

# РЕЦЕНЗИИ И БИБЛИОГРАФИЯ / REVIEWS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

## DISCUSSING VARIOUS ASPECTS OF EROTIC ETHNO-GEOGRAPHIES OF THE GREEK CITY-STATES

Book review: Gilhuly, Kate. *Erotic Geographies in Ancient Greek Literature and Culture*. London; New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2018. Pp. VI, 150. ISBN 978-1-138-74176-8.

ALEXANDER A. SINITSYN,

RUSTAM B. GALANIN

Russian Christian Academy for the Humanities

aa.sinizin@mail.ru; mousse2006@mail.ru

---

**ABSTRACT:** The work provides a brief description of the content and a critical analysis of the main provisions of the monograph by an American researcher Kate Gilhuly: Gilhuly K. *Erotic Geographies in Ancient Greek Literature and Culture*. London; New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2018.

**KEYWORDS:** ancient Greece, polis, culture, literature, lyric poetry, novel, drama, erotica, geography, Sappho, Euripides, Longus, Lucian, Lesbos, Corinth, Sparta, hetaera, gender, sexuality.

---

Over the last three decades, the themes of gender, sex, homoerotics and the meaning of these phenomena in culture have become part of the classical studies prompting discussions that keep gaining popularity.<sup>1</sup> If we talk about Antiquity,

---

<sup>1</sup> The Literature is listed in the work of one of the authors of this review: Sinitsyn 2008a, 393–407. See also: Halperin, Winkler, Zeitlin (eds.) 1990; Halperin 1990; Richlin 1992; Thorp 1992; Richlin 1993; Lambert, Szesnat 1994; Williams 1995; Percy 1996; Bannon 1997; Hubbard 1998; Davidson 2001; Cantarella 2002; Halperin 2002; Davidson 2007; Williams 2010; Lear 2014; Hubbard 2014a; Fisher 2014; Richardson 2014; Blanshard 2015; Masterson, Rabinowitz, Robson 2015; Blondell, Ormand 2015; Dover 2016; Kapparis 2018; Boehringer 2021.

first and foremost, it pertains to *amor Graecorum*.<sup>2</sup> Though, of course, we must proceed with caution, considering, so to speak, the poignancy of sexual topics and “a heightened demand” for them. Yet we cannot close our eyes to these aspects if we set ourselves the task of studying the phenomenon of Hellenic (and by extension, ancient) culture *in toto*. The first part of this article reviews the book with due regard to certain literature; the second part contains critical opinions, comments, and the call for discussion about the important and interesting topic that is essential to forming a holistic picture of the Ancient Greek *polis* culture.

The author of the monograph under review (“Erotic Geographies in Ancient Greek Literature and Culture”) is an American researcher, Kate Gilhuly, Associate Professor of Classical Studies at Wellesley College. Her 2009 feminist-erotic book “The Feminine Matrix of Sex and Gender in Classical Athens”<sup>3</sup> on the fashionable, especially in the 2000s, gender topic received a well-deserved acclaim.<sup>4</sup> Together with Nancy Worman she prepared a cultural collection on geography and topography of Hellenes through the prism of literary sources “Space, Place, and Landscape in Ancient Greek Literature and Culture”.<sup>5</sup> And in another monograph of 2018, Kate Gilhuly combined the gender-erotic and geographical aspects.

Here the proverbial utterance by a Russian classic pops to mind – “Theatre begins at the cloakroom”; likewise, every book begins with a frontispiece. K. Gilhuly’s book is permeated with ‘eroticism’ (and not only in the cultural and geographic senses at that), literally, from cover to cover. The front cover of the book features not a reproduction of an Ancient Greek vase, sculpture or mosaic,

---

<sup>2</sup> On homoerotic relations in Hellas, we refer to Kenneth James Dover’s book: Dover 2016 (the first edition came out in 1978). In Russian there are only articles and translated books; for example: Likht 1995; Marru 1998: 49–61; Kon 1998: 140–170; Pavlov 2001; Selivanova 2007; Sinitsyn 2008a; Sinitsyn 2008b; Surikov 2015, 433–508; Glukhov 2017, 24–28; Selivanova 2017; Galanin 2022a; Galanin 2022b; Galanin 2022c.

<sup>3</sup> Gilhuly 2009. Also see other publications similar in the topic – about courtesans, lesbians, and gender issues in ancient writings: Gilhuly 2006; Gilhuly 2007 (these works were incorporated in the 2018 monograph on erotic geographies).

<sup>4</sup> See, for example, reviews by Stephanie Larson in “Brynmaur Classical Review” (Larson 2009) and Erika Wenstrom in “Women’s Studies” (Wenstrom 2009): both reviews are critical, with comments on the discussion of the sources, the structure of the book, the concept of the “matrix” put forth by the author, various repetitions, etc.

<sup>5</sup> Gilhuly, Worman (eds.) 2014. A small collection consists of seven articles devoted to various aspects of culture based on the ancient Greek monuments of the Classical Age: Herodotus’ “Histories”, Aristophanes’ “The Frogs”, Delphi in Pindar’s odes, landscape in Xenophon’s “Anabasis”, et al. Kate Gilhuly’s article “Corinth, Courtesans, and the Politics of Place” (Gilhuly 2014) written for this collection became the chapter of the monograph under review.

but a photograph of a fragment of a tattered T-shirt covering the body of a person whose gender is impossible to identify. It is the only picture in the whole book devoted to erotic *polis*-, ethnic-, geographies of Hellenes. It is not clear what the author purported to say by this “utterance”, having placed the picture of somebody’s body clad in a threadbare shirt on the front cover of the book on Ancient Greek culture.

K. Gilhuly’s book consists of an introduction, six chapters, a list of the used literature, and an index. At the beginning of the Introduction (pp. 1–10) the author ponders not-so-trivial a question determining the following exposition and the system of the book: “How does a place get a reputation?” (p. 1). Gilhuly admits that she got the idea from Lucian’s “Dialogues of the Courtesans”, where the Ancient Greek satirist “uses geography to amplify the sexual semantics of the conversation between the two courtesans,<sup>6</sup> alluding to Lesbian women, Spartan pederasty, Corinthian prostitutes, and the Theban Tiresias’ transsexuality”<sup>7</sup> (ibid.). That certain geographical places (*poleis*, regions, areas, islands of Hellas, as well as names of certain peoples<sup>8</sup> (Phoenicians, Thracians, Medians, Scythians<sup>9</sup>, and

---

<sup>6</sup> On the inaccurate rendering of the Greek word *ἑταίρα* as a “courtesan”, see below.

<sup>7</sup> See Luc. *Dial. meretr.* 5. 4: γένοιτό τις ἐν Θήβαις ἐκ γυναικὸς ἀνὴρ, ὁ δ’ αὐτὸς καὶ μάντις ἄριστος, οἶμαι, Τειρεσίας τοῦνομα. We remind that that in the ancient mythology, Tiresias was punished after he had struck the copulating snakes: he was transformed into a female. After years of womanhood, he struck the same snakes again and was returned to the state of a man. Thus, the would-be prophet knew “this love and the other” (Ovid. *Met.* 3. 322–331). For the discussion of the dual nature of the image of the illustrious Theban prophet, see Krappe 1928; Coleman 1990; Loraux 1995; O’Hara 1996; Liveley 2003; Balsley 2010; Michalopoulos 2012; Giusti 2018; Gabbertas 2020; Boehringer 2021: 69–72, 210–211, 222–224. In essence, on transformation and gender aspects in Ovid’s “Metamorphosis”, see Makowski 1996; Zajko 2009; Lateiner 2009; Kamen 2012; see the articles in the collection: Sharrock, Möller, Malm 2020. On Teresias as a (bi)sexual image and “The Poetics of Tiresias” in the culture of the 19th–20th centuries, in the context of rethinking Ovid’s story about the change of gender and discourses of homosexual identity in the modern age: Madden 2008.

<sup>8</sup> In note 3 in the first chapter (p. 10) K. Gilhuly adduces another dozen of words meaning modelling on the manners of inhabitants of a particular locality: a city, island, region or people of an alien ethnic group: αἰγυπτιάζειν, ἀττικίζειν, βοιωτιάζειν, κορινθιάζεσθαι, λακεδαιμονιάζειν, λακωνίζειν, μεγαρίζειν, σιφνιάζειν, συβαρίζειν, συβαριάζειν, χαλκιδίξειν, χιάζειν (NB: this list has been corrected; see annotations below). It should be noted that the frequency of the verbs pointed out by the American researcher varies in Ancient Greek sources: some occur frequently in the entire corpus of ancient literature, some occur but once. By the way, this list of words reflecting local (“parochial”) and ethnic stereotypes can be extended even if only drawing upon the archives of the Attic com-

others) had long been associated with a specific way of life and behaviour becomes clear, first of all, from the ancient comedy abundant in verbs derived from a particular place or ethnos, such as κορινθιάζομαι (“play the Corinthian”, “become corinthised”, i.e., act like Corinthians, model on Corinthians), λακωνίζειν, (“become lacedaemonised”, i.e., model on Spartans), φοινικίζειν (“become phoenicianised”, i.e., emulate the Phoenicians), λεςβιάζειν<sup>10</sup> (“become lesbianised”, i.e., act like an inhabitant of Lesbos), and such like. It stands to reason that all these verbs, apart from their denotative locative, have a clear-cut sexual connotative associated with certain practices popular with the inhabitants of those places, that is why the indicated characteristic words were much loved by the Attic comedy dramatists.

Gilhuly refers to the names of researchers, and, occasionally, their works she has drawn upon: the works by philosophers, historians and classics, classic philologists, psychologists and anthropologists, geographers, and, *par excellence*, contemporary ideologists of the gender theory (pp. 3–6). The author refers to James Davidson as her forerunner in the ancient “erotic cartography”, who concluded his 600-page book on the ‘Greek love’ with “A Map of Greek Love”,<sup>11</sup> where he examines the genealogy of this phenomenon and its local peculiarities. But Gilhuly, abstracting herself from other territories of the antiquity, concentrates primarily on Athens to trace “the way Athenian discourse affected the identities of other places and to uncover the Athenian investments that shaped these places” (p. 3), which is right as to methodology since the Attic is the most thoroughly documented Ancient Greek region. For her research, the author chooses Korinthos, Sparta and Lesbos, and she specifies: “I chose these three places because they seem to have attained especially strong symbolic associations with very particular sexual cultures” (*ibid.*). Gilhuly focuses on the “rhetoric of otherness” that

---

edy. We can refer to the recently published collection on ethnicity and identity in the Antiquity: Figueira, Soares (eds.) 2020; see a critical review of this book: Sinitsyn, Surikov 2021.

<sup>9</sup> For example, verbs with the “ethnic” root σκυθ-, which got established in the language of Hellenes during the Archaic Age (meaning “scythianise”, “act like a Scythian”, “turn into a Scythian”, or “put on the Scythian airs”), see works of one of the authors of this review (with literature in each article): Sinitsyn 2008c, 281–282 (nn. 50–53); Sinitsyn 2011, 628–629 (n. 174), 632–636; Sinitsyn 2012, 52–53 (nn. 10, 13–15), 55–56, 63.

<sup>10</sup> The verbs λεςβιάζειν and φοινικίζειν, which served as euphemisms for *fellatio* and *cunnilingus*, respectively, sometimes were used in medical discourse (cf. Gal. *De simpl. med.* 10. 1) denoting menstrual and urinary secretions in drug therapy (in greater detail, see Petit 2020).

<sup>11</sup> See Davidson 2007, 466–516.

the “Athenian discursive imperialism” had elaborated during the classic age (p. 6).

The author proceeds from the structural paradigm that, just like in the case of linguistic units, “the notion of place is essentially relational: each place is defined in opposition to others and therefore contains the other within its own identity” (p. 3).<sup>12</sup> Gilhuly thereby frames a concept of place, which is closely related to the social visionary, where it overlaps identity: “also implicated in the construction of place” (ibid.).

