

Four Exegetical Notes on Plutarch's *Dialogue on Love*

[Cuatro Notas Exegéticas sobre el *Diálogo del Amor* de Plutarco]

by

Bram Demulder

KU Leuven

bram.demulder@kuleuven.be

Abstract

These notes offer interpretations of Plutarch, *Dialogue on Love* 756D, 764C-D, 764E, and 770A-B.

Key-Words: Plutarch, *Dialogue on Love*. Textual criticism.

Resumen

Estas notas ofrecen interpretaciones sobre Plutarco, *Diálogo del Amor* 756D, 764C-D, 764E, y 770A-B.

Palabras-clave: Plutarco, *Diálogo del Amor*. Crítica textual.

ialogue on Love 756D

πόρρω γὰρ
οὐκ ἄπειμι τὴν δ'
Ἀφροδίτην οὐχ
ὀρᾷς ὅση θεός;
ἥδ' ἐστὶν ἡ σπείρουσα καὶ διδοῦσα
ἔρον, οὗ πάντες ἐσμὲν οἱ κατὰ
χθὼν ἔκγονοι. (Teubner ed.¹)

I do not go far

Do you not see how mighty is
the goddess Aphrodite [= Euripi-

des, fr. 898.1 *TrGF*]?

She sows and gives that love

From which all we upon this
earth are born [= Euripides, *Hippo-
lytus* 449-450]. (Loeb² tr. modified)

The phrase πόρρω γὰρ οὐκ ἄπειμι has
caused problems for some translators
and interpreters. Both the Budé³ ('[s]
ans aller plus loin') and the Loeb edition
(‘not to go farther’) translate as if πόρρω

¹ C. HUBERT, 1938.

² E.L. MINAR – F.H. SANDBACH – W.C. HELMBOLD, 1961.

³ R. FLACELIÈRE – M. CUVIGNY, 1980.

were a comparative⁴. H. Görgemanns, although offering a correct translation, comments that the meaning of the phrase within the context is unclear⁵. D. Russell correctly translates 'I go not far away'⁶ and rightly observes elsewhere that the phrase does not indicate the return from a digression, as the Budé and Loeb translations suggest, but, on the contrary, a promise to go further along the lines of the argument⁷. As a matter of fact, γάρ suggests that these words even mark the *beginning* of a digression. Indeed, the whole part on Aphrodite and Eros and their relation as cosmic gods is structurally speaking a digression; the *return* from this digression is indicated by οὖν at 756f⁸. This fits into Plutarch's strategy of underemphasising the most important parts of his speech in the *Dialogue on Love* (cf. 762a-b; 763f; 770b)⁹. The interpretation of the sentence is not a problem if we keep in mind the general point which Plutarch is making here (i.e. that questioning the existence of one god has important implications for the other gods). The concrete example

is that, if Eros is undermined, Aphrodite suffers from this as well and the unity of the Greek pantheon is threatened. The jump from Eros to Aphrodite is indeed not πόρρω: both gods are closely associated (cf. e.g. 756e, 752a-b).

Dialogue on Love 764c-d

πλὴν ἐκείνη γε δόξειαν ἄν διαφέρειν, ἣ δείκνυσιν ἥλιος μὲν ἐπὶ γῆς τὰ καλὰ καὶ τὰ αἰσχροὶ τοῖς ὁρῶσιν, Ἔρως δὲ μόνων τῶν καλῶν φέγγος ἐστὶ καὶ πρὸς ταῦτα μόνον τοὺς ἐρῶντας ἀναπείθει βλέπειν καὶ στρέφεσθαι, τῶν δ' ἄλλων πάντων περιορᾶν. (Teubner ed. modified [underlined])

Yet, there is, it seems, a difference to be pointed out: on earth the sun exhibits both the beautiful and the ugly to men's eyes, while Love illumines only what is beautiful. Only this does he persuade lovers to contemplate and turn to; everything else they must overlook. (Loeb tr. modified)

The *Dialogue on Love* is preserved in only two manuscripts: Parisinus gr.

