




ERICH BETHE

THE DORIC BOY-LOVE
ITS ETHICS AND IDEOLOGY

Abstract from
“Rheinisches Museum für Philologie”
Neue Folge, Band 62, 1907, pp. 438÷475

English Edition
with Additional Annotations
by

Franco Luigi Viero



Free of Charge Editions Audacter.it

2017

German original title: *Die dorische Knabenliebe
Ihre Ethik und ihre Idee*

Franco Luigi Viero © 2017

EDITOR'S NOTE. – *Since our Free of Charge Editions Audacter.it are virtual, we can make them better as we detect, thanks to a communication or directly, imperfections, errors, and misprints. Here is the date of the last amelioration: JANUARY 2018.*

In the previous page: detail from the title page of *Utriusque Cosmi Maioris scilicet et Minoris Metaphysica, Physica atque Technica Historia* by Robert Fludd (Oppenheim 1617).

PREAMBLE

In our sad times, in which the honest citizens must obey their governments, that, being enslaved by economic power (especially the pharmaceutical companies), torment the former through psychological and physical torture, a student who wants to deal with sexual customs in ancient Greece—in spite of the institution of the mad so-called civil unions, recently approved in Italy too—, would nevertheless be looked ... ὑπόδρα (ipódhra), would say Homer, ‘askance,’ to testify that cowardly maliciousness is not a novelty of modern society, where, however, maliciousness has evolved into cowardly wickedness, which has assumed proportions of mass crime perpetrated by impudent gnomes and witches, to whom fate has granted positions of power.

About Greek eros, more or less consciously, have been expressed in the last decades innumerable nonsense, mainly because of the interference of individual attitude towards some of today’s sexual behaviours; interference that is manifested especially in the promiscuity of the terminology employed. In fact, speaking of ‘homosexuality’ is devious, since neither the concept nor the word existed in the ancient Greek language: homosexuality does not really exist and never existed: it is an imposed concept. Homosexual relationships have always existed, not homosexuality or heterosexuality, bizarre formation that would etymologically signify ‘different sexuality’ (compare, for example, ‘orthodox’ with ‘heterodox’). It is as if we were to impose the concept of ‘vegetarianity’ or ‘veganity’ to those who chose, whatever their motivation, to follow a particular diet, forcing them to ‘coming out’ and impose on them behavioural clichés to overthrow their natural daily life. Soon you would come to the following: Are you a vegetarian? Then in that restaurant you do not have to go! Or: Are you a carnivore? So, you approve the cruelty to animals, don’t you? Piss off! It would be absurd! But you never can tell ... Not to mention the preposterous concept behind the word ‘bisexuality’!

In order to make easier the way for the student wishing to begin investigating again the complex topic, we have decided to translate the first serious paper on the so-called ‘pederasty.’

Erich Bethe (1863-1940) was a prominent philologist. Classical students should be familiar with his name and recall the Onomasticon of Pollux, of which Bethe published an excellent edition, which is still the reference one.

This article of his is mentioned, yes, but in a way that leads to the suspicion that it has been read in full by a few, among which few we also include German readers.

What is impressive in Bethe’s reasoning is, first of all, the serenity and candour, with which he exposes the matter, thanks to a surprising and admirable absence of preconceptions and, therefore, prejudices; secondly, the intelligence and rigor of his method. Through no other works published after this essay (1906) is gleaming the terse fairness, which enlightens Bethe’s text.

A few years later, a couple of scholars, Anatol Semenov and Albert Ruppertsberg, published two separate articles (*Philologus* 70 [1911] pp. 146÷150 e 151÷154) entitled *Zur dorischen Knabenliebe*, the first, and *εἰσπνήλας*, the second, with which they pretended to thwart the entire work of Bethe. Although the numbering of the pages clearly indicates which of them is the first and the second, we could not detect which is on the right and which on the left. Ruppertsberg's consideration, however, cannot be kept silent, as it explains his motive: "Also waren die Helden von Thermopylae und die Heilige Schar der Thebaner eine Gesellschaft von homosexuellen Wollüstlingen! Ist das mit dem Begriff der ἀρετή vereinbar (So the heroes of the Thermopylae and the sacred band of the Thebanians were a society of profligate homosexuals! And is this compatible with the *areté*)?" Funny, is not it? We also do not want to hide that we do not agree with Bethe's conclusions for the reason fleetingly exposed in the note (§§).

Obviously the literature, which flourished about the subject after Bethe, is quite large; much of it, however, is cheap stuff, especially from overseas.

The first task of the student will be to examine the terminology, both technical and current, in the most common languages of use. The social consortium of our time, just because of the more and more dominant globalization, does not live by nature, but according to imposition of obligations that alter the individuals' mental and physical health. Much of the modern terminology, and not only in the sexual field, is the expression of inconveniences—caused by the devastating complex of guilt—the more dangerous as they are deeper, able to inhibit reflection, the light of reason, in a word the knowledge, whose purpose is not to change one's own destiny, but rather to favour its understanding, since our destiny is nothing but our character unfolded over time: it is not modifiable, just as the motion of stars, but knowable.

Following Wolfram Setz's example, which in 1983 (Berlin, Verlag rose Winkel) republished separately this work of Erich Bethe, we inserted, in the text or in note, the translation of the words and passages cited in their original language, in order to make reading accessible to a wider audience. Whenever possible, we completed bibliographic references and checked quotes. Finally, it seemed necessary to add some notes.

We hope we did a useful turn, and we will be grateful to all those who will have the kindness to report mistakes or omissions.

Dorno, May 2017

Franco Luigi Viero

THE DORIC BOY-LOVE (§) ITS ETHICS AND IDEOLOGY

The boy-love is one of the most striking features of the ancient Greek culture. This is barely uttered honestly and frankly, but no one will deny it. The more one must reasonably be amazed at how risky the position of the researcher, who intends to deal with, is. The material has not yet been sighted, nor, consequently, an outline of the pederasty as Dorian state institution in its forms and essence has been attempted. As a historical issue the Greek boy-love was set up only by F. G. Welcker and C. O. Müller, but barely touched on,¹ since, to my knowledge, in the last eighty years of diversified and fruitful activity it has not been seriously tackled. It goes a bit better for its natural complement, that is the homosexual love for girls, but mostly carried out, however, incorrectly. The trouble is that, when one is talking about it, even recently, the moral tone, deadly enemy of science, almost always interferes. The phenomenon must be understood, not judged.

The mild apologetic tone is even worse, of course. The Greeks need no excuse. In the Middle Ages, in the seventh, sixth, and in most of the fifth

¹ F. G. Welcker, *Sappho von einem herrschenden Vorurtheil befreyt*, Göttingen 1816, p. 32 ff. = Kl. Schrift. II, 1823, p. 80 ff.; C. O. Müller, *Die Dorier*, II², Breslau 1844, pp. 285÷293. Müller has rightly felt (p. 289 f.) that “such a custom penetrating the whole of life must be rooted more deeply than on any lone consideration.” (*) And aptly he judges: “That this sentiment was not merely spiritual but also sensual ... was absolutely inevitable in a time where people were not yet accustomed to separate the physical and spiritual existence.” Eventually, however, he comes—seduced by Xenophon fairy tales, and by his idealistic conception, in force at the time, of everything was Greek—to which we nowadays, educated to the comparative research of customs, consider a whimsical view (p. 292): in fact, he asserts “that that peculiar relationship had grown up in a quite natural and noble way among the northern Hellenic peoples, before the boys’ profanation, probably coming from Lydia, was known in Greece,” so, at first an ideal relationship, then its falling from a heavenly purity into sensuality. From O. Müller and Welcker, the most important works on pederasty are: the article of M. H. E. Meier in *Hall. Encykl. sez.* III vol. IX 149-189; A. Becker & K. F. Hermann, *Charikles*, Leipzig 1854, II², p. 199÷230, where you find a bibliography too (p. 227 ff.); J. A. Symonds in H. Ellis and J. A. Symonds, *Das konträre Geschlechtsgefühl* (German edition in “Bibliothek f. Socialwissenschaft” VII [1896], p. 37÷126).

century, for many of them both the boy-love and Sapphic love (†) are not a shame, nor a vice, but as well as procuring the pleasure of senses, which has always been given only by sexual love, are a proven source of delicate and intimate feelings, self-sacrificing devotion, ideal exaltation. It must be openly said: same-sex love opened the hearts of the Greeks and brought forth their erotic poetry. And when, in the second half of the fifth century, the moral opposition began to take place in Athens—it was not caused by religion, but by the all-round elevation of civilization and spiritual liberation, led by the greatly mocked, and yet incomparably praiseworthy sophists—, in that context, both Socrates and Plato from this strange tree, to which the axe was cutting the roots, plucked its delicious fruit, brought it to safety, and sowed it again. Whoever has ever sought and therefore freed himself; whoever has ever taught and loved—but, mind you, just such an individual—must be able to understand the Platonic eroticism and, so, guess that even the olden boy-love had something sacred, that is it was not sprung from vulgarity but from holy seed.

There is something strange about this Greek boy-love and Sapphic love, perhaps the strangest thing about this extraordinary Greek culture. Everywhere in the world there is same-sex love, and it does not begin with man; the mighty drive of nature calls for it in need.² In all its forms, from the harmless delicate affection of unaware or still budding youth to the sensual glow of those who have eaten from the tree of knowledge, love is still alive today more than ever, in every place and among us. There are many things on earth that are not in books and records, but about love people have written often enough indeed. The love—in the sense of boy-love only—has been treated once again with joyous frankness and proud naturalness, as in the case of the Greeks, as far as I know, only in the Arab literature during the Abbasid period and in the Persian literature,³ and even there imbued with a delicate sentiment and a higher beauty. But it is only a poetic play of a misdirected impulse; the Koran forbids it. In the Doric culture of the early Middle Ages it is a publicly recognized, sacred, fundamental and of vital importance element. For this reason alone, the repeated and most obvious attempt to explain the Greek and Persian-Arab boy-love by calling into question the social conditions, namely the segregation of women, could not lead to a satisfactory result. An explanation which crumbles away because of the fact that in the Sparta and Lesbos, where the boy-love and Sapphic love are best known to us, the mutual relation between the sexes were freer than in the other Greek states. Yes, the Greek boy-love is really a unique phenomenon. All the more reason why its knowledge has to be improved, especially because it is simply skipped, everywhere, even in literary history, which is hardly intelligible without it. The material is richer and, above all, more productive than it initially appears. Then, an explanation may be tried. I want to do an attempt, even if I

² Ellis-Symonds, *cit.*, p. 1 ff.; F. Karsch, *Päderastie und Tribadie bei den Tieren* (“Jahrb. f. sexuelle Zwischenstufen” II [1900] p. 126 ff.); in primitive peoples (“ibid.” III). Cf. B. Friedländer, “ibid.” VI p. 210.

³ Cf., *ex. gr.*, P. Horn, *Gesch. der persischen Litteratur*, Leipzig 1901, p. 78 and 120. On the current situation, cf. P. Näcke, *Homosexualität im Orient* (“Archiv für Kriminalanthropologie und Kriminalistik” hg. von Gross XVI [1904] p. 353 ff.). Pederasty, forbidden in India, is openly practiced in the Indian archipelago by the Mohammedan peoples too. Among the Olo-Ngadju, it is “so common that some ‘basirs’ (shamans) are formally married to other men”, cf. Rich. Schmidt, *Liebe und Ehe im alten und modernen Indien*, Berlin 1904, p. 263, cf. p. 260. V. *infra* note 76.

am running a risk. At least it will retain the merit of having shown that there is a problem, which needs a different explanation from the physical one.

* *
* *

First, an important fact is to be stated: the boy-love was introduced by the Dorians, by the raw mountain tribes which were last to enter Greece, and which spread from the north-west over the motherland and the southern islands until to reach Asia Minor, and then, as conquerors, after having subjected imperiously what was left of the primitive inhabitants, settled in their territories. Not that before them such kind of intercourse was quite unknown. That would be unlikely. But what the Dorians brought was the boy-love as a publicly recognized and honourable institution. Homer never mentions a pederastic relationship, even with a slight hint,⁵ so the legitimate pederasty was unknown to the Asiatic Aeolians and Ionians just as to their fellow-countrymen remained in the motherland. The curious transformation in Boeotia of the Oedipus legend, as I have proved dealing with the *Oedipody*, clearly shows how strong the horror of that bad habit, perceived as worthy of the divine punishment, was.⁴ The great influence which in the Greek Middle Ages these Dorians had thanks to their warlike ability, their closed tie-up, their manly exuberance and mettle is evident even by the fact that their pederasty, together with other Doric institutions and ideas, spread to neighbouring states, especially in the mother country. — The Chalcidians of Euboea had long been aware that the boy-love, legitimated by public recognition, had been imported from outside.⁵ — In Athens,⁶ at Solon's time, it had penetrated so deeply, and so thoroughly acknowledged and felt as respectable, that he, a respectable Athenian old-fashioned, was able to draw it as a self-evident joy of youth with plain clarity (fr. 25 B 4):

ἔσθ' ἤβης ἐρατοῖσιν ἐπ' ἀνθεσι παιδοφιλήσῃ
μηρῶν ἰμείρων καὶ γλυκεροῦ στόματος. (**)

By his legislation he kept the boy-love, as well as the gymnastics, for the free man, so the slave was forbidden to love boys.⁷ And in Athens the situation remained unchanged until the second half of the fifth century. The vases of those times with the inscriptions to favourites illustrate it in the best way. But even the highest art did not disdain the boy-love: Aeschylus and Sophocles, too, spoke about it in their tragedies with the same openness and vividness as Solon did. And there is no reason to doubt that they in their lives paid homage to it. Of course, even the young Plato tasted this love and its hot passion: how could he describe it so adorably, and, later, fight against such a sensuality so hardly and earnestly? — About 600 B.C. also the Aeolian knights in Lesbos, in their admiration for the Spartan essence (Alkaios, 49),

⁴ See my *Thebanische Heldenlieder*, Leipzig 1891, p. 1 ff. and p. 143.

⁵ Plut. *amat.* 761 A ff., and Athen. 13,601 E; cf. K. Hubert, *De Plutarchi Amatorio*, diss., Berlin. 1903, p. 11.

