

English 313.010/CLCIV 342/CL 374/Women's Studies 380  
Department of English Language & Literature  
University of Michigan, Winter 2010  
TuTh 6-7:30, G115 Angell Hall  
F 10-11, 11-12: 1359 MH  
F 10-11, 11-12: 3356 MH

David M. Halperin  
3124 Angell Hall, 647-5884  
<halperin@umich.edu>  
Hours: W 2:30-4, Th 4:30-6, or by appt.  
Michael Gorwitz <mgorwitz@umich.edu>  
Bessie McAdams <emcadams@umich.edu>

## ANCIENT GREEK/MODERN GAY SEXUALITY

### Course Syllabus

#### *Course description:*

Sexuality, we tend to think, has no history, any more than gravity or any natural force does. Attitudes to sexuality may change, or ways of classifying sexual behavior may vary from one society to another, but sexuality itself, or so we often assume, is always the same. In the last forty years, however, a growing body of scholarship and theory has argued the opposite—that sexuality is not natural but cultural, not biological but historical, not universal but tied to particular time-periods and societies. Sexual life itself varies; human desire differs across different social worlds. Some historians have even argued that sexuality itself is a recent phenomenon, which emerged in northwestern Europe during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: before then, and outside that region, there was no sexuality.

Ancient Greece has provided a classic test case for this new and controversial approach to the history of sexuality. That is because social life in ancient Greece is sometimes astonishingly well documented, because the ancient Greeks were often quite forthright and explicit about their sexual attitudes, and because the two and a half millennia separating us from ancient Greece provide an opportunity to measure exactly how much or how little has changed in the interval. Also, as educated people have known for centuries, Greek sexual practices and attitudes were quite different from modern European and American middle-class ones in a particularly striking respect: namely, the routine acceptance of certain kinds of homosexual behavior.

For centuries, in fact, homosexually-inclined women and men have looked to ancient Greece for a prestigious example of a society that not only tolerated but even celebrated same-sex love and desire. For that reason ancient Greece, as well as ancient Greek authors such as Sappho and Plato, still function today as important sources of lesbian and gay pride. But what did such authors actually say, and what exactly did the Greek approval of homosexuality come down to? Was ancient Greece really a world without homophobia? What was the relation between the ancient Greek acceptance of some kinds of homoerotic behavior and other features of ancient Greek society, such as slavery or the subordination of women?

Does it matter how we answer those questions? Historians live in two worlds at once: the past, which they try to reconstruct as accurately as they can, and the present, which shapes their outlook and which they shape in turn through their research. The history of sexuality, and of homosexuality, has a divided loyalty, dedicated both to telling the truth about the past and to

changing attitudes in the present. What are the political and theoretical stakes in different interpretations of ancient Greek sexual life? What does an understanding of ancient Greek sexual attitudes and practices teach us about the history of sexuality, the limits of human nature, our own sexual lives and psychologies? What does ancient Greece have to offer queer politics or queer culture today?

In an effort to answer these and other questions, we will read in modern English translation a wide selection of ancient Greek (and a few Roman) texts that deal with same-sex love, desire, sexual behavior, and gender dissidence. Some of these texts are classics, so to speak; others are almost unknown, even to experts. We will also read some recent historical scholarship on the topic. We'll conclude by studying some modern writing by lesbian, gay, and bisexual authors that looks at ancient Greece and that indicates the range of possible re-uses of ancient Greek materials by contemporary queer culture.

*Required texts* (on sale at local bookstores and on library reserve):

Richmond Lattimore, tr., *The ILLIAD of Homer* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951).  
 Anne Carson, *If Not, Winter: Fragments of Sappho* (2002; New York: Vintage, 2003).  
 Sophocles, *Philoctetes*, tr. Carl Phillips (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003).  
 Mary Renault, *The Last of the Wine* (1956; New York: Vintage, 2001).  
 Mark Merlis, *An Arrow's Flight* (New York: St. Martin's, 1998).  
 John J. Winkler, *The Constraints of Desire* (New York: Routledge, 1990).  
 Thomas K. Hubbard, ed., *Homosexuality in Greece and Rome: A Sourcebook of Basic Documents* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003).

**All other assigned texts are in the Resources section of the CTools website for this class.**

*Assigned work for the subject:*

Attendance at all meetings of the class, both lecture and discussion sections (you are allowed two absences per term—every additional absence will lower your final grade by one percentage point—and you are responsible for knowing what happened in class when you weren't there); punctual completion of all reading assignments; thoughtful, regular participation in class discussions, demonstrating evidence of reading and independence of mind; one poetic exercise, due on **February 4**; one in-class speech, on **February 18**; one scheduled quiz, on **April 6**; occasional pop quizzes; and three essays, of different lengths, due on **February 26**, **March 19**, and **April 20**. *Note: No piece of written work submitted late will receive credit. The quiz on April 6 must be taken in class to qualify for credit: failure to show up for it for any reason, even due to forces beyond your control, will result in a grade of 0 on the quiz.*

*Grading:*

Your final grade is not determined on the basis of a strict mathematical calculation. It is based on your work over the course of the term, your degree of seriousness, thoughtfulness, and engagement, and your intellectual growth. The key terms here are “seriousness” and “engagement,” which is to say the degree to which you make the issues raised by this class part of your own intellectual life.

