

International Plato Studies

*Published under the auspices of the
International Plato Society*

Series Editors:

Franco Ferrari (Salerno), Lesley Brown (Oxford),
Marcelo Boeri (Santiago de Chile), Filip Karfik (Fribourg),
Dimitri El Murr (Paris)

Volume 35

PLATO IN SYMPOSIUM

SELECTED PAPERS FROM THE
TENTH SYMPOSIUM PLATONICUM

Edited by

MAURO TULLI AND MICHAEL ERLER

Academia Verlag  Sankt Augustin

Illustration on the cover by courtesy of the Bodleian Library,
Oxford, MS. Ashmole 304, fol. 31 v.

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der
Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten
sind im Internet über <http://dnb.ddb.de> abrufbar.

ISBN: 978-3-89665-678-0

1. Auflage 2016

© Academia Verlag
Bahnstraße 7, D-53757 Sankt Augustin
Internet: www.academia-verlag.de
E-Mail: info@academia-verlag.de

Printed in Germany

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

Ohne schriftliche Genehmigung des Verlages ist es nicht gestattet, das Werk
unter Verwendung mechanischer, elektronischer und anderer Systeme in
irgendeiner Weise zu verarbeiten und zu verbreiten. Insbesondere vorbehalten
sind die Rechte der Vervielfältigung – auch von Teilen des Werkes –
auf fotomechanischem oder ähnlichem Wege, der tontechnischen Wiedergabe,
des Vortrags, der Funk- und Fernsehsendung, der Speicherung in
Datenverarbeitungsanlagen, der Übersetzung und der literarischen
und anderweitigen Bearbeitung.

List of contributors

Olga Alieva, National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow
Carolina Araújo, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro
Francesco Aronadio, Università di Roma Tor Vergata
Ruby Blondell, University of Washington
Sandra Boehringer, Université de Strasbourg
Marcelo D. Boeri, Universidad Alberto Hurtado, Chile
Beatriz Bossi, Universidad Complutense de Madrid
Francisco Bravo, Universidad Central de Venezuela
Luc Brisson, CNRS, Villejuif
Giuseppe Cambiano, Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa
Andrea Capra, Università degli Studi di Milano
Giovanni Casertano, Università degli Studi di Napoli "Federico II"
Gabriele Cornelli, Universidade de Brasília
Michele Corradi, Aix-Marseille Université
Ivana Costa, Universidad de Buenos Aires
Gabriel Danzig, Bar-Ilan University
Piera De Piano, Università degli Studi di Napoli "Federico II"
Dino De Sanctis, Università di Pisa
Margherita Erbi, Università di Pisa
Mehmet M. Erginel, Eastern Mediterranean University
Rafael Ferber, Universität Luzern / Universität Zürich
Arianna Fermani, Università di Macerata
Giovanni R.F. Ferrari, University of California, Berkeley
Lloyd P. Gerson, University of Toronto
Christopher Gill, University of Exeter
Stephen Halliwell, University of St Andrews
Edward C. Halper, University of Georgia
Annie Hourcade Sciou, Université de Rouen
Chad Jorgenson, Université de Fribourg
Yahei Kanayama, Nagoya University
Filip Karfik, Université de Fribourg
Christian Keime, Université Paris IV-Sorbonne / University of Cambridge
Manfred Kraus, Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen
Yuji Kurihara, Tokyo Gakugei University
Annie Larivée, Carleton University
Aikaterini Lefka, Université de Liège
Francisco L. Lisi, Instituto Lucio Anneo Séneca / Universidad Carlos III de Madrid
Arnaud Macé, Université de Franche-Comté
Graciela E. Marcos de Pinotti, Universidad de Buenos Aires – CONICET
Silvio Marino, Università degli Studi di Napoli "Federico II"
Giusy Maria Margagliotta, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg
Irmgard Männlein-Robert, Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen

Mariella Menchelli, Università di Pisa
 Maurizio Migliori, Università di Macerata
 Gerard Naddaf, York University
 Hugues-Olivier Ney, Aix-Marseille Université
 Noburu Notomi, Keio University, Tokyo
 Lidia Palumbo, Università degli Studi di Napoli "Federico II"
 Richard D. Parry, Agnes Scott College
 Richard Patterson, Emory University
 Federico M. Petrucci, Scuola Normale Superiore / Università di Pisa
 Mario Regali, Università degli Studi di Bari "Aldo Moro"
 Olivier Renaut, Université Paris Ouest – Nanterre La Défense
 Nicholas P. Riegel, University of Toronto
 Cristina Rossitto, Università di Padova
 Christopher Rowe, Durham University
 David T. Runia, Queen's College, The University of Melbourne
 † Samuel Scolnicov, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
 Richard Stalley, University of Glasgow
 Alessandro Stavru, Freie Universität Berlin
 Thomas Alexander Szlezák, Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen
 Ikko Tanaka, Kyoto University
 Harold Tarrant, University of Newcastle, Australia
 Alonso Tordesillas, Aix-Marseille Université
 Álvaro Vallejo Campos, Universidad de Granada
 Mario Vegetti, Università degli Studi di Pavia
 Matthew D. Walker, Yale-NUS College
 Roslyn Weiss, Lehigh University

