

SO THIS IS LOVE? TRANSLATING PLATO'S DOCTRINE OF HOMOEROTIC
LOVE INTO THE HETEROEROTIC RELATIONSHIPS OF THE GREEK NOVEL

by

Carly Rae Hall

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the Degree of

Bachelor of Arts with

Honours in Classics

Acadia University

April, 2016

© Copyright by Carly Rae Hall, 2016

This thesis by Carly Rae Hall
is accepted in its present form by the
Department of History and Classics
as satisfying the thesis requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honours

Approved by the Thesis Supervisor

Dr. Vernon Provencal Date

Approved by the Head of the Department

Dr. Gillian Poulter Date

Approved by the Honours Committee

Anna Redden Date

I, Carly Rae Hall, grant permission to the University Librarian at Acadia University to reproduce, loan or distribute copies of my thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats on a non-profit basis. I, however, retain the copyright in my thesis.

Signature of Author

Date

Table of Contents

Title Page	i
Approval Page	ii
Permission for Duplication Page	iii
Abstract	v
List of Abbreviations and Terminology	vi
Introduction	1
Chapter One: Plato's <i>Symposium</i> and <i>Phaedrus</i>	3
I. Plato's <i>Symposium</i>	3
II. Plato's <i>Phaedrus</i>	17
Chapter Two: Plutarch's <i>Amatorius</i>	27
I. The Homoerotic Argument	29
II. The Heteroerotic Argument	34
III. Plutarch's speech	38
Chapter Three: Platonic Love in the Greek Novel	47
I. Achilles Tatius' <i>Leucippe and Clitophon</i>	48
II. Longus' <i>Daphnis and Chloe</i>	65
Conclusion	75
Bibliography	77

Abstract:

This thesis aims to demonstrate the presence of Plato's homoerotic doctrine of Love, as set out in the *Symposium* and *Phaedrus*, in the heteroerotic relationships of the ancient Greek novels, Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* and Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*. In Plato's dialogues, Eros, the god of love and desire, is the guiding principal which leads male homoerotic lovers to Plato's Idea of the Good. Plutarch's *Amatorius* is an adaptation of Plato's doctrine of Love, which transfers Plato's doctrine of homoerotic love to heteroerotic relationships and marriage. Plutarch's *Amatorius* thus links Plato's pederastic Eros to the heteroerotic Eros of the Greek novels. The presence in the ancient Greek novel of Plutarch's adaptation of Plato's homoerotic doctrine of Love to heteroerotic relationships shall be demonstrated through the analysis of four key passages of *Leucippe and Clitophon* and *Daphnis and Chloe*.

Introduction

The ancient Greek novel (c. 50-250 CE) centers upon the heteroerotic relationship of the hero and heroine, two young lovers whose union is destined by Eros, the god of love and desire. The intended reader of these novels were the Greek *pepaideumenoí*, or the educated class of Imperial Greece under Roman rule, who possessed knowledge of Plato, especially the Platonic doctrine of Love as set out in the *Symposium* and *Phaedrus*. By examining key passages of two ancient Greek novels, Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* and Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*, this thesis will consider how the Greek novel translates Plutarch's adaptation of Plato's homoerotic theory of Love to the heteroerotic relationships of the Greek novel.

Chapter One will summarize Plato's *Symposium*, and the *Phaedrus*. The *Symposium* takes place at a dinner party hosted by the great playwright Agathon in 416 BC Athens, celebrating the dramatist's victory in a tragedy contest.¹ Worn out from their previous night of drinking, the guests of the party agree to have a moderate evening, drinking only for one's own pleasure, each giving a speech on the nature and human benefits of Eros. The last speech of Socrates is the climax of the dialogue, showing Love as the human desire for immortality, and indeed the greatest resource mortals have to achieve a vision of the cosmic principle of the Good. Plato's *Phaedrus* also contains speeches on Eros' nature and benefits. Set in a beautiful pastoral landscape, Socrates gives two orations on Love. In his second speech, Socrates praises Eros as the benefactor

¹ William S. Cob, introduction to *The Symposium and the Phaedrus: Plato's Erotic Dialogues* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993), 11.

of the human soul, as it allows homoerotic partners to ascend to the heavens, provided that they possess virtuous love for each other.

Chapter Two will outline Plutarch's *Amatorius*. Plutarch's work is greatly influenced by the Platonic doctrine of Love, but Plutarch deviates from Plato in that he expands Eros to heteroerotic relationships. Without rejecting the merits of pederastic love outright, Plutarch bridges the gap between the Eros found in Plato's homoerotic relationships, and the Eros of the Greek novel's heteroerotic relationships.

Finally, Chapter Three will present four key passages in Achilles Tatius' and Longus' work which demonstrate the presence of Plato's theory of Love in the novel.

Chapter One: Plato's *Symposium* and *Phaedrus*

Plato's *Symposium* and *Phaedrus* are key texts that express the theory of Platonic Eros. This chapter will summarize each dialogue, relating the crucial concepts of Plato's doctrine of Love in the speeches of their respective works. The *Symposium*, Plato's most popular discourse on love, is comprised of six speeches in praise of Eros. Socrates' speech is the pinnacle of the previous orations, and recounts the teachings of Diotima. Some scholars believe that Plato sets up the prior five speeches for Socrates to "sweep them away"² and reveal them as false assumptions on Eros. Plato, however, utilizes the former speeches to introduce basic concepts of Platonic Love. Instead of directly rejecting the theories put forth, Socrates perfects and in some cases alters the ideas of the speakers, thereby creating a more complete understanding of Eros. All speakers maintain that Eros is the source of all happiness and human benefits, and vary in their approach to explaining Eros. The *Phaedrus* takes place in a beautiful pastoral landscape, and is a dialogue between Socrates and Phaedrus discussing the nature of Eros and the soul. As in the *Symposium*, multiple speeches are given on Eros, and Socrates' final speech provides the corrected teaching of Platonic Love.

I. Plato's *Symposium*

Phaedrus, Pausanias, and Eryximachus

Phaedrus gives the first eulogy on Eros, and his speech is the shortest and simplest of the six. Phaedrus claims that Eros' origins as a Primordial god make him

² Thomas Gould, *Platonic Love* (London: Routledge & Paul, 1963), 23.

“responsible for some of our greatest benefits,”³ enabling one to “attain goodness and happiness.”⁴ As Phaedrus states, the greatest benefit for a young man is to find a virtuous *erastes*, an older male lover or boyfriend.⁵ An *erastes* is better able to guide a young man to a good life because he influences the boy in a way his family, friends, and worldly possessions cannot: the lover instills in the younger beloved, or the *eromenos*, a sense of shame in bad behaviour, and pride in good behaviour.⁶ Since *erastai* have this effect on their *eromenoi*, Phaedrus asserts that the ideal city would be composed of lovers and beloveds.⁷ This is also the case of soldiers fighting alongside their boyfriends. Phaedrus refers to the heroic deeds of Achilles to explain the power Love has on men:

although ... his killing of Hector would cause his own
death ... he was brave enough to stand by his lover
Patroclus and to avenge him—he didn’t choose just to die
for Patroclus, but even to die as well as him.⁸

Love grants Achilles the courage to die in Troy and be reunited with his lover in death.

The *eros* that an *eromenos* develops for his *erastes* is considered to be a higher emotion

³ Plato, *Symposium*, trans. Robin Waterfield (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 178c3-4.

⁴ Plato, *Symposium*, 180b9-10.

⁵ Plato, *Symposium*, 178c6.

⁶ Plato, *Symposium*, 178d.

⁷ Plato, *Symposium*, 178e.

⁸ Plato, *Symposium*, 180a1-2.

than the love of an *erastes*, since lovers are “possessed by a god and therefore in a more godlike state.”⁹ This concept of *anteros*, or the *eromenos*’ love for his *erastes*, receives greater expression in Plato’s *Phaedrus*.

The second speech by Pausanias begins by distinguishing between two kinds of Eros: the Common and the Celestial. This duality of Eros stems from the intimate connection between Eros and Aphrodite; “she is twofold and so, inevitably, Love is twofold too.”¹⁰ Since Love is not uniform, the praise for the different types of Love should also be different, as they are means to different ends. According to Pausanias, there is also a duality in the nature of every action. One’s action is itself neither right nor wrong, but the outcome of the action depends upon whether it was executed in a just or unjust manner.¹¹ This is applied to Love, and the Common and Celestial Eros come to represent a right and wrong way in which individuals may love another. Plato develops this idea later within the speech of Socrates, replacing Pausanias’ “right and wrong” with knowledge and ignorance. The difference between the Common and Celestial Aphrodite, and by extension, Eros, lies within the nature of each. The love which the ordinary person experiences is that of Common Eros, and the effects of this love are entirely at random due to the nature of the Common Aphrodite.¹² As the child of Zeus and Dione, the Common Aphrodite has both male and female attributes, making her inferior since she is

⁹ Plato, *Symposium*, 180a12-13.

¹⁰ Plato, *Symposium*, 180d6.

¹¹ Plato, *Symposium*, 180e.

¹² Plato, *Symposium*, 181b.

partly governed by feminine passion and not pure reason. The followers of Common Aphrodite are lovers of both boys and women, and are attracted to their bodies, rather than their minds.¹³ These men are guided by menial satisfaction, unconcerned with whether their desire is satisfied properly.¹⁴ The Common Eros lacks the spiritual transcendence of Celestial Love, which raises the individual to a position of virtue.

The nature of Celestial Eros is connected to that of Celestial Aphrodite. This Love is “wholly male,” and inspires men to love the masculine, that which “is inherently stronger and more intelligent.”¹⁵ The nature of Celestial Eros is further analysed through the distinction between men who have affairs with their *eromenos* before the beloved has reached the appropriate age (when their intellect has formed), and those who wait until the boy has become the proper age.¹⁶ In Celestial Love, then, there is a right and wrong way in which lovers may behave, according to the principle that actions in themselves are neither right nor wrong but dependent upon the manner in which they are executed. Gratifying one’s lover is not seen as a shameful activity, nor is the slavish behaviour of the *erastes*, as long as it is done in the right way. The *erastes*’ self-imposed slavery which aims toward goodness is the only acceptable way that an *eromenos* may gratify his *erastes*. This creates a bond between the two, as both partners perform services for each

¹³ Plato, *Symposium*, 181b.

¹⁴ Plato, *Symposium*, 181b8-9.

¹⁵ Plato, *Symposium*, 181c.

¹⁶ Plato, *Symposium*, 181d2-3.

other that target the mutual improvement of virtue and knowledge.¹⁷ This form of Celestial Eros is the only love which inspires the moral improvement of one's self, making it praiseworthy.

Eryximachus' speech approaches Eros from a scientific perspective, and expands upon the oration of Pausanias. Eryximachus asserts that Eros' influence is not only found in the erotic response to a beautiful physique, but in all aspects of life, such as music, medicine, and religion. According to Eryximachus, Celestial Eros presides over moderation and harmony, and is the source of all human happiness,¹⁸ being rooted in virtue and moral behaviour.¹⁹ This Celestial Eros is suitable for gratification, as it aims for something pure, and is concerned for one's well-being. Followers of Celestial Eros are careful not to practice over-indulgence, which leads to self-corruption; whereas those who follow the Common Eros must be careful in their gratification so that they may not lose sight of the goodness behind the reward.²⁰ Harmony also plays a role in the proper functions of Eros, because it brings two extremes into agreement.²¹

Eryximachus is the first speaker to argue that Eros is the means of communication between mortals and immortals.²² Socrates' speech expands upon this concept,

¹⁷ Plato, *Symposium*, 184c.

¹⁸ Plato, *Symposium*, 187c.

¹⁹ Plato, *Symposium*, 187e.

²⁰ Plato, *Symposium*, 187e2-6.

²¹ Plato, *Symposium*, 188c9-d1.

²² Plato, *Symposium*, 188d5-10.

accrediting the reconciliation of the mortal and divine through the intermediacy of Eros. Eryximachus, however, focuses his point upon the proper rituals and Love's functional role in divination.²³

Aristophanes and Agathon

Aristophanes uses myth in order to express the philosophical concept of the longing and desire for wholeness experienced by the human soul. This oration on Eros indeed seems similar to the modern day concept of romance, where an individual can never feel a sense of completeness until they find their soulmate. Aristophanes' speech introduces an Eros that is reciprocal and equal,²⁴ as well as the notion of self-love.

According to Aristophanes, before one can understand the nature of Eros, it is necessary to first understand the original nature of mankind. In the beginning, there were three primordial genders: the male, female, and an androgynous gender, made up of both male and female.²⁵ These primordial beings were complete, each comprised of two bodies which constituted a whole (male-male, female-female, and male-female). After challenging the gods, Zeus split these beings in half as punishment, thus creating the current human condition of longing to return to an original state of wholeness and happiness. Sexual instinct arose from the desire to be complete; embracing another temporarily relieved the loneliness and estrangement felt within one's divided self,

²³ Plato, *Symposium*, 188c.

²⁴ Gary Alan Scott and William A. Welton, *Erotic Wisdom: Philosophy and Intermediacy in Plato's Symposium* (New York: State University of New York Press, 2008), 67.

²⁵ Plato, *Symposium*, 189d8-e3.

caused by the split. In Aristophanes' myth, Eros is credited for bringing individuals together, trying "to reintegrate ... and heal the split in [human] nature."²⁶ Until one's counterpart is found, humans may be satisfied in the company of another; however, when one finds their other half, they cannot describe the surge of emotion they experience, nor exactly what it is that they want from each other.²⁷ On the surface, it may appear to these couples that their sexual relationship or their overall compatibility was what they sought after in each other. Aristophanes maintains that this cannot be the case, for if Hephaestus had offered to permanently weld them together, they would gladly accept the offer, remembering what their soul yearned for all along.²⁸ (This concept of the soul's remembrance of its true desire is further explained in the *Phaedrus*). According to Aristophanes, humans desire by nature to become fused together, no longer estranged from their own selves, but restored to their original nature. In this way, Aristophanes introduces the concept of self-love, in so far as each individual has the desire to be reunited with its own half to become whole. Not only is Eros the name given to the desire of wholeness, but it is also responsible for leading humans to their counterparts, promising the recovery of original human nature and "perfect happiness," so long as mortals show due reverence for the gods.²⁹

²⁶ Plato, *Symposium*, 191d3-4.

