the Greco-Roman east; this chapter is also unique in presenting an analysis in chronological order, oriented towards the history of Roman emperors.

Chapter 1 deals with the origin of Greek *agones* in respect to their cultic foundations; the subject of the other chapters is the rôle of athletics in the process of the socialization of Greek *paides*, especially with respect to the internalization of gender-specific rôles. S. draws much attention to female sports, devoting essays to the Heraia at Olympia, the gymnastic education of Spartan girls, the competitions of the 'she-bears' at Brauron, and the myth of the wrestler and sprinter Atalante (Chapters 4–7). The rest of the book treats the athletics of males, focusing on the institution of the gymnasium and the rôle of pederasty in the context of Greek *paideia*.

S.'s book is a treasure-house for any scholar interested in the topic. It not only quotes numerous literary sources, among them several less well-known ones, but also includes archaeological data, primarily vase-paintings. Text and footnotes show a profound insight into the Anglo-Saxon, as well as the German, Italian, and French, research. The orientation within the volume is made easier by useful conclusions at the end of every chapter and by clearly formulated views on central problems.

The exclusion of the political sphere from the field of culture, however, creates some problems, for example in Chapter 8 'Eros and Greek Athletics', which also has delivered the title for the entire book and which is the longest chapter, comprising ninety-five pages (including the notes). S. presents a great number of sources proving the importance of the erotic element in Greek athletics. He deals with the frequent reference to athletes on *kalos*-inscriptions, the introduction of athletic nudity, the rôle of the gymnasium as a place of contact for *erastes–eromenos* relations and their regulation by law, 'wrestling' as metaphor for sexual intercourse, the sexual attractiveness of successful athletes, the question of the sexual abstinence of Greek athletes, and the presentation of Eros in gymnasium-scenes in Attic vase-painting, etc. The mass of the material is impressive; the individual results, however, are somewhat less surprising. Considering the great importance of Eros in every culture and of athletics in Greek culture, it was to be expected that there are many relations between the two. S. admits that 'attitudes differed from city to city, generation to generation, and perhaps among different classes' (p. 272), but he does not provide a systematic distinction between epochs or *poleis*, and is therefore unable to explain these differences either. As a consequence of this, the precise causal and functional relations of the connected elements, for example between pederasty and athletics, remain unclear.

In conclusion, there is much scope left for further studies in this field, but none of them will be able to disregard S.'s book.

University of Freiburg CHRISTIAN MANN

AMOR GRAECUS—OR *ROMANUS*?

C. A. WILLIAMS: *Roman Homosexuality. Ideologies of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity.* Pp. xii + 395, pls. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-19-511300-4.

Roman homosexuality has long endured shabby treatment. Unlike the homosexuality of classical Greece, few have felt warmly or sympathetically towards it. In the history of ideas, it has proved a bit of a dead end. The eroticism of the *Symposium* and the *Phaedrus* has always proved more inspirational and intellectually exciting. It is the

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.468 Published online by Cambridge University Press

vocabulary of Greece that has dominated the articulation of same-sex attraction for most of post-classical history. Politically, the homoeroticism of Rome has been a bit of an embarrassment. Even the most radical of nineteenth-century homosexual apologists found its character indefensible. They felt much more comfortable in the company of Alexander the Great and the Theban 'Sacred Band' than Bathyllus and Sporus. Even Hadrian seemed a bit too lush. At best, it has been characterized as an awkward and unsatisfactory imitation of Greek practices. At worst, it is best ignored.

To these centuries of discourse, W.'s book provides a valuable corrective. His greatest contribution to the field is his demonstration that the key to understanding Roman homosexuality is to forget about the homosexual part. It is the Roman-ness that matters. This is not *paiderastia* in togas.

The opening chapters are extremely promising and the strongest in the book. Here he outlines what he identifies as a 'Priapic paradigm' of sexuality. It is a model that envisages mature, rough-haired, and freeborn penetrators, and compliant, smooth-skinned, and receptive subordinates. Domination and submission are its key, but not its only, motifs. W. contends that this paradigm was firmly engrained into Roman culture, and can be attested in a variety of art forms from the earliest periods of Roman history. Plautus appears at his most Roman when joking about these matters. Second-century B.C. statesmen seem comfortably conversant with all the protocols. Indeed, this model provides the pattern for all male public behaviour. Its exploration constitutes one of the key themes of Roman culture. The epistemology of the *cinaedus* underpins the Roman literary project.