Gilhuly acknowledges that her optics was determined by the works of François Hartog and Froma Zeitlin.<sup>13</sup> She says that both the works “are formative models in my thinking” (p. 3), though she refers to them only twice.<sup>14</sup> F. Hartog in his book on Herodotus attempted to show how “the Father of History” creates “the image of the Other” to emphasize the Hellenic “selfhood”.<sup>15</sup> Yet, contrary to the French classic, who was interested in cultural differences between Hellenes and non-Hellenes<sup>16</sup> (barbarians, primarily, Scythians), Gilhuly examines differences within the Greek-speaking realm – through the prism of erotic geography. In the field of general methodology for the gender theory predicated in the Introduction, Gilhuly, it appears, is an advocate of the gender performativity theory elaborated by the American queer-theorists Judith Butler and Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick.<sup>17</sup> This theory purports simultaneous circulation of various, frequently conflicting, discourses engaging individuals who learn, through reiteration of linguistic performative practices, to identify themselves as a ‘he’ or a ‘she’ to gain a status of

---

<sup>12</sup> It is appropriate to refer to F. de Saussure’s thesis that language has nothing but differences; hence the linguistic salience grows out of “disparities” of two or more juxtaposed linguistic units (de Saussure 1977, 152).

<sup>13</sup> See the monograph by F. Hartog “Le miroir d’Hérodote”: Hartog 1980 (K. Gilhuly used the English translation: Hartog 1988); and the fundamental article by F. Zeitlin “Thebes”: Zeitlin 1990a, 130–167.

<sup>14</sup> Yet, Gilhuly somehow “misses” Zeitlin’s work on personality and society, which, as she admits, has had a great impact on her, in the list of literature, and the bibliography gives only one of her articles, that on art and imitation in Longus’ “Daphnis and Chloe”: Zeitlin 1990b.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Sinitsyn, Surikov 2021, 203.

<sup>16</sup> F. Hartog speaks about the *Hellenic* “selfhood” proper, and not about specifically *Athenian*, as Gilhuly says, “Like Hartog, I am interested in exploring the way *the Athenians* (italics added — A. S., R. G.) grappled with cultural difference...”, p. 3), since the historian Herodotus was not an Athenian.

<sup>17</sup> The “innovative” works of American feminists have been translated into Russian; for example: Sedzhvik 2002; Batler 2002; Batler 2018. The gender theory became a “fashion trend”; see also the collections: Zherebkin 2001; Bredikhina, Dipuell (eds.) 2005.

humanness/identity (cf. pp. 5–6). This approach classes this book as *radical social constructivism*<sup>18</sup> and leaves no room for the methodological assumption made by essentialists, according to which, in ancient times, as well as today, there may be – well, there actually was – a more or less steady percentage of people who, for example, felt drawn to persons of the same sex and regarded themselves as such. Yet, the Greeks did not, and could not, have an appropriate – in the first place, medical – terminology which would have ‘embedded’ this kind of Eros into the binary dispositif of the Procrustean “norm-and-pathology”.

In the last part of the Introduction, Gilhuly briefly delineates all the six chapters of her work presenting all the points that are further elaborated in each section (pp. 6–9).

The first chapter entitled “Corinth, courtesans and the politics of place: Bewitching arts of the courtesans” (pp. 11–29) speaks about the rich *polis* of Corinth that was a master of two harbours and carried on vigorous trade. The chapter opens with a lengthy quotation from Strabo’s “Geography” (8. 6. 20, with reference to Homer) where the ancient geographer describes all the assets of the wonder-city and, surely, the enormous number of female slaves at the temple of Aphrodite and costly hetaerae. The author points out that Strabo’s special emphasis on hetaerae and other treats in Corinth correlates with the Athenian attitude to Corinthians and their way of life, which, in turn, is reflected in the semantic of the verb *κορινθιάζεσθαι*, denoting not only ‘to philander’ but also to ‘be a whore’, and in the case of men, to be a *pimp* (p. 11; see p. 29, n. 2). Strabo himself, while delighting in describing the happy life in Corinth, is strongly influenced by the Athenian vision of Corinthians, which regards this locality as a den of prostitution not only in discourse but in reality (pp. 12–13).<sup>19</sup> Thus, the Corinthian prostitute is seen through the lens of the Athenian political *imaginative*, where Corinth – understood as An Other city for the Athenians, is also rich, also a seaport

---

<sup>18</sup> This may be the most popular aspect of the gender theory and, by extension, those works on the history of sexuality that apply it as a method. Here the pace is set by *Michel Foucault*, and continued in the theoretical part by J. Butler (1990); E. Kosofsky Sedgwick (1990) and others; and, as to the Antiquity, by such works as those by Halperin 1990; Winkler 1990, and others galore. These theoreticians hold to the view that such things as gender, sexual attraction, the very sexuality and everything related to it are the products of “discourse”. Subject-in-itself, “hollow” at first, is being constructed by cultural practices, basically performative and linguistic, hence there is no initial hetero-homo and other sexualities, all of them are a product of culture, or a social machine.

<sup>19</sup> It goes without saying that in this methodological paradigm discourse is a reality, and there is no reality that would be outside discourse (in greater detail, see Galanin 2016).

town and a tourist hub, a *polis* very similar to theirs, yet not the same as they, for it is *oligarchic* – becomes for the Athenians a *topos* to comprehend themselves (p. 12, 22–24).

Gilhuly highlights that *hospitality* (*xenia*) was an inalienable part in the representation of Corinth in the minds of Ancient Greeks, to prove which she adduces chronologically scattered fragments of texts: Aelius Aristides' speeches (p. 13) along with Pindar's odes (*ibid.*), Aristophanes' comedies (p. 14) and quotations from Athenaeus (p. 15), and all these overlap with the image of the prostitute as "the ultimate symbol of pleasure, is also a figure of nostalgia" (p. 15), which comes into focus through Gilhuly's reading of the French poststructuralist *Jacques Derrida*, who, in turn, borrowed it from Jean-Jacques Rousseau, so the initially understandable and devoid of mystery figure of the prostitute turns into "a *dangerous supplement*<sup>20</sup> for the always denied libidinal investment in the mother (italics ours — *A. S., R. G.*)" (*ibid.*). Why Gilhuly should have chosen such a theoretically complicated description of a particular historical object called a Corinthian hetaera is not, mildly speaking, clear.

Then Gilhuly turns to the issue of the Corinthian gender (pp. 16–18) and points out that the identification of Corinthians with hetaerae invariably feminizes them, and such an association, also absorbing Corinthians' military allies, persisted throughout the Classical Age, which is evident in quotations from Aristophanes ("Peace", "Lysistrata", and others). The effect of such feminization of Corinthians is the Athenians' implicit perception of their right to phallic preponderance and domination over them as their competitors (p. 18).<sup>21</sup> What makes it even spicier is that Corinthian hetaerae use their bodies when working (ἐργάζεσθαι τῷ σώματι), and such bodily labour outside home (except for the military service) was despised by the Athenians, so all jobs "outside" home (trade and the rest) were not unquestionable from the moral point of view (p. 19).<sup>22</sup>

"Love" for sale invokes the money theme (pp. 18–22). When discussing the ancient adage "Not for every man is the voyage to Corinth", which emphasizes the costliness of this city and its courtesans, the author focuses on the opposition be-

<sup>20</sup> About this concept see Derrida 2000.

<sup>21</sup> Here the reference to Akro-Corinth comes into play, pejoratively calling the inhabitants of Heracleia Ἀνδροκόρινθοι ("Androcorinthians" / "mannish Corinthians"); for in Hellas Corinthian women were known for their lewd conduct, similar to that of Heracleian men. This feminization of citizens of a different *polis* – by analogy with the Acropolis of Corinth – occurs in Athenaeus (8. 351d).

<sup>22</sup> This, by the way, is one of the reasons why in Athens sophists (and *metoikoi*, for that matter) were not much liked for their wanderings and their inability to fare in their own *polis*. On travelling in sophism: Woodruff 2006; Galanin 2019.

tween the two types of prostitutes – *ἑταίρα* and *πόρνη* (pp. 20–22). “The *hetaera* was associated with an elite discourse that embraced a culture of pleasure, cultivated Eastern, specifically Lydian luxury, and was associated with gift exchange and undemocratic politics, while the *porne* was associated with the agora, democracy, and monetary exchange” (p. 21). Thus, an expensive and exclusive *hetaera* is a symbol of oligarchy as a strong Corinthian polity, while a woman of pleasure, *πόρνη*, is a daughter of the Athenian democracy, hence, the identification of peculiarities of Corinthian prostitution forms the Athenian identity proper (p. 25).

The Athenian representation of Corinthians, the author argues, is set to have a long life, and we find its repercussions even after centuries: Athenaeus (the turn of the 3rd century AD) speaks, for example, about competition between two *hetaerae*, Phryne and Lais<sup>23</sup> (pp. 25–28). The latter, which was always among her suitors, contrary to Phryne, did not distinguish between the rich and the poor and pleased everyone. It follows that Lais behaves not as an elite Corinthian *hetaera*, but as an egalitarian Athenian *πόρνη*, which, in turn, must contradict the previous assumptions made by the author of the book. Yet, Gilhuly argues that such an inversion looks contradictory only at first sight; instead, Athenaeus’ passage “invites us to map a competition between Corinth and Athens directly onto the discourse of prostitution, and supports the argument of reading both cities together” (p. 25). Then the author adduces some biographical details of both *hetaerae* and arrives at the conclusion that the ageing and thereby rather promiscuous Lais<sup>24</sup> recedes to give way to the younger and fresher Phryne, “just as Corinth was replaced by Athens as a maritime power, tourist destination, and centre for trade” (p. 27). At the end of the chapter, Gilhuly argues that all the above-mentioned evidence allows for a conclusion that shaping its identity through “branding” Corinth, “this discourse reflects an anxiety about an internal other”, whose place Athens had occupied because of its new identity as a maritime power (p. 28).<sup>25</sup>

The second chapter is a small, but a more interesting in its content, section of the monograph. It develops the Corinthian theme of the previous chapter (again, in the specific, erotic vein) and is entitled “Medea in Corinth” (pp. 30–42) and

---

<sup>23</sup> Athen. 13. 588e: διαζηλοτουμένη δέ ποτε ἡ Λαίς Φρύνη πολὺν ἐραστῶν ἔσχηκεν ὄμιλον, κτλ. On the rivalry of these two notorious Hellenic *hetaerae*, see the book by Hans Likht 1995 (§ “Queens of Love: Lais and Phryne”).

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Athen. 13. 570c–d. Athenaeus cites the excerpt from the play by the comedy dramatist of the 4th century BC, Epicrates’ “Antilaida” (Epicr. fr. 2, *CAF* II: 282).

<sup>25</sup> Here it is easy to throw a bridge into the field of contemporary social politics, for example, the figure of eastern migrants (especially, Islamic refugees) in Europe as a figure of “the internal Other”.

examines the most well-known and influential tragedy by Euripides. The production of this drama was to be of special importance for the Athenians, for they were on the verge of war with Corinth and its Peloponnesian allies owing to Athens' aligning with Kerkyra and its aftermath (p. 30).<sup>26</sup> Gilhuly believes that the tragedy "Medea" purports how the Athenians conceived the *polis* in the north-east of Peloponnesus: "...Euripides' depiction of Corinth resonates with a generalized characterization of Corinth as a travel hub, an overly hospitable gateway to the East, with a dominant marketplace ethos. ... These conceptions were distilled in comedy in a stereotype that imagines Corinth as a city of courtesans" (p. 30). This thesis is the key one in the Second Chapter. Throughout the Antiquity, Corinth enjoyed the glory of a *polis* that served people who threaded their way through, and, according to the author, this *philoxenical polis* was charged with orientalism. Euripides' "Medea" contributes to the conceptualization of Corinth as a *place* that seemed too welcoming.

