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Editorial note:

I have used primarily the translation of Jowett, but have substituted the translation of Fowler for words, phrases, or sentences that seemed to me to be more logical or beautiful. These
substitutions are indicated in the footnotes. Having no facility with Greek, I used Bury’s commentary and the Perseus Digital Library’s lexicon to help me make these decisions. In addition to these substitutions, I have edited Jowett’s translation for punctuation, grammar, and formatting not consistent with the conventions of Standard English. Plato’s narrative style switches point of view so frequently that it can be confusing for students newly approaching the dialogues. Therefore, I have edited the pronouns and formatting for clarity’s sake. These corrections should not be noticeable to the reader. Words appearing in brackets without a footnote indicating the source are my own additions and substitutions. It is my hope that this edition will make the Symposium as accessible as possible to the modern college student.

RLK
**PERSONS OF THE DIALOGUE:**

Apollodorus: the narrator of this dialogue, but not an attendant of the banquet; a wealthy follower of Socrates from Phalerum; he was only 13 when the banquet took place.

Aristodemus: “a little fellow, who never wore any shoes” is the man who told the tale to Apollodorus and whom Apollodorus is quoting; he was at the symposium, but did not deliver a speech (encomium).

Glaucon: possibly, Plato’s older brother

Phaedrus: Aristocratic Athenian

Pausanias: lawyer; Agathon’s lover

Eryximachus: physician

Aristophanes: comedic playwright

Agathon: tragic playwright

Socrates: Athenian philosopher; founder of the Western tradition of philosophy.

Alcibiades: Athenian aristocrat and general

A Troop of Revellers: accompanying Alcibiades.

**SCENE: The House of Agathon. 416 BC.**

**Prologue**

APOLLODORUS: Concerning the things¹ about which you² ask to be informed I believe that I am not ill-prepared with an answer. For the day before yesterday I was coming from my own home at Phalerum to the city,³ and one of my acquaintance, who had caught a sight of me from behind, calling out playfully in the distance, said: “Apollodorus, O thou Phalerian man, halt!” So I did as I was bid; and then he said, “I was looking for you, Apollodorus, only just now, that I might ask you about the speeches in praise of love, which were delivered by Socrates, Alcibiades, and others, at Agathon’s supper. Phoenix, the son of Philip, told another person who told me of them; his narrative was very indistinct, but he said that you knew, and I wish that you would give me an account of them. Who, if not you, should be the reporter of the words of your friend? And first tell me,” he said, “were you present at this meeting?”⁴

“Your informant, Glaucon,” I said, “must have been very indistinct indeed, if you imagine that the occasion was recent; or that I could have been of the party.”

“Why, yes,” he replied, “I thought so.”

“Impossible,” I said. “Are you ignorant that for many years Agathon has not resided at Athens; and not three [years] have elapsed since I became acquainted with Socrates, and have made it my daily business to know all that he says and does. There was a time when I was running about the world, fancying myself to be well employed, but I was really a most wretched being, no better than you are now. I thought that I ought to do anything rather than be a philosopher.”

“Well,” he said, “jesting apart, tell me when the meeting occurred.”

“In our boyhood,” I replied, “when Agathon won the prize with his first tragedy, on the day after that on which he and his chorus offered the sacrifice of victory.”

“Then it must have been a long while ago,” he said; “and who told you—did Socrates?”

¹ The story of the symposium or banquet held at Agathon’s house and attended by Socrates.
² The man to whom Apollodorus is narrating the tale is uknown.
³ Athens.
⁴ Note the perhaps intentionally confusing chain of the narrative, including unnamed men and friends of friends; Bury suggests that Plato wrote *The Symposium* to correct inaccurate accounts of the banquet floating around the rumor mill (R. G. Bury. *The Symposium of Plato*. Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons [1909]. Perseus Digital Library).
“No indeed,” I replied, “but the same person who told Phoenix;—he was a little fellow, who never wore any shoes, Aristodemus, of the deme of Cydathenaeum. He had been at Agathon’s feast; and I think that in those days there was no one who was a more devoted admirer of Socrates. Moreover, I have asked Socrates about the truth of some parts of his narrative, and he confirmed them.”