Any student whose performance improves strikingly over the course of the term can expect to see that improvement reflected in the final grade. So a slow or shaky start can always be redeemed by a good finish.

If you are not satisfied with the work you did on the first two essays or the grade you received on them, you may revise and resubmit those essays for regrading at any time up to the final class on April 20. For more details about this procedure, see *Notes on the Writing Assignments*, below.

Attendance will be taken in each class. Leaving class early, or leaving the classroom during class for any reason, will be counted as an absence.

Smart contributions to class discussion, especially those that indicate careful, observant reading of the texts under consideration, count for a lot. Not everyone feels comfortable speaking in class, but you should make an effort to contribute, and *you should also be prepared to be called on* and to be asked for your views; your responses will be taken into consideration in determining your final grade.

Pop quizzes will be administered on occasion as the instructor may see fit. High and low grades on those quizzes will be factored into the final grade; a grade of B will not affect the final grade one way or the other. The same grading policy applies to the scheduled quiz on April 6.

The grading for this class will be done entirely by **Bessie McAdams** and **Michael Gorwitz**, the Graduate Student Instructors, who will also be teaching the Friday morning discussion sections. Bessie will hold office hours on Tuesday afternoons, from 4 to 6 pm, in 3057 Tisch Hall and Michael will hold office hours on Wednesday afternoons, from 1:30 to 3:30, in 3049 Tisch Hall. Both Michael and Bessie will also be available by individual appointment. Michael can be reached at <mgorwitz@umich.edu> and Bessie at <emcadams@umich.edu>.

Although I won't be seeing your first two essays as a matter of course, I'll be happy to read and comment on any piece of written work that you may care to show me.

*Schedule of reading and writing assignments:*

- Thursday, January 7: Introductory meeting.
- Tuesday, January 12:
- Khaled El-Rouayheb, "Introduction," *Before Homosexuality in the Arabic-Islamic World, 1500-1800* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 1-12, 163-65;
- Gregory M. Pflugfelder, "Authorizing Pleasure: Male-Male Sexuality in Edo-Period Popular Discourse" (excerpt), *Cartographies of Desire: Male-Male Sexuality in Japanese Discourse, 1600-1950* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 23-44;
- Michael Rocke, "Introduction: Florence and Sodomy," *Forbidden Friendships: Homosexuality and Male Culture in Renaissance Florence* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 3-16, 255-58;
- T. Dunbar Moodie (with Vivienne Ndatshé and British Sibuyi), "Migrancy and Male Sexuality on the South African Gold Mines," in *Hidden from History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past*, ed. Martin Bauml Duberman, Martha Vicinus, and George Chauncey Jr. (New York: New American Library, 1989), 411-25, 566-68;
- Tim Reid, "Kandahar Comes out of the Closet," *The Times of London* (12 January 2002), 2 pages.
- Thursday, January 14:
- Pindar, *First Olympian Ode*: **1.87** Hubbard, 49-53;
- Richmond Lattimore, "A Note on Pindar and his Poetry," in *The Odes of Pindar*, tr. Lattimore, 2d ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976), vii-xiv;
- Pindar, *First Olympian Ode*, tr. Richmond Lattimore, *The Odes of Pindar*, 1-4;
- Sappho, *Ode to Aphrodite*: **1** Carson, 2-5.
- Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, 6.54-59: **2.2** Hubbard, 60-61;
- Carmina popularia*, fr. 893: **1.89** Hubbard, 53-54.