²⁷ Plato, *Symposium*, 192b10-c5.

²⁸ Plato, *Symposium*, 192d6-192e12.

²⁹ Plato, *Symposium*, 192e14-15; 193d2-6.

Agathon's speech examines the divine, perfect side of Eros, and he begins by describing the very nature of Eros' divinity, something that he claims none of the previous speakers have accomplished thus far. There is a sense of whimsicality and levity in Agathon's speech, which is quite appropriate as it furthers his own view of Eros' nature. Agathon's Eros seems to possess of all the attributes associated with Agathon himself. He is the youngest, loveliest, and best of all the gods (or in this case, the best of all the speakers), only partaking in loveable things, making his home only in the minds of pleasant individuals.³⁰ Eros is fair in his treatment of gods and men and is self-disciplined in pleasure and desire, never harsh or oppressing.³¹ Eros is also wise, creating poets out of the hardest of men, and both mortal and immortal pupils of Eros are led to their craft by love and desire, and become masters in their skill; even Zeus himself learned governance from Eros.³² It appears that Agathon depicts Eros as Plato's concept of the Good itself, the cause and mover of all good and beautiful things, establishing order to the cosmos at his birth: "the gods often behaved in a terrible fashion (as the stories record), under the rule of Necessity. Once Love was born, however, both men and gods began to thrive as a result of their love of beauty."³³ Eros in this speech also seems to represent the ideal *eromenos*, the beautiful young man who inspires love and desire in a

³⁰ Plato, *Symposium*, 195b.

³¹ Plato, *Symposium*, 195e

³² Plato, *Symposium*, 197b3-4.

³³ Plato, *Symposium*, 197b9-12.

lover. According to Agathon, Eros loves and is the object of itself, both in possession of beauty and goodness.

Socrates

Socrates' speech is the culmination of the previous speeches, where he relates his knowledge about Eros learned from a woman named Diotima, an "expert in love."³⁴ Socrates' speech does not follow the same model as the previous speeches, but is presented as a dialogue between himself and Diotima on the nature of Eros. Before Socrates delivers his speech, he engages Agathon in a series of questions in order to prove that if someone possesses something they love and desire, they cannot possibly desire that quality or object itself, since they already possess it. Instead, what a person desires is the future possession of that certain quality or object. Eros, then, is the desire for something which one currently lacks.³⁵ This logic of Love is then applied to the character of Eros itself, and since Eros loves beauty, he must lack beauty—and by extension good things, since all good things are beautiful.³⁶ The object of Eros has not yet been revealed, but yet it seems obvious that if Eros lacks good and beautiful things, then its object must be that which is good and beautiful.

Socrates begins his speech similar to Agathon's, in that he first sets out to describe the nature of Eros, which he accomplishes by relating his conversation with Diotima. Socrates admits that he also believed that Eros was completely good and

³⁴ Plato, *Symposium*, 201d3-4.

³⁵ Plato, *Symposium*, 201b1-3.

³⁶ Plato, *Symposium*, 201c6-8.

beautiful, just as Agathon asserted in his speech; however, through the same method of questioning he just applied to Agathon, Diotima proved that Eros was neither good nor attractive.³⁷ That is not to say that Eros is bad and repulsive, but that Love lies within the middle ground of all extremes, such as attractiveness and repulsiveness. Similar to Aristophanes, Socrates uses allegory to explain the intermediate nature of Love. Eros is the child of Poverty and Plenty, and was conceived during a party celebrating Aphrodite's birth. Since Eros' parents are two opposing extremes, it is only natural that Eros would have qualities of both parents, thereby attributing to the intermediary nature of Eros. Like his mother Poverty, Eros is destitute, a "vagrant, with tough, dry skin ... and sleeps in the open in doorways and by the roadside."³⁸ However, Eros also takes after his father Plenty, thereby making him resourceful, courageous, and a pursuer of beauty and knowledge.³⁹ More importantly, Eros is found between knowledge and ignorance, just as those mortals who love knowledge. Only the gods have complete knowledge, and therefore they do not desire it. Eros pursues knowledge since it is "one of the most attractive things there is, and attractive things are Love's province."⁴⁰ Since Eros does not completely possess knowledge, Socrates asserts that he is not a god, but a spirit, occupying the middle ground between human and divine. Mortals who love wisdom also

³⁷ Plato, *Symposium*, 201e8-11.

³⁸ Plato, *Symposium*, 203c7-203d3.

³⁹ Plato, *Symposium*, 203d5-10.

⁴⁰ Plato, *Symposium*, 204b4-5.

fall between knowledge and ignorance, because they recognize the beauty of wisdom and desire to permanently possess knowledge.⁴¹

After describing the nature of Eros, Socrates moves on to explain what mortals gain from Eros. On the surface, it appears that humans desire happiness, which can be obtained through the acquisition of good things. However, if “the desire for good and for happiness is everyone’s ‘dominant, deceitful love,’” which can be expressed in different ways,⁴² then Eros must be something more than just the acquisition of something one desires—such as goodness or happiness. Socrates uses Aristophanes’ speech to prove his point: people cannot love another half, even if that half has been separated from the self, unless the half is itself good. Indeed, people are “prepared to amputate ... arms and legs if ... they’re in a bad state.”⁴³ Mortals do not just desire and love good things, but rather the “permanent possession of goodness for oneself.”⁴⁴ This is the goal of Eros, and is achieved through procreation, whether mental or physical, in a beautiful medium.⁴⁵ That Eros occupies the space between mortality and immortality further suggests that Love desires that which is everlasting. It then follows that the aim of Eros and mortals is immortality, since neither possess immortality themselves. Eros cannot be considered a god because he seeks knowledge and beauty, things which the gods completely possess.

⁴¹ Plato, *Symposium*, 204b6-8.

⁴² Plato, *Symposium*, 205d 3.

⁴³ Plato, *Symposium*, 205e 4-5.

⁴⁴ Plato, *Symposium*, 206a 12-13.

⁴⁵ Plato, *Symposium*, 205d 2-4.

However, just because Eros does not possess these qualities does not mean that he does not partake in them. By pursuing qualities such as immortality or beauty, Love can participate in them, insofar as the desire for these qualities can affect and move a lover's soul.⁴⁶ Moreover, mortals are able to participate in immortality since they are inspired by Eros to procreate. The only resource available to human nature in attaining immortality is the ability to give birth to a new generation of physical or mental traits, which resemble past characteristics.⁴⁷

According to Socrates, all humankind is pregnant, and it is only within the presence of beauty that one may give birth. The presence of beautiful things makes physically and mentally pregnant individuals pleasant, relaxed, and willing to give birth; repulsiveness restricts birth and causes people to withdraw and suffer.⁴⁸ Those men who are physically pregnant are inclined to procreate with women, hoping to perpetuate their self through the birth of children. These men also seek fame in order to be remembered throughout the ages. Socrates uses the example of Achilles and Patroclus (just as did Phaedrus), stating that Achilles would not have willingly died both for and with Patroclus unless he believed that his actions would be remembered for eternity.⁴⁹

⁴⁶ Scott and Welton, *Erotic Wisdom: Philosophy and Intermediacy in Plato's Symposium*, 106.

⁴⁷ Plato, *Symposium*, 207d1-4.

⁴⁸ Plato, *Symposium*, 206d4-8.

⁴⁹ Plato, *Symposium*, 208d3-7.

Those individuals who are mentally pregnant carry children of virtue and wisdom,⁵⁰ and pertain to justice and self-discipline, allowing men to oversee political and domestic matters.⁵¹ Another instance of mental pregnancy takes place in male lovers of wisdom, who have been pregnant since boyhood and have yet to find a partner. These pregnant men are attracted to physically beautiful young men; however, it is the beauty of one's mind that these individuals find especially attractive, as it allows the couple to discuss virtuous, good qualities of men.⁵² Having been pregnant for so long, the man can finally give birth in the presence of his beautiful partner, and in their partnership both men raise their progeny together. These intellectual and artistic creations are closer to immortality than the children born of physical pregnancies, since they are capable of winning fame for themselves and for their creator.⁵³

Recalling Pausanias' speech, there is a right and wrong way in which one may love a boy. The right love enables one to rise above worldly images of beauty to glimpse true Beauty, or *to kalon*, itself. The wrong love holds one away from the divine, since it involves mistaking the Good for something else, and obsessing in false beauty. In order to love properly, one must first love the physical beauty of one individual, and give birth to "beautiful reasoning."⁵⁴ From there, one should understand that the physical beauty of

⁵⁰ Plato, *Symposium*, 209a2-4.

⁵¹ Plato, *Symposium*, 209a8-10.

⁵² Plato, *Symposium*, 209b8-12.

⁵³ Plato, *Symposium*, 209c5-14; 209d3.

⁵⁴ Plato, *Symposium*, 210a12.

one body is no different than the physical beauty of another body; thereafter the *erastes* is able to realize that obsessing over one beautiful body is senseless. Consequently, a beautiful mind is more attractive to the *erastes*, and enables him to give birth (even though his partner may not be physically attractive), and pursue “reasoning which help young men’s moral progress.”⁵⁵ Once a lover realizes how attractive the actions and institutions of people are, physical beauty is no longer as important, and leads to the examination of thought until beauty reveals itself there. Subsequently, one may behold great amounts of beauty simultaneously, able to perceive more than just singular instances of beauty. It is one’s love of knowledge that becomes the medium in which beauty and reasoning are born, and leads to the final phase in achieving the Good for oneself. After birthing many beautiful, comprehensive reasonings and thoughts, one can create enough energy in oneself to view Beauty itself. *To kalon*, or the idea of Beauty, does not take the shape of any physical or mental beauty; rather it is perceived as an eternal beauty, neither coming nor ceasing to exist.⁵⁶ All beautiful things participate in true Beauty; however, their participation in *to kalon* is of the purest sense, and does not corrupt Beauty itself, whose state remains untainted by earthly beauty. Eros aids mortals in attaining the Good, and provides the means for mortals to potentially attain immortality, which is itself good and beautiful.

⁵⁵ Plato, *Symposium*, 210c2-3.

⁵⁶ Plato, *Symposium*, 211a1.

I. Plato's *Phaedrus*

The first speeches

In the *Phaedrus*, Socrates's speeches are inspired by Lysias' speech, which argues that it is to a young man's greatest benefit to favour a non-lover rather than an *erastes*, for non-lovers are not stricken by the passion experienced by lovers. Passion is portrayed as a hindrance to healthy pederastic relationships; according to Lysias, lovers admit that they are "sick" and are aware of their folly.⁵⁷ Moreover, a lover's passion is fickle, which can lead to the desertion of his beloved once his initial desires have diminished.⁵⁸ Eros in Lysias' speech is not thought to be a benefactor of mankind, as expressed in the speeches of the *Symposium*. Socrates' first speech takes up Lysias' argument, and begins by defining the nature of Eros as a madness, an irrational desire for physical beauty which overcomes one's rational judgement.⁵⁹ This speech presents a debased Eros as the cause of madness and jealousy in *erastai*, and leads to the spread of ignorance in their *eromenoi*. In this sense, the Eros Socrates speaks of is similar to the Common Eros of Pausanias, and indeed is the opposite his own (Diotima's) teachings in the *Symposium*. This debased Eros fails to recognize true beauty, and does not contain reciprocal love or *anteros*; rather, the primary concern of this Eros is the *erastes*' self-satisfaction. Socrates, however, abandons the ideas of Lysias and the arguments of his own speech, intending to

⁵⁷ Plato, *Phaedrus*, trans. R. Hackforth (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1952), 231d3.

⁵⁸ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 233a1.

⁵⁹ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 238b8-c3.

give a recantation speech on Eros: Love is not an “evil thing” as they claimed, but divine and good.⁶⁰

The second speech of Socrates

Socrates’ second speech is a palinode which asserts that not all madness is evil, since “the greatest blessings come by way of madness ... that is heaven sent.”⁶¹ Divine madness, then, cannot be immoral by nature, and is divided into three main types. The first type is prophecy: without divine inspiration or madness the prophetess at Delphi or Dodona could not have prophesied the future to great men.⁶² Initially, madness had been connected to the divine and had no negative connotations. “Manic” was the term used to describe the blessing of prophecy born from divine madness; however, “mantic” came to replace manic possession, involving uninspired prophets discerning bird signs—an activity which does not possess divine wisdom, but human discretion and knowledge.⁶³ Socrates holds manic activity at a higher regard, since it connects the mortal and immortal through divine possession. Inspired individuals are seen to have a sanity of a different kind, which allows one to see within the divine perspective, and temporarily escape the finitude of the corporeal realm. The second type of divine madness is that which brings relief to individuals and families who suffer due to “ancient sin.”⁶⁴ Through

⁶⁰ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 242d15.

⁶¹ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 244a8-b 1.

⁶² Plato, *Phaedrus*, 244b1-2.

⁶³ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 244c9-11.

