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he is looking through the phallocentric lens of male pederasty. If both women were *tribades* and were viewed as deviant social transgressors, then the pederastic model would not work.

Halperin employs a male model in another respect as well. We can document distinctions among sexual acts, relations, desire, and love in ancient texts concerning male pederasty and other male-male relations. Thus one man might have intercultural sex with a nondoinesious boy. Another might analytically penetrate a free citizen male against his will. A third might analytically penetrate a free citizen male who desired to be penetrated. The male creators of classical Greek culture would not conflate these situations or assume that if a sexual act occurred, it must have involved penetration, or that if penetration occurred, it must have been consensual. Halperin insists that what he has found for males must apply equally to women.

In one respect Halperin is correct, because Roman-period writers were often as steeped in the Greek pederastic model as he is. They too tried to view female homoeroticism through the lens of male pederasty, as an occurrence between two unequal partners, one of whom takes an active role.

But in another respect Halperin is profoundly incorrect, because the ancient male writers found at another level that they could not fit female erotic experience into a male model. Thus sometimes they presented both women as *tribades* and sometimes apparently only the "active" partner.

Pellegrini and Halperin go to extraordinary lengths to deny that some in the Roman world saw both female partners as deviant. First, they restrict themselves to the pagan sources. Why? They mount no arguments against the wide array of data I have assembled that demonstrate the similarity of conceptualizations of female homoeroticism among the various peoples of the Roman world. Pellegrini explicitly agrees with me on the similarity of Christian discourse to other discourses of the Roman world. Why do she and Halperin set aside Paul, early rabbinic Jewish sources, early Christian apocalyptic sources, Clement of Alexandria, Artemidorus, and others who define both female partners as *tribades* or as doers of unnatural or culpable deeds? They give no reasons. Even after setting an artificial boundary between pagans and their Jewish and Christian neighbors, Pellegrini and Halperin must contend with Asclepiades and Seneca the Elder. For Asclepiades (third century B.C.E.), Halperin defines sex between two women as "nontribadic" (having defined *tribadie* as "phallic"), but he has to concede that his interpretation runs counter to that of the medieval scholast who explicitly called the two women *tribades.* Even the nontribadistic explanation causes Halperin difficulties, however, because he must allow that "nontribadic sex" did not put the two women "beyond reproach." Then he returns to the phallocentric model that he has just declared in *tribas* was not necessarily to century R.C.E.-first century B.C.E. partners as *tribades,* even if having dismissed all nonpagan. Without explanation, exceptional.

Because Pellegrini and Halperin do not consider eroticism from a male perspective, they can dismiss the possibility of female eroticism. In contrast, I analyze the image of the penetrating woman in two centuries c.e., for example, repeat (which involves not only the eroticism of the woman, but also the eroticism of the men). Pellegrini and Halperin dismiss the eroticism of women as "ordinary girls." But

Pagan sources further indicate that implicate both female through a phallic perspective. For example, in the *Book of Hermes Trismegistos* to be a "fricatrix" (thrusting) or a fricatrix.** Fricata may "rub" hips during coitus. Fricatrix, literally "to rub." This text (which precedes that one term, *fricatrix* or *fricatrix* Greek source used by this astrological text) that sexual acts, sexual love, a The Latin term for "is loved" or "rubbing" certainly implies a lifelong tendency of fricatrices or cribriatae. What do we know? A thrust might be the possibly loved by a rubber, which assumes that active and passive
female pederasty. If both women were transgressors, then the pederastic other respect as well. We can document desire, and love in ancient texts male relations. Thus one man might another might actually penetrate a free free penetrate a free citizen male of classical Greek culture would if a sexual act occurred, it must have it must have involved desire, or gender, and sex must apply equally to women. Because Roman-period writers were and as he is. They too tried to view pederasty, as an occurrence between a man and another man. Consequently, incorrectly, because they could not fit female erotic they presented both women as tribe's partners. They padded to delay that some in the deviant. First, they rest there were no arguments against the wide similarity of conceptualizing peoples of the Roman world. Poetry of Christian discourse to other Roman society. Paul, early Christian sources, Clement of Alexandria, female partners as tribes or as tribeless. Even after setting an ideal Christian neighbors. Pederasty and Seneca the Elder. For men's sex between two women as a couple. But he has to concede that medieval scholastic who explicitly eudaimonic explanation causes Hal that "nontribadic sex" did not return to the phallocentric model that he has just declared irrelevant for Asclepiades: "But . . . to be fucked by a tribes was not necessarily to assume a deviant identity." But Seneca the Elder (first century B.C.-first century C.E.), our earliest source for tribes, defines both female partners as tribes, even though he assumes some sort of penetration. Halperin, having dismissed all nonpagan sources without reason, dismisses Seneca as exceptional. Without explanation, Pellegrini dismisses both Asclepiades and Seneca as exceptional.