- Tuesday, January 19: Alcman, *First Maidens' Song*: 1.4 Hubbard, 26-29; Alcman, fragments 1 and 3 (the Louvre *partheneion* and the second *partheneion*), tr. Peter Bing, in *Games of Venus: An Anthology of Greek and Roman Erotic Verse from Sappho to Ovid*, tr. Peter Bing and Rip Cohen (New York: Routledge, 1991), 62-67;  
Lyric poems by Anacreon, Ibycus, and Theognis: 1.29-83 Hubbard, 36-47;  
Sydney Olson, "Theognidea";  
Plato, excerpts from *Lysis, Charmides, Protagoras*, in Plato, *Complete Works*, ed. John M. Cooper (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1997), 687-95, 706-707, 639-45, 662-63, 746-49;  
Jody Wilgoren, "Rape Charge Follows Marriage to a 14-Year-Old," *New York Times* (30 August 2005);  
James Davidson, "Age-Classes, Love-Rules and Corrupting the Young" (excerpt), *The Greeks and Greek Love: A Radical Reappraisal of Homosexuality in Ancient Greece* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2007), 68-90, 526-28.
- Thursday, January 21: Aeschines, *Against Timarchus*. (For the historical background, check out Hubbard's brief introduction to the abbreviated version of the text provided on p. 131 of his sourcebook.)
- Tuesday, January 26: Homer, *Iliad*, Book 1 (entire); Book 2, lines 671-74; (in Lattimore's translation); Books 3, 5, 6, 9 (entire); Book 11, lines 595-847; Book 15, lines 390-405; Books 16 and 17 (entire).
- Thursday, January 28: Homer, *Iliad*, Book 18, lines 1-355; Book 19 (entire); Book 20, lines 230-35, 419-454; Book 21, lines 1-135; Book 22 (entire); Book 23, lines 1-286; Book 24 (entire).
- Tuesday, February 2: Emily Wilson, "Tongue Breaks," *London Review of Books* (8 January 2004), 27-28;  
Carson, *If Not, Winter* (the whole thing, but pay special attention to fragments 2, 16, 23, 24a, 31, 34, 44, 46, 47, 49, 51, 52, 94, 96, 102,

105a, 105b, 111, 112, 121, 130, 131, 132, 137, 147, 150, 168b);

Winkler, "Double Consciousness in Sappho's Lyrics," *The Constraints of Desire*, 162-87;  
Anne Carson, "Ruse" and "The Reach," *Eros the Bittersweet* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 12-17, 26-29.

Thursday, February 4:

Nossis, four epigrams: **6.16-19** Hubbard, 288-89;  
Carson, *If Not, Winter*, fragment 58 (pp. 120-21);  
John J. Winkler, "Sappho and the Crack of Dawn (fragment 58 L-P)," *Journal of Homosexuality*, 20.3-4 (1990), 227-33;  
Anne Carson, "The Beat Goes On," *New York Review of Books*, 52.16 (20 October 2005), 47;  
James Merrill, "Losing the Marbles," *The Inner Room* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1988), 84-91.  
NOTE: POETIC EXERCISE DUE by 6:10 pm (by e-mail via the class listserv bulletin board).

Tuesday, February 9:

David M. Halperin, "Homosexuality," *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3d ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 720-23, available on CTools or online at the following address: <http://www.oxfordreference.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/views/ENTRY.html?entry=t111.e3142> ;  
Sophocles, *Philoctetes*;  
Carl Phillips, "North," *The Rest of Love* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 2004), 38-39;  
Caryn James, "Chill, Warrior Outcast, the Gods Are With You," *New York Times* (23 October 2007).

Thursday, February 11:

Plato, *Symposium*, tr. Walter Hamilton (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1951), 31-72, with notes (notes are at the end of the photocopy on CTools).

Tuesday, February 16:

Plato, *Symposium* (entire);  
Plato, *Symposium* 210a4-212a7, tr. Halperin;  
DMH, a guide to Platonic *erôs*.

- Thursday, February 18: David M. Halperin, "Love's Irony: Six Remarks on Platonic Eros," in *Erotikon: Essays on Eros, Ancient and Modern*, ed. Shadi Bartsch and Thomas Bartscherer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 48-58.  
**Post-Valentine's Day Symposium** in class (each student is to give a two- or three-minute speech in praise of Eros).
- Tuesday, February 23: Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Volume I: An Introduction*, tr. Robert Hurley (New York: Pantheon, 1978), 3-49;  
 DMH, a guide to Foucault;  
 Winkler, "Introduction," "Unnatural Acts: Erotic Protocols in Artemidoros' *Dream Analysis*," and "Laying Down the Law: The Oversight of Men's Sexual Behavior in Classical Athens," *The Constraints of Desire*, 1-70.
- Thursday, February 25: David M. Halperin, "One Hundred Years of Homosexuality," *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality and other essays on Greek Love* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 15-40 and 154-68;  
 David M. Halperin, "How to do the History of Male Homosexuality," *How to Do the History of Homosexuality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 104-37 and 185-95.
- Friday, February 26: FIRST ESSAY DUE in discussion section.
- Tuesday, March 9: Achilles Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, 2.33-38: **10.18** Hubbard, 483-87;  
 Pseudo-Lucian, *Forms of Love*: **10.37** Hubbard, 505-31;  
 James Davidson, "Sexing up the Greeks" and "Language as a Mirror of the World" (excerpt), *The Greeks and Greek Love*, 101-121, 135-51, 529-34.
- Thursday, March 11: Kenneth Dover, "Two Women of Samos," in *The Sleep of Reason: Erotic Experience and Sexual Ethics in Ancient Greece and Rome*,

ed. Martha C. Nussbaum and Juha Sihvola  
(Chicago: University of Chicago Press,  
2002), 222-28;

Lucian, *Dialogues of the Courtesans* 5: **10.9**  
Hubbard, 468-69;

David M. Halperin, "The First Homosexuality?"  
(excerpt), *How to Do the History of*  
*Homosexuality* (Chicago: University of  
Chicago Press, 2002), 48-53 and 170-72.

