

December 3, 1992

CHAPTER V:

RISE OF MACEDONIA, 359-323

THE LAWS

In the Laws, a work written at the very end of his life, and probably edited and published only by one of his pupils, Plato condemned all forms of homosexual expression. The authenticity of the Laws has been challenged, first by the Plato scholar Friedrich Ast (1816). He began by summarizing the argument of the Laws,¹ then continued: "The Laws are a quite peculiar work that is essentially different from the writings of Plato which have hitherto been treated, in particular from the Republic. If we examine the content, then they are as opposed to the Republic as the factual is to the ideal; since in the Republic the idea of the state is expounded without regard to whether it is realizable or not; and so the general outlines of political life are sketched; in the Laws on the contrary the author goes into the smallest detail, as if he had the intention of supplementing the Republic and adding what it lacks, the legislation namely. Regarded from this aspect it would seem as if the Laws stood in such close connection with the Republic that the pair formed a single whole.

But this semblance dissolves into nothing when we take into consideration the passages in the Republic where Plato speaks of legislation. . . . Hence the very idea of giving specific laws for all the external relationships of life, and indeed with such careful precision down to the smallest detail, as we find it in the Nomoi, is unphilosophical, and one familiar with the Platonic genius will not hesitate to say, altogether un-Platonic. The Laws to be sure do speak of education and training, which are treated as the foundation of political life; but the Laws themselves are so lost in the details of external life that their relation to any founding principle utterly vanishes, and therefore the positive aspect of the legislation not seldom appears as arbitrariness. In addition, there are significant departures from the Republic, for which one can offer no reason, as the author had no real state before his eyes, but merely discoursed on the legislation at his leisure. . . . The true Platonic laws are already contained in the Republic; those set forth in the Nomoi are likewise merely applications and further extensions of those principles of philosophical legislation for the purpose of practical political life.

¹ Ast (1816) 379-392.

"If the content of the Laws is un-Platonic, then the spirit and tone of the work and the language are far more so. We find in them neither that beautiful abundance, that clarity and vivacity of exposition nor that dialectical skill and acuity which we admire in Plato's other works, and especially in the Republic; rather do we perceive a clumsy and at the same time dull mind, which, being unable freely to master its subject and shape it artistically. is unequal to its complexity, and only with patent labor and effort develops it. . . . Just the assumption that Plato wrote the Laws after the Republic stands, even if it has the express witness of the ancients such as Aristotle on its side, in open contradiction with the fact that by Plato's own declaration the Republic, the Timaeus and the unfinished Critias were his last works, and that he wrote the Timaeus and Critias after the Republic. When therefore could Plato, since he could not finish the last tetralogy, have written the verbose and laboriously formulated Laws? And can the dullness of age explain the fact that the Laws betray such an un-Platonic character? . . .

"We find another piece of evidence in the ancients (Diog. Laert. III, 37. Suid. ad Philosophos and Eudoc. p. 425) that the Laws were copied and published only after Plato's death by his pupil Philippus of Opus (see Diogen. Laert. III, 47); of this same Philippus it is reported (see Suid.) that he first divided the Laws into two books and appended the Epinomis or the Philosopher, see Diogen. Laert. III, 37. This indication leads us, if consideration of the work has already made its authenticity doubtful, necessarily to the conclusion that a disciple of Plato, whether Xenocrates, Philippus or some other, undertook after Plato's death to write the Laws as a supplement to the Republic, and as Plato depicted the ideal state in the Republic, to outline in the Laws the one most approaching it (see Leges V, 739a-e. Cf. Aristotle Politeia IV, 1). In so doing he had the intention, in order to exhaust the whole of politics, of likewise describing the third state, the real or usual one, in which everything is precisely determined and regulated by laws (see Leges X, 876a-e).

. . . .

"One can cherish the hypothesis that Plato probably outlined a law code for actual use, as the ancients report that he was requested by the Arcadians, Cyrenaeans and Thebans to give them laws [footnote: Plutarch, ad princip. inerudit. 779d, Aelian, V.H. II, 42 et al.]; but this indication is so unreliable and so much like a pure legend that it would be highly uncritical to make it still more fabulous by any further conclusion or hypothesis."²

The unsigned article in the Pauly-Wissowa on Philippus of Opus, after citing Diogenes Laertius III 25, 37 and the article on

² Loc. cit., 393-

Philippus in the Suda, continues: "Both accounts complement each other and attest in the clearest fashion to an editorial activity of Philippus on the work of Plato's old age. This part of the account can rest solely upon genuine tradition, as it is impossible to understand how something of this kind could have been invented in regard to the otherwise little-known Philippus. It leads, however, immediately to the question of whether Philippus' activity was confined to rewriting from the manuscript and the division into books, or other interventions were also performed. In antiquity the informant of Olympiodorus (Procl. in Plut. philos. Append. Plut. 218 Hermann) assumed such, saying exactly that if Plato's *Laws* are in readable order at all, this is a work of Philippus and not of Plato himself. Of course this can be a supposition and need not rest upon tradition. In modern times I. Bruns was the first to take up the question (*Platons Gesetze vor und nach ihrer Herausgabe durch Philippus von Opus*, Weimar 1880) and attempted himself to discover the traces of Philippus' editorial activity through an analysis of the work, an undertaking continued by Bergk--the theory of E. Praetorius *De legibus Platonis a Philippo Opuntio retractatis*, Diss. Bonn 1884 is fantastic--and at the instigation of Erwin Rohde by M. Krieg (*Die Ueberarbeitung der platonischen Gesetze durch Philipp von Opus*, Diss. Heidelb. 1896) in a cautious manner. On the other hand C. Ritter (*Platons Gesetze. Kommentar*. Leipzig 1896, 142ff. 402ff.), Theodor Gomperz (*Platonische Aufsätze* III 1ff.) and others--on the basis of the in itself doubtless correct observation: first, that a set of inconsistencies in the *Laws* are such that they could be ascribed solely to the author himself, not to an editor, second, that a set of the difficulties noted by Bruns can be resolved by interpretation, third, that just the unfinished state of the *Laws* shows that they underwent no thorough polishing, fourth, that the *Laws* must have been published shortly after Plato's death, as Isocrates alludes to them in the *Philippus* composed in 346, and hence there was no time for a comprehensive revision--came to the result that the *Laws* exist in essentially the form given them by Plato. But all these observations can lead only to the finding that Philippus' editorial activity cannot have been as extensive as I. Bruns assumed, while on the other hand the unfinished condition, which must be conceded even by the supporters of the purely Platonic origin of the *Laws*, leaves it extremely improbable that the gigantic work existed at Plato's death in exactly the condition in which it has been transmitted to us, that is in a form in which everything is so interconnected that the work can be read at one stretch, but at the same time the connections between the separate parts are rather thin and artificial. It should probably also be mentioned in this connection that in accordance with ancient principles of style it was impossible to publish in fragments a work conceived as one interconnected whole and therefore, if lacunae were present, the editor had to fill them in as well as he could. . ." (cols. 2358-2359).

Guthrie summarized modern opinion on the question of authorship when he wrote that the authenticity is no longer questioned: "The *Laws* contain infelicities of style, irregularities of syntax verging occasionally on incomprehensibility, repetitions and internal inconsistencies which some nineteenth-century scholars, on the familiar 'unworthy of Plato' argument, attributed to heavy posthumous editing on the part of Plato's pupil" Philippos of Opus. He added: "Nowadays it is recognized that faults of the type found are more naturally explained by the unrevised state in which Plato had to leave this work of his old age, and their retention as a mark of the scrupulousness with which Philip carried out his work of copying.

