

There has been a flood of scholarship on same-sex love in ancient Greece since Dover's *Greek Homosexuality*. Much of this has been critical of Dover; still, almost all has accepted several of his key methodological choices. Dover defines Greek mores synchronically, through the interpretation of textual evidence from Classical Athens, in particular Aristophanes, Plato, and Aeschines. When he considers evidence from other places and times, he does so in the light of these texts. Subsequent scholarship has tended to narrow this focus further: Foucault, Cohen, and Halperin focus almost exclusively on Classical Athenian evidence; while they occasionally adduce later evidence, from such authors as Plutarch and Artemidorus, the evidence for places and times contemporary with or prior to Classical Athens is barely mentioned. Though there are good arguments for this methodology, there are also inherent problems in a synchronic view of the mores of a culture as long-lived and disunited as the ancient Greek world.

I argue that a particular weakness in this methodology stems from what seems to be its greatest strength: the ethical explicitness of these Classical Athenian texts. Several of them make relatively clear distinctions between approved and disapproved same-sex alternatives. Indeed, ethical discussion of this issue is so prominent in these texts that it led Foucault to assert that the custom of *paiderastia* (generally the approved option) was 'problematized' in Greek culture: it was (1985.192) "the object of a special — and especially intense — moral preoccupation."

In this talk, I argue that this high degree of problematization is typical of Classical Athenian (and later) Greek culture, rather than of Greek culture in general. Like so many things in Classical Athens — including the genres of comedy and philosophy themselves — it was novel and revolutionary in its cultural context. In our Archaic evidence (as well as that for such cities as Sparta and Thebes), *paiderastia* is not problematized to this degree. Indeed it would be more natural to say that the sources for these other places and times idealize this custom.

In this paper, I deal with the evidence from Archaic Athenian vase-painting. The argument has been made (Koch-Harnack 1983) that the gifts offered by erastai to eromenoi in courting scenes portray *paiderastia*, symbolically, as pedagogical. I argue that this is imprecise: gifts with possible pedagogical implications (hares, lyres) alternate in an unmarked manner with gifts without such implications (flowers, astragaloi) in these scenes. I argue that vase-painting nonetheless portrays the custom as broadly pedagogical by associating it, or indeed homologizing it, with activities that were valorized for males and seen in particular as educative for boys (hunting, athletics, the symposium). The pederastic relation serves to encourage boys to excel at these activities or to congratulate them for succeeding. While emphasizing the erotic nature of pederastic relations, vase-painting nonetheless also portrays the individuals involved (in particular eromenoi) as models of self-control. Finally, it defines *paiderastia* as ideal by excluding from it a group of attitudes and activities present in such contrasting iconographies as Satyr scenes, orgies with hetairai, and the komos scenes on Tyrrhenian amphorae. Key elements of pederastic iconography are absent from these scenes: nothing connects them to the gymnasium or hunting, and there is no evidence of courtship preceding their sexual activities. These latter include such activities as fellatio and group sex; the participants are either ugly or have sexual attributes (such as over-size penises, symbolic of a lack of self-control) absent from pederastic scenes; they display attitudes such as mutual desire that contrast strongly with the restrained attitudes of erastai and eromenoi. Thus, by techniques of both inclusion and exclusion, the iconography of pederastic scenes presents an idealizing vision of *paiderastia*.