⁴ Cf. also M. VALVERDE SÁNCHEZ – H. RODRÍGUEZ SOMOLINOS – C. ALCALDE MARTÍN, 2003, 68: 'Pues sin ir más lejos'.

⁵ H. GÖRGEMANN, 2011, 155 n. 132. Cf. W. SIEVEKING, 1940, 99.

⁶ D. RUSSELL, 1993, 259.

⁷ D. RUSSELL, 1997, 101. Moreover, he notes the iambic rhythm of the phrase and suspects that it is a quotation from an unknown dramatic source (D. RUSSELL, 1997, 110 n. 10; cf. D. RUSSELL, 1993, 378); this does not strike me as particularly compelling.

⁸ For this structuring function of γάρ and οὖν see C.M.J. SICKING, 1993, 20 and 27; I.J.F. DE JONG, 1997; S.R. SLINGS, 1997.

⁹ Cf. P. VAN NUFFELEN, 2007 on rhetorical silence in Plutarch.

1672 (E) and Parisinus gr. 1675 (B)¹⁰. These manuscripts read ἐπὶ γῆς, as I do here along with G.N. Bernardakis¹¹, A. Barigazzi¹² and M. Valverde Sánchez in his translation¹³. A.J. Kronenberg's emendation ἐπίσης ('equally'), however, has now become generally accepted¹⁴. Barigazzi states that '[a] prima vista la correzione [sc. to ἐπίσης] sembra imporsi', while I even fail to see the problem with the reading of the manuscripts. Although I follow his reading, I differ very slightly from Barigazzi in the interpretation of the passage. He defends ἐπὶ γῆς 'perché suggerisce il cammino che si percorre, secondo Plutarco, sotto la guida di Eros, dalle cose belle sulla terra verso gli intellegibili del mondo iperuranio'. However, the procession from the sensible to the intelligible will only become relevant later in the comparison (764d-e) and it is not necessary to import this further development here in order to make sense of the passage. The opposition between the

sun and ἔρως explored here is an opposition which plays out squarely in the sensible world and is quite trivial (like the examples given just before this passage, 764b-c): on earth the sun illuminates both beautiful and ugly, whereas the lover will be focussed on the beautiful on earth. The later opposition between the sun as guide towards the sensible and Eros as guide towards the intelligible has not yet come into play here¹⁵.

Dialogue on Love 764e

ἀποστρέφει γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν νοητῶν ἐπὶ τὰ αἰσθητὰ τὴν διάνοιαν, χάριτι καὶ λαμπρότητι τῆς ὄψεως γοητεύων καὶ ἀναπείθων ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ περὶ αὐτὸν αἰτεῖσθαι τὰ τ' ἄλλα καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ἐτέρωθι δὲ μηθέν· (Teubner ed. modified [underlined])

For it is the sun that turns our attention from intelligibles to sensibles, bewitching it by the charm and brilliance of vision,

¹⁰ M. MANFREDINI, 1976 offers the most extensive discussion of the (uncertain) relation between these two manuscripts.

¹¹ G.N. BERNARDAKIS, 1892.

¹² A. BARIGAZZI, 1986, 245.

¹³ M. VALVERDE SÁNCHEZ – H. RODRÍGUEZ SOMOLINOS – C. ALCALDE MARTÍN, 2003, 98.

¹⁴ A.J. KRONENBERG, 1924, 88 is followed by Teubner; Budé; Loeb; W. SIEVEKING, 1940, 134; D. RUSSELL, 1993; G.N. BERNARDAKIS – P.D. BERNARDAKIS – H.G. INGENKAMP, 2011; H. GÖRGEMANN, 2011.