Table of Contents

List of contributors	v
Table of contents	vii
Preface (Mauro Tulli)	xi
I C.J. De Vogel Lecture		
Stephen Halliwell	Eros and Life-Values in Plato's <i>Symposium</i>	3
II Reading the <i>Symposium</i>		
Francisco Bravo	¿Propone el <i>Banquete</i> una ciencia del amor?	16
Luc Brisson	Éros éducateur: entre <i>paidèrastia</i> et <i>philosophia</i>	24
Gabriel Danzig	"Testing the Truth and Ourselves" (<i>Prot.</i> 348a). Boasting and Philosophizing in Plato's <i>Symposium</i>	36
Arianna Fermani	Perché tanta "morte" in un dialogo sull'amore e sulla vita? Riflessioni sulla dialettica amore-morte-immortalità nel <i>Simposio</i> di Platone	44
Christian Keime	<i>Lector in dialogo</i> : Implied Readers and Interpretive Strategies in Plato's <i>Symposium</i>	52
Mariella Menchelli	Isocrate, la condotta di vita e il discorso di Diotima nel <i>Simposio</i> di Platone	59
Maurizio Migliori	L'importanza della dimensione esperienziale ed empirica nel <i>Simposio</i>	65
Hugues-Olivier Ney	L'amour, drame de Socrate	71
Nicholas P. Riegel	Tragedy and Comedy at Agathon's Party: Two Tetralogies in Plato's <i>Symposium</i>	77
Harold Tarrant	Stylistic Difference in the Speeches of the <i>Symposium</i>	84
III The Frame Dialogue		
Dino De Sanctis	<i>Agathon agathos</i> : l'eco dell' <i>epos</i> nell' <i>incipit</i> del <i>Simposio</i>	92
Giovanni R.F. Ferrari	No Invitation Required? A Theme in Plato's <i>Symposium</i>	98
Lidia Palumbo	Narrazioni e narratori nel <i>Simposio</i> di Platone	104
Matthew D. Walker	The Functions of Apollodoros	110
IV Phaedrus		
Annie Hourcade Sciou	Éros sans expédient: Platon, <i>Banquet</i> , 179b4-180b5	118
Noburu Notomi	Phaedrus and the Sophistic Competition of Beautiful Speech in Plato's <i>Symposium</i>	124
V Pausanias		
Olga Alieva	"Ερως προτρέπων": Philosophy and Seduction in the <i>Symposium</i>	131

Olivier Renaut	La pédérastie selon Pausanias: un défi pour l'éducation platonicienne	140
VI Eryximachus		
Ivana Costa	Qué aporta Erixímaco a la filosofía del <i>Simposio</i> y a Platón	148
Silvio Marino	La medicina di Erissimaco: appunti per una cosmologia dialogica	155
Richard D. Parry	Eryximachus' Physical Theory in Plato's <i>Symposium</i>	160
Richard Stalley	<i>Sophrosyne</i> in the <i>Symposium</i>	165
VII Aristophanes		
Michele Corradi	Aristofane e l'ombra di Protagora: origini dell'umanità e <i>orthoepeia</i> nel mito degli uomini-palla	172
† Samuel Scolnicov	What Socrates Learned from Aristophanes (and What He Left Behind)	178
Roslyn Weiss	Split Personalities in the <i>Symposium</i> and the <i>Bible</i> : Aristophanes' Speech and the Myth of Adam and Eve	183
VIII Agathon		
Aikaterini Lefka	<i>Eros Soter</i> . How Can Love Save Us?	192
Irmgard Männlein-Robert	Die Poetik des Philosophen: Sokrates und die Rede des Agathon	198
Mario Regali	La <i>mimesis</i> di sé nel discorso di Agatone: l'agone fra poesia e filosofia nel <i>Simposio</i>	204
Richard Patterson	Agathon's Gorgianic Logic	209
IX Diotima		
Francesco Aronadio	What's in the Name "Eros"? <i>Onoma</i> and <i>Holon</i> in <i>Symposium</i> 204e-206a	218
Giovanni Casertano	La difficile analogia tra poesia e amore	224
Mehmet M. Erginel	Plato on the Pangs of Love	231
Lloyd P. Gerson	The Hermeneutics of Mystery in Plato's <i>Symposium</i>	237
Chad Jorgenson	Becoming Immortal in the <i>Symposium</i> and the <i>Timaeus</i> ..	243
Yahei Kanayama	Recollecting, Retelling and <i>Melete</i> in Plato's <i>Symposium</i> : A New Reading of ἡ γὰρ ἀνδρὸς καὶ γυναικὸς συνουσία τόκος ἐστίν (206c5-6)	249
Filip Karfik	Eros und Unsterblichkeit: das Hervorbringen im Schönen	257
Manfred Kraus	Socrates' <i>thea</i> : The Description of Beauty in <i>Symposium</i> 211a and the Parmenidean Predicates of Being	270
Yuji Kurihara	<i>Telos</i> and Philosophical Knowledge in Plato's <i>Symposi- sium</i>	278
Francisco L. Lisi	<i>Symposium</i> 210d4: τὸ πολὺ πέλαιος τοῦ καλοῦ	255
Arnaud Macé	L'océan du beau: la Forme et ses reflets hétérogènes (<i>Banquet</i> , 210a-211c)	291
Giusy Maria Margagliotta	Eros e l'Anima nel <i>Simposio</i>	297

Cristina Rossitto	Plato's <i>Symposium</i> and the Notion of Intermediate	303
Ikko Tanaka	Divine Immortality and Mortal Immortality in Plato's <i>Symposium</i>	309
Alonso Tordesillas	Le beau, une nature merveilleuse, une vision soudaine (<i>Banquet</i> 210e2-211d1)	315
Mario Vegetti	Immortalità personale senza anima immortale: Diotima e Aristotele	321
X Alcibiades		
Gabriele Cornelli	Alcibiades' Connection: Plato's <i>Symposium</i> Rewriting the Case on Socrates and Alcibiades	337
Edward C. Halper	Alcibiades' Refutation of Socrates	342
Alessandro Stavru	Socrate <i>karterikos</i> (Platone, <i>Simposio</i> 216c-221b)	347
XI The Ethics of Eros		
Carolina Araújo	Who Loves? The Question of Agency in Plato's <i>Symposium</i>	356
Marcelo D. Boeri	Ἐρῶς γυ συνουσία en el <i>Simposio</i>	362
Christopher Gill	Are the "Higher Mysteries" of Platonic Love Reserved for Ethical-Educational Pederasty?	371
Annie Larivée	Le pouvoir protreptique de l'amour. Eros, soin de soi et identité personnelle dans le <i>Banquet</i> .	380
Federico M. Petrucci	La dottrina della virtù di secondo grado nel <i>Simposio</i>	386
Christopher Rowe	On the Good, Beauty, and the Beast in Plato's <i>Symposi- sium</i>	391
David T. Runia	Eudaimonist Closure in the Speeches of Plato's <i>Symposi- sium</i>	403
Álvaro Vallejo Campos	Desire and Will in the <i>Symposium</i>	409
XII The Picture of Socrates		
Beatriz Bossi	On Which Step of the <i>Scala Amoris</i> Is Socrates Standing in the Dramatic Action of the <i>Symposium</i> ? Notes on the Practical Consequences of Theory	420
Giuseppe Cambiano	Chi è il Socrate del <i>Simposio</i> ?	428
Andrea Capra	Transcending the Silenus. Aristophanes, Plato and the Invention of Socratic Iconography	437
Rafael Ferber	Plato as Teacher of Socrates?	443
Graciela E. Marcos de Pinotti	Sócrates aprendiz y maestro de Eros	449
Gerard Naddaf	The Young "Historical" Socrates in the <i>Apology</i> and <i>Symposium</i>	455
Thomas Alexander Szlezák	Sokrates' Rollen im <i>Symposion</i> . Sein Wissen und sein Nichtwissen	461
XIII Reception		
Ruby Blondell and Sandra Boehringer	Un <i>Banquet</i> revisité: l'érotisme paradoxal de Platon et de Lucien	470