Tuesday, March 16:

Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 9.666-797: **8.21** Hubbard,  
373-77;

Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 9.666-797, tr. A. E. Watts (San  
Francisco: North Point Press, 1980), 212-216;

Gabe Anderson, "Metamorphosis of Iphis, a Sestina";  
Seneca the Elder, *Controversiae* 1.2.23: **9.2** Hubbard,  
388-89;

Seneca the Younger, *Moral Epistles* 95.21: **9.11**  
Hubbard, 394;

Martial, Epigrams, 7.67, 7.70: **9.26-27** Hubbard, 425-  
26; please compare the alternate translation by  
D. R. Shackleton-Bailey posted on CTools;

Kirk Ormand, "Impossible Lesbians in Ovid's  
*Metamorphoses*," in *Gendered Dynamics in*  
*Latin Love Poetry*, ed. Ronnie Ancona and  
Ellen Greene (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins  
University Press, 2005), 79-110.

Thursday, March 18:

Pindar, *Encomia*, fragment 123: **1.85** Hubbard, 48;  
Theocritus, *Idylls* 12 and 29: **6.10, 12** Hubbard, 279-  
80, 283-84; please compare the translations by  
Anna Rist posted on CTools;

Catullus, poem 63: **7.48** Hubbard, 331-35;

Seneca, *Natural Questions* 1.16.1-9;

Petronius, *Satyricon* 83-87: **9.14** Hubbard, 413-16;

Juvenal, *Satires* 2 and 9: **9.38-9** Hubbard, 431-42;

Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* ["The Golden Ass"], 8.24-  
29: **10.15** Hubbard, 474-77;

Dio Cassius, *Roman History*, 80.13.1-80.17.1.

Friday, March 19:

SECOND ESSAY DUE in discussion section.

Tuesday, March 23:

Mary Renault, *The Last of the Wine*, 1-138.

- Thursday, March 25: Plato, *Phaedrus* 227a-257b: **5.9** Hubbard, 221-51; James Merrill, "The Charioteer of Delphi," *From the First Nine: Poems 1946-1976* (New York: Atheneum, 1982), 46-47.
- Tuesday, March 30: Mark Merlis, *An Arrow's Flight*, 1-134.
- Thursday, April 1: Merlis, *An Arrow's Flight*, 137-215.
- Tuesday, April 6: Merlis, *An Arrow's Flight*, 219-373.  
NOTE: QUIZ on Renault and Merlis, in class.
- Thursday, April 8: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 10.298-502, tr. A. E. Watts, 226-32;  
Frank Bidart, "The Second Hour of the Night," *Desire* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1997), 27-59.
- Tuesday, April 13: Carson, "Data on the Mysterious Phaon," *If Not, Winter*, 394-95;  
Ovid, *Heroides* 15, tr. Grant Showerman, in G. P. Goold, ed., *Ovid I: Heroides and Amores*, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977), 180-97;  
Paul Verlaine, "Sappho," tr. Halperin;  
Marguerite Yourcenar, "Sappho, or Suicide," *Fires*, tr. Dori Katz (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1981), 115-30.
- Thursday, April 15: Carson, *If Not, Winter*, fragment 147 (pp. 296-97), with note (pp. 379-80);  
Renée Vivien, "Quelqu'un, je crois, se souviendra dans l'avenir de nous/Someone, I believe, in time to come will remember us," *Sappho* (1903), translation and commentary by Heather Love, *Feeling Backward: Loss and the Politics of Queer History* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007), 34-35;  
Carl Phillips, "Youth with Satyr, Both Resting," *Cortège* (Saint Paul, MN: Graywolf Press, 1995), 31-32;  
Olga Broumas, "Twelve Aspects of God," *Beginning with O* (New Haven: Yale University Press,

1977), 3-24;

Monique Wittig, excerpt from *The Lesbian Body* (1973), tr. David Le Vay (New York: Avon, 1976), 16-19.

Tuesday, April 20:

Richard Howard, "What Word Did the Greeks Have for It?" *Like Most Revelations* (New York: Pantheon, 1994), 85-88.