¹⁵ The difference between the two oppositions becomes clear if we look at the persuasive effects of ἔρως and the sun in both instances. In the passage under discussion ἔρως persuades (ἀναπείθει) us to look at and turn to (στρέφεσθαι) beauty *on earth*. In the later, more Platonically coloured development (see next exegetical note) it is the sun which persuades (ἀναπείθων, 764e) our διάνοια to look for truth on earth and turns it towards this earthly beauty (ἀποστρέφει γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν νοητῶν ἐπὶ τὰ αἰσθητὰ), while Eros does the opposite this time.

and urging it to seek truth and everything else in her or in her realm, and not in any other place. (Loeb tr. modified)

The verb αἰτεῖσθαι, which is the reading of the manuscripts, is generally regarded as corrupt¹⁶. Following G.N. Bernardakis¹⁷ and the Budé edition, which keep αἰτεῖσθαι, I would disagree. If the reason is that the exact expression does not occur elsewhere and that αἰτεῖσθαι is used rather freely, then it should be noted that in these pages of the *Dialogue on Love* Plutarch often resorts to creative language, even to the extent of using *hapax legomena* – not unlike Plato in Socrates' second speech in the *Phaedrus* (244a-257b). An unfamiliar construction or a not quite straightforward meaning alone are surely no reasons for emendation. The Budé keeps αἰτεῖσθαι, translating '[le soleil] tâche à nous persuader de ne chercher qu'en lui et autour de lui la vérité et tous les autres biens, sans jamais nous adresser ailleurs'¹⁸. There is no need, however, to make 'nous' the subject of αἰτεῖσθαι: Plutarch is still talking about the διάνοια (εἶοικε

[...] φαρμάττειν τὴν διάνοιαν ὁ ἥλιος, 764f), as D. Russell's translation rightly suggests¹⁹. The generally accepted conjecture (κεῖσθαι) obscures this.

Dialogue on Love 770A-B

καὶ γὰρ ὁ νόμος βοηθεῖ καὶ γεννήσεως κοινῆς <οὔσης> καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς Ἑρῶτος ἢ φύσις ἀποδείκνυσι δεομένους. οὕτω γὰρ ἔρᾶν μὲν ὄμβρου γαῖαν' οἱ ποιηταὶ λέγουσι καὶ γῆς οὐρανόν, ἔρᾶν δ' ἥλιον σελήνης οἱ φυσικοὶ καὶ συγγίνεσθαι καὶ κυεῖσθαι· καὶ γῆν δ' ἀνθρώπων μητέρα καὶ ζώων καὶ φυτῶν ἀπάντων γένεσιν οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον ἀπολέσθαι ποτὲ καὶ σβεσθῆναι παντάπασιν, ὅταν ὁ δεινὸς ἔρως ἢ μέρος τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν ὕλην ἀπολίπη καὶ παύσῃται ποθοῦσα καὶ διώκουσα τὴν ἐκεῖθεν ἀρχὴν καὶ κίνησιν; (Teubner ed. modified [underlined])

The law, in fact, assists since procreation too is a shared undertaking; and nature shows that the gods need eros. It is in this sense, then, that the poets say that 'the earth loves rain' [Eur., fr. 898.7 *TrGF*] and that heaven loves earth; and in this sense, too, natural

¹⁶ The Teubner edition places a *crux*. D. WYTTEBACH, 1797, 65 SUGGESTED READING αἰωρεῖσθαι, κεῖσθαι (which was adopted in the Loeb edition, as well as in W. SIEVEKING, 1940, 136 AND H. GÖRGEMANN, 2011) or διατᾶσθαι.

¹⁷ G.N. BERNARDAKIS, 1892; G.N. BERNARDAKIS – P.D. BERNARDAKIS – H.G. INGENKAMP, 2011.

¹⁸ Cf. also M. VALVERDE SÁNCHEZ – H. RODRÍGUEZ SOMOLINOS – C. ALCALDE MARTÍN, 2003, 99: 'INDUCIÉNDONOS A BUSCAR EN él y en torno a él la verdad y lo demás, y a no buscar nada en otra parte'.

