



ORDINES

*Per un sapere interdisciplinare sulle istituzioni europee*

ISSN 2421-0730

NUMERO 1 – GIUGNO 2019

FRANCESCO ROTIROTI

**On Misogyny, the Classics,  
and the Political Right:**

**For an Ethical Scholarship of Ancient History**

D. ZUCKERBERG, *Not All Dead White Men: Classics and  
Misogyny in the Digital Age*, Harvard University Press,  
Cambridge, Mass., and London 2018, pp. 270

**On Misogyny, the Classics, and the Political Right:  
For an Ethical Scholarship of Ancient History**

D. ZUCKERBERG, *Not All Dead White Men: Classics and Misogyny in the Digital Age*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., and London  
2018, pp. 270

I.

*Not All Dead White Men* is the first book by Donna Zuckerberg, an American classicist educated at Princeton University, best known as the founder and chief editor of *Eidolon*, an online journal whose declared mission is to “mak[e] the classics political and personal, feminist and fun.”<sup>1</sup> Some of the most attractive and remarkable of *Eidolon*’s articles are precisely those which adopt a progressive, inclusive, and feminist perspective on the place of ancient history and the classics in present-day politics.

The book under review has a similar inspiration, concerned as it is with the appropriation of the classics by what is often described as the “manosphere,” a loose network of online communities connected by their awareness of the purported misandry of present-day societies and fostering

---

\* Postdoctoral Researcher in Legal History at “Magna Graecia” University of Catanzaro.

<sup>1</sup> *Eidolon*’s Mission Statement, in *Eidolon*, Aug. 21, 2017, <https://eidolon.pub/eidolons-mission-statement-d026012023d5>. On the political element, see esp. D. ZUCKERBERG, *Welcome to the New Eidolon!* in *Eidolon*, Aug. 21, 2017, <https://eidolon.pub/welcome-to-the-new-eidolon-3b8a4230da5b>.

an essentially patriarchal and antifeminist ideology.<sup>2</sup> The manosphere's claim to an enlightened awareness motivates their self-identification around the metaphor of the "Red Pill" (Zuckerberg's favorite label for the collective designation of these communities), a reference to the 1999 film *The Matrix*, whose protagonist is offered a choice between a blue pill that will maintain him in his former life of delusion, and a red pill that will awake him to the hidden truth about the world in which we live.<sup>3</sup>

## II.

The book, as Zuckerberg states in the "Introduction" (pp. 1–10), "is about how the men of the Red Pill use the literature and history of ancient Greece and Rome to promote patriarchal and white supremacist ideology" (p. 5). Declaredly, the objective is not so much disputing the flaws of these interpretations as engaging with their ideological purpose: "By revealing how this self-mythologizing works, we can develop strategies for counteracting its pernicious influence" (p. 10).

Other than illustrating the general plan and argument of the book, the introduction also makes a case for the relevance of the Red Pill community—and, therefore, its study—to a world that has recently elected Donald Trump as President of the United States, an event that has seemingly empowered those online circles to be even more outspoken about their misogynist ideology (and, perhaps, more secure in their misappropriation of the

---

<sup>2</sup> On the manosphere, see D. GING, *Alphas, Betas, and Incels: Theorizing the Masculinities of the Manosphere*, in *Men and Masculinities*, May 10, 2017, publ. online ahead of print (DOI: 10.1177/1097184X17706401).

<sup>3</sup> The metaphor of the red pill is not exclusive to the manosphere but is commonly used by different currents of the Alt-Right spectrum; see G. HAWLEY, *Making Sense of the Alt-Right*, Columbia University Press, New York, 2017, 83–84; S. F. AIKIN, *Deep Disagreement, the Dark Enlightenment, and the Rhetoric of the Red Pill*, in *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, July 4, 2018, publ. online ahead of print (DOI: 10.1111/japp.12331).

classics: as Zuckerberg observes, key personalities near the president are known aficionados of ancient history). The argument unfolds through four chapters and a conclusion.