Because Pellegrini and Halperin view the ancient sources on female homoeroticism through a male pederastic lens — an aroused and desirous male seeking gratification from a theoretically disinterested younger male — they cannot account for, and they therefore discount, alternative ancient conceptualizations of female homoeroticism.

In contrast, I analyze several ancient discourses that competed with the image of the penetrating woman. Church father Clement of Alexandria (second century C.E.), for example, represents women who, contrary to nature, behave like men by marrying other women and by being married by them. This passage cannot be explained with a pederastic model. Both types of women, those who marry and those who are married, behave like men and transgress against nature. According to Pellegrini's and Halperin's model, Clement should see the passive women as "ordinary girls." But he does not.

Pagan sources further document this multiplicity of discourses (some of which implicate both female partners) and the problem of monocular vision through a pederastic lens. For example, the Latin astrological work known as the Book of Hermes Trismegistus describes a constellation under which a woman will be a "crisatexis" or a fricatexis and is loved by women who are fricatexes. Crisatexis may derive from a verb that designates how one moves the hips during coitus. Fricatexis, like frictus, apparently derives from a verb meaning "to rub." This text (which predates the fourth century C.E.) constitutes further evidence that one term, fricatexis (this Latin term may translate tribes in the original Greek source used by this astrologer), designates both partners. Note, moreover, that sexual acts, sexual love, and possibly sexual relations come together here. The Latin term for "is loved" carries an affective sense, the terms for "thrusting" and "rubbing" certainly imply acts, and the astrological determinism of the text implies a lifelong tendency to perform such acts and to be oriented toward fricatexes or cricatexes. Whether "thrust" is a synonym for "rubber," we cannot know. A thrust might be a penetrator (hence sexual relations), but she is passively loved by a rubber, which either calls that interpretation into question or assumes that active and passive roles can alternate. If a thrust penetrates, then
perhaps a rubber is engaged in a nonpenetrative activity and the "active" role designates an activity other than penetration. We can see the impossibility of fitting this text into a pederastic model. Who is the active one, and who is the passive one? Do women mainly thrust, or do they mainly rub? Why do thrusters not love thrusters or rubbers but rather are loved by rubbers? This text illustrates a discourse that both Pellegrini and Halperin are unable to theorize with the model that they present as the ancient Greek and Roman model but that is, in fact, a Greek male pederastic model.

Halperin further objects that by using such terms as sexual contact, sexual relations, female homoeroticism, and sexual love interchangeably, I amalgamate "behavioral, sexological, sociological, forensic, psychological, psychiatric, and erotic categories into a single unifying idea." In the first place, his lexicographic method is flawed, for he assumes that a term's first attestation (as documented in the Oxford English Dictionary) forever after determines its meaning. If forensic specialists first used sexual relations, then (Halperin assumes) a judicial penumbra will forever surround the term. The sharp response of my reviewers to "the male sexual use of children" illustrates my point. They take sexual use not as its earliest English hearers might have done centuries ago but only in its contemporary, negative sense (which I also mean). Words change in nuance. Halperin does not demonstrate that our contemporaries think of a psychiatrist's couch when reading female homoeroticism but of a forensic expert when reading sexual relations. Rather than use jargon, I chose terms understandable to a broad audience or—in the case of homoeroticism—relatively unmarked, so that I could fill them with ancient nuances. Halperin does not demonstrate how my terminology prevents readers from understanding these ancient meanings. He, on the other hand, continues to apply homosexuality to ancient sources even though he has argued that one should not.18

Beyond my interchangeable use of originally forensic and psychiatric terms, Halperin objects that the ancients, on seeing a given sexual act, did not assume that both parties felt desire or love and that they could focus on male sexual acts other than penetration. Thus he and Pellegrini take pains to find an ancient woman seduced by a tribas whom the ancients viewed as normal, not deviant. Her lack of desire would confirm to the pederastic model that Halperin and Pellegrini define as the ancient model, namely, that of the nondesirous boy or adolescent preserving his honor through disinterest (feigned or genuine). In this case, gender inversion on the part of the tribas, rather than homoeroticism per se, would be at issue. Further, this "ordinary girl" would demonstrate that female homoerotic behavior challenged the social structure only through penetration and not through the refusal to have a woman rather than from a man.