⁶ The oldest Athenian inscription on a pitcher from Dipylon ("Athen. Mitth." VI, 1881 p. 106 tav. III = CIA. IV 1 p. 119 Nr. 492^a, and better "Athen. Mitth." XVIII, 1893 p. 225 tav. X with the Studniczka's reading), related to boy-love, could be compared with the rock inscriptions of Thera, see IG XII 3. 1536 ff.

⁷ Cf. note 47.

certainly practiced it (Alkaios, 57), even if in poetry this does not stand out quite clearly; but the women's close-knit associations,⁸ known through Sappho presuppose an equally close union of masculinity, just as such associations have their counterpart in Spartan female consociations. — Traces are not completely missing among the Ionians at this time: Mimnermos (1,9) and Anakreon treat the boy-love as serenely and gracefully as the sexual love.

Well, at that time, like Doric chivalry at all, also the boy-love was fashionable among all the Greeks. But nowhere else, as far as we can see, it is, as in the case of the Dorians, an institution approved, even demanded by the State, developed in solid forms, and sacred. The testimonies confirm what in Plato's Banquet Pausanias says in close connection, as it seems, to his own little book on boy-love⁹ (*Sympos.* 182 A): "It is easy to note the rule with regard to love in other cities: there it is laid down in simple terms, while ours here is complicated."¹⁰ For in Elis and Boeotia and where there is no skill in speech they have simply an ordinance that it is seemly to gratify lovers, and no one whether young or old will call it shameful, in order, I suppose, to save themselves the trouble of trying what speech can do to persuade the youths; for they have no ability for speaking. But in Ionia and many other regions where they live under foreign sway, it is counted a disgrace. Foreigners hold this thing, and all training in philosophy and sports, to be disgraceful, because of their despotic government."

* *
 *

On the boy-love in the Doric States there are, excluding Crete, only sparse utterances, mostly disjointed notes, but they are enough to prove that in all of them it was based on the same views, was in the same high respectful reputation, and probably also showed itself in the same forms. Such reports date back to the late 5th and 4th centuries and derive from the then lively struggle arose in defence of the boy-love, or from political and historical writings: it is the material that was later always exploited for further discussion. At the same time, the reactionary philosophical fashionable enthusiasm of this period for the idealized social structure in Sparta and Crete transfigured into 'platonic' also the local practice of pederasty, while Elis and Boeotia, on the basis of the Athenian Pausanias' record, were repeatedly presented as examples of those States in which the boy-love was without difficulty practiced in uncovered sensuality.¹¹ The fact that the Cretans and Spartans, in reality, did not perceive it otherwise than that way, would never have required any proof, if the idealization of the Hellenic people had not shut the eyes—even on the most natural things—, so that even sober scholars like M. H. E. Meier,¹² ended up concluding that the sensuous boy-love in Sparta had indeed been forbidden by law, which, however, was

⁸ Cf., besides C. O. Müller e Welcker, also Diels, *Alkaios Partheneion*, "Hermes" XXXI (1896), p. 352÷355.

⁹ Compare Xen. *symp.* 8,34s. with Plat. *symp.* 182 B, 178 E.

¹⁰ ὁ δ' ἐνθάδε καὶ ἐν Λακεδαίμονι ποικίλος *codd.* Winckelmann's expunction of καὶ ἐν Λακ. is necessary, because afterwards Plato does not drop a specific hint at Lacedaemon.

¹¹ Yet, there have been attempts to idealize even the Boeotian pederasty: see the anecdote of Philip at Chaironeia, which Plutarch in *Pel.* 18, towards the end, tells with patriotic sympathy.

¹² See the diligent article 'Päderastie' in Ersch & Gruber, *Hall. Encyclopädie*, 3rd Section, 9th Part (1837).

unfortunately broken often enough. The fact remains that the Plato's severe words (*Laws*, pp. 636 and 836 ff.) and the remark of Aristotle (*pol.* 2,10 p. 1272 B 23), according to whom the Cretan legislator had introduced the boy-love to prevent overpopulation,¹³ sweep away Ephoros' report (Strabo 10,484). On the other hand, the depiction of the Spartan relationships in Plutarch's *Lycurgus* (particularly in c. 18 towards the end), where even the Sapphic love is clearly testified, it is enough alone to thwart both the blatant assertion of the Socratic Xenophon (*Rpbl. Laced.* 2,14) about the Spartans' ideal love,¹⁴ and the disgusting attempt at mediation between that idealism and the crude reality witnessed by Cicero in *rpbl.* 4,4: *Lacedaemonii ipsi cum omnia concedunt in amore iuvenum praeter stuprum, tenui sane muro dissae-piunt id quod excipiunt; complexus enim concubitusque permittunt palliis interiectis.* (††)

The Dorians have regulated the love-relationship of a man with a boy in fixed forms, and treated it as a very important institution, with an earnest seriousness, and quite publicly, under the protection of the family, society, the State, and religion. On all sides, where only the pure truth has come down, in Sparta, Crete, and Thebes, it is clear that the male citizens' education to ἀρετή (*virtue*)—that is, the manly efficiency, which is mainly proven at war, its training and preservation—was based on pederasty;¹⁵ In effect, the Doric States never tried to go beyond the limits of such a medieval chivalrous conception, nor could they do so, as long as that view was still extant. The highest ethics and wisdom Theognis had to offer, he could not better utter than by warning a beloved boy, the heir of his ἀρετή.

In Sparta the boys were associated with their lovers from the twelfth year, and the lovers were so responsible for their beloved that they were punished for a dishonourable act of the boy, not the latter.¹⁶ Moreover, the lover was liable before the family of the boy, whom he represented in all the business on the *agora*, to which a young guy could not attend until his thirtieth year:¹⁷ so the *erastes* was legally equal to the father and the older brothers of his *eromenos*, even more than equal because he had a responsibility which the family had not. In battle-line, however, Sparta did

¹³ Cf. also Plat. *leg.* 8,838 E f.: "... τέχνην ἐγὼ πρὸς τοῦτον τὸν νόμον ἔχοιμι τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν χρησθαι τῆ τῆς παιδογονίας συνουσία, τοῦ μὲν ἄρρενος ἀπεχομένους μὴ κτείνοντάς τε ἐκ προνοίας τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος, μηδ' εἰς πέτρας τε καὶ λίθους σπείροντας, οὐ μήποτε φύσιν τὴν αὐτοῦ ῥίζωθῆν λήψεται γόνιμον... ([I stated that] I know of a device for making a natural use of reproductive intercourse, —on the one hand, by abstaining from the male and not slaying of set purpose the human stock, nor sowing seed on rocks and stones where, although established, it can never take up its own nature...)."

¹⁴ Repeated by Plutarch in *de educandis pueris* 14 (*instituta Laconica* 7 p. 337 C); Aelian *v.h.* 3,12; Maxim. Tyr. *diss.* 26,8.

¹⁵ Xen. *Lac. rep.* 2,13: "ὁ δὲ Λυκοῦργος... εἰ μὲν τις αὐτὸς ὦν οἶον δεῖ ἀγασθεὶς ψυχῆν παιδὸς περιῶτο ἄμεμπτον φίλον ἀποτελέσασθαι καὶ συνεῖναι, ἐπήναι καὶ καλλίστην παιδείαν ταύτην ἐνόμιζεν (*Lycurgus ... if someone, being himself an honest man, admired a boy's soul and tried to make of him an ideal friend without reproach and to associate with him, approved, and believed in the excellence of this kind of training.*)" Cf. Pausanias of Athens in Xen. *sympos.* 8,32 ff. and in Plat. *symp.* 182 B, 178 E; Plut. *Pelop.* 19.

¹⁶ Plut. *Lyc.* 17 at the beginning and 18 toward the end. Once, for an anxiety cry of the beloved in action, the authorities punished his *erastes*. The event is anecdotically handed down, like almost all, but no less valuable for that. Similarly, Aelian. *v.h.* 3,10.

¹⁷ Plut. *Lyc.* 25 at the beginning.

not, in Xenophon time, put the pairs of lovers together in principle;¹⁸ I should like to say no more, for the Eleans and Thebans certainly did so at the end of the fifth century, as confirmed by the testimony of the Athenian Pausanias in his book on love,¹⁹ and the Thebans still did so at the time of Pelopidas and Epameinondas, and even in the battle of Chaironeia (338 B.C.).²⁰ The Cretan name of the beloved boy, παρασταθένης, shows that that arrangement was common among the Cretans (§§§)The reason given by Pausanias is quite convincing: any action which somehow did not comply with the chivalrous code of honour was excluded by the burning endeavour of the man to be a model of true ἀρετή to his beloved, and by the duty-consciousness of the boy to show himself to be worthy of his lover as well. With warm sympathy, Plato, in his *Banquet*, after the Pausanias' essay, as I believe, lets Phaedrus develop these Doric views (178 D): «“I assert that a man in love, should he be detected in some shameful act or in a cowardly submission to shameful treatment at another's hands, would not feel half so much distress at anyone observing it, whether father or comrade or anyone in the world, as when his favourite did; and in the selfsame way we see how the beloved is especially ashamed before his lovers when he is observed to be about some shameful business.” Such a chivalrous sense of honour for the beloved is illustrated by the anecdote of the warrior who, falling in a brave battle upon his face because of a stumble, begged his enemy, who was about to stab him in the back, for permission to turn around and offer his breast, for fear that his beloved might see his corpse with a shameful back wound, feel ashamed, and turn away from him, just tarnished.²¹

How great was the success of those views and the education founded upon them, you can establish by the judgments on the warlike prowess of these armies of pederasts. The same Pausanias of Athens, too, without the danger of becoming ridiculous, could assert that the strongest army would be that which consisted only of pairs of lovers,²² a statement which in an anecdote Plutarch puts into Pammenes' mouth, an Epameinondas' comrade. Here is the reason: the lovers were irresistible warriors, and an enemy could never force his way through a pair of lovers, or get out unscathed.²³ And from the same time and sphere, as well, will come the statement, also reported by Plutarch, that the Boeotians, Lacedaemonians, and Cretans were the most warlike races, being the strongest people in love.²⁴

History has confirmed these judgments of the contemporaries, who knew the matter, having experienced it for oneself: the corpses of the lovers pairs of the Thebans sacred rank covered the battlefield of Chaironeia, and in Mantinea Epameinondas died along with his beloved Caphisodoros.²⁴

In the light of such facts I think it is quite understandable that against the moralizing preachers, who condemned the boy-love as an unnatural sexual offence, enthusiastic defenders have appeared in the fifth and again in the fourth century. Both of them were right: in the non-Doric States, where this opposition had arisen and could gain ground, the boy-love was, in spite

¹⁸ Xen. *symp.* 8,35.

¹⁹ Cf. Xen. *symp.* 8,34 and Plat. *symp.* 182 B.

²⁰ Plut. *Pelop.* 18, Dio Chrys. *or.* 22 (II p. 272 Arnim).

²¹ Plut. *amat.* 761 C and *Pelop.* 18; on a Cretan, cf. Aelian. *hist. anim.* 4,1.

²² Cf. Xenophon *symp.* 8,32, Plat. *symp.* 178 E in Phaedrus' speech. Cf. Plut. *amat.* 760 D, Aelian. *v.h.* 3,9 (κατὰ τὴν Κρητῶν ἐννοίαν).

²³ Plut. *amat.* 761 BC and *Pelop.* 18.

²⁴ Plut. *amat.* 761 D.

of public recognition, a vice, even if—that is unquestionable—also in Athens, for example, Chalkis,²⁵ and otherwise, it let fine shoots come out through fine persons: without it the Socratic-Platonic erotic would not have been possible. Nevertheless, in the case of the Dorians, pederasty, although love was everywhere practiced and exercised in all senses, was not really a vice, but it was or could be and should be the most conceivable society of two people of the same sex, from which the noblest boosts plentifully burgeoned both to self-perfection in competitive zeal with each other and unconditional devotion to the beloved in every danger and till death in the prime of life. The ideal of military camaraderie and high yearning are certainly involved in these pairs of pederasts, who filled with these thoughts and sealed their union with their blood. And certainly there were not few of them. It is the most wonderful phenomenon in the history of human culture, is it not? An act of hot sensuality, unnatural, repugnant, becomes custom; it is recognized, respected, sanctified, and becomes the foundation of pure aspirations, unconditional fidelity, unlimited sacrifice, and high morality.

Doric boy-love borrowed certain forms of marriage ritual. From the description of Ephoros we know that in Crete the association of a man with a boy went on in the form of the marriage by abduction.²⁶ The custom, therefore, dates back to a very old age, and, since some traces in Corinth and Boeotia coincide with what was customary in Crete, I hold not too bold the assertion that once not only there, but also among all the Dorians, these same forms prevailed, and, accordingly, they go back to the time before the Doric immigration, or even before the scattering of the Dorians.

In Crete, the man, at least three days before, announced to the relatives of the boy, whom he had chosen not for his beauty but for his bravery and efficiency, that he would abduct him in a certain way. What a tremendous disgrace for the boy, if he would have been concealed! In fact, that decision contained the admission that he was unworthy of such a lover. If, however, the relatives thought the lover was not noble enough for their boy, they snatched the latter from the former at the appointed time. If, instead, they deemed the lover a suitable fellow, they only pretended to follow the pair just to the abductor's house. Then, the φιλήτωρ (*lover*) lived together with the boy (παρασταθένς, *posted beside*) out in the countryside for two months, and eventually released him with a rich gift, that is at least a military equipment, a cup, and an ox, which was sacrificed to Zeus and eaten together with the relatives. The armour remained the pride of the beloved, who was honoured as a grown-up, got the places of honour in the choirs and races (not to be mistaken with 'dance floors and racetracks'), could be recognized just by his clothes, and had the honorary title of κληνός (*honoured*).

The same custom of the boy's abduction is at least still evident for the ancient Corinth in a story, which, however, as for that archaic custom, has been misunderstood by the late narrators (scholiast to Apoll. Rhod. 4,1212, Plut. *amat.narr.* 772 EF, Max. Tyr. 24, cf. Alex. Aet. v. 7-10 *ap.* Parthenius 14), but scarcely distorted. Its—moreover varied—aetiological connection

²⁵ Plut. *amat.* 760 EF, 761 (Aristotele).

