design of imperial biography, see Mader 2005.
- 23 The prime venue for proper display of masculinity was oratory, where rigorous conventions of authoritative posture, dress, gesture, and speech were observed; consult Richlin 1997 and Gunderson 2000. On the political message conveyed by the deliberate violation of such conventions, see Corbeill 2004, 133–7.

REFERENCES

- Barton, C. A. 1993. *The Sorrows of the Ancient Romans: The Gladiator and the Monster*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Black, J. 1998. “Taking the Sex out of Sexuality: Foucault’s Failed History.” In Larmour, Miller, and Platter, eds., 42–60.
- Blok, J. 1987. “Sexual Asymmetry: A Historiographical Essay.” In J. Blok and P. Mason, eds., *Sexual Asymmetry: Studies in Ancient Society*, 1–57. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben.
- Bordo, S. 1990. “Feminism, Postmodernism, and Gender-Scepticism.” In L. J. Nicholson, ed., *Feminism/Postmodernism*, 133–56. New York: Routledge.
- Boswell, J. 1980. *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality: Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Boswell, J. 1990. “Concepts, Experience, and Sexuality.” In Konstan and Nussbaum, eds., 67–87.
- Butler, J. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. 1993. *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of “Sex.”* New York: Routledge.
- Carson, A. 1990. “Putting Her in Her Place: Woman, Dirt, and Desire.” In Halperin, Winkler, and Zeitlin, eds., 135–69.
- Cohen, D., and R. Saller. 1994. “Foucault on Sexuality in Greco-Roman Antiquity.” In J. Goldstein, ed., *Foucault and the Writing of History*, 35–59. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Corbeill, A. 2004. *Nature Embodied: Gesture in Ancient Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Davidson, J. 1997. *Courtesans and Fishcakes: The Consuming Passions of Classical Athens*. Hammersmith, London: HarperCollins.
- Davidson, J. 2001. "Dover, Foucault and Greek Homosexuality: Penetration and the Truth of Sex." *Past & Present* 170: 3–51.
- Davidson, J. 2007. *The Greeks and Greek Love: A Radical Reappraisal of Homosexuality in Ancient Greece*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- de Beauvoir, S. 1974. *The Second Sex*. Trans. H. M. Parshley. New York: Vintage Books.
- de Lauretis, T. 1987. *Technologies of Gender: Essays on Theory, Film, and Fiction*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Dover, K. J. 1973. "Classical Greek Attitudes to Sexual Behavior." In Sullivan, ed., 59–73.
- Dover, K. J. 1978. *Greek Homosexuality*. New York: Vintage Books.
- duBois, P. 1988. *Sowing the Body: Psychoanalysis and Ancient Representations of Women*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- duBois, P. 1998. "The Subject in Antiquity after Foucault." In Larmour, Miller, and Platter, eds., 85–103.
- Elam, D. 2005. "Feminist Theory and Criticism: 3. Poststructuralist Feminisms." In M. Groden, M. Kreiswirth and I. Szeman, eds., *The Johns Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory and Criticism* (2nd edn.). At <http://litguide.press.jhu.edu.ezproxy2.library.arizona.edu/cgi-bin/view.cgi?cid=90&query=French%20Feminism> (accessed 3/11/10).
- Firestone, S. 1970. *The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution*. New York: Morrow.
- Flax, J. 1990. *Thinking Fragments: Psychoanalysis, Feminism, and Postmodernism in the Contemporary West*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Foucault, M. 1978. *The History of Sexuality*, vol. 1: An Introduction. Trans. R. Hurley. New York: Vintage Books. [Original edition: *La Volonté de savoir*, Paris 1974.]
- Foucault, M. 1980. "Truth and Power." In Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*, edited by C. Gordon, 109–33. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. 1986. *The History of Sexuality*, vol. 2: The Use of Pleasure. Trans. R. Hurley. New York: Vintage Books. [Original edition: *L'Usage des plaisirs*, Paris 1984.]
- Foucault, M. 1988. *The History of Sexuality*, vol. 3: The Care of the Self. Trans. R. Hurley. New York: Vintage Books [Original edition: *Le Souci de soi*, Paris 1984.]