Piera De Piano	Gli eroi e la natura demonica di Amore: Proclo interprete di <i>Simposio</i> 201e-204b	476
Margherita Erbi	Lettori antichi di Platone: il caso del <i>Simposio</i> (POxy 843)	483
Indices		
<i>Index locorum</i>	493
<i>Index nominum</i>	520

Premessa

Questo volume offre, per selezione suggerita dall'Executive Committee, 67 contributi, rivisti dagli autori anche in base al sempre vivace dibattito, dei 120 proposti al X Simposio dell'International Plato Society. Dopo la decisione dell'Assemblea Generale nel 2007 presso il Trinity College di Dublino e dopo il IX Simposio del 2010 gestito con geometrico rigore da Shinro Kato e Noburu Notomi presso il Mita Campus dell'Università Keio di Tokyo, nel 2013 Pisa, fiera della ricca tradizione umanistica, con l'Alto Patronato del Presidente della Repubblica e con il sostegno dell'Università, fra il 15 e il 20 luglio ha salutato con l'immagine del Verziere, l'affresco monumentale nei colori di Buffalmacco, fra il Duomo e il Battistero, circa 200 studiosi giunti da ogni continente: un cammino già lungo e fertile, che ha origine lontana, in Messico, per lodevole iniziativa nel 1986 di Conrado Eggers Lan, e che, con la fondazione in Italia per impresa diplomatica nel 1989 di Livio Rossetti dell'International Plato Society, ha favorito negli anni un confronto sui dialoghi di più grande rilievo, il *Fedro* e il *Politico*, il *Timeo* e il *Crizia*, la produzione aporetica, *Carmide*, *Liside* o *Eutidemo*, le *Leggi*, *Gorgia* e *Menone*, il *Filebo*, la *Repubblica*, nel generoso impegno di centri di ricerca non marginali per la storia della letteratura e della filosofia in Grecia. La nostra gratitudine va oggi ai protagonisti dell'International Plato Society, bravi tedorfi, garanzia di successo fra Bristol e Granada, fra Toronto e Würzburg, con risultato felice che la collana stampata sotto gli auspici dell'International Plato Society, presso l'Academia Verlag per militante cura della famiglia Richarz, rispecchia con palese continuità. Il futuro è già da tempo tracciato: Brasilia ci attende con il *Fedone*, per l'XI Simposio, e Parigi offre l'organizzazione per il *Sofista*, con il XII Simposio, nel 2019. Così cresce la trama dell'International Plato Society, sempre più vasta e prestigiosa, in organico rapporto con la ricerca nel mondo e aperta, con dinamica mirabile, ai metodi più praticati o più innovativi per l'analisi del testo. La memoria purtroppo restituisce con dolore il profilo di Samuel Scolnicov, scomparso nel 2014, dopo le parole che ha donato qui: la cornice di Gerusalemme nella quale ha voluto con tenacia il VI Simposio del 2001 è fra le più nobili mai frequentate dall'International Plato Society. Ma le generazioni si alternano e Pisa, con matura convinzione, ha sollecitato la voce più giovane ricavandone 8 contributi da dissertazioni di dottorato, culmine di un entusiasmo radicato nel passato e terreno già solido per un sicuro sviluppo.

Tema per il X Simposio, con gioco di parole inevitabile quanto allusivo, è il *Simposio*, forse il più ammaliante dei dialoghi nel *corpus*, enigmatico e sublime, senza dubbio scritto con l'ispirazione di un'abile Musa, capace di connettere letteratura e filosofia, con scarto vorticoso fra livelli espressivi per lo slancio più esplicito nella dimensione ideale. Pagine che guidano sulla scena le maschere della retorica e della medicina, della produzione comica e della produzione tragica, per trascenderle, con la definizione di *eros*, nel segno della filosofia: la doppia cornice, che richiama il passato in prospettiva critica e proietta nel testo le sfumature dell'*eikos*, apre un agone modulato con il rifiuto della flautista, con il ruolo di Erissimaco e il singhiozzo di Aristofane, scherzoso motivo per il ritardo nell'ordine annunciato, con la *klimax* nella riflessione su *eros*, da Fedro al racconto di Socrate, con la brusca irruzione di Alcibiade ubriaco per l'encomio di Socrate, con il misterioso *elenchos*, al termine, sulla produzione comica e sulla produzione tragica. Il panorama variegato della realtà intellettuale di un periodo ben preciso nasconde, per limpida trasfigurazione, un esame della letteratura gestito con la *mimesis* degli autori. Ma, fra il silenzio pensoso di Socrate nel *prothyron* e la

Ἔρως προτρέπων: Philosophy and Seduction in the *Symposium*

Olga Alieva

National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow

The scope of this paper is to provide some literary background for Pausanias' speech in the *Symposium* and, against this background, to reconsider the notion of Ἔρως προτρέπων in the dialogue. A comparison of Pausanias' speech with Antisthenes' *reliquiae* suggests that one of Plato's purposes in this dialogue was to question the protreptic function of Eros as understood in Antisthenes.¹ If we then compare Pausanias' speech with that of Lysias in the *Phaedrus*, we will note certain parallelism which can be explained by the fact that in both pieces Plato alludes to Antisthenes. This, in turn, enables to shed some light on Plato's attitude to literary protreptics and to the problem of voluntary slavery for the sake of virtue (ἔθελουσία) related to them.