⁶⁴ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 244d7.

divine madness, prayer and worship leads to the purification and rites needed to deliver the sufferer from present and future afflictions.⁶⁵ The third type of madness pertains to the divine possession of poets. It is under the influence of the Muses that poets produce their masterpieces, and indeed the works created by human sanity cannot compare to the beauty and eloquence expressed by divinely inspired individuals.⁶⁶ Similar to prophets, possessed poets are closer to the divine, and in their connection with the immortal they are able to create something which goes beyond earthly sanity. After describing the benefits of madness, Socrates' task is to show love as a fourth type of madness, one which "is a gift of the gods, fraught with the highest bliss."⁶⁷

Eros and the soul

In order to reveal the truth about Eros, the nature of the soul and its experiences must be examined. Socrates begins with the statement that "all soul is immortal."⁶⁸ Similar to the Good described in the *Symposium*, soul neither comes nor ceases to be; it is a first principle which moves itself and is the source of movement in all other things.⁶⁹ The soul is the only part of the human which shares in the divine since it is itself immortal, and has seen true Being, or the Good, described in the *Symposium*. True Being, or the Beautiful, lies just beyond the heavens and is true knowledge, comprehensible

⁶⁵ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 244e2-4.

⁶⁶ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 245a7-8.

⁶⁷ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 245c1-2.

⁶⁸ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 245c7.

⁶⁹ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 245c9-12.

only by reason.⁷⁰ The nature of human and divine souls are differentiated by way of analogy with a charioteer with two winged horses. The driver and steeds of the gods' souls are wholly perfect, and their ascent to the summit of the heavens is effortless. By contrast, human soul is comprised of a good, noble horse as well as a wicked, excessive horse. The human's charioteer attempts to climb up beyond the heavens to the Plain of Truth, inhibited by the wicked horse's attempt to follow its own indulgence. All human souls have viewed the Good at one point, and indeed a human soul may not enter a mortal body unless it has seen and contemplated true knowledge. The very nature of the human soul desires to ascend to the heavens in order to view and be nourished by true Being; however, not all souls are able to continually reach the summit of heaven. In their desperation to perceive the Good, confusion ensues as souls scramble and trample over each other, the driver of the two horses unable to rear in his team. Thus the wings of the soul are damaged, and the soul settles upon the nourishment of things which only resemble the Good,⁷¹ failing to obtain the proper nourishment required for it to prosper. Thereafter, the human soul becomes weighed down and forgetful of the pure goodness it once beheld,⁷² leading to the complete loss of its wings and its descent to earth, where it finds a human host. Souls are assigned to a mortal body based upon how much of true Being, or Beauty, they had seen, creating a hierarchy of souls. The souls which had perceived the Good in its fullest form enter the body of a philosopher, a lover of wisdom

⁷⁰ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 247c7-8.

⁷¹ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 248b5-6.

⁷² Plato, *Phaedrus*, 248c8-9.

and beauty, devoted to the Muses.⁷³ The next nine types of human souls have subsequently seen less of the Good than the type of soul which precedes it. For example, the second type of soul, which has seen less than the soul of the philosopher, goes into the body of one destined to rule with justice; the last two types of souls, which have seen the least amount of goodness, are put into the bodies of those who live unjust and corrupt lives, such as sophists or demagogues of the eighth type of soul, and the tyrants of the ninth.⁷⁴ The philosopher's soul, whose life is devoted to seeking true wisdom and beauty, has greater potential in growing its wings and returning to the heavens, and may do so within three thousand years. This is the reward for the souls that lead just lives. The other eight types of souls must wait ten thousand years before their actions in their first life can be judged. After judgement, the soul may regrow its wings and hasten back to the heavens; but if the soul leads a life of wrongdoing, it faces punishment appropriate to its transgression.⁷⁵ That the soul of the philosopher can attain beatitude before the other types of souls is appropriate; it had the fullest vision of Being, it can more easily recall the memory of what it witnessed beyond the heavens. The philosopher's remembrance of the Good drives the soul into a frenzy, as it tries desperately to ascend to the heavens to see the Beauty it remembers. Eventually, the individual gives up earthly activity and focuses his energy on viewing true Being. This gives the philosopher an appearance of being mad, and indeed attracts the disapproval of many people. However, the madness

⁷³ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 248d4.

⁷⁴ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 248e4.

⁷⁵ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 249a5-b1.

experienced by the philosopher is the result of being possessed by Eros.⁷⁶ This then, is the fourth kind of madness Socrates' speech argues for: the love of the true Being, the Good, Beauty itself.

Remembering the Good

Lovers may have trouble recollecting exactly what it was that they saw beyond the heavens, and indeed those souls whose "purity has been sullied" cannot see Beauty itself beyond earthly beauty.⁷⁷ As stated in the *Symposium*, all beautiful earthly things have a share in the Good. However, since impure souls cannot promptly recognize the Good behind earthly beauty, they do not properly venerate the object of their love. This leads to a debased love, in which the lover surrenders their self to pleasure and self-satisfaction, birthing mortal children.⁷⁸ In contrast, pure souls revere things which resemble true beauty, especially the godlike beauty of young men; indeed an *erastes* would offer praise to an *eromenos*, were it not for being "deemed a very madman."⁷⁹ Upon viewing a beautiful boy, a sense of overwhelming warmth floods into the lover, "whereby his soul's plumage is fostered."⁸⁰ The soul's remembrance of Beauty itself initiates the regrowth of its wings, and is accompanied by discomfort and an internal throbbing, which is overcome by the joy and passion felt by the soul when in the

⁷⁶ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 249d3.

⁷⁷ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 250e2-3.

⁷⁸ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 250e5-6.

⁷⁹ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 251a2-6.

⁸⁰ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 251b2-3.

presence of his beloved.⁸¹ The lover constantly yearns to be in the sight of the boy, as the boy's beauty allows the soul to remember the vision of true Beauty it once beheld, thereby providing nourishment and relieving the soul from its sufferings. Indeed, an *erastes* will do anything he can to be near his *eromenos*, going so far as to willingly accept the status of a slave.⁸² Additionally, a lover's life, and his choice and pursuit of his beloved, is dependent upon which of the gods his soul had followed during the heavenly procession toward the Good. Lovers live in as much likeness as possible to the deity they had followed, and seek a beloved whose soul and disposition also resembles the god. Souls which followed the train of Zeus enter the body of a philosopher, and are able to bear Eros' effects with more consistency than the followers of the other gods.⁸³ Consequently, they look for a beloved who loves wisdom by nature, and takes on the education of the boy so that he may also come into the likeness of his lover, and of the god whom the lover worships.⁸⁴ Due to the imperfect nature of the human soul, the lover must also refrain from giving in to sexual desire for his beloved, which is understood to be caused by the designs of the excessive wicked horse. When in the company of his loved one, the dark horse urges toward the beloved, set upon its own desire of carrying

⁸¹ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 250d1-7.

⁸² Plato, *Phaedrus*, 252a5.

⁸³ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 252c4.

⁸⁴ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 252e1-4; 253a7.

out the “monstrous and forbidden act,” or sexual intercourse.⁸⁵ However, it is the work of the charioteer to force the horse to submit until it is finally humbled.⁸⁶ Once the *erastes* becomes the master of this horse, he is more capable of viewing true Beauty in his *eromenos*, thereby allowing him to more genuinely revere and love his beloved.

Anteros

An aspect of the pederastic paradigm brought forth in the *Phaedrus* is *anteros*, or reciprocal love, between a lover and his beloved. Though the *eromenos* has love for his *erastes*, the manner in which his love is established and experienced is different than the love of the *erastes*. Due to the misunderstanding of the divine source of madness, young men may be advised by family and friends against taking a lover, for “it is shameful to have commerce with a lover.”⁸⁷ Nevertheless, the nature of the young man’s soul eventually leads to his taking of a lover, as it is destined,⁸⁸ and indeed is the only way in which the soul can view the Good. In the eyes of the beloved, a lover provides something which one’s own family and friends cannot supply: love aimed toward the Good. Through his love, the *erastes* establishes the means in which the *eromenos* may begin his own journey in understanding true Being, thus the lover is admired more than any other

⁸⁵ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 254b2. Referring to the immorality of sexual behaviour brought about by lust, or love which is debased and only concerned with the physical beauty of a thing, not for its capacity for true Beauty.

⁸⁶ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 254e6-7.

⁸⁷ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 255a5-6.

⁸⁸ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 255a7.

individual known to the beloved. Once the wings of the lover's soul have been rejuvenated by his beloved's beauty, and the soul has been filled up by love, the "flood of passion" which pours into the lover's soul returns to its source, and flows into the soul of the beloved.⁸⁹ The boy has no knowledge of what it is that he loves in his partner and, as Socrates states, it is as if he "has caught a disease of the eye from another."⁹⁰ This is quite appropriate, in that sight is the greatest resource humans possess when first identifying and beholding beautiful things. The beloved unknowingly sees in his lover an image of himself,⁹¹ wherein he is able to view his own beauty, which participates in true Beauty.

Thus the wings of the beloved's soul are fostered, and the foundation of the beloved's love for his partner is established; however, the beloved refers to his emotions as friendship or *philia*, not love (*eros*).⁹² Thereafter, the boy experiences the same longing and anguish as his lover when they are separated, for the beauty radiated by the lover is the only remedy for the affliction of the beloved's soul. Moreover, the *eromenos* feels sexual desire for his *erastes*, and he is indeed willing to satisfy his partner physically in return for all his kindness; although his desire is not as potent.⁹³ The wanton horse of the *erastes*' soul would attempt to persuade his charioteer to allow him to lie with the beautiful boy; however, reason and complete mastery over the wicked horse

⁸⁹ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 255c3-6.

⁹⁰ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 255d4.

⁹¹ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 255d5-6.

⁹² Plato, *Phaedrus*, 255e1.

⁹³ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 255e2.

leads both individuals to the “ordered rule of the philosophic life,” allowing for the recovery of the soul’s wings.⁹⁴

In certain situations, some partners succumb to their sexual desires and continue to gratify this desire occasionally thereafter.⁹⁵ Though these individuals certainly do not possess the ideal love of the true philosopher, they still have the potential to attain goodness. The act that the two engage in is not one in which they are “wholly set thereupon,” but rather the result of each being caught momentarily off guard by their corrupt horses.⁹⁶ These individuals still hold high regard for reason and the desire to observe the true Beauty, which they remember by the sight of each other. These souls will eventually sprout new wings after their first life, as their love of wisdom and beauty prevents them from returning to the “dark pathways beneath the earth.”⁹⁷ This distinction between the rewards of the lovers of wisdom who are overcome by their sexual desire, and the punishments of the common man who cannot see past his own desire, is important in understanding the paradigm of Platonic Love. The reciprocal love and reason that the *erastes* and *eromenos* inspire in each other enables their observance and understanding of true Being. It is through this Eros that the soul may rejoin the gods in the heavenly procession.

⁹⁴ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 256a8; 256b3-4.

⁹⁵ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 256c3-5.

⁹⁶ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 256c7.

⁹⁷ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 256d6-7.

Chapter Two: Plutarch's *Amatorius*

Plutarch's *Amatorius* provides the link between the chiefly pederastic (male same-sex) Platonic doctrine of Love in the *Symposium* and *Phaedrus* to the Eros of the heteroerotic relationships found in the Greek novel. This chapter will summarize the speeches in the *Amatorius*, and indicate parallels and differences between Plutarch's "Middle Platonists" teaching and Plato's original doctrine of Love, to which Plutarch is indebted. Similar to Plato's dialogues, the *Amatorius* contains speeches on Eros. Unlike Plato's works, the speeches in Plutarch's dialogue address the possibility of heteroerotic relationships, especially marriage, containing the same philosophic *eros* found in virtuous pederastic relationships. Moreover, a woman's capacity for having characteristics common to a male *erastes* is questioned, especially her ability to inspire and maintain friendship with her husband. Though Plutarch's arguments for Platonic Love in marriage goes against the basic foundation of pederastic relationships championed by Plato, the *Amatorius* "offers a broadening of the Platonic vision in changed social circumstances and under the pressure of Plutarch's own (Platonising) convictions."⁹⁸

Plutarch informs the reader of the Platonic flavour of this dialogue by setting his work during the Erotidia, the festival of Love, and also from an explicit reference to the *Phaedrus*. The *Amatorius* begins with Flavian requesting Plutarch's son Autobulus, to give an account of the debate and speeches on Eros which took place at the shrine of the

⁹⁸ Richard Hunter, *Plato and the Traditions of Ancient Literature*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 177.

Muses on Mount Helicon. Flavian requests that Autobulus refrain from reciting the worn out *topos* of the *Phaedrus*;

of the meadows and shady nooks of the poets, the gadding growth of ivy and smilax, and all the other commonplaces on which writers seize, as they endeavour more with enthusiasm than success to endorse their work with Plato's Ilissus.⁹⁹

The pastoral landscape of the *Phaedrus*¹⁰⁰ itself seems to have become a literary tradition in its own right for authors wishing to make a connection to Plato's doctrine.¹⁰¹ However, Autobulus' response is that the discourse which he is about to relate needs no such preface: the events and speeches given have enough dramatic Platonized elements to speak for themselves.¹⁰² In the city of Thespieae, Ismenodora—a wealthy widow with honourable breeding and moral dignity—proclaims her love for the young and beautiful Bacchon. Unable to decide how to respond to her proposal, Bacchon leaves the decision to Piasias, “the most sober of his admirers”¹⁰³ and his older cousin, Anthemion. Piasias is

⁹⁹ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” *Plutarch's Moralia*, trans. by W. C. Helmbold, vol. IX, (London: William Heinemann, 1961), 749a2-7.

¹⁰⁰ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 229a; 230b-c.

¹⁰¹ Especially in the Greek novel, referring to this image in the *Phaedrus* is typical in establishing Platonic sentiments.

¹⁰² Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 749a10-13

¹⁰³ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 749f1.

outraged by the very thought of Bacchon being married away to the widowed Ismenodora; while Anthemion believes this to be a suitable match for the youth. A debate over the merits of homoerotic and heteroerotic relationships erupts between Pisiias and Anthemion, who find support from some of Plutarch's friends: Protogenes advocating pederasty and Daphnaeus supporting marriage.