The first chapter, “Arms and the Manosphere” (pp. 11–44), begins with introducing the reader to the book’s subject matter through an overview of the manosphere, its subgroups, and its connection with the Alt-Right. Thereafter, the focus is brought to the manosphere’s appropriation of the classics, which is fittingly understood in the context of “the millennia-long use of classical antiquity to promote reactionary ideologies” (p. 22); in particular, misogynist views from Hesiod, Semonides, Xenophon, and Juvenal are surveyed and read together with their reception by the writers of the manosphere. In the next section, Zuckerberg documents the fear—common across the right-wing spectrum but also shared by a number of scholars—of the disengagement of the West with the classics, whose preeminence in the curricula is allegedly challenged by new methods of inquiry and political sensitivities. The final section continues pursuing the familiarization of the reader with otherwise unfamiliar grounds, this time by detailing a number of rhetorical strategies that are commonly employed by members of the Red Pill in their interactions with feminists.

Zuckerberg has read deeply into her sources; in the first chapter and throughout the book, the author does her best to familiarize the reader with the manosphere’s jargon and practices. This is particularly noticeable in a later chapter, when Ovid’s method of seduction is juxtaposed with an informative account of the modern techniques advised by so-called pick-up artists.

The second chapter, “The Angriest Stoics” (pp. 45–88), documents the appropriation of ancient Stoicism by the Red Pill community. Zuckerberg first draws attention to the glaring distance seemingly separating the manosphere from this ancient philosophy, which is recognized as having fostered some forms of gender equality and chiefly advised its adherents to

care only about virtue—the sole thing within one’s power—and to remain unaffected by anything else.

Nonetheless, the author argues, this picture of Stoicism is not exhaustive. Indeed, while it is true that the writers of the manosphere adopt a simplified version that is mostly meant to bolster stereotypical masculinity, “the attitudes ancient Stoic writers held about gender and virtue were more complex and less progressive than they at first appear.” Therefore, the readings of these texts by the Red Pill community should not be hastily dismissed as erroneous interpretations, for “they may be responding to and drawing on parts of Stoicism that advocates of the philosophy would prefer to ignore” (p. 48). This remark underlies key aspects of the enterprise attempted by the book under review. While guided by a clear distaste for the manipulation of the classics by reactionary forces, Zuckerberg is also aware that ancient literature does not autonomously express enlightened and ready-made values for the regulation of present-day societies. Some, of course, may conclude that feminist scholars and activists are in fact willing to erase the classics (together with the rest of our patriarchal inheritance); erasure, however, is not the scenario envisaged by the author of *Not All Dead White Men*, who readily maintains that the ancient world can also be used to promote progressive and feminist politics.

After a brief overview of ancient Stoicism (with a specific focus on the Late Stoa, wherein the interests of the manosphere mostly lie), Zuckerberg analyzes its distortive reception by the Red Pill community, wherein Stoicism is reduced to a practical tool for self-improvement and essentially framed as a philosophy for the male elite, thus reinforcing individualistic and sexist beliefs. The sexist reception is particularly troublesome; indeed, while the claim that men are superior to women because of their superior rationality may seem to distort the ancient Stoic notion that women, too, partake of the *logos*, “beneath the surface of Stoicism’s apparent profeminism is a gender politics easily adaptable to Red Pill ideology” (p. 70). Zuckerberg’s approach to this complexity is commendably balanced

and well-aimed, as it neither falls for a quick dismissal of ancient Stoicism by reason of its sexism—an assessment that would not do justice to the merit that certain ideas may have had in their own time—nor unduly praises it by reason of its supposed profeminism. Rather, it offers a timely warning to the reader against adopting obsolete and essentially harmful stereotypes about gender.

Zuckerberg also attempts to understand the deeper reason for the fascination of the manosphere with ancient Stoicism; the chapter's final section argues that by projecting the appearance of the Stoic sage onto their personas, Red Pill writers rhetorically construct their own moral superiority over women and people of color—that is, groups that are often perceived as less rational and more emotional.

The third chapter, “The Ovid Method” (pp. 89–142), is the longest and, perhaps, the most interesting of the book; here Zuckerberg's method is at its best. The appropriation of Ovid by the writers of the manosphere, which constitutes the chapter's subject matter, is documented through examples from a number of so-called pick-up artists who have variously commented on Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* in both their online and printed works. While informing the reader about the strategies of seduction that are theorized and practiced by these writers, Zuckerberg also indicates their similarities with the techniques advised by the narrator of the *Ars*; Red Pill advice and Ovid's poem are read alongside each other to the end of illuminating both. This works very well; the appropriation of Ovid by the manosphere is fittingly documented and the similarities are numerous. Beyond the individual similarities in strategies of seduction, by means of the author's analysis Ovid's narrator and the writers of the Red Pill community are compellingly shown to share some fundamental—and essentially oppressive—ideas about female agency and personhood. This reveals that a “disturbing subtext” may be “lying just beneath the surface of apparently innocuous texts” (p. 108).

Zuckerberg also performs well in arguing for the inherently political nature of the Red Pill theory of seduction, which is effectively conceived of

by pick-up artists as “a way of subverting the ‘traditional’ hierarchies of sexual politics, which they claim favor women” (p. 118). This elicits an association with the political significance of Ovid’s unchaste teachings in the highly moralized context of the Augustan regime. Of course, it is argued, the impression of subversion is essentially fallacious, for both Ovid’s poetry and the theory of the manosphere are expressions of traditional masculinity.

The fourth chapter, “How to Save Western Civilization” (pp. 143–184), attempts to use classical antiquity to both understand and disarm the concern of the manosphere with false rape allegations. Although the focus is not so much on specific instances of classical reception by the writers of the Red Pill, their wish to revive ancient sexual ethics lurks in the background of Zuckerberg’s analysis, especially in the chapter’s final section.

The first step of the chapter’s multifaceted argument is centered around the contrast between the narrow notion of rape held within the manosphere, which tends to be exclusive of date rape (sometimes, according to pick-up artists, “no means yes”), and the very broad definition that can be advocated on the basis of radical feminist theory. If, as argued by Andrea Dworkin, heterosexual sex occurs in a context of power relations in which men—all men—have some kind of power over women—all women<sup>4</sup>—then every instance of sexual intercourse between a man and a woman may be classed as rape. While recognizing this definition as a hyperbole, Zuckerberg understands its heuristic potential for the analysis of sex in the ancient world. Provided that ancient Greece and Rome were societies that severely restricted female autonomy and agency, “was all sex in the ancient world rape?” (p. 154).

The chapter proceeds through a brief analysis of a number of classical authors (Herodotus, Lysias, Homer, and Livy) who indeed appear to describe what Zuckerberg defines as “rape culture”; that is, a culture in

---

<sup>4</sup> A. DWORKIN, *Intercourse*, 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary ed., Basic Books, New York, 2007, 158–159.

which rape is a regular occurrence, is often unrecognized as such, and carries minimal consequences for rapists. Some may contend that Zuckerberg is superimposing modern notions and sensitivities on the ancient world, but this judgment would not do justice to the orientation of her enterprise, which is prompted by the need to counter ideologies that advocate the present-day revival of ancient norms. In this perspective, scholars not only have the option, but also the duty to question the ancient world through the eyes of modern ethics. Zuckerberg's conclusions are fairly balanced, as she acknowledges that the exact degree of female oppression in ancient societies is up to scholarly debate; however, "no scholar argues that the overall state of women's rights in the ancient world was worthy of emulation" (p. 163).

In its next step, the chapter takes issue with the Red Pill misconception that false rape accusations are the product of our "gynocentric" society, in which women, who are alleged to be natural liars, are given too much credibility. To counter this delusion, Zuckerberg analyzes the ancient myth of Phaedra and Hippolytus, showing that the success of Phaedra's false allegation is directly dependent on her flawless record of sexual morals—which makes her account plausible to her male relatives—and on Hippolytus's failure to adhere to the norms of masculinity; in other words, Phaedra's tragedy owes more to the institutions of a patriarchal and chauvinistic society "than to any flaw in her character or, for that matter, female psychology in general" (p. 180).<sup>5</sup>

This analysis is one of the highlights of the book. Through her unconventional reading of the myth, Zuckerberg not only exposes the counterintuitive association that connects false rape accusations with the actuality of patriarchal institutions, but also provides a compelling response

---

<sup>5</sup> The main points of this interpretation were already argued by Zuckerberg in a 2015 article on online feminist magazine *Jezebel*: D. ZUCKERBERG, *He Said, She Said: The Mythical History of the False Rape Allegation*, in *Jezebel*, July 30, 2015, <https://jezebel.com/he-said-she-said-the-mythical-history-of-the-false-ra-1720945752>.



to those who may be all too willing to dispose of ancient classics that seemingly promote misogynist and patriarchal ideology. Much like the myth of Phaedra, which does *not* substantiate the belief that women are natural liars who endanger innocent men through false rape allegations, but, on the contrary, contributes to expose the mechanisms of female and male subjugation, so can other classics be wielded to the same end. It is all about posing the right questions—and answering them unreservedly—both in the classroom and in scholarly debate.

As shown through the brief “Conclusion” (pp. 185–189), Zuckerberg is well aware of the need to defend the classics from both the political right and some on the political left, for both parties share the belief that classics only or mostly matter to “reactionary white men” (p. 187). But the classics are also claimed by numerous intellectuals who recognize themselves in the tradition of progressive and feminist thought. While progressives may not feel at ease with many of the views advocated by ancient authors, this discomfort, Zuckerberg correctly argues, is the necessary ingredient for an ethical classicism in today’s world.

The “Conclusion” is followed by a “Glossary of Red Pill Terms,” which helps the reader navigate the many neologisms of the Red Pill community, and then by endnotes, references, acknowledgements, and an index.

### III.

In summary, *Not All Dead White Men* is a timely study of the appropriation of the classics and ancient history by online communities that vilify women and campaign for the reenacting of reactionary and misogynist ethics.

Zuckerberg has performed the commendable task of bringing this subset of classical reception to the attention of both classical scholars and the educated reader, taking hold of an elusive subject matter and

emancipating it from the fallacious impression of its irrelevance. Why should classicists and society concern themselves with marginal online communities of resentful men who counsel one another on techniques to either seduce women or avoid them altogether? Unfortunately, as Zuckerberg recognizes, those online communities are neither marginal nor irrelevant but interact with the larger landscape of United States politics. Nonetheless, the book could have done more in order to guide the reader to make sense of the connection between male supremacism and right-wing politics—a connection that is neither specific to the occasional overlaps between the manosphere and the Alt-Right, nor merely circumstantial.<sup>6</sup>

Whether combined with male supremacism, as in the case of the manosphere, or in support of other doctrines, the appropriation of classical antiquity is yet another common feature across the right-wing spectrum. While most scholars may be familiar with the use of the Greco-Roman past in the discourses deployed in right-wing politics throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century, recent years have been no exception. As documented by the online platform *Pharos: Doing Justice to the Classics*, among others, classical antiquity does indeed continue to appeal to groups promoting racist, nationalistic, misogynist, and homophobic ideologies, in both North America and Europe.<sup>7</sup> The appropriation of the classics by the subaltern, on the contrary, has become infrequent, as reported by the international research network “Claiming the Classical”; in the early 21<sup>st</sup> century, within

---

<sup>6</sup> For an enterprise of this type, see M. N. LYONS, *Insurgent Supremacists: The U.S. Far Right’s Challenge to State and Empire*, PM Press/Kersplebedeb Publishing, Oakland, Cal., and Montreal, 2018, 93–122, placing the misogynist ideology of the manosphere in the number of the approaches to sexuality and gender developed within the different currents of the U.S. far right, which, in turn, is understood as “express[ing] ... the fear and anger of groups whose historical privileges have eroded or seem to be under threat” as a consequence of the large-scale societal and economic changes of the last fifty years (at xv).

<sup>7</sup> At <http://pages.vassar.edu/pharos/>. The platform has been in operation since November 2017; it was founded and is currently directed by Curtis Dozier, Visiting Assistant Professor of Greek and Roman Studies at Vassar College.

the boundaries of formal political discourse, “the Greco-Roman world is no longer deployed as easily by the left as it is by the right, by the subaltern as by the establishment, by radicals as by conservatives.”<sup>8</sup> The individual manifestations of this phenomenon, including the one researched by Zuckerberg, deserve the attention of both classical and political scholars.

Denouncing the appropriation of antiquity by an extremist community does not exhaust the purpose of the book under review. Part of its interest also lies in employing that extremist appropriation as a lens through which to reconsider more familiar interpretations of the classics. For example, the manosphere’s rebranding of Stoicism as a sort of practical tool for the self-improvement of the male elite is understood as part of a bigger trend in contemporary popular Stoicism more generally; the second chapter, therefore, includes the call for an effort, directed at the advocates of the neo-Stoic movement, to ensure that the embracement of Stoicism will not serve the perpetuation of systemic injustice. Likewise, the third chapter warns against treating Ovid’s *Ars Amatoria* as “fundamentally playful or subversive, as some scholars do ... when there is a community using it today to normalize an attitude toward consent that would not be out of place in ancient Rome” (p. 95).

This is one of the main merits of Zuckerberg. Much of her book reads as an invitation to classical scholars to implement an ethical perspective in their reading of the classics—not by disavowing their cultural and aesthetic achievements, but by avoiding ethically uncommitted interpretations that may in fact contribute to the validation of the voices of inequality and injustice.

While the balance sheet of Zuckerberg’s enterprise is undoubtedly in the black, *Not All Dead White Men* also has some minor flaws, which, however,

---

<sup>8</sup> N. MAC SWEENEY et al., *Claiming the Classical: The Greco-Roman World in Contemporary Political Discourse*, in *Council of University Classical Departments Bulletin*, 48/2019, 16, <https://cucd.blogs.sas.ac.uk/files/2019/02/MAC-SWEENEY-ET-AL-Claiming-the-Classical.pdf>.

do not detract from the book's other accomplishments. In particular, the specific role played by ancient history in the ideology of the manosphere is not always clear and, at times, appears to be overstated. For example, through pages 76–79, Zuckerberg documents the manosphere's belief that men are logical while women are prone to emotions, particularly anger; after discussing a number of articles by a Red Pill blogger who goes by the pseudonym of Rollo Tomassi—none of which contain discernible references to Stoic philosophy<sup>9</sup>—Zuckerberg concludes (pp. 78–79):

The idea that women are inherently angrier than men goes back to the ancient world: Seneca says in *De Ira* that women and children are angrier than men are (1.20). The Red Pill community has enthusiastically adopted this view. They believe that women are *by nature* more emotional and less rational than men—a position expounded at length in a two-part article on *Illimitable Men*, “The Myth of Female Rationality.” Ideas about female nature, often understood with reference to pseudo-evolutionary psychology, are then buttressed with support from Stoic philosophy.

However, “The Myth of Female Rationality” does not contain discernible references to Stoicism.<sup>10</sup> That men are more rational while women are more emotional is a commonly held belief in Western cultures; to some extent, as Zuckerberg observes, the dichotomy is also present in ancient Stoicism, and some writers of the manosphere have indeed adopted their own version of Stoic philosophy, but the specific relevance of Stoicism to the manosphere's

---

<sup>9</sup> R. TOMASSI, *Anger Management*, in *The Rational Male*, Nov. 6, 2013, <https://therationalmale.com/2013/11/06/anger-management/>; ID., *The Apologists*, in *The Rational Male*, Apr. 28, 2014, <https://therationalmale.com/2014/04/28/the-apologists/>; ID., *The Anger Bias*, in *The Rational Male*, Mar. 29, 2017, <https://therationalmale.com/2017/03/29/the-anger-bias/>. Accessed March 7, 2019.

<sup>10</sup> *The Myth of Female Rationality (Part 1)*, in *Illimitable Men*, Feb. 1, 2016, <https://illimitablemen.com/2016/02/01/the-myth-of-female-rationality-part-1/>; *The Myth of Female Rationality (Part 2)*, in *Illimitable Men*, Feb. 9, 2016, <https://illimitablemen.com/2016/02/09/the-myth-of-female-rationality-part-2/>. Accessed March 8, 2019.

endorsement and conceptualization of the dichotomy remains to be argued more cogently.

The problem afflicts the entire chapter more generally, as Zuckerberg discusses only a limited number of writings of the manosphere that effectively enlist ancient Stoicism; therefore, the extent of the relation between the two philosophies remains unclear. Perhaps, the book could have benefited from a deeper engagement with the different sources of the manosphere's ideology—other than, for example, the occasional mentions of the contribution brought by evolutionary psychology—in order to give a better picture of the placement of ancient history in relation to the whole.

Finally, throughout the book, Zuckerberg discusses a fair number of ancient texts and authors, spanning from 8<sup>th</sup> century B.C.E. Greece to the 2<sup>nd</sup> century Roman Empire, alternating interpretations of individual passages and broader overviews, which variously serve the purpose of either illustrating ancient misogyny per se or contextualizing its modern reception. The treatment of the classical sources is mostly adequate to the book's scope and often insightful; Zuckerberg does a good job of highlighting elements of misogyny that may easily be overlooked by the enthusiastic reader of classical literature. Nonetheless, the book also includes occasional oversights and simplifications that could be avoided, as in the uncomplicated statement that Augustus punished Ovid "severely" (with banishment) for composing a poem, the *Ars Amatoria*, that subverted the sexual morality promoted by the regime (p. 119). While this version plays well with Zuckerberg's thesis that the *Ars* should not be regarded as an innocuous literary fiction, the reasons for Ovid's exile—and the actual role played by the poem—are much debated in Ovidian scholarship.<sup>11</sup> Besides

---

<sup>11</sup> For recent surveys, see A. LUISI, N. F. BERRINO, *Carmen et error: Nel bimillenario dell'esilio di Ovidio*, Edipuglia, Bari, 2008; M. M. MCGOWAN, *Ovid in Exile: Power and Poetic Redress in the Tristia and Epistulae ex Ponto*, Brill, Leiden and Boston, 2009, 20–21 and passim.

reporting the minority opinion that the exile may itself be a literary fiction, *Not All Dead White Men* contains no mention of this debate.

Another consequential oversight comes at an earlier point. In arguing that ancient Stoicism is not devoid of substantial strains of misogyny, Zuckerberg observes that, “although female virtue is granted as a possibility, virtue itself is always coded in ancient texts as male. The words for virtue in both languages—*andreia* in Greek, *virtus* in Latin—literally mean manliness” (p. 74). This statement improperly conflates *andreia* with *aretē*. I will not dwell on whether “virtue” is the most appropriate rendering of the Greek *aretē*—it is not.<sup>12</sup> Nonetheless, when Zuckerberg says that, “female virtue is granted as a possibility,” that would be *aretē*—a key notion of Stoic ethics—to which, according to an echo of the early Stoic Cleanthes in Stobaeus, “all humans” have a natural predisposition (*SVF* 1.566). According to Diogenes Laertius (7.175), Cleanthes had also authored a work on the sameness of *aretē* in men and women, which Zuckerberg recalls at p. 71. Musonius Rufus, with whom Zuckerberg deals in detail, similarly writes that not only men but also women have a natural affinity with *aretē* (Muson. 3, Hense 9.8–10); both men and women, Musonius argues elsewhere, ought to have the same *aretai*, that is, *aretē* in the plural (4, Hense 13–14). *Andreia*, on the other hand, meaning “courage,” literally “manliness,” merely is one of the different virtues that pertain to both men and women (4, Hense 15). In short, while it may be relevant that *aretē* includes manliness, the two cannot be conflated. This oversight, however, should not detract from the whole; Zuckerberg is correct that strains of male chauvinism are deeply encoded in ancient Stoicism.

---

<sup>12</sup> For a brief overview of the Greek notion of *aretē*, see Z. PAŃPUCH, *Areté*, in A. MARYNIARCZYK et al. (eds.), *Powszechna Encyklopedia Filozofii*, vol. 1, A–B, Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, Lublin, 2000, 318–325 (the entry is translated in English on the Internet website of the publisher: <http://www.ptta.pl/pef/haslaen/a/arete.pdf>).

## IV.

In conclusion, regardless of some minor flaws, *Not All Dead White Men* brings a valuable contribution to at least two different areas of both scholarly and political debate. Most visibly, at a historical moment in which right and far-right politics are on the rise throughout the globe, Zuckerberg's book contributes to tracking the continued attempts on the right side of the political spectrum to co-opt the classical legacy into noxious ideologies of oppression. While these appropriations are often grounded in selective readings and misinterpretations, ancient literature does indeed reflect the values of a time of profound inequalities, which can still easily appeal to the like-minded political movements of today. In other words, as Zuckerberg argues, the distance between the manosphere and Ovid, to name one, is not so great as we may wish to believe.

This acknowledgement, however, does not translate into a call for the abandonment of ancient literature. On the contrary, classical scholars are urged to *vindicate* the classics, not so much through direct engagement with those who misappropriate ancient history for the causes of inequality and injustice, as through a full-fledged ethical scholarship; that is, a scholarship that does not downplay the shortcomings of the ancient Greeks and Romans but willingly interrogates them, attempting to understand how a number of ancient values and ideas have already supported the cause of the oppressor in the time past and may continue to do so. This approach will ensure that the classics may remain relevant to the world of today, while also preventing the future of classical scholarship from resembling its not so distant past, when the classics were consistently mobilized to reinforce racial, gendered, and social boundaries.

In the end, Zuckerberg's proposal—which is consonant with the sentiment of many other scholars on the political left—does not break with the tradition of classical studies as much as some of her critics may contend. Indeed, for longer than two millennia, the classics have been read not only

because of their beauty and historicity but also, and especially, because of their educational value. This is something that we can keep doing, provided that we let ourselves be guided not by an unrelenting deference to the proclaimed fathers of Western civilization—often camouflaged under the guise of scientific objectivity—but by critical morality.