Gilhuly points to the scholia, according to which the Corinthians paid Euripides five talents so that he would "shuffle the blame" for the murder of Medea's and Jason's children from the Corinthians onto a foreign woman (p. 32).<sup>27</sup> The author points out that Medea combines the features of a barbarian sorceress with elements of masculine Greek aristocratism, that is, she is a mixture of masculinity and femininity which constitute a hetaera (p. 32–34).<sup>28</sup> Gilhuly analyses the scene of *agon* between Medea and Jason (Eur. *Med.* 446–626), highlighting that the barbarian heroine converses with her treacherous husband in the idiom of aristocratic friendship, insisting on the mutuality of *philia* and *charis* (pp. 34–38). Medea appeals to Jason's duty, but the hero takes her for a woman who sells herself to make profit. The author of the book makes a remark on magic potions, on the relation between *pharmaka* and prostitution, on the magic hetaerae use (pp. 36,

---

<sup>26</sup> The play was staged in 431 BC — the first year of the Archidamian War.

<sup>27</sup> According to one version of the myth derived from *Eumelus of Corinth*, Medea was not guilty of the children's murder; she killed them accidentally, just as when she wanted to make them immortal. Another tradition, deriving from Creophylus of Samos (through Didymus Chalcenterus) says that it is the Corinthians themselves who had made short work of Medea's children, and then left the barbarian heroine the blame. No matter how it really happened, Euripides may have been the first to make the legendary sorceress kill her own children, which, of course, was to leave the theatre audience, who were well-aware of the local mythology, in shock. In greater detail, see: Séchan 1928; Page 1938; McDermott 1987; Mastronarde 2002; William 2002.

<sup>28</sup> Here Gilhuly (p. 41 and 42) refers to the article by Helene Foley on Medea's ambivalence of "Self" of (Foley 1989) and to the annotated edition of Euripides' drama in Donald J. Mastronarde (Mastronarde 2002).

39). Drawing upon Theodote's experience (pp. 33, 37–38), Xenophon's "Memorabilia" in which Socrates instructs a well-known beautiful kept mistress, Gilhuly speaks about the art of seduction and hetaerae's use of their clients.

Of interest are notes on Medea-hetaera and Leaina-lioness (λέαινα) featured in the fragments about hetaerae in the comedies by Machon (a poet in the 3rd century BC), who was born either in Corinth or the neighbouring *polis* of Sicyon (p. 39–40). Gilhuly points out two examples to illustrate how the comic poet impersonates Euripides' poems<sup>29</sup>. Machon (fr. 12) speaks about Leaina and Demetrius; Λέαινα (Leaina/"Lioness") was a common name of a Hellenic hetaera, but also it referred to the female straddle position (which was considered shameful for women)<sup>30</sup>; and Machon's fr. 18 contains a conversation between Lais, a Corinthian, and Euripides, the tragic dramatist.

A rather detailed analysis of "Medea" serves to substantiate the thesis that Euripides in this play deliberately undermines the tragic norm to forestall the comedian image of Corinth – "it is the Corinth of courtesans" (p. 41).

The Third Chapter's title is terse: "Laconic sex" (pp. 43–72). It is the largest section of the book and it begins with the semantic analysis of the verb λακωνίζειν, which, apart from the denotative meaning "to live in a Spartan way", "model on the Spartans", "speak briefly", had a comical – connotative – meaning, which pertains to the peculiar practices of the Spartans since it is well-known that the latter are not only avaricious perjurers but also "proverbial pederasts" (p. 43). In this respect, there is a strong tradition to read λακωνίζειν as: "use τὰ παιδικά", which in the comedy entails a long trail of other words zestfully characterizing the Laconi-

<sup>29</sup> Machon. fr. 12 et 18 Gow 1965 = Athen. 13. 577d, 582c–d.

<sup>30</sup> For example, Aristoph. *Lys.* 231–232; School. in Aristoph. *Lys.* 231 (Dübner); Polyæn. 8. 45; Luc. *Dial. meretr.* 5; Paus. 1. 23; Athen. 6. 253a–b; 13. 577c–d; 596e. On hetaerae of the Hellenistic age, their occupations, careers and the role they played at kings' courts, on the meaning of names and nicknames of some hetaerae who made themselves notorious through the positions they took during sex acts, see, for example, Ogden 1999: 215–272, 273–281. He speaks about Leaina-"Lioness", whose name he argued points to a peculiar "style" practiced by the hetaera (*hic*: "doggy style") (pp. 260–261). But as has been noted, this "such a specific 'working specialization' allegedly even instrumental in coining their names, cannot help but raise certain doubts" (Ladynin, Gabelko, Kuzmin 2009, 121, n. 4). Compare, however, the note to Athenaeus by N. T. Golinkevich: Afinej 2010, 471, n. 64 (*comm. ad Athen.* 13. 577d): "...in a position of a 'lioness'... – for which she must have received the name Leaina (lioness)"; though, in our opinion, the reference to the scholia to Aristophanes' "Lysistrata" (ad v. 231) Golinkevich gives here is not a satisfactory argument to link "the lewd leonine position" with the name/nickname Leaina.

ans: εὐρυπρῶκτος, καταπύγων, λακκόπρωκτος, etc. (ibid.)<sup>31</sup> Gilhuly examines certain peculiarities of the Athenian pederasty and notes: “although the Greeks did not stigmatize erotic relations between men, they were nonetheless very anxious about the role of the penetrated male in homoerotic relationships” (p. 45). It is this aspect, according to the author, that prompted the Athenians to make a mockery of the Spartans since the Spartans practiced such relations not only with boys but also with women, and it is the representation of the Spartan woman that emphasizes “the difference between Sparta and Athens in terms of their sex and gender constellations” (p. 47). Of no less importance is the fact that King Leonidas claimed descent from Hercules, for the latter was “compulsively masculine”, “the very type of the super male”, who had lots of sons by many women (p. 52).

Gilhuly mentions the “Laconian” weakness of Alcibiades (with the interpretation of the bizarre word *κυσολάκων* in Photius’ “Lexicon”)<sup>32</sup> (p. 43) and discusses the information found in the ancient sources that testifies to the “Spartan-style” anal sex (pp. 43–46). The author adduces quotes containing *λακωνίζειν* from Aristophanes’ plays and fragments of works by other Hellenic comedians (Europolis), Xenophon, Photius, Athenaeus and others. There are few extant sources testifying to the women involved, so to speak, in this type of sexual intercourse and there is no reference book on the Athenian attitude to “anal sex”, which Gilhuly regrets since it complicates the task (p. 44).

The author proceeds with the review of peculiarities of Spartan life, behaviour and education by analysing fragments from Herodotus, Plutarch, Aristophanes, Thucydides and Aristotle (pp. 52–60). Drawing upon these sources, the researcher states that “we can develop a picture of Spartan pederasty...” (p. 60). The specifics of certain social and pedagogical institutions (*agoge*, *krypteia*, *syssition*) are instrumental in concluding that “this extremely homosocial upbringing fostered homoerotic relationships” (ibid.). The character of this relationship was not always transparent, and Gilhuly analyses a series of representative fragments of the

---

<sup>31</sup> In greater detail of the obscene lexis in the Attic comedy, see Henderson 1991; *sexual insults* in Ancient Greek comedy and historiography: Lateiner 2015; Lateiner 2017 (with literature); cf. Sinitsyn 2020a: 463–466; Sinitsyn 2020b: 20–33.

<sup>32</sup> Aristoph. fr. 907, *CAFI*: *κυσολάκων* ὁ Κλεινίου = Phot. *Lex.* K 192, 12–15. Everything is clear about the second part of the compound word, but the first part Gilhuly, following the authors of dictionaries (for example, *Lexicon* by Liddell and Scott, and others where *κυσός* = *κύσθος*), renders it correctly by the Latin phrase *pudenda muliebra*. See in the *lexicon* by Liddell, Scott 1996: 1014, col. 2, s.v. *κυσολάκων*: “= παιδεραστής, from the Spartans being accused of the practice” (with reference to Hesych. *Lex.* K 4735). Cf. Boisacq 1916: 539, s.v. *κύσθος*; Frisk 1960: II, 56, s.v. *κύσθος*; Chantraine 1970: 603, s.v. *κύσθος* (1).

“Constitution of the Lacedaimonians” by Xenophon, as well as those of Plato’s “Symposium” and “Laws”. The researcher refers to the hypothesis advanced by James Davidson to the effect that sexual intercourse between men and adolescents in Sparta could be exercised only if the latter still had their cloaks on (p. 62),<sup>33</sup> and she has a mild take on the issue, along with Lycurgus, the law-giver of Sparta (Xen. *Lac. pol.* 2. 13–14), who was for loving the souls of the young and for refraining from fleshly passions. But Gilhuly is sympathetic to Davidson’s hypothesis and does not exclude the fact that Xenophon speaks about the “gold standard” that may well never existed, which perhaps was the case (ibid.). And Xenophon himself says (*Lac. pol.* 14. 1) that he is not sure that Lycurgus’ laws are still abided by in their entire purity.

The last section of this chapter (pp. 67–70) begins with a long quotation from Aristoteles’ “Politics” on the status of women in Lacedaemon. Also, it contains the discussion of anti-Spartan dramas by Euripides (pp. 68–69). In the end, the researcher arrives at the conclusion that “the laconic brand of pederasty contributed to a gender matrix in which the contours of male pederastic eros determined even feminine sexuality and marriage” (p. 64). The result was that a woman in Sparta behaved like a man, be it an elderly mother with her pretty strong wording: “with the shield or on the shield”, or a young wife or a woman, “they are given to luxury, avarice, and insolence, and they dominate their men” (p. 68). Thus, the Athenians may have believed that Spartans, resembling barbarians in certain ways, contribute to “the degeneration in which the power of kings and women is a corrupted political ideology devaluating male civil identity”. Sparta is a country where women “replicate masculinity up to and including male sexuality, as committed to death in battle” (p. 69), which pertained to the connotative meanings of the verb *λακωνίζειν*, denoting absolutely a non-productive but anti-existential kind of sexual relations permeated by the culture and the ideology of death, alien to the Athenians (cf. p. 70).

Chapter Four “Lyric poetry, rape, and Spartan song on the comic stage” (pp. 73–90) is devoted to the analysis of Aristophanes’ “Lysistrata”. This section develops the theme of Laconian sex examined in the previous chapter. The author emphasizes that she sides against the traditional vision of the pro-Spartan character of the play and argues that Aristophanes, on the contrary, depicts Spar-

---

<sup>33</sup> Davidson (2001: 333) conducts a full hypothetical reconstruction of Cicero’s context (Cic. *De Rep.* 4. 4) and it is rather tough: “the boy really would be coolly gazing on his *lust-drunk* admirer, not just *frigid* but *frigidized*. It is hard to imagine a more solipsistic sexual experience (italics added. — A. S., R. G.)”. It must be said that though it is a radical interpretation, but it is not unwarranted, for in the said passage Cicero says himself that the Spartans put a thin wall (*tenui muro*) between the warranted and the unwarranted.

tans “as failing to engage in normative sexual and cultural reproduction” (p. 73). Certain sections of this chapter are devoted to Spartan men (pp. 74–76) and Spartan women (pp. 76–77).

This play describes men “as speaking differently, lacking linguistic fluency, being bellicose, dirty, anti-democratic, and overly fond of anal sex” (p. 74). The depiction of Spartan women is radical “and, even in terms of Athenian norms, much more offensive” (p. 76). The acuteness of such a depiction is emphasized by the name of one of the characters, Lampito, the same as that of the mother of King Agis II, who at that time deployed his garrison in Decelea (pp. 82, 83). With references to the works by Henderson, Dover and Davidson, the author discusses the obscene vocabulary in “Lysistrata” (*καταπύγων et al.*) (p. 81).

Chapter Five “Lesbians are not from Lesbos” (pp. 91–116) is an historical study of the issue of how Lesbos started being associated with female homosexuality, entirely obscuring the main geographical meaning of the word – to be an inhabitant of Lesbos (p. 91). The text of this chapter was published back in 2015 (see p. 113, n. 1), and the issue proved especially “topical”. The author cites the BBC report in May 2008<sup>34</sup> about inhabitants of Lesbos trying to ban the word “lesbian” since the use of this word to denote sexual orientation violates their human rights (p. 91).