NOTE: THIRD ESSAY DUE by 6:10 pm (via e-mail to the entire class).

Tuesday, April 20 (night):

Class party.

#### *Notes on the Writing Assignments:*

**The Poetic Exercise**, due by 6:10 pm on February 4, by e-mail to the entire class via the class listserv bulletin board address (w10-english-313-010@umich.edu: for more information, see p. 17 of this syllabus).

When you have completed all the reading for February 4, including the poem by James Merrill, select a fragment of a poem by Sappho and complete it in your own fashion, being sure to preserve the parts of it that have survived in the exact order in which they have come down to us. You may choose to restore the poem as you imagine Sappho originally composed it, or you may construct a modern "Sapphic" poem in the style of Anne Carson's translation, or you may invent a new poem of your own, in your own voice, that incorporates the surviving fragments of Sappho's poem. See how clever you can be in your completion of the poem, *taking Merrill as your model*.

Send your completed poem by e-mail to the entire class via the listserv bulletin board.

#### **The Three Essays.**

The three essays are all intended to be opportunities for you to demonstrate a combination of ingenuity, originality, and understanding of the material. No additional reading or research is necessary except for the texts specified in the assigned essay topics themselves. You will, however, be judged on the quality of your writing as well as on the content of your thought. Your essays should be carefully expressed, your grammar and spelling should be correct, and your thinking should be clear.

There is a mandatory topic assigned for each essay. Each essay topic, however, provides considerable latitude for individual choice and creativity.

The first two essays should be handed in to your GSI via hard copy at the start of the discussion section on the dates indicated on the syllabus. No late essays will be accepted for credit without a valid medical (or similar) excuse. Computer and printer failures, network problems, disk malfunctions, and dead or dying grandparents do not constitute acceptable reasons for turning in essays late.

If you are not satisfied with your work or your grade on either of the first two essays, or if you would like to explore the topic further or to expand in some way on the work you have already done, and by doing so to raise your grade, you have the option of submitting additional versions of those essays at any time *on or before* the final class session on Monday, April 20. For an essay to qualify for resubmission and regrading, it will need to have been handed in on time. It will also need to have been considerably revised since the last graded version. The mere rewriting and resubmission of an essay will not guarantee a higher grade: the revised version must represent a clear improvement over the previous one in both style and content. Be sure to submit the original, graded copy of the essay along with the revised version. There is no limit on the number of times you may resubmit an essay, so long as the resubmitted essay fulfills these specific conditions. Note, however, that *you may resubmit only one essay on the last day of class*.

*First essay* (minimum length 1000 words).

Michel Foucault famously dated the birth of “the psychological, psychiatric, medical category of homosexuality” to the second half of the nineteenth century (p. 43). Both John J. Winkler and David M. Halperin argue that ancient Greece was “before sexuality,” that there was no sexuality (either homo- or hetero-) in ancient Greece. Khaled El-Rouayheb, Gregory M. Pflugfelder, Michael Rocke, and T. Dunbar Moodie make similar points, respectively, about the pre-modern Arab-Islamic world, about 17th- and 18th-century Japan, about 14th- and 15th-century Florence, and about early 20th-century Black South Africa—although they may all have slightly different understandings of the precise sense in which “sexuality” is absent from the culture they study.

Despite the differences in emphasis or conception among them, what on the whole do all these scholars mean, exactly, when they make some version of that outrageous, implausible, counter-intuitive claim? How can there have been a human society without sexuality? In what sense could such a claim be true?

Put it into your own words (as if you had to communicate it to a friend), using any literary form you like, and explain it, making it sound reasonable and sensible, *and* basing your argument both on a reading of some of the scholarship we have surveyed and on a reading of some of the ancient texts we have studied so far this term. Judging by those texts, would you say that the no-sexuality-in-ancient-Greece view applies equally to women and to men? Or is it based on a single, gendered notion of what “sexuality” is?

Of course, you may not agree with the view that there was no homosexuality, heterosexuality, bisexuality, or sexuality in ancient Greece. You don’t have to agree with it. But you do have to make the best possible case for it, *whether you believe it or not*.

Your job in this essay, then, is not to explain why you disagree with the “before sexuality” thesis (if you do), or to refute it. You will have an opportunity to do *that* in the second essay you write for this class. Your job in this first essay is to explain that thesis in your own words and in the most clear, compelling, powerful, sensible way that you can, citing some good examples from the ancient documents to back it up, as if you believed it yourself and as if you were trying to convince someone else who had never heard of this view and didn’t find it very credible.

In other words, before you decide whether or not this approach to the history of sexuality is correct, you have to be sure that you understand what it is. This paper is an opportunity for you to show that you understand it thoroughly.

Now, let me give you two bits of advice.