The problem is that Pelle equivalents of the desirous adultology. Clement of Alexandria's discourse in which both female περίαστρος shows the ancient di eroticism; the author ultimately the Book of Hermes Trismegistus furtive assume a lifelong connection between toward a woman erotically and Halperin come to the disi Lucian of Samosata depicts as so the ancients can depict a woman panions for sex as seduced by tw only "phalic women" aroused di involved in the seduction of Leu [m.] I define the other, "Demon as kissing Leanna "like men" as Leanna as she kisses her, altho orgasm, albeit in the presence of an embarrassed participant who contributes to his eroticization of marriage but apparently tries to ronstution does not support Pelle homoeroticism per se was not a resembling the women as we through a potential irony: by high level of wealth at which they no sex with women. By representing voice of a nonhomoerotically incl such behavior is more shame Halperin does, however, a part of lesbian history. I state, "I've obscure the historical discontinu torial discontinuities between
The problem is that Pellegrini and Halperin are unable to find the female equivalents of the desirous adult man and the disinterested youth in ancient ideology. Clement of Alexandria and the Book of Hermes Trismegistos testify to a discourse in which both female partners are implicated. The Book of Hermes Trismegistos shows the ancient difficulty in even conceptualizing female homoeroticism; the author ultimately could not fit it into an active-passive model. The Book of Hermes Trismegistos further demonstrates that the ancients could indeed assume a lifelong connection between affection ("is loved") and a woman's orientation toward a woman erotically inclined toward her. The closest that Pellegrini and Halperin come to the disinterested, nondeviant female is Leaena, whom Lucian of Samosata depicts as seduced by two wealthy fellow courtesans. But that the ancients can depict a woman who is otherwise not oriented toward female companions for sex as seduced by two who are does not support Halperin's claim that only "phallic women" aroused disapproval. In fact, Lucian depicts both women as involved in the seduction of Leaena. One of them, "Megilla" (n.k.a. "Megillus" [m.]) defines the other, "Demonassa," as "her wife." Lucian presents both of them as kissing Leaena "like men" as she lies between them, with "the wife" biting Leaena as she kisses her, although apparently only Megilla/Megillus seeks an orgasm, albeit in the presence of her wife. Lucian's representation of Leaena as an embarrassed participant who does it only for a necklace and a fine linen dress contributes to his exoticization of a female couple that defines its relationship as a marriage but apparently tries to spice it up by adding in Leaena. But this representation does not support Pellegrini's and Halperin's hypothesis that female homoeroticism per se was not an issue. Lucian presents Megilla/Megillus as resembling the women of Lesbos, "with faces like men, who are unwilling to suffer 'it' from men"; thus for Lucian, the penetrating woman is not the only issue. Representing these women as wealthy courtesans may be Lucian's way of thinking through a potential irony: by having sex with enough men, women may achieve a level of wealth at which they no longer have "to suffer 'it' from men" but can have sex with women. By representing Megilla/Megillus and Demonassa through the voice of a nonhomoerotically inclined courtesan, Lucian may also communicate that such behavior is more shameful in women than in men. Halperin does, however, accept my classification of the material I cover as part of lesbian history. I state, "I will not use the term 'lesbian' in a way that could obscure the historical discontinuities," but I also remind the reader that the historical discontinuities between the concepts "tribas" and "lesbian" are no greater than
for slavery, marriage, or family (18). Halperin claims to have made quilms about these very terms his professional business. But in One Hundred Years of Homosexual-
ity he regularly uses them. Further, in his commentary he applies the term
career choice to ancient prostitutes, tribades, and others. Is career choice a proper
term even for Roman-period prostitution, in which a high percentage of prostitutes
were slaves? Halperin also applies batch and fem to ancient women, which I would
never contemplate doing. (Pellegrini also glosses tribas with "batch.") Batch and
fem come from an explicit subculture. Masculine role and feminine role do not
exhaust their meanings, as Halperin and Pellegrini imply by applying batch and
fem transhistorically to antiquity. To employ such terms for antiquity, even tongue
in cheek, precludes and obscures meanings. Ancient male preoccupations with an
overly large clitoris, for example, differ from the range of meanings that contem-
porary lesbians may apply to a batch role. Pellegrini's defining tribas as "batch" fixing a meaning that the ancients refrained from fixing.