I. The Homoerotic Argument

According to Protogenes, the attempt to place the union of man and woman under the domain of Eros is forcing "the foulest acts and passions into the company of the most honourable and dignified of names."¹⁰⁴ Men love women no more than "flies feel love for milk."¹⁰⁵ Protogenes' argument combines the notions of Eros from Socrates' first speech in the *Phaedrus*¹⁰⁶ with Pausanias' speech in the *Symposium*. Alluding to the *Phaedrus*, Protogenes transfers the madness of the *erastes* to the base love of women. However, whereas Socrates calls irrational desire Eros, Protogenes refuses to give this sacred name to such a base, "pathological condition."¹⁰⁷ Protogenes argues that the love of women cannot justly be given the name Eros, for it is corrupt with excessive desire of physical pleasure and enjoyment,¹⁰⁸ which "becomes torrential and almost out of control."¹⁰⁹ If

¹⁰⁴ Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 750b9-13.

¹⁰⁵ Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 750c10.

¹⁰⁶ Hunter, *Plato and the Traditions of Ancient Literature*, 194.

¹⁰⁷ Hunter, *Plato and the Traditions of Ancient Literature*, 194.

¹⁰⁸ Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 750e2.

¹⁰⁹ Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 750d.

this passion must be called Eros, Protogenes declares that it should be considered an “effeminate and bastard love.”¹¹⁰ In this sense, Protogenes’ speech reflects Pausanias’ sentiments concerning the Common Eros, who affects the common man, moved only by individual physical desire and satisfaction.¹¹¹ Genuine Eros, then, governs only the love of boys, and through mutual friendship leads the soul to a virtuous life.¹¹² This Boy Love is not “flashing with desire ... or drenched with unguents, shining bright. No, its aspect is simple and unspoiled.”¹¹³ This makes further reference to the first speeches of Lysias and Socrates in the *Phaedrus*: a lover should deny his passion and desire in order to love justly. As Hunter points out, arguments from the *Phaedrus* and *Symposium* are blended within the arguments of Protogenes.¹¹⁴ Thus, Plutarch effectively references two imperfect understandings of Eros found within Plato’s works, which are to be perfected by Plutarch’s thoughts on Platonic Love later in the dialogue.

The pederastic argument continues after an outburst from Pisis in response to Daphnaeus:

¹¹⁰ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 750f6.

¹¹¹ Plato, *Symposium*, 181b.

¹¹² Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 751a5-6; 750d6. Cf. *Symposium* 181c.

¹¹³ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 751a6-9. This attitude is picked up by the pederasts in *Leucippe and Clitophon*, who also debate the benefits of Boy Love over hetero love, and the unnaturalness of Woman Love. This will be expounded in the next chapter.

¹¹⁴ Hunter, *Plato and the Traditions of Ancient Literature*, 195.

To think that human beings who acknowledge that they are locked like dogs by their sexual parts to the female should dare to transport the god from his home in the gymnasia and the parks with their wholesome fresh-air life in the sun and confine him in brothels with the vanity-cases and unguents and philtres of disorderly females! Decent women cannot, of course, without impropriety either receive or bestow a passionate love.¹¹⁵

Pisias presents a new question which is taken up by Protogenes. There are two sorts of women: the disorderly women, who desecrate Eros and virtue with sexual pleasure; and the decent, mentally sound, or prudent women (σωφροσύνη),¹¹⁶ whom Ismenodora comes to represent. As Goldhill states, σωφροσύνη expresses a woman's "proper place within the patriarchal household."¹¹⁷ Protogenes argues that the purpose of relationships with women is strictly for procreation.¹¹⁸ Rist points out that pederasts cannot conceive prudent women to be lovers because they refuse to initiate sexual acts even within marriage; even Plutarch admits that these women are known to be "prudish" and

¹¹⁵ Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 752b10-18.

¹¹⁶ J. M. Rist, "Plutarch's Amatorius: A Commentary on Plato's Theories of Love?," *The Classical Quarterly* 51.2 (2001): 563.

¹¹⁷ Simon Goldhill, *Foucault's Virginit: Ancient Erotic Fiction and the History of Sexuality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 4.

¹¹⁸ Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 750c5.

‘disagreeable.’”¹¹⁹ Ismenodora, then, provides an interesting figure in the *Amatorius*. She is a well-born, wealthy, and respectable prudent woman who has publicly declared her love for Bacchon. Piasias and Protogenes turn their line of attack toward Ismenodora herself—especially against her wealth—claiming that in her life of opulence she has only the “determination to command and to dominate.”¹²⁰ Surely, if she “is really modest and orderly,”¹²¹ she should await her suitors at her home. In this way, Ismenodora maintains an active, or masculine role in asserting her love, and her capacity for masculine behaviour does not end there. Convinced that Bacchon’s unwillingness to marry was not from his own repugnance but from that of his lovers’, Ismenodora devises an almost unthinkable plot. Aided by trusted men and women, Ismenodora kidnaps Bacchon and begins the preparations for their wedding. Naturally, this event outrages Piasias and Protogenes; but Daphnaeus and Plutarch attribute this “unnatural act” to Ismenodora being infected by the divine madness of Eros.

The very thought of a woman proclaiming her love for a younger man is absent in Plato; however, it is important to remember that Plato gives the most important speech on Eros to Diotima, a woman philosopher who educates Socrates on the mysteries of Eros. Moreover, both the *Symposium* and the *Amatorius* make use of the story of Alcestis, a woman whose soul the gods rescued from the underworld because of her love and self-sacrifice for her husband. This anecdote is related by Phaedrus in the *Symposium*, who

¹¹⁹ Rist, “Plutarch’s *Amatorius*: A Commentary on Plato’s Theories of Love?,” 563.

¹²⁰ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 752e12-13.

¹²¹ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 753b5-6.

argues that “only lovers are prepared to sacrifice themselves—and this goes for women as well as for men.”¹²² This is the first instance in the *Symposium* where a woman is verbally addressed as a lover. In the *Amatorius*, Plutarch reiterates this same story in his defense for Woman Love.¹²³ Certainly, Plato must have thought women were capable of the principle of virtuous Eros, otherwise it would have been counterproductive to his argument to include a story which relates the capacity and power of a woman’s love. There are other instances in Plato’s work which hints at a sort of equality in homoerotic and heteroerotic relationships, which Plutarch does not seem to utilize in his speech. It can be argued that Aristophanes also includes women in the realm of lovers in his myth of the three sexes; however, he is ambiguous in his speech. Aristophanes does not refer to any one particular sex in his description of a lover, but rather addresses all sexual preferences when describing one’s individual search for wholeness: “Now when someone who loves boys—or whatever his sexual preferences may be ...”¹²⁴ Furthermore, in the *Phaedrus*, Socrates states “all soul is immortal,”¹²⁵ and that every human soul has viewed the Beautiful¹²⁶ and yearns for the nourishment of true Beauty. Thus it stands that women have also seen the Good and desire to be in its presence. This is evidence that women are

¹²² Plato, *Symposium*, 179b3-5.

¹²³ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 761e9-12.

¹²⁴ Plato, *Symposium*, 192b8-9.

¹²⁵ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 245c7.

¹²⁶ Plato, *Phaedrus*, 428d, 428e

indeed under the influence of Eros, since it is Eros who moves all mortals toward their true desire for the Good.

II. The Heteroerotic Argument

If the arguments of Pisis and Protogenes reflect the first imperfect speeches in the *Phaedrus* and *Symposium*, then the arguments of Daphnaeus, and especially Plutarch, provide the reader with a sort of palinode of Eros found in the *Phaedrus*, or an oration akin to that of Socrates' speech in the *Symposium*. Marriage is the most sacred of unions according to Daphnaeus.¹²⁷ Marital love is more natural than that of homoerotic relationships, and is capable of producing friendship between man and wife over time from "favour" (χάριτος) or consensual sex in marriage.¹²⁸ Intercourse with males, consensual or otherwise, is an "ill-favoured favour ... an unlovely affront to Aphrodite."¹²⁹ It is an exploitation of the beautiful male form, one which gives pleasure to the *erastes* (the active participant), but debases the *eromenos*, who maintains the passive role during intercourse.¹³⁰ Daphnaeus uses Plato's own words to further his argument, paraphrasing from the *Phaedrus*: "to consort with males ... those who, contrary to nature, allow themselves in Plato's words 'to be covered and mounted like cattle.'"¹³¹ Daphnaeus is using Plato himself, whose doctrine praises homoerotic

¹²⁷ Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 750c2-3.

¹²⁸ Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 750c.

¹²⁹ Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 751e2-3.

¹³⁰ Rist, "Plutarch's Amatorius: A Commentary on Plato's Theories of Love?," 566.

¹³¹ Plutarch 751d13-e 1.

relationships, to show that the doctrine of Love is not definite: Plato can effectively be used to defend heteroerotic love.¹³² It goes against nature for boy lovers to engage in sex, and indeed the passive partner is always looked upon as effeminate and weak, even if his consent is given.¹³³ There is no reciprocity in this union; the lover receives the pleasure and the beloved receives none in return. While Protogenes used Solon's 6th century Athenian decree against slaves having sex with boys in order to protect the bond created by pederastic love, Daphnaeus references Solon in his later years: "Dear to me now are the works of the Cyprus-born, of Dionysus and the Muses, works that make men merry."¹³⁴ Once the "pelting storm" of his Boy Love came to a close, Solon's life entered into the "peaceful sea of marriage and philosophy."¹³⁵ Furthermore, what is clear in the speech of Daphnaeus is that for every accusation Protogenes uses against conjugal love,¹³⁶ Daphnaeus has a counter charge which utilizes the same authorities found in Protogenes' oration (Plato and Solon), effectively rebutting the first set of the pederastic arguments.

Daphnaeus does acknowledge that Boy Love is a type of love, one with its own merits. What he expresses in his speech is that the desire for boys and women is one and

¹³² Hunter, *Plato and the Traditions of Ancient Literature*, 196.

¹³³ Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 751d11-13.

¹³⁴ Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 751e7-8.

¹³⁵ Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 751e9-11.

¹³⁶ That is, until he turns his arguments toward the character of Ismenodora herself.

the same thing: Eros.¹³⁷ Nevertheless, Daphnaeus ranks conjugal Eros above pederasty, equating the love of boys to “a late-born son, and aged man’s bastard.”¹³⁸ Moreover, it is the Eros of boys that attempts to discredit the Eros of women and marriage. According to Daphnaeus, pederastic love uses the pretext of “friendship and virtue,” and outwardly expresses philosophic discipline; however, some men do indulge in sexual pleasures: “when the night comes in and all is quiet, sweet is the harvest when the guard’s away.”¹³⁹ This alludes to the *Phaedrus* in Socrates’ discussion of the wicked horse of the soul.¹⁴⁰ While the charioteer of the soul is preoccupied, the wicked horse finally consummates its lustful desire. Plato also states in the same work that those who do indulge in fleshly pleasures may still ascend to the Good, provided that they do not continue this behaviour often, since this pleasure is something “that their minds are not wholly set thereupon.”¹⁴¹ As an attendant to Aphrodite, it is impossible to separate Eros from the goddess, or from sexual pleasure. If, as the pederasts claim, pleasure has no place in Eros, then they are denying both Aphrodite and Eros their due honours, and is then likened to “drunkenness without wine,” an unfulfilled and fleeting expression of Eros.¹⁴²

¹³⁷ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 751f1-2.

¹³⁸ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 751f4.

¹³⁹ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 752a10-11.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. *Phaedrus* 256c2-5.

¹⁴¹ Cf. *Phaedrus* 256c.

¹⁴² Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 752b.

Plutarch does not hesitate to enter the debate once the pederasts begin to belittle the character of Ismenodora and heteroerotic relationships. Admittedly, there are women who indeed exploit wealthy men. Plutarch cites an instance where, due to his love, the great king Ninus fell to the schemes of Semiramis, a “servant and concubine of a house-born slave of the king,”¹⁴³ eventually leading to his death at her command.¹⁴⁴ However, as Plutarch points out, there have been poor men who have married wealthy noble women and have “enjoyed honour and exercised benevolent authority to the end of their life together.”¹⁴⁵ A man should not diminish the character of a noble wife, for in doing so he makes her ugly: he strips the woman of her self-worth so that she would permit sex with an ignoble man.¹⁴⁶ While it would be foolish for a husband to shun a wife of good character and wealth, it would be equally foolish to make his wife poor, or to allow himself to be regarded as inferior to his wife. Using his own “self-possession and prudence ... he must hold his own without servility ... thus his wife is controlled and guided with as much profit as justice.”¹⁴⁷ Picias’ worry that Bacchon will disappear like tin mixed in copper¹⁴⁸ if he marries such an opulent woman is addressed here by Plutarch.

¹⁴³ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 753d9-10.

¹⁴⁴ Semiramis asked her husband if she could rule the affairs of the state for one day, during which she rallied guards to arrest Ninus and put him to death.

¹⁴⁵ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 754a2-3.

¹⁴⁶ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 754a.

¹⁴⁷ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 754b.

¹⁴⁸ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 752e9-10.

If Bacchon truly was of a sound mind himself, he would not allow such a thing to occur; rather, he would cultivate a reciprocal bond with Ismenodora. Plutarch extends his argument to examine how an older woman can indeed be an *erastes* to a young boy. No one can completely rule over his own life; as humans we are ruled by a sense of community and rely on the help of others to live justly. Plutarch sees no problem in having an older, sensible woman like Ismenodora guiding the life of a younger man. There is a time when the admirer rules over the young boy; however the boy eventually becomes a man, finding a new master in the form of law.¹⁴⁹ A woman can be just as beneficial to a young boy as a male *erastes*; “she will be useful because of her superior intelligence; she will be sweet and affectionate because she loves him.”¹⁵⁰ This diverges from the Platonic doctrine of Love; however, Plutarch reconciles heteroerotic Eros to the teachings of Plato in his oration on Eros.

III. Plutarch’s Speech

Once Pisis and Protogenes rush to the city after discovering Bacchon is kidnapped by Ismenodora, Plutarch gives his own speech on Eros, a blending of Socrates’ speech in the *Symposium* with his second speech in the *Phaedrus*. Plutarch seemingly collects elements of both speeches and compiles them with theories of his own in favour of conjugal Eros, to create a perfect understanding of Eros. In response to Pemptides’ question of the divinity of Eros, Plutarch declares that the ancient traditional faith is proof enough; it is the “common foundation of religion” which, if challenged, will cripple the

¹⁴⁹ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 754d4-5.