Homer mentioned the beauty of the female inhabitants of this island in the north-east of the Aegean Sea.<sup>35</sup> Gilhuly underlines that “The erotic identity of Lesbos was forged to a great extent in the crucible of Athenian comic representational practices involving places, prostitutes, and the personification of style”, which was embodied in the verb *λεσβιάζειν*, and which, according to Eustathius’ comments on a passage in the “Iliad”, means to commit shameful acts (p. 93). The researcher invokes (pp. 93–94) poems by Athenian comedy dramatists: Pherecrates’ fragment (fr. 149, *CAF I*) and lines from Aristophanes’ “Ecclesiazusae”/“Assemblywomen” (v. 918–920).<sup>36</sup> She points to one of the main meanings of the word *λεσβιάζειν*: “making music in a Lesbian style”, that is, in Eastern Greek lustful manner, which manifested itself in the Aeolic style of Terpander, Alcaeus, and Sappho (p. 95).<sup>37</sup> Over time, this musical tradition transformed into the so-called new music in a Lydian style, which Plato criticized in a number of

<sup>34</sup> Gilhuly (p. 113, n. 2) refers to this source: Brabant 2008.

<sup>35</sup> Hom. *Il.* 9. 128–130, 270–272: the catalogue of gifts Agamemnon wants to give Achilles mentions seven women of Lesbos, who surpassed all women in beauty (*κάλλει ἐνίκων φῶλα γυναικῶν*, *ibid.* v. 130, 272).

<sup>36</sup> Here, Gilhuly’s reference to Aristophanes is inaccurate.

<sup>37</sup> New works on ancient music: Hagel 2009; Afonasin, Afonasina, Shchetnikov 2015; Lynch, Rocconi (eds.) 2020.

his works (*Leg.* 700a–701a; *Rep.* 398e–399a). Still earlier, we find a comical description of such music in Aristophanes (*Ran.* 1301–1308), which portrays “a culturally debased woman whose relationship to the musical tradition is emblemized by the use and abuse of the Lesbian poetic tradition” (p. 99). Thus, the word *λεσβιάζειν* combines two meanings: one comes from a particular feminine sexual practice,<sup>38</sup> the other derives from the new music mass culture, which resulted in the following: “Lesbianism as sexuality was invented on the Athenian comic stage to describe an Athenian style of music”, and so, according to Gilhuly, we can assert that “Lesbianism therefore comes from Athens” (p. 101).

Central in this story is the figure of Sappho, who initially does not carry strong allusions to what we now understand as lesbianism, “that homoerotics were rarely associated with her image” (p. 101). More often she was treated “through the heteroerotic literary prism”, which was superimposed by the figure of masculine hetaera through her brother’s relation with the hetaera Rhodopis (*Hdt.* 2. 135). In the Roman age, the works of Catullus merge the image of Sappho with that of his heroine, Lesbia (p. 108); Horace also regards Sappho as his forerunner, calling her masculine (pp. 108–109), and, according to Gilhuly<sup>39</sup>, this adjective prompted the poet to incorporate Sappho in “the Roman discourse of female homosexuality” (p. 109). Of great interest is the discussion of Sappho’s image in Ovid’s “*Heroides*”, (15: the epistle from Sappho to Phaon, in which the poetess addresses women in Lesbos, v. 199–205) (pp. 109–110). Having analysed the poems by Catullus, Horace and Ovid, Gilhuly concludes that “Now Sappho can be masculine; she can be homosexual; she can be a poet” (p. 110).

In Lucian’s “*Dialogues of the Courtesans*”, we can find “the first explicit articulation of a sexual orientation associated with Lesbos” (p. 111). At the end of the chapter, the author warns against unearthing the reality with which images of Lesbos and Sappho could, or could not, be related, but to focus on the only available reality “that representations create” (p. 113). “The trajectory of Lesbos from Sappho to Lucian exemplifies the way that discourse creates sexuality and not the other way round. Lesbians do not come from Lesbos; they come from Athens and from Rome. Lesbians come from literature” (*ibid.*).

Chapter Six “Lesbos and the invention of heterosexuality in Longus’ *Daphnis and Chloe*” (pp. 117–137) proceeds with the topic of the previous chapter on Lesbos and lesbians. Gilhuly begins with a brief review of the information about the author of the novel, his name and the time when it was written (pp. 117–118),

---

<sup>38</sup> Meaning heterosexual *fellatio*.

<sup>39</sup> With reference to the article by J. Hallett “Female Homoeroticism and the Denial of Roman Reality in Latin Literature” (*non vidimus*).

drawing upon the works of her predecessors, though not getting involved in the discussion. She notes that by the time when Longus had been writing his work (the 2nd century AD), Lesbos had already gained the fictitious reputation, but the Ancient Greek writer chose only particular aspects of the locality when “presenting a new Lesbos to his reader” (p. 117). According to Gilhuly, Longus’s novel is a specific response to “the urban Imperial Roman and Athenian projection of Lesbos”, an attempt to create a new “‘geography of the mind’ for Lesbos” (pp. 117–118).<sup>40</sup> Longus’s other Lesbos is a *topos* of the origin of heterosexuality, the place where women are dominated by men, and pederasty is deemed unnatural and comic.

In Longus’ “Daphnis and Chloe” the actions take place in the vicinity of Mytilene, in the countryside, and the researcher stresses that the pastoral landscape of the novel pursues exclusively an ideological aim: “to naturalize a version of heterosexuality that is inextricably intertwined with the place where it happens” (p. 119). The logic of such an assertion is that landscape is always related to the function of naturalization of certain social constructs, that is, things *artificial* in themselves, which, when being placed in certain natural environment, become natural and canonical.<sup>41</sup>

Gilhuly juxtaposes this work with the extant novels by Chariton, Achilles Tatius, Xenophon, Heliodorus in which they speak about their heroes’ exotic travels across almost the entire *oecumene* (for the most part, its eastern territories) (p. 120).<sup>42</sup> She underlines the principal “locality” of action in Longus’s novel; it is confined solely to Lesbos (contrary to many other adventure novels about travels).<sup>43</sup> According to Gilhuly, Hellenes’ vision of Lesbos was dual: it existed as a *fantasy land* and an island of a *historical reality*, it existed both in *mythical* and *historical* times (p. 121).

Sappho’s poetry is an essential part of the identity of Lesbos as a place, and Gilhuly examines the allusions in “Daphnis and Chloe” to the poetry of “the Tenth Muse” (about intertextual conversation between Sappho and Longus, about a single apple in a tree and the meaning of Daphnis’s act when he, contrary to all

---

<sup>40</sup> With reference to the work by Hugh Mason “The ‘Aura of Lesbos’” (Mason 2006).

<sup>41</sup> Roland Barthes enjoyed unmasking such nature-society mythology in his “Mythologies”.

<sup>42</sup> On geography in the ancient novel, see, for example, works by A. V. Podossinov: Podossinov 2013; Podossinov 2014; Podossinov 2015, 131–144; Podossinov 2020a; Podossinov 2020b.

<sup>43</sup> Gilhuly defines “Daphnis and Chloe” as “topographical novel”, “it is a novel that is written by a place” (p. 119). On another occasion she says that “the space of the novel is miniaturized” (p. 121).

the entreaties of his mistress, picks the fruit, pp. 124–127); she analyses stories about Phatta, Syrinx, Pan, Echo, Lykainion and other characters (pp. 127–135).<sup>44</sup> The author shows that there is no feminine homoeroticism in this novel, and even the perception of pederasty in “Daphnis and Chloe” is openly negative: the parasite Gnathon, a comic character that appears in the fourth book makes an attempt to rape Daphnis; but Gnathon is presented as a repulsive creature possessed by an unnatural passion, and the author shows that in Daphnis’s eye pederasty is an affront to Nature (see the discussion: p. 136, n. 7, with the discussion on the issue: S. Goldhill and J. J. Winkler).

As Gilhuly points out that, by the time when the novel “Daphnis and Chloe” had been written, Lesbos was strongly associated with feminine homosexuality, that is why Longus did decide to write the novel – a heteroerotic education – to win the island back to heterosexuality, describing it as a place instrumental in the production of heterosexuality, hence, “Longus knew that place and sexuality are shaped in part by literature” (p. 135). Still, it is difficult to accept Gilhuly’s intention of making Longus a conscientious ideologist and propagandist of “traditional” values since we know nothing about the personality of the writer except the time when he lived.

For some odd reason, Kate Gilhuly’s book lacks a conclusion. Why did the author not find it necessary to sum up her research and systematize the results? Are the chapters conclusive? It turns out that the researcher amassed in one book all her articles (and some of them, as noted above, have been already published) which analyse different ancient sources on certain topics, yet she disregarded the *noblesse-oblige* conclusions.

The very pattern of presenting material is not indisputable: thus, the second chapter, in our view, is rather superfluous in the whole structure of the narration; the content (the analysis of “Medea” from the erotic viewpoint) of the chapter is interesting, but it leads the review astray rather than approaches the aim of the book. It seems that the whole book is chapters patched to defy a system: neither geographically (Gilhuly narrowed her study to the *poleis* of Corinth, Sparta and the island of Lesbos), nor chronologically (again, a “selective” choice from the centuries-long history – from the Greek antiquity to the Roman Empire of the late principate), nor generically (different monuments of the Hellenic culture). The research is conducted solely on the literary monuments though the title of the book declares literature *and culture*, and the Introduction enlarges on it. But

---

<sup>44</sup> On the names of the characters of this novel, see a new research work: Braginskaya 2020.

the author confines her research strictly to literary sources, ignoring iconographic monuments which would allow her to highlight other aspects of the chosen topic.

Yet here is another substantive remark on Gilhuly's research work: in the Classical Age, all the amassed facts of the Athenians' presentation of "others" (non-Athenians), including the obscene language, are largely scenes from the Attic comedy, first and foremost, from Aristophanes' dramas. But the comedy is like a "crooked mirror" distorting reality and exaggerating everything. Apart from the words with erotic connotations, the comedian writers used animalising, feminising, infantilising and other suchlike pejorative and playful words.<sup>45</sup> As often as not, it is noted that when the Athenians compared individuals from other *poleis* with women it purported their (the Athenian citizens') superiority over aliens: pp. 6, 10, 74–75, 88, 89, n. 1. It would be expedient to consider the collection "Clio and Thalia" (2017) published as a supplement to the American electronic journal "Histos".<sup>46</sup>

The book cites huge excerpts (sometimes longer than half a page) from various sources and their English versions (for example, pp. 106, 118, 123, 125, 127–128, 131, 133, 134), but, amazingly, never once does Gilhuly mention the relevant source, *locus classicus*, pertaining to the topic: Lucian's "The Two Kinds of Love", which speaks about hetero- and homosexuals, all the advantages and disadvantages of the relations. The essentialist approach, and everything related to the essentialism, is not popular nowadays. Yet, there are some well-known researchers who either adhere to it directly,<sup>47</sup> or at least share some of its fundamental postulates.<sup>48</sup>

Along with the Roman and the Persian Empires, the author frequently refers to Athens of the Classical Age as an empire, speaks about the Athenian imperialism and imperial ambitions of the *polis* of the 5th–4th centuries BC, for example, "Athens began to grow into an imperial power" (p. 2), "Athenian discursive impe-

---

<sup>45</sup> Lateiner 2017, 39: "Associating rivals with polluting excretions and their relevant organs is the crude first step in the Art of Dissing: Aristophanes supplies explicit and metaphorical vocabulary for defecate, urinate, crepitate, and expectorate (spit or vomit). To *animalise*, *feminise*, *infantilise*, and/or *barbarise* (after Mykale) your opponent, diminishes his standing. Actual sexual penetration (rape or its analogues) ultimately degrades domestic and foreign opponents, short of delimiting or murder"; and in general see Lateiner 2017, 39–47; discussion: Sinitsyn 2020a, 464–465; Sinitsyn 2020b, 25–33, 65–67.