Halperin also speaks of "masculine, phallic women who desire and sex-
ually penetrate other women and even boys" when he discusses the ancient
astrologers. In addition, he states that the astrologers focus only on the "tribades
to the exclusion of their female or male partners." The astrological sources, how-
ever, never claim that tribades or viragines (a parallel term) have male partners.
Halperin's statement is not mere imprecision. His concept of "masculine, phallic
women" is based on his dimorphic model of "phallic women" and their socially
acceptable partners. He argues that the ancients rejected only "sexual role rever-
sal," or "tribadism," that is, phallic women, and "not homoeroticism as such." Pel-
legrini's interpretation of tribas closely resembles Halperin's.

Pellegrini's lexicographic method shares Halperin's flaws, for both apply
the image of the tribas Phileaeis in the Latin poet Martial to all uses of the term
tribas.22 In contrast, I try to distinguish tribas as applied to both partners from
tribas as applied only to the active one, and instead of taking a single Latin poet
as an exemplar of all types of Mediterranean discourse, I take account of all
usages and consult ancient and medieval dictionaries. Halperin and Pellegrini do
not explain why we should prefer their definition of tribas as "phallic woman" or

"batch" to Hesychius's dictionary entry (fifth century C.E.) for dihetaristia
(another ancient term I discuss): "women who, like men, are oriented toward
female companions for sex, just like tribades.23" The rabbinic term, m'sallelet,
derived from "to rub" and applied to both female partners, also attests to a non-
phallic ancient understanding of sexual relations between women,24 as does appar-
ently friacratix (used by the Book of Hermes Trismegistos).

By viewing tribades through the lens of ancient male pederasty and exclud-
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The recognition of these meanings that do not fit this model, Halperin and Pellegrini are able to claim that only tribas (according to their limited definition) and "not homoeroticism as such" (Halperin) or "same-sex sexual contact" (Pellegrini) called forth the disapproval of the ancients. But they have had to define tribas in a way that runs counter to its earliest extant usage (Seneca the Elder), to the earliest relevant dictionary entry (Hesychius), and to some medieval usage; to ignore other equally relevant ancient terms; to define Asclepiades as an exception; to distinguish artificially between pagan and nonpagan sources; and to ignore such relevant pagan texts as the Book of Hermes Trismegistos.

**Ancient Pederasty**

Four of the five reviewers criticize my representation of ancient male pederasty as anachronistic and/or unfair to men. Pellegrini states that I identify pederasty as "sexual abuse." I do not. I use the phrase sexual abuse once, in connection with slavery. I point out that "the sexual use of slaves was commonplace in the Roman world" and raise the question whether we need to classify sexual contact between an elite Roman woman and a slave woman as sexual abuse (13; see also 6). Throughout the book I assess the sexual use of slaves negatively, and I pose questions about the power imbalance inherent in sexual contacts with slaves, including those between female slave owners and female slaves (49, 98, 102–5; see also 43); such assessment and questioning demonstrate that I do not idealize relationships between women as always and everywhere egalitarian. Why does no one criticize me for my ethical evaluation of the sexual use of slaves, including that of female slaves by female slave owners?

Stone and Pellegrini contrast the one occurrence of the phrase "the male sexual use of children" with my phrase "love between women" (56). Similarly, Kampen argues that I present pederasty and abuse as for men, while Halperin classifies the phrase "the male sexual use of children" as "misleading, tendentious, and inaccurate." To begin with, I use many other terms to describe male homoeroticism: "male same-sex love" (1n, 144), "boy-love" (50), "sexual love of boys" (54), "love for boys" (330), "love . . . between men" (69), "sexual love between males" (75, 361), "man who physically expresses love and affection toward a person of the same sex" (264), "men who love other men" (275), and "sexual love between men" (299). Furthermore, I use "sexual use of girls and boys" to explain Coptic church father Shenute's prohibition against women and men having sex with girls or boys (349). As in the case of slaves, I do not gloss over glaringly nonegalitarian relations between females. Shenute holds only the adult responsi-
ble for male and female pederastic encounters, which demonstrates that to do so was an ethical, albeit an infrequently exercised, option in antiquity and illustrates Sjenut’s concept of childhood.