I. Ἔρως σοφιστής

In 1944, F. Lasserre suggested that prosaic λόγοι ἐρωτικοί, as we find them in the *Symposium* and in the *Phaedrus*, originated among the sophists.² In his seminal *Protreptik und Paränese bei Platon*, K. Gaiser adopted Lasserre's thesis on sophistic λόγοι ἐρωτικοί and claimed that Lysias' speech had as a "precondition" (*Voraussetzung*) the existence of the genre.³

Yet as a matter of fact, we don't have to go that far: the only "precondition" here is the common opinion μὴ ἐραστᾶ χαρίζεσθαι αἰσχρόν which can be used as a departure point for λόγος παράδοχος. We do actually find this opinion in the anonymous *Dissoi Logoi*.⁴ A chapter of this writing entitled Περὶ καλοῦ καὶ αἰσχροῦ contains the following statement: αὐτίκα γὰρ παιδὶ ὠραίῳ ἐραστᾶ μὲν [χρηστῶ] χαρίζεσθαι καλόν, μὴ ἐραστᾶ δὲ [καλῶ] αἰσχρόν. Thereafter, a set of "comparative" examples follows, many of them concerning sexual comportment.⁵ The conclusion of the section is: "disgraceful and seemly are really the same thing" (2, 21),⁶ or πάντα καιρῶ μὲν καλὰ ἐντι, ἐν ἀκαιρίᾳ δ' αἰσχρά. In other words, under certain circumstances, μὴ ἐραστᾶ χαρίζεσθαι may also be καλόν. It is this thesis which is de-

* This study (research grant No 15-01-0005) was supported by The National Research University—Higher School of Economics' Academic Fund Program in 2015-2016. The financial support from the Government of the Russian Federation within the framework of the implementation of the 5-100 Programme Roadmap of the National Research University—Higher School of Economics is acknowledged.

¹ In this paper, I cannot linger on parallels with Aeschines in the *Symposium*. On his notion of eros see Dittmar (1912); Ehlers (1966); Gaiser (1959); Kahn (1994); Kahn (1996).

² Lasserre (1944).

³ Gaiser (1959), 66.

⁴ The unknown author of this writing adopted Protagoras' methods; see Guthrie (1971), 316.

⁵ See, e.g., *Diss. log.* 2, 16 and 2, 12.

⁶ Transl. by Sprague (1972).

fended by Lysias, but we find here a feature unparalleled in the *Dissoi Logoi*: Lysias mentions moral perfection among the reasons to yield to the non-lover (*Phaedr.* 233a4-5).

Still, we know that the technical παιδεία of the sophists was absolutely unconcerned with the erotic disposition of the person being converted. His χάρις is of no interest to the teacher.⁷ On the contrary, in the earliest testimonies on Socrates his παιδεία is so to say sexually connoted. Thus, in Aristophanes' *Clouds*, Socrates is presented on the one hand as the leader of the sophistic movement,⁸ and on the other hand as a sexually licentious person.⁹ Far from being historically reliable, this image testifies to the effect that Socratic education was understood "in terms of eros" as late as in 423 BC.¹⁰

Polycrates developed some of the motifs already present in Aristophanes. After Polycrates' accusation,¹¹ there were attempts to reconsider the Socratic eros ("corruption") in a more positive way. It is at this point where eros and moral protreptic become closely associated. That is why we assume that Pausanias' speech, as well as that of Lysias, is not a specimen of some generalized sophistic reasoning,¹² but a response to one particular "sophist",¹³ Antisthenes.

II. Monopoly on Seduction

An accurate reading of Pausanias' speech reveals an enormous significance attributed to the χαρίζεσθαι by the speaker. He is particularly and even annoyingly insistent that a youth should yield to a lover in order to gain moral excellence. The verb χαρίζεσθαι in different forms is used 11 times by Pausanias.¹⁴ Throughout the speech, χαρίζεσθαι is qualified by adverbs καλῶς or αἰσχροῶς; alternatively, a neutral adjective καλόν (αἰσχρόν) is used. One might get the impression that Pausanias' aim is to distinguish between two "modes" of Eros, and that this distinction proceeds from a clear idea of what the noble and the base is. However, Pausanias remarks that (180e5-181a6, hereinafter Fowler's translation):

every action [...] as acted by itself (αὐτὴ ἐφ' ἑαυτῆς πραττομένη) is neither noble nor base (οὔτε καλὴ οὔτε αἰσχρά): when the doing of it is noble and right, the thing itself becomes noble; when wrong, it becomes base. So [...] Eros is not in every case noble [...], but only when he impels us to love in a noble manner (ὁ καλῶς προτρέπων ἐρᾶν).

At first glance, this text is highly reminiscent of the *Dissoi logoi*. In both cases, the focus is on noble and base actions; in both cases a "comparative cultural study" (cf. *Symp.* 182b1-3)

⁷ Gaiser (1959), 69, tries to overcome this difficulty by pointing to Ps.-Demosthenes' *Erotikos*. However, the *Erotikos* (350th BC) is later than the bulk of the Socratic literature. On Ps.-Demosthenes, see Blass (1893), 406 ff.; Wendland (1905), 71 ff.

⁸ Shichalin (2012) observes that Aristophanes' Socrates worships the Clouds as the gods of the sophists (*Nub.* 331), whereas the Clouds consider Socrates to be inferior only to Prodicus (*Nub.* 360-361); the graduate of Socrates' school is supposed to become a sophist (*Nub.* 1111). Aristophanes' Socrates is engaged in typically sophistic activity: linguistic contrivances, making the just logos unjust etc.

⁹ The Just Logos claims that Socrates' παιδεία will make the young boy καταπύγων (*Nub.* 909 and 1022) and εὐπρόσωπος (1085). Cf. Dover (1989), 141 ff.

¹⁰ The *Clouds* do not enable to maintain, as Kahn (1994), 93, does, that "no one before Aeschines proposed to understand the protreptic and educational influence of Socrates in terms of eros".