- Fox, M. 1998. "The Constrained Man." In L. Foxhall and J. Salmon, eds., *Thinking Men: Masculinity and Its Self-Representation in the Classical Tradition*, 6–22. London and New York: Routledge.
- Foxhall, L. 1998. "Pandora Unbound: A Feminist Critique of Foucault's History of Sexuality." In Larmour, Miller, and Platter, eds., 122–37.
- Fredrick, D. 2002a. "Introduction: Invisible Rome." In D. Fredrick, ed., *The Roman Gaze: Vision, Power, and the Body*, 1–30. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Fredrick, D. 2002b. "Mapping Penetrability in Late Republican and Early Imperial Rome." In D. Fredrick, ed., *The Roman Gaze: Vision, Power, and the Body*, 236–64. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Gaca, K. 2003. *The Making of Fornication: Eros, Ethics, and Political Reform in Greek Philosophy and Early Christianity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gardner, J. F. 1998. "Sexing a Roman: Imperfect Men in Roman Law." In L. Foxhall and J. Salmon, eds., *When Men Were Men: Masculinity, Power and Identity in Classical Antiquity*, 136–52. London / New York: Routledge.
- Gilhuly, K. 2008. *The Feminine Matrix of Sex and Gender in Classical Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gleason, M. 1995. *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Gold, B. K. 1993. "‘But Ariadne Was Never There in the First Place’: Finding the Female in Roman Poetry." In Rabinowitz and Richlin, eds., 75–101.
- Gold, B. K. 1998. "‘Vested Interests’ in Plautus’ *Casina*: Cross-Dressing in Roman Comedy." *Helios* 25: 17–29.
- Golden, M., and P. Toohey. 2003. "Introduction." In M. Golden and P. Toohey, eds., *Sex and Difference in Ancient Greece and Rome*, 1–20. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Goldhill, S. 1995. *Foucault’s Virginity: Ancient Erotic Fiction and the History of Sexuality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gordon, L. 1986. "What’s New in Women’s History." In T. de Lauretis, ed., *Feminist Studies/Critical Studies*, 20–30. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Greene, E. 1996. "Sappho, Foucault, and Women’s Erotics." *Arethusa* 29: 1–14.
- Griffin, S. 1980. "Sadism and Catharsis: The Treatment Is the Disease." In L. Lederer, ed., *Take Back the Night: Women on Pornography*, 141–7. New York: Morrow.
- Grimal, P. 1967. *Love in Ancient Rome*. Trans. A. Train, Jr., New York: Crown Publishers.
- Gunderson, E. 1990. *Staging Masculinity: The Rhetoric of Performance in the Roman World*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Hallett, J. P. 1977. "Perusinae glandes and the Changing Image of Augustus." *AJAH* 2: 151–71.
- Hallett, J. P. 1989. "Woman as *Same* and *Other* in Classical Roman Elite." *Helios* 16: 59–78.
- Hallett, J. P. 1997. "Female Homoeroticism and the Denial of Roman Reality in Latin Literature." In Hallett and Skinner, eds., 255–73.
- Hallett, J. P., and M. B. Skinner, eds. 1997. *Roman Sexualities*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Halperin, D. M. 1990. *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality and Other Essays on Greek Love*. London: Routledge.
- Halperin, D. M. 1995. *Saint Foucault: Towards a Gay Hagiography*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Halperin, D. M. 2002. *How to Do the History of Homosexuality*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Halperin, D. M., J. J. Winkler, and F. I. Zeitlin, eds. 1990. *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hawkesworth, M. 2000. "Confounding Gender." In C. Allen and J. A. Howard, eds., *Provoking Feminisms*, 141–77. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Hitchcock, L. A. 2008. *Theory for Classics*. London: Routledge.
- Hubbard, T. K. 1998. "Popular Perceptions of Elite Homosexuality in Classical Athens." *Arion* ser. 3, 6: 48–78.
- Hubbard, T. K. 2000. "Pederasty and Democracy: The Marginalization of a Social Practice." In T. K. Hubbard, ed., *Greek Love Reconsidered*, 1–11. New York: Wallace Hamilton Press.
