

The hypothesis that oratory and comedy illustrate popular contempt for paederasty at Athens, while the homoerotics of Plato were confined to elites, remains influential in scholarship on Greek homoerotics (Hubbard 1983, 2003 p.86-9, 118-21, Sissa, Dover p.151, Donlan p. 64-5). Others have argued against this division of attitudes to homoerotic love along class lines, and rather suggest that the common citizen saw paederastic values as a source of aristocratic credentials to which he aspired (Halperin p.91-4, Winkler p.195-7, Stewart p.70-85, Fisher 1998, Wohl p.3-10, 30-72). However, new approaches to the attitudes and social composition of the dramatic audience and the Athenian jurors resolve this debate, revealing proper paederastic behavior as a *topos* of Athenian popular (as well as aristocratic) morality.

The hypothesis that invective against sexually passive elites in oratory and comedy reflects popular hostility to homoerotics postulates the same class of audience for both genres. However, although orators and comic poets maintain a populist fiction identifying their audiences with the entire *demos*, the two audiences did not completely overlap in their social composition. The comic audience, who paid to attend, likely contained wealthier citizens than the remunerated jurors (Sommerstein 1997, Todd 1990, Ober p.145-7). Nor did 'popular' theatre audiences always show distaste for homoerotics. Though the tragic audience has as much claim to popular status as the comic one, the plot of Aeschylus' *Myrmidons* was a sympathetic depiction of Achilles and Patrokles as paederastic lovers (Goldhill 1997, Plat.*Sym.* 180a, A.Fr.135 *TGrF*). The Athenian theatre-goers and the jurors are not securely socially contiguous with one another, nor was the 'popular' dramatic audience consistently contemptuous of homoerotic love.

The attitudes of 'popular' audiences toward the paederastic ideal support its general cultural acceptance. Speakers in court portray themselves as following paederastic *mores*, while accusing opponents of erotic malfeasance (contra Hubbard 1983 p.67-8, Sissa p. 156, Aeschin.1.136-9, 2.166, Lys.3.5, 39). In anti-elite invective, the men targeted for their sexual passivity are depicted as failed aristocrats. By thus violating their own honor, they fail to participate properly in erotics as well as other spheres (e.g. sympotic) of aristocratic activity (Wohl p.13, 44, Winkler p.186-97, Dem.54.3, 14-17, Aeschin.1.65, 70). Comic poets are not so much critical of paederastic ideals as they are cynical about their realization, attributing base motives to *erastes* and *eromenos* alike (Wohl p.88-92, Ar. *Plut.* 149-59, Amphis fr. 15 *PCG*). The condemnation of the mercenary *eromenos* and the insincere *erastes* are equally at home in philosophical praise of paederasty (Plat. *Sym.* 181d, 184a-b, Xen. *Sym.* 8.19-24). The paederastic ideal emerges as a *topos* of Athenian popular (and philosophical) morality. There is no evidence for social-class stratification in the moral evaluation of homoerotics at Athens.