“Then,” said Glaucon, “let us have the tale over again; is not the road to Athens just made for conversation?” And so we walked, and talked of the discourses on love; and therefore, as I said at first, I am not ill-prepared to comply with your request, and will have another rehearsal of them if you like. For to speak or to hear others speak of philosophy always gives me the greatest pleasure, to say nothing of the profit. But when I hear another strain, especially that of you rich men and traders, such conversation displeases me; and I pity you who are my companions, because you think that you are doing something when in reality you are doing nothing. And I dare say that you pity me in return, whom you regard as an unhappy creature, and very probably you are right. But I certainly know of you what you only think of me—there is the difference.

COMPANION: I see, Apollodorus, that you are just the same as always, speaking evil of yourself, and of others; and I do believe that you pity all mankind, with the exception of Socrates, yourself first of all, true in this to your old name, which, however deserved, I know not how you acquired, of Apollodorus the madman; for you are always raging against yourself and everybody but Socrates.

APOLLODORUS: Yes, friend, and the reason why I am said to be mad, and out of my wits, is just because I have these notions of myself and you; no other evidence is required.

COMPANION: No more of that, Apollodorus; but let me renew my request that you would repeat the conversation.

APOLLODORUS: Well, the tale of love was on this wise:—But perhaps I had better begin at the beginning, and endeavour to give you the exact words of Aristodemus.

[ARISTODEMUS Speaking to APOLLODORUS]

I met Socrates fresh from the bath and sandalled; and as the sight of the sandals was unusual, I asked him whither he was going that he had been converted into such a beau.

“To a banquet at Agathon’s,” he replied, “whose invitation to his sacrifice of victory I refused yesterday, fearing a crowd, but promising that I would come to-day instead; and so I have put on my finery, because he is such a fine man. What say you to going with me unasked?”

“I will do as you bid me,” I replied.

“Follow then,” he said, “and let us demolish the proverb, ‘To the feasts of inferior men the good unbidden go;’ Instead of which our proverb will run, ‘To the feasts of the [Goodman] the good [men] unbidden go;’ and this alteration may be supported by the authority of Homer himself, who not only demolishes but literally outrages the proverb. For, after picturing Agamemnon as the most valiant of men, he makes Menelaus, who is but a fainthearted warrior, come unbidden to the banquet of Agamemnon, who is feasting and offering sacrifices; not the better [man] to the worse, but the worse [man] to the better.”

---

5 Township.
6 Also the hometown of Aristophanes.
7 That is, Socrates had just put his shoes on; Aristodemus possibly makes note of this fact because he himself eschews shoes or because Socrates rarely wore his best shoes.
8 Handsome man.
9 Agathon won the prize at the Dionysia (a theatrical competition and religious festival) in 416 BC. Agathon has been celebrating this accomplishment with sacrifices and feasts.
10 That is, a good man does not need an invitation to an inferior man’s dinner.
11 Socrates is punning Agathon’s name (which can be translated as “Goodman”).
12 Il. 2.408.
“I rather fear, Socrates,” said I, “lest this may still be my case; and that, like Menelaus in Homer, I shall be the [fool], who ‘To the feasts of the wise unbidden goes.’ But I shall say that I was bidden of you, and then you will have to make an excuse.”

“Two going together,” he replied, in Homeric fashion, “one or other of them may invent an excuse by the way.”

This was the style of our conversation as we went along. Socrates dropped behind in a fit of abstraction, and desired me, who was waiting, to go on before him. When I reached the house of Agathon, I found the doors wide open, and a comical thing happened. A servant coming out met me, and led me at once into the banqueting-hall in which the guests were reclining, for the banquet was about to begin.

“Welcome, Aristodemus,” said Agathon, as soon as I appeared, “you are just in time to sup with us; if you come on any other matter put it off, and make one of us, as I was looking for you yesterday and meant to have asked you, if I could have found you. But what have you done with Socrates?”

I turned round, but Socrates was nowhere to be seen; and I had to explain that he had been with me a moment before, and that I came by his invitation to the supper.

“You were quite right in coming,” said Agathon; “but where is he himself?”

“He was behind me just now, as I entered,” I said, “and I cannot think what has become of him.”