. . . After a fairly close study of all the other dialogues, I feel no doubt that, to adapt the ancient critic's verdict on the *Odyssey*, it is a work of old age, but definitely--even if (as the content may occasionally make one think) regrettably--the old age of Plato."³

In the *Laws*, the only dialogue hostile to pederasty because it was against nature, i.e., could not lead to procreation, from about 347, the old, intransigent Plato, with an increased interest in and knowledge of medicine and biology, had an elderly Athenian voice what may have become his own opinions. As in some other late dialogues, Socrates never appeared. The Athenian, clearly Plato himself, lectured a Cretan and a Spartan, with a good deal of irony because Athens had modelled its laws on Crete's and Sparta's, on legislating for a new colony to be established inland on Crete. Forbidding intercourse between free and noble persons of the same sex but not apparently outlawing it with slaves, the Athenian regarded homosexuality as a disruptive and "unnatural" vice (*Laws*, 636). He insisted on chastity outside of marriage and monogamy within it. Plato wished to banish poets whom he considered inherently disruptive because they were intuitive rather than rational and could, like lascivious painters, encourage lust (*Republic* and *Laws*).

Although he had favored spiritual pederasty in his other dialogues, Plato turned against any form of it at all in the *Laws*, perhaps because he now favored tyranny and tyrants had long feared, criticized, and suppressed pederasty. More likely he was worried about the declining populations of Athens, Sparta, Syracuse, and other war-beleaguered cities although he also argued that if contraception, abortion, and exposure failed to control population growth, new colonies might be founded to drain the excess, "with mutual goodwill between the emigrants and their mother-city" (740). By that time it would have appeared inconsistent for the same person to advocate tyranny and

³ Guthrie (1978) 321-322.

pederasty:

ATHENIAN: . . . We're faced with the fact that though in several other respects Crete in general and Sparta give us pretty solid help when we frame laws that flout common custom, in affairs of the heart (there's no one listening, so let's be frank) they are totally opposed to us. Suppose you follow nature's rule and establish the law that was in force before the time of Laius. You'd argue that one may have sexual intercourse with a woman but not with men or boys. As evidence for your view, you'd point to the animal world, where (you'd argue) the males do not have sexual relations with each other, because such a thing is unnatural. But in Crete and Sparta your argument would not go down at all well, and you'd probably persuade nobody. However, another argument is that such practices are incompatible with what in our view should be the constant aim of the legislator--that is, we're always asking 'which of our regulations encourages virtue, and which does not?' Now then, suppose in the present case we agreed to pass a law that such practices are desirable, or not at all undesirable--what contribution would they make to virtue? Will the spirit of courage spring to life in the soul of the seduced person? Will the soul of the seducer learn habits of self-control? No one is going to be led astray by that sort of argument--quite the contrary. Everyone will censure the weakling who yields to temptation, and condemn his all-too-effeminate partner who plays the role of the woman. So who on earth will pass a law like that? . . .

ATHENIAN: And a violent and stormy friendship it is, when a man is attracted to someone widely different to himself, and only seldom do we see it reciprocated. When men are alike, however, they show a calm and mutual affection that lasts a lifetime. But there is a third category, compounded of the other two. The first problem here is to discover what this third kind of love is really after. There is the further difficulty that he himself is confused and torn between two opposing

instincts: one tells him to enjoy his beloved, the other forbids him. The lover of the body, hungry for his partner who is ripe to be enjoyed, like a luscious fruit, tells himself to have his fill, without showing any consideration for his beloved's character and disposition. But in another case physical desire will count for very little and the lover will be content to gaze upon his beloved without lusting for him--a mature and genuine desire of soul for soul. That body should sate itself with body he'll think outrageous; his reverence and respect for self-control, courage, high principles and good judgment will make him want to live a life of purity, chaste lover with chaste beloved. This combination of the first two is the 'third' love we enumerated a moment ago (Laws, 836-837).

As in politics he shifted from an aristocratic republic to an enlightened despotism, Plato's attitude toward pederasty and perhaps his sexual preference, although not apparently his aversion to sexual intimacy between men--at least from the age he began writing, probably in his late 20s--changed over his long lifetime. Sexual pleasure, designed for procreation, as he argued from the supposed evidence of the animal kingdom, must not occur without that in mind. The Pseudo-Lucian and Strato, who later gaily described sex play between young male dogs, pointed out that nature was inferior to civilization, which was artificial. Anything else, thought Plato, is "contrary to nature." The Cretans should be ashamed for having attributed pederasty to Zeus to excuse their own transgressions of natural love. Love between women and girls so common at Sparta was equally reprehensible. Plato thus became the first thinker in history to condemn all sexual activity between members of the same sex and to equate female with male homosexual acts as contrary to nature. Why he did so remains a psychological enigma. Was he a self-hating homosexual who could never accept his own physical urges? Had he become embittered and envious in his old age after suffering the scorn and rejection visited on the elderly? The Athenian forbade men "to use sexually men or young boys like women" (836c), a custom introduced by Laius. But as Plato himself admitted, this innovation would go against the religious beliefs and myths cherished by his contemporaries. He imagined that if such urges were ubiquitously and vociferously condemned they would simply recede from consciousness, as did incestuous urges. Physical exercises should absorb the extra energy that motivates sex, and semen should not be wasted. The Athenian observed that

gymnastic exercises and common meals, useful though they are to a state in many ways, are a danger in their encouragement of revolution--witness the example of the youth of Miletus, Boeotia, and Thurii. Moreover, the very antiquity of these practices seems to have corrupted the natural pleasures of sex, which are common to man and beast (Laws, 636).

If not Philo and St. Paul, then the Christian Fathers, particularly Clement of Alexandria, the first to devote a treatise to sexuality, took over these arguments almost verbatim (Paedagogus, X, 87, 3) without thinking that monogamy, and especially chastity, might be more contrary to nature than boy-love. Because Plato opposed giving physical expression to love he was not a precursor of Christian teaching. However, it took more than a philosopher's utopia invoking an ideal of "self-restraint" or "civic duty" to overthrow the religiously sanctioned institution of pederasty. It took a new religion, one implacably opposed to any form of homosexual expression, to effect such a massive change in the mores of the Greco-Roman world of late antiquity.

ARISTOTLE

Plato's best student, Aristotle (384-322), and his rival as the most influential philosopher of antiquity both in general and on pederasty, followed his master's later views without their censoriousness in calling homosexuality unnatural. He believed that some preferred other males because of a congenital defect while others through early practice acquired the taste. Considering homosexuality from many points of view throughout his multifaceted works, he more pitied those who by nature preferred other males as incompletely developed and fulfilled people than condemned them for depravity or even bad taste. In modern parlance he was an "essentialist" because like Plato he recognized that some males were born with an exclusive preference for other males, although unlike Plato he did not specifically discuss female homosexuality. Violently dominated by Eros, the pederast, who became less generous as his passion cooled, sought pleasure and the boy advantages, but he was not responsible and must therefore be pardoned (Eudemian Ethics, VII, 3, 7, 10, 31; II, 8, 21). To prevent the type of homosexuality caused by practice instead of nature, a puritanical education had to prohibit obscene paintings and sculptures as well as the kisses and caresses authorized even by Plato (Politics, VII, 15, 7-9; V, 10, 15 ff.). Thus he considered even the acquired type of homosexual preference a disability to be prevented if possible, not by punishment but by careful supervision during the formative years.