¹⁹ D. RUSSELL, 1993, 272.

philosophers assert that the sun loves the moon and that they unite and that she conceives. And since earth is the mother of all men and a source of generation for all beasts and plants, will she not be destined to perish at some time or other and be completely extinguished if ever the mighty Eros or a part of the god abandons matter and if ever she stops longing for and pursuing the principle of her motion which derives from that source? (Loeb tr. modified)

(1) The two manuscripts read γεννήσεως κοινῆς²⁰. The text does not seem to be intelligible without addition. Therefore, I adopt A. Barigazzi's conjecture <οὔσης>, which is also printed by H. Görgemanns. As Barigazzi points out, γεννήσεως κοινῆς <οὔσης> is more readily explained as a haplography than

other proposals which boil down to the same meaning²¹. However, I depart from Barigazzi and Görgemanns by reading γεννήσεως κοινῆς <οὔσης> with ὁ νόμος βοηθεῖ instead of with the following clause²². Just stating that 'the law assists' without giving any further information seems abrupt and a bit unclear. Greek legal concern with procreation within marriage is well documented, both in Plutarch and elsewhere²³. Moreover, only this reading places the passage in the context of Plutarch's description of the ideal marriage as a mutual endeavour (769e-770a).

(2) For ἐρᾶν δ' ἥλιον σελήνης οἱ φυσικοὶ καὶ συγγίνεσθαι καὶ κυεῖσθαι (the reading of one of the manuscripts²⁴), which is adopted in the Loeb and Budé editions, some editors accept J. J. Reiske's emendation ἐρᾶν δ' ἡλίου σελήνην, thus switching subject and

²⁰ M. VALVERDE SÁNCHEZ – H. RODRÍGUEZ SOMOLINOS – C. ALCALDE MARTÍN, 2003, 118 retains the reading of the manuscripts (which is also printed by G.N. BERNARDAKIS, 1892), interpreting γεννήσεως κοινῆς along with Ἐρῶτος as an object of δεομένους (cf. also D. WYTTEBACH, 1797, 86). This, however, would make for an odd word order. D. RUSSELL, 1993, 281 suggests a lacuna; G.N. BERNARDAKIS – P.D. BERNARDAKIS – H.G. INGENKAMP, 2011 suspects a gloss.

²¹ A. BARIGAZZI, 1986, 262. The Teubner, Budé, and Loeb editions add <ἐνεκα>; cf. also W. SIEVEKING, 1940, 162.

²² The Loeb translation seems to take the two word groups together but translates rather freely: 'The law, in fact, assists Eros in bringing about procreation in all societies (γεννήσεως κοινῆς <ἐνεκα>)'.

²³ In *On Affection for Offspring* 493e Plutarch mentions various legal sanctions against childlessness. For passages in other authors see K. PRAECHTER, 1901, 144. The marital function of procreation is particularly important in the (Middle-)Stoic conception of the city; see e.g. I. RAMELLI, 2009, 120. For the use of this argument in rhetoric see, e.g., Libanius' *Whether one should marry* 9-12.

²⁴ This is the reading of E. B, the other manuscript, has ἥλιον δὲ σελήνης, adopted by D. WYTTEBACH, 1797, 86.

object²⁵. Reiske's argument 'κυεῖσθαι de sole nequit dici' (in the Teubner apparatus) seems compelling: κυέω (LSJ: 'bear in the womb, be pregnant with [...] [m]ed., bring forth [...] abs., to be big or pregnant') cannot be said of a male subject²⁶; the passive is only said 'of the embryo or foetus' (LSJ)²⁷. Agreeing with this argument but resisting the ensuing conjecture, I suggest that the subject changes twice: the subject of ἐρᾶν is the sun, the subject of συγγίγνεσθαι are both the sun and the moon²⁸, the subject of κυεῖσθαι is, indeed, the moon²⁹. This once again ties in with the emphasis on reciprocity³⁰.

The abrupt change of subject is rather fitting given the context. It occurs again (and this time with certainty) in the next example: ἀπολίπη καὶ παύσεται – the subject of the first verb is the male principle (akin to the sun), while the subject of the second verb is the female principle (akin to the moon).