“Go and look for him, boy,” said Agathon, “and bring him in; and do you, Aristodemus, meanwhile take the place by Eryximachus.”

The servant then assisted me to wash, and I lay down, and presently another servant came in and reported that our friend Socrates had retired into the portico of the neighbouring house.

“There he is fixed,” said he, “and when I call to him he will not stir.”

“How strange,” said Agathon; “then you must call him again, and keep calling him.”

“Let him alone,” said I; “he has a way of stopping anywhere and losing himself without any reason. I believe that he will soon appear; do not therefore disturb him.”

“Well, if you think so, I will leave him,” said Agathon. And then, turning to the servants, he added, “Let us have supper without waiting for him. Serve up whatever you please, for there is no one to give you orders; hitherto I have never left you to yourselves. But on this occasion imagine that you are our hosts, and that I and the company are your guests; treat us well, and then we shall commend you.” After this, supper was served, but still no Socrates; and during the meal Agathon several times expressed a wish to send for him, but I objected; and at last when the feast was about half over—for the fit, as usual, was not of long duration—Socrates entered.

Agathon, who was reclining alone at the end of the table, begged that he would take the place next to him. “That I may touch you,” he said, “and have the benefit of that wise thought which came into your mind in the portico, and is now in your possession; for I am certain that you would not have come away until you had found what you sought.”

“How I wish,” said Socrates, taking his place as he was desired, “that wisdom could be infused by touch, out of the fuller into the emptier man, as water runs through wool out of a fuller cup into an emptier one; if that were so, how greatly should I value the privilege of reclining at your side! For you would have filled me full with a stream of wisdom plenteous and fair; whereas my own is of a very mean and questionable sort, no better than a dream. But yours is bright and full of promise, and was manifested forth in all the splendour of youth the day before yesterday, in the presence of more than thirty thousand Hellenes.”

---

13 Socrates is here depicted as the easily distracted philosopher.
14 Greeks reclined on pillows or couches when they dined.
15 That is, Socrates’ abstraction.
16 A cloth filter for purifying drinking water.
17 Small or poor.
18 Greeks; the audience of Agathon’s winning tragedy at the Dionysia.
“You are mocking [me], Socrates,” said Agathon, “and ere long you and I will have to
determine who bears off the palm\textsuperscript{19} of wisdom—of this Dionysus shall be the judge; but at
present you are better occupied with supper.”

Socrates took his place on the couch, and supped with the rest; and then libations were
offered, and after a hymn had been sung to the god,\textsuperscript{20} and there had been the usual
ceremonies, they were about to commence drinking, when Pausanias said, “And now, my
friends, how can we drink with least injury to ourselves? I can assure you that I feel severely the
effect of yesterday’s potations, and must have time to recover; and I suspect that most of you
are in the same predicament, for you were [at] the party yesterday. Consider then: How can the
drinking be made easiest?”

“I entirely agree,” said Aristophanes, “that we should, by all means, avoid hard drinking, for I
was myself one of those who were yesterday drowned in drink.”

“I think that you are right,” said Eryximachus, the son of Acumenus; “but I should still like to
hear one other person speak. Is Agathon able to drink hard?”

“I am not equal to it,” said Agathon.

“Then,” said Eryximachus, “the weak heads like myself, Aristodemus, Phaedrus, and others
who never can drink, are fortunate in finding that the stronger ones are not in a drinking mood.
(I do not include Socrates, who is able either to drink or to abstain, and will not mind, whichever
we do.) Well, as of none of the company seem disposed to drink much, I may be forgiven for
saying, as a physician, that drinking deep is a bad practice, which I never follow, if I can help,
and certainly do not recommend to another, least of all to any one who still feels the effects of
yesterday’s carouse.”

“I always do what you advise, and especially what you prescribe as a physician,” rejoined
Phaedrus the Myrrhinusian, “and the rest of the company, if they are wise, will do the same.”

It was agreed that drinking was not to be the order of the day, but that we were all to drink
only so much as we pleased.