<sup>46</sup> First and foremost, D. Lateiner's article (referenced in the previous note) and other works in the collection Baragwanath, Foster (eds.) 2017.

<sup>47</sup> For example, Boswell 1980; Thorp 1992; Epstein 1987; Richlin 1993 and others.

<sup>48</sup> Among them: Hubbard 1998; Cantarella 2002; Davidson 2007; Kapparis 2018; Percy 2004.

rialism” (p. 6), “Athenian polis... as a maritime empire (p. 7, *bis*), “Athens’ self-definition as a rising and falling empire in the fifth and fourth centuries” (p. 48) and so forth. But it is not correct to equate the Athenian *arche* to the Roman empire, and here, the author should have clarified the vision of the Athenian *polis* as a “maritime empire” or “discursive imperialism” of Athens (there is a corpus of literature devoted to the topic, and it will be appropriate to refer to it since experts are well aware of it).

As to Gilhuly’s remarks on Euripides’s tragedy “Medea” as an exclusive drama in which the action takes place in Corinth, we admit that it deserves special attention. But, in our opinion, the author should have mentioned that it is the only tragedy set in Corinth that *is known to us*. Since only a small number of Ancient Greek works have come down to us (34 tragedies written by three authors as compared with hundreds of plays created by Athenian dramatists), and most of them only in scarce fragments (and sometimes only titles are extant), we cannot specify their localities. For instance, the assertion made over a hundred years ago to the effect that Sophocles’ tragedy “Rhizotomoi” (“The Root-cutters”) based on the subject of mythical tales about Argonauts (Sophocl. fr. 534–536, *TGF IV*) also had a story where Medea, the barbarian sorceress, plotted to take revenge on Jason, who intended to marry the Corinthian princess.<sup>49</sup>

Gilhuly writes about the King of Sparta, Cleomenes I, gone mad (p. 56 and cf. p. 59: “whose madness was discussed above”), she has trust in the stories of his mental disease caused by Scythian-style-wine-drinking (proverbial *ἐπισκύθισον* in Hdt. 6. 84. 3). Cleomenes’s story (and a similar one about Pausanias) prompts Gilhuly to conclude that the Spartans were strong only when they fenced their system against other *poleis* (p. 56 on the Scythian influence on Cleomeones), and that they did not approve of communication with other *poleis* (p. 59). The thesis of the Spartan insulation is true (and surely well-known), but reference to Cleomeones is misfit. Accounts of his ailment and his horrible death are found in Herodotus’ “Histories” (6. 75, 84), retold in the later Hellenic tradition (for example, Ael. *Var. hist.* 2. 41)<sup>50</sup>; but the legends which painted a gloomy picture of his persona were created in Sparta after the death of the glorious king, and they must

---

<sup>49</sup> See, for example, Zelinskij 1914, 217–218; Jarkho 1990, 384.

<sup>50</sup> The analysis of ancient tales about deeds and death of Cleomenes I, see in recent works (each one with a review of bibliography): Surikov 2005, 211–269; Pechatnova 2006; Welwei 2007; Pechatnova 2007, 82–141. Discussion of *μανία νοῦσος* of the Spartan king in “The Histories” by Herodotus, see in the article by Paul Demont “Herodotus on Health and Disease”: Demont 2018, 187–188. Igor Surikov (2005, 266) and Larisa Pechatnova (2006, 58–62; 2007: 127–134) deny the veracity of the tale about Cleomenes’ madness.

have been caused by the propaganda spread against Cleomenes, and they hardly can testify to his actual biography.<sup>51</sup>

We find it rather unconvincing when Gilhuly expounds her view on the dual perception of Lesbos (an outlandish, while also a real, historical, island) by the Hellenes of other *poleis* (first of all, surely, by the Athenians), that has been mentioned earlier. In her view, such a perception was formed because this island in the eastern fringe of the Aegean Sea was the borderland between the Hellenic and alien territories (p. 121). But this explanation seems wrong since the Greek realm goes eastward beyond Lesbos. The entire eastern coast of the Aegean Sea belonged to the Hellenes, while the “mental border” ran inward Asia Minor. And, Lesbos, in this sense, was not a unique location since there were other Greek islands off the coast: Samos, Chios, Kos, Rhodes, and dozens of smaller ones.

To render the Greek word *ἑταίρα* Gilhuly uses either the Latin transcription (there are dozens of *hetaira*, *hetairai*, *hetairein*, or *hetaera*), or the English word *courtesan* (derived from the French, *courtisane*); the latter denotes women living under the protection of rich lovers, ruler and aristocrats. The Index of the book says: “hetaera see prostitution” (p. 149). The author equates hetaerae with courtesans and prostitution, and they become interchangeable. But the Attic authors used the word *ἑταίρα* to denote “a girl-friend”, that is, a mistress, and if the French word can be used (yet with certain reservations) to refer to “courtesans” at the courts of Hellenic rulers,<sup>52</sup> but hetaerae of the Classical Age were not necessarily well-off and influential living their lives in a splendid fashion. Even more so, this cannot be said about those *ἑταίραι* whose stories are found in “Dialogues of the Courtesans” (exactly in the work with which Gilhuly begins her research): the position of Lucianian “courtesans” (and only in scare quotes), their conversations, dreams, advice given by their female friends and mummies, low stations of most men they were intimate with – all this can only provoke laughter; their status and

---

<sup>51</sup> “Yet the traditional view of Cleomenes’ congenital mental deficiency, extravagant behaviour and drunkenness contradicts the abundant evidence of his long and rather successful military and political career. The sudden madness of the king was too convenient an excuse for the Spartan authorities to believe in (with references to opinions made many scholars who questioned the veracity of the tale about Cleomenes’ suicide caused by his madness); “Massive propaganda spread both within and without Sparta, proved successful, and the ancient tradition had that Cleomenes was a madman and blasphemer whom gods had deprived of reason and forced to commit a suicide”. As we have demonstrated, the highly negative attitude to Cleomenes started growing in Sparta only after his death, and while alive, he was well-known in the whole Greece as a talented general and honest politician” (Pechatnova 2006, 59, 61, 62; Pechatnova 2007, 129, 132, 134).

<sup>52</sup> See, for example, Ogden 1999, 215–281.

behaviour have nothing in common with that of the French glitterati of the 18th century.

Sensuality, gender, hetaerae, pederasty and other piquant aspects of this book are surely substantive issues to understand culture; but if we are concerned not with these fashionable topics proper (undoubtedly, they have been mainstream in the Western scholarship of the recent decades), if we speak about the contribution to the study of Antiquity, Gilhuly's book evokes a lot of comments and objections. We assess the scholarly contribution not to the gender theory but specifically to the classical studies.

It should be also noted that we cannot argue with full confidence that gender and sexual specifications are an unambiguous component of what we can describe as 'Ancient Greek identity', and if the sexual sphere played such an important role in the Ancient Greek self-identification as it does in our time, – the Hellenes were greatly concerned about a host of other factors which worried them more than "the affairs of Eros and Aphrodite", for example, nourishment, wars, their households, or religious and ceremonial practices.<sup>53</sup> Likewise, the thesis to the effect that "Athens represented the sexual culture of other places as nonnormative – that is, different from the implicit Athenian norm – a normativity that is

---

<sup>53</sup> Here we cannot help but give credit to *Michel Foucault's* insight, who, after having said heavens only know what about the ancient sexuality, was clever enough to fathom that "the affairs of Aphrodite" were of much less concern for the Greeks than they are for us. Consequently, it is not improbable that if they did have something resembling an "identity", the extent of its sexualisation raises great doubts. On the other hand, "the right love for adolescent boys" as a characteristic feature distinguishing the Athenian society from that of barbarians and so greatly cherished by Plato, may well allow for "incorporating" the realm of Eros into the notion of "identity". Yet! It is not inconceivable that the philosophers Socrates, Plato, Xenophon were indeed the first persons who placed the question on the "agenda". Nor is it inconceivable that the code of Attic pederasty, morally devaluated during the Peloponnesian War, when those whom we would now call "nouveaux riches" and petty bourgeoisie started abiding by it, was a matter of great concern for Plato, and that is why he decided to create a new conception *dikaios eros* to bring back the erstwhile aristocratic social practice to aristocratism, only it was to be not the aristocratism of blood but that of spirit. Plato, one of the elite and who had strong fellow feelings for his class, could not tolerate how certain tanners and potters would practice pederasty, caring only for the flesh, not souls, of the young men. But here we face yet another problem, namely: the attitude of common people to pederasty – whether it was the lot of the elite or everyone practiced it. In greater detail, see Hubbard 1998; Lear 2014; Shapiro 2015.

never explicated, although its contours can be traced through reflection” (p. 4).<sup>54</sup> It seems that the Athenian ambiguity of the “norm” cannot be of much use in representing other identities as “non-normative” or deviant.

It goes without doubt that a scholarly work requires from the author, first and foremost, meticulousness of analysis, the awareness of classical monuments, the exactness of references to the sources and the general accuracy in arranging the work. Just like that: the exactness before anything else. And here we have a lot of issues with the text under consideration and its author as an expert in the study of ancient culture.

A lot of verbs in the note 3 on page 10 (see above) are questionable: they are either repeated, or displaced, or substituted for: αἰγυπτῖαζεν instead of the right αἰγυπτῖάζεν; an absurd word αὐβαρίζεν comes to life, which does not exist in the Ancient Greek; but it seems (? owing to the incoherence of the author, you cannot be certain) that here it is a *lapsus calami*, and there should have been συβαρίζεν<sup>55</sup>; the verb χαλκιδίζειν is repeated twice (the first time it beats the alphabetical order, probably “substituting” for another word, but there is no guessing which one). There are frequent inaccuracies in diacritical signs: Λάμιαν — Λαμίαν (p. 39), ἄς, αἰ instead of ἄς, αἰ (p. 93) and many other occasions; “portmanteau” words (for example, πρὸς|ταῦτα, p. 39), missing words and misprints, two stresses in one word, and sometimes no stress at all; p. 13 (3 mistakes), p. 15 (10 mistakes), p. 22 (12 mistakes), pp. 23, 25, 26, 27 (6 mistakes) and 27 mistakes (in Latin quotes), p. 32, pp. 51–52 (4 mistakes in one quote), p. 57 (4 mistakes), etc.

The author adduces quotations from Ancient Greek sources together with their English versions. The quotes are long. But they are not always rendered properly, missing words and phrases. And each quotation can have several such blunders. Thus, for example, there are lots of mistakes in the Greek sentence on page 19 (we refer to some of them): “...οἱ Ἑλληγνες (here and further on a spiritus is required: Ἑλληγνες), ... ὀρέων (must be ὀρέων) καὶ θρήικας (with a capital letter: Θρήικας) καὶ Σκύθας (and here, the middle of the word must have a lower-case letter: Σκύθας) ... ἐς τὸν πολεμον (the stress is missing: πόλεμον) ἀνειμένους (a colon is missing after the word) ... οἱ Ἑλληγνες (it must be: Ἑλληγνες), Ἴσθμίου...” (excess signs in the word, p. 13), etc., and there are lots of such blunders in this rather small book. On page 20 the quote from the original (Xenophon’s “Oeconomicus”)

---

<sup>54</sup> Here Gilhuly refers to the handbook on the geography of sexuality: Brown, Browne (eds.) 2016.

<sup>55</sup> The verb “live a life of a sybarite”, i.e., like inhabitants of south-Italic Greek city of Sybaris; this word meant “to live in contentment and luxury”.

misses not only diacritical signs but also an entire sentence which is part of the English translation used here.