¹⁵⁰ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 754d6-9.

entire belief system.¹⁵¹ Eros was present among the primordial divinities,¹⁵² otherwise the ancient gods would have lacked the desire for procreation. Additionally, if one were to question the power of Eros, they would also be bringing into question the divinity and honours of Aphrodite, whom Eros serves. At this point Plutarch makes reference to Daphnaeus' argument, claiming that "intercourse without Eros is like hunger and thirst, which can be sated, but never achieve a noble end."¹⁵³ Plutarch also stresses that pleasure should be brought into the realm of Eros. Without Eros and reciprocal love (*anteros*), pleasure is worth nothing more than a drachma;¹⁵⁴ pleasure with Eros is priceless and results in genuine love. Taking a page from the *Phaedrus*, Plutarch goes over the types of divine madness, or enthusiasm: prophetic, poetic, and frenzy of war¹⁵⁵ (the latter does not appear in Plato). Love, the fourth type of madness, has no cure; "there is no reading of literature, no 'magic incantation,' no change of environment, that restores him to calm."¹⁵⁶ Eros causes lovers to be feel joy and love when in the presence of their beloved, and longing when separated.¹⁵⁷ Indeed, Plutarch bases his ideal *erastes* upon the soul of the lover viewing his beloved in the *Phaedrus*:

¹⁵¹ Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 756b.

¹⁵² Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 756d5-7.

¹⁵³ Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 756e8-9.

¹⁵⁴ Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 759e11-12.

¹⁵⁵ Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 758e-d.

¹⁵⁶ Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 759b4-7.

¹⁵⁷ Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 759b7-9.

a man in love ... fears nothing, he admires nothing, he pays service to nothing. He's capable of braving 'even the Thunderbolt, the spear-wielder'; but once he catches sight of the handsome boy ... his confidence is broken to bits and the pride of his soul is overthrown.¹⁵⁸

According to Plutarch, Plato's theory of Love is similar to the Egyptian myth of the three types of Love: the Heavenly, the Earthly, and the sun.¹⁵⁹ Plutarch may possibly have brought Egyptian mythology into his argument as a result of his Egyptian teacher Ammonius, who would have brought to Athens a sort of Platonism from Alexandria.¹⁶⁰ With regard to Platonic teachings, the Egyptian sun goes nicely with the sun of Plato's *Republic*, in which the sun rules the visible realm analogous to how the Good rules the intelligible realm. In Plutarch, Plato's Good becomes Eros. Just as Socrates points to similarities between the sun and the Good, Plutarch points out obvious similarities between the sun and Eros. Primarily, neither the sun nor Eros are actually fire; they are a "radiance of sweet and fertile warmth."¹⁶¹ Just as the sun's radiance nourishes the body, Eros radiates with nourishment for the soul.¹⁶² However, just as the sun is not the Good in

¹⁵⁸ Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 762e7-14. Cf. *Phaedrus* 252a1-7.

¹⁵⁹ Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 764b5-6.

¹⁶⁰ John M. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists, 80 B.C. to A.D. 220* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1977), 184.

¹⁶¹ Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 764b9-11.

¹⁶² Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 764b11-13.

Plato, so in Plutarch there are differences between the sun and Eros. While the sun illuminates both beautiful and ugly things, Eros displays only those things which are truly beautiful, and humans must overlook the sun's deceitful attractions.¹⁶³ In this sense, the sun opposes the goal of Eros: where the sun and the Good are alike in Plato, in Plutarch the Sun and Eros are opposed. The sun deals in tangibles, "bewitching the soul by the charm and brilliance of vision, and convincing us that truth ... is to be found in the sun, or in the realm of the sun, and not in any other place."¹⁶⁴ Distracted by the false beauty revealed by the sun, the soul becomes forgetful of the true vision of the Good. The soul is most wakeful in dreams, as it is able to view the divine without interference from the images of the sun.¹⁶⁵

Plutarch condenses the Platonic doctrine of Love from the *Phaedrus* into a few sections, referencing the soul's ascent to the Plain of Truth via Eros, the corporeal forms which are mere "beautiful reflections of beautiful realities," and the *erastes* eventual disregard for physical beauty in favour of mental beauty.¹⁶⁶ Though an advocate of heteroerotic relationships, Plutarch can never outright reject pederastic Boy Love; Plato's theory of Eros centers upon pederasty, and dismissing Boy Love would damage Plutarch's reworking of Plato's doctrine. Instead, Plutarch embraces both homoerotic and heteroerotic loves as legitimate forms of Eros. Sappho, the 6th century Greek poetess

¹⁶³ Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 764c12-d 3.

¹⁶⁴ Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 764e2-6.

¹⁶⁵ Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 764e.

¹⁶⁶ Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 765a-d.

displays just as much Erotic madness as any male *erastes*: she cannot find the words to say, nor can she calm the burning or giddiness of her soul.¹⁶⁷ Clearly, women are able to experience this “supernatural agitation of the soul,”¹⁶⁸ and Plutarch’s next task is to describe this process.

In true accordance with Platonic Love, Plutarch asserts that the soul is filled with love when it sees a beautiful physical form, which has a share in the cosmic principle of the Good. Plutarch believes that women can also be reflections of true Beauty, especially if their good character shines forth through their physical beauty.¹⁶⁹ A true lover of Beauty will be moved by Eros whenever he or she comes across a virtuous soul, “without regard for any difference in physiological detail.”¹⁷⁰ Indeed, men pay no heed to the sex of horses or dogs so long as the animal is attractive and useful;¹⁷¹ therefore, it is senseless for a lover of human beauty to discriminate against a woman if she has external and internal beauty. Furthermore, married women possess mutual self-restraint with their husbands, for Eros bestows upon each individual the temperance and self-restraint required for a successful union.¹⁷² Women in love are indeed capable of virtue, as Plutarch illustrates with the story of the beautiful Camma of Galatia. Sinorix fell in love

¹⁶⁷ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 763a3-6.

¹⁶⁸ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 763a10.

¹⁶⁹ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 766e-f.

¹⁷⁰ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 767a3-6.

¹⁷¹ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 767a.

¹⁷² Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 767e.

with Camma and murdered her husband, hoping that she would now consent to his sexual advances. Camma became a priestess of Artemis, and when Sinorix approached her with intentions to marry her, she mixed a libation with poison, so that they could both drink from the phial. Once Sinorix drank the mixture, Camma cried out in triumph: she had remained faithful to her departed husband, while avenging his death.¹⁷³ Such virtue is found in married women, and this indeed is the result of Eros and Aphrodite. Plutarch labels homoerotic relationships devoid of Aphrodite as hubris, a “lascivious assault” rather than a union.¹⁷⁴ There is no friendship in this relationship, for it lacks the reciprocity required to create such a bond. Indeed, if a young man is not already of a vicious nature before he accepts a passive sexual role, he will soon become hateful of those who abused him.¹⁷⁵ On the other hand, sex in lawful marriages introduces friendship to the relationship; it is a “sharing, as it were, in great mysteries.”¹⁷⁶ Indulging in pleasure in marriage creates reciprocal respect, friendship, and loyalty between husband and wife. Plutarch also makes use of Solon, referring to his recommendation that married partners should have intercourse at least three times a month.¹⁷⁷ This intimacy is

¹⁷³ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 768b-d.

¹⁷⁴ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 768e4-6.

¹⁷⁵ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 768e13-f 4.

¹⁷⁶ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 769a1-2.

¹⁷⁷ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 769a10.

not aimed at pleasure, rather this “act of tenderness” seeks to renew the marriage and eliminate any grievances which arise from daily life.¹⁷⁸

To counter the argument of the base madness of Woman Love, Plutarch states that the same base obsession can be found within Boy Love: “just as this is boy-madness, so that other affliction is to be woman-crazy: neither is love.”¹⁷⁹ Like Plato, Plutarch acknowledges that there is a right and wrong way to love. Women can certainly love and be loved correctly, especially when they exhibit intelligence, prudence, loyalty, justice, and courage “which is truly masculine.”¹⁸⁰ Plutarch comments on the strangeness of deeming women as unable to love or be loved properly when they display characteristics common to virtuous lovers found in Plato; “their affections are like a rich soil ready to receive the germ of friendship; and beneath it all is a layer of seductive grace.”¹⁸¹ Women are naturally given the gifts of charm, beauty, and persuasion, all of which aid the chaste woman in obtaining her husband’s kindness and friendship.¹⁸² In the case of Ismenodora, who provides the perfect hypothetical example for Plutarch’s discourse, it would be wrong to think that she is incapable of being an *erastes* to Bacchon. Her wealth and beauty are secondary to her outstanding character, and through marital bonds both Ismenodora and Bacchon can lead philosophical lives under the guidance of Eros.

¹⁷⁸ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 769b2-4.

¹⁷⁹ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 769b10-11.

¹⁸⁰ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 769b12-c 1.

¹⁸¹ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 769c5-7.

¹⁸² Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 769c7-d1.

Plutarch champions Eros as the protector of marriages, and indeed a woman should sacrifice to Eros so that he “may smile on her marriage and be guardian of her home, adorning her with such allurements as become a woman, and that her husband may not be diverted to a rival.”¹⁸³ No greater pleasure can be found outside of marital Eros, and the beauty and friendship which flourishes from this union is without equal.¹⁸⁴ This Eros combines physical pleasure with what is truly beautiful, and results in mutual love, allowing both souls to ascend to the Plain of Truth. The beauty of women also possesses immortality, in that it never fades; the beauty of boys, however, dies when the youth become a man.¹⁸⁵ Plutarch also states that a true *erastes* can love boys or women. A lover is truly genuine in their steadfast affections for their partner, even in old age: “Euripides’ remark is clever: he observed upon embracing and kissing Agathon, though the latter’s beard had already grown, that even the autumn of the fair is fair.”¹⁸⁶

Plutarch’s *Amatorius* is successful in grafting Platonic Love on to heteroerotic Eros, without outright rejecting the merit of homoerotic lovers. At the end of the dialogue, the reader is reminded of the situation of Ismenodora and Bacchon. There is to be a wedding after all, and it is the pederast Pusias who first agrees to Ismenodora’s proposal to Bacchon.¹⁸⁷ The dialogue ends on a somewhat playful note, as Plutarch’s

¹⁸³ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 769d5-9.

¹⁸⁴ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 770a2-6.

¹⁸⁵ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 770c.

¹⁸⁶ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 770c4-7.

¹⁸⁷ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 11-14.

group goes to the city to poke fun at their former opponent. It would appear that heteroerotic love has won the day, as Pusias gladly leads the marital procession to the temple of Eros. However, what is more important to Plutarch is acknowledging the difference between true love and base obsession, and that marital love falls within the higher realm of Eros. It is through this work that “Plutarch provides the theory, as it were, to the practice of the novel,”¹⁸⁸ which is based upon the love between the beautiful hero and heroine.

¹⁸⁸ Goldhill, *Foucault's Virginit* *Ancient Erotic Fiction and the History of Sexuality*,

144.

Chapter Three: Platonic Love in the Greek Novel

This chapter will consider how Plato's doctrine of Love is translated to the Greek novel. Plato's Eros not only found a later expression in philosophical dialogues and treatises, but also in the Greek romance novels written during the period of the Second Sophist (c. 50-250 CE). In these novels, Greek authors draw heavily upon Plato to create idealized fantasies, whose heroes and heroines overcome impossible odds to achieve their destined unions. Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* (*LC*) and Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* (*DC*) translate the homoerotic Platonic theory of Eros into the relationships of the heteroerotic lovers, while retaining the homoerotic relationships traditionally idealized in Plato. Indeed, homoerotic relationships often run parallel with the heteroerotic relationship of principal characters, and even aid in their marriage. Both novels contain a wealth of allusions to the Platonic doctrine of Love, and this chapter will analyze four similar, key passages from each novel, which will demonstrate the reworking of the Platonic doctrine of Eros, especially as reiterated in Plutarch's *Amatorius*. Book One, chapter three of *Leucippe and Clitophon* (*LC*1.3) and Book One, chapter thirteen of *Daphnis and Chloe* (*DC* 1.13) both center on the Platonic elements of the primary heteroerotic relationship, and their respective characters. Each work contains the education of the primary characters, seen in *LC* 1.9 and 1.10, and *DC* 2.7. These teachings reflect the union of physical pleasures with the pursuit of Plato's Good—which the *Amatorius* advocates. Additionally, in *Leucippe and Clitophon*, the hero is educated by a pederast, who helps in advancing the relationship of the hero and heroine. *LC* 2.37 and *DC* 4.16 and 4.29 are concerned with the transfer of Plato's homoerotic Eros to heteroerotic Eros. These passages reflect the transfer in different ways: Tatius includes a

debate on which love kind of love—homoerotic or heteroerotic—is superior, while Longus includes a transformation of a pederast who aids in the marriage of Daphnis and Chloe. Finally, each novel expresses the difference between physical virginity and emotional fidelity, the latter being the most important aspect of genuine love. The passages which reflect this concept are *LC* 5.27 and *DC* 3.20 and 1.30.

I. Achilles Tattius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*

Leucippe and Clitophon is one of the more sophisticated novels of the genre, and is clearly infused with Platonic allusions. There are four key passages which evidence the translation of the Platonic doctrine of Love into the novel. First, at *LC* 1.9, the reader encounters elements from Aristophanes' speech in the *Symposium*, as well as a characteristic description of 'love at first sight' in the *Phaedrus*. Second, at *LC* 1.9 and 1.10, Tattius introduces Clinias, Clitophon's pederast cousin, who advises Clitophon on the best way to win over Leucippe. Third, at *LC* 2.37, Tattius takes a page from the *Amatorius*, fashioning his own pederastic versus heteroerotic debate between Menelaus and Clitophon, where both advocate their own cause using Platonic arguments. Fourth at *LC* 5.27, the meaning of true love is suggested by determining what it means for the primary characters to be faithful to their partners. Clitophon's past sexual experiences, including his affair with Melite, seem far removed from the Platonic teaching of Eros, and more appropriately belonging to the acts of Common Aphrodite. However, this sexual encounter has no real love in it on the part of Clitophon, but mere pity for a fellow victim of Eros.