²⁶ Ephoros in Strab. 10,483/4, cf. Athen. 11,782 C (III p. 19, Kaibel); Aristotle in *excerpta Heraclidis* περὶ πολιτειῶν 3, FHG II p. 211/12. — The provisions of the Gortyn laws, II 2 ff., are related to acts of violence (κάρτει οἴπει, *does violence / commits rape*). — The inscription of Thera IG XII 3, 1417 could refer to the abduction of the bridegroom-boy, if Kretschmer ("Philologus" 1899, 467) has rightly interpreted τὰδ' ὤπηε οἴσων σε.

with the history of the Corinthian colonies' foundation is indifferent; only the sequel is important for us. A man of the noblest Corinthian family loves a boy, and comes to abduct him. But the father and the family do not want to consent, so grab the boy to hold him back. The lover wants to carry out the abduction: the boy is torn in the violent conflict. Here, then, is the case of the rejection of the lover, which is also mentioned by Ephoros as a Cretan custom: here and there it occurs in such a way that the boy's relatives did not want to let the abductor in love have him.

The custom of the abduction of the bridegroom-boy is quite evident in two legends, which are excellent testimonies, since they must date back to the early Greek Middle Ages, at a time when such a custom was generally and publicly practiced by the Dorians: I mean the legend of the abduction of Pelops' son, Chrysippus, committed by Laios, and the one of Ganymede abducted by Zeus.

The former was in the *Oedipodea* the motif for the misfortune of Oedipus and his house, presumably invented by the poet just for this purpose: the facts took place in Boeotia.²⁷ It is interesting the turn, which that motif took, being a matter of boy-love, and Plutarch has reported in his *parallela minora* (313 E): Pelops would have forgiven Laios for the sake of love. — The love relationship between Zeus and Ganymed is not familiar with the Homeric epic, which, however, knows the boy's abduction by the gods (Hom. *Il.* 20,232, cf. *hymn. Hom.* 5,202). In motherland this plot was then reorganized, under Doric influences, where cult or memory of Ganymede were still extant from pre-Greek times, as in Chalkis (Athen. 13,601 F) (***) or in Crete (Plat. *leg.* 1, 636 C) (†††).

There is no testimony of the abduction of the bridegroom-boy just from Thebes, but that the external forms of the connection were the same as in Crete, is suggested by the fact that here and there its solemn conclusion was the same: as in Crete, the boy, back from his lover's house, conventionally received by the latter, at least a suit of armour, a cup, and an ox, so that the Theban provided his beloved with a panoply on the boy's acceptance among the men.²⁸

The presumption that in Thebes, Thera, and Crete the union of the male couple was not managed without a religious consecration becomes a certainty by further parallels. Which is most astonishing for our feelings, but precisely this fact proves that the boy-love was a sacred matter to the Dorians. In essence, it is only a confirmation of what the remaining testimonies teach, but only to those who have overcome moral prejudices in historical view through scientific work. From Crete, is only attested that the final sacrifice of the ox, given by the φιλήτωρ to his beloved together with a suit of armour and a cup, is due to Zeus.²⁹ The engagement, or rather the sexual intercourse in a holy place even under the protection of a god or hero, is sure for Thera and Thebes. In Thera³⁰ there are quite archaic graffiti on rocks almost certainly of the seventh century — Hiller's most precious discoveries —

²⁷ Cf. my *Theban. Heldenlieder* 12 ff.

²⁸ Plut. *amat.* 761 B: “παρ' ὑμῖν δ' ὦ Πemptίδη τοῖς Θεβαίοις οὐ πανοπλία ὁ ἐραστής ἐδώρειτο τὸν ἐρώμενον εἰς ἄνδρας (Winckelmann, ἀνδέτας codd.) ἐγγραφόμενον (And is it not a custom among you Thebans, Pemptides, for the lover to present the beloved with a complete suit of armor when he is come of age?).”

²⁹ Ephor. *ap.* Strab. 10,483, near the end; cf. Aristot. *ap.* Heraklid. 3, near the end.

³⁰ Hiller von Gaertringen IG XII 3, 536–601 and 1410–1493 with pl. I, and his book on Thera I p. 152 f., III p. 67 ff., atlas l. 3 and 4.

in large letters carved on the Mount Olympus just below the city, only 50 to 70 meters from the Temple of Apollo Karneios and the holy sites of Zeus, Kure, Chiron, Athena, Ge, Artemis, close to an old circular building and a natural cave,³¹ both of which were later incorporated in the construction of the Gymnasium; places, where even in those old days people practiced the Doric gymnastics, and the boys' dances were performed.³² Well, those graffiti speak a non-ambiguous language. You can read (IG XII 3. 537): [τὸν δεῖνα] ναὶ τὸν Δελφίνιον ἠ[ο?] Κρίμων τε(ῖ)δε ωῖπθε, παῖδα Βαθυκλέος, ἀδελπθεὸ[ν δὲ τοῦ δεῖνα (... by [Apollo] Delphinios here Krimon fucked a boy, son of Bathykles...)]. So, in this holy place Krimon, invoking Apollo Delphinios, completed its connection to the son of Bathykles and he has proudly announced it to the world, leaving memory of that on an indestructible monument. And many Thereans with him, and after him, made the holy covenant with their boys in the same holy place. I do not doubt that from this firm and unquestionable testimony the custom of the Thebans recorded by Aristotle³³ is to be regarded as still alive in his time. Upon the tomb of the hero Iolaos, he writes, the lovers and their beloved boys still made their promises of faith, because, Plutarch adds, Iolaos had been the lover of Herakles, and therefore participated in his fighting as his squire. At that time one might have been satisfied with a solemn symbolic form in Thebes, which corresponds to the ceremony in front of divine witnesses. But originally the same act as in Thera may have been performed in Thebes just in the holy places in the face of the heroic example, patron of the boy-love. To explain the name of the holy company from the holiness of the pederastic relationship is now close at hand.

The custom practiced in Megara at the tomb of hero Diocles, which is known to us only in later adaptation by Theocritus 12,27–34³⁴ as a competition of the boys in kissing, will go back to the same ancient 'erastic' custom. Even C. O. Müller (*Die Dorier* cit. II² 289) rightly observed: "The most beautiful boys kissed the faithful lover, according to the original idea." We may now continue to conclude that, as in Thebes, in Megara, too, at a hero's tomb there was once the engagement and, even before, the union of the man with his boy.

I do not know anything about Sparta that shows the same forms of pederasty. But since it has been demonstrated their existence in Crete,

³¹ It is probable that the cave, as suggested by Hiller (*cf.* Thera I 295 A 62 III 63), was early dedicated to the tutelary deities of the later Gymnasium, *i.e.* Hermes and Herakles. But the original relationship of them on the subject of boy-love, as claimed by Kaibel in "Nachr. d. Gött. Ges. d. Wiss." 1901, 509, is doubtful to me, especially since Hermes, as far as I know, was not pederast.

³² IG XII 3, 536. 540. 543.

³³ Aristot. *ap.* Plut. *Pelop.* 18 (and *amat.* 761 D-E): "Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ καὶ καθ' αὐτὸν ἔτι φησὶν ἐπὶ τοῦ τάφου τοῦ Ἰόλεω τὰς καταπιστώσεις ποιεῖσθαι τοὺς ἐρωμένους καὶ τοὺς ἐραστάς (Aristotle says that even down to his day the tomb of Iolaüs was a place where lovers and beloved plighted mutual faith)."

³⁴ *Cf. schol. ad Aristoph. Ach.* 774. In Thebes, too, there was a grave of a Diocles, who was celebrated as the faithful beloved of the Bakchidean Philolaos of Corinth, legislator of Thebes. He was identified with the Olympic champion of 728, *cf.* Aristot. *pol.* 2,1274 A 31 ff. — One is tempted to consider also the tomb of the celebrated pederast Kleomachos, which is situated in the market-square of the Euboean Chalcis, as a site of such a custom. — Perhaps one may assume the same custom for Argos from the remarkable legend of Dionysus and Prosymnos, *see* Clem. Alex. *protrept.* 2,34; Westermann *Mythographi Gr.* p. 348, 15 ff.; *schol. ad Luc. de dea Syria* 28 p. 258 Jacobitz = p. 187,21 Rabe.

Thebes, and Thera, and they were certainly kept up to the fourth century in the last two States, there would be serious reasons to make probable that Sparta had not had them. But it is not so. The commonality of the male life, however, cannot be contrasted, since it was also common in Crete. Rather, since the same views on the boy-love, even in Sparta, lasted at least up to the fourth century—indeed they were specially developed there—, I would therefore consider it to be certain that in Sparta, too, those same forms, ancient and common, have been preserved for a long time.

* *
* *

One can approach the essence of the Doric boy-love, if one properly considers the collected facts, brings them together with each other and with the information gleaned, some of which sound curiously, and precisely for that very reason have been preserved. First, attention deserves a statement made by several witnesses: in Crete and Sparta, and probably among all of the Dorians, a relationship was not established thanks to the beauty and the charm of the boy, or the wealth or other external virtues of the man. It was the beauty, however, which was the most rousing and important thing in the boy-love, which, as for Athens, is evident both from the many inscriptions *ὁ καλός παῖς* (*beautiful is the boy*) and the attestation of many Athenians, most notably Plato. Ephoros expressly remarked, though, that it was not the boy who stood out for by his beauty to be attractive to the Cretans, but the one who distinguished himself by courage and honour.³⁵

The traditions already mentioned above (p. 4) teach us that that is not a fairy-tale: so in Sparta the ‘erastes’ was responsible for the performance of his beloved; moreover, he was punished if his beloved did not behave in a chivalrous way, but in reverse he shared the boy’s good reputation.³⁶

I am inclined, from now on, to give some of the inscriptions devoted to favourites, engraved on the sacred rock in Thera, an explanation, which is different from that of the discoverer. In contrast to the Attic inscriptions, the word *καλός* (*beautiful*), which is always common in Athens next to a name, is only used once in a more recent inscription (IG XII 3. 549), while *ἀγαθός* (*good*) (IG XII 3. 540 7, 544, 545, 546, 1416) is more frequent. Taking the inscription *Εὐμηλος ἄριστος ὄρκ(η)εστάς* (*Eumelos excellent dancer*) (540. 2, cf. 546?) as a starting point, Hiller has related this *ἀγαθός* to the

³⁵ Cf. Strab. 10,483: “ἐράσμιον δὲ νομίζουσιν οὐ τὸν κάλλει διαφέροντα, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀνδρεία καὶ κοσμιότητι (*they regard as a worthy object of love, not the boy who is exceptionally handsome, but the boy who is exceptionally manly and decorous*);” *v. supra* (note 15) the passage extracted from Xen. *Lac. rep.* 2,13. Cf. Plut. Ages. 2: “ἐν δὲ ταῖς καλουμέναις ἀγέλαις τῶν συντρεφομένων παίδων Ἄγ. Λύσανδρον ἔσχεν ἐραστήν, ἐκπλαγέντα μάλιστα τῷ κοσμίῳ τῆς φύσεως αὐτοῦ. Φιλονεικότατος γὰρ ὢν καὶ θυμοειδέστατος ἐν τοῖς νέοις καὶ πάντα πρωτεύειν βουλόμενος... (*while he was among the so-called ‘aghele’ of boys who were reared together, he had as his lover Lysander, who was smitten particularly with his native decorum. Actually, he was contentious and high-spirited beyond his fellows, wishing to be first in all things...*)”

³⁶ Plut. *Lyc.* 18,8: «ἐκοινώνουν δὲ οἱ ἐρασταὶ τοῖς παισὶ τῆς δόξης ἐπ’ ἀμφότερα (*the boys’ lovers also shared with them in their honour or disgrace*)”; the story mentioned above (cf. note 16) follows as a proof.

dance performance of the boys. But ἀγαθὸς ὀρκεστᾶς does not occur here: it would be an amazingly limp love expression, while in IG XII,3 543 (cf. Suppl. p. 308) Βάρβακς ὀρκεστᾶς(ς) τε ἀγαθός (*Barbax is also a good dancer*)... sounds very fitting alongside other adjectives. The highly archaic no. 547 (Πυκιμήδης ἄριστος Σκα.τ.δαν) suggests something else. In fact, whether we accept, with reference to the name Σκαμότας, the supplement of Hiller Σκα[μο]τ[ιδ]αν, or reject it, being unsure (760), it is certain that there was no talk either of dancing, leaping about or gymnastics. Hiller's idea of putting in a family name, so that Pykimedes would be praised as the prime of his house, seems very happy. Like the Cretans and Spartans, these heroes were not so much interested in the beauty of their beloved as in his ἀρετή, which indeed could show, among other things, in gymnastics and dance performances as well. Therefore they wrote: Qυ[δ]ρος ἄριστος (1414), Μενιάδας πρᾶτος (1437), Κληγόρας τίμιος (1461), or simply ὁ δεῖνα ἀγαθός, not — like the Athenians — ὁ δεῖνα καλός.³⁷

Thus it becomes comprehensible that in Crete it was a disgrace, when a boy of a good house—of course, in the matter of boy-love and knighthood always and only 'good families' are involved, since the plebeians have no honour—, a noble boy, did not find a lover: it seemed a proof of his bad temper.³⁸ On the other hand, it was an honour for the boy if many men tried to get him.³⁹

And more important is the ἀρετή of the lover. It lies in efficiency, courage, respect, nobility, in short, in everything that makes the knight without fear and reproof. The Cretan family examined precisely the one who proposed as 'erastes' of their son, and, if he did not meet their demands for rank and reputation, they snatched the boy when the man tried to abduct him.⁴⁰ In Sparta only the personal value could be decisive. This is emphasized by Xenophon,⁴¹ and by the source of Plutarch's account on the Spartiate education; a source that the latter exploited for his *Lycurgus* 17 and was

³⁷ Το κ(η)αριτε[ρπ]ής (alone!) of IG XII,3 1416 = 546,2 and κηαριτερ[π]ής (sic!) Λαμψαγόρας of *ibid.* 1450 = 590,2 it would be possible to give a meaning corresponding more or less to καλός, as Hiller does (cf. *Thera*, III, Berlin 1904, p. 68), who, comparing that word with Διειτρέφης, explains it by 'nourished by the Charites'. But could not the word be a proper name? See Ἐπιτρέφης and Ἐρμοτρέφης in Fick-Bechtel, *Griech. Personennamen* p. 269. The second inscription, then, should also be divided into two. — There is still the no. 1437: Αἴνησις θαλερός (*Ainesis is flourishing*). — All the explanations of these Theraean inscriptions, which contain something lascivious, are wrong. It is very instructive that Kaibel's interpretation of no. 540—by which he sought in Krimon a Don Juan, explained κονίαλος = κονίσαλος = πέος, and attempted to introduce even the virgin boys' cunning—has been removed by the inscription's revision (Suppl. 1413 = 540), which, unfortunately, has not provide any clarification. If the Krimon of 537, 538b, 540,3 = 1413 is indeed the same person (the letters' shapes probably point to the same time), then he was an admired and much-courted hero.