I consider erotic relations between women in the context of ancient male pederasty because I have found a number of ancient male voices promoting male pederasty, but I have found almost none—pagan, Jewish, or Christian—supporting erotic relations between adult women. I also observe that Plutarch, one of the few authors to comment positively on female homoeroticism, praised female pederasty (50, 350). And such opponents of male pederasty as Philo of Alexandria held that the boy partner should be executed. Even the most conservative fundamentalist today would probably not argue for such a punishment. In his review of my book Kenneth Dover helpfully points out a piece of evidence in support of my thesis. I discussed Asclepiades, who calls on Aphrodite to hate two women, interpreted by a medieval commentator as tribades, who have lived contrary to her laws and have turned to dishonorable acts. (As noted above, both women are culpable.) Dover remarks that the same Asclepiades “shows himself in other poems to be an enthusiastic pederast, an activity which he treats as falling within the province of Aphrodite.”

Some readers may wonder how an ancient author who despises erotic relations between women can have accepted male pederasty. In Love between Women I argue that pederasty, whether male-male or female-female, was more acceptable in the Greek and Roman worlds than erotic relations between adult women or between free, adult, male citizens, because it maintained the hierarchical structure of society. The adult male Athenian citizen was to play the active role, either with a woman or with a younger male partner (or with another subordinate, such as a slave). These types of acts maintained a phallocentric social order. Asclepiades, who accepts pederasty and rejects sexual relations between two women, exemplifies this attitude.

Pellegrini argues that my feminist assessment of pederasty is inadequate because I neglect important theoretical work on the history of childhood and because ancient male pederasty was “carefully scripted” (5–6). I concede that I do not discuss the work of Philippe Ariès, Norbert Elias, and other historians of childhood.24 I appreciate Pellegrini’s and Elizabeth A. Castelli’s pointing out this omission to me, and I hope to read more deeply in this area to learn more about ancient and medieval definitions of childhood, including critiques that Ariës’s hypothesis on the modern invention of childhood is not borne out by the sources.25 However, the issue is not, as Pellegrini has it, whether people conceived of “childhood as a distinct period of life, which is or should be innocent of sexual ity,” but why the pagan world feared adult women or between them. If greater scorn on the part of male pederasty may have her penalties a high-status boy, but Pseudo-Lucian, the one who children,” assumes that permitted the man. He also writes that “a gay sexual use in the ancient world the natural use of the woman” vaginal and anal sexual use of a sexual use does have a negative connotation of the sexual services that they actually coincide well with Hellenic sexual pleasure.”

Halperin’s and Pellegrini’s work can gain an objective view of and into the fifth or the first or the offer classics and ancient history how our presuppositions and eth work with that fact. Some understand theological principles as “ethical codes” and, indeed, all of the ancient sources are.
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ity," but why the pagan world found pederasty more tolerable than erotic contact
between adult women or between adult men and why Christians and Jews often
heaped greater scorn on the passive boys than on their adult partners. Further,
although pederasty may have been carefully scripted to exclude, for example, anal
penetration of a high-status boy, ancient sources testify to the practice of anal pen-
etration. Pseudo-Lucian, the one case in which I refer to the "male sexual use of
children," assumes that permitting anal penetration is the boy's way of gratifying
the man. He also writes that "a woman, too, can be used [chroiomai] like a boy."20
I employ sexual use in the ancient sense of chrēsis (used by Paul in Romans 1.26:
"the natural use of the woman" [KJV]) or usus (used by Augustine to refer to the
vaginal and anal sexual use of a woman). In contemporary English, of course, sexual
use does have a negative connotation, which represents Pseudo-Lucian's depiction
of the sexual services that the boy is to provide to the adult male. The term
actually coincides well with Halperin's view that the aim of pederasty was "adult
sexual pleasure."29

Halperin's and Pellegrini's idea seems to be that if we just try hard enough,
we can gain an objective view of history; we can get out of the twentieth century
and into the fifth or the first or the second. Biblical scholarship has a great deal to
offer classics and ancient history in helping scholars self-consciously reflect on
how our presuppositions and ethical norms shape our interpretations and how to
work with that fact. Stone understands well how I consciously employ feminist theo-
logical principles as "ethical criteria" against which to weigh Paul's teachings
and, indeed, all of the ancient sources that I treat.