“Then,” said Eryximachus, “as you are all agreed that drinking is to be voluntary, and that
there is to be no compulsion, I move, in the next place, that the flute-girl, who has just made
her appearance, be told to go away and play to herself, or, if she likes, to the women who are
within.\textsuperscript{21} To-day let us have conversation instead; and, if you will allow me, I will tell you what
sort of conversation.” This proposal having been accepted, Eryximachus proceeded as follows. “I
will begin,” he said, “after the manner of Melanippe\textsuperscript{22} in Euripides, [who said] ‘Not mine the
[tale, my mother taught it to me]’ [it is not my own idea] which I am about to speak, but that of
Phaedrus. For often he says to me in an indignant tone, ‘What a strange thing it is, Eryximachus,
that, whereas other gods have poems and hymns made in their honour, the great and glorious
god, Eros,\textsuperscript{23} has no encomiast\textsuperscript{24} among all the poets who are so many. There are the worthy
sophists\textsuperscript{25} too—the excellent Prodicus for example, who have descanted in prose on the virtues
of Heracles and other heroes; and, what is still more extraordinary, I have met with a
philosophical work in which the utility of salt has been made the theme of an eloquent discourse;
and many other like things have had a like honour bestowed upon them. And only to think that
there should have been an eager interest created about them, and yet that to this day no one
has ever dared worthily to [sing] Eros’s praises! So entirely has this great deity been neglected.’
Now in this Phaedrus seems to me to be quite right, and therefore I want to offer him a
contribution; also I think that at the present moment we who are here assembled cannot do
better than honour the god Eros. If you agree with me, there will be no lack of conversation; for

\textsuperscript{19} Prize.
\textsuperscript{20} Dionysus, god of wine and celebration; patron god of the Dionysia.
\textsuperscript{21} These women are the matrons and unmarried aristos for whom it would be forbidden to dine with a
group of men to whom they were unrelated.
\textsuperscript{22} Either the lover/rape victim of Aeolus or Poseidon.
\textsuperscript{23} God of love.
\textsuperscript{24} One who praises.
\textsuperscript{25} Professors.
I mean to propose that each of us in turn, going from left to right, shall make a speech in honour of Eros. Let him give us the best which he can; and Phaedrus, because he is sitting first on the left hand, and because he is the father of the thought, shall begin."

“No one will vote against you, Eryximachus,” said Socrates. “How can I oppose your motion, who profess to understand nothing but matters of love; nor, I presume, will Agathon and Pausanias;26 and there can be no doubt of Aristophanes, whose whole concern is with Dionysus and Aphrodite;27 nor will any one disagree of those whom I see around me. The proposal, as I am aware, may seem rather hard upon us whose place is last; but we shall be contented if we hear some good speeches first. Let Phaedrus begin the praise of Eros, and good luck to him.” All of us expressed our assent, and desired him to do as Socrates bade him.

APOLLODORUS:28 Aristodemus did not recollect all that was said, nor do I recollect all that he related to me; but I will tell you what I thought most worthy of remembrance, and what the chief speakers said.

---

26 Agathon and Pausanias cannot object, says Socrates, because they are a loving couple.
27 According to Socrates, Aristophanes cannot object to the praise of Eros, because he writes so much about sex and revelry.
28 The rest of the Symposium is told from Apollodorus’ P.O.V.
Phaedrus began by affirming that Eros is a mighty god, and wonderful among gods and men, but especially wonderful in his birth.

[PHAEDRUS SPEAKS]
For he is the eldest of the gods, which is an honour to him; and a proof of his claim to this honour is, that of his parents there is no memorial; neither poet nor prose-writer has ever affirmed that he had any. As Hesiod says, “First Chaos came, and then broad-bosomed Earth, the everlasting seat of all that is, and Eros.” In other words, after Chaos, the Earth and Eros, these two, came into being. Also Parmenides sings of Generation, “First in the train of gods, he fashioned Eros.” And Acusilaus agrees with Hesiod.