¹¹ Isocrates witnesses in his *Busiris* (5, 9-13) that before Polycrates no one heard of Alcibiades as a student of Socrates.

¹² Rosen (1968), 86, notes that Pausanias' "sexual inversion" is "assisted by the teaching of the Sophists". It is agreed that Pausanias was a pupil of Prodicus; see Nails (2002), 222.

¹³ We know that Antisthenes endorsed some key sophistic attitudes, for instance, τὴν ἀρετὴν διδάσκειν εἶναι (*SSR V A 99* = Diog. Laert. VI 105), and studied with Gorgias. He is one of the "sophists" Isocrates addresses in his *In sophistas*. See Usacheva (2013).

¹⁴ *Symp.* 182a2-3, 182b1-3, etc.

is carried out in order to blur the difference between the two; finally, both texts deal with χαρίζεσθαι έρασταίς motif and are fallaciously reasoned.¹⁵ But Pausanias' speech has one important novelty as compared to the *Dissoi logoi*, namely the protreptic element.

Pausanias is not interested in defending the paradoxical thesis μη έραστᾶ χαρίζεσθαι καλόν; he aims at more: it is only noble to gratify a lover for the sake of wisdom and moral perfection (184c7-d3, 185a5-b5).¹⁶ The pursuit of virtue justifies, in his opinion, δουλεία έκούσιος (184c2, 184c2-7: έθελοδοουλεία). In full compliance with this view, Alcibiades wants to gratify (218d4: χαριζόμενος) Socrates in order to become better (218d2: βέλτιστον [...] γενέσθαι).

In the *Euthydemus*, where Socrates invents his own protreptic, the interlocutors are also driven to the conclusion that there's no disgrace in being a slave for the sake of wisdom (282b).¹⁷ M. Narcy justly observes that in both dialogues the use of the verb προτρέπω recurs in a context where the case in point is the exceptional value of wisdom. Philosophical protreptic therefore involves what Narcy labels as "monopoly on seduction". In what follows, it will be shown that this conception stems from Antisthenes, to whom Plato playfully alludes in the *Symposium*.

III. Antisthenes: άξιέραστος ό σοφός

The extant fragments of Antisthenes abound in scornful remarks concerning "worldly" love and pleasure (SSR V A 122-123), and so on:

I would rather go mad than enjoy pleasure.

If I could catch Aphrodite I would shoot her with my bow, because she has corrupted so many excellent and beautiful women among us.¹⁸

At the same time, Antisthenes, as Kahn puts it,

has a much more positive conception of philosophical eros in the sense of intimate friendship among intellectuals in pursuit of virtue.¹⁹

According to Diogenes Laertius, Antisthenes maintained that "the wise man will be in love (έρασθήσεσθαι) for he is the only one who knows whom one should love (έρᾶν)" (SSR V A 58 = Diog. Laert. VI 11) and that "it is the sage who is worthy of love (άξιέραστον τε τόν σοφόν) and friend to one like himself" (SSR V A 99 = Diog. Laert. VI 105).

It is difficult to account for this inconsistency unless we assume that Antisthenes distinguished between the two Erotes: a vulgar one and a philosophical one, just like Pausanias does. This assumption is indirectly corroborated by a passage from Xenophon's *Symposium* where Socrates draws a distinction between the vulgar and the heavenly Aphrodite (VIII 10).²⁰

In the above cited fragment (άξιέραστος ό σοφός), Diogenes Laertius refers to the writing *Heracles* where Antisthenes showed την άρετήν διδακτικήν είναι. There, Heracles was depicted as one of Chiron's students, along with Achilles. A passage from Ps.-Eratosthenes says that Antisthenes' Heracles came to the centaur Chiron δι' έρωτα (SSR V A 92 = Ps.-Erat.

¹⁵ Pausanias' argument is circular: if there is nothing noble or base "by itself", any "manner" under certain circumstances can be regarded as either noble or ignoble.

¹⁶ By "wisdom" he means no more than persuasiveness in speech. See Rosen (1968), 89.

¹⁷ Narcy (1984), 114. On the slavery for the sake of virtue as a protreptic motif see Slings (1999), 117-118.

¹⁸ Transl. by Kahn (1996), 7 ff.

¹⁹ Kahn (1990), 289.

²⁰ On this passage, see Kahn (1990), 290.

Catast. 40).²¹ We can infer therefrom that eros in Antisthenes was endowed with educational function.

Different interpretations of this δι' έρωτα have been suggested. Thus, Rankin compares this passage with a fragment from Themistius' oration *On virtue*²² (SSR V A 96) and assumes that Heracles was urged "to progress towards full human development". "A crude and brutalized Heracles", Rankin believes, was forced to direct his "animal energy" towards philosophy:

The animal is converted to virtue by the influence of Chiron – another animal itself conspicuously virtuous. Fully aware that we are speculating, may we ask whether the σοφός [...] who is άξιέραστος, is Chiron?²³

The same suggestion was earlier made by Dümmler in connection with another fragment (SSR V A 93 = Procl. *In Alc.* 98, 14):

λέγει γοῦν και ό 'Αντισθένης 'Ηρακλῆς περί τινος νεανίσκου παρά τῷ Χείρωνι τρεφομένου· μέγας γάρ, φησι, και καλός και ώραϊός, οὐκ ἂν αὐτοῦ ήράσθη δειλός έραστής.

"Damit wird der άνδρεϊός έραστής, als welchen man sich Cheiron oder Herakles selbst denken kann, doch nicht gemißbilligt," he remarks.²⁴ A passage cited by Dümmler from Dio²⁵ suggests that Achilles might have been depicted as a Chiron's έρώμενος. Though the verb χαρίζεσθαι does not occur in our fragments, we know that Antisthenes praised Achilles for undergoing service (διακοπεϊν) to Chiron for the sake of education (SSR V A 95).²⁶

Diogenes notes certain parallelism between the *Kyros* and the *Heracles* of Antisthenes: both dialogues were dedicated to the same problem and dealt with the topic ό πόνος άγαθόν (SSR V A 97 = Diog. Laert. VI 2). We know that Alcibiades' παρανομία was discussed in the *Kyros* and that the whole piece was probably a reported Socratic dialogue written, Dittmar believes,²⁷ as a response to Polycrates. Dümmler claims that "Cheiron war bei Antisthenes vielmehr echter Tugendlehrer und sein Verhältniß zu Achill analog dem des Socrates zu Alkibiades".²⁸ Rankin agrees saying that Antisthenes probably saw in Alcibiades "a Heracles

²¹ Rankin (1986), 104-105, rejects Mullah's conjecture έρωτα <παιδείας>. He thinks that "eros" is used here "with an ironical layer of intention to refer to its sexual meaning in addition to its 'Socratic' and metaphorical sense of spiritual and intellectual frenzy for knowledge".