Throughout the book, Ancient Greek words are spelled differently. For example, κρυπτεία has “u” — *krupteia* (p. 60) and συσσίτιον in Latin rendering contains “y” — *syssition* (p. 60, cf. p. 73: *syssitia*), likewise, *sybarizein* (p. 1, 93), but *kata-pugon* (p. 81, *bis*). The philosophical term σωφροσύνη is rendered four times as *sophrosune* (pp. 50–51), but at the same place three times (*sic!*) as *sophrosyne* (pp. 50–51). Now it is *hetaira*, now *hetaera*; and the word *lakonizein* occurs now with a capital letter, now with a low case, now in inverted commas, now without, *etc.*

The variety of spellings of personal and geographical names is confusing: Kleitagora and Cleisthenes; Xenokleides, but Bdelycleon and Philocleon; Archedice, but Arkheanassa; Akropolis (p. 74) and Acropolis (p. 81); Demetrius (p. 34) and Demetrius (p. 42); Klonarion (1, *ter*, 111, 149) and simultaneously Klonarium (p. 111 — both versions occur in a two-sentenced passage; and also p. 112); Heraclia, and Heraclia in the next sentence (p. 18, *bis*); Archedice (p. 102), but Arkheanassa (p. 1, 112), Aesklines (p. 24), but Aeschines (pp. 29, 41, 97) Aeschin[...] (p. 71, n. 47), Antisthenes (p. 38), Lykourgos (pp. 61, 62), and about a dozen times, either Lycurgus (pp. 47, 49, 54, 57, 62, *et al.*), or Lycurgos (p. 64), *etc.* References to the same sources are also very variegated: now it is Plato, now Pl. (these are references to Plato); same goes for Herodotus: Hdt., or Hdt. Hist. (p. 22), on another occasion it is Hdt. Histories (p. 59) or differently: Herod. (p. 19). The name of Athenaeus is frequently rendered in the first part as Athenaios (pp. 12, 15, 18, *et al.*), but then over a dozen times in its Latinized form — Athenaeus (pp. 25, 26, 103, *ter*, 105, *bis*, 112, *et al.*; the same occurs in Index); Aristophanes and Aristotle are abbreviated in the same way: Arist. (for both authors: pp. 7, 57, 58, *bis*<sup>56</sup>, 67), but at the same time abbreviated references to Aristophanes frequently appear as Ar. (?); references to the comedy “Women at the Ecclesia” “Ecclesiazusae” appear as Ekk. (pp. 20, 94), or get “Latinized” Eccl. (pp. 115, 148), and suchlike “reshufflings”.

At times Gilhuly gives incorrect references to the ancient sources: for example, referring to Thucydides (p. 121): 1. 22, she should have given: 1. 22. 4; and also the proverbial phrase used by the Athenian historian is provided with a mistake (*sic*: κτῆμα εἰς ἄελ). The description of Aristagoras’ Map in “The Histories” by Herodotus belongs not to Chapters 49–55 of Book Five (as Gilhuly has it, p. 59), and Hdt. 5. 49, 52–54. As was already mentioned, Gilhuly adduces a long quote from Aris-

---

<sup>56</sup> Page 58 has an in-text reference Arist. *Peace* (reference to Aristophanes) and a little below, Arist. *Pol.* (Aristotle’s “Politics”).

totle, where the Athenian philosopher speaks about Lycurgus and his laws regarding Spartan women (p. 67). This one-and-a-half-page quotation is from “Politics” (!), but the American researcher refers only to *a single line* from Aristotle’s treatise: Arist. *Pol.* 1269b20, though she should have given another exact reference to the place cited: *Pol.* 1269b19–1270a15 (and it is over 40 lines of the original text of the source). The reference to Longus is also inaccurate: 4. 11. 4–7 (p. 114, n. 31), instead of the correct 4. 11. 2; there are incorrect references to Aristophanes and other source.

In the Notes on page 42 (n. 35), the reference to the edition of the comedy dramatist Machon is incorrect: Gow 1964, but in the Bibliography section the date is right: Gow 1965 (p. 142). The list of references is rather long (pp. 138–147), but it should be noted that the author largely draws upon English-language papers or English versions of foreign works. The list of used literature, like the book itself, contains quite a few inaccuracies. As was already noted, Gilhuly’s bibliography features only one article by F. Zeitlin (p. 147) though the author refers to two articles by her colleague, and either belongs to a different collection of 1990 (see pp. 3, 10, 120, 136). The list of literature has many other blunders and omissions, and the author is incorrect in the title of her own article of 2007 in “The American Journal of Philology” (p. 141). What accounts for that? It may be carelessness on the part of the author of the book, and the editor, and the proof-reader. Since most of the book consists of the parts already published as articles, it only needed to be arranged, lined up and revised.

In every edition, an index saves the reader the trouble of finding the page where certain proper and geographical names, and terms occur. The Index in Gilhuly’s book is incomplete (pp. 148–150). It misses many names of ancient authors and contemporary researchers, their works and various terms; and geographical names are used selectively. Somehow Hesiod, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Tiresias, Jason, Megilla, Demonax, Demonassa, Socrates, Cleomenes, Xerxes, Demaratus, Menander, Andromache, Neoptolemos, Hector, Hermione have been forgotten, though their names can be frequently found in the text. Yet, the Index contains Simone de Beauvoir and Judith Butler (p. 148; cf. pp. 5 and 10), well-known representatives of social philosophy and ethics, who had a profound effect on matters of feminism; as well as *Michel Foucault* (p. 149, cf. pp. 2, 5, 81–2), Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick (p. 150; cf. pp. 6, 10, 89). Strange “selectiveness” with an ambiguous gender-sexual focus. Or are these “gaps” just mere omissions: some names featured in the book happened to be considered and some left out?

Corrections could fill several pages should we have reworked the whole text. But why should we waste time on this? In fact, all this is but typographic trifles, but they are many times too many. And together, they deflate the overall impres-

sion of the book. All these unfortunate inaccuracies are surely the author's guilt. But it must be admitted that such oddities are unseemly for such a prestigious publishing house as "Routledge. Taylor & Francis Group".

The author and the publishers should have been more scrupulous to avoid these blunders and "discrepancies". The sources in *Altertumswissenschaft* are akin to formulae in humanities, and exactness in citing and references to them is an indicator of professionalism of the classic and the only thing that inspires confidence in the mastery of the researcher and gives strength to his/her conclusions. Aren't I right, colleagues?

Summing up, we may say that Gilhuly's book is a graphic example of how interestingly, creatively and heuristically the poststructuralist methodology may interpret and clarify certain – frequently familiar and indisputable – realities of the ancient culture. But with "Erotic Geographies" one cannot help feeling that the author overcomplicates this methodology by multiplying Ockham's entities, which finally results not in clarifying certain aspects but, on the contrary, in their greater prevarication. Numerous blunders look like the tattered-and-torn T-shirt the photograph of which (we are still unaware of its place and meaning in *the erotics of place*) for some unfathomable reason appears on the front cover of the quasi-geographical book on the ancient culture.

### Abbreviations

- CAF — *Comicorum Atticorum fragmenta*. T. Kock (ed.). Vol. I–II. Lipsiae: Teubner, 1880–1884.  
 TGF — *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*. S. Radt (ed.). Vol. IV: Sophocles. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977 (= 1999).

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Афиней. (2010) *Пир мудрецов. В 15-и книгах*. Т. 2: Кн. IX–XV. Пер. Н. Т. Голинкевича. Москва.  
 Афонасин, Е. В., Афонасина, А. С., Щетников, А. И. (2010) *ΜΟΥΣΙΚΗ ΤΕΧΝΗ. Очерки истории античной музыки*. С.-Петербург.  
 Батлер, Дж. (2002) *Психика власти: теории субъекции*. Пер. с англ. З. Баблюяна. Харьков, С.-Петербург.  
 Батлер, Дж. (2018) *Заметки к перформативной теории собрания*. Пер. с англ. Д. Кралечкина, под ред. А. Кондакова. Москва.  
 Брагинская, Н. В. (2020) "Как придумать имя: «Дафнис и Хлоя»" в кн.: А. В. Белоусов, Е. В. Илюшечкина (ред.). *Ното отпнιυт hογαrit: Сборник статей в честь 70-летия А. В. Подосинова*. Москва, 95–133.

- Бредихина, Л. М., Дипуэлл, К. ред. (2005) *Гендерная теория и искусство. Антология: 1970–2000*. Москва.
- Галанин, Р. Б. (2016) *Риторика Протагора и Горгия*. С.-Петербург.
- Галанин, Р. Б. (2019) “Две стратегии воспитания: софистическая и сократическая”, *Платоновские исследования* 11 (2), 137–152.
- Галанин, Р. Б. (2022a) “Эротика и пайдейя как фон диалога «Лисид»”, в кн.: Платон. *Диалоги «Лисид» и «Лахет»*. Исследование, перевод и комментарий Р. Б. Галанин и Р. В. Светлов. С.-Петербург, 37–57.
- Галанин, Р. Б. (2022b) “Греческий обычай: каковы истоки афинской пайдерастии?”, *Нож*. URL: <https://knife.media/paiderastia/>
- Галанин, Р. Б. (2022c) “Эротическая демократия: почему Перикл призывал граждан Афин стать любовниками своего полиса?”, *Нож*. URL: <https://knife.media/eros-daemosrasy/>
- Глухов, А. А. (2017) “Введение. Форма и контекст”, в кн.: Платон. *Федр*. С.-Петербург, 7–42.
- Деррида, Ж. (2000) *О грамматологии*. Пер. с фр. и вступ. ст. Н. Автономовой. Москва.
- Жеребкин, С. В. ред. (2001) *Введение в гендерные исследования*. Харьков; С.-Петербург.
- Зелинский Ф. Ф. (1914) Отрывки. В кн.: Софокл. *Драмы*. Пер. с предисл. и введением. Ф. Ф. Зелинского. Т. III. Москва, 185–421.
- Кон, И. С. *Лики и маски однополый любви: Лунный свет на заре*. 2-е изд., перераб. и доп. Москва.
- Ладынин, И. А., Габелко, О. Л., Кузьмин, Ю. Н. (2009) “Новая концепция династической истории эллинизма? Размышления по поводу монографии Д. Огдена”, *Античный мир и археология* 13, 120–148.
- Лихт Г. *Сексуальная жизнь в Древней Греции*. Пер. с англ. В. В. Федорина. Москва, 1995.
- Марру, А.-И. (1998) *История воспитания в античности (Греция)*. Пер. с фр. А. И. Любжина и др. Москва.
- Павлов, А. А. (2001) “Греческая paiderastia и античный полис: миф, реальность, философия”, *Адам и Ева* 1, 166–191.
- Печатнова, Л. Г. (2006) “Античное предание о гибели спартанского царя Клеомена I”, *Античный мир и археология* 12, 52–65.
- Печатнова, Л. Г. (2007) *Спартанские цари*. Москва.
- Подосинов, А. В. (2013) “География и географические знания в античном романе (некоторые наблюдения)”, в кн.: О. В. Раевская (ред.). *Вторые и третьи Аверинцевские чтения. К 75-летию со дня рождения академика С. С. Аверинцева*. Москва., 200–222.
- Подосинов, А. В. (2015) *Куда плавал Одиссей?: О географических представлениях греков архаической эпохи*. Москва.