Thus numerous are the witnesses who acknowledge Eros to be the eldest of the gods. And not only is he the eldest, he is also the source of the greatest benefits to us. For I know not any greater blessing to a young man who is beginning life than a virtuous lover, or to the lover than a beloved youth. For the principle which ought to be the guide of men who would nobly live—that principle, I say, neither kindred, nor honour, nor wealth, nor any other motive is able to implant so well as love. Of what am I speaking? Of the sense of honour and dishonour, without which neither states nor individuals ever do any good or great work. And I say that a lover who is detected in doing any dishonourable act, or submitting through cowardice when any dishonour is done to him by another, will be more pained at being detected by his beloved than at being seen by his father, or by his companions, or by any one else. The beloved too, when he is found in any disgraceful situation, has the same feeling about his lover. And if there were only some
way of contriving that a state or an army should be made up of lovers and their loves, they would be the very best governors of their own city, abstaining from all dishonour, and emulating one another in honour; and when fighting at each other’s side, although a mere handful, they would overcome the world. For what lover would not choose rather to be seen by all mankind than by his beloved, either when abandoning his post or throwing away his arms? He would be ready to die a thousand deaths rather than endure this. Or who would desert his beloved or fail him in the hour of danger? The veriest coward would become an inspired hero, equal to the bravest, at such a time; Eros would inspire him. That courage which, as Homer says, the god breathes into the souls of some heroes, Eros of his own nature infuses into the lover. Eros will make men dare to die for their beloved—love alone; and women as well as men. Of this, Alcestis, the daughter of Pelias, is a monument to all Hellas, for she was willing to lay down her life on behalf of her husband, when no one else would, although he had a father and mother; but the tenderness of her love so far exceeded theirs, that she made them seem to be strangers in blood to their own son, and in name only related to him; and so noble did this action of hers appear to the gods, as well as to men, that among the many who have done virtuously she is one of the very few to whom, in admiration of her noble action, they have granted the privilege of returning alive to earth; such exceeding honour is paid by the gods to the devotion and virtue of love. But Orpheus, the son of Oeagrus, the harper, they sent empty away, and presented to him an apparition only of her whom he sought, but herself they would not give up, because he showed no spirit; he was only a harp-player, and did not dare like Alcestis to die for love, but was contriving how he might enter Hades alive; moreover, they afterwards caused him to suffer death at the hands of women, as the punishment of his cowardliness. Very different was the reward of the true love of Achilles towards his lover Patroclus—his lover and not his love (the notion that Patroclus was the beloved one is a foolish error into which Aeschylus has fallen, for Achilles was surely the fairer of the two, fairer also than all the other heroes; and, as Homer informs us, he was still beardless, and younger far). And greatly as the gods honour the virtue of love, still the return of love on the part of the beloved to the lover is more admired and valued and rewarded by them, for the lover is more divine; because he is inspired by God. Now Achilles was quite aware, for he had been told by his mother, that he might avoid death and return home, and live to a good old age, if he abstained from slaying Hector. Nevertheless he gave his life to revenge his friend, and dared to die, not only in his defence, but after he was dead. Wherefore the gods honoured him even above Alcestis, and sent him to the Islands of the Blest. These are my reasons for affirming that Eros is the eldest and noblest and mightiest of the gods; and the chiefest author and giver of virtue in life, and of happiness after death.

29 Greek women.
30 Eurydice, Orpheus’ wife who had died suddenly and very young.
31 The Greek afterlife.
32 Maenads, women in the thrall of the god Dionysus, ripped Orpheus to pieces when he dishonored Dionysus at his own temple.
33 Greek hero of the Iliad who went on a rampage after the Trojan Hector killed Patroclus, Achilles’ lover and best friend.
34 Phaedrus is making a distinction between the lover (the older, dominant partner) and the love or beloved (the younger, submissive partner). The beloved is always more beautiful and, in gay male relationships, young enough to be beardless.
This, or something like this, was the speech of Phaedrus; and some other speeches followed which Aristodemus did not remember; the next which he repeated was that of Pausanias.

[PAUSANIAS SPEAKS]

Phaedrus, the argument has not been set before us, I think, quite in the right form; we should not be called upon to praise Eros in such an indiscriminate manner. If there were only one Eros, then what you said would be well enough; but since there are more gods of Love than one, [we] should have begun by determining which of them was to be the theme of our praises. I will amend this defect; and first of all I will tell you which Eros is deserving of praise, and then try to hymn\textsuperscript{35} the praiseworthy one in a manner worthy of him. For we all know that Eros is inseparable from Aphrodite, and if there were only one Aphrodite there would be only one Eros; but as there are two goddesses there must be two [gods]. And am I not right in asserting that there are two goddesses? The elder one, having no mother, who is called the heavenly Aphrodite—she is the daughter of Uranus; the younger, who is the daughter of Zeus and Dione—her we call common;\textsuperscript{36} and the Eros who is her fellow-worker is rightly named common, as the other love is called heavenly. All the gods ought to have praise given to them, but not without distinction of their natures; and therefore I must try to distinguish the characters of the two

\textsuperscript{35} Used here as a verb, as in “sing a hymn to.”