²² Preserved only in Syriac; Giannantoni cites the Latin translation of R. Mach (SSR V A 96). For different interpretations of this passage see Höistad (1948), 57 ff.; Luz (1996); Moles (2005). It would be tempting to assume, together with Dümmler (1891), 291, that with the image of the "sophist" Prometheus "die anspruchsvollere platonische Weisheit verspottet wurde" and that Antisthenes did not sympathize with Prometheus' words. Cf. Giannantoni (1985), 285 ff., and Decleva Caizzi (1966), 96. However, Themistius is rather explicit in highlighting the positive meaning of Prometheus' image in Antisthenes.

²³ Rankin (1986), 105.

²⁴ Dümmler (1891), 293.

²⁵ Dümmler (1891), 294. Dio *Or.* 58, 4-5: ό Χείρων όργισθείς [...] μόλις δέ άπεχόμενος τοῦ μη παίσαι αὐτόν, ότι διενοείτο έρᾶν αὐτοῦ etc. Cf. Höistad (1948), 176: "That Chiron in Dio appears as the έραστής of Achilles agrees with the Antisthenes fragments".

²⁶ Dümmler (1891), 293, also cites several passages from Xenophon's *Cyngeticus* (12, 18-20) where the love for άρετή is mentioned along with Chiron's name. Cf. esp. Xenoph. *Cyng.* 12, 20: όταν μὲν γάρ τις όράται ὑπό τοῦ έρωμένου, ἅπας έαυτοῦ έστι βελτίων. It seems, however, that the passage in question may as well be influenced by the *Phaedrus*, but I leave alone this issue so far.

²⁷ Dittmar (1912), 90.

²⁸ Dümmler (1891), 291.

figure” who “met his Chiron too late for good effect”.²⁹ This provides us with a connection between the *Heracles* and the *Symposium*.³⁰

Given that, it is likely that the mention of Heracles at 177b3 refers not only to Prodicus, but to Antisthenes as well. Interestingly, the encomium of salt mentioned along the encomium of Heracles (177b4-6) is paralleled in Isocrates’ *Helen* (12, 2-3):

τῶν μὲν γὰρ τοὺς βουμβυλιούς καὶ τοὺς ἄλας καὶ τοιαῦτα βουληθέντων ἐπαινεῖν οὐδεὶς πώποτε λόγων ἠπόρησεν.

The *Protrepticus* of Antisthenes contained an encomium of the βουμβυλιός,³¹ and the encomium of salt was probably also authored by him. Commenting on 177b, Bury (following Dümmler) notes that χρηστοὶ σοφισταὶ mentioned here include Antisthenes.³²

In any case, it is clear that in the *Heracles* and, probably, in other Antisthenes’ dialogues the teaching of virtue was discussed and the erotic disposition of the characters played a significant role. That the wise man in those writings had the same “monopoly on seduction” that Pausanias defends in his speech does not seem to be a bold assertion.

Interestingly enough, it has been noted that Pausanias’ distinction between the two Erotes corresponds to the basic Stoic notion of love. As Inwood puts it, Pausanias’ theory with its division between love for exceptional people and that for ordinary, or base, “is the most appropriate backdrop for an exploration of eros in Stoic thought”.³³ If we bare in mind that Antisthenes is in the background of Pausanias’ speech this parallelism becomes more understandable, though of course it requires a closer consideration.

IV. Sophistic Palinode?

Ἐρως προτρέπων in Pausanias’ speech is reminiscent of Socrates’ closing words in his “palinode” in the *Phaedrus*. Addressing himself to Eros, Socrates says (*Phaedr.* 257a-b, transl. Fowler):

Pardon, I pray, my former words and accept these words with favor; be kind and gracious to me; do not in anger take from me the art of love (τὴν ἐρωτικὴν [...] τέχνην) which thou didst give me [...] Make [Lysias] to cease from such speeches, and turn (τρέψον) him, as his brother Polemarchus is turned (τέτραπται), toward philosophy, that his lover Phaedrus may [...] direct his life with all singleness of purpose toward love and philosophical discourses (πρὸς Ἐρωτα μετὰ φιλοσόφων λόγων).

To what kind of discourse is Lysias supposed to be “turned”? Socrates gives but a hint by saying: “I advise Lysias also to write as soon as he can, that [...] the lover should be favored rather than the non-lover (ὡς χρὴ ἐραστῆ ἢ μὴ ἐρῶντι [...] χαρίζεσθαι)”. And Phaedrus assures that Lysias will do so (243d-e).

A comparison of Lysias’ speech with that of Pausanias reveals strict symmetry between the two. Both Lysias’ non-lover and Pausanias’ lover aim at the ὠφελία of the ἐρώμενος³⁴

²⁹ Rankin (1986), 127.

³⁰ More parallels Pausanias – Antisthenes: 1) κολακεία (*Symp.* 183b1, 184c1-3; cf. Stob. *Anthol.* III 14, 19 = *SSR V A* 132; Plut. *De vit. pud.* 536B = *SSR V A* 94: “the youth should not yield – μηδὲν χάριν ἔχειν – to the adulators”; 2) “vulgar” lovers and adulators keep the youth from νοῦς and φρόνησις (*Symp.* 181b1-6, 181c4-6; cf. *SSR V A* 94, 132); 3) lovers have “indulgence from the gods” when they forsake vows, ὑποσχέσεις (*Symp.* 183b5-8; 183e1-5; cf. Porphy. *Schol. ad Od.* VII 257 = *SSR V A* 188).