Erotic Orientation

Halperin, whose book One Hundred Years of Homosexuality I criticize for its the-
ory that the ancient world had no concept of lifelong or long-term erotic orienta-
tion, criticizes my book for the theory that it did. This argument is relevant to New
Testament scholarship, for many hold that if Paul had only known of sexual orient-
tation, he might have accepted same-sex sexual expression. In Love between
Women I voice skepticism about contemporary genetic and neuroscience research
on sexual orientation. In a conference several years ago at the Harvard Medical
School I used the ancient astrological and medical texts to point out to Simon
LeVay, Dean Hamer, and others how culturally limited the current dimorphic
model was, how the ancients, to whom this scientific research should theoretically
apply, would have been uninterested in the categories they employed in their
research. Halperin and I share the view of significant historical discontinuity, Fur-
ther, many of us lesbians simply do not experience ourselves as having known that we were "like that" since we were five years old, as we hear from many of our gay male friends. And many of us are surprised to fall in love with a man or to be married to a man but find ourselves falling in love with a woman. I also think that the innateness argument, as seductive as it may be, is not the best political strategy. Thus I have no stake in the debate about whether or not the ancients believed that some women are turned toward women because they were born that way. But I was surprised to find that some believed that the configurations of the stars, the improper mingling of the seeds at conception, or an anatomical or other medical condition could cause women and men to "turn" or be "oriented" in particular directions. In my book I point out that the ancients did not employ a dimorphic model of same-sex–opposite-sex orientation, that their framework differed greatly from twentieth-century models, and that it included factors central to Roman-period culture, such as social status and sexual role—hence men inclined toward low-status women, slave women, or foreign women or men inclined to be both passive and active because their father's and mother's seeds had clashed at conception.

Halperin argues that the presence of prostitutes as a parallel to tribades in the ancient astrological texts demonstrates that those texts concerned not erotic orientations but social types, and he ascribes to me an understanding of tribas and virago as having "an innate, fixed, lifelong dimension of the personality, a deep-seated sexual or erotic orientation" and as missing the fact that tribades and viragines, like prostitutes, were social types. He thereby shows that he has misconstrued the principal, feminist thesis of Love between Women, which is that people in the Roman world opposed women who were erotically oriented toward other women, because they recognized the structural danger to public social order in such personal behavior, even when private. For this reason I would never apply to tribas and virago such modern concepts derived from psychology or psychoanalysis as "personality" or "deep-seated." My horizon for the terms erotic orientation and sexual orientation is the social order of the Roman Empire. Against the backdrop of colonizing, elite Roman males and females, who dominated an empire of subjugated, foreign peoples with the help of an economy dependent on vast numbers of slaves, we can readily understand why the astrologers servicing the Roman world included not only gender and active and passive roles but also such categories as foreign and slave.

How prostitutes fit into these taxonomies is not yet fully clear. In my book I lay the groundwork by noting the many points of convergence between female homoeroticism and prostitution, from Sappho depicted as a prostitute onward. As researchers, we need to be more aware of the texts that define women more frequently as a whole to understand how the sex of one was born, resulted, or may be oriented toward certain others, even though we write about them. These ancient roles are important to the history of testimony and how women come to be categorized.