³⁸ Ephor. *ap.* Strab. 10,484 A; Cic. *rep.* 4,3 *ap.* Serv. *ad* Aen. 10,325.

³⁹ Sparta: Plut. *Lyc.* 18; Thessaly: Plut. *amat.* 761 C; Crete: Conon 16. Cf. Pausanias of Athens *ap.* Plat. *symp.* 178 E.

⁴⁰ Ephor. *ap.* Strab. 10,21 (483): "συνιόντες δὲ (οἱ τοῦ παιδὸς φίλοι), ἂν μὲν τῶν ἴσων ἢ τῶν ὑπερεχόντων τις ἦ τοῦ παιδὸς τιμῆ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὁ ἀρπάζων, ἐπιδιώκοντες ἀνθήσαντο μόνον μετρίως..., ἂν δ' ἀνάξιος, ἀφαιρούνται (when they [scil. the friends of the boy] meet, if the abductor is the boy's equal or superior in rank or other respects, they pursue him only in a very gentle way, ... if, however, the abductor is unworthy, they take the boy away from him)."

⁴¹ *Lac. rep.* 2,13: "... εἰ μὲν τις, αὐτὸς ὦν οἶον δεῖ, ἀγασθεὶς ψυχὴν παιδός (if someone, being himself an honest man, admired a boy's soul)..."

certainly clearer than Plutarch himself, who speaks only of the ἐρασταὶ τῶν εὐδοκίμων νέων (*lovers from among the reputable young men*). What Aelian (*v. h.* 3,10) has reported is in agreement: he tells the ephors had reproached a boy who had preferred a bad rich lover to an honest poor one. Even clearer is what the same author adds: in Sparta—and the story, as will be shown below, is undoubtedly true—a well-qualified man was punished because he did not love a boy. Such were the men, whom the boys themselves tried to attract, whereas the opposite appears as more natural, and is otherwise attested.⁴² But, from an excellent source Aelian (*v. h.* 3,12) has noted down this other custom, though foolishly generalized: the Spartan boys had asked a man to εἰσπνεῖν αὐτοῖς, which was the Spartan expression for ‘to love’.

Thus a man in his courting of a boy had to represent himself above all as ἀγαθὸς ἀνὴρ, especially if he had a rival.

There was occasionally a propensity to a sort of idyllic heroism, which at best we can compare with our medieval chivalry, except that here it is a matter of ladies, there of boys, before whom the knight had the moral and institutional duty to show his heroism. Significant is the Chalcidian story regarding just the Kleomachos, who had been buried on the market in Chalcis with heroic honours—but according to Aristotle, who, therefore, already knew that story, it was another Kleomachos.⁴³ Be that as it may be, this Kleomachos, a Thessalian, since—being up in arms with the Chalcidians against Eretria—was required to advance against the overpowering enemy knights, asked his beloved whether he wanted to see this fight. The latter agreed, kissed his lover, put on his head a helmet, so Kleomachos breaks violently the ranks of the knights, conquers and falls. Just as in the twelfth and thirteenth century, the lady sent her knight from one love test to another, Konon 16 tells of a Cretan boy (named Leukokomas), who “instructs his lover (Promachos) to take up great and dangerous struggles (ἄθλα... μεγάλα... καὶ κινδύνων μεστά).” These are not late distortions, but they depict the common notion in the fifth century, and quite certainly already in the sixth century. In effect, the contemporaries of Aeschylus and Pindar could hardly conceive the heroic couples such as Achilles and Patroclus, Theseus and Peirithoos, Heracles and Iolaos other than love couples.⁴⁴ The man’s ambition to show himself to his boy as a hero went as far as self-mutilation: in *amat.* 761 C Plutarch has kept the story of Theron, a Thessalian, who himself cut off the thumb of his left hand to take the rival’s place in his beloved boy’s affections. In this context, Eurystheus, παιδικά (*pet*) of Herakles, is particularly amusing: the hero accomplishes for the sake of his boy even the most difficult tasks, which the latter gets for him. The epic poet Diotimus, quoted in Athenaeus 13,80 (603 D), appears to belong to the early Hellenistic period, as Th. Bergk (*Commentationum de reliquiis comodeiae Atticae antiquae libri duo*, Lipsiae 1888, p. 24) and Wilamowitz (*Euripides Herakles*, I, Berlin 1889, p. 310 n. 78) assumed, but he invented his story according to the spirit of the Doric pederastic romanticism, as long as he

⁴² For Crete: Ephor. *ap.* Strab. 10,21 (483); for Sparta: Plut. *Lyc.* 18 at the end.

⁴³ Plut. *amat.* 760 EF. Cf. Athen. 13,601 E. — An Athenian named Melete eventually ordered his admirer Timagoras to throw himself from the Acropolis, and the latter did so without delay. As etiological legend connected with the altar of Anteros in the citadel, cf. Pausan. 1,30,1, better Suid. *s.v.* Μέλητος = Aelian. *fr.* 147.

⁴⁴ Cf. Xen. *symp.* VIII 31; Plat. *symp.* 180 A; Aeschin. *in Tim.* 144 = 133.

simply did not take in an older invention. Because of the boy-love the heroes' sagas have been more strongly transformed than we can see, because such a pederastic poetry, though it was received by Alexandrinians, was not preserved, because the school had to reject it.

Again, the ideal influence of the boy-love on men occurs with startling clarity. The combination, unique, of the love for their younger fellows with the jealousy against the rivals stretched their heroic zeal to extremes, indeed to madness, because only an ἀγαθὸς ἀνὴρ could claim to the devotion of the courted boy. From this view it is easy to understand what a disgrace was to a wooer if he was rejected—his ἀρετή was questioned, denied, his honour destroyed, his position shattered among his equals; a blot was thrown upon him, which could only be washed with blood. One ends up involuntarily speaking the language of our chivalrous code of honour. The sentimental novella reported by Conon 16 about the Cretan Promachos, who, despised by the beloved Leukokomas, eventually takes his own life, does not prove much, but it evidences why from this point of view one can understand the ancient Corinthian story, already mentioned above (p. 6), on the nobleman, who, while abducting his beloved, in order to prevent the disgrace of rejection, tries at any cost to seize the boy, and so, seriously struggling against the relatives, lacerates the poor youth. An unquestionable testimony is given by Plato in the Phaidrus 252 C. He depicts the different behaviour of men in love, different according to the nature of their pre-existent souls, each of whom had chosen one of the Olympic gods as leader. “Those who are servants of Ares and followed in his train, when they have been seized by Eros and think they have been wronged in any way by the beloved, become murderous and are ready to sacrifice themselves and the beloved (φονικὸὶ καὶ ἔτοιμοι καθιερεύειν αὐτούς τε καὶ τὰ παιδικά).”

The ugly story too, which—hitherto explained as illustrating the Spartans' brutality—Plutarch (*narrat. amat.* 3,773 F) has preserved, is clear: having realized the point of view of both the Doric concept of honour and the Doric boy-love it becomes comprehensible. Aristodamus, sent by Sparta to Oreos in Euboea as 'harmost' (*governor*), tries to abduct a boy from the Palaestra, where he is prevented by the intervention of the trainers and many youths—it is presumably a misunderstanding of the Cretan boy's abduction—, but the day after he succeeds in abducting the boy, takes him on his trireme, and crosses over to the other side—again, perhaps, according to the Doric tradition, testified from Crete, which commanded the 'erastes' to withdraw from the city with the abducted boy. But the boy is still opposing his lover's embrace, so Aristodamus thrust him down with his sword. Then, he is back to Oreos and holds a banquet. The father of the poor boy travels to Sparta, bringing the matter before the ephors, who “take no notice of it.” I would like to believe that they approved the action of their 'harmost' considering the sense of honour of their class.⁴⁵

⁴⁵ The coupling in Plut. *narrat. amat.* 3 of this story with the one about Boeotian girls deflowered by Spartans and the refused satisfaction on the part of the Spartan authorities is not indeed useful to understand this view. The connection of the two stories is very superficial: they are both used to motivate the annihilation of the Spartan power by Epameinondas. — That's my interpretation captures the mark here or not, it seems to me, however instructive to consider the consequences of that way of understanding the honour.



Those who are able to gather these many weak, often broken, and only incidentally perceptible rays and trace back to their origin will easily find a single source of light in this only conception: the qualities of the man, his heroism, his ἀρετή are somehow transmitted to the boys through the love. This is why the society insists on the fact that skilful men have to love boys; this is why boys offer themselves to the hero; this is why ‘erastes’ and ‘eromenos’ share glory and disgrace; this is why the ‘erastes’ is blamed for the cowardice of his beloved; this is why he is also the legitimate representative of his boy beside the blood-relatives of the latter; this is why the man looks, above all, at the active abilities of the boy he chooses, and, on the other hand, the man’s ἀρετή is even more sharply examined to realize if it is worth being transferred; this is why it was a shame for the boy not to find a lover, but, in reverse, it was an honour for him—publicly celebrated in Crete and by the family as well—to have found an honourable lover, and to have been solemnly united to him. Hence comes the title of κληνοί (*respected, honoured*) for the boys, who had shared the love of a man; hence come their suit of honour, the respect on every public occasion, not for a single time, but lastingly. Through love, in fact, these boys have come into possession of the ἀρετή, which deserves such distinctive honouring. How deeply rooted this faith in the ennoblement of a boy through the love of a man, and how generally it was spread, it is clearly shown by Plato. In the Symposium, however, he lets Aristophanes say: only those would be able men in the state who, being boys, have experienced the love of a man.⁴⁶

From here, eventually, the Solonian law,⁴⁷ which is often quoted as oddity, is also more intelligible—it forbids the slave gymnastics and boy-love. On the one hand, the slave should not have the opportunity to train gymnastically like a free man and strengthen his position by means of love affairs; on the other hand, it was necessary that the slave, who in himself has no ἀρετή and should not have, was as a lover prevented infusing his bad

⁴⁶ Plat. *symp.* 191E-192A. Actually, it is only the sensual boy-love, which is discussed here: “ὅσοι δὲ ἄρρενος τμημά εἰσι, τὰ ἄρρενα διώκουσι καὶ τέως μὲν ἂν παῖδες ᾧσιν, ἅτε τεμάχια ὄντα τοῦ ἄρρενος, φιλοῦσι τοὺς ἄνδρας καὶ χαίρουσι συγκατακείμενοι καὶ συμπεπλεγμένοι τοῖς ἀνδράσι, καὶ εἰσιν οὗτοι βέλτιστοι τῶν παίδων καὶ μειρακίων, ἅτε ἀνδρείοτατοι ὄντες φύσει... μέγα δὲ τεκμήριον· καὶ γὰρ τελεωθέντες μόνον ἀποβαίνουσιν εἰς τὰ πολιτικά ἄνδρες οἱ τοιοῦτοι (*men who are sections of the male pursue the masculine, and so long as their boyhood lasts they show themselves to be slices of the male by making friends with men and delighting to lie with them and to be clasped in men’s embraces; these are the finest boys and striplings, for they have the most manly nature... sure evidence of this is the fact that on reaching maturity these alone prove in a public career to be men*).”

⁴⁷ Aeschin. in *Tim.* 138-139: “δοῦλον, φησὶν ὁ νόμος, μὴ γυμνάζεσθαι μηδὲ ξηραλοφείν ἐν ταῖς παλαίστραις... πάλιν ὁ αὐτὸς εἶπε νομοθέτης· δοῦλον ἐλευθέρου παιδὸς μήτ’ ἐρᾶν μήτ’ ἐπακολουθεῖν ἢ τύπτεσθαι τῇ δημοσίᾳ μάστιγι πενήκοντα πληγὰς (*a slave, the law says, is not to exercise himself, nor to rub himself dry with oil in the wrestling grounds... Again, the same lawgiver said: a slave is not to be the lover of a free boy, nor to pursue him, or else he is to receive fifty lashes with the public whip*).” Plut. *amat.* 4,751B; *sept. sap. conv.* 7,152D-E. Whether in the Attic law the ban was expressly confined to the free boys, it is hard to say that. In any case, these boys should be especially protected from the love of a slave. The laws of Gortyn prove that love-relationships between slaves and free citizens happened. In Plat. *Symp.* 182B Pausanias portrays pederasty, gymnastics, and philosophy as dangerous to tyranny. Slaves are not allowed to take part in any of that.

qualities, such as cowardice, humility, into a free boy, just as an excellent man infuses his own positive qualities.

There is another observation of importance, which has already emerged in this examination; it only needs to be formulated. In the boy's life the pederastic act represented an epoch-making fact, it was an important event, at least in Doric states. In fact, as explicitly testified for Crete and Thebes, the 'erastes' had to furnish his boy, after union, with a suit of armour, and for the future the latter would remain beside the former in battle: Cretans called παρασταθένς (*set beside*) the beloved, and the battlefields of Chaironeia and Mantinea covered the dead bodies of the lovers couples next to each other. In other words, the Doric boy entered directly into the fellowship of the men, an important day for him, his relatives and his friends, and, as witnessed from Crete, celebrated with thanksgiving and feasting as a joyful day. Age-old and widespread is the festive celebration of the admission of the boy among the men, in the 'male organization,' often enough among quaint fulfilments. Could not the pederastic act be counted among them? Could the Doric boy perhaps be enabled by this to enter the male organization? I shall come back later.