1. *Avoid dictionary definitions.* The historical question of whether or not (homo)sexuality existed in a particular society goes beyond the question of whether or not that society had a word for it, how words relate to things, and when a word for (homo)sexuality occurred for the first time—though language can provide interesting clues. Anyway, dictionary definitions are not as objective as we sometimes assume them to be; in fact, they are often infused with cultural values and judgments, especially (it seems) in the case of many of the key words in this class (such as the much-contested “sexuality”). Furthermore, when you introduce the key terms of your argument, it would serve you far better to define them within the context of your discussion. For instance, instead of repeating how some dictionary defines “sexuality,” check out how the scholars mentioned above understand the term in the context of their work and for the purposes of their own arguments. (They may not all understand it in the same way.) Dictionaries remind us how words are used generally (these definitions are always generic, though rooted culturally and temporally), whereas part of your job in this paper is to provide a focused, particular analysis that is limited to a specific time and place. Besides, how could any English or American dictionary today provide a guide to the languages of the ancient, non-English-speaking world?

2. *Avoid general opening statements.* Spare us the sort of fluff that you may be tempted to use in the initial paragraph of a paper: “Throughout all time, there have been societies. In these societies, men and women have struggled with power issues. In Ancient Greece, there were gender discrepancies among the sexes. . . .” etc., etc. You may have been taught to write that way in high school (the so-called “pyramid introduction”), but it is not too late for you to stop, and to quit wasting breath and space. Try to clean up your introduction and keep it focused, as this will help you make sure that your broader argument is sharp and properly launched.

*Second essay* (minimum length 2500 words).

Choose a couple of texts from among the works of Greek and Roman poetry and prose assigned for March 18. If you like, you may also browse freely through the first six sections of Hubbard’s sourcebook, and pick out other texts from there, but in any case you should select no more than two or three different texts to concentrate on for the purposes of your essay. *You may not write about any of the ancient sources we have already studied in class: you must choose to focus on a text, or texts, that did not get assigned in class up to now.*

Read the documents you have selected against one or two examples of the scholarship you have studied (including Hubbard), and read the scholarship against the documents you have chosen to examine.

Perform, that is, two opposite critical operations: (1) read the texts in the light of what you have learned about the ancient world from the scholarship, using the scholarship to interpret those texts, to make sense of them, to unlock their meanings, to analyze the erotic experiences to which they refer, and to assess their significance for the history of sexuality in general and the history of homosexuality in particular; (2) reconsider the scholarly materials you have selected in the light of the ancient texts you have chosen to examine, using the ancient texts to test the adequacy and the limitations of the scholarship: what aspects of antiquity does that scholarship include and leave out, how well can it account for the details in the ancient texts you have selected to focus on, do its political or ideological commitments prevent it from providing a complete reading of the ancient texts? Does the literary evidence you are examining confirm or disprove the claims made by the modern scholars you have selected to study? If it disproves their claims, does it disprove all of them, or can some of their arguments survive critique? Which arguments? How, if at all, can their claims be saved?

In other words, the time has finally come for you to be your own historian of sexuality, and to make some claim of your own about the subject matter of the class. What conclusions do you draw about the history of sexuality on the basis of your independent reading of the surviving documents from the ancient Mediterranean world? You are invited to take some stand of your own, using the ancient sources as evidence, and to argue for your own view either against or in support of some of the positions that have been taken by classical scholars.

Remember that your job here is to perform those two critical operations, setting up a dialogue between the scholarship and the ancient texts while also intervening with your own take on the ancient texts and the possible limitations that you see in the scholarship.

*Third essay* (minimum length 2000 words).

Make your own contribution to contemporary queer culture, using ancient Greece as a vehicle. You could model your essay on any one of the modern works we have encountered in class, especially from March 23 onward. Or you could undertake a modern rewriting or adaptation of a particular ancient Greek text that you have already studied for this class. Or you could write an original story, poem, political essay, commentary, editorial, social satire, open letter, or cultural critique that refers to ancient Greece or adopts an ancient Greek setting. Feel free to be as creative and free-wheeling as you like, so long as the reader can grasp the particular aptness or logic or purpose or intellectual advantage of using ancient Greece to make a queer point about love, desire, gender, sexuality, or sexual politics. *Send your completed essay by e-mail to the entire class via the class listserv bulletin board.*

*Final notes:*

Studying sexuality can be an adventure and a challenge. There is perhaps no other topic in which the subject and object of knowledge so completely coincide—in which, that is, the student is so much a part of what is studied. Sexuality is a provocative topic because it is not only “out there,” in the world, but “in here,” in each individual: at once a personal experience, a social identity, and a daily practice. The study of sexuality invites us to be anthropologists of our own cultures and archaeologists of ourselves.