Plato's Symposium

Halperin helpfully notes that "women who are attracted to other women" is a more accurate phrase than "female homosexual" or "lesbian". He has misinterpreted my use of the term "women who are attracted to other women". I agree with Halperin that he has misinterpreted the term "women who are attracted to other women". He has misinterpreted my use of the term "women who are attracted to other women". I also use the phrase "women who are attracted to other women". This is a more accurate phrase than "female homosexual" or "lesbian". Halperin does not include the term "women who are attracted to other women" in his analysis. It is misleading for him to say, "Taking heterosexuality for granted, I do not use the word "women who are attracted to other women". Women are not simply representations of an image of women who are attracted to other women."
researchers, we need to undertake a fuller social history of ancient prostitution and of female homoeroticism, in which comparisons from other time periods may be helpful. Prostitutes servicing men may engage in erotic relations with other women more frequently than the female population at large does. We further need a better grasp of the ancient taxonomies of erotic relations and of erotic orientation as a whole to understand whether the astrologers often placed *tribades* and prostitutes side by side because they were both public about their erotic behavior (as I suggest in my book) or for some other reason. Ancient taxonomies differed from our own, but we cannot dismiss the fact that the configuration of stars under which one was born resulted, according to astrologers, in a lifelong condition of erotic orientation toward certain types of partners, such as foreign women, paying clients, or boys, even though we would not classify such an inclination as a sexual orientation. These ancient etiological attempts to make sense of erotic inclination are important to the history of science and the history of sexuality, and we need to record and analyze them even though they do not resemble twentieth-century conceptualizations.

**Plato's Symposium**

Halperin helpfully notes that the Aristophanes speech in Plato's *Symposium* is not dimorphic. Rather than simply speak of "men who are attracted to women" and "women who are attracted to men," the text also speaks of "adulterers" and "adulteresses." I agree with Halperin that they are an intriguing feature of the text, but he has misrepresented my interpretation and my translation. I do not use the phrases "male heterosexuals" and "female heterosexuals" to translate Plato. I do use the phrase "men and women attracted to each other" to summarize Plato's terms *philogynaios* [men who love women] and *philandroi* [women who love men]. I also use the phrase "women who are attracted to women" to summarize this sentence from Plato: "But the women who are a section of a woman (i.e., of the female-female double primal being) do not at all turn their attention toward men, but are rather turned toward women, and the *hetairistrias* are of this type." Halperin does not include the first part of Plato's sentence in his commentary, and it is misleading for him not to do so. He also misrepresents my position when he says, "Taking *hetairistrias* to mean 'lesbians' doesn't produce a terribly witty solution." I do not use the word *lesbian* to interpret Plato. But I appreciate Halperin's pointing to the adulterers and adulteresses. I wonder whether they represent an intensification of women loving men and men loving women and whether *hetairistria* similarly represents an intensification of women being turned toward women.
perhaps in the sense of women who break social norms, just as in adultery. Some centuries later the astrologer Ptolemy classifies adultery as an intensification of natural erotic relations and classifies the public expression of female homoeroticism, specifically for a woman to speak as if her partner were her "lawful wife," as an intensification vis-à-vis female homoerotic acts performed privately.32 I thank Halperin for the opportunity to think further about hetairaismia, but I do not see how my prior reading was a "similarly motivated misreading."33

Ancient Art

I hope that in the future Kampen will give a fuller interpretation of the visual material that I include in the book than I was able to do. We would all benefit from her art-historical acumen and sensitivity. I note that she disagrees with my interpretation of the Augustan funerary relief on which two women are depicted with their rights hands clasped in the gesture typical of married couples [dextrarum iunctio]. Perhaps she will give her reasons on another occasion.

Ecclesiastical Constraints?

Kampen argues that homophobia and my desire to speak to the churches constrain me and limit my playfulness. If she gave more concrete examples of where that may have occurred, I could respond more directly. She and I agree that I hide nothing. In the interpretations of which Kampen is thinking (e.g., Ovid on Iphic and lanthe) we might debate the nuances. I have undoubtedly missed some (especially in the passages that I review only briefly), perhaps because of ecclesiastical constraint or perhaps for some other reason.

But I do not discuss the ancient sources for relationships that women defined as marriage with another woman in order to convince church people today. Perhaps some Christian churches will never accept lesbians. At a minimum I hope to convince church people to accept decriminalization and civil rights. In writing this book, I have contributed three points to the history of women: women commissioned erotic spells to attract other women; medical writers (over many centuries) recommended clitoridectomy for women with "masculine desires"; and women sometimes defined their relationships as marriages. None of these points directly contributes to my goal of social and religious acceptance of lesbians. I would not argue that past occurrences of same-sex marriage justify their existence today. As a society, we need to base that decision on values that we hold today. But knowing that, historically, women have been capable of long-term, loving relation-
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