* *
*

But now let us turn to another question.

How could one think that a man was able to pass his own ἀρετή on to a boy through love? Xenophon, Ephoros, according to Plato or Socrates, and, perhaps, other moralists of the late 5th century too, interpret such a transmission of ἀρετή as the result of the boy's education through the constant dealings with the adult-lover and the example given by the latter. As a matter of fact, they have certainly caught the most effective and conducive part in this relationship. But another question is whether they, all non-Dorians, have touched on both the right Doric view and the source of the whole institution with all its peculiarities. Certainly not. In fact the bestowal of love would have after all been only overindulgence; and, actually, all of them they endeavour to describe it as such.

But that is untrue. The very opposite is the case. This whole exposition has shown it, and it will be plausible to those who think in a historical way. The sensual boy-love is elemental, and it is the foundation of the odd and yet admirable construction up to the ideal height. The Therean inscriptions on rock, with the naive openness of an old, honourable custom, show what mattered: [τὸν δεῖνα] ναὶ τὸν Δελφίνιον ἡ[ο?] κρίμων τε(ῖ) δε ωῖπθε παῖδα βαθυκλέος... And I have already shown that not only this practice was spread everywhere among the Dorians, *i.e.* in Crete and Sparta too, but also that the act itself of love was carried out as a holy one in a holy place, surrounded by publicly recognized customs. There is a curious hunch, which may be rejected, but always recurs with a logical necessity, that, according to the old Doric idea, the man had to pass on to the boy what to himself, the boy, and the State appeared worthy of being infused and desirable, that is his ἀρετή, just through the sensual act of love.

Now, we have an unquestionable testimony from the language of the

Spartans:⁴⁸ they called εἰσπνήλας the pederast. In ancient times, it had been derived from εἰσπνεῖν. Rightly, since “formally everything is in order.” Admittedly unusable is μιμηλάς⁴⁹ ‘painter,’ because this word was created only by mistake. But, being secondary forms in -ας and -ης next to *nomina agentis* in -ος quite usual, e.g. τριήραρχος τριηράρχης, the basic form would be *πνεφῆλος.⁵⁰ It has been handed down that the word εἰσπνεῖν in Lakonia meant ἔραν. If, however, εἰσπνήλας has been explained as ‘the one into whom someone has breathed love,’ this contradicts any analogy: μιμηλός is the one who μιμεῖται (*imitates*), ἀπατηλός ὃς ἀπατᾶ (*who deceives is deceptive*), σιγηλός ὃς σιγᾶ (*who keeps quiet is silent*). So εἰσπνήλος εἰσπνήλας must be the one who εἰσπνεῖ (*breathes into*). And in fact, we can understand just that way a second independent witness for this gloss with its explanation, namely Aelian *V.H.* 3,12: “... αὐτοὶ γοῦν (οἱ παῖδες) δέονται τῶν ἔραστῶν εἰσπνεῖν αὐτοῖς· Λακεδαιμονίων δέ ἐστιν αὕτη ἡ φωνή, ἔραν δεῖν (?)⁵¹ λέγουσα (*they need lovers to ‘breathe into’ them—this is the term among the Lacedaemonians meaning ‘love’*).” The Spartan boys, therefore, asked the admired man to ‘breathe into them’. What? One can scarcely think of something other than what one breathes, that is πνεῦμα, *animam*, soul. It is the valiance, the ἀρετή of the hero that the boys wished to win, and it is only in the soul, it must be the soul itself indeed.

⁴⁸ εἰσπνήλας has been used as a learned gloss by Theocr. 12,13 (ὁ μὲν εἰσπνήλας, φαίη χ’ ὤμυκλαῖζων, ‘*inspirer*,’ so a man from Amyclae might say) and Callimachus (fr. 169 Schn). Their scholia explain it consistently (therefore Theon); as for the Callimachus’ fragment kept in *Et. M.* p. 306,22, cf. *Et. Gud. s. v.* αἴτης, perhaps from the same source exploited by the poet. Theon explains the word as a laconic term, and derives it from εἰσπνεῖν, which means ἔραν in Laconic dialect. But then he misinterprets εἰσπνήλας passively, see *Et. M.*: “εἰσπνήλας... ὁ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἔρωτος εἰσπνεόμενος· Λακεδαιμόνιοι γὰρ εἰσπνεῖν φασιν τὸ ἔραν (*‘ispnīlas’... the one who is breathed by Eros: as a matter of fact the Lacedaemonians say ‘ispnīn’ meaning ‘erán’*).”

⁴⁹ W. Prellwitz, *Etym. Worterb. s. v.*, from Herwerden. You find it only in Plut. *Ages.* 2,4: “αὐτὸς γὰρ οὐκ ἠθέλησεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀποθνήσκων ἀπέειπε μήτε πλαστὰν μήτε μιμηλὰν τινα ποιήσασθαι τοῦ σώματος εἰκόνα (*he would not consent to any likeness, and even when he lay dying forbade the making of ‘either statue or picture’ of his person*).” But πλαστὰν and μιμηλὰν are to be referred to εἰκόνα (Bücheler). Cf. [Plut.] *apophth. Lac. Ages.* 79,215 A; 26,210 D.

⁵⁰ The etymological instruction I owe to Messrs. Bartholomae, Solmsen and Wackernagel. αἴτας = ἐρώμενος in Alkaios 41,2—taken up by Theokrit 12,14 as a Thessalian term—according to the opinion of the three linguists is scarcely to be brought back to ἄημι, although Bartholomae does not consider it excluded, “it is to be approached to lit. *vejas* = wind, *vejū* = to blow and further to Greek ἄρημι, which may have lost an *i*-sound behind an η, cf. Brugmann *Grundriss* I² 203 ff.” Like the predecessors C. O. Müller (*Dorier* cit. II² p. 286, who had already taken into account Alkman) and Diels (“Hermes” [XXXI] 1896, p. 372), Solmsen and Wackernagel make it derive from αἴω and explain it ‘who listens to another,’ ‘compliant.’ “The αἴτας of Alkaios 41,2 shows that the αἴταν of Theokrit of 12,14 has a metrical length on the last foot, as for Alkaios the $\bar{\alpha}$ is based on metrical length. Diels’ etymology is not exactly faultless; for αἴω we would expect αἴστας by analogy with the Herodotean ἐπάιστος” (Solmsen). Wackernagel explains it as a regular formation from αἴω, “nevertheless, even though W. Schulze (*Kuhns Zeitschrift* XXIX, p. 253, and *Quaestiones epicae*, Gütersloh 1892, p. 357f.) in the analysis of the verb (which is not quite certain to me) is right, he could, on the example of μηνῶ : μηνύτης, derive an αἴτης. The somewhat abnormal accent might be explained by analogy with the denominatives in -ίτης as ὀδίτης etc. Besides, there was also a female: αἴτις: ἐρωτική, *Et. M.* 43, 40.”

⁵¹ ἔραν αἴειν λέγουσα *coniec. Buecheler* (ΔΕΙΝ – ΑΕΙΝ) *conl. schol. Ambros. ad Theocr.* 12,13 [Wendel p. 253].



Seeing the soul in the breath, πνεῦμα *anima*, is a widely disseminated and common idea, and it is not so disconcerting the belief that the soul can be communicated by breathing. It was still alive in Christendom: in *John's Gospel* 20,22, the risen Jesus breathed on his disciples and said, “Receive holy spirit (καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἐνεφύσησεν καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς: λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον).”⁵² The question may well arise as to whether the one who will one day explore the history of the kiss will meet with the same or similar ideas. For a mystical faith appears to form the basis of the sacramental kiss in the rite of the Roman and Greek-Orthodox Church, whereas the view of the calls for kissing in the *Apostles' Letters* is rather indifferent.⁵³

However, the idea that the transmission of the heroic soul was carried out by breathing or kissing, which is the basis of the Doric boy-love, is not evident. Although everybody is at first inclined to think of such a thing, it is scarcely possible after all that has been said so far: just the action of οἴφειν (*fuck*) that the Theraeans practiced, as documented, on to the ἀγαθοὶ παῖδες, while invoking Apollo Delphinios to witness, and the explanation of εἰσπνεῖν as ἐρᾶν exclude such idea — ἐρᾶν does not mean kissing.

But before we turn to this new problem, that is how the man can transfer his soul to boys through the act of love, we overlook the gained knowledge. Well, everybody, I am sure, will agree on the following point: the Doric boy-love as publicly acknowledged institution promoted by the State must have been based on a supernatural, ideal thought, and we have found it in the

⁵² H. Holtzmann (*Hand-commentar zum Neuen Testament*, Freiburg 1893) compares *Ez.* 37,5÷10 (breath = spirit of God) with *Io.* 9,6 (saliva, which, however, according to Gunkel is never an ingredient of the Babylonian magic cure). *Gen.* 2,7 is probably closest to the original conception, because here the breath, which Yahweh blows into the human being, means just all that is not corporeal in him, cf. H. Gunkel, *Handkommentar zum alten Testament*, Göttingen 1902, p. 5. Catholic baptism, “the priest then asks the evil enemy to move and give way to the holy spirit, and for this purpose blows the person to be baptized three times (*Gen.* 2,7, *Io.* 20,22) ... ears and nose of the one to be baptized are touched with saliva by the example of Jesus (*Marc.* 7,33),” cf. *Lehrbuch der kathol. Religion zunächst für Gymnasien*, München 1886. — The shamans have the reputation of being able to kill by mere breathing, cf. Preuss, “Globus” 86, p. 362 f. — Cf. also A. Dieterich, *Mithras Liturgie*, pp. 96, 117, 119; R. Wünsch, “Hess. Blätter für Volkskunde” 1902, p. 135.

⁵³ Cf. F. X. Krauss, in *Realencyklopädie der christl. Alt.* I p. 542ff. The Laodicean Synod, *canon* 19, gives the ἀνακραθῆναι τὰς ψυχὰς (*the union of the souls*) as the purpose of the liturgical *osculum*. The kiss was or, better, is given on the occasion of baptism, mass, consecration and ordination, absolution, nuptials, and to the dead. It was expressly confined to the Christian community, only to be given to *fraters*, not to catechumens (Tertull. *de orat.* 14). Particularly interesting is the kissing of the altar by the bishop, who then goes on to kiss the priests, or, according to the Greek ritual, the kiss is given by the priests just ordered, whereas, according to the Latin ritual, the new consecrated ones are kissed by the bishop. It looks as if through the kiss something specifically Christian is transmitted to the communion's new member, the new priests, and the bishop, and as if this something is strengthened by repetition of the kiss at each new celebration. — As evidence of the transmission of the soul through the kiss Dr. Robert Fritzsche-Giessen points out the pseudo-Platonic epigram in *Anth. Pal.* 5,78: “τὴν ψυχὴν, Ἀγάθωνα φιλῶν, ἐπὶ χεῖλεσιν ἔσχον· ἦλθε γὰρ ἢ τλήμων ὡς διαβησομένη (*as I was kissing Agathon, my soul was on my lips: she came ready to cross over on to the other side*).”

belief that the man's soul is mysteriously communicated to boys by physical contact.⁵⁴

Perhaps I should say, by means of magic—I mean, after the example given by K. Th. Preuss,⁵⁵ the body of those very old and original ideas, which may not be called religion and yet are regarded as source of religious fulfilments and religion-like customs. But I do not, because I believe I can speak more precisely in this case. When I speak of transmission of the soul, I am aware that this word 'soul' is not accurate enough, but I do not know a better one.

What revives the body, what makes it speak and act, people have always sought from the beginning of time, and have always looked at and believed to find it in ever different forms. Many peoples, as well as the Greeks have regarded breath and blood as a soul: both are only suitable to the living body; both have also the property of the warmth, which leaves the body when it dies. We also know that other warm excretions of the body gave the primitives occasion for whimsical ideas, which, if not on the same line, seem to have developed in parallel. Preuss, in "Globus" 85 (1904), pp. 325 ff. and 415 f., compiled not a few customs based on the belief that in the urine and excrement there was something special and magical.⁵⁶ Amid his material there is a custom observed among the inhabitants of the Gulf of Papua in British New Guinea:⁵⁷ during the puberty celebration, the boy had to drink the urine of the chief among many other initiation ceremonies, by which he was going to be accepted into the ranks of the warriors—the chief, standing over the boy, who lay on his back, let his urine fall directly into the latter's mouth. The point of such a peculiar consecration can be no doubt: the chief, the best hero, shares his 'magic,' his soul, his ἀρετή with the new warrior. It is an astonishing, but in my opinion clear case of analogy with the Doric pederasty, only the Dorians attribute to the male sperm the strength that those seek in the urine. Here and there the man, and indeed the best man, inspires the boy, in the most tangible sense, with something of his living warm life; and here and there, this is done in a solemn manner the festive epochal day of the admission of the boy into the male community.

The Dorian seems to me even more intelligible. That the primitive conception of manhood also includes a strong sexual capacity, it is obvious,⁵⁸ there is no need to turn to Herakles. And that there is a connection between sexual excitement and fighting courage, heroic strength, daring, can still teach

⁵⁴ Konon 33 tells of Branchos, the beloved of Apollo: "ὁ δὲ Βράγχος ἐξ Ἀπόλλωνος ἐπίπνοος μαντικὸς [μαντικῆς Hoefler] γεγονός ἐν Διδύμοις τῷ χωρίῳ ἔχρα (*Branchos, inspired by Apollo, was used to prophesy in the village of Didymos*). One might wonder whether it was the breath or the love to convey into Branchos the gift of prophecy; to the Ions the former hypothesis is most likely, cf. the previous note.

⁵⁵ K. Th. Preuss, *Der Ursprung der Religion und Kunst*, in "Globus" 86 (1904) No. 20 ff. I found these remarks instructive and received suggestions from them, but I would not like to make them my own, let alone the one-sided derivation of every culture from magic.

⁵⁶ Cf. L. Blau, *Das altjüdische Zauberwesen*, Budapest 1898, in "Jahresbericht der Rabiner-schule", p. 162 (Wünsch). — From Australia according to Haldon, in "Archiv f. Relig.-Gesch." 1907, p. 144.