LC 1.3: Clitophon's dream and description

The first book of *Leucippe and Clitophon* contains two examples of Platonic teaching: the first taking the form of a dream, the other a description of the soul in love. Before Clitophon meets Leucippe, his father Hippias planned for him to marry his half-sister Calligone. While Hippias was making the preparations for the future marriage, Clitophon dreams of a Fury¹⁸⁹ ripping his whole body into two:

I had a dream in which my lower parts were fused up to the navel with those of my bride, while from there we had separate upper bodies. A huge, terrifying woman with a savage countenance appeared ... She was wielding a sickle in her right hand, and a torch in the other ... raising her sickle she brought it down on my loins were the two bodies were joined, and lopped off my bride.¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁹ Robin Whitmarsh, *Explanatory Notes to Leucippe and Clitophon*, by Achilles Tatius (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 147. In his notes, Whitmarsh suggests that the iconography of the figure indicates a Fury, and states: “oddly, as there is no suggestion of Clitophon’s having committed a crime; but an epicizing travel narrative is best motivated by divine wrath.” However, it seems that the Fury would have been avenging Eros. Clitophon has not yet shown the god due reverence, and he is planning on marrying a woman whom Eros has not intended.

¹⁹⁰ Achilles Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, trans. Tim Whitmarsh (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 6.

This passage recalls Aristophanes' myth of the three genders in Plato's *Symposium*.¹⁹¹ However, the fact that Clitophon is not completely one with his bride, whom one can only think to be Calligone, diverges from Aristophanes' myth. In Aristophanes' speech the original state of human beings is that of a whole circular body in which two half bodies are utterly integrated with their other half. In Clitophon's dream, the reader is given an image of a whole which is only half complete, in that the upper bodies are not connected, but merely joined at the genitals. In the *Symposium*, after Zeus split these first humans into two separate beings, Aristophanes explains that in order to relieve their stress and pains of loneliness "so that people would just relax,"¹⁹² humans would have casual and non-comital intercourse before moving on, continuing the search for their own missing half, their true love. Clitophon states that before he met Leucippe he has had sex only with prostitutes,¹⁹³ but not with someone he truly loves.

Clearly, the marriage to Calligone would not have been an ideal match for Clitophon. Considered in light of the Aristophanic myth, Clitophon and Calligone do not long to be one with each other as do the true lovers in Aristophanes' speech. His union with her would only grant his soul temporary fulfillment in the pleasures of intercourse; after all, they are only joined at the genitals. According to Socrates in the *Phaedrus*, mutual love is a fundamental element in virtuous relationships, and is established through the *erastes* and *eromenos* perceiving aspects of their own selves, and true Beauty, in the

¹⁹¹ See page 5-6.

¹⁹² Plato, *Symposium*, 191c8.

¹⁹³ Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, 41.

mind itself of their partner. Clitophon obviously does not have this relationship with Calligone; they are not of one mind, lacking the friendship both Plato and Plutarch value greatly. Thus, Clitophon and Calligone cannot properly love each other. Indeed, the narrator relates that Eros has ordained that Clitophon belongs to Leucippe and Calligone to Callisthenes.¹⁹⁴ Only in their own respective relationships are Clitophon and Calligone able to find their true other half.

Almost immediately after this dream, Clitophon meets Leucippe and instantaneously falls in love with her. Clitophon's reaction to the sight of Leucippe undoubtedly alludes to the *Phaedrus*:

As soon as I saw I was done for: beauty pricks sharper than darts, and floods down through the eyes to the soul ... All kinds of reactions possessed me at once ... I admired her stature, I was awestruck by her beauty, I was terrified in my heart, I gazed without shame, I felt ashamed at having been captivated so. I tried to force myself to tug my eyes away from the girl, but they resisted, tugging themselves back

¹⁹⁴ Tattius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, 62. In a separate dream, Artemis and Aphrodite tell Leucippe and Clitophon that they are destined to be married. Calligone is at first kidnapped by Callisthenes, and during their time together Callisthenes falls in love. His love for Calligone overcomes his original "youthful nature, violent as it is" (Tattius 144), just as the harsh mind in Plato's *Phaedrus* is overcome by Eros.

there again, as if towed by the lure of beauty. In the end,
the eyes won.¹⁹⁵

Clitophon's account of his experience of Leucippe's beauty harkens back to Plato's account of the tripartite soul in the *Phaedrus*.¹⁹⁶ Though the white and dark horses of the soul are not explicitly referenced, the Platonic reader will recognize the soul's internal struggle when it first witnesses something that mirrors the beauty of the Good. It would seem that the wanton part of Clitophon's soul has won out; try as he may, he cannot help but stare and indulge in Leucippe's beauty. This contest of the eyes seems similar to the charioteer attempting to reign in the wicked horse, who insists on charging headlong to the beloved.¹⁹⁷ However, Clitophon does not approach Leucippe at first, but rather allows her presence to nourish his soul, like the lovers of the *Phaedrus*. Indeed, during their first dinner together Clitophon does not eat the food set out, but feasts upon the sight of Leucippe.¹⁹⁸

Regarding Clitophon as the ideal Platonic lover, however, is problematic in that his desire for physical intimacy is his greatest concern within the first three books. Plato would certainly not agree with Clitophon's bee sting scheme in order to receive kisses from Leucippe, nor the forceful kisses he bestows (which Leucippe agrees to with a

¹⁹⁵ Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, 7.

¹⁹⁶ Cf. *Phaedrus* 254a.

¹⁹⁷ Cf. *Phaedrus* 254a3-5.

¹⁹⁸ Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, 7.

degree of hesitancy).¹⁹⁹ Clitophon would more appropriately be classified by Plato under the category of the debased lover, seeking physical pleasure in order to temporarily cure his pining spirit. Moreover, Plutarch himself chastises lovers whose primary goal aims toward physical satisfaction.²⁰⁰ Nonetheless, after Book Three Clitophon stops pressing Leucippe for sex, as each character has a similar dream, in which Artemis appears to Leucippe and Aphrodite to Clitophon, both goddesses asserting that the couple must refrain from intercourse until marriage.²⁰¹ Helen Morales points out that it is indeed possible to perceive the relationships of Clitophon and Leucippe as a Platonic allegory, in which their marriage is praised as the new model of male-female love, and not the “impious” model of heterosexual relationships.²⁰² Additionally, the very name ‘Leucippe’ can be read as ‘the white horse,’ suggestive of Plato’s noble horse of the soul in the *Phaedrus*.²⁰³ Clitophon, then, could very well represent the dark wanton horse in his ardent sexual compulsions. Together, they comprise two parts of one whole soul, which can only ascend to the Beautiful with the guidance of Eros.

¹⁹⁹ Tattius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, 23-24.

²⁰⁰ Cf. “The Dialogue on Love” 769b2-4.

²⁰¹ Tattius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, 62.

²⁰² Helen Morales, *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tattius’ Leucippe and Clitophon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 57.

²⁰³ Morales, *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tattius’ Leucippe and Clitophon*, 56.

LC 1.9 and 1.10: Clinias' advice

Before Clitophon begins his attempt to seduce Leucippe, he receives a teaching on Eros from the pederast Clinias. Here, the homoerotic lover educates the heteroerotic lover in the ways of Eros. However, before he advises Clitophon, Clinias delivers a misogynistic rant against the female sex after learning that his beloved Charicles is to be married to an unattractive woman.²⁰⁴ In his tirade, Clinias accuses even Penelope—the archetype of female virtue—of leading men to their deaths, for women will kill men by loving them and by rejecting them.²⁰⁵ For Clinias, it is indeed one thing for a man to be married to a beautiful murderer, but a separate thing entirely to be married to an ugly woman. Clinias' attack on marriage, especially to unattractive women, is followed by his response to Clitophon's complaint of his misfortune:

But you see her continually! ... And you complain, with luck like that? ... You are an ungracious recipient of Eros' gifts. You do not understand the value of the sight of the beloved: it yields more pleasure than the act itself. You see, when two pairs of eyes reflect in each other, they forge images of each other's body, as in a mirror. The effluxion of beauty floods down through the eyes to the soul, and

²⁰⁴ Tattius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, 10.

²⁰⁵ Tattius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, 10.

effects a kind of union without contact. It is a bodily union
in miniature, a new kind of bodily fusion.²⁰⁶

In the *Symposium*, Socrates states that beauty is the only medium wherein mentally or physically pregnant people can give birth, attaining immortality either through the production of great works or in reproducing children.²⁰⁷ The beauty of Leucippe is the medium in which Clitophon's soul may gain immortality. Clitophon is constantly stimulated by her beauty, making him more fortunate than Clinias himself. Furthermore, Clinias' teaching reminds the reader of Plato's teachings in the *Phaedrus*.²⁰⁸ Once the *erastes* views the image of true Beauty reflected in the *eromenos*, the flood of passion which surges out from the *erastes* soul re-enters the eyes of the beloved, thereby nourishing the beloved's soul as well as establishing *anteros*. Clinias himself, however, appears to focus more upon achieving physical intimacy, using erotic sophistry to do so: "it is the act that you should aim to achieve, and in silence ... the pleasure she derives from your words leads her to think that she is actually experiencing the act, and not simply listening to your attempts."²⁰⁹

As Makowski notes, the Platonic division between male and female love "exerted considerable influence up to the time of the Second Sophistic, as indicated by Plutarch's

²⁰⁶ Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, 11.

²⁰⁷ See page 10-11.

²⁰⁸ Cf. *Phaedrus* 251b, 255c.

²⁰⁹ Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, 12.

Amatorius.²¹⁰ Plutarch's work presents a new model of Platonic Eros, one which included, and certainly championed, heteroerotic love and physical intimacy aimed at creating a permanent friendship between a husband and wife. Without realizing it, this is certainly what the misogynistic Clinias is teaching Clitophon. Beholding one's lover creates a bond stronger than sexual pleasure, and is the preliminary "union without contact" that sets in motion the unification of the two souls in friendship, which sexual pleasure will later strengthen in matrimony. That a pederast would share erotic knowledge with the heteroerotic hero, and help the two principal characters elope,²¹¹ indicates a transfer from pederastic love to the love of women.

Clinias' lesson is interrupted by a messenger, reporting that Charicles has died in a riding accident. Scholars have explored multiple theories to explain this event, all of which suggest that heteroerotic love is just as important as pederasty, and that the sacred bond of marital Love should be respected. Makowski suggests that the death of Charicles indicates a conflict between the model of pederastic bachelorhood, and the societal and familial model of marriage.²¹² Same-sex relationships are not intended to be permanent; once an *eromenos* matures he is expected to take a wife, and perhaps later become the

²¹⁰ John F. Makowski, "Greek Love in the Greek Novel," *A Companion to the Ancient Novel*, ed. Edmund P. Cueva and Shannon N. Byrne (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2014), 495.

²¹¹ Tattius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, 36.

²¹² Makowski, "Greek Love in the Greek Novel," 495.

erastes himself to a younger *eromenos*.²¹³ Charicles' premature death aborts the homoerotic relationship which would have been terminated by his marriage.²¹⁴ Anderson and Morales agree that there is an element of irony behind this episode. Moments after Clinias gives a bitter speech against marriage, his beloved is killed by the very horse Clinias gave to him. Anderson refers to this as a punishment by Eros for Clinias' speaking against the sacred bond of marriage: "his tirade has been undercut and his rhetoric [is] in vain."²¹⁵ Morales refers to Charicles' death as a "cautionary tale against Clinias' way of loving."²¹⁶ True lovers, as Plutarch teaches, will love beautiful souls regardless of sex,²¹⁷ something which Clinias fails to see in his outburst.

LC 2.37: The homoerotic vs. heteroerotic debate

The short debate between the pederast Menelaus and Clitophon in Book Two imitates of the debate in the *Amatorius*. Similar to the advocates of male-female relationships in Plutarch's work, Clitophon gives Platonic arguments to support the love of women. The debate begins with Menelaus stating that the love of boys "is far superior to the other kind," for the beauty of boys is simpler and is a greater stimulant for pleasure

²¹³ Makowski, "Greek Love in the Greek Novel," 491.

²¹⁴ Makowski, "Greek Love in the Greek Novel," 493.

²¹⁵ Graham Anderson, *Eros Sophistes: Ancient Novelists at Play*, American Classical Studies 9 (Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1982), 28.

²¹⁶ Morales, *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon*, 152.

²¹⁷ Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 767a3-6.

than the artificial beauty of women.²¹⁸ The beauty of boys is not everlasting, which makes the longing for their beauty stronger.²¹⁹ Makowski notes that Menelaus seems to begin by taking a philosophical stance on the matter in introducing the distinction between heavenly and vulgar beauty, but then turns to belittling the mortal women with whom Zeus had affairs.²²⁰ In his explanation of heavenly and vulgar beauty, Menelaus states that “the heavenly type is distressed at being chained to mortal beauty and seeks to flee swiftly heavenwards, while the vulgar has been cast down here, a long-term visitor in the corporeal world.”²²¹ Menelaus’ speech recalls Pausanias’ speech in the *Symposium*, in associating heavenly, or celestial beauty with the fleeting beauty of boys. In his rebuttal, Clitophon turns Plato’s teaching on immortality as the ultimate goal of the soul against Menelaus:

But surely ... women’s beauty would seem to be heavenly precisely in that it does not dissolve quickly: indestructibility and divinity ... are closely linked. Anything that moves in the realm of the perishable, in imitation of mortal nature, is not heavenly but vulgar.²²²

²¹⁸ Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, 40, 42. According to Menelaus, women use make-up, hair dye, and perfume to create their beauty.