³¹ On the *Protrepticus* of Antisthenes, see Alieva (2013).

³² Bury (1909), xxi.

³³ Inwood (1997); Laurand (2007).

³⁴ *Phaedr.* 230e7, 233b6-c2, 234c3-4. On Antisthenes’ pragmatic attitude to love see Shichalin (1989), xvii.

and are going to remain faithful to him (*Phaedr.* 233c5-6, 234a6-7: διὰ παντὸς τοῦ βίου; *Symp.* 181d4-5: τὸν βίον ἅπαντα συνεσόμενοι, 183e5-6: διὰ βίου) even when he is older (*Phaedr.* 234a1-3; *Symp.* 183e1-5), because they are attracted not to his body, but to his soul (*Phaedr.* 232e3-233a4; *Symp.* 181b1-6).

The ἐρώμενοι in the two speeches also have much in common: they should yield (*Phaedr.* 233d5, 233e6: χαρίζεσθαι) – one to the non-lover, the other to the lover – in order to gain moral excellence (*Phaedr.* 233a4-5: βελτιονί σοι προσήκει γενέσθαι; *Symp.* 185b2-3: ἀρετῆς γ’ ἕνεκα καὶ τοῦ βελτιῶν γενέσθαι, 184c4-7: ἀμείνων ἔσσεσθαι). Both speakers try to convince a youth that there is no ὄνειδος in gratifying a (non-)lover (*Phaedr.* 232a6-b3, 231e3-4; *Symp.* 182a1-2, 183a2, 183b1, 183b4, 183c7, 183c8, 184c1) and hold those possessed with “worldly” passion in contempt (*Phaedr.* 232e3-6, 233b1-6, 231d2-4: αὐτοὶ ὁμολογοῦσι νοσεῖν μᾶλλον ἢ σωφρονεῖν).³⁵

Pausanias’ speech turns out to be a sort of sophistic “palinode” promised to Socrates in the *Phaedrus*. However, it makes little difference for Socrates in these dialogues whether a sophist praises or rebukes Eros. To take an image from the *Phaedrus* itself, Lysias and Pausanias think they are urging “to buy a horse and fight against the invaders”, but none of them has a slightest idea of what a horse is (260b). Their sophistic tendency to gratify the listeners makes them commit the same blunder that a youth, in their opinion, commits by choosing an improper object for his χάρις.

Socrates defends a radically different sort of rhetoric: one aimed at pleasing not the listeners, but gods themselves. At this point, the problem of χαρίζεσθαι gains a broader meaning. As Socrates himself claims in the *Phaedrus*, a wise man will study rhetoric not (273e5-9):

for the sake of speaking and acting before men, but that he may be able to speak and to do everything, so far as possible, in a manner pleasing to the gods (θεοῖς κεχαρισμένα). For those who are wiser than we, Tisias, say that a man of sense should surely practice to please not his fellow slaves (οὐ [...] ὁμοδούλοις δεῖ χαρίζεσθαι μελετᾶν τὸν νοῦν ἔχοντα), except as a secondary consideration, but his good and noble masters.

This entails that both rhetorical and erotic χάρις must be turned (“converted”) not to the “fellow slaves”, however wise they might be, but to gods alone.³⁶ Thus, dealing with Ἐρως προτρέπων, Plato offers his solution to the problem of δουλεία ἐκούσιος and to the combination of eros and exhortation in speeches. The protreptic power of Socrates’ speeches, described by Alcibiades at the end of the dialogue (216ab, 222a), originates in gods themselves, is addressed to the gods and – eventually – converts his listeners to the divine.

P.S.: A Question of Chronology

Though *Phaedrus* is now believed to be a later dialogue,³⁷ it has also been observed that certain motifs would be more appropriate in an earlier writing. Thus, Hackforth notes that some reminiscences of Isocrates’ speeches could hardly be detected by Plato’s readers some

³⁵ Shichalin (1989) observes that Lysias’ speech bears many traits of Antisthenes’ teaching on eros. Thus, Lysias thinks that those in love suffer from an illness that makes them mad (cf. *SSR V A* 123: θεὸν τὴν νόσον καλοῦσιν) and stresses that one should yield to those who would be grateful for that (*Phaedr.* 233d5-8: χάριν [...] εἰσόνται; cf. Diog. Laert. VI 3 = *SSR V A* 56: καὶ χρὴ τοιαύταις πησιάζειν γυναῖξιν αἱ χάριν εἰσόνται).

³⁶ This theoretical consideration is manifested at the practical level: Socrates’ speech in the *Phaedrus* is marked by the ostensible change of addressee.

³⁷ Erler (2007), 216; Hackforth (1952), 7; Robin (1985), ix; De Vries (1969), 7. For an earlier date, see Moore (1973); Bury (1909), lxvii.

15-20 years after these speeches were published.³⁸ The so called “theory of revision”, suggested by H. Thesleff,³⁹ enables to assume that some parts of the dialogue (Lysias’ speech among them) were written before the *Symposium*. This fits in with the upshot of the present paper, but the question should be left open so far.