In short, he was censorious but pitying rather than vindictive.

Aristotle moved as a boy to Pella, where his father immigrated from the Chalcidian colony of Stagira to become court physician and friend of Amyntas II (c.393-370). At seventeen he went to Athens to enroll in Plato's Academy, where he stayed on after finishing his studies, working as a research assistant for twenty years, and perhaps became an eromenos. Although Aristotle took a second wife when his first died, and disparaged, as we have just seen, homosexual drives, gossip later attributed four eromenoi to him without saying that the relationships became physical; they were probably only "Platonic." Sometime after Plato's death in 347 he became the lover of Hermias, tyrant of Atarrea (c.355-341), whose niece he married, and whose court he left after the Persians crucified the tyrant. If he courted the boy when Hermias was twelve, Aristotle would have been about forty. Another eromenos was Theodectes (c.375-334), the technical perfection of whose tragedies he praised (Diogenes Laertius, V, 9; Diodorus Siculus, XV, 52, 5-7; Strabo, XIII, 1, 57; Athenaeus, XIII, 566e; Steph. Byz., s.v. Phaselis; Valerius Maximus, VIII, 14, 3).⁶⁰ The Suda attributed yet another eromenos to Aristotle, his student Palaiphatus, an expert in explicating rationally myths and wonders (s.v. Palaiphatus). In his testament, Aristotle made provision for "Myrmex, the little one" (Diogenes Laertius, V, 1, 14).

Unfortunately Aristotle's two treatises on love are lost along with all his dialogues, which apparently resembled Plato's, and other early works. Practically nothing of the Theseis eroticai and only a few fragments of the Eroticus survive.⁶¹ Besides the large number of spurious works, approximately twenty, and ones of doubtful authenticity, often calculated at five, including the Eudaemian Ethics, which some think earlier than the Nicomachean but others assign later and edited by his son, for whom it was named, Aristotle's productions are classified into: 1. Dialogues; 2. Collections of data on a wide range of subjects such as animals, literary forms, games, and barbarian customs, of which the only surviving one is on the Athenian constitution, one of 158; and 3. The "memoranda," as they are called, more full and ordered than student notes (which some claim them to be) or polished products meant for publication. Of these we possess approximately twenty, though parts of these were probably added by later writers after his death. Some were written piecemeal during his Wanderjahrzeit (347-337), and his second period in Athens (336-323).

All surviving works come from his second Athenian stay when from age 49 to 62 Aristotle, who founded the Lyceum in 334, enjoyed Macedonian patronage. His inconsistencies usually stemmed, therefore, less from a change of mind over decades, as

with Plato, than from his eclecticism in science, esthetics, and politics, as well as from student editings. Christians have emphasized the sex-negativism of the somewhat elderly (in his fifties) Aristotle and that of the elderly Plato. The still flourishing Hippocratic school, then headed by Praxagoras of Cos, who explained the pulse, greatly influenced Aristotle towards the golden mean. Other physicians under the influence of the new science of biology began to influence Aristotle and the Peripatetics towards a concept of a genetic preference of a minority for homosexual acts, foreshadowed the myth that Plato ascribed to Aristophanes (Symposium, 189d-193d) of the lost half seeking its counterpart, the earliest reference to innate homosexuality. It is virtually impossible to assign chronological order to works from his last period when most were published. Aristotle's works were not widely known in antiquity and they did not rival Plato's before the twelfth century. In fact, Tyrannion and Andronicus of Rhodes made the edition that we still possess in the first century B.C.⁶² Aristotle's works comprise 23 volumes in the Loeb Classical Library against 12 for Plato and 28 for Cicero.

His On the Interpretation of Dreams and thirty-six of the seventy books of the Problems survive, of which Book IV is devoted to sexuality, a collection his students or their followers put together probably in the third century B.C., discussing about 900 questions about mathematics, music, philology, the senses, ethics, plants, the soul, diseases, and wind. Problems may have incorporated parts of Aristotle's lost work of the same title. E. Richter⁶³ believed that the work was arranged as late as the fifth and even the sixth centuries, an opinion shared by the Oxford Classical Dictionary.⁶⁴ The collection, however, has a clear structure such as one would expect to find in an original and the concepts in them, especially those regarding pederasty, seem Aristotelian.⁶⁵ Certain men enjoy only the passive role, while others enjoy both passive and active because for some the anus was erotic, a finding confirmed by modern medicine, although not because sperm moved to the anus, as Aristotle claimed. He did realize that pain from being anally penetrated ceased with practice. Those by nature exclusively homosexual were as insatiable as women, whereas those habituated during puberty could go both ways:

Those who are effeminate by nature are so constituted that little or no semen is secreted into that place where it is secreted in those who have a natural constitution; but it is secreted into this part of the body (the fundament). The reason is that they are unnaturally constituted. For though they are male, they have been so formed that that part of them has been maimed. Maiming causes

generally either destruction or perversion. The former, however, is impossible, for that would imply that they have become a woman. They must therefore become perverted and desire that the semen is secreted in some other direction. That is why they are unsatisfied, like woman; for the moisture is scanty and has not enough force to leave the body (to find its way out) and is quickly chilled. The men whose semen secretes into the fundament, desire to perform the passive role (pathein), but whose semen secretes into both directions, like to play both the active and the passive role. And the more semen secretes in one direction, the stronger is the corresponding desire. In some men this condition (perversion) is also the result of habit. For men take pleasure in whatever they are accustomed to do and emit semen accordingly. They therefore desire to do that by which these things (pleasure and the emission of semen) occur: habit becomes more and more a second nature. For this reason everyone who has been accustomed to play the passive role in sexual intercourse not before but about puberty--because the recollection occurs during the act of copulation and with the recollection the feeling of pleasure--desires to play the passive role because of the habit as though he has that desire naturally; frequent repetition, however, and habit become a second nature. If someone happens to be lustful and effeminate, this is all the more likely to occur (IV, 25-50).

Hupperts commented on this passage:

In his description and explanation of the pathicus the author of the text of the *Problemata* uses words which Aristotle applies to women. The semen of the pathicus is scanty and is quickly chilled. They are unsatisfied, like women. They are called malakos (soft), a word that Aristotle uses of his description of the character of women (H.A. 608a25). They are also called phusei theludriai: effeminate by nature. . . . The

pathicus is no real man, not only by being passive in sexual intercourse, but also in other aspects of his constitution and nature. In many respects he is ranked with a woman. So, behind the apparent objective scientific description of a pathicus an implicit condemnation of this type of man is hidden.⁶⁶

Aristotle regarded natural homosexuals as maimed: inferior to true men (Physiognomy, III). The highest level of friendship had to be restricted to one person and presumably to be "Platonic:"

It is . . . disputed whether the happy man will need friends or not. It is said that those who are blessed and self-sufficient have no need of friends; for they have the things that are good, and therefore being self-sufficient they need nothing further while a friend, being another self, furnishes what a man cannot provide by his own effort; whence the saying 'when fortune is kind, what need of friends?' But it seems strange, when one assigns all good things to the happy man, not to assign friends, who are thought the greatest of external goods (Nicomachean Ethics, IX, 10, 5).