\textsuperscript{36} Popular, perhaps even vulgar.
gods of Love. Now actions vary according to the manner of their performance. Take, for example, that which we are now doing, drinking, singing and talking—these actions are not in themselves either good or evil, but they turn out in this or that way according to the mode of performing them; and when well done they are good, and when wrongly done they are evil; and in like manner not every love, but only that which has a noble purpose, is noble and worthy of praise. The Eros who is the offspring of the common Aphrodite is essentially common, and has no discrimination, being such as the meaner sort of men feel, and is apt to be of women as well as of youths, and is of the body rather than of the soul—the most foolish beings are the objects of this love which desires only to gain an end, but never thinks of accomplishing the end nobly, and therefore does good and evil quite indiscriminately. The goddess who is his mother is far younger than the other, and she was born of the union of the male and female, and partakes of both. But the offspring of the heavenly Aphrodite is derived from a mother in whose birth the female has no part; she is from the male only; this is that love which is of youths, and the goddess being older, there is nothing of wantonness in her. Those who are inspired by this love turn to the male, and delight in him who is of the more valiant and intelligent nature; any one may recognise the pure enthusiasts in the very character of their attachments. For they love not boys, but intelligent beings whose reason is beginning to be developed, much about the time at which their beards begin to grow. And in choosing young men to be their companions, they mean to be faithful to them, and pass their whole life in company with them, not to take them in their inexperience, and deceive them, and play the fool with them, or run away from one to another of them. But the love of young boys should be forbidden by law, because their future is uncertain; they may turn out good or bad, either in body or soul, and much noble enthusiasm may be thrown away upon them; in this matter the good are a law to themselves, and the coarser sort of lovers ought to be restrained by force; as we restrain or attempt to restrain them from fixing their affections on women of free birth. These are the persons who bring a reproach on love; and some have been led to deny the lawfulness of such attachments because they see the impropriety and evil of them; for surely nothing that is decorously and lawfully done can justly be censured. Now here and in Lacedaemon the rules about love are perplexing, but in most cities they are simple and easily intelligible; in Elis and Boeotia, and in countries having no gifts of eloquence, they are very straightforward; the law is simply in favour of these connexions, and no one, whether young or old, has anything to say to their discredit; the reason being, as I suppose, that they are men of few words in those parts, and therefore the lovers do not like the trouble of pleading their suit. In Ionia and other places, and generally in countries which are subject to the barbarians, the custom is held to be dishonourable; the love of youths shares the evil repute in which philosophy and gymnastics are held, because they are inimical to tyranny; for the interests of rulers require that their subjects should be poor in spirit, and that there should be no strong bond of friendship or society among them, which love, above all other motives, is likely to inspire, as our Athenian tyrants learned by experience; for the love of Aristogeiton and the constancy of Harmodius had a strength which undid their power. And, therefore, the ill-repute into which these attachments have fallen is to be ascribed to the evil condition of those who make them to be ill-reputed; that is to say, to the self-seeking of the governors and the cowardice of the governed; on the other hand, the indiscriminate honour which is given to them in some countries is attributable to the laziness of those who hold this opinion of them. In our own country a far better principle prevails, but, as I was saying, the explanation of it is rather perplexing. For, observe that open loves are held to be more honourable than secret ones, and that the love of the noblest and highest, even if their persons are less beautiful than others, is especially honourable. Consider, too, how great is the