(3) Instead of the manuscripts' μέρος, editors have unanimously printed H. Stephanus' 1572 emendation ἕμερος. I wonder whether this is as compelling as it seems. After all, in the *Platonic Questions* (2.1001c) Plutarch has no problem with calling the rational part of the world soul a τοῦ θεοῦ [...] μέρος. Although the

²⁵ Reiske is followed by G.N. BERNARDAKIS, 1892; W. SIEVEKING, 1940, 162; H. GÖRGEMANN, 2011; G.N. BERNARDAKIS – P.D. BERNARDAKIS – H.G. INGENKAMP, 2011, and by the current Teubner edition.

²⁶ A notable exception is Plato's use at *Symp.* 206c, where metaphorical pregnancy is extended to include males (πάντες κυοῦσιν ἄνθρωποι). See G. VLASTOS, 1981, 21 n. 59. Cf. also D.D. LEITAO, 2012.

²⁷ Pace M. VALVERDE SÁNCHEZ – H. RODRÍGUEZ SOMOLINOS – C. ALCALDE MARTÍN, 2003: 118: 'el Sol ama a la Luna y se une a ella y la fecunda'; cf. D. WYTTEBACH, 1797, 86.

²⁸ Cf. *Amat.* 765c for a similarly abrupt shift in subject involving the same verb: οὐκ ἂν εἴη πολὺς χρόνος, ἐν ᾧ τό τε σῶμα τὸ τῶν ἐρωμένων παρελθόντες ἔσω φέρονται καὶ ἄπτονται τοῦ ἡθους, ἃ ἐκκαλούμενος τὰς ὄψεις καθορᾶσι καὶ συγγίνονται διὰ λόγων πολλὰ καὶ πράξεων ἀλλήλοις. The ἐρασταί are the subject of the first three main verbs (φέρονται, ἄπτονται, καθορᾶσι). The word ἀλλήλοις makes it clear that the subject of συγγίνονται are both the ἐρασταί and the ἐρώμενοι. Cf. G. PASQUAL, 1997, 218. (On the *crux* in this passage, which does not affect the argument here, see A. BARIGAZZI, 1986, 249–250; H. GÖRGEMANN, 2011, 180 n. 330).

²⁹ Similarly, A. BARIGAZZI, 1986, 262 keeps the texts of the manuscripts on the argument that 'il soggetto dei due infiniti non è espresso'. However, instead of assigning subjects, he considers the infinitives to be generic (translating 'e avviene che ci sono unioni e gravidanze'); cf. D. RUSSELL, 1993, 281 ('the sun is in love with the moon and joins with him, and conception follows'). This is possible, but it draws away from the point Plutarch is making here: love is reciprocal.

³⁰ Cf. *De Is. et Os.* (e.g. 356a, 372d-f), where mutual love between Osiris (the demiurgic figure akin to the sun) and Isis (the matter-like figure akin to the moon) drives the cosmos. Cf. also my next remark sub 3.