⁵⁷ J. Holmes, *Initiation Ceremonies of Natives of the Papuan Golf*, in "Journ. Anthrop. Inst." XXXII (1902) p. 424 (I could not see this essay).

⁵⁸ Preuss, p. 415 B, notes: "Of the Maori and other Polynesians, we know directly the view that between fertility, namely the condition of the penis, and great courage there is a close connection (W. E. Gudgeon, *Phallic Emblem from Atin Island*, in "Journ. Polynes. Soc." 1904, p. 209 ff.)." Cf. also Preuss p. 398.

the city dweller any rural stroll in the mating season, should he refuse to observe the people of his cultural circle. From this viewpoint the use of the Solomon islanders, who destine the penis to their chief as part of the cannibal feast, is justly explained.⁵⁹ And when a victor amputates the fallen enemy's sexual member, this also becomes intelligible from this point of view. Spartans still did it in the seventh-sixth century—which was certainly known—,⁶⁰ as it happens still today in Ethiopia and South Africa; and the Israelites had practiced it in the days of Saul and David⁶¹ in the same way as the Indians were used to scalp.⁶² It may be said that it is unthinkable that no

⁵⁹ Preuss p. 415 B, from R. Andree, *Die Anthropophagie*, p. 114, where the reference is missing. On the idea, cf. A. Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie* cit., p. 101.

⁶⁰ Tyrt. 10,25: «αἰσχρὸν... κείσθαι... ἄνδρα παλαιότερον... αἱματόεντ' αἰδοῖα φίλαι-σ' ἐν χερσὶν ἔχοντα (for shame is to see... an elder... fallen down... clasping his bloody pudenda with his own hands),” explained by F. Dümmler, *Sittengeschichtliche Parallelen*, in “Philologus” LVI (N. F. X) (1897) p. 12 = *Kleine Schriften* II p. 220.

⁶¹ *1 Sam.* 18,27: Saul had asked David as a wedding gift for his daughter “a hundred Philistine foreskins” (18,25). “Then David and his men went out and killed two hundred Philistines. He brought their foreskins and presented the full number to the king so that he might become the king's son-in-law. Then Saul gave him his daughter Michal in marriage.” My Giessen colleague Fr. Schwally, the author of *Semitische Kriegsalterthümer* (Leipzig 1901), whom I thank and owe the reference of this passage to, teaches me that “*orlah* (עֲרֵלָה) means foreskin actually, here ‘uncut penis’, in order to characterize the Philistines, who, therefore, unlike the Israelites were not circumcised”. It is clear that not the overwhelmed enemies' foreskins were cut off as trophies, but the whole penes.

⁶² Being afraid of expressing maybe lightweight combinations, which are so likely in these areas, and so numerous over-swarm out of the minds unbecomingly, I would only like to recommend investigating a question, about which—perhaps only because of ignorance—in this wide literature I have not hitherto found anything, *i.e.* whether the phallus is to be regarded or not as a representation of the soul. (The matter has also been mentioned by W. Wundt in *Völkerpsychologie*, II/2, Leipzig 1906, pp. 10 ff.; cf. his “Anfänge der Gesellschaft”, in *Psychologische Studien* III, Leipzig 1907, p. 44.) For those who saw the soul in the *semen virile*, the phallus, especially the erect one, had to be the seat of the soul. Likewise, the Greeks understood the head, from which the soul emanates through the breath, as a representation of the soul. This is proved by Homer, who lets the νεκῶν ἀμενηνὰ κάρηνα (*powerless heads of the dead*) hover in the Hades (*Od.* 10,521,536 and 11,29, 49), and by his verse *Il.* 11,55: πολλὰς ἰφθίμους κεφαλὰς Ἄιδι προΐαψεν (*he was about to send forth to Hades many a valiant head*), which Aristarchus, too, read this way (*schol.* A), whereas he read the identical verse of *Il.* 1,3—differently from Apollonios and others (*Aristonikos, schol.* A)—: πολλὰς ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς (*many valiant souls*); cf. *Il.* 4,162; 17,242; *Od.* 2,237; 3,74; 9,255. The Munich vase in E. Gerhard, *Auserlesene griechische Vasenbilder*, III, Berlin 1847, plate 233 = A. Baumeister, *Denkmäler des klassischen Altertums*, III, München-Leipzig 1888, p. 1902, depicts the soul of Troilos, round whose corpse there had been battle, as a hovering head. To my great joy G. Weicker, in his excellent work *Der Seelenvogel*, Leipzig 1902, p. 30 f., has accepted my interpretation, which I had communicated to him, and confirmed it by means of other pictorial testimonies. But I will not conceal that Loeschcke does not agree with my the interpretation of the Troilos' vase, since on the amphora of the plate 213 in Gerhard *cit.* (original in Bonn) the head of Astyanax is clearly held by the right hand of Neoptolemos, who wants to throw it to the Trojans: it is obvious that Troilos' head is flying. — Thus, in the German popular belief the heart is considered to be the seat of the soul to this day: the deep and sensitive composer of ballades Carl Loewe, according to disposition by will, wanted his heart to be set in the pillar of the *Jacobikirche* in Stettin, close to his beloved organ, which he had played for many years. It is the heart of Zagreus, which the Titans devour. The Caribbeans offer the enemy's heart, as the seat of the soul, to the most valiant as a meal: they believed this way to improve his fighting strength, cf. Theodor Koch, *Die Anthropophagie der Südamerikanischen Indianer*, in “Internat. Archiv für Ethnographie” XII, Leiden 1889, p. 14. — In addition to the heart, in Hebrew and Babylonian areas the liver is often considered the seat of the soul. — Hair must also be understood in the same way; this is shown by both the sacrifice of hair and scalps as

magical effect has been attached to the male sperm, differently from urine and excrement, or, in other words, that the sperm has not been regarded as ‘soul,’ just as the breath and the blood.⁶³

It is difficult to produce evidence of such primordial ideas. For as long as they are alive in a people, there is no literature; and if they remain till the time, in which a national culture has formed, this is only possible in the lowest classes, which are not touched by it; if ever they penetrate the literature, this can only be at a time of extreme depression or when a new faith or belief grow from those down sides.

Prophetesses, sibyls, Kassandrae, and Pythiae have been reported among the Greeks since the seventh century. All these women were full of the god, and the consequent ἐνθουσιασμός (*ecstasies*) put them in a position to make the god’s thoughts and wills manifest: the divine spirit was in them. But how did it get there? The rudest of the ideas, whose progressive series Alb. Dieterich (*Eine Mithrasliturgie*, Leipzig 1903, p. 92 ff.) has compiled in an explanatory way, *i.e.* feeding on the god, is not relevant here as in the case of the Bacchantes, unless the ἐγγαστρίμυθοι (*ventriloquists*) are to be understood so.⁶⁴ But for sure the second one is that, *i.e.* the love-union of the god with the woman. And that is what we are looking for: if, through the god’s embrace the woman is filled with divine spirit, there must be the faith that

well as the story of Samson, whose heroic strength lay in his hair; *cf.* Georg Knaack, “Rhein. Mus.” LVII (1902) p. 217 n. 3; Otto Gruppe, *Griechische Mythologie*, München 1906, p. 882 n. 3. Sacrificing your hair is like giving your life up. Whoever possesses the hair possesses the person, *cf.* R. Wünsch, *Defixionum tabellae Atticae*, IG III,3 p. XXIX col. left centre; Ernst Samter, *Familienfeste der Griechischen u. Römer*, Berlin 1901, p. 126. — So, to find the phallus as a portrayal of the soul would not surprise us. I am determined to this presumption by the parallelism of the circumcision with the hair-sacrifice, the taking of some drops of blood, etc., as Samter (in “Philologus” LXII [1903] p. 91) achieved, without drawing the due conclusion. All the sacrifices mentioned are only replacements for the sacrifice of life, which the god asks. A part of each one replaces the sacrifice of the whole. If, then, the phallus has to be understood this way, it would finally be understandable why it had been placed on graves (*cf.* Gruppe, *Griech. Myth. cit.*, II p. 866 s. n. 2 – some phalli have been several times found in graves, *cf.* Körte-Löschcke, in “Ath. Mitth.” 1899. p. 10; even in the ones around Trier); which role it played in the Eleusinian mysteries; why it is necessary to the hermae (*cf.* Ludwig Curtius, *Die antike Herme*, Münch. Diss. 1903); and perhaps also why it was used as an amulet, worn on the neck, placed above the doorways in Pompeii, put up in the markets of Southern Italy. O. Jahn’s explanation, in “Sachs. Berichte” 1855, illuminates me little. — Material from the islands of the Straits of Torres (Australia) is given by Maddon’s work in “Referat Archiv f. Religions-Wissenschaft” 1907, p. 142 f.

⁶³ One may well doubt whether the “primitives” had already recognized the *semen virile* and birth as cause and effect respectively, but the sense that the man in one way or another could very soon figure this connexion, is very ancient. Qualifying expressions such as “primitives” and “natural people” are fluctuating concepts, and therefore are often employed, of course, in a certain literature; in their considerable flexibility they repeatedly bring about a great deal of confusion, despite Ernst Grosse, *Die Anfänge der Kunst*, Freiburg-Leipzig 1894.

⁶⁴ Plut. *def. orac.* 9, 414 E: “εὐηθεὶς γὰρ ἐστὶ καὶ παιδικὸν κομιδῆ τὸ οἶσθαι τὸν θεὸν αὐτὸν (ὥσπερ τοὺς ἐγγαστρίμυθους Εὐρυκλέας πάλαι νυνὶ δὲ Πύθωνας προσαγορευομένους) ἐνδύόμενον εἰς τὰ σώματα τῶν προφητῶν ὑποφθέγγεσθαι, τοῖς ἐκείνων στόμασι καὶ φωναῖς χρώμενον ὄργανοις (certainly it is foolish and childish in the extreme to imagine that the god himself (after the manner of ventriloquists who used to be called ‘Eurycleis,’ but now ‘Pythones’), entering into the bodies of his prophets, whispers, employing their mouths and voices as instruments).” For other testimonies, *cf.* Gruppe, *Griech. Myth. cit.*, p. 928 n. 1. If, indeed, Philochorus (in Suid. *s.v.* ἐγγαστρίμυθος; *FHG* I 416) speaks of γυναῖκες ἐγγαστρίμυθοι, one might think here also of a love affair with the god. *Cf.* the passages quoted in notes 66 and 67. Norden, too, has dealt with the matter in his *P. Vergilius Maro. Aeneis Buch VI*, Leipzig 1903, p. 144.

this spirit has penetrated her through the seed, and the seed is the soul. The testimonies are scantily sufficient indeed. The Sibyl Herophile, as Pausanias 10,12,2 draws from Alexander Polyhistor,⁶⁵ designates herself in a ‘Delian hymn’ not only as the sister and daughter of Apollo, but also as his γυνή γαμετή (*spouse*)— all denominations that show her as possessed by the spirit of the god. With brutal clarity John Chrysostomus⁶⁶ describes the penetration of the prophetic divine spirit into the Pythia through the sexual path, and even if he oddly blends, as it seems, the idea of the love affair with that of the ascending vapour (πνεῦμα), the action is evident, and certainly he has not invented it. A quote in Suidas⁶⁷ also shows the same. This information suggests that Cassandra, too, was originally given the gift of prophecy by the embrace of Apollo.⁶⁸ The common legend that she rejected the god after receiving the prophetic gift may be a deliberate alteration with respect to the crude sensual conception, perhaps also under the influence of the chastity reputation of the prophetesses, which they shared with all the god’s brides, untouched by earthly men.

The scholarship of my former Giessen colleague, R. Wünsch, who accompanied this study with lively interest, has produced a direct proof of the belief that sperm is soul. The doctrine of Barbelo-Gnostics, which flourished in Egypt in the third century A.D., rests on that belief.⁶⁹ Such teachings reached the peak of fanaticism by uniting the wild oriental sensuality with the religious ecstasy, while from that belief the salvation doctrine of the escape from the world and nostalgia of heaven was developing with crazy consistency, together with the striving in all seriousness to destroy the human race on earth through fruitless lust and child-murder.⁷⁰ In the report

⁶⁵ Cf. E. Maass, *De Sibyllarum indicibus*, Diss., Gryphiswaldiae 1879, p. 7.

⁶⁶ Jo. Chrys. in *epistolam primam ad Corinthios hom.* 29,1 (Montf. 260 = Migne P.G. LXI p. 242): “λέγεται τοίνυν αὐτή ἡ Πυθία γυνή τις οὔσα ἐπικαθῆσθαι τῷ τρίποδι ποτε τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος, διαιρούσα τὰ σκέλη. εἶθ’ οὕτω πνεῦμα πονηρὸν κάτωθεν ἀναδιδόμενον καὶ διὰ τῶν γεννητικῶν αὐτῆς διαδυόμενον μορίων πληροῦν τὴν γυναῖκα τῆς μανίας (*this same Pythoness then is said to be a woman, who, sitting upon the tripod of Apollo, parts her legs, thus the evil spirit, ascending from beneath and entering the genital parts of her body, fills the woman with madness*).”

⁶⁷ Suidas: “Πύθωνος δαιμονίου μαντικοῦ· ἴτας τε πνεύματι Πύθωνος ἐνθουσίωσας καὶ φαντασίαν κηρύξεως παρεχομένης τῇ τοῦ δαιμονίου περιφορᾷ ἤξιον τὸ ἐσόμενον προαγορεύσαι· αἱ δὲ τῷ δαιμονίῳ κάτοχοι ἐφασκον τὴν νίκην Μήδοις παρέσεσθαι’ (*of Python, prophetic demon, he demanded that those (women), who were invaded by the spirit of Python, and who, surrounded by the demon, performed a sort of conception, predicted the future. Those, possessed by the demon, said that victory would be favourable to the Medians*).” Cf. Origenes c. *Celsum* 7,3.

⁶⁸ Cf. Alb. Dieterich, *Eine Mithraslit.* cit., p. 134; O. Gruppe, *Griechische Mythologie*, München 1906, p. 928.