- Подосинов, А. В. (2020a) "Alter orbis terrarum: «другие миры» в античной географии", *Индоевропейское языкознание и классическая филология (чтения памяти И. М. Тронского)* XXIV (1), 607–631.
- Подосинов, А. В. (2020b) "Плавание по океану в географических описаниях Плиния Старшего" *Шаги* 6 (1), 40–56.
- Селиванова, Л. Л. (2007) "Гендерные исследования в антиковедении", *Адам и Ева* 14, 7–36.
- Селиванова, Л. Л. (2017) "Гендерный подход и гендерные исследования в современном антиковедении", *Электронный научно-образовательный журнал «История»* 8/2 (56).
- Синицын, А. А. (2008a) "Plut. Mor. 785b: критические замечания о достоверности источника", *Мнемон* 7, 377–418.
- Синицын, А. А. (2008b) "Свежо предание..., или Историографический миф о близости двух античных писателей современников", *Res Cogitans* 4, 122–159.
- Синицын, А. А. (2008c) "Софокл и Скифский логос Геродота", *Археология Восточно-Европейской степи* 6, 269–292.
- Синицын, А. А. (2011) "По поводу упоминания в классической драме экстравагантного «боспорского феномена» (Soph. Frag. 473 TrGF 4 Radt)", *Боспорский феномен: население, языки, контакты*. С.-Петербург, 626–641.
- Синицын, А. А. (2020a) "Две веселых музы: о взаимосвязях и взаимовлиянии греческого историописания и аттической комедии", *Метаморфозы истории* 18, 7–89.
- Синицын, А. А. (2020b), "О задорной Клио, политизированной Талии и восприимчивой афинской публике (Review on *Clio and Thalia: Attic Comedy and Historiography* / ed. by E. Baragwanath, E. Foster (Histos, Supplement 6). Newcastle: Newcastle University, 2017)", *Вестник Русской христианской гуманитарной академии* 21 (3), 461–481.
- Синицын, А. А., Суриков И. Е. (2021), "Геродотовские логосы о древних этносах: новый сборник об этничности и идентичности в античности", *Мнемон* 21 (1–2), 201–231.
- Соссюр, Ф. де. (1977) *Труды по языкознанию*. Пер. с фр. под ред. А. А. Холодовича. Москва.
- Суриков, И. Е. (2005) *Античная Греция. Политики в контексте эпохи. Архаика и ранняя классика*. Москва.
- Суриков, И. Е. (2015) *Античная Греция: Ментальность, религия, культура*. Москва.
- Сэдживик, И. (2002) *Эпистемология чулана*. Пер. с англ. О. Липовской, З. Баблюяна. Москва.
- Ярхо, В. Н. (1990) *Фрагменты*. В кн.: Софокл. *Драмы*. Пер. Ф. Ф. Зелинского; изд. подгот. М. Л. Гаспаров, В. Н. Ярхо. Москва, 381–435.
- Balsley, K. (2010) "Between Two Lives: Tiresias and the Law in Ovid's 'Metamorphoses'", *Dictynna: Revue de poétique latine* 7, 13–31.
- Baragwanath, E., Foster, E., eds. (2017) *Clio and Thalia: Attic Comedy and Historiography*. Newcastle.

- Boehringer, S. (2021) *Female Homosexuality in Ancient Greece and Rome*. A. Preger (trans.). London, New York.
- Boisacq, É. (1916) *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Étudiée dans ses rapports avec les autres langues Indo-européennes*. Heidelberg, Paris.
- Boswell, J. (1980) *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality: Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century*. Chicago.
- Brabant, M. (2008) *Lesbos Islanders Dispute Gay Name*. BBC News, May 1, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/7376919.stm>.
- Brown, G., Browne K., eds. (2016) *The Routledge Research Companion to Geographies of Sex and Sexualities*. London; New York.
- Butler, J. (1990) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York; London.
- Cantarella, E. (2002) *Bisexuality in the Ancient World*. New Haven.
- Chantraine, P. (1970) *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*. T. II: E–K. Paris.
- Coleman, K. M. (1990) “Tiresias the Judge: Ovid ‘Metamorphoses’ 3,322–38”, *Classical Quarterly*, 40 (2), 571–577.
- Davidson, J. N. (2001) “Dover, Foucault and Greek Homosexuality: Penetration and the Truth of Sex”, *Past & Present* 170 (1), 3–51.
- Davidson, J. N. (2007) *The Greeks and Greek Love: A Radical Reappraisal of Homosexuality in Ancient Greece*. London.
- Demont, P. (2018) “Herodotus on Health and Disease”, in E. Bowie (ed.) *Herodotus – Narrator, Scientist, Historian*. Berlin; Boston, 175–196.
- Dover, K. J. (2016) *Greek Homosexuality*. With Forewords by S. Halliwell, M. Masterson, J. Robson. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Epstein, S. G. (1987) “Gay Politics, Ethnic Identity: The Limits of Social Constructionism”, *Socialist Review* 93, 9–54.
- Figueira, Th., Soares, C. eds. (2020) *Ethnicity and Identity in Herodotus*. London; New York.
- Foley, H. (1989) “Medea’s Divided Self”, *Classical Antiquity* 8 (1), 61–85.
- Frisk, H. (1960) *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bd. I–II. Heidelberg.
- Gabbert, R. (2020) “‘Throbbing Between Two Lives’: Gender, Pleasure and Insight in Literary Representations of Tiresias”, *The Foundationalist* 5(2), 2–23.
- Gilhuly, K. (2006) “The Phallic Lesbian: Philosophy, Comedy, and Social Inversion in Lucian’s ‘Dialogues of the Courtesans’”, in C. A. Faraone, L. K. McClure (eds.) *Prostitutes and Courtesans in the Ancient World*. Madison, WI; London, 274–291.
- Gilhuly, K. (2007) “Bronze for Gold: Subjectivity in Lucian’s ‘Dialogues of the Courtesans’”, *American Journal of Philology* 128 (1), 59–94.
- Gilhuly, K. (2009) *The Feminine Matrix of Sex and Gender in Classical Athens*. Cambridge; New York.
- Gilhuly, K. (2014) “Corinth, Courtesans, and the Politics of Place” in K. Gilhuly, N. Worman (eds.) *Space, Place, and Landscape in Ancient Greek Literature and Culture*. Cambridge; New York, 171–199.

- Gilhuly, K. (2015) "Lesbians are Not from Lesbos", in R. Blondell and K. Ormand (eds.) *Ancient Sex: New Essays*. Columbus, 143–176.
- Gilhuly, K., Worman, N. eds. (2014) *Space, Place, and Landscape in Ancient Greek Literature and Culture*. Cambridge; New York.
- Giusti, E. (2018) "Tiresias, Ovid, Gender and Trouble: Generic Conversions from 'Ars' into 'Tristia'", *Ramus* 47 (1), 27–57.
- Gow, A. S. F. (1965) *Machon: The Fragments*. Cambridge.
- Hagel, S. (2009) *Ancient Greek Music: A New Technical History*. Cambridge.
- Halperin, D. (1990) *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality and Other Essays on Greek Love*. New York; London.
- Halperin, D. (2002) *How to Do the History of Homosexuality*. Chicago.
- Halperin, D., Winkler, J. J., Zeitlin F. eds. (1990) *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*. Princeton.
- Hartog, F. (1980) *Le miroir d'Hérodote: Essai sur la représentation de l'autre*. Paris.
- Hartog, F. (1988) *The Mirror of Herodotus: The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History*, J. Lloyd (trans.), Berkeley.
- Henderson, J. (1991) *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*. 2nd ed. New York; Oxford.
- Hubbard, T. K. (1998) "Popular Perceptions of Elite Homosexuality in Classical Athens", *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and the Classics* (6) 1, 48–78
- Kamen, D. (2012) "Naturalized Desires and the Metamorphosis of Iphis", *Helios* 39 (1), 21–36.
- Kapparis, K. (2018) *Prostitution in the Ancient Greek World*. Berlin; Boston.
- Kosofsky Sedgwick, E. (1990) *Epistemology of the Closet*. Berkeley.
- Krappe, A. H. (1928) "Tiresias and the Snakes", *American Journal of Philology*, 49 (3), 267–275.
- Larson, S. (2009) Review on Kate Gilhuly, *The Feminine Matrix of Sex and Gender in Classical Athens*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press xii, 208. *BMCR* 2009.11.23. URL: <https://bmc.brynmawr.edu/2009/2009.11.23/>
- Lateiner, D. (2009) "Transsexuals and Transvestites in Ovid's 'Metamorphoses'", in Th. Fögen, M. M. Lee (eds.). *Bodies and Boundaries in Graeco-Roman Antiquity*. Berlin; New York, 125–152.
- Lateiner, D. (2015) "Obscene Acts and Objects in Herodotos' *Histories*", in D. Dutsch, A. Suter (eds.) *Ancient Obscenities: Their Nature and Use in the Ancient Greek and Roman Worlds*. Ann Arbor, 91–124.
- Lateiner, D. (2017) "Insults and Humiliations in Fifth-Century Historiography and Comedy", in E. Baragwanath, E. Foster (eds.) *Clio and Thalia: Attic Comedy and Historiography*. Newcastle, 31–66.
- Lear, A. (2014) "Was Pederasty Problematized? A Diachronic View", in M. Masterson, N. Sorkin Rabinowitz, J. Robson (eds.) *Sex in Antiquity*. New York; London, 115–137.
- Liddell, H. G., Scott, R. (1996) *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Revised and Augmented Through-out by Sir H. S. Jones, with the Assistance of R. McKenzie; with a Revised Supplement. Oxford (=1940<sup>2</sup>).

- Liveley, G. (2003) "Tiresias/Teresa: A 'Man-made-Woman' in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*" 3.318–38", *Helios* 30, 147–162.
- Loroux, N. (1995) *The Experiences of Tiresias: The Feminine and the Greek Man*. P. Wissing (trans.). Princeton.
- Lynch, T. A. C., Rocconi E. eds. (2020) *A Companion to Ancient Greek and Roman Music*. Hoboken.
- Madden, E. (2008) *Tiresian Poetics: Modernism, Sexuality, Voice, 1888–2001*. Madison.
- Makowski, J. F. (1996) "Bisexual Orpheus: Pederasty and Parody in Ovid", *Classical Journal* 92 (1), 25–38.
- Mason, H. (2006) "The 'Aura of Lesbos' and the Opening of Daphnis and Chloe", in S. Byrne, E. Cueva, J. Alvares (eds.) *Authors, Authority, and Interpreters in the Ancient Novel*. Eelde, 186–195.
- Mastrorarde, D. J. (2002) *Euripides: Medea*. Cambridge; New York.
- McDermott, E. (1987) "Medea Line 37: A Note", *American Journal of Philology* 108 (1), 158–161.
- Michalopoulos, C. N. (2012) "Tiresias between Texts and Sex", *Eugesta: Journal of Gender Studies in Antiquity* 2, 221–239.
- O'Hara, J. J. (1996) "Sostratus Suppl. Hell. 733: A Lost, Possibly Catullan-Era Elegy on the Six Sex Changes of Tiresias", *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 126, 173–219.
- Ogden, D. (1999) *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death. The Hellenistic Dynasties*. London; Swansea.
- Page, D. L. (1938) *Euripides. Medea*. Oxford.
- Percy, W. A. (1996) *Pederasty and Pedagogy in Archaic Greece*. Urbana.
- Petit, C. (2020) "Naming Sexual Perversion: A Note on Galen, Simples X, 1", *The Journal of Greco-Roman Studies* 59 (3), 95–106.
- Podossinov, A. V. (2014) "The Indians in Northern Europe? On the Ancient Roman Notion of the Configuration of Eurasia", in A. V. Podossinov (ed.) *The Periphery of the Classical World in Ancient Geography and Cartography*. Leuven; Paris; Walpole, MA., 133–145.
- Richlin, A. (1993) "Not before Homosexuality: The Materiality of the Cinaedus and the Roman Law against Love between Men", *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 3(4), 523–573.
- Séchan, L. (1928) "La Légende de Médée", *Revue des études grecques* 40, 234–310.
- Shapiro, J. (2015), "Pederasty and the Popular Audience", in R. Blondell, K. Ormand (eds.) *Ancient Sex: New Essays. Classical memories/modern identities*. Columbus, 177–207.
- Sharrock, A., Möller, D., Malm, M., eds. (2020) *Metamorphic Readings. Transformation, Language, and Gender in the Interpretation of Ovid's "Metamorphoses"*. Oxford.
- Sinitsyn, A. A. (2012) "ΣΚΥΘΙΣΤΙ ΧΕΙΡΟΜΑΚΡΟΝ. Sophocles' Record of the Extravagant Scythian Custom", *Anabasis* 3, 49–73.
- Thorp, J. (1992) "The Social Construction of Homosexuality", *Phoenix* 46 (1), 54–61.
- Welwei, K.-W. (2007) "Kleomenes I. und Pausanias: Zum Problem von Einzelpersönlichkeit und Polis in Sparta im späten 6. und im frühen 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.", in

- B. Bleckmann (hrsg.). *Herodot und die Epoche der Perserkriege. Realitäten und Fiktionen. Kolloquium zum 80. Geburtstag von Dietmar Kienast*. Köln; Weimar; Wien, 37–52.
- Wenstrom, E. (2009) "Review on Gilhuly, Kate. *The Feminine Matrix of Sex and Gender in Classical Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009", *Women's Studies* 38, 818–820.
- Williams, C. A. (1995) "Greek Love at Rome", *Classical Quarterly* 45(2), 517–539.
- Winkler, J. J. (1990) *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece*. Routledge.
- Woodruff, P. (2006) "Socrates Among the Sophists", in S. Ahbel-Rappe, R. Kamtekar (eds.) *A Companion to Socrates*. Malden, MA; Oxford, 36–47.
- Zajko, V. (2009) "Listening With" Ovid: Intersexuality, Queer Theory, and the Myth of Hermaphroditus and Salmacis. *Helios* 36 (2), 175–202.
- Zeitlin, F. I. (1990a) "Thebes: Theater of Self and Society in Athenian Drama", in J. J. Winkler, F. I. Zeitlin (eds.) *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in Its Social Context*. Princeton, 130–167.
- Zeitlin, F. I. (1990b) "The Poetics of Eros: Nature, Art, and Imitation in Longus' 'Daphnis and Chloe'", in D. Halperin, J. J. Winkler, F. I. Zeitlin (eds.) *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*. Princeton, 417–464.