context of the passage under discussion is obviously less technical, it is not a stretch to suspect that Plutarch is thinking along the same lines here. The god Eros, who plays the role of Platonic demiurge in the *Dialogue on Love* (esp. 756d-f), is somehow present in matter while remaining a divinity. Through his presence he provides ἀρχὴ καὶ κίνησις, which is indeed what the world soul does (cf. e.g. *De an. procr.* 1024c-e). In this regard, Eros can be compared to Osiris, who is the demiurgic figure in *On Isis and Osiris* (cf. esp. 374b-c, where Osiris' identification with the demiurgic Eros is brought to the fore). Isis, who is associated with matter (cf. 382c), is the one who desires and pursues Osiris (ποθοῦσαν καὶ διώκουσαν, 371a; cf. 374f-375a), who as a demiurgic divinity is also present in matter through his efflux, which constitutes the rational part of the world soul (371a-b). Similarly, matter in the *Dialogue on Love* desires and pursues (ποθοῦσα καὶ διώκουσα) Eros, of whom a part (μέρος) is present in matter. On this interpretation, which ties in with Plutarch's general views on cosmology, it makes sense to read the manuscripts' μέρος instead of the rather redundant conjecture ἥμερος.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BARIGAZZI, A.,
- "Note critiche ed esegetiche all'*Eroticos* di Plutarco (2)", *Prometheus*, 12 (1986) 245-266.
- BERNARDAKIS, G.N.,
- *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia. Vol. IV*, Lipsiae, 1892.
- BERNARDAKIS, G.N. – BERNARDAKIS, P.D. – INGENKAMP, H.G.,
- *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia. Vol IV*, Athens, 2011.
- DE JONG, I.J.F.,
- "Γὰρ Introducing Embedded Narratives", in A. RIJKSBARON (ed.), *New Approaches to Greek Particles*, Amsterdam, 1997, pp. 175-185.
- FLACELIÈRE, R. – CUVIGNY, M.,
- *Plutarque. Œuvres morales. Tome X*, Paris, 1980.
- GÖRGEMANNS, H.,
- "Text, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen", in H. GÖRGEMANNS – B. FEICHTINGER – F. GRAF – W.G. JEANROND – J. OPSOMER (eds.), *Dialog über die Liebe. Amatorius. 2., korrigierte und erweiterte Auflage*, Tübingen, 2011, pp. 45-197.
- HUBERT, C.,
- *Plutarchi Moralia. Vol. IV*, Leipzig, 1938.
- KRONENBERG, A.J.,
- "Ad Plutarchi Moralia (Continued)", *Mnemosyne*, 52 (1924) 61-112.
- LEITAO, D.D.,
- *The Pregnant Male as Myth and Metaphor in Classical Greek Literature*, Cambridge, 2012.
- MANFREDINI, M.,
- "La tradizione manoscritta dei *Moralia* 70-77 di Plutarco", *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*, III.6 (1976) 454-485.
- MINAR, E.L. – SANDBACH, F.H. – HELMBOLD, W.C.,
- *Plutarch. Moralia. Volume IX*, Cambridge, MA – London, 1961.
- PASQUAL, G.,
- "ΠΑΘΟΣ, ΕΡΩΣ, ΓΑΜΟΣ: 1' *Amatorius* di Plutarco fra ΔΡΑΜΑ e discorso", *Acme*, 50 (1997) 209-220.

PRAECHTER, K.,

- *Hierokles der Stoiker*, Leipzig, 1901.

RAMELLI, I.,

- *Hierocles the Stoic: Elements of Ethics, Fragments, and Excerpts*, Atlanta, 2009.

RUSSELL, D.,

- *Plutarch. Selected Essays and Dialogues*, Oxford – New York, 1993.
- “Plutarch, *Amatorius* 13-18”, in J. Mossman (ed.), *Plutarch and His Intellectual World. Essays on Plutarch*, London, 1997, pp. 99–111.

SICKING, C.M.J.,

- “Devices for Text Articulation in Lysias I and XII”, in C.M.J. Sicking – J.M. van Ophuijsen, *Two Studies in Attic Particle Usage. Lysias & Plato*, Leiden – New York – Köln, 1993, pp. 3–66.

SIEVEKING, W.,

- *Plutarch: Über Liebe und Ehe. Eine Auswahl aus den Moralia*, München, 1940.

SLINGS, S.R.,

- “Adversative Relations between PUSH and POP”, in A. RIJKSBARON (ed.), *New Approaches to Greek Particles*, Amsterdam, 1997, pp. 101–129.

VALVERDE SÁNCHEZ, M. – RODRÍGUEZ SOMOLINOS, H. – ALCALDE MARTÍN, C.,

- *Obras morales y de costumbres (Moralia) X*, Madrid, 2003.

VAN NUFFELEN, P.,

- “Words of Truth. Mystical Silence as a Philosophical and Rhetorical Tool in Plutarch”, *Hermathena*, 182 (2007) 9–39.

VLASTOS, G.,

- “The Individual as Object of Love in Plato”, in G. Vlastos, *Platonic Studies. Second Edition*, Princeton, 1981, pp. 3–42.

WYTTENBACH, D.,

- *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia, id est opera, exceptis vitis, reliqua. Tomus IV pars I*, Oxonii, 1797.