*

- Alieva, O., “Protreptic in the Socratics. In Search of a Genre”, in F. De Luise & A. Stavru (eds.), *Socratica III: Studies on Socrates, the Socratics, and the Ancient Socratic Literature*, Sankt Augustin 2013, 128-139 = Alieva (2013).
- Blass, F., *Die Attische Beredsamkeit III. 1: Demosthenes*, Leipzig 1893 = Blass (1893).
- Bury, R.G., *The Symposium of Plato*, Cambridge (1909) = Bury 1909.
- Decleva Caizzi, F., *Antisthenis Fragmenta*, Milano 1966 = Decleva Caizzi (1966).
- Dittmar, H., *Aischines von Sphettos: Studien zur Literaturgeschichte der Sokratiker*, Berlin 1912 = Dittmar (1912).
- Dümmmler, F., “Zum Herakles des Antisthenes”, *Philologus* 50 (1891), 288-296 = Dümmmler (1891).
- Dover, K.J., *Greek Homosexuality*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1989 = Dover (1989).
- Ehlers, B., *Eine vorplatonische Deutung des sokratischen Eros: der Dialog Aspasia des Sokratikers Aischines*, München 1966 = Ehlers (1966).
- Erler, M., *Platon / Die Philosophie der Antike*, Band 2/2, Basel 2007 = Erler (2007).
- Gaiser, K., *Protreptik und Paränese bei Platon: Untersuchungen zur Form des Platonischen Dialogs*, Stuttgart 1959 = Gaiser (1959).
- Giannantoni, G., *Socratis et Socraticorum reliquiae* III, Roma 1985 = Giannantoni (1985).
- Guthrie, W.K.C., *The Sophists*, London & New York 1971 = Guthrie (1971).
- Hackforth, R., *Plato’s Phaedrus*, Cambridge 1952 = Hackforth (1952).
- Höistad, R., *Cynic Hero and Cynic King: Studies in the Cynic Conception of Man*, Uppsala 1948 = Höistad (1948).
- Inwood, B., “Why do fools fall in love?”, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 41 S68 (1997), 55-69 = Inwood (1997).
- Kahn, C., “Plato as a Socratic”, in *Hommage à Henri Joly, Recherches sur la Philosophie et le Langage* 12, Grenoble 1990, 287-301 = Kahn (1990).
- Kahn, C., “Aeschines on Socratic Eros”, in P. A. Vander Waerdt (ed.), *The Socratic Movement*, Ithaca (NY) 1994, 87-106 = Kahn (1994).
- Kahn, Ch., *Plato and the Socratic Dialogue. The Philosophical Use of a Literary Form*, Cambridge & New York 1996 = Kahn (1996).
- Lasserre, F., “Ερωτικοί λόγοι”, *Museum Helveticum* 1 (1944), 169-178 = Lasserre (1944).
- Laurand, V., “L’Eros pédagogique chez Platon et les stoïciens”, in M. Bonazzi & C. Helmig (eds.), *Platonic Stoicism. Stoic Platonism. The dialogue between Platonism and Stoicism in antiquity*, Leuven 2007, 63-86 = Laurand (2007).
- Luz, M., “Antisthenes’ Prometheus Myth”, in J. Glucker, A. Laks et al. (eds.) *Jacob Bernays: un philologue juif*, Villeneuve d’Ascq 1996, 89-104 = Luz (1996).
- Moles, J., “The Thirteenth Oration of Dio Chrysostom: Complexity and Simplicity, Rhetoric and Moralism, Literature and Life”, *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 125 (2005), 112-138 = Moles (2005).

³⁸ Hackforth (1952), 34. De Vries (1969), 16, notes that “before arriving at the end of *Phdr.*, the reader will have been struck by many allusions to Isocrates”.

³⁹ Thesleff (1981), 172. The theory of revision was endorsed by Shichalin (1989), Shichalin (2010), 20, and Usacheva (2010). Commenting on the latter paper, Tarrant (2010), 98, singles out several “stylistic clusters” in the *Phaedrus* and remarks: “This may owe something to Plato’s conscious changes in linguistic register, but is better explained in terms of chronology”.

- Moore, J.D., “The Relation between Plato’s *Symposium* and *Phaedrus*”, in J.M.E. Moravcsik (ed.), *Patterns in Plato’s Thought. Papers Arising Out of the 1971 West Coast Greek Philosophy Conference*, Dordrecht & Boston 1973, 52-71 = Moore (1973).
- Nails, D., *The People of Plato. A Prosopography of Plato and Other Socratics*, Indianapolis 2002 = Nails (2002).
- Narcy, M., *Le Philosophe et son double. Un commentaire de l’Euthydème de Platon*, Paris, 1984 = Narcy (1984).
- Rankin, H.D., *Anthisthenes Sokraticos*, Amsterdam 1986 = Rankin (1986).
- Robin, L. (ed.), *Platon. Oeuvres complètes IV 3: Phèdre*, Paris 1985 = Robin (1985).
- Rosen, S., *Plato’s Symposium*, New Haven 1968 = Rosen (1968).
- Платон, Федр / Ред. Ю. Шичалин, перев. А. Егунов. Москва, 1989 [Platon, Fedr / Ed. Y. Shichalin, trans. A. Yegunov. Moskva 1989] (in Russian) = Shichalin (1989).
- Shichalin, Y., “On the New Approach to the Chronology of the Corpus Platonicum”, *Hermathena* 189 (2010), 15-32 = Shichalin (2010).
- Шичалин, Ю., “Сократ-пифагореец – изобретение Платона?”, *Вестник ПСТГУ* I:3 (41), 2012, 76-86 [Shichalin, Y., “Socrates the Pythagorean – Plato’s invention?”, *Vestnik PSTGU* I:3 41 (2012), 76-86] (in Russian) = Shichalin (2012).
- Slings, S.R., *Plato. Clitophon*, Cambridge (UK) 1999 = Slings (1999).
- Sprague, R. K., *The Older Sophists. A Complete Translation by Several Hands of the Fragments in Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker, Edited by Diels-Kranz. With a New Edition of Antiphon and Euthydemus*, Columbia (SC) 1972 = Sprague (1972).
- Tarrant, H., “Some Support from Computational Stylistics”, *Hermathena* 189 (2010), 93-102 = Tarrant (2010).
- Thesleff, H., *Studies in Platonic Chronology*, Helsinki 1981 = Thesleff (1981).
- Usacheva, A., “Concerning The Date of Plato’s *Phaedrus*”, *Hermathena* 189 (2010), 53-70 = Usacheva (2010).
- Usacheva, A., “‘Socratics’ as the Addressees of Isocrates’ Epideictic Speeches (*Against the Sophists, Encomium of Helen, Busiris*)”, in F. De Luise & A. Stavru (eds.), *Socratica III: Studies on Socrates, the Socratics, and the Ancient Socratic Literature*, Sankt Augustin 2013, 183-189 = Usacheva (2013).
- de Vries, G.J., *A Commentary on the Phaedrus of Plato*, Amsterdam 1969 = de Vries (1969).
- Wendland, P., *Anaximenes von Lampsakos. Studien zur ältesten Geschichte der Rhetorik*, Berlin 1905 = Wendland (1905).