37 Young men
38 Pausanias is drawing a distinction between pederasty (a sometimes erotic relationship between a male teacher and his very young male student) and the love of two adult men of differing ages.
39 The Tyrannicides, lovers who assassinated the tyrant Hipparchus who had insulted Harmodius’ sister after Harmodius rejected Hipparchus’ sexual advances. They were celebrated at defenders of Athenian democracy.
encouragement which all the world gives to the lover; neither is he supposed to be doing anything dishonourable; but if he succeeds he is praised, and if he fails he is blamed. And in the pursuit of his love the custom of mankind allows him to do many strange things, which philosophy would bitterly censure if they were done from any motive of [self] interest, or wish for office or power. He may pray, and entreat, and supplicate, and swear, and lie on a mat at the door, and endure a slavery worse than that of any slave—in any other case friends and enemies would be equally ready to prevent him, but now there is no friend who will be ashamed of him and admonish him, and no enemy will charge him with meanness or flattery; the actions of a lover have a grace which ennobles them; and custom has decided that they are highly commendable and that there [is] no loss of character in them; and, what is strangest of all, he only may swear and forswear himself (so men say), and the gods will forgive his transgression, for there is no such thing as a lover’s oath. Such is the entire liberty which gods and men have allowed the lover, according to the custom which prevails in our part of the world. From this point of view a man fairly argues that in Athens to love and to be loved is held to be a very honourable thing. But when parents forbid their sons to talk with their lovers, and place them under a tutor’s care, who is appointed to see to these things, and their companions and equals cast in their teeth anything of the sort which they may observe, and their elders refuse to silence the reprovers and do not rebuke them—any one who reflects on all this will, on the contrary, think that we hold these practices to be most disgraceful. But, as I was saying at first, the truth as I imagine is, that whether such practices are honourable or whether they are dishonourable is not a simple question; they are honourable to him who follows them honourably, dishonourable to him who follows them dishonourably. There is dishonour in yielding to the evil, or in an evil manner; but there is honour in yielding to the good, or in an honourable manner. Evil is the vulgar lover who loves the body rather than the soul, inasmuch as he is not even stable, because he loves a thing which is in itself unstable, and therefore when the bloom of youth which he was desiring is over, he takes wing and flies away, in spite of all his words and promises; whereas the love of the noble disposition is life-long, for it becomes one with the everlasting. The custom of our country would have both of them proven well and truly, and would have us yield to the one sort of lover and avoid the other, and therefore encourages some to pursue, and others to fly; testing both the lover and beloved in contests and trials, until they show to which of the two classes they respectively belong. And this is the reason why, in the first place, a hasty attachment is held to be dishonourable, because time is the true test of this as of most other things; and secondly there is a dishonour in being overcome by the love of money, or of wealth, or of political power, whether a man is frightened into surrender by the loss of them, or, having experienced the benefits of money and political corruption, is unable to rise above the seductions of them. For none of these things are of a permanent or lasting nature; not to mention that no generous friendship ever sprang from them. There remains, then, only one way of honourable attachment which custom allows in the beloved, and this is the way of virtue; for as we admitted that any service which the lover does to him is not to be accounted flattery or a dishonour to himself, so the beloved has one way only of voluntary service which is not dishonourable, and this is virtuous service.

For we have a custom, and according to our custom any one who does service to another under the idea that he will be improved by him either in wisdom, or in some other particular virtue—such a voluntary service, I say, is not to be regarded as a dishonour, and is not open to the charge of flattery. And these two customs, one the love of youth, and the other the practice of philosophy and virtue in general, ought to meet in one, and then the beloved may honourably indulge the lover. For when the lover and beloved come together, having each of them a law, and the lover thinks that he is right in doing any service which he can to his gracious beloved; and the [beloved] that he is right in showing any kindness which he can to him who is making him wise and good; the [lover is] capable of communicating wisdom and virtue, the [beloved is] seeking to acquire them with a view to education and wisdom; when the