Although the design of this course obviously reflects the instructor’s intellectual and political commitments, the course itself will not promote any particular point of view. Its purpose is *critical*: that is, it aims to motivate you to become more conscious of the beliefs that you hold and the feelings that you harbor, to examine those beliefs and feelings in the light of different beliefs and other feelings, and to subject your beliefs and feelings to a rigorous analysis. The ultimate objective is not necessarily to change your beliefs or feelings; rather, it is to put those beliefs and feelings to the test by bringing them into strenuous competition with a number of other possible candidates for your personal and intellectual allegiance, thereby enabling you *either* to arrive at a more reasoned and self-conscious acceptance of the values you already hold *or* to reject the values you had previously taken for granted and to adopt instead new values more in keeping with your current beliefs and feelings. The choice is, obviously, yours to make, not anyone else’s.

The critical purpose of this course is in keeping with the unique role of the university in contemporary society. There are many different agencies in our society whose purpose is to tell you what to believe, what to think and what to do, what is good for you and for other people, what is normal, healthy, decent, patriotic, acceptable, serious, or worthwhile. The university is the sole institution in this society whose function is to enable you to question and to criticize what these other agencies urge upon you, what they tell you to think. Because this function is unique, it is also precious, and it should not be wasted. You will not often have the freedom (let alone the encouragement) to explore complex issues in some depth. In order to make the most of it, you will need to allow yourself sufficient time to do all the assigned work for the course. You will notice that the assigned readings are often intense; some readings are also conceptually difficult or complex. The writing assignments are comparatively light. This class is designed for people who want to read, reflect, and talk. Its ultimate objective is not to impart knowledge so much as to foster original and independent thinking.

Most class sessions will feature discussions, not lectures. These discussions will be relatively unstructured and open-ended. They are designed to clarify the readings, to explore issues raised *in your mind* by the readings, and to relate the topic to your own experience. Classes will normally begin with me asking you, first, whether you have any informational or procedural questions about the course and its organization; then, whether you have questions or reactions or comments in response to the readings. That is your chance to clarify anything in the assigned texts that you didn’t understand, to raise issues of importance to you, and to determine the agenda for the class. If you have no input to offer, you will lose control of the class, which will in that case conform to other

people's notions—either mine or your fellow students'—of what the agenda ought to be. The class discussions should, ideally, revolve around you: your needs, your questions, your relation to the material. No study questions for the readings have been provided in the course materials, because no one but you can know in advance what you will get out of the readings, and you are the one whose interests should guide the discussion. Everyone should try to participate in the discussion, which should be respectful towards all members of the class but which may otherwise be entirely free-wheeling. I'll intervene to keep the discussions on course, or to steer them towards specific kinds of analysis, as the need may arise.

The discussions will be informal and relaxed. As we get to know each other better, we should be able to have a lot of fun in class. Do not however make the mistake of imagining that the free and easy atmosphere in the classroom means easy grading, lax discipline, or low standards. On the contrary: just as I see no reason why being intellectually serious should require solemnity or formality, I also see no reason why having fun should conflict with being careful, precise, engaged, thoughtful, or rigorous. I take this class seriously (can you tell?), and I expect you to do the same. As a gesture of good faith, I have posted to the CTools website for this class one of the less successful papers I wrote as an undergraduate: it will give you an idea of the sort of standard I find it reasonable to uphold. I see no reason why your papers should be any worse than one of my more mediocre efforts as a college student. So that will give you an idea of how the grading will be done.

This course deals with a lot of unfamiliar material from a historically distant culture. You will need some help understanding it all. The textbooks I have assigned provide a good deal of the background you may need in their introductions, notes, and commentaries. You should spend some time in particular with the Hubbard sourcebook, so as to make sure you know how it is organized and where different sorts of important information are located in it. I will try to provide you with as much additional background as I can. I can't equip you with a glossary for every mysterious term or name you may happen to come across in your reading, however. A convenient source of information is available from the various standard reference works produced by the Oxford University Press; these are accessible on line through the University library at:

[http://www.oxfordreference.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/views/SUBJECT\\_SEARCH.html?subject=s3](http://www.oxfordreference.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/views/SUBJECT_SEARCH.html?subject=s3)

All work on the written assignments should be your own. You may of course discuss your work with other members of the class, and you may even seek the advice, help, and criticism of your fellow students and your friends. But you should not work on any of these assignments with other members of the class. All work handed in must be original with you. Anyone whose writings or conversation may have influenced your thinking in specific ways should be given due credit by means of footnotes or other kinds of references. The same holds for any source, published or electronic. Putting someone else's idea or sentence into your own words does not give you the right to claim credit for it; you still need to indicate where you got it. Failure to acknowledge your indebtedness to the thought of others is PLAGIARISM, which is the most serious academic offense and will be treated as such. If you are at all unsure how to acknowledge the contributions which others may have made to the work you are handing in, or if you have any doubts about what is a

legitimate use of the internet, please consult the document on plagiarism provided by the Department of English Language and Literature, and in any case do not hesitate to ask for more detailed guidance BEFORE you turn in your written work.