*References in Russian:*

- Afinej (2010) *Pir mydretsov [The Learned Banqueters]*. Vol. 2: Books 9–15. Per. N. T. Golinkevicha. Moscow.
- Afonasin E. V., Afonasina A. S., Shchetnikov A. I. (2015) *МОУΣΙΚΗ ΤΕΧΝΗ. Oчерки istorii antichnoj muzyki [ΜΟΥΣΙΚΗ ΤΕΧΝΗ. Essays on the History of Ancient Music]*. St. Petersburg.
- Butler J. (2002) *Psikhika vlasti: teorii subektsii [The Psychology of Power: the Theory of Subjects]*. Per. Z. Bablojana. Kharkov; St. Petersburg.
- Butler J. (2018) *Zametki k performativnoj teorii sobranija [Notes for the Performance Theory of the Meeting]*. D. Kralechkin (trans.), A. Kondakov (ed.). Moscow.
- Braginskaja N. B. (2020) Kak pridumat' imja: "Dafnis i Khloja" [How to come up with a Name: "Daphnis and Chloe"]. In: A. V. Belousov, E. V. Iljushechkina (eds.). *Homo omnium horarum: Sbornik statej v chest' 70-letija A. V. Podossinova [Homo omnium horarum: Collection of articles in honor of the 70th anniversary of A. V. Podossinov]*. Moscow. 95–133.
- Bredikhina L. M., Dipuell K. (eds.) (2005) *Gendernaja teorija i iskusstvo. Antologija: 1970–2000 [Gender Theory and Art. Anthology: 1970–2000]*. Moscow.
- Derrida Zh. (2000) *O grammatologii [Of Grammatology]*. Per. i vstup. st. N. Avtonomovoj. Moscow.
- Galanin R. B. (2016) *Ritorika Protagora i Gorgija [Rhetoric Protagoras and Gorgias]*. St. Petersburg.
- Galanin R. B. (2019) Dve strategii vospitanija: sofisticheskaja i sokraticeskaja [Two Types of Education: The Socratic and the Sophistic]. *Platonovskie issledovanija [Platonic Investigations]* 11/2: 137–152.
- Galanin R. B. (2022a) Erotika i pajdeja kak fon dialoga "Lisid" [Erotica and paideia as the background of dialogue "Lysis"]. In: Platon. *Dialogi "Lisid" i "Lahet"*. Issledovanie, perevod i kommentarij R. B. Galanina i R. V. Svetlova. St. Petersburg, 37–57.

- Galanin R. B. (2022b) "Grecheskij obyčaj": kakovy istoki afinskoj paiderastii? ["Greek Custom": What are the Sources of Athenian Pederasty?]. *Nozh [Knife]* 21.03.2022. URL: <https://knife.media/paiderastia/>
- Galanin R. B. (2022c) Erotičeskaja demokratija: pochemu Perikl prizyval grazhdan Afin stat' ljubovnikami svoego polisa? [The Erotic Democracy: Why did Pericles call on the Citizens of Athens to become Lovers of their Polis?]. *Nozh [Knife]* 06.05.2022. URL: <https://knife.media/eros-daemocracy/>
- Glukhov A. A. (2017) Vvedenie. Forma i kontekst [Introduction. Form and context]. In: Plato. *Fedr [Phaedrus]*. St. Petersburg. 7–42.
- Jarkho V. N. (1990) Fragments. In: Sophocles. *Dramas*. F. F. Zelinskij (trans.). M. L. Gasparov, V. N. Jarkho (red.). Moscow. 381–435.
- Kon I. S. (2003) *Liki i maski odnopoloj lyubvi: Lunnyj svet na zare [Faces and Masks of same-sex Love: Moonlight at Dawn]*. 2-e izd. Moscow.
- Ladynin I. A., Gabelko O. L., Kuzmin Yu. N. (2009) Novaja kontseptsija dinasticheskoj istorii elinizma? Razmyshlenija po povody monografii D. Ogdena [A New Concept of the Hellenistic Dynastic History? Thoughts about the Book of D. Ogden]. *Antichnyj mir i arkeologija [Ancient World and Archaeology]* 13: 120–148.
- Likht G. (1995) *Seksual'naya zhizn' v Drevnej Grecii [Sexual Life in Ancient Greece]*. Per. s angl. V. V. Fedorina. Moscow.
- Marru A.-I. (1998) *Istorija vospitanija v antichnosti (Gretsija) [The History of Education in Antiquity (Greece)]*. Per. A. I. Ljubzhina i dr. Moscow.
- Pavlov A. A. (2001) Grecheskaja paiderastia i antichnyj polis: mif, real'nost', filosofija [Greek pederastia and ancient polis: myth, reality, philosophy] *Adam i Eva [Adam and Eve]* 1: 166–191.
- Pechatnova L. G. (2006) Antichnoe predanie o gibeli spartanskogo tsarja Kleomena I [The Ancient Tradition about Spartan King Kleomenes I' Death]. *Antichnyj mir i arkeologija [Ancient World and Archaeology]* 12: 52–65.
- Pechatnova L. G. (2007) *Spartanskie tsari [Spartan Kings]*. Moscow.
- Podossinov A. V. (2013) Geografija i geograficheskie znanija v antichnom romane (nekotorye nabljudenija) [Geography and geographical knowledge in the ancient novel (some observations)]. In: O. V. Raevskaja (ed.). *Vtorye i tret'i Averintsevskije chtenija. K 75-pjatiletiju so dnja rozhdenija akademika S. S. Averintseva [The Second and Third Averintsev's Readings. To the 75 anniversary of academician S. S. Averintsev]*. Moscow. 200–222.
- Podossinov A. V. (2015) *Kuda plaval Odissej?: O geograficheskikh predstavleniakh grekov arkhaiskoj epokhi [Where did Odysseus sail? On the geographical concepts of archaic Greeks]*. Moscow.
- Podossinov A. V. (2020a) Oceanic Navigations in Geographical Descriptions by Pliny the Elder. *Shagi / Steps* 6/1: 40–56.
- Podossinov A. V. (2020b) Alter orbis terrarum: "Other Worlds" in Ancient Geography. *Indoevropskoe jazykoznanie i klassičeskaja filologija (chtenija pamjati I. M. Tronskogo) [Indo-European Linguistics and Classical Philology (Joseph M. Tronsky Memorial Conference)]* 24/1: 607–631.
- Sedgwick I. (2002) *Epistemologija chulana [Epistemology of the Closet]*. Moscow.
- Selivanova L. L. (2007) Gendernye issledovanija v antikovedenii [Gender Research in Ancient Studies]. *Adam i Eva [Adam and Eve]* 14: 7–36.
- Selivanova L. L. (2017) Gender Studies and the Current Gender Research in Ancient Studies. *Istorija* 8/2 (56). DOI: 10.18254/S0001680-7-1

- Sinitsyn A. A. (2008a) *Plut. Mor. 785b: kriticheskie zamechanija o dostovernosti istochnika* [*Plut. Mor. 785b: Critical Remarks on the Authenticity of the Sophocles' Ode Addressed to Herodotus*]. *Mnemon* 7: 377–418.
- Sinitsyn A. A. (2008b) Svezho predanie..., ili Istoriograficheskij mif o blizosti dvukh antichnykh pisatelej sovremennikov [Fresh legend..., or Historiographical Myth of Two Ancient Writers]. *Res cogitans* 4: 122–159.
- Sinitsyn A. A. (2008c) Sofokl i Skifskij logos Gerodota [Sophocles and the Scythian Logos by Herodotus]. *Arkheologija Vostochno-Evropeskoj stepi* [*Archaeology of the East European Steppe*] 6: 269–292.
- Sinitsyn A. A. (2011) Po povodu upominanii v klassicheskoj drame ekstravagantnogo “bospor-skogo fenomena” (Soph. Frag. 473 TrGF 4 Radt) [Regarding the Mention of the Extravagant “Bosporus Phenomenon” in the Classic Drama (Soph. Frag. 473 TrGF 4 Radt)]. *Bosporskii fenomen: naselenie, iazyki, kontakty* [*Bosporus Phenomenon: Population, Languages, Contacts*]. St. Petersburg. 626–641.
- Sinitsyn A. A. (2020a) O zadornoj Klio, politizirovannoj Talii i vospriimchivoj afinskoj publike [On provocative Clio, politicized Thalia, and the sensibility of the Athenian public] (Clio and Thalia: Attic Comedy and Historiography / ed. by E. Baragwanath, E. Foster (Histos, Supplement 6). Newcastle: Newcastle University, 2017). *Vestnik Russkoj khristianskoj gumanitarnoj akademii* [*Review of the Russian Christian Academy for the Humanities*] 21/3: 461–481.
- Sinitsyn A. A. (2020b) Dve veselykh muzy: o vzaimosvjazjakh i vzaimovlijanii grecheskogo istori-opisanija i atticheskoj komedii [The two Merry Muses: On Interrelations and Mutual Interference of Early Greek Historiography and Attic Comedy]. *Metamorfozy istorii* [*Metamorphoses of History*] 18: 7–89.
- Sinitsyn A. A., Surikov I. E. (2021) Gerodotovskie logosy o drevnikh etnosakh: novyj sbornik ob etnichnosti i identichnosti v antichnosti [The Herodotus Logoi on Ancient Ethnic Groups: A New Collection of Papers on Ethnicity and Identity in Antiquity]. *Mnemon* 21/1–2: 201–231.
- Sossjur F. de. (1977) *Trudy po yazykoznaniju* [*Linguistics Research*]. Per. s fr. pod red. A. A. Kholodovicha. Moscow.
- Surikov I. E. (2005) *Antichnaja Gretsija: Politiki v kontekste epokhi. Arkhaika i rannjaja classica* [*Ancient Greece: Politicians in the Context of the Epoch. Archaic and Early Classical Periods*]. Moscow.
- Surikov I. E. (2015) *Antichnaja Gretsija: Mental'nost', religija, cultura* [*Ancient Greece: Mentality, Religion, Culture*]. Moscow.
- Zherebkin S. V., ed. (2001) *Vvedenie v gendernye issledovanija* [*Introduction to Gender Research*]. Kharkov; St. Petersburg.
- Zelinskij F. F. (1914) Otryvki [Fragments]. In: Sophocles. *Drama*. F. F. Zelinskij (trans.). Vol. 3. Moscow. 185–421.