The rest of the work consists of an elaboration of these key principles. W. provides a useful and long overdue discussion of the Roman concept of *stuprum*. The term is crucial for understanding the regulation of sexual behaviour, but the concept has been badly treated by a number of commentators in the past. Domination is explored through the axes of ethnicity and gender. Masculinity is explored through its discursive categories of men, boys, and slaves. The fragility of these categories is revealed. These were not robust enough to stand on their own. They always threatened to collapse. All participants needed to employ themselves in a constant regime of boundary demarcation and definitional reaffirmation. The expectations of domination exact a heavy toll from all participants. The work closes with a study of those who find the price too high—those figures (real or imagined) who embraced transgressive acts outside the accepted range of behaviour; the *fellatores*, *cunnilingi*, and *cinaedi*. Throughout the discussion, the inadequacy of concepts of homo/heterosexuality for illuminating the material is stressed. Indeed, so often is this warning issued that theoretically aware readers for whom this statement is no great surprise (or even those who can pick up an idea on first reading) may well find its endless repetition starting to grate after a while.

There is a lot of sensitive reading. For example, W. notes that the tendency to treat the division of penetrator/penetrated as synonymous with a division into active/passive entirely erases any active contribution by the penetrated (p. 18 n. 16). The passivity of the penetrated can only be a willed fiction. Lived experience must have told a different story. There are levels of penetrated experience that need to be explored. As he notes, the common reference to the pleasure of 'shitting out' (*cacare*) the penis of the penetrator seems grounded in the experience of the penetrated rather than the penetrator (p. 30). Here the development of a discourse of withdrawal rather than the now over-familiar discourse of penetration shows an unexpected depth to a sometimes monotonous erotic rhetoric.

However, if one has any criticism, it is that W. often lacks the courage to follow

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.468 Published online by Cambridge University Press

through on the points he enumerates. The possibilities of the complexities that he identifies are never fully explored. Ultimately, the work exposes just how troublesome we still find discussing sex. As always, handling the sources remains the problem. W. knows (as we all do) that they are not mimetic. Yet it would be equally wrong to regard them as divorced from the *realia* of the world; self-contained products of their own particular genre. Such a view does disservice to the literature it seeks not to violate. For if we elevate the literary, we run the risk of depriving it of any weight on earth. Literature must have an effect in conditioning the way its consumers think and behave—both for good and evil. It choreographs transgressive action as much as providing a vocabulary for transgressive thought. We run the risk of losing all sense of agency. We can unearth the script. However, we fool ourselves if we think this equates to the performance. There is a rich level that runs alongside the discursive. W. is very good at taking us into the mouths of the *fellatores*. We still await a book that takes us into their heads.

University of Reading ALASTAIR BLANSHARD

PAST TIMES

G. Cajani, D. Lanza (edd.): *L'antico degli antichi*. Pp. 181, ills. Rome: Palumbo, 2001. Paper, €15.49. ISBN: 88-8020-298-7.

The study of the past has taken a new and productive turn of late. Historicism, guided by the nineteenth-century imperative to know the past *wie es eigentlich gewesen*, has turned in on itself. The guiding problem is no longer simply to know what the past is or was, but also to know what it is or was to have a past. More and more, scholars are turning to the way antiquity conceived its own history. And more and more, it is becoming apparent that our sense of the past is shaped by its sense of its own past. Witness the recent explosion of studies on Pausanias, antiquarianism, nostalgia, pilgrimage and tourism, cults and revivals, of new forms of palimpsestic histories, not to mention the booming interest in the history of classical studies—for example, to mention just a few, J. Boardman, *The Archaeology of Nostalgia: How the Greeks Re-created their Mythical Past* (London, 2001); S. E. Alcock, *Archaeologies of the Greek Past: Landscape, Monuments and Memories* (Cambridge, 2002); S. E. Alcock, J. F. Cherry, and J. Elsner (edd.), *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece* (New York, 2001); and on the modern side, L. Barkan, *Unearthing the Past* (New Haven, 1999); A. Schnapp, *The Discovery of the Past* (London, 1996). No longer unidimensional, linear, and progressive, history appears like a cascade of Chinese boxes, each moment containing its own tightly packed historical pasts within itself.

When did antiquity discover itself? The present collection of essays does not exactly set out to answer this question, but it does make an interesting go at it from twelve perspectives. The result of a Franco-Italian conference in Pavia in 1999, the essays are of uneven quality, and generally cleave too closely to the conference format to do more than skim over a vast area. But all raise important issues, and collectively they will probably be best remembered for the title that brings them together, which marks a new intensification of the problem of how antiquity responded to its internal pasts.

C. Darbo-Peschanski lays out some of the categories by which an ancient sense of historicity might be conceived and investigated today. As the objects of historical focus change, the nature of what counts as a historical event likewise changes over time.

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.468 Published online by Cambridge University Press