²¹⁹ Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, 40.

²²⁰ Makowski, “Greek Love in the Greek Novel,” 496.

²²¹ Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, 40.

²²² Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, 41.

For Clitophon, the “heavenly” beauty of women, in outlasting that of young men, has more claim to association with the ideal of heavenly beauty of the Good (*to kalon*). In a way, the “heavenly” beauty of women is a kind of manifestation of divine beauty—in heteroerotic love, the lovers permanently pursue the immortal life which the pederastic lovers can only partake of fleetingly. Yet, as Makowski states, both speakers focus upon sensual pleasure, with “little concern for the moral edification of either lovers or beloved or for the meaning of love relationships, much less *eros* as an avenue to the higher good.”²²³ It may be, however, Plutarch’s argument in the *Amatorius* is that sensual pleasure can lead to the “higher good,” in that it creates reciprocal friendship and loyalty in virtuous heteroerotic relationships.²²⁴ This revamped Eros, which is not obsessed with the base pleasure from women or boys, becomes the new method to ascend to the Good.

LC 5.27: Clitophon’s affair

Achilles Tatius also presents the meaning of true love, separating physical virginity from the emotional fidelity of the soul. The emotional loyalty and commitment between the hero and heroine become the defining characteristic of the ideal couple.²²⁵ According to Clitophon, he has imitated the virginity of Leucippe;²²⁶ however, he has admittedly had sex with prostitutes, agreed to marry Melite and, as if to add insult to

²²³ Makowski “Greek Love in the Greek Novel,” 496.

²²⁴ Plutarch, “The Dialogue on Love,” 769a.

²²⁵ David Konstan, *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994), 46.

²²⁶ Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, 91.

injury, had an affair with Melite, while knowing Leucippe was alive. The virginity Clitophon refers to is not concerned with chastity, but with fidelity, the constancy of his love for Leucippe.

The reader is first made aware of Clitophon's experiences with prostitutes during the debate in Book Two. His sexual experiences are "limited" only to the realm of the Common Aphrodite,²²⁷ that is to say, sex without Eros. As Morales notes, it seems that Clitophon is distinguishing between sex and love.²²⁸ Surely, Clitophon harbours no strong emotions for these women, and his experience is nothing more than a past indulgence of sexual desire. Clitophon has only experienced vulgar desire with the prostitutes; with Leucippe he experiences the love of Celestial Eros. In this sense, Clitophon's past affairs have no effect on his love for Leucippe. Aware of Clitophon's past sexual experiences, the reader can understand why the hero goes to Clinias for advice.²²⁹ Clitophon does not need to be taught about how to initiate intercourse; rather, he must learn the morality of marital love, the right balance between Eros (love) and Aphrodite (sex).

In Book Five, Leucippe appears to be murdered by pirates, which is later revealed to reader to be a false death. After a mourning period and reuniting with Clinias, Clitophon reluctantly agrees to Clinias and Menelaus to meet Melite, a beautiful, young

²²⁷ Tattius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, 40.

²²⁸ Morales, *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tattius' Leucippe and Clitophon*, 153.

²²⁹ Morales, *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tattius' Leucippe and Clitophon*, 152.

and wealthy widow.²³⁰ Melite has fallen deeply in love with Clitophon, and indeed resembles a sort of Ismenodora figure in the novel.²³¹ Clitophon's marriage to Melite and their affair does not impede on his primary love of Leucippe. Konstan comments that this new Platonic Eros in the novel has a dualism, and "by its nature maintains the original emotion, yet supplements it by the very fact of endurance."²³² The love between Leucippe and Clitophon conquers the various obstacles threatening to separate the couple, making their *eros* different than that of their rivals. Melite's *eros* is one sided, and is not reciprocated by Clitophon, who is still faithful to Leucippe. Clitophon concedes to the marriage, insisting that their marital oaths will only begin once they arrive in Ephesus. Melite "must give way to Leucippe" in Alexandria,²³³ the place of Leucippe's supposed death and tomb. Clitophon has no desire to consummate their relationship, for he does not reciprocate Melite's love. Even when the pair begin their voyage and leave Alexandria behind, Clitophon still finds excuses to evade Melite's desires, claiming that the sea itself frowns upon the acts of Aphrodite on boats.²³⁴

²³⁰ Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, 84.

²³¹ Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, 84. Cf. "The Dialogue on Love" 749e. Melite similarly has pledged her entire life to Clitophon, wanting to take Clitophon as her "master" rather than husband.

²³² Konstan *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres*, 46.

²³³ Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, 85.

²³⁴ Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, 85.

Once in Ephesus, Melite and Clitophon meet Lacaena,²³⁵ a new slave girl on Melite's country estate. The girl pleads that Melite take pity on her, for she is a free woman of noble birth. Lacaena later reveals herself to be Leucippe in a letter to Clitophon, who was sold by pirates to Melite's estate. Leucippe's beauty still shines out behind her new slavish appearance, and indeed Clitophon notices that "she seemed to have something of Leucippe about her," and is greatly saddened when he sees the lash marks on her back.²³⁶ Clitophon proves his fidelity even here, as he both remembers Leucippe and maintains his feelings for her,²³⁷ as suggested by his distress at seeing Leucippe's scars. Once Clitophon discovers his love is still alive, he abandons the marriage with Melite, and denies her from fulfilling her desire, despite his promise. If Clitophon were to reciprocate Melite's *eros*, he would indeed be forsaking his primary *eros* of Leucippe;²³⁸ however, Clitophon remains faithful and steadfast in his *eros* for Leucippe, similar to the ideal Platonic lover in the *Phaedrus*, who commits his love entirely to the soul of his beloved.

Melite uses sophistic arguments in order to persuade Clitophon to satisfy her sexual desire, claiming that Eros would not be content if Clitophon did not initiate her

²³⁵ Robin Whitmarsh, *Explanatory Notes to Leucippe and Clitophon*, by Achilles Tatius (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 158. An allusion to Helen of Sparta, wife of Menelaus and Paris.

²³⁶ Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, 88.

²³⁷ Konstan, *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres*, 52.

²³⁸ Konstan, *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres*, 52.

into Love's mysteries in return for restoring Leucippe to him.²³⁹ In response to Melite's pleading for liberation from the throbbing in her soul, Clitophon deliberates:

... I felt a natural human reaction. I was also genuinely scared of Eros, that he might visit his wrath upon me; and, what was more, I considered how I had regained Leucippe, how I was about to get rid of Melite, how the act to be performed was a matter not of marriage but of the remedy for a king of illness of the soul.²⁴⁰

Clitophon's fidelity cannot be deduced by his physical virginity. Fidelity in the novel is concerned with consistency of the original love for one's partner, and the remembrance of this love.²⁴¹ Clitophon agrees Melite's request not out of love for her; "his motive is part mercy, part humility before the gods,"²⁴² for he himself knows well the power and wrath of Eros. Certainly, this one sexual episode does not obstruct Clitophon's original love or fidelity for Leucippe.

Conclusion

Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* effectively translates Plutarch's adaptation of Plato's homoerotic theory of Love in the *Amatorius* to the relationships of heteroerotic lovers, while recognizing Plato's idealized homoerotic relationships.

²³⁹ Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, 96.

²⁴⁰ Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, 97.

²⁴¹ Konstan, *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres*, 52.

²⁴² Konstan, *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres*, 53.

First, *LC* 1.3 demonstrates the Platonic elements in the relationship of the hero and heroine. Clitophon's dream of being joined to Calligone at the genitals is an allusion to Aristophanes' myth of the three genders in the *Symposium*. Clitophon and Calligone are only joined at the genitals, which suggests that their marriage is not ideal. Indeed, true lovers in Aristophanes' myth yearn to be completely whole with their partner; however, neither Clitophon nor Calligone desire to be one with each other. Clitophon's description of his experience of seeing Leucippe's beauty in *LC* 1.3 also translates Plato's idealized homoerotic Eros to heteroerotic relationships. Clitophon's description resembles Plato's account in the *Phaedrus*, of the human soul's experience when it beholds the beloved. Clitophon's soul is nourished by Leucippe's beauty, and feels the same reverence and shame experienced by the noble and ignoble horses of Plato's tripartite soul.

Second, Clinias' advice at *LC* 1.9 and *LC* 1.10 transfers Plato's homoerotic *anteros* in the *Phaedrus* to heteroerotic relationships. As Clitophon's soul is filled with passion, the image of Beauty flows into the eyes of Leucippe, thus establishing reciprocal love. This passage also includes Plutarch's adaptation of the Platonic doctrine of Eros: beholding one's lover establishes a preliminary *eros* between heteroerotic couples, which is strengthened by physical pleasure. Clinias also aids the heteroerotic characters achieve their marriage, suggesting that heteroerotic is no longer considered a debased form of Eros.

Third, in the homoerotic versus heteroerotic debate at *LC* 2.37, Tattius transfers the goodness of immortality in the *Symposium* to the beauty of women. The soul desires immortality, thus loving beautiful women can only aid the soul in achieving its ultimate aim.

Finally, at *LC* 5.27 Tattius expresses the importance of emotional fidelity over physical virginity. In the *Amatorius*, the *eros* of true lovers is constant. Clitophon's previous sexual experiences and his affair with Melite does not deter his original *eros* for Leucippe. Clitophon does not love Melite, and he certainly does not desire to have an affair with her. Indeed, the threat of Eros' wrath influences Clitophon's decision to have sex with Melite more than his feelings for the woman. In his devotion to Leucippe, Clitophon resembles the ideal *erastes* of Plato's *Phaedrus*. He does not waver in his emotional fidelity or desire the beauty of another beloved; rather Clitophon commits his love entirely to Leucippe.

II. Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*

Daphnis and Chloe contains four similar passages of Plato's theory of Love being transferred into the Greek novel. Daphnis and Chloe already possess friendship, a key element of Eros in the *Phaedrus* and *Amatorius*. In *DC* 1.13, Chloe and Daphnis fall in love with each other, transforming their *philia*, or friendship, into the ideal *eros* of lovers. Daphnis and Chloe are educated by Philetas in *DC* 2.7, a man versed in the ways of Eros. Philetas' teachings, like Clinias', seems to aim more toward physical pleasures as a treatment of the lovesick soul. However, it is through intimate gestures that heteroerotic couples cultivate their tender friendships. In *DC* 4.16 and 4.29, Gnathon, an immoral pederast, becomes an important figure of the novel. Gnathon is transformed into a virtuous Platonic lover through his love of Daphnis, and performs the final reunification of the heteroerotic couple. Longus also expresses the difference between physical virginity and emotional fidelity. In *DC* 3.20, Daphnis consents to intercourse with Lycaenion, so that he might learn how to fulfill his love with Chloe. Prior to this, Chloe

shares a kiss with her admirer Dorcon in *DC* 1.30. Though the hero and heroine have intimate moments with other characters, it does not hinder their primary love of each other.

DC1.13: Friendship and love

The friendship (*philia*) between Daphnis and Chloe began in their childhood, for even at a young age, “they were inseparable and did everything together,” sharing the responsibilities of their flocks and enjoying the company of each other.²⁴³ Though the hero and heroine in *Daphnis and Chloe* are not as exaggerated or risqué as in *Leucippe and Clitophon*, they nonetheless show signs of a reworking of the Platonic doctrine by Plutarch. Chloe falls in love when she sees Daphnis’ naked body while bathing, and her account bares resemblance to the ideal beloved of the *Phaedrus*:²⁴⁴

‘I’m sick now, but what my sickness is I don’t understand;
I’m in pain, but haven’t been injured; I am burning hot, yet
here I am sitting in the dark shade ... so many bees have
pricked me, and I never shouted out. But this prick in my
heart is more pointed and bitter than all of those.’ ... These

²⁴³ Longus, “Daphnis and Chloe,” *Greek Fiction: Callirhoe, Daphnis and Chloe, Letters of Chion*, trans., Phiroze Vasunia, ed. Helen Morales (London: Penguin Books, 2011), 141.

²⁴⁴ Cf. *Phaedrus* 255d.

were the things she felt ... but the word she was searching
for was *love*.²⁴⁵

Chloe also exhibits the symptoms of a Platonic *erastes*: she has lost the desire to eat or tend to her flock, sleep evades her, and she fluctuates between joy and sorrow.²⁴⁶ Not only does she internally praise Daphnis and his beauty, but she also tries to convince Daphnis to bath again so that she may look upon his beautiful form. As Plato indicates in the *Phaedrus*, beholding the beauty of the beloved nourishes the lover's soul, and increases their longing to be near the source of their pleasure. As a female *erastes*, Chloe does not fit the paradigm of Platonic Eros; however, the reworking of the Platonic doctrine of Love in the *Amatorius* allows her to be viewed as an *erastes*. Women in Plutarch's dialogue are indeed capable of Eros, and it is their virtue and beauty which makes them ideal lovers. Daphnis also exhibits the signs of both lover and beloved,²⁴⁷ alluding to Plutarch's teaching that both partners in a relationship are simultaneously lovers and beloveds, for it is far better to be a lover than a beloved.²⁴⁸ Though Daphnis and Chloe possess a preliminary friendship and love, their bond is strengthened after they apply Philetas' teaching on Eros.

²⁴⁵ Longus, "Daphnis and Chloe," 144.

²⁴⁶ Longus, "Daphnis and Chloe," 144.

²⁴⁷ Longus, "Daphnis and Chloe," 146.

²⁴⁸ Plutarch, "The Dialogue on Love," 769d 12-e1.