- Janan, M. 1994. *When the Lamp Is Shattered?: Desire and Narrative in Catullus*. Carbondale and Edwardsville, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Janan, M. 2001. *The Politics of Desire: Propertius IV*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kappeler, S. 1986. *The Pornography of Representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kay, N. 1985. "Roman Obscenity." *CR* n.s. 35: 308–10.
- Keuls, E. C. 1985. *The Reign of the Phallus: Sexual Politics in Ancient Athens*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Kiefer, O. 1934. *Sexual Life in Ancient Rome*. Trans. G. and H. Highet. London: Kegan Paul.
- Konstan, D., and M. Nussbaum, eds. 1990. *Sexuality in Greek and Roman Society*. Special issue of *differences* 2.1.
- Kuefler, M. 2001. *The Manly Eunuch: Masculinity, Gender Ambiguity, and Christian Ideology in Late Antiquity*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Kurke, L. 1999. *Coins, Bodies, Games, and Gold: The Politics of Meaning in Archaic Greece*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Langlands, R. 2006. *Sexual Morality in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Larmour, D. H. J., P. A. Miller, and C. Platter, eds. 1998. *Rethinking Sexuality: Foucault and Classical Antiquity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Lee, M. M. 2006. "Acheloös Peplophoros: A Lost Statuette of a River God in Feminine Dress." *Hesperia* 75: 317–25.
- Lloyd, G. E. R. 1966. *Polarity and Analogy: Two Types of Argumentation in Early Greek Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Loraux, N. 1990. "Herakles: The Super-Male and the Feminine." In Halperin, Winkler, and Zeitlin, eds., 21–52.
- Mader, G. 2005. "History as Carnival, or Method and Madness in the 'Vita Heliogabali.'" *CA* 24: 131–72.
- McClure, L. K. 2003. *Courtesans at Table: Gender and Greek Literary Culture in Athenaeus*. New York / London: Routledge.
- McDonnell, M. A. 2006. *Roman Manliness: Virtus and the Roman Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McManus, B. F. 1997. *Classics and Feminism: Gendering the Classics*. New York: Twayne.
- Miller, P. A. 1998. "Catullan Consciousness, the 'Care of the Self,' and the Force of the Negative in History." In Larmour, Miller, and Platter, eds., 171–203.
- Miller, P. A. 2004. *Subjecting Verses: Latin Love Elegy and the Emergence of the Real*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Millett, K. 1970. *Sexual Politics*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Milnor, K. 2005. *Gender, Domesticity, and the Age of Augustus: Inventing Private Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Montserrat, D. 2000. "Reading Gender in the Roman World." In J. Huskinson, ed., *Experiencing Rome: Culture, Identity and Power in the Roman Empire*, 153–81. London: Routledge.
- Morgan, R. 1980. "Theory and Practice: Pornography and Rape." In L. Lederer, ed., *Take Back the Night: Women on Pornography*, 134–40. New York: Morrow.
- Newman, L. M. 1991. "Critical Theory and the History of Women: What's at Stake in Deconstructing Women's History." *Journal of Women's History* 2: 58–68.
- Nugent, G. 1990. "This Sex Which Is Not One: De-Constructing Ovid's Hermaphrodite." In Konstan and Nussbaum, eds., 160–85.
- Ormand, K. 2009. *Controlling Desires: Sexuality in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Parker, H. 2001. "The Myth of the Heterosexual: Anthropology and Sexuality for Classicists." *Arethusa* 34: 313–62.
- Partner, N. 1993. "No Sex, No Gender?" *Speculum* 68: 419–43.
- Pomeroy, S. B. 1973. "Selected Bibliography on Women in Antiquity." In Sullivan, ed., 125–57.
- Pomeroy, S. B. 1975. *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity*. New York: Schocken.
- Poovey, M. 1988. "Feminism and Deconstruction." *Feminist Studies* 14: 51–65.
- Rabinowitz, N. S., and A. Richlin, eds. 1993. *Feminist Theory and the Classics*. London: Routledge.
- Reckford, K. J. 1996. "Shameless Interests: The Decent Scholarship of Indecency." *AJP* 117: 311–14.
- Richlin, A. 1981. "The Meaning of *irrumare* in Catullus and Martial." *CP* 76: 40–6.
- Richlin, A. 1983. *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Richlin, A. 1991. "Zeus and Metis: Foucault, Feminism, Classics." *Helios* 18: 160–80.