⁶⁹ The main source is the Epiphanius’s († 403) ‘Book of Heresies,’ composed around 376/7: *κατὰ αἱρέσεων ὀγδοήκοντα, haeres.* XXV-XXVI, Migne P.G. XLI pp. 321÷363. The Giessen theologian Gustav Krüger, a colleague of mine, attracts my attention on the older attacks against this sect, on the *second book of Jeu* p. 304,18 f., and on the *Πίστις Σοφία* p. 251,1 and 15, both written in Egypt in the 3rd century—*Jeu’s second book* in the first half (see pp. XVII and XXIV)—translated from Coptic and edited by Carl Schmidt, *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte her. von der Berliner Akademie. XIII: Koptisch-christliche Schriftsteller*, 1. Bd., Leipzig 1905.

⁷⁰ This is shown by the quoted controversies very mild in the *second Book of Jeu*, p. 304,18f., violent in the *Pistis Sophia*, p. 251,15, and in Epiphanius.

It seems useful to summarize the teaching of this sect, scarcely known for comprehensible reasons (by the way, there were several minor variants, as when besides

on this doctrine, taken from their sacred books, which Epiphanius or its author apparently saw—he recapitulates in detail from the *Μεγάλαι Ἐρωτήσεις Μαρίας* (*Great Questions of Mary*), p. 344 A, the establishment of the ‘Last Supper’ according to this sect—, well, in this report, p. 344 D, there is what we are looking for, certainly true Gnostic, because only from here their doctrine becomes understandable: “τὴν δὲ δύναμιν τὴν ἐν τοῖς καταμηνίοις καὶ ἐν ταῖς γοναῖς ψυχὴν εἶναί φασιν, ἣν συλλέγοντες ἐσθίομεν (*the power in the menses and the seed is soul, they say, ‘which we gather and eat’*).” It is to be noticed that γοναί after καταμήνια and all that precedes can only mean σπέρμα, cf. p. 344 A, 337 C, and the passages in the Coptic books.

Being in agreement with Dr. Hepding, who told me his thought after reading this essay, another proof of the idea that man’s seed, which gives and creates life, is the soul, one may well recognize—and this is of great value—in the Roman body of notions. The ‘genius’ of the Romans is to be consulted. The ‘genius’ is suitable only for the man; the woman has her Juno. The word shows a clear relationship with the root *gen-* of *gignere*, which means ‘generate;’ the *lectus genialis* is the site of his activity. The ‘genius,’ therefore, as G. Wissowa says (*Religion und Kultus der Römer*, München 1902, p. 154), is nothing more than the “divine embodiment of the generating power, which is active in man, and is responsible for the continuity of the family.” But he may well be called, and reasonably, the soul of the man since he “reflects and

βαρβηλώ is named a similar Προύνικος). Every life on this earth in human, animals, and plants comes from Πατήρ or, rather, directly from Βαρβηλώ—, produced by the former (προσβεβλήσθαι, *has been emitted*, 321 C Migne, like Christ ἐκβάλλει, *produces*, a woman from his own side, p. 344 A)—and from her (*scil.* Βαρβηλώ’s) descendants, the archons. However, she seeks to bring back the power that has gone out of her, so it is said of her that she ἀποσυλάτῃ τὸ ἐξ αὐτῶν σπέρμα δι’ ἡδονῆς καὶ ἐκχύσεως (*steals the sperm generated by their voluptuousness and [consequent] ejaculation*), p. 324 A. This force, which is, of course, life, soul, is seen into σπέρμα and menstrual blood (p. 344 D). Pious people, therefore, have a purpose in life, that is to bring back to life’s source as far as possible the vital atoms that have flowed out of it, namely the souls of men, animals, and plants (p. 344 D). To this end, they ate as far as possible, without any distinction (344 D f., pp. 336 B, 337 B-C), so as to absorb the souls of animals and plants. Thus, they also ate the *semen virile* they took out by themselves with the help of the women (p. 337 C-D)—Christ himself taught this holy ordinance and demonstrated it in the presence of Mary, who was horrified about it, indeed, till she fainted; which was to be read in their sacred book, *Μεγάλαι Ἐρωτήσεις Μαρίας* (p. 344 A)—and they fed on menstrual blood (p. 337 C-D, 340 A, 344 D, and the *2nd Book of Jeu* p. 304,15, *Pistis Sophia* p. 251,15). Therefore, they avoided conception (340 A-B) and, if it arrived, they scraped away the embryo and supposedly sought to eat it with honey, pepper, and the like (p. 352 D, 336 B). As a scriptural evidence, they adduced especially *ev. Joh.* 6,55÷56: “ἢ γὰρ σὰρξ μου ἀληθὴς ἐστὶν βρῶσις, καὶ τὸ αἷμα μου ἀληθὴς ἐστὶν πόσις: ὁ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα ἐν ἐμοὶ μένει καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ (*my flesh is real food and my blood is real drink; whoever eats my flesh and drinks my blood remains in me, and I in him*).” — A parallel to the almost unbelievable eating of embryos is offered for example by the following custom of certain South American Indians, a notion I would like to thank Theodor Koch-Grünberg for (*Die Anthropophagie der s. a. Ind.*, in “Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie”, Leiden 1903, p. 8 ff.): they ingest with a sort of wine the bone remnants, ground like flour, of their parents and ancestors, which they disinter and roast fifteen years after their burial; so they want to acquire their good qualities, that is the souls. Therefore, there is the same idea as the ‘feeding on the god’ in the form of an animal, etc., as recently discussed by A. Dieterich, *Eine Mithraslit.* cit., p. 95 ff. H. Hepding has described an analogous custom among the Maniotes of medieval Greece from a report referring to 1415/6 of the monk Isidoros to the Emperor Manuel and of Joannes Argyropulos, cf. “Archiv f. Religionswiss.” IX (1906) p. 146.

represents all the strength, energy, pleasure, in a word, the whole personality of the man, his higher and inner essence,” and yet the ‘genius’ is born with the man to whom he is destined and dies with him. Now I also learned that the Attic law about inheritance contained evidence of this belief. The ἐπίκληρος, the heiress, has no right in herself to inheritance, but she merely acts as intermediary between her father and a son, whom he has to give to a man of her father’s family, whereas a baby she gave to a man not related to her father would be deprived of her heredity.⁷¹ So only the man has a soul; the woman receives it with the seed of a man and delivers it to his son.⁷²

Well, I think I have adduced the proof that in the Mediterranean region the soul has been seen and believed in the male seed, just as in the breath and the blood. It was, and probably still, a much widespread idea. In fact, I am inclined to believe that this or that enigmatic custom and view might be explained by that idea. So the ‘couvade,’ which defied so many explanations, finds an explanation from here: the father must look after himself and strengthen through fasting and other means his ‘magic power,’ his soul, which has been weakened by the birth of the child, since only from him, from his soul, the child’s life can come. The child is begotten by his father, who put him into the mother; she does not contribute to child’s generation more than the sand-nest where an animal has laid his eggs. The same explanation—as I have seen afterwards—has already been advanced by K. von d. Steinen, whose reasoning by this far-reaching exposition may be welcomed as a confirmation.⁷³

* *
* *

A people in which the conviction that the soul is in sperm is alive, can easily conclude that the man’s soul, his magical power, his ἀρετή can also be transferred to comrades of the same sex by the semen through the act similar to the copulation. I believe this assumption is probable in itself. Of the Doric boy-love and the Doric word εἰσπνήλας, *i.e.* the lover, it seems to me a satisfactory explanation that can be given, and, as far as I can see, the only one. I would also keep it up even failing parallels, which, however, most likely do exist, though the ethnographic literature hardly seems to offer any. Indeed, this practice is not easy to observe,⁷⁴ and is even less easy to understand, and it is presumably always, if not quite concealed, discussed with moralistic indignation and branded as animal aberration and unnaturalness, as

⁷¹ Cf. J. H. Lipsius, *Der Attische Process*, II, Berlin 1887, pp. 575 ff.; A. Koerte, in “Philologus” 1906, pp. 388 ff., and the literature picked out by them.

⁷² See the picture of the Attic black-figure amphora Berlin 1684 and, with it, G. Weicker, *Der Seelenvogel in der alten Litteratur und Kunst*, Leipzig 1902, p. 2 n. 4.

⁷³ K. v. d. Steinen, *Unter den Naturvölkern Zentral-Brasiliens*, Berlin 1894, p. 337 ff. Cf. Preuss, in “Globus” 1904, p. 399. Recent contributions about the ‘couvade’ in Ploss-Bartels, *Das Kind*, 1², Berlin 1882, p. 143 ff.; H. Suchier, *Aucassin et Nicolette*, Paderborn 1903, 28, 18; Rich. Schmidt, *Liebe und Ehe in Indien*, Berlin 1904, p. 530 ff.; Theodor Koch, *Die Anthropophagie der südamerikanischen Indianer*, “Internationales Archiv f. Ethnographie,” Leiden 1903.

⁷⁴ The strict secrecy, which almost regularly surrounds male associations spread all over the world, hides perhaps something like that: in fact, the men’s communal life presents some resemblance to certain Doric customs, among which can likely be counted the scourge of boys up to make them bleed. Cf. Heinrich Schurtz, *Altersklassen und Männerbünde*, Berlin 1902.

even today, in spite of so many testimonies, the Doric eroticism. True experts of this wide-ranging literature and independent researchers of comparative custom, I think, can nevertheless, just from now on, supply with additional material, and perhaps, after the problem has been developed, a similar custom, here and there, will become understandable through this or analogous view. I know only two parallels so far. The first is the abovementioned ceremony of puberty in the Gulf of Papua in British New Guinea, during which the chief urinates into the mouth to the boy. The second one has been provided by Epiphanius in his criticism of the aforesaid Gnostic heresy, p. 352 C XIII: «οἱ δὲ Λευῖται⁷⁵ παρ' αὐτοῖς καλούμενοι οὐ μίσγονται γυναῖξιν, ἀλλὰ ἀλλήλοις μίσγονται καὶ οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ προκριτέοι παρ' αὐτοῖς δῆθεν καὶ ἐπαινετοί (*the ones they call Levites do not have to do with women, but with each other. And these are their supposedly distinguished and praiseworthy persons*)». Which, according to the teaching of this sect, reported in note 70, can hardly be understood otherwise that they held the man capable of absorbing the soul = *semen* not only through his mouth, but also through the opposite path: this would be precisely the conception presented for the Dorians. Frankly, going by their teaching, I cannot understand such a special standing of these Levites-pederasts within the Gnostic communities. Here, however, the Doric parallel is pressing.⁷⁶ — I would like, however, to mention the Japanese pederasty too. According to Suyewo Jwaya-Tokio's short information⁷⁷ it seems to have been formed with the chivalry that was consolidating around 1200 A.D., mostly in the southern regions, especially in Satsuma, in such a way as to provide an intriguing parallel to the conceptions I developed for the Doric

⁷⁵ Here the Levites seem to be a particularly godly class within the Barbelo-Gnostic community, hence their honorific title, while according to p. 321 C 2 one should think of a distinct sect: «φημι δὲ Γνωστικοὶ καὶ Φιβιονῖται καὶ οἱ τοῦ Ἐπιφανοῦς καλούμενοι Στρατιωτικοὶ τε καὶ Λευῖτικοὶ ἄλλοι πλείους (*I mean the people who are called Gnostics and Phibionites, the so-called disciples of Epiphaneus, the Stratiotics, Levitics... and the rest*).» Epiphanius assembles the teachings of most or all of these sects. Cf. p. 345 A, 324 B.

⁷⁶ P. Näcke (*Die Homosexualität im Oriente*, in "Archiv f. Kriminal-Anthropologie und Kriminalistik" hg. von Gross, XVI [1904] p. 353 ff.) mentions the statements of a guy who asserts that the dancing dervishes had sexual intercourse with their prior. Similarly, among the Olo-Ngadjus in the Indian Archipelago some 'basirs' (shamans) get married to other men (Rich. Schmidt, *Liebe und Ehe in Indien*, p. 530 ff.). Cf. *supra* note 3 — They would be parallels to these Levites.

⁷⁷ Suyewo Iwaya-Tokio (*Die Päderastie in Japan*, in "Jahrb. f. homosexuelle Zwischenstufen" IV [1902] pp. 265÷271) explains according to the quoted sources that some say that pederasty is very old in Japan, others that it was introduced first by Buddhist monks around 600 A.D., who, living together with lovely boys, often loved them passionately, since they were not allowed to have intercourse with women. — The knights emerged in Japan since 1200. They thought it was "more brave and heroic, if the men loved other men, and had intercourse with them, than if they associated with women. This opinion predominated for several centuries for miles around. Almost every knight sought the young guy, who was worthy of him, and established with him a firm brotherhood. It often happened that the knight started a jealous quarrel or a duel because of his beloved. If you read Nanshok'-Okagami (*Päderastische Geschichten von Saikak'*, a famous novelist of the XVII century), you will frequently find similar stories. Thus the relation was first held only between knights and baby-knights (so the beloveds were called). But later it became quite general" (p. 266). ... "Pederasty is not evenly known in all the provinces of Japan. Especially in Satsuma (in the south), it is particularly widespread from ancient times. This may be due to the fact that in Satsuma bravery and masculinity count so much." Moreover, cf. B. Friedländer "ibid." VII (1905) p. 465 ff.

chivalry. Unfortunately, I am not in a position to pursue this Japanese custom and its special conception. Being extant a rich tradition, one must certainly be able to clear it up. It would be of great interest if one could prove that basically there is the same or a similar idea: then the probability would be great that pederasty could develop spontaneously as a rite of passage within men's societies and, in the context of increasing culture, train through it its own specific ideality.

There is still a last obstacle to overcome: whether the taking of the sperm = soul by the boy cannot be compared to that of the woman during the copulation and contemporaneous generation; and if the idea that the hero's soul can be introduced through the πυγή (*ass*) is by no means plausible. Well, the custom of the Barbelo-Gnostics can succour—they thought they would appropriate the soul by making it pass in the form of σπέρμα through the mouth to the stomach and so bring it up to heaven.⁷⁸ It is a conception familiar to us from cannibalism, from the consumption that the Bacchantes made of animals torn to pieces, and something like that.⁷⁹ However, it is an obstacle that only civilized, modern man can put. In any case, animals do not usually have aversion to the orifices of the body. If in all ages human beings ascribed a particularly magical effect to the urine and excrement, then it is certainly possible to find the reason of that precisely in what is disgusting. But like all orifices of the body, the anus was also considered to be the gateway to demonic entities, as shown by Fr. Schwally, *Semitische Kriegsaltertümer*, I p. 67 f. And if there are only evil demons, then it is also certain that magic, a supernatural being, can reach man through that way. Consider then the enormous power of analogy, which I find decisive here.