If you have a learning disability or some other special need that requires accommodation, please let me or your GSI know as soon as possible, producing whatever documentation may be appropriate, and we will be happy to make the necessary adjustments.

Also, if your religious observances conflict with any academic obligation for this class as specified in this syllabus, and you wish for that reason to be excused from class or to make alternate arrangements to fulfill an assignment, you must let me and your GSI know by **January 29**. Current University policy does not require us to honor such requests if they are made after that date.

Students involved in the performing arts, in scientific or artistic endeavors, or in intercollegiate athletics, who must miss classes due to their commitments to represent the University of Michigan around the nation and world, are entitled to make alternate arrangements to compensate for the work they miss. It is the obligation of the student who expects to miss classes, examinations, or other assignments as a consequence of representing the University of Michigan to give reasonable notice for dates of anticipated absences and to arrange for make-up assignments. Students should present this information *at the beginning of the term, and no later than the end of the fourth week of classes*.

As you will have noticed from the preceding paragraphs, the disciplinary framework of this subject is quite strict. By contrast, the intellectual content of the subject is entirely open. You *must* complete all the assigned work each week as specified in this syllabus. But you *may* think, write, say anything you want—adopt any position, voice any opinion, argue for any perspective, so long as you show minimal respect for other members of the class. Your instructor, your GSI, or your fellow students may disagree with you; they may even argue against you or try to change your mind. That is as it should be. But you will not be graded down, punished, or penalized in any way for the views you hold or advocate. I may well try to persuade you that my views are correct: I *think* they are correct, after all; otherwise I wouldn't hold them. *But there is no official doctrine or party line in this course*. In fact, at no time will you be evaluated on the basis of a right or wrong answer to a question. You will be evaluated on the basis of the seriousness, thoughtfulness, care, complexity, originality, and imaginativeness with which you address any question you take up—on the basis of the quality of your engagement with the material of this class.

You will notice that a great deal of emphasis has been placed on your intellectual autonomy—on your own independence of mind, ability to think for yourself, and freedom to decide whatever you choose. Some students may find this amount of intellectual leeway disorienting, or may feel the need for more guidance, or for a somewhat more traditionally authoritarian mode of instruction. Students who wish for greater direction should feel free to seek out their instructor or their GSI for meetings outside of class. Such meetings may serve to extend the class discussion, to review your written work in detail, or to provide you with professional and personal advice. You

should feel free to take advantage of that opportunity. But don't expect to get definitive answers. I can give you information, arguments, concepts and ideas, intellectual tools, and my own opinions, but no final answers. (If I had them, I would no longer be interested in teaching this material.) It is the premise of this course that university instruction is geared towards adults who can and should determine for themselves how to make sense of the world, what is right and wrong, and what it all means. Accordingly, this class asks you to make up your mind about a range of questions which no one can answer for you except yourself. And, in the end, what you will remember about this class is not what I said but what you thought.

I have set up an electronic bulletin board for the class in the form of a Lyris listserv group: the address is <w10-english-313-010@umich.edu>. *In order to send a message to that address, you will first need to be logged in through the umich server using your username* (if you wish to send messages from some other address, such as your gmail account, please give me your alternate e-mail address and I will add it to the official Lyris mailing list for the bulletin board). E-mail sent to the listserv address will go to all the members of the class (including Bessie McAdams, Michael Gorwitz, and myself) at our umich mailboxes.

Feel free to use this forum to raise questions, to make points that got left out of class discussion, to bring up things you meant to say in class but forgot, to make that witty comeback you wish you'd had the presence of mind to think of at the time, to ask for points of clarification, to make announcements, to seek information or help from members of the class (especially if you missed class because you were sick), or simply to continue the discussion. The electronic bulletin board will also serve as the medium by which you will hand in your poetic exercise and your final writing assignment.

If you have any questions at any point, or if you wish to discuss the reading outside of class, or if you wish to discuss any other topic, you should feel free to drop by my office (3124 Angell Hall) during office hours (Wednesdays from 2:30 to 4 pm or Thursdays from 4:30 to 6 pm) or make an appointment to see me, or Bessie McAdams, or Michael Gorwitz, at some other time. We'll be delighted to talk to you. My office telephone number is 647-5884, and there is an answering machine there; you can also contact me directly by e-mail at <halperin@umich.edu>. You can also contact Michael by e-mail at <mgorwitz@umich.edu>; you can contact Bessie at <emcadams@umich.edu>.