- Richlin, A. 1992a. "Introduction" to *The Garden of Priapus* (rev. ed.), xiii–xxxiii. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Richlin, A., ed. 1992b. *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Richlin, A. 1993a. "The Ethnographer's Dilemma and the Dream of a Lost Golden Age." In Rabinowitz and Richlin, eds., 272–303.
- Richlin, A. 1993b. "Not before Homosexuality: The Materiality of the *cinaedus* and the Roman Law against Love between Men." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 5: 41–54.
- Richlin, A. 1997. "Gender and Rhetoric: Producing Manhood in the Schools." In W. Dominik, ed., *Roman Eloquence*, 90–110. London: Routledge.
- Richlin, A. 1998. "Foucault's History of Sexuality: A Useful Theory for Women?" In Larmour, Miller, and Platter, eds., 138–70.
- Ringrose, K. M. 2003. *The Perfect Servant: Eunuchs and the Social Construction of Gender in Byzantium*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Scott, J. W. 1988. *Gender and the Politics of History*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Sedgwick, E. K. 1990. *Epistemology of the Closet*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Shapiro, H. A. 1986. Review of E. C. Keuls, *Reign of the Phallus*. *AJA* 90: 361–3.
- Shulman, A. K. 1980. "Sex and Power: Sexual Bases of Radical Feminism." In *Women: Sex and Sexuality*, edited by C. R. Stimpson and E. S. Person, 21–35. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Skinner, M. B. 1979. "Parasites and Strange Bedfellows: A Study in Catullus' Political Imagery." *Ramus* 8: 137–52.
- Skinner, M. B. 1986. Review of A. Richlin, *The Garden of Priapus*. *CP* 81: 252–7.
- Skinner, M. B. 1996. "Zeus and Leda: The Sexuality Wars in Contemporary Classical Scholarship." *Thamyris* 3: 103–23.
- Skinner, M. B. 1997. "Introduction: *Quod multo fit aliter in Graecia . . .*" In Hallett and Skinner, eds., 3–25.
- Skinner, M. B. 2005. *Sexuality in Greek and Roman Culture*. Oxford / Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Stehle [Steigers], E. 1990. "Sappho's Gaze." In Konstan and Nussbaum, eds., 88–125.
- Sullivan, J. P. 1973a. "Editorial." In Sullivan, ed., 5–6.
- Sullivan, J. P., ed. 1973b. Women in Antiquity. *Special issue of Arethusa* 6.1.
- Taylor, C. 1984. "Foucault on Freedom and Truth." *Political Theory* 12: 152–83.
- Veyne, P. 1985. "Homosexuality in Ancient Rome." In P. Ariès and A. Béjin, eds., *Western Sexuality: Practice and Precept in Past and Present Times*. Trans. A. Forster, 26–35. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Vidal-Naquet, P. 1981. "Recipes for Greek Adolescence." In R. L. Gordon, ed., *Myth, Religion and Society: Structuralist Essays by M. Detienne, L. Gernet, J.-P. Vernant and P. Vidal-Naquet*, 163–85. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vuot, C. 2007. *Power and Eroticism in Imperial Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Walters, J. 1997. "Invading the Roman Body: Manliness and Impenetrability in Roman Thought." In Hallett and Skinner, eds., 29–43.
- Wender, D. 1973. "Plato: Misogynist, Paedophile, and Feminist." In Sullivan, ed., 75–90.
- West, C., and D. H. Zimmerman 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender and Theory* 1: 125–51.
- Williams, C. 1999. *Roman Homosexuality: Ideologies of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Winkler, J. J. 1990. *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece*. New York / London: Routledge.

- Wohl, V. 2002. *Love among the Ruins: The Erotics of Democracy in Classical Athens*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Zeitlin, F. I. 1990. "The Poetics of *Erōs*: Nature, Art, and Imitation in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*." In Halperin, Winkler, and Zeitlin, eds., 417–63.
- Zeitlin, F. I. 1996. "Playing the Other: Theater, Theatricality, and the Feminine in Greek Drama." In F. Zeitlin, *Playing the Other: Gender and Society in Classical Greek Literature*, 341–74. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.