* *
 *

The idea, from which the pederasty had developed as a state institution among the Dorians, could not last in their States, which had in the long run averted from that culture.⁸⁰ It had to break with them, and if it endured, it could be found as superstition only in remote parts of the world, or in the uncultured lower strata. And even if, like in the case of the Barbelo-Gnostics, it regains new form and attracts the masses, the lowest classes only accept it. But there was still the boy-love as a generally practiced pleasure, and it was regarded by the whole of antiquity and throughout the vast Hellenistic cultural area as a necessary element of the elegant, Greek-cultured living. It was only the Christian Church, which, having always railed against this pa-

⁷⁸ Epiphanius, p. 344 D Migne: "... συλλέγοντες ἀπὸ πάντων τὴν ψυχὴν (namely, through food) καὶ μεταφέρονται μεθ' ἑαυτῶν εἰς τὰ ἐπουράνια (... by gathering the soul from them all and taking it to the heavens with us)."

⁷⁹ Incidentally, from this point, in the same way as *pedicatio*, one might explain *irrumatio*: the chief of the Gulf of Papua would be the perfect analogue. For the Doric pederasty, however, it is not to be taken into account. Whether it is anywhere connected with any belief, I do not know: the doctrine of Barbelo-Gnostics might suggest such assumption.

⁸⁰ In Thera, there are additions by foreign hands to the honourable testimonies about the unions between men, such as πόρνος in IG XII 3, 536, and ἀδής in 552—quite disrespectful.

gan vice, not excepted the Gnostic one either,⁸¹ banished the pederasty from Christian society, and, since it was not able to do so by means of spiritual means, could obtain the sentence as a criminal deed in the year 342.⁸²

Giessen, March 1906.

E. B e t h e (Lipsia).

Postscript. It was only during the correction that I learned about the book by Ellis-Symonds, quoted in note 1, and paid attention to the curious communications of Joh. Georg von Hahn on the pederasty among the Albanians published in "Albanesische Studien" (1855) pp. 166÷168 and 143÷150, where samples of their παιδικὸς ἔρως-songs are given. His informant describes the relationships between the youths of 15÷25 years with the boys of 12÷17 as quite pure but enthusiastic and passionate; there is the sensual love too, but only as an exception. On the other hand, Gustav Weigand, a professor in Leipzig, who knows Albania, in particular Elbassan Korytsa Berat, from experience and in-depth studies, assures me that those relationships are very real despite their dreamlike idealization; he too collected some poetic essays; every 'trim' *i.e.* *Palikar*, hero, has his 'dasure' *i.e.* beloved. Finally, in his opinion, being a traditional custom, it should not be misjudge.

E. B.



⁸¹ *Pistis Sophia* p. 201,22: pederasts are beside murderers and "the remaining very serious sins;" p. 208, 38; 251,3 ff.: punishment for pederasts and blasphemers in the hereafter.

⁸² IX *Cod. Theodos. tit.* VII 3 & 6 = *Cod. Iustinian.* IX 9 lex 30. For the dating, see Krüger. Cf. N. Praetorius, *Die strafrechtlichen Bestimmungen gegen den gleichgeschlechtlichen Verkehr*, in "Jahrb. für sexuelle Zwischenstufen" 1 (1899) p. 101 ff.

EDITOR'S ANNOTATIONS

(§) As Bethe uses both *Knabenliebe* (compound word made up of *Knabe* 'boy' and *Liebe* 'love') and *Päderastie*, we chose to respect this alternate use, so we translated *Knabenliebe* with 'boy-love,' *Päderastie* with 'pederasty.'

(*) Here we follow Müller's text, which Bethe blends slightly: "Es ist klar, daß eine solche das ganze Leben durchdringende Sitte kaum aus irgend einer einzelnen Überlegung hervorgegangen sein kann: sie muß auf einer dem Volkstamme von Anfang an natürlichen Empfindung beruhn. Diese lebhafteste Zuneigung von Männern zu Knaben, dies innige Anschließense, das jene zu zweiten Vätern dieser macht, muß tiefer wurzeln als auf einem einzelnen Institute (*It is clear that such a custom penetrating the whole of life must be rooted more deeply than on any lone consideration: it must be based from the beginning on a natural feeling of the population. This intense union of men and boys, this intimate relationship, which makes them the second fathers of these, must be rooted more deeply than any single institution.*)"

(†) We translated *Mädchenliebe* with 'Sapphic love' here, even though the compound word literally means 'love for girls,' as little above, where, however, Bethe adds *homosexuelle*. Without the adjective the expression remains ambiguous.

(§§) This is also confirmed by K. J. Dover, *Greek Homosexuality*, Cambridge (Harvard University Press) 1978, updated 1989, p. 194: "... there is no overt homosexuality at all in this epics [*scil.* Homer], neither enshrined in the traditional ingredients nor imported by the Ionian culture which generated the poems as we now have them..." Well, that in Homer there is no hint of pederastic relationship in the strict sense, it is true, but that Homer ignores homosexual intercourses is definitely questionable. In a good article (*Achilles and Patroclus in love*, in "Hermes" 106 [1978] pp. 381÷396) W. M. Clarke, checking through far and wide the Homeric poems, tries to prove that Achilles and Patroclus were in love and, consequently, had to have sexual intercourse, even though, he writes, "the sexual question is in any case irrelevant" (*ibid.* p. 395). On the other hand, Dover, in the 'Postscript' of the aforementioned edition (p. 206)—with the biting humour and the self-controlled aplomb characterizing the true English gentleman—gets rid of Clarke's 14 pages in two lines: "W. M. Clarke [...] treats (like Aiskhines) the relation between Akhilles and Patroklos as erotic and discerns other oblique and decorous allusions to homosexuality in Homer, but that does nothing to reduce the crucial difference between the overt and the covert." In this regard, let us consider the following episode: "But when they had poured libations, and had drunk to their heart's content, they went, each to his home (οἰκόνδε ἕκαστος), to take their rest (κακκείοντες ἔβαν). But the horseman, Nestor of Gerenia, bade Telemachus, the dear son of divine Odysseus, to sleep there on a corded bedstead under the echoing portico, and by him (πὰρ δ' ἄρ' ἔσπευσε) Peisistratus, of the good ashen spear, a leader of men, who among his sons was still unwed in the palace." (*Od.* 3,395÷401, transl. by A. T. Murray). Then this one: "So they laid them to sleep there in the fore-hall of the house, the herald and Priam ... / but Achilles slept in the innermost part of the well-built hut, and by his side lay (παρελέξατο) fair-cheeked Briseis." (*Il.* 24,673÷676, transl. by A. T. Murray). Before we continue, we turn our attention to Achilles' encounter with his mother. Jupiter sends for Thetis—who at first misunderstands (*cf.* v. 91, of which a meaningless translation is agreed)—to ask her to convince her son to accept the ransom for the return of Hector's corpse. Well, Thetis accepts and goes to his son and, sitting very close to him (*Il.* 24,126: μάλ' ἄγχι αὐτοῖο καθέζετο),

says: “My child, how long wilt thou devour thine heart with weeping and sorrowing (ὀδυρόμενος καὶ ἀχέουσιν), and wilt take no thought of food, neither of the couch? Good were it for thee even to have dalliance in a woman’s embrace (ἀγαθὸν δὲ γυναικί περ ἐν φιλότῃ / μίσησθαι). For, I tell thee, thou shalt not thyself be long in life, but even now doth death stand hard by thee and mighty fate.» (*Il.* 24,128÷132, transl. by A. T. Murray). It is necessary to clarify the translation of v. 130, otherwise περ remains unexplained (*cf.* Clarke *cit.*, p. 387): “Yet it is pleasing to get entangled in amorous embrace, with a woman I mean.”

By Eva Cantarella’s account (*Secondo natura. La bisessualità nel mondo antico*, Milano [Rizzoli] 2010, p. 25) “Achilles, says Thetis, must continue to live and, forgetting Patroclus, must marry, ‘as it should be right’”; as reference she quotes “Hom., *Il.* XXIV, 128-130.” Such an interpretation is understandable only if ἀγαθὸν is given the meaning of δίκαιον / θέμις, *righteous*, and μίσησθαι that of γαμεῖν, *to get married*. Now, without wanting to consider the statement, ‘Achilles must continue to live,’ since Thetis is sure that the opposite will happen, as well as the imaginative parenthesis ‘forgetting Patroclus,’ of which there is no trace in the Homeric verses, the synonyms imposed by the famous jurist are impossible. But what does Thetis really say to her son? “Achilles, you have little to live on: why do you not try to have sex, with a woman I mean, you like? It’s not so bad!” Why on earth does Thetis feel the need to force her son to shag a woman, being impending the death?

Now, unless you consider Thetis suffering from *dementia praecox*, her words imply that she knew Achilles had never had sex with a woman. Hence, the episode of *Il.* 9,661 ÷ 668 and the quotations of his son Neoptolemos (*Il.* 19,326 ff.) are an enlargement after the composition of the xxivth book. The second implication is that not even Briseis—who in any case loved Patroclus (*cf.* *Il.* 19,287)—had been touched until then; in fact, Agamemnon’s assurances that he never raped her (*cf.* *Il.* 9,133) only make sense if Briseis was still virgin. In other words, either Achilles had always been chaste, or had only practiced homosexual intercourses. The maternal expression, γυναικί περ “with a woman I mean,” seems eloquent enough, even if Homer does not specify.

Now let us go back to the aforementioned episode of Telemachus: all of them “take their rest.” Why does Homer’s inspiration need to add that Nestor makes Odysseus’ son stay in order that he lies close (παρά) to his own splendid (*cf.* *Od.* 4,303) son Peisistratus? It is an addition totally useless to the story and does not seem particularly poetic. To understand, let us reconsider the details cited about Achilles and Briseis: it is time to go to sleep; Priam and the herald sleep in “in the fore-hall of the house,” while Achilles “in the innermost part of the well-built hut,” in a secluded place, “and by his side lay (παρελέξατο) ... Briseis.” Again παρά. Is this another unnecessary addition? No, because with it Homer informs that Achilles decided, good boy, to follow the advice of the mother, that is, of μίσησθαι with a woman before dying. And as for Telemachus? First, the parallel assures that that night Telemachus and Peisistratus did not just sleep, and, about the addition seemingly unnecessary, the only plausible explanation is that the audience would be pleased with the clear allusion to their flirtation. To expect, as Dover does, to read in Homer’s verses every detail “to reduce the crucial difference between the overt and the covert,” it is too much in our opinion, but we let the Reader judge ...

In conclusion, the relationship between Achilles and Patroclus was unlikely to be pederastic. Homer seems to be alluding to a society in which two friends could establish a very intimate relationship free from those institutional constraints that would have regulated the future sexual activity of the Greeks, just as it is today, albeit in different forms. Therefore, in pederasty there is nothing of initiation, since it was a political imposition, and the first to want it were probably the Spartans.

As for the alleged Indo-European origins of pederasty, the two most distinguished precedents are enough to deny them: David and Jonathan (even if the biblical lexicographers speak—against all evidence that the context of 2 *Sam.* 1,26 displays—of “friendship between men,” *cf.* *Grande lessico dell’Antico Testamento*, I, Brescia [Paideia]1988, p. 220), and Gilgamesh and Enkidu., both non-Indo-European and non-pederastic couples, whose intimate liaison had to be very similar to that of Achilles and Patroclus.

(**) “As long as you are chasing the boys subdued by the lovely flowers of youth, greedy for thighs and sweet mouth.” Other translation: “Then dote upon the flowery youth of boys, their fragrant breath admiring and soft thighs.” It is difficult to determine if the second singular person of the middle aorist has impersonal value or is directed to a specific character.

(††) “The Spartans themselves, while they permit everything in love affairs with young men except penetration, put up a very thin barrier to prevent what it is not admitted [*scil.* penetration]: actually, they allow hugs and couplings, provided that there is a cloak in between.”

(§§§) Doric form for παρασταθείς, both not attested. The plural παρασταθέντες is in Ephor. *ap.* Strab. 10,4,21.

(***) Athen 13,601 F: “Ἐχεμένης γοῦν ἐν τοῖς Κρητικοῖς οὐ τὸν Δία φησὶν ἀρπάσαι τὸν Γανυμήδην ἀλλὰ Μίνωα. οἱ δὲ προειρημένοι Χαλκιδεῖς παρ’ αὐτοῖς φασὶν ἀρπασθῆναι τὸν Γανυμήδην ὑπὸ τοῦ Διὸς καὶ τὸν τόπον δεικνύντες Ἄρπάγιον καλοῦσιν, ἐν ᾧ καὶ μυρρίναι διάφοροι πεφύκασιν (*Echemens, in his History of Crete, says that it was not Jupiter who carried off Ganymede, but Minos. But the before-mentioned Chalcidians say that Ganymede was carried off from them by Jupiter; and they show the spot, which they call Harpagius; and it is a place which produces extraordinary myrtles.*)”

(†††) Plat. *leges* 1,636 C: “πάντες δὲ δὴ Κρητῶν τὸν περὶ Γανυμήδη μῦθον κατηγοροῦμεν ὡς λογοποισάντων τούτων· ἐπειδὴ παρὰ Διὸς αὐτοῖς οἱ νόμοι πεπιστευμένοι ἦσαν γεγονέναι, τοῦτον τὸν μῦθον προστεθηκέναι κατὰ τοῦ Διός, ἵνα ἐπόμενοι δὴ τῷ θεῷ καρπῶνται καὶ ταύτην τὴν ἡδονὴν (*and we all accuse the Cretans of concocting the story about Ganymede. Because it was the belief that they derived their laws from Zeus, they added on this story about Zeus in order that they might be following his example in enjoying this pleasure as well.*)”