40 That is, whatever the teacher/lover’s expertise entails as long as the field of study is regarded as a legitimate one.
two laws of love are fulfilled and meet in one—then, and then only, may the beloved yield with honour to the lover. Nor when love is of this disinterested sort is there any disgrace in being deceived, but in every other case there is equal disgrace in being or not being deceived. For he who is gracious to his lover under the impression that he is rich, and is disappointed of his gains because he turns out to be poor, is disgraced all the same: for he has done his best to show that he would give himself up to any one’s base [usage] for the sake of money; but this is not honourable. And on the same principle he who gives himself to a lover because he is a good man, and in the hope that he will be improved by his company, shows himself to be virtuous, even [if] the object of his affection turns out to be a villain, and to have no virtue; and if he is [thus] deceived he has committed a noble error. For he has proved that for his part he will do anything for anybody with a view to virtue and improvement, than which there can be nothing nobler. Thus noble in every case is the acceptance of another for the sake of virtue. This is that love which is the love of the heavenly goddess, and is heavenly, and of great price to individuals and cities, making the lover and the beloved alike eager in the work of their own improvement. But all other loves are the offspring of the other, who is the common goddess. To you, Phaedrus, I offer this my contribution in praise of love, which is as good as I could make extempore.”
Pausanias came to a pause, saying “This is the balanced way in which I have been taught by the wise to speak;” and Aristodemus said that the turn of Aristophanes was next, but either he had eaten too much, or from some other cause he had the hiccups, and was obliged to change turns with Eryximachus the physician, who was reclining on the couch below him. “Eryximachus,” he said, “you ought either to stop my hiccups, or to speak in my turn until I have stopped hiccupping.”

“I will do both,” said Eryximachus. “I will speak in your turn, and do you speak in mine; and while I am speaking let me recommend you to hold your breath, and if after you have done so for some time the hiccough is no better, then gargle with a little water; and if it still continues, tickle your nose with something and sneeze; and if you sneeze once or twice, even the most violent hiccup is sure to go.”

“I will do as you prescribe,” said Aristophanes, “and now get on.”

[ERYXIMACHUS SPEAKS]

Seeing that Pausanias made a fair beginning, but a lame ending, I must endeavour to supply his deficiency. I think that he has rightly distinguished two kinds of love. But my art further informs me that the double love is not merely an affection of the soul of man towards the fair, or towards anything, but is to be found in the bodies of all animals and in productions of the earth, and I may say in all that is; such is the conclusion which I seem to have gathered from my own art of medicine, whence I learn how great and wonderful and universal is the deity of love, whose empire extends over all things, divine as well as human. And from medicine I will
begin that I may do honour to my art. There are in the human body these two kinds of love, which are confessedly different and unlike, and being unlike, they have loves and desires which are unlike; and the desire of the healthy is one, and the desire of the diseased is another; and, as Pausanias was just now saying, that to indulge good men is honourable, and bad men, dishonourable, so too in the body the good and healthy elements are to be indulged, and the bad elements and the elements of disease are not to be indulged, but discouraged. And this is what the physician has to do, and in this the art of medicine consists, for medicine may be regarded generally as the knowledge of the loves and desires of the body, and how to satisfy them or not; and the best physician is he who is able to separate fair love from foul, or to convert one into the other; and he who knows how to eradicate and how to implant love, whichever is required, and can reconcile the most hostile elements in the constitution and make them loving friends, is a skilful practitioner. Now the most hostile are the most opposite, such as hot and cold, bitter and sweet, moist and dry, and the like. And my ancestor, Asclepius, knowing how to implant friendship and accord in these elements, was the creator of our art, as our friends the poets here tell us, and I believe them; and not only medicine in every branch but the arts of gymnastics and husbandry are under his dominion. Any one who pays the least attention to the subject will also perceive that in music there is the same reconciliation of opposites; and I suppose that this must have been the meaning of Heracleitus, although his words are not accurate; for he says that The One is united by disunion, like the harmony of the bow and the lyre. Now there is an absurdity saying that harmony is discord or is composed of elements which are still in a state of discord. But what he probably meant was, that harmony is composed of differing notes of higher or lower pitch which disagreed once, but are now reconciled by the art of music; for if the higher and lower notes still disagreed, there could be no harmony, clearly not. For harmony is a symphony, and symphony is an agreement; but an agreement of disagreements while they disagree there cannot be; you cannot harmonize that which disagrees. In like manner rhythm is compounded of elements short and long, once differing and now in accord; which accordance, as in the former instance, medicine, so in all these other cases, music implants, making love and unison to grow up among them; and thus music, too, is concerned with the principles of love in their application to harmony and rhythm. Again, in the essential nