



FOUNDING THE CLOSET: Sexuality and the Creation of Art History

Author(s): Whitney Davis

Source: *Art Documentation: Journal of the Art Libraries Society of North America*, Winter 1992, Vol. 11, No. 4 (Winter 1992), pp. 171-175

Published by: The University of Chicago Press on behalf of the Art Libraries Society of North America

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27948479>

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

https://www.jstor.org/stable/27948479?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Art Libraries Society of North America and *The University of Chicago Press* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Art Documentation: Journal of the Art Libraries Society of North America*

FOUNDING THE CLOSET: Sexuality and the Creation of Art History

by Whitney Davis
Northwestern University

In 1992, it might appear that calls for censorship of the arts have become increasingly common. The recent efforts of authorities in Cincinnati to police Dennis Barrie's exhibition of Robert Mapplethorpe's photographs sparked a controversy that was intense in its own right and also came to stand for the larger problems facing artists, art historians, art curators, art archivists, and art librarians today. We have, of course, won some important battles. To take one notorious example, Senator Jesse Helms's proposed amendments to congressional appropriations bills would have changed the accepted way in which the National Endowment for the Arts disburses grants to artists through peer review processes standard throughout the scientific and academic world—but they were beaten back.¹

In a war, as another recent experience has shown, it is very easy to represent the other side according to convenient stereotype and to overlook the extent of one's own hypocrisy, opportunism, or responsibility for the very situation one claims to oppose. Art scholarship is no exception. Today it finds itself fighting intervention or censorship from the outside, at the same time as it has experienced and practiced various forms of internal censorship dating from the 1750s or 1760s, when modern techniques of collecting art objects, exhibiting and cataloging them, acquiring and storing information about them, and analyzing them were formalized in what we now call art history.² I have no intention of arguing here that art history's contemporary efforts to combat censorship and ensure wide access to art and the knowledge about it are totally vitiated by its own long-standing implication in techniques of policing art and art historical knowledge. (No doubt, however, there is some truth in the old saw about the mote in your brother's eye.) Instead, in this brief essay I want to notice something more complex in the particular case of art history's relationship with homosexual artists, collectors, critics, and scholars, among whom Robert Mapplethorpe must be counted. Since its beginning in the 1760s, the scholarly study of art has involved a displacement of questions of sexuality, especially homosexuality. This displacement has so profoundly affected the very methods, theories, and resources of art history that art history, over 200 years later, is not in the best position to do the job in contexts like the Cincinnati struggle. Crudely, in Cincinnati, art history was forced to lie when it should have been speaking the truth.

I have space to comment on this matter in only two ways. First, I want to remark—mostly through personal observation, since systematic studies are lacking—on the gap between what kind of resources art history needs to fight its battles today and the actual state of these resources in existing museums, libraries, and scholarly databases. My point here will be that art history's own history has not provided what is needed today. Second, I want to identify briefly some of the psychological, social, and historical forces—they must be deep, persisting, and pervasive ones—that

might explain this resource gap. There are many ways to examine this question, but I will do so by going to the historical origins of the problem.

In the fall of 1991, I cotaught a course on "Greek Civilization in the Classical Period" as part of a regular eight-course introductory sequence dealing with "Patterns in European Thought and Culture," qualifying as a college-wide "distribution requirement" in the arts and sciences. A course of this kind risks becoming a celebration of the masterworks of Western philosophy, art, and literature, especially if it adopts the sort of "Great Books" curriculum seemingly favored by Lynne Cheney, the chairperson of the National Endowment for the Humanities, when she calls for teaching the enduring values of Western culture through study of its great spiritual and artistic expressions³—a study supposedly to tell today's multiethnic and perhaps socially disruptive student population what brings Americans together as people with a common heritage. In other words, one cannot teach a course on ancient Greece today without landing right in the middle of the most divisive contemporary debates about national and cultural identity.

In this extremely charged context, I was determined to give two lectures—out of the eight assigned to me—on the homosocial or homosexual structure of elite male social life in classical Athens, in particular as this way of life was represented in the popular medium of vase painting. A substantial number of Greek painted vases depict scenes of homosocial relationships and homosexual courtship or sexual activity and were actually made as love gifts to be passed between men.⁴ They are related to an equally important series of vases that represent the specific roles for women in classical Greek society, in which a woman is either a gracious, dignified, but sequestered housekeeper or an amusing, pathetic whore.⁵ Rather than his wife, it was a late adolescent boy whom a mature man in Athens treated as a moral equal, albeit younger and more passive than he. According to the system, the mature man who courted an adolescent boy had once been such a boy himself, courted by his own suitors. Thus, in the broadest terms, the homosocial and homosexual liaison functioned as a means of passing on male knowledge and status in the community of voting citizens, which was, of course, exclusively male as well. A Greek man rose up in this system by exchanging the youth's passive homosexual role, which was not supposed to provide bodily pleasure but was an accepted ritual of apprenticeship in wisdom, for the man's adult, active homosexual role, which *was* supposed to provide him pleasure, challenge, and relaxation and correlated with his full status as a man of affairs, of real economic, political, and sexual power. Greek vase paintings represent aspects of this complex sociocultural system in finely nuanced detail.

I had three reasons to present this material. First, it is obvious that the homosocial or homosexual culture of Greece, in its broad

sense, was central to the fashioning of Greek literature, art, philosophy, and the rest. This fact has been evident for as long as classical scholarship and archaeology have existed, although, as we will see, with major qualifications. Second, I was interested in having my students challenge the rather sanitized, if not downright inaccurate, accounts propounded by various proponents of "our Western heritage." Lynne Cheney wants students to study Socrates; and why not? I thought. Socrates was surrounded with pretty boys; the dialogues, as narrated by Plato and others, are partly just fancy versions of the intellectual cultivation, the ostentation, contest, and romance, and the idealization of the merely sexual into the broadly ethical that characterized Greek male courtships.⁶ Certainly most of the standard textbooks of the history of art do not address the issue, despite the great importance that studies of gender and sexuality have come to have in art history generally and the obvious presence of an erotically meaningful representation of the male body in classical art.⁷ And third, I have been an "out" gay teacher for a number of years; I know that students come to some of my classes to learn about things they will not hear mentioned elsewhere.

My reasons for deciding what I wanted and needed to teach were good and my motivation was strong. But pulling the two lectures together—I only had three hours in all—to do barest justice to the material was nearly impossible. When I turned to it, I discovered that our slide collection had only a few reproductions of vase paintings which had any direct bearing on my topic. The gap in our slide library was not to be blamed on its curator but rather on my forerunners in the faculty of my department. Although they were art historians actively teaching ancient art, apparently they saw no need, or, more likely, did not have the resources, to deal with this, one of the three or four most focal aspects of the whole story.

No problem, I thought; it would be easy enough to have slides made (I have been doing it incrementally over five years in other areas). But the elementary job of collecting the images turned out to be no small chore. One might think that a teacher could go over to the art library, pluck a monograph or two from the shelves, hike them over to the studio, and have some slides shot. In fact, however, there is only one monograph in English on homosexuality in Greek art (Dover's pioneering *Greek Homosexuality*) and only a small handful of monographs, such as Keul's *Reign of the Phallus*, which, in the course of more wide-ranging studies, cover the topic in any detail.⁸ Although the subject is addressed in other places, they are not accessible through the subject headings for Greek art or for homosexuality in the Library of Congress or Dewey classification systems. ("Sodomy," "pederasty," and similar headings will sometimes reveal other sources, depending on the library's holdings.) One might have some luck with other possibilities. For example, pursuing the many disparate, and often rather out-of-the-way, books classified under the subject heading "erotic art" will ultimately yield such useful essays as Otto Brendel's conceptualization of different types of ancient erotic art, where the topic at hand is briefly considered;⁹ but the issue of homosocial and homosexual meanings in Greek art should not really be reduced to a question of merely sexual or even more broadly erotic representation, at least as that has traditionally been defined by Western collectors and historians. Just as one would not think to limit an inquiry into the way women have been conceived in Western art—as objects of representation and as subjects making and observing representations—to erotic or pornographic images of women, so one cannot limit the study of Greek homosocial masculinity to ancient sexual images of men.

If Dover's book is unavailable, to find references to the salient vase paintings, let alone decent reproductions of them, one has to comb through highly specialized literature, a task that the average art historian, not trained in classical art and archaeology, will be unable to accomplish in the limited time usually available for preparing a lecture course. (Because Dover's book did not appear until 1978, it is clear why the slide collections in major

American universities, even those as extensive as that at the Fogg Art Museum at Harvard, provide limited material.) Even a specialist can easily overlook the most important articles, some of them famous in the scholarly underground, like one published in 1942 in an obscure Danish periodical with the wonderfully uninformative title "Attic Motives on Some Clazomenian Sarcophagi";¹⁰ the equally closeted "Some Attic Vases in the Cyprus Museum," written by the foremost expert on Greek vases in 1947;¹¹ or other penetrating discussions of individual works, and their wider contexts, by leading classical art historians.¹² Presuming one is able to locate these publications, a further problem, especially for students, arises in reading them. Although the scholarly commentators discuss individual images, the wider context, the economic, social, and historical significance of Greek homosexuality, is not explored in depth. An uninitiated reader might be just as confused by the unexplained assumptions, assertions, and obfuscations of some of the modern writers as by the frequently puzzling iconography of the paintings themselves. Again, with luck one might track down the straightforward, honest, and intelligent essays on Greek homosexuality in its social and cultural context by Kenneth Dover or by the anthropologist George Devereux, written, not surprisingly, in the 1960s, when classical scholarship began to shed some of its prudishness.¹³ But an undergraduate or nonspecialist is just as likely to end up depending on euphemistic or evasive earlier studies just because they are easily accessible through library catalogs and are frequently cited in encyclopedia articles or handbooks of ancient history.¹⁴

There is no doubt that Dover's book changed the data base and, just as important, our access to it, practically overnight; all subsequent writers owe a tremendous debt to it. But by the standards of scholarly publication within art history, *Greek Homosexuality* (not written primarily as a work of visual reference or an art historical analysis) rates a "B" at best. The photos are small and cropped and frequently do not show *all* the images on a vase but only the ones Dover selected according to his own criteria. What Dover took to be salient might be correct as far as it goes but certainly cannot be accepted on faith; one needs to have the full range of visual, archaeological, and epigraphic evidence at hand. (For example, Dover hardly touches on sculpture. His focus on explicitly homoerotic or homosexual depictions in vase paintings, or depictions that employ homoerotic metaphors, is not balanced by attention to the broader, not necessarily sexualized or homosocial, image of masculinity that Greek sculpture established.) One really should go back to the original publications Dover worked from, themselves very partial, or to museum collections, where it is often possible to run into further trouble (the sequestering of erotic vases in some kind of "X" collection was once a common practice, and even now, when such objects are displayed, the euphemistic labeling can be highly misleading). In the end, having limited time and resources at my disposal, I compromised and worked up my slide lectures from Dover's pictures, knowing all along that subsequent classical scholarship had already come up with different, sometimes more encompassing or subtle accounts of the materials.¹⁵ I venture to say that something like this is the absolutely standard experience for any scholar teaching, or just touching on, lesbian and gay art history in the modern West or on the history of same-sex sexuality in the visual arts in other cultures.

It would be easy to see this general phenomenon as the obvious, inevitable result of systematic long-standing homophobia in the academy and of myriad outside disincentives that have kept comprehensive projects for collecting resources from ever getting off the ground. There is a lot to this analysis; it has only been in the last two years, for example, that the Bibliography Committee of the Gay and Lesbian Caucus of the College Art Association has begun the time-consuming and painstaking work of attempting a comprehensive listing of existing publications. But the irony is that there has really been very little need for outsiders to shove art history back into the closet, as it were,

whenever it threatens to “come out,” because art history already is *in* the closet. Indeed, at a fundamental level, art history was invented and its resources collected, exhibited, and interpreted as a closet, that is, as art historians’ practical and to some extent necessary way of avoiding painful social conflicts and wrenching personal questions by transposing the direct subjective expression of same-sex erotics into substitutes formalized by the disciplinary discourse of art history into a vast, but peculiarly sterile and arid, framework of supposedly objective interests. Same-sex sexuality and history precisely fails to be one of the objective interests of art historians, informing their collecting, research, and writing about people in the past, precisely because its *subjective* reality, for them, is continually being denied. Again, speaking out of personal experience, this displacement leads to the curious unreality of supposedly objective scholarship in art history, the weird feeling I had in college, graduate school, and still today of being surrounded by lesbian and gay artists, scholars, librarians, and students with basically zero explicit engagement with the fact. Evidently art history still functions as a successful closet. Exactly why, I am not fully sure, for it is impossible to know all the details of the many ways in which lesbian and gay students or scholars have chosen, or been forced, to shape their sexual and professional identities. The general situation, moreover, is rapidly changing, so that in a few years I hope my experience will be dated; but features of its *historical* emergence can be partially identified. To the extent that art history today is a product of its own history, how could it not be, considering its dependence on great collections, libraries, archives, and photograph or slide collections founded many years ago? The earliest stages in the development of art history are worth recalling.

Although there are important roots for modern art history in the archaeology and antiquarianism of the Renaissance, for my purposes the main episode to consider is the crafting of what is generally accepted as the first true history of art, Winckelmann’s *History of Ancient Art*, first published in Dresden in 1764.¹⁶ Winckelmann is an enigmatic figure. Serious study of his achievement is hampered by the very closeting of essential resources I have already identified. Intimate letters detailing his erotic interests and sexual escapades, for example, still remain partly untranslated.¹⁷ Winckelmann’s same-sex erotics were recognized by his acutest commentator, Goethe, to motivate much of his conceptual labor;¹⁸ but what those erotics actually involved remains uncertain, although we have at least one possibly reliable document in Casanova’s report of discovering Winckelmann relaxing with one of the young Roman castrati he favored, as well as Winckelmann’s own testimonies to his infatuations with noble German boys he was hired to tutor or guide. Late in his life, before his murder in 1768, Winckelmann was a valued member of the Papal Court, the personal librarian to the great collector Cardinal Alessandro Albani, as well as Albani’s advisor and confidant.¹⁹ But he was born to a poor family in Prussia, studying and finding his first secretarial jobs in a state with some of the most repressive laws against sodomy, harshly enforced for the lower classes by Frederick the Great.²⁰ Although he seems to have had a long affair in the 1740s with his first private student, a modern psychologist might say that through Winckelmann’s early middle age he ferociously sublimated both his sexual appetite and his political views, which turned toward republicanism and anticlericalism. His self-censorship was not only in the interest of personal security, however. As he moved up in the world and especially after he moved to Italy with his patron Cardinal Albani, in 1755, he was freer to move in the sexually permissive world of the upper classes.²¹ He also behaved opportunistically. Recognizing, for example, that nominal Catholicism was a paper credential for employment in Rome, he converted. The threads are tangled: he converted in order to get to Rome, for Rome was where he could best pursue classical studies, but Rome, as well as Greek art, already signified sexual freedom to any worldly European.²² It is safe to suppose that Winckelmann, both socially and personally defined as a sodomite interested in sexual activity with others of

his own sex, participated in the sodomitical subculture of his day, a subculture that revolved, like some 20th-century urban homosexual subcultures, around certain cafés, theaters, and drinking establishments, as well as open-air strolling in various quarters of the city and suburbs. It is entirely relevant to remember that one of Winckelmann’s chief employments as papal antiquarian was to guide British, German, and other northern gentlemen on their tour through the ruins of Rome, an activity that by the late 18th century already clearly signified, at least for many participants, the availability of sex with local working boys, liaisons that tended to be frustrated or proscribed in the Anglo-German states. That Winckelmann’s apartment in Rome was graced with a bust of a faun, which he published and described in his treatise, was not, then, merely a manifestation of his antiquarian scholarship in the questions of Greco-Roman art history. It also was fully consistent with, and probably functioned partly as, his self-definition and representation in the contemporary subculture to which he belonged.

Winckelmann raised art history from the chronicle of artists’ lives and commissions to a higher level that includes systematic stylistic analysis, historical contextualization, and even iconographical analysis, especially if we include writings like his publications of gems and other antiquities and his treatise on visual allegory. Of course, Winckelmann also helped to forge one of the essential tools of general criticism: in his essays on the *Belvedere Torso* and *Apollon* and on the *Laokoön*, the latter included in the *History*,²³ he produced lengthy focused descriptions of the individual artwork as it appears to us, an appearance that can be turned either to aesthetic-ethical or to historical analysis. Winckelmann’s *History* has to be read carefully to identify his strange separation between the known meaning of ancient Greek sculptures, revolving partly around the sexualized cult of masculinity noted earlier, and the history of Greek style. Essentially, Winckelmann focused his attention, and that of the entire tradition of art history which inherits its twinned methods of “formalism” and “historicism” from him, on the *form* of Greek art and on the facts of technique, use, and the like, going all the way back to such factors as climate, which he deemed to be relevant to explaining form historically. But major aspects of the art’s *content*, its frequent depiction of or allusion to the social practices of ancient Greek masculinity, homosociality, and homosexuality, were not usually acknowledged. When meaning absolutely *had* to be addressed in the formal or historical analysis, Winckelmann employed an elaborate euphemism. For him, Greek art is formally about and historically depends on “freedom,” although the freedom to be or to do exactly what is left somewhat undefined. It would certainly be a misreading of German Enlightenment discourse to suppose that Winckelmann’s *Freiheit* means political freedom alone; as in Kant, freedom is a cognitive condition or capability.²⁴

At points, Winckelmann’s understanding of the freedom of Greek art does shine forth, but always in code. For example, the naturalistic beauty of a Greek statue came, for Winckelmann, from the Greek sculptors’ close observation of inherently beautiful boys naked in the gymnasium. But exactly why the boys are inherently beautiful is not represented as a personal attitude of the historian-observer, which it must be; instead, it is said to result from the favorable Greek climate and social context of training men for war, factors which must somehow determine particular forms of beauty or of art. In general, throughout Winckelmann’s writing on the history of art, as opposed, in some cases, to his more philosophical meditations on questions of aesthetics, such objective historicist explanation overrides the subjective aesthetic, political-sexual response that motivated it in the first place.

An alert reading can catch Winckelmann’s contradictions in his systematic transposition of subjective personal erotics and politics into objectivizing formalist and historicist analysis. One striking contradiction creeps in almost as if he could not help it. According to the explicit standards of Winckelmann’s analysis, the Hellenistic hermaphrodites, let alone the Roman portraits of Hadrian’s

young lover Antinous, were contemporary with the total decline of general freedom in Greece and thus could not embody the essence of Greek art. But Winckelmann nonetheless cites them as great Classical works: which just goes to show that the real denotation of freedom, for Winckelmann, is not, or not only, in civic politics at all but rather in species of social-sexual license possible in a monarchic or imperial society as much as in a democratic one.²⁵ Winckelmann's very definition of classicism can only be established in implicit relation to the various formal and historical precursors of classicism itself—the Egyptian, archaic Greek, Etruscan, and late Roman (Byzantine) arts which Winckelmann, although bound by his own historicist reasoning, cannot quite disentangle from a classicism that is supposedly the autonomous formal expression of historical factors peculiar to the 5th century and late 4th century Greek city-states. For example, because Greece in the 6th century possessed the same climate and roughly the same militarized competitiveness as Greece in the 5th century, according to Winckelmann's historicism, its art should be classically beautiful. What archaic Greece supposedly lacked, of course, was political freedom; but if Winckelmann is willing to admit the unfree, if Hellenized, art of Hadrianic Rome or Justinian's Ravenna as producing great classicism, on what grounds can he exclude the 6th-century *kouroi*, the remarkable but frequently unnaturalistic standing statues of naked youths? Obviously, the real point of distinction must lie in other aesthetic or ethical responses to the *kouroi* and naturalism respectively, but Winckelmann does not directly produce his criteria. Instead, the objective formal-historical chronology, with its statement of causes and sequences and classification of species of the beautiful, is supposed in itself to render the distinction intelligible to us *ex post facto*. Despite their lack of freedom, Rome or Ravenna preserve enough of a memory of Greek classicism to engender a Classical art, while archaic Greece, although causally and chronologically closer to the zenith, did not. As Winckelmann's logic here implies, one of his criteria for the presence of the Classical turns on the play of memory and retrospective allusion, a condition foreclosed in advance for all forerunners of the Classical Greeks, who cannot remember and allude to what has not yet happened. Thus Egyptian art remains aesthetically inert for Winckelmann even though he makes some penetrating observations about its formal organization and historical meaning. Significantly, however, Etruscan art gives Winckelmann trouble: it is neither really a forerunner nor quite an inheritor of 5th-century Greek art but rather a parallel cultural development. A reader of Winckelmann's book can be forgiven for not being able to work out these tangles even though they have interested historians today: the general point is that the *History of Ancient Art* largely manages the erotic—the wish for and memory of what is subjectively witnessed as beautiful and desirable in sexual, political, and ethical terms—almost entirely off stage.

"Off stage," that is, from the point of view of the reader. From the point of view of Winckelmann, however, it is possible that he was having things both ways. Exploring his sexual and ethical attractions, actively filling them out with images, information, and a social and historical reality, both through and in the very doing of his research, he finally transposes them all into another narrative for others. In the process, the resource gap I noted in the first part of this essay opens up. What seems, from the point of view of a reader hunting for information, to be the *primary* data base, the collection of visual and archaeological facts with basic formal and historical analysis attached to them, is actually already *secondary*. The ostensibly primary data is a selection from and euphemization or substitution of those data that are *truly* primary—namely, on the one hand, the sexual-political responses of researchers to their own desires and to the social world in which they find themselves and, on the other, the particular knowledge they gather to understand and control these responses. Art history is a *discipline*, as has been pointed out many times; but what it disciplines are not the facts of art history, or only

secondarily the facts of art history. What it primarily and inaugurally disciplines is itself.

We can readily fault Jesse Helms for trying to censor art and its exhibition, publication, and discussion, for the external intervention in the disciplines of art history, curatorship, or archiving. But I do not blame art historians for the internal closeting I have been indicating here. Winckelmann's complex personal and textual self-discipline is not exactly the same thing as social censorship, especially if it is undertaken, as might have been or still be the case, to avoid or survive an external, imposed censorship or suppression. And I do not just mean to refer to the historical suppression of homoeroticism, pederasty, and sodomy or, latterly, of homosexuality. The repressions requiring the self-discipline or self-censorship of art history include much broader, more diffuse attempts to contain human variety and its multiple ways of immediately engaging the world. At what might be the most general level of all, art history has consistently sited visual meaning in the fully abstract, derealized domains of optics and of signs and the salient historical context of this meaning in the domain of articulated, rationally managed disputes about ideas in institutional policies and in wider social affairs. Optics, signs, and historical contexts so defined are, of course, objectively describable using one or another of the many scientific, or, more properly, scientific, techniques of art theory, semiology, or sociology; but in each case, to carry out the objective analysis, one must be transported, or transposed, out of the actual bodily and mental realities involved, namely, for optics, looking; for signs, sense; and for social context, subjectivity. And as the examples of Winckelmann and Mapplethorpe show, this transposition is not a full translation of the erotically interesting into the objectively known; certain realities drop out.

One of the ironies of Dennis Barrie's trial in Cincinnati, for me, was the argument, successful, it turned out, of the curators and scholars. In reviewing the transcripts, one finds that Barrie's defenders said very little about the content or meaning of Mapplethorpe's "X" pictures, about B&D and the leather world, rubber, or water sports, and Mapplethorpe's intriguing, problematic images as particular historical versions of the affective or aesthetic realities of those worlds.²⁶ Their argument was, as it were, *falsely* affective and aesthetic: they went on about the striking compositions, superb lighting, and general formal beauty of the photos, and about Mapplethorpe's historical place in the development of modern photography. The jury, of course, was reassured to hear this voice from the closet, for it actually implied that the images are more closeted, less disruptive, than they really are—art, not representation, beauty, not freedom. In this particular case, the closet did the job against censorship without needing to put into evidence anything other than tried-and-true aesthetic and art historical banalities it could parade in hundreds of other situations as well. But one wonders how long this device is going to work before outsiders see it for the deflection and euphemism the historians already know it to be.

NOTES

1. After this paper was delivered, the situation changed for the worse. Reports have circulated that the peer review process has been compromised, prompting the president of the College Art Association, Larry Silver, to complain to the acting chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts (see the *CAA Newsletter*, May 1992). As is widely known, the previous chairperson, John Frohnmayer, was forced out of his job when the administration caved in to pressure from the far-right wing of the Republican party.
2. The full history of the formation of art history remains to be written; for two views, see Heinrich Dilly, *Kunstgeschichte als Institution: Studien zur Geschichte einer Disziplin* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1979), and Donald Preziosi, *Rethinking Art History: Meditations on a Coy Science* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989). For collecting practices at the end of the 18th century, see especially Krzysztof Pomian, *Collectors and Curiosities: Paris and Venice, 1500–1800*, trans. Elizabeth Wiles-Porter (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990).
3. See Lynne Cheney, *Humanities in America: A Report to the President, the Congress, and the American People* (Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Human-

- ities, 1988); see also Lynne Cheney, et al., *50 Hours: A Core Curriculum for College Students* (Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities, 1989).
4. See H. A. Shapiro, "Courtship Scenes in Attic Vase-Painting," *American Journal of Archaeology* 85 (1981): 133–43; Gundel Koch-Harnack, *Knabenliebe und Tiergeschenke: Ihre Bedeutung im pädagogischen Erziehungssystem Athens* (Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1983).
 5. There are excellent studies of this iconography and its textual complements, by Eva Keuls, *The Reign of the Phallus: Sexual Politics in Ancient Athens* (New York: Harper and Row, 1985), and Page du Bois, *Sowing the Body: Psychoanalysis and Ancient Representations of Women* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988).
 6. A forthright and sensible discussion can be found in Kenneth Dover, ed., *Plato's Symposium* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980). A classic essay is David M. Halperin, "Why Is Diotima a Woman?" *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality and Other Essays on Greek Love* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 113–51.
 7. Among the introductory texts, Hugh Honour and John Fleming's *The Visual Arts: A History*, 3rd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1991), 109–11, is the most informative; Honour and Fleming discuss the connection between the representation of the naked male body in Greek sculpture and "the upper echelon of a male-dominated society" which "smiled on pederasty," as well as note the existence of "explicitly homo-erotic" paintings on "love cups." Paradoxically enough, books that are frequently assigned in ancient art courses, despite their more specialized and scholarly focus, do not help students. An undergraduate student reading John Boardman's *Athenian Black Figure Vases* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1975), 201–2, or *Athenian Red Figure Vases: The Archaic Period* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1975), 213, will not easily recognize from Boardman's somewhat cryptic comments about *kalos* names on vases ("inscriptions designating a youth, athlete or hero as 'beautiful'") that they are one of the most important items of evidence for the study of ancient Greek homosexual and homosexual practices.
 8. Kenneth Dover, *Greek Homosexuality* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978); Keuls, *The Reign of Phallus*.
 9. Otto Brendel, "The Scope and Temperament of Erotic Art in the Greco-Roman World," in *Studies in Erotic Art*, ed. Theodore Bowie and C. V. Christenson (New York: Basic Books, 1970), 3–69.
 10. K. Friis Johansen, "Attic Motives on Clazomenian Sarcophagi," *From the Collections of the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek* 3 (1942): 123–43.
 11. J. D. Beazley, "Some Attic Vases in the Cyprus Museum," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 33 (1947): 193–243.
 12. For example, Emily Vermeule, "Fragments of a Symposium by Euphronios," *Antike Kunst* 8 (1965): 34–39; id., "Some Erotica in Boston," *Antike Kunst* 12 (1969): 9–15; John Boardman, "A Curious Eye Cup," *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 19 (1976): 281–90; Peter H. von Blanckenhagen, "Puerilia," in *In Memoriam Otto J. Brendel*, ed. Lisa Bonfante and H. von Heintze (Mainz: von Zabern, 1976), 37–41. For a possible Bronze Age parallel, see Robert B. Koehl, "The Chieftain Cup and a Minoan Rite of Passage," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 107 (1986): 99–110.
 13. Kenneth Dover, "Eros and Nomos," *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* (London) 11 (1964): 31–42; George Devereux, "Greek Pseudo-Homosexuality and the 'Greek Miracle,'" *Symbolae Osloensis* 42 (1967): 69–92. Both essays occasionally adopt a sardonic tone, perhaps the only available strategy at the time, for addressing the issues; although their interpretations have been partly superseded, they still make extremely provocative reading.
 14. For example, Hans Licht, *Sexual Life in Ancient Greece*, trans. J. H. Freese (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1952); in other languages, Bernard Sergent's *L'homosexualité dans l'Europe ancienne* (Paris: Payot, 1986) is suggestive but idiosyncratic. Fortunately, the situation has changed rapidly in the past three years (see below, note 15), but there is still a dearth of art historical analysis.
 15. Here one should mention Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, vol. 2, *The Use of Pleasure*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Random House, 1985); John J. Winkler, *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece* (New York: Routledge, 1989); David M. Halperin, *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality* (New York: Routledge, 1990); David M. Halperin, John J. Winkler, and Froma I. Zeitlin, eds., *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1990); the last contains some essays that are primarily art historical. Very useful related studies are cited in note 5 above.
 16. The only English translation, by G. H. Lodge (4 vols., Boston: Little, Brown, 1880), is unsatisfactory in several respects; a new rendition is long overdue. The French translation (supposedly by Hubert, but not credited in the publication) is worth consulting for its more subtle representation of Winckelmann's nuanced prose (*Histoire de l'art chez les anciens, par Winckelmann, avec des notes historiques et critiques de différents auteurs* [Paris: Bossange, Masson et Besson, 1802–3]).
 17. The best (but still incomplete) edition is J. J. Winckelmann, *Briefe*, ed. Walter Rehm, 4 vols. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1952–55); selections can be found in the standard, still unsurpassed biography: Carl Justi, *Winckelmann und seine Zeitgenossen*, 3 vols., 2nd ed. (Leipzig: F. C. W. Voegel, 1898).
 18. J. W. von Goethe, *Winckelmann und sein Jahrhundert in Briefen und Aufsätzen*, ed. H. Holtzhauer (Leipzig: Seeman Verlag, 1969). Although there have been numerous subtle studies of Winckelmann's art historical writing and aesthetic theory, only a handful have attempted to integrate them with an account of his sexuality. The most successful, although still problematic or idiosyncratic in one way or another, are Leopold D. Ettlinger, "Winckelmann, or Marble Boys are Better," in *Art the Ape of Nature: Studies in Honor of H. W. Janson*, ed. Moshe Barasch and Lucy Freeman Sandler, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1981), 505–11; Hans Mayer, "Winckelmann's Death and the Discovery of a Double Life," in *Outsiders: A Study in Life and Letters*, trans. Denis M. Sweet (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1982), 167–74; Denis M. Sweet, "The Personal, the Political, and the Aesthetic: Johann Joachim Winckelmann's German Enlightenment Life," in *Journal of Homosexuality* (special double issue subtitled "The Pursuit of Sodomy: Male Homosexuality in Renaissance and Enlightenment Europe") 16, no. 1/2 (1988): 147–61.
 19. See W. O. Collier, "The Villa of Cardinal Alessandro Albani, Hon. F.S.A.," *Antiquaries Journal* 67 (1987): 338–47. According to G. S. Rousseau, "The villa of Cardinal Albani in Rome . . . was an unrivaled nervecenter for combined antiquarian and homosocial activity. In the unique atmosphere of this Roman villa many homosexual aesthetes, in addition to Winckelmann, the bisexual [Anton] Mengs, and the homosocial Richard Payne Knight, discovered their artistic and erotic sides conjoined." ("The Pursuit of Homosexuality in the Eighteenth Century: 'Utterly Confused Category' and/or Rich Repository?," *Eighteenth Century Life* (special issue subtitled "Unauthorized Sexual Behavior in the Enlightenment") 9 (May 1985): 155).
 20. James D. Steakley, "Sodomy in Enlightenment Prussia: From Execution to Suicide," *Journal of Homosexuality* 16, no. 1/2 (1988): 163–74.
 21. Much remains to be done in reconstructing the social and cultural history of male-male and female-female sexuality in the Ancien Régime, the German courts, the Papal Court, and elsewhere, but solid beginnings have been made by MacCubbin, ed., "Unauthorized Sexual Behavior in the Enlightenment" (see note #19); Gerard and Hekma, eds., "The Pursuit of Sodomy" (see note #18); and G. S. Rousseau and Roy Porter, eds., *Sexual Underworlds of the Enlightenment* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1988). In addition to his homoerotic or pederastic involvements with young men, Winckelmann was interested in castrati and hermaphrodites. Although the former had a major role in 18th-century cultural life and the latter a well-defined place in the 18th-century topography of gender, hard information about their participation in "sexual underworlds" of the 18th century is still very scattered.
 22. See especially G. S. Rousseau, "The Sorrows of Priapus: Anticlericalism, Homosocial Desire, and Richard Payne Knight," Rousseau and Porter, eds., *Sexual Underworlds of the Enlightenment*, 101–53.
 23. For Winckelmann's publications of gems and other antiquities, see J. J. Winckelmann, *Description des Pierres gravées du feu Baron de Stosch* (Florence, 1760); *Monumenti Antichi Inediti* (Rome, 1767). For his treatise on allegory, see *Versuch einer Allegorie, besonders für die Kunst* (Dresden, 1766). For his general aesthetic ideas, see especially *Gedanken über die Nachahmung der griechischen Werke in der Malerei und Bildhauerkunst* (Dresden, 1755). A good English translation of the last, Winckelmann's early but extraordinarily influential call for the "imitation" of ancient art by modern artists, is *Reflections on the Imitation of Greek Works in Painting and Sculpture*, trans. Elfriede Heyer and Roger C. Norton (La Salle, Ill.: Open Court, 1987).
 24. See especially Peter D. Fenves, *A Peculiar Fate: Metaphysics and World-History in Kant* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1991). The most overt (although not wholly intelligible) connection between Winckelmann's idealization of freedom and the principles of political republicanism was made by his French readers at the end of the 18th century; see Alex Potts, "Political Attitudes and the Rise of Historicism in Art Theory," *Art History* 1 (1978): 191–213; id., "Beautiful Bodies and Dying Heroes: Images of Ideal Manhood in the French Revolution," *History Workshop Journal* 30 (1990): 1–21; Edouard Pommier, "Winckelmann et la vision de l'Antiquité classique dans la France des Lumières et de la Révolution," *Revue de l'Art* 83 (1989): 9–21. In German-speaking countries, Winckelmann's thought provoked other responses altogether: see especially Henry C. Hatfield, *Aesthetic Paganism in German Literature from Winckelmann to the Death of Goethe* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948), and Michael Embach, "Kunstgeschichte und Literatur: zur Winckelmann-Rezeption des Deutschen Idealismus," in *Ars et Ecclesia: Festschrift für Franz J. Ronig zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Hans-Walter Stork (Trier: Paulinus, 1989), 97–113. This and the following paragraphs are considerably amplified in my "Winckelmann Divided," in *Outlooks: Lesbian and Gay Studies in Art History*, ed. Whitney Davis (Binghamton, N.Y.: Haworth Press, 1993), forthcoming.
 25. Various other disjunctions in Winckelmann's history are explored in the essays by Potts and Davis noted above (note 24); see also Alex Potts, "Winckelmann's Construction of History," *Art History* 5 (1982): 377–407; Barbara Maria Stafford, "Beauty of the Invisible: Winckelmann and the Aesthetics of Imperceptibility," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 43 (1980): 65–78; Wolf Lepenies, "Der andere Fanatiker: Historisierung und Verwissenschaftlichung der Kunstauffassung bei Johann Joachim Winckelmann," in *Ideal und Wirklichkeit der bildenden Kunst im späten 18. Jahrhundert*, ed. Herbert Beck, Peter C. Bol, and Eva Maek-Gerard (Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1984), 19–29; Michael Fried, "Antiquity Now: Reading Winckelmann on Imitation," *October* 37 (1986): 87–97. In each case, I believe, one could relate the turmoil in Winckelmann's texts—not only his contradictions and inconsistencies but also his explicit commitments and ambitions—to the real and imagined dimensions of his sexuality and eroticism, broadly conceived. This reading would not be an alternative to more standard histories of ideas or to a social history of art history but would supplement them by grounding Winckelmann's representations in his actual experience within his social milieu.
 26. It is well worth reading these transcripts in comparison with Goethe's reflections on the life, work, ethics, and eroticism of Winckelmann (see above, note 18). In both cases, although the commentators know something about the reality of the artists or the writer's interests, they do not directly name them. Actually, to be fair, Goethe was more honest than some of Mapplethorpe's defenders.