Those assigned a passive role by nature or "victims of lust from childhood," accustomed to it by long practice, should be considered sick, but the deliberate pederast is evil:

These states are brutish, but others arise as a result of disease (or, in some cases, of madness, as with the man who sacrificed and ate his mother, or with the slave who ate the liver of his fellow), and others are morbid states resulting from custom, e.g., the habit of plucking out the hair or of gnawing the nails, or even coals or earth, and in addition to these is pederasty; for these arise in some by nature and in others, as in those who have been the victims of lust from childhood, from habit. Now those in whom nature is the cause of such a state no one would call incontinent, any more than one would apply the epithet to women, because of the passive part they play in copulation. . . . (Nicomachean Ethics, VII, 5, f)

Boys and youths should be protected from the advances of slaves and in the gymnasia segregated from their elders:

In keeping an eye on the children's way of life in general, the Trainers of Children should particularly see that as little time as possible is spent in the company of slaves. . . . younger persons shall not be spectators at comedies or recitals of iambics, not, that is to say, until they have reached the age at which they come to recline at banquets with others and share in the drinking. (Pol., 1336a) . . . This area {the 'free' square} could be made attractive if the gymnasia of the older folk were also laid out there; for in this amenity also there should be separation of age-groups, the younger in one place, the older in another; the latter should follow this pursuit in the company of the officials, and some of the officials should mingle with the younger men. . . . (Pol., 1331a)

In discussing the political ramifications of pederasty, Aristotle offhandedly assumed without condemnation the existence of bisexuality and lesbianism. From Archaic times factions as well as assassinations, of which he offered many examples, often arose from pederastic affairs (Pol., 1303b and 1311a).

Neither he [the tyrant] nor any of his entourage should be seen to violate any of his youthful subjects male or female; and this applies equally well to the women of his court in their behavior toward other women. Female hubris too has often caused the fall of tyrannies. He should abstain from all ill-treatment in all its forms, and two in particular-- offenses against the person and against youth . . . His liaisons with young persons should spring from love, not simply from the opportunities open to him (Pol., 1314b)

Aristotle thought that men should marry late because "the acme of a man's physical development is reached between 30 and 35, the acme of mature development not til 49" and he remains strong til 70. Although procreative powers begin in males at 21, they should only marry at 37 (no one else recommended such a late date) women of 18, who cease to bear progeny at 50. Thus after 32 years the couple simultaneously cease to be procreative (Pol., VII, 1335).

Like Plato in the Laws, however, Aristotle opined that couples should only procreate for ten years, perhaps because they might produce too many offspring:

[Aristotle recommended] "a law that no crippled child be reared . . . a limit to the production of children . . . abortion. . . produced before the embryo has acquired life and sensation . . . [that] extra-marital intercourse . . . should generally be a disgrace . . . punished by such measure of disgrace as is appropriate. . . . (Pol., 1335b).

More realistic than Plato, Aristotle recognized that pederasty had been institutionalized on Crete to curb population (Pol., VII, 4.7, 1326b 2-3; 4.5-8, 1326a, ff.). Although the Hippocratic Oath forbade giving pessaries to cause abortion, Aristotle recommended abortion over exposure, but only of fetuses no more than ninety days old. Apparently, repugnance for late-stage abortion induced Aristotle to limit it to the early stage. More than Plato, he felt the necessity of "preventing the household from becoming a source of overpopulation and pauperism and he relies less than Plato on the possibility of shipping the surplus off to colonies."⁶⁷ In Works and Days, Hesiod had recommended that a man not marry before 30, prefer one son to two, restrict intercourse to certain seasons and days, realizing that overpopulation was the main cause of poverty. Such recommendations to counter overpopulation, including abortion and infanticide, run from Lycurgus through Solon to Aristotle. Although none said so except Aristotle, Greeks thought that late marriage of males did help to curb population. If the old Plato, Aristotle, and Xenophon criticized excessive pederasty, they did not try to alter the other arrangements that had been established to limit the population explosion. Nor did they themselves abstain from "pure" pederasty.

OTHER LATER PHILOSOPHERS

Aristippus, grandson of one of Socrates's companions, also named Aristippus (c.435-c.356), the citizen of Cyrene given to luxury who served as a courtier of Dionysus I of Syracuse, founded the relatively short-lived Cyrenaic school which came to an end c.275. It foreshadowed Epicureanism with the difference that the Cyrenaics favored physical pleasure, including bountiful sex, whereas the Epicureans favored mental pleasures. Its major figures included Theodorus, Hegesias, and Anniceris. Most modern scholars feel that he rather than his grandfather taught the basic doctrines of the school that immediate pleasure of the senses was the final aim of life and that the present is the only reality.

Family, marriage, and the city could collapse without troubling the Cyrenaics. Aristippus, who had gotten a courtesan with a child, quipped to a boy: "It is not going in that is dangerous, but being unable to go out" (Diogenes Laertius, II, 69). With a joke he cautioned that one should not teach boys how to exploit their beauty:

When Aristippus was asked what are the subjects which handsome boys ought to learn, his reply was, 'Those which will be useful to them when they are grown up' (Diogenes Laertius, II, 80).

Their followers at least maintained that sages could use boys freely and without scruple.⁶⁸

Besides Diogenes the Cynic (discussed above), the main rivals of Aristotle and his school, the Peripatetics, were the Academicians, as Plato's successors at the Academy were called. Plato's nephew Speusippus headed the academy from 347 to 339. Only fragments and later discussions of his voluminous works, which Aristotle esteemed, remain. He argued that, as the Peripatetics were to agree, goodness appears not at the origins, but at the final stages of development and that in itself pleasure was neither evil nor good. Two of his books censured Aristippus, the founder of the Cyrenaics.⁶⁹

Speusippus's eromenos Xenocrates, the erastes of Polemo, succeeded him as head of the Academy in 339 and was succeeded in turn by his eromenos Polemo, whom he converted from dissipation to philosophy, in 314. Although we do not know the details of his ethical writings, he transformed Plato's theories of forms. The Stoics absorbed some of his doctrine: "The reason for discovering philosophy is to allay that which causes disturbance in life."

ORATORS AND COMEDIANS ON CINAEDI, PORNOI, AND EFFEMINATES

No source is richer for Athenian history than the orators. They treat public more than private business and as homosexuality was not illegal they rarely discuss it. Most in other cities and even in Athens were never written. Although we have orations by the ten greatest Attic orators, the ones by Demosthenes far exceeding in length all the others, we do not have a single oration by a non-Athenian, although they must have even in oligarchies they must have delivered political as well as forensic speeches. Only in the Hellenistic period do the encomiums, panegyrics, rhetorical exhibitions and exercises survive from places outside Athens. Because the overwhelming majority of surviving classical orations are political and forensic, pederasty finds little place in them. Licht did not devote a special

article to the orations. Dover has most emphasized the information to be garnered from orations. The core of his Greek Homosexuality amounts to an extended commentary on Aeschines' Against Timarchus.

Like comedians, orators, who excelled in rhetoric, routinely ridiculed as pathics or prostitutes those they were trying to discredit, without ever attacking pederasty itself. In Athens, procurers of either sex could incur the death penalty for providing free women or free children. Keepers of legal brothels, whether they contained women or boys or both, paid taxes according to the number of prostitutes they employed. Because free boys who rented out their bodies lost certain civic rights, slaves or metics normally staffed brothels. Although some free boys or women worked as prostitutes, it was illegal to keep them there against their wishes.

The law against hubris protected all free persons, including metics, and even slaves (except against their own masters), from violence, with the penalty or fine, to be doubled if a free person was the victim (Lysias, On the Death of Erastothenes, 32; Against Theomnestus, 19), otherwise at the judges' discretion (Against Timarchus, 15, 184). Any Athenian had the right to prosecute violent offenses against himself or against anyone else, man, woman, or child, whether free or servile (Demosthenes, Against Midias, 47-48). Both parties were penalized if a father, uncle, or tutor contracted out a boy under eighteen in his care to a man for sex. The prostituted boy was relieved of the obligation to provide bed and board for his father in old age but still had to bury him decently (Against Timarchus, 13).

The earliest fourth-century oration, and except for Antiphon who flourished in the fifth century, the earliest of all from whom we have an entire speech, since Gorgias of Leontini fused Sicilian techniques with those developed along with democracy in Athens after Solon's time, Lysias' Defense Against Simon (composed we do not know how many years after 394) used these techniques to smear opponents. He prosecuted a young Athenian who tried to steal a boy from a metic past fifty from Plataea. The metic (who may or may not have had a sort of partial Athenian citizenship which was awarded to Platean refugees to Athens in 427 and perhaps their descendants in Athens) was enamored of the 15- to 18-year-old Theodotus, with whom he lived in his house, thus cohabiting as was the custom in Elis and Boeotia. Although ashamed that the case had come to court, the old lover complained that the plaintiff Simon, a jealous young man, had while drunk invaded his house at night, thrown stones at him, and molested the boy:

To tell all the ill-treatment that the boy
has suffered from him would be a lengthy

business: but I think it proper that you should hear the numerous offences he has committed against myself. Hearing that the boy was at my house, he came there at night in a drunken state, broke down the doors, and entered the women's rooms [occupied by a sister and some orphaned nieces]. . . . (5-6)

Afterwards, the metic and the boy went away on a long trip, hoping Simon would forget about Theodotus. But after their return, Simon and his friends, drunk, assaulted the boy, who escaped losing his coat, when on the street they found him hiding and a veritable battle took place. Simon stayed away awhile but then came to court with a contract saying that he had bought for 300 drachmae from Theodotus the exclusive sexual rights to his body, not an illegal transaction (Aeschines referred to such contracts (Against Timarchus, 160-1)). As the amount exceeded Simon's estate of 250 drachmae, Lysias presumed the contract to be a forgery. That, as Simon alleged, the old man had helped the young boy to arrange to swindle him by pretending to attack his own house were shown to be equally implausible:

You [Lysias] ought to take all this, gentlemen, as primary proof that he is lying to you. And then, consider how incredible his statements are. He has valued his property altogether at two hundred and fifty drachmae: yet how surprising that he should hire his companion for more than he himself in fact possesses! . . . he says that he gave it {the money}, so as to avoid the scandal of daring to commit such an outrage on the lad without any bargain struck between them; and he pretends that he has got it back, because it is clear that he never laid a claim to money or made the least mention of the matter. . . .

He [Simon] says that I [the old metic] gave him a beating at the door of his house, which left him in a terrible state. But we find that he pursued the boy for more than four stades from his house with no sign of injury, and this he denies, although it was seen by more than two hundred people.

He states that we went to his house with potsherds in our hands, and that I threatened to kill him, and that this is premeditation. But I think that this lie of his, gentlemen, is easily detected,

not only by you who are used to investigating this sort of case, but by everyone else as well. For who can find it credible that by a premeditated manœuvre I went to Simon's house after daybreak with the boy, when so many people had gathered about him, unless I had become so utterly insane as to be eager to fight them all single-handed; especially when I knew that he would have been delighted to see me at his door,--he who in fact kept coming to my house, and entered it by force, and, disregarding both my sister and my nieces, had the audacity to seek me out, and having discovered where I happened to be dining called me out and beat me? And so, as it seems, I, who at first, to avoid notoriety, kept quiet, taking this man's wickedness to be so much misfortune to myself, was yet after a lapse of time, as he says, converted to a desire for notoriety! Now if the boy had been living with him, there would be some show of reason in his lie that I was driven by my desire to an act of quite improbable folly: but the fact is that the boy would not even talk to him, but hated him more than anyone in the world, and was actually living with me (23-32).

Though we have no other full account, such fracasés may have been common.

An even fuller account appears in Aeschines's indictment of Demosthenes's sordid ally Timarchus. In 347/346, near the beginning of their ten-year duel over how best to keep Greece out of the clutches of Philip of Macedon, Aeschines (c.397-c.322) disbarred Demosthenes' ally Timarchus from privileges of active citizenship by convicting him of prostitution while a youth. Prior to this, Demosthenes had accused one of the Athenian envoys, who was a supporter of Aeschines, of having brought along his son to prostitute him to Philip of Macedon (Embassy, 233).

Athens rigorously prohibited a citizen who had prostituted himself, whether to an individual or to all comers, after eighteen, at which age he was supposed to know the laws, from addressing the Assembly or Council, acting as archon or priest, or exercising other civic offices because if he had sold his body as a boy, he might as an adult sell his influence or authority and otherwise corrupt politics (Aeschines, Timarchus, 19-20; 29; 31). No penalty befell free boys who did not receive money or those

who did if they stayed out of public life. While detailing the debaucheries of Timarchus, Aeschines cited the so-called "Laws of Solon," the exact phrasing of which as well as their date and author is not certain. In 424 in Knights (876-880) Aristophanes had referred to a successful conviction under the "Laws of Solon."⁷⁴ Taken in by the forgers, Pogeey-Castries published them as Appendix IV of his L'Amour Grec.⁷⁵

The upper middle-class Aeschines admitted that at 45 he haunted gymnasia and had many eromenoi. He prognosticated that his opponent would produce poems he had penned to boys and mention injuries he had received in courting them. Extolling Achilles and Patroclus as well as Harmodius and Aristogiton, he conceded that beautiful boys appeal to all, listing honorable ones and those who had sullied themselves (Against Timarchus, 135; 132-4; 158).

His democratic antagonist, Demosthenes (384-322), also made the standard slurs, including those against bearded men who played the passive role (Athenaeus, XIII, 592f). In Against Conon, he impugned men for effeminacy, perhaps implying that they played the passive role:

I am inclined to think . . . that many of you know Diotimus and Archebiades and Chaeretimus, the grey-headed man yonder, men who by day put on sour looks and pretend to play the Spartan and wear short cloaks and single-soled shoes, but when they get together and are by themselves leave no form of wickedness or indecency untried (34-35).

Though not himself accused of effeminacy, as far as we know, Aeschines, though a boy chaser in his sixties, was more circumspect about hurling accusations. In his Embassy, he charged Demosthenes with letting his wife get involved with his eromenos:

The orator was unbridled in sexual matters, according to Idomeneus. At any rate, having fallen in love with a lad named Aristarchus, because of him he attacked Nicodemus in a drunken fit and gouged out his eyes. It is a well-known tradition that he spent money lavishly on dainty foods, young boys, and women. Hence his clerk once said: "What can one say of Demosthenes? For all that it has taken him a year of industry to acquire, one woman in one night has spoilt completely." He is said, at any rate, to have taken even into his own house a young lad named Cnosion, although he had a wife; she, in turn, lay

with Cnasion to show her resentment (Athenaeus, XIII, 592-593).

Such taunts must have amused at least the lower classes in the Assembly as in the theaters and courts. Although noted for his pederastic involvements, in 349 Demosthenes (Against Neaera, 122) uttered a line perhaps typical of contemporary morals: "Mistresses we keep for the sake of pleasure, concubines for the daily care of our persons, but wives to bear us legitimate children and to be faithful guardians of our households," while he extravagantly praised a young boy, Epicrates, for his beauty and grace, urged him to study philosophy, and discussed how many benefits were to be acquired from honorable love (Erotica, VII, 42-83).

GYMNASIA, GAMES, AND SYMPOSIA

Athletics resumed quickly because of the general Athenian recovery after the war but Athens experienced a drastic reduction in equestrian triumphs. Lycurgus (c.390-c.325/4) restored or expanded all three gymnasia as part of his general rebuilding program. Some say the gymnastic expansion of building programs in some ways anticipated those of the Hellenistic Age. In the shadow of Macedonia, Lycurgus tried to revive Athenian grandeur and repaired or expanded the gymnasia. We do not know much about victors in this period, though all Athenians to win gymnastic prizes were boys and youths. Nouveaux riches displayed their wealth in equestrian events throughout the history of Greek gymnasia, bathing facilities expanded from simple tripods to ever more elaborate facilities, and by the fourth century the therapeutic value of hot baths was recognized, before generally thought fit only for the elderly and ill.⁷⁶

LAWS IN OTHER POLEIS

For more than a century, homophobes such as Flacelière and Marrou have ransacked Greek laws, vainly attempting to prove that at least one polis outlawed homosexuality as such or its particular and, to the modern bourgeois mind, more shocking form, pederasty. Scholars often "mistake" sanctions against particular types of crimes involving homosexual acts or attempts such as use of force or threats upon citizens in Lysias' Against Simon and Aeschines' Against Timarchus for laws against homosexuality itself. Denying that Symposium and Phaedrus, much less the Iliad, are about "overt homosexuality," Dover, who was originally planning to co-author his work with the Hungarian psychoanalyst Devereux (who maintained that Greek pederasty was "pseudo-homosexuality"), claimed that Timarchus is the longest piece of surviving Greek literature treating homosexuality. Basically a commentary on the

politically motivated oration against Timarchus, around which he weaves his other evidence, his work virtually ignored the lower classes and slaves, as too many dons have done in the past, relegating the fragments of the lost works to the margin.⁷⁰

Whatever Spartan opinion and early custom (laws were not written), few believed that the supposed prohibition against sexual contacts between lovers was enforced there. To be sure, tyrants or in Ionia Persians forbade gymnasia and common meals, pederastic concomitants that they considered potentially seditious. Between 478 and 461, as Cimon liberated Ionia, Athens restored democratic institutions and pederasty in its poleis. Although we have no edicts or direct statements, the restoration and proliferation there of gymnasia⁷¹ and Herodotus's clear statement that the Persians learned pederasty from the Greeks (I, 135), presumably the Ionians from this period, support our assumption. Persians proscribed them again in 387 after the Peace of Antalcidas. Plato (c.350) noted that gymnastic exercises and common meals had encouraged revolutions in Miletus [in 494?], Boeotia [at Thebes in 378?], and Thurii [413?] (Laws, 636; cf. Aristotle, Pol., V, 1307a 23).

As we have seen, the "lawgivers," often the founders, established pederasty as an institution in many cities but unfortunately none of their edicts survive. The Code of Gortyn, inscribed in 450, the oldest that survives, made no distinction between force against girls or against boys. In fact, nowhere in Greek law do we find among the Greeks reluctance to condone homosexual relations less than heterosexual ones which, of course, all poleis regulated, as they did homosexual ones, or in fact, even more because they afforded the possibility of illegitimate offspring. The outlying regions adopted pederasty late, Macedonia only in the reign of Archelaus (413-399).

Plato had Pausanias say c. 385 or just before Pelopidas and Epaminondas took over Thebes in 378, but after the Persians had regained control of Ionia:

here [in Athens] and in Lacedaimon the law about love is confusing, but that in other states is easy to understand. In Elis and Boeotia, and where people are not clever speakers, it is simply laid down that it is right to gratify lovers, and no one young or old would call it ugly; as I think, they wish not to have the trouble of convincing the young, because they cannot argue; but in many other parts of Ionia it is considered ugly, where they are under barbarians. For the barbarians because of the rule of despots

call this ugly, as well as philosophy and sports (Symposium, 182C).

Xenophon had Socrates acknowledge to Pausanias that overt pederasty existed before Epaminondas in Elis and Boeotia: "It is their custom, but at Athens disgraceful" (Smp., 8.32f). He disagreed with Pausanias's statement in Plato's Symposium that Spartan "law" was "confusing:" custom and public opinion rather than law forbade sex with eromenoi. He mentioned "places," without specifying which, where "they absolutely prevent erastai from talking to boys" (Const., 2.12f). Sex between adult males and oral sex, apparently opprobrious throughout Hellas, even with females, were supposedly outlawed along with pederasty in some, we know not which.⁷² Some poleis barred males under forty, except teachers and family, from schools for young boys more strictly than others. Solon's supposed prohibition of adults attending palaestras (Timarchus, 12) was obviously not enforced in the time of Socrates, who, along with many other "idlers," haunted them.

In Thebes (Xen., Symp., viii, 32f; Plato, Symp., 182b), and in Elis boy-love contained a sensual element, as well as a religious component. In Chalcis, too, heroism combined with sensuality. On Euboea and in its colonies an anonymous popular song has come down to us and also a similar one of Seleucus (Athenaeus, XV, 697d) calling boy-love more valuable than marriage because it caused knightly comradeship:

O ye boys of brave fathers, shining in the
grace of your charms, never grudge the
companionship of your beauty to honourable men,
for in the cities of Chalcis, in union
with manly virtue still ever blooms your
gracious, heart-infatuating sweet youth.
(Plutarch, Loves, 17)

Aristotle (Plutarch, Loves, 761), traced this song back to the relationship between the hero Cleomachus and his eromenos. A lemma in Hesychius proved the pederastic taste of the Chalcidians. This is corroborated by Athenaeus, who added that the Chalcidians claimed the honor that Zeus abducted Ganymede near their polis, which they proudly pointed out to tourists: Harpagion (the place of the rape). Throughout Hellas glorified the beauty of youths. At Megara during the spring at the Diocleia (Theocr., xii, 30) boys and youths competed in kissing. At Thespieae (Plut., Amat., 1; Pausan., ix, 31, 3; Ath., xiii, 601a) during the festival of Eros, boys vied for prizes in the singing of love songs. The Delians (Lucian, De Saltat., 16) are reported to have specially enjoyed boys' round dances.⁷³

PHILIP'S AND ALEXANDER'S EROMENOI

Blatantly inventing a pretext, the Thebans convinced the Boeotian Amphictyony to condemn and heavily fine some rich Phocians for sacrilege. When they did not pay on time, their lands were declared forfeit and consecrated to the Delphic Apollo. In desperation, the Phocaeans, under the leadership of the wealthy Philomachus, seized the treasures at Delphi in 356 to raise an army of mercenaries. Privately, the Spartans supported the Phocian seizure of the shrine that they had formerly always protected because they wished to see their enemy Thebes humiliated. Eventually Sparta allied openly with Phocis and Athens expressed support so that all of Greece was drawn into the struggle--the Third Sacred War (356-346).

When the Phocaeans pillaged Delphi, one of their chiefs, Onomarchus, a boy-lover, offered five strigiles from the dedications of the Sybarites in return for the favors of a beautiful boy, the son of Puthadourus of Sicyon, who had come there to consecrate to Apollo his koure (long boyish locks), because he had attained adulthood (Theopompus, On the Objects Pillaged at Delphi, Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum, ed. T. Muller, 1841-1870). To another handsome boy, Physcidas from Trichoneium in Aetolia, who was also at the age to become a citizen, he gave a golden crown of laurel leaves, which the Ephesians had dedicated. The father of the second boy later took and prostituted him to Philip of Macedonia but was dismissed without payment; Onomarchus also gave to another beautiful boy, Damippus of Amphipolis, another votive offering (Athenaeus, XIII, 605a-c). Thus we see that even crude chieftains from backward areas indulged themselves in boy love as much as sophisticated Athenians or Macedonian monarchs, and impiously.

After the defeat and suicide of the original Phocian leader Philomelus in 354, Onomarchus succeeded to the leadership. Brilliant in battle and diplomacy, he defeated all those allied against him until the Thessalians, hard-pressed by him, begged Philip of Macedon to intervene. In struggles in which neither side took prisoners, Onomarchus defeated Philip more than once, before Philip captured and hanged him (352). Philip's resultant appearance south of Mt. Olympus opened a new phase of Greek history.

After the death of Epaminondas, her most dangerous rival, when Athens resumed leadership of Greece, she sought to reassert her control of the north Aegean but after 359 Philip of Macedonia, whom she underestimated, thwarted her ambitions to regain the Greek cities of the Chalcidice, which guaranteed access to the Propontis and to the gold mines near Mt. Pangaeus. He gradually improved his kingdom, completing the Hellenization begun by Archelaus (413-399), and expanded it until he conquered all of Greece in 338. Many historians have argued that the glories of

Greek pederasty ended with the loss of Greek liberty to the Macedonians at Chaeronea: "At Chaeronea, Greek liberty, Greek heroism, and Greek love, properly so called, expired."⁸⁸ But in fact, they continued for almost two centuries to regain their freedom or retain it in the face of overwhelming Macedonian and Roman superiority. The Macedonians had adopted pederasty and all the related Greek institutions: gymnasia, theaters, and symposia, to which their achievements are largely owed. It was only by Hellenization that the Macedonians became great. All of its kings from Archelaus to Antigonus Gonatas (c.284/3-239) practiced pederasty.

Towards the end of the fifth century, the Macedonian sovereigns adopted pederasty along with some other Greek institutions without abandoning their customary same-age adolescent love-affairs. Having strangled his uncle and cousin in one night and thrown his seven-year-old half-brother into a well to gain the throne in 413, Archelaus did more than his predecessors to make Macedonia powerful. According to Thucydides, in addition to fortresses, he "built straight roads through the country, reorganized the cavalry, the arming of the infantry, and equipment in general, so as to put the country in a stronger position for war than it had ever been under all the eight kings who had ruled before him" (II, 100). He also Hellenized it, drawing both Euripides, Agathon, the epic poet Chairilus of Samos, the painter Zeuxis, and Timotheus the musician to Pella, inviting Socrates, who declined, and institutionalizing pederasty (Plutarch, Moralia, 177; Aelian, Varia Historia, 2.21.13, 4.14, 17; Aristophanes, Ranae Sch. 85, Athenaeus, VIII, 345d, Sen. benef. 5, 6). Plato, however, painted an unflattering picture of Archelaus's rise to power:

POLUS: Wicked? Of course he is! He had no claim to the power he now enjoys, being the son of a woman who was a slave to Alcetas, the brother of Perdicas, and by rights he was the slave of Alcetas. And if he had chosen to act justly, he would still have been his slave and, according to you [i.e., Socrates], would have been happy, but now he has become monstrous unhappy, since he has done the greatest of wrongs. In the first place he sent for this master and uncle of his, ostensibly to restore to him the power of which Perdicas had deprived him, and then entertained the man and his son, Alexander, who was his own cousin and about his own age, and after making them drunk he flung them into a wagon, took them away by night, and made away with them by murder. And these

crimes he committed without realizing that he was the most wretched of men, and felt no regrets. But a little later, so far from wishing to become happy by justly bringing up the rightful heir to the throne, his own brother, the legitimate son of Perdiccas, a child of about seven years, and restoring the throne to him, he threw him into a well and drowned him, and then told the child's mother, Cleopatra, that the boy had fallen in and killed himself while chasing a goose
(Gorgias, 471a-c)

Two of Archelaus's three assassins were former eromenoi of his, one of whom, Decamnichus, he had had flogged for saying that Euripides had bad breath: "In the conspiracy against Archelaus, Decamnichus stimulated the fury of the assassins and led the attack; he was enraged because Archelaus had delivered him to Euripides to be scourged; for the poet had been irritated at some remark made by Decamnichus on the foulness of his breath" (Aristotle, Pol., V, 1311a-b). Only Diodorus Siculus maintained that Archelaus died as the result of a hunting accident, "unintentionally struck while hunting by Craterus, whom he loved, and met his end, after a reign of [sic] seven years" (XIV, 37.6).

Among those assassinated in the struggle for the succession, Amyntas II the Short, one of Archelaus's bastards, who struggled for a year for the throne against the son of Arriopus II, Pausanias, until he was victorious, died at the hands of Derdas, "because he boasted of having enjoyed his youth" (Aristotle, Pol., V, 10, 15). Diodorus Siculus confused him with Amyntas III, the father of Philip II (XIV, 89.2). Coming to the throne probably after the assassination of Amyntas II, Amyntas III (c.393-370) restored stability and strengthened his kingdom by astutely warding off the Illyrian barbarians and Bardyles, the Dardanian king, through diplomatic maneuvers and allying with the Chalcidian league, the Spartans who overturned it (382-379), the Athenians when in turn they drove out the Spartans, and finally with Jason of Pherae, who gained control of all of Thessaly in 374 and who upon his assassination in 370 was jockeying for hegemony in Greece with methods that perhaps foreshadowed or even suggested those soon to be used by Philip II.⁸⁹

After the brief reigns of Alexander II (370-368) and Ptolemy (368-365), Perdiccas III (365-359) resumed the task of building up the monarchy, reforming the state revenues and conquering Amphipolis (364). Perdiccas murdered his guardian, his stepfather Ptolemy, but he was slain six years later along with 4,000 other Macedonians by invading Illyrians, leaving a child heir, Amyntas IV. In the critical situation with the Paeonians threatening from the north, the Thracians invaded to enthrone a pretender.

Philip, the young king's uncle, assumed the regency at age 24. Philip bribed the Paeonians to make peace and the Thracians to abandon the pretender that they were supporting and renounced claims to Amphipolis, the chief seaport in the Chalcidice which his brother Perdiccas had garrisoned. He remodelled his army along the latest lines that he had learned while a hostage in Thebes. With his new army he defeated the Paeonians and Illyrians and seized frontier areas, in which were large gold deposits, from the Thracians and annexed Amphipolis, which was near the mines, building nearby a great fortress that he named Philippi. He reorganized the mines so that they provided no less than one thousand talents a year, a revenue no other Greek state could match. Then he founded a new capital at Pella and soon seized Pydna and Potidea. In the next years he welded the tribes from the hills with the coastal Macedonians and certain areas annexed into a nation, and created a superior army with "Companions"--heavy cavalry and highly honored "royal" regiments of infantry in a new superior phalanx that used a long spear.⁹⁰

At 15, while hostage at Thebes, Philip became eromenos of Epaminondas' friend and successor Pammenes (Inv. in Aisch., c. 71). Two years after Chaeronea, an outraged ex-eromenos, Pausanias, assassinated Philip:

There was a Macedonian Pausanias who came of a family from the district Orestis. He was a bodyguard of the king and was beloved by him because of his beauty. When he saw that the king was becoming enamored of another Pausanias (a man of the same name as himself), he addressed him with abusive language, accusing him of being a hermaphrodite and prompt to accept the amorous advances of any who wished. Unable to endure such an insult, the other kept silent for the time, but, after confiding to Attalus, one of his friends, what he proposed to do, he brought about his own death voluntarily and in a spectacular fashion. For a few days after this, as Philip was engaged in battle with Pleurias, king of the Illyrians, Pausanias stepped in front of him and, receiving on his body all the blows directed at the king, so met his death.

The incident was widely discussed and Attalus, who was a member of the court circle and influential with the king, invited the first Pausanias to dinner and when he had plied him till drunk with un-mixed wine, handed his unconscious body

over to the muleteers to abuse in drunken licentiousness. So he presently recovered from his drunken stupor and, deeply resenting the outrage to his person, charged Attalus before the king with the outrage. Philip shared his anger at the barbarity of the act but did not wish to punish Attalus at that time because of their relationship, and because Attalus's services were needed urgently. He was the nephew of the Cleopatra whom the king had just married as a new wife and he had been selected as a general of the advanced force being sent into Asia, for he was a man valiant in battle. For these reasons, the king tried to mollify the righteous anger of Pausanias at his treatment, giving him substantial presents and advancing him in honour among the bodyguards.

Pausanias, nevertheless, nursed his wrath implacably, and yearned to avenge himself, not only on the one who had done him wrong, but also on the one who failed to avenge him. In this design he was encouraged especially by the sophist Hermocrates. He was his pupil, and when he asked in the course of his instruction how one might become most famous, the sophist replied that it would be by killing the one who had accomplished most, for just as long as he was remembered, so long his slayer would be remembered also. Pausanias connected this saying with his private resentment, and admitting no delay in his plans because of his grievance he determined to act under cover of the festival in the following manner. He posted horses at the gates of the city and came to the entrance of the theatre carrying a Celtic dagger under his cloak. When Philip directed his attending friends to precede him into the theatre, while the guards kept their distance, he saw that the king was left alone, rushed at him, pierced him through his ribs, and stretched him out dead; then ran for the gates and the horses which he had prepared for his flight. Immediately one group of the bodyguards hurried to the body of the king while the rest poured out in pursuit of the assassin; among these last were Leonnatus and Perdiccas and Attalus. Having a good start, Pausanias would have mounted his horse before they could catch him had he not caught his boot in a vine and fallen. As he was

scrambling to his feet, Perdikkas and the rest came up with him and killed him with their javelins (Diodorus Siculus, XVI, 93-94).

Philip had contemplated banishing Alexander's teen-age aristocratic Macedonian Companions and lovers, Ptolemy, Nearchus, Harpalus, and perhaps Hephaestion, so that his son would marry.⁹¹

Tutored but not seduced by Aristotle, Alexander the Great admired and imitated Achilles, whom he believed to be one of his ascendants. When he arrived at Troy, he laid a wreath on the alleged tomb of Achilles, while his greatest coeval lover Hephaestion (c.356-324) laid another on that of Patroclus (Arrian, *Alex.*, 11). Aelian (*Hist. Var.*, XII, 7) reported that Hephaestion put wreaths on the tomb of Patroclus "letting it be understood that he was the eromenos of Alexander just as Patroclus had been that of Achilles." Even Alexander's statues, invariably beardless--in vanity he introduced the custom of shaving to Greece--reflect the youthful demeanor of Achilles:

Now you Stoics take your favorites about with their chins shaven; shaving the beard came into fashion under Alexander, as your Chrysippus says in the fourth book of his work On Pleasure and the Good. It will not be inappropriate, I am convinced, if I recall his exact words; for I like the man very much for his wide learning and respectable character. The philosopher speaks as follows: "The custom of shaving the beard increased under Alexander, although the foremost men did not follow it. Why, even the flute-player Timotheus wore a long beard when he played the flute. And at Athens they maintain that it is not so very long ago that the first man shaved his face all round, and had the nickname Shaver" (Athenaeus, XIII, 564f-565b)

Celebrating games like those Achilles held for Patroclus's funeral, Alexander wept, danced, and ran naked around Troy. Though his Companion Cleitus saved his life at the battle of the Granicus, Alexander later ran him through in a drunken rage, a temper worthy of Achilles. Indeed, Alexander viewed himself as leading the third stage, after the Trojan War and the invasions of Darius and Xerxes, in the wars between the Greeks and the Orientals.

Alexander had numerous affairs, as with the courtesan Thais, including one with Bagoas, eunuch of the vanquished Darius III:

King Alexander . . . was madly devoted to boys. Dicaearchus, at any rate, in his

book On the Sacrifice at Ilium says that he was so overcome with love for the eunuch Bagoas that, in full view of the entire theatre, he, bending over, caressed Bagoas fondly, and when the audience clapped and shouted in applause, he, nothing loath, again bent over and kissed him. But Carystius in Historical Notes says: "Charon of Chalcis had a beautiful boy who was dear to him. But when Alexander, at a drinking-party in the house of Craterus, praised the boy, Charon bade him kiss Alexander; and Alexander said, 'Not so! For that will not delight me so much as it will pain you.' For, passionate as this king was, he was in like measure self-controlled when it came to the observance of decency and the best form (Athenaeus, XIII, 603b-c).

But Hephaestion was "by far the dearest of all the king's friends; he had been brought up with Alexander and shared all his secrets" (Curtius, History, 6,5,22; 3,12,16). When Hephaestion died, the grief-stricken Alexander cut off his own hair and the manes of his horses, brought three thousand artists from Greece to Ecbatana for sumptuous theatricals, demolished the crenellations of the city walls, crucified the doctor who had neglected Hephaestion, and sacrificed all the men of fighting age from a whole tribe of robbers from Susiana (Plutarch, Alexander, 116).

From the able Archelaus through the more spectacular Antigonus Gonatas, all Macedonian sovereigns loved boys. In their tempestuous, besotted, and semi-barbaric society, deaths from assassinations by aggrieved eromenoi and from alcoholism occurred frequently. On the other hand, two of the pederastic Macedonian kings rank perhaps as the greatest conquerors ever, as well as among the most astute of diplomats and cleverest administrators the world has yet seen. Finally, the high nobility that was usually related to them and also practiced pederasty fought heroically to divide Alexander's empire and governed their shares brilliantly. It would certainly be wrong, as many have done, to end their discussion of Greek pederasty with the Macedonian takeover because it then expanded into all of the Levant and Greek settlements in Egypt to underlie not merely military exploits but a burst of creativity in science as well as in letters and the arts.