DC 2.7: Philetas' teaching

Due to their innocence, neither Chloe nor Daphnis search for a teacher as does Clitophon; instead a teacher comes to them. Philetas, an old rustic man, receives direct knowledge from Eros that the union of Daphnis and Chloe is consecrated.²⁴⁹ Philetas gives the young couple a lesson on Eros, one which seems to mingle aspects of Agathon's speech in the *Symposium* with Socrates' teaching in the *Phaedrus*:

Love, my children, is a god, young and beautiful and winged; he rejoices in youth and pursues beauty and gives wings to souls. He has more power than Zeus ... There is no remedy, no cure, for Love.²⁵⁰

In the *Symposium*, Agathon's speech praises Eros as the youngest of gods, able to persuade other divinities. Eros concerns himself with youths, and indeed Philetas is told by the god to consider himself lucky: he alone has had the pleasure of seeing Eros in his older years.²⁵¹ As part of his education, Philetas states that "kisses and embraces and lying down naked together" is the only remedy for Eros.²⁵² This concept is taken from the *Amatorius*; the only remedy for the sting of Love is the beauty and tender friendship of

²⁴⁹ Longus, "Daphnis and Chloe," 158.

²⁵⁰ Longus, "Daphnis and Chloe," 158-159.

²⁵¹ Longus, "Daphnis and Chloe," 158.

²⁵² Longus, "Daphnis and Chloe," 159.

one's partner.²⁵³ Like Clinias, Philetas' teaching seems to be aimed at sensual pleasure. After their lesson, the hero and heroine try Philetas' techniques to no avail; kissing and embracing has only little effect, making their desire for the other increase. Finally, the couple try lying down naked together, but their inexperience in the mysteries of Eros hinders them from consummating their love.²⁵⁴ Philetas expresses the Plutarchan belief that intimacy in heteroerotic relationships is the primary way to foster genuine friendship in *eros*. Intercourse itself is virtuous only within the marriage; however, the preliminary kisses and embraces which Philetas introduces to Chloe and Daphnis increase their pre-existing bond.

DC 4.16 and 4.29: The transformation of Gnathon

The stories of the pederastic characters set inside the greater narrative of the Greek novel are important;²⁵⁵ however Longus does not provide personal stories of his homoerotic character. Instead, Longus provides the transformation of Gnathon, a debased pederastic lover, to a virtuous Platonic lover. Quite effectively, Longus displays the characteristic of the ignoble and noble lover from Plato's tradition in one character.²⁵⁶

²⁵³ Cf. "The Dialogue on Love"769e1-2. Plutarch tells Zeuxippus not to fear the initial sting of Love. The stinging in the soul subdues as the couple continues their friendship and love in marriage.

²⁵⁴ Konstan, *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres*, 54.

²⁵⁵ Makowski, "Greek Love in the Greek Novel," 497.

²⁵⁶ Makowski, "Greek Love in the Greek Novel," 498.

Gnathon, the slave of Astylus, is first introduced as a “parasite,”²⁵⁷ and is described as “nothing other than the sum of his mouth, his stomach and his loins.”²⁵⁸ Gnathon is the gluttonous indulger of the wanton horse in the *Phaedrus*, purely devoted to satisfying his desires with a debased enjoyment of food, wine, and sex. Upon seeing Daphnis, Gnathon decides that he will enjoy the physical pleasures of the boy’s body, willing to use force against Daphnis should he resist.²⁵⁹ Rather than overcoming Daphnis, Gnathon is pushed to the ground, inciting Gnathon to behold Daphnis in a new way: not only is Daphnis outwardly beautiful, but he is also strong.²⁶⁰ From this point on, Gnathon begins to cultivate a Platonic *eros* for Daphnis, and mimics the ideal *erastes* of the *Phaedrus*: “I’ve lost my taste for rich food ... I’d much rather be a she-goat and eat grass and leaves, if only I could hear Daphnis’ piping, if only I could be pastured by him.”²⁶¹ Plato’s ideal lover, like Gnathon, would willingly become a slave if it meant he could be near to his beloved.²⁶²

The polarization between same-sex and heteroerotic love does not receive the same treatment in *Daphnis and Chloe* as it does in *Leucippe and Clitophon*; there are no debates, no speeches which attack the merit of homoerotic or heteroerotic love. Instead,

²⁵⁷Longus, “Daphnis and Chloe,” 195.

²⁵⁸ Longus, “Daphnis and Chloe,” 196.

²⁵⁹ Longus, “Daphnis and Chloe,” 196.

²⁶⁰ Longus, “Daphnis and Chloe,” 196.

²⁶¹ Longus, “Daphnis and Chloe,” 198.

²⁶² Cf. *Phaedrus*, 252a5.

the focus is centered upon the right way to love. Gnathon's debasement does not stem from the fact that he loves boys, but that he is self-indulgent in this love.²⁶³ Nor yet is it that Daphnis is not right for Gnathon, but that Gnathon is not right for Daphnis, whom Eros has ordained to be with Chloe. Gnathon realizes his true potential as a virtuous lover in rescuing Chloe from Lampis and returning her to Daphnis. In this sense, Gnathon is similar to Clinias²⁶⁴ in that both pederasts aid in the reunification of the heteroerotic couple, thus securing the reconciliation between the love of boys and women.²⁶⁵

DC 3.20 and 1.30: Daphnis' and Chloe's fidelity

As Konstan states, "the events in the Greek novel are designed to test the love of the primary couple."²⁶⁶ Chloe and Daphnis are both put to the test, and this can be seen in their sexual experiences with other characters. In addition to Philetas' teachings, Daphnis receives a private lesson from Lycaenion, an older woman unfaithful to her husband. Lycaenion witnesses Daphnis trying desperately to make love with Chloe, imitating the goats of his flock. Now aware of the couple's dilemma, she devises a plan which would both grant Daphnis the knowledge of love-making, and fulfill her own desire for Daphnis. Daphnis willingly agrees to be Lycaenion's student, but his consent is not for the sake of sexual pleasure. On the contrary, Daphnis wishes to learn "the skill through

²⁶³ Makowski, "Greek Love in the Greek Novel," 497.

²⁶⁴ Makowski, "Greek Love in the Greek Novel," 489.

²⁶⁵ Longus, "Daphnis and Chloe," 205.

²⁶⁶ Konstan, *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres*, 46.

which he could do what he wanted to Chloe.”²⁶⁷ Never is Daphnis concerned with the Lycaenion’s pleasure, nor does he desire or love the woman, whose own passion is an one-sided “‘desire’ or ‘appetite,’” rather than *eros*.²⁶⁸ After the lesson, Daphnis’ first thought is to rush back to Chloe, so that he might share with her this last mystery of Eros.²⁶⁹ Lycaenion departs with a warning: since Chloe is a virgin, she will feel pain during intercourse. This deters Daphnis’ excitement, who then becomes concerned that Chloe should feel discomfort or pain during his pleasure.²⁷⁰ Daphnis’ experience with Lycaenion has not altered his love for Chloe; rather his feelings are strengthened, since he cares more about her comfort than his own pleasure.²⁷¹ This act was purely for the sake of education, without which Daphnis would continuously fail in his imitation of the he-goats of his flock.²⁷² His affair is therefore harmless, with no ramifications upon the *eros* between Daphnis and Chloe.²⁷³

Although Chloe remains a virgin until her wedding day, she shares a kiss with Dorcon, Daphnis’ rival in Book One, before he dies. Chloe’s kiss at *DC* 1.30 is out of

²⁶⁷ Longus, “Daphnis and Chloe,” 181.

²⁶⁸ Konstan, *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres*, 54.

²⁶⁹ Longus, “Daphnis and Chloe,” 182.

²⁷⁰ Longus, “Daphnis and Chloe,” 183.

²⁷¹ Longus, “Daphnis and Chloe,” 182. Daphnis is more worried with Chloe’s physical comfort than soothing the burning in his soul to have sex with her.

²⁷² Longus, “Daphnis and Chloe,” 180.

²⁷³ Konstan, *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and other Genres*, 54.

pity for the Dorcon, and as a gift in exchange for his pipes (which Chloe later uses to save Daphnis).²⁷⁴ Her emotional fidelity is not threatened by this kiss; she is not moved by Eros to kiss Dorcon, and this point is more critical than the act of one mere kiss.

Conclusion

Like Tatius' novel, Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* displays the transfer of Plato's homoerotic theory of Love to the heteroerotic relationships of the Greek novel, as adapted by Plutarch's *Amatorius*, whilst maintaining Plato's ideal pederastic lover.

First, Daphnis and Chloe possess an initial friendship with each other (an important aspect of erotic relationships in Plato and Plutarch); this *philia* is transformed into *eros* at *DC* 1.13. Chloe's experience of love reflects the experience of the ideal *erastes* in the *Phaedrus*: her desire for all worldly possessions is replaced by her love for Daphnis. That Chloe falls in love first and experiences *eros* this way indicates a transfer from Plato's homoerotic doctrine of Love to heteroerotic Eros. Furthermore, both Daphnis and Chloe are lovers, simultaneously giving and receiving love, which alludes to Plutarch's ideal heteroerotic relationship.

Second, at *DC* 2.7, the education Philetas gives the heteroerotic couple on Eros reflects Agathon's speech in Plato's *Symposium*. Agathon's Eros is idealized as eternally young, as is the Eros described by Philetas. Plutarch's reiteration of the Platonic doctrine of Eros asserts that physical intimacy aimed toward goodness in heteroerotic relationships is the catalyst for genuine love, and indeed Philetas teaches Daphnis and Chloe that the only cure for their soul's affliction is sensual pleasure.

²⁷⁴ Konstan, *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and other Genres*, 54.

Third, Longus simultaneously provides an example of Plato's debased and idealized homoerotic lover in Gnathon at *DC* 4.16 and 4.29. Inspired by his love for Daphnis, Gnathon's gluttonous behavior is overcome, and he transforms into the idealized Platonic homoerotic lover. At *DC* 4.29, Gnathon reconciles homoerotic love with heteroerotic love when he rescues Chloe and returns her to Daphnis, thus restoring the principal heteroerotic relationship.

Last, Longus also shows the importance of emotional fidelity over physical chastity in *DC* 3.18 ad 1.30. In the same way that Clitophon is faithful to Leucippe, Daphnis and Chloe are faithful to each other. Daphnis' and Chloe's intimate experiences with Lycaenion and Dorcon do not affect their original friendship or *eros*. In this way, the primary heteroerotic relationship mimics Plato's ideal homoerotic lover of the *Phaedrus*.

Conclusion

Plato's homoerotic doctrine of Love in the *Symposium* and *Phaedrus* are indeed present in the heteroerotic relationships of the Greek novel. Plutarch's *Amatorius* reiterates the Platonic doctrine, arguing that heteroerotic relationships and marriage are equally as important—if not more important—as homoerotic relationships. The *eros* between men and women contains physical pleasure aimed toward the Platonic Good of the *Symposium*, which allows heteroerotic partners to experience the highest bliss. Through the analysis of four key passages of both Greek novels, Tattius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* and Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* demonstrate the transfer of Plato's homoerotic Eros to heteroerotic relationships, as reiterated by Plutarch's *Amatorius*.

The heteroerotic relationships of both novels contain elements of Plato's doctrine of Love, and indeed the heroes and heroines of demonstrate themselves to be ideal Platonic lovers. The erotic teachings given by Clinias and Philetas reflect Plutarch's argument that physical pleasure can achieve Plato's Good, for it inspires mutual *eros* and loyalty in heteroerotic relationships.

Each novel is concerned with the transfer of Plato's homoerotic love to heteroerotic love; however, Tattius and Longus express this differently. In *Leucippe and Clitophon*, Clitophon uses Platonic arguments to support the love of women in the debate between homoerotic and heterotic love. Plato's immortality, the ultimate desire of the human soul in the *Symposium*, is present in female beauty. Therefore, a woman is certainly able to support the virtuous and philosophical improvement of a man. In *Daphnis and Chloe*, the transfer from pederastic love to heteroerotic love is established through Gnathon, who comes to represent the ideal homoerotic lover in Plato. Gnathon

reconciles Plato's homoerotic doctrine of Love with heteroerotic Eros by performing the final reunification of Daphnis and Chloe.

The importance of emotional fidelity over physical chastity, as seen in the *Amatorius*, is also expressed in In *Leucippe and Clitophon* and *Daphnis and Chloe*. The sexual experiences which the heroes and heroines have outside of their principal relationship do not affect the original *eros* for their partner. The love shared between the heteroerotic characters is eternal, thus reflecting the ideal *erastes* of Plato's doctrine of Love.

Bibliography

- Anderson, Graham. *Eros Sophistes: Ancient Novelists at Play*, American Classical Studies 9. Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1982.
- Achilles Tatius. *Leucippe and Clitophon*. Translated by Tim Whitmarsh. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Cob, William S. *The Symposium and the Phaedrus: Plato's Erotic Dialogues*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993.
- Dillon, John M. *The Middle Platonists, 80 B.C. to A.D. 220*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1977.
- Goldhill, Simon. *Foucault's Virginitly: Ancient Erotic Fiction and the History of Sexuality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Gould, Thomas. *Platonic Love*. London: Routledge & Paul, 1963.
- Hunter, Richard. *Plato and the Traditions of Ancient Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Konstan, David. *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Longus. "Daphnis and Chloe." In *Greek Fiction: Callirhoe, Daphnis and Chloe, Letters of Chion*. Translated by Phiroze Vasunia, edited by Helen Morales. London: Penguin Books, 2011.

Makowski, John F. "Greek Love in the Greek Novel." *A Companion to the Ancient Novel*, edited by Edmund P. Cueva and Shannon N. Byrne, 490-501. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2014.

Morales, Helen. *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Plato. *Phaedrus*. Translated by R. Hackforth. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1952.

Plato. *Symposium*. Translated by Robin Waterfield. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Plutarch. "The Dialogue on Love." In *Plutarch's Moralia* vol. IX. Translated by W. C. Helmbold, 306-442. London: William Heinemann, 1961.

Rist, J. M. "Plutarch's Amatorius: A Commentary on Plato's Theories of Love?." *The Classical Quarterly* 51.2 (2001): 557-575.

Scott, Gary Allan, and William A. Welton *Erotic Wisdom: Philosophy and Intermediacy in Plato's Symposium*. New York: State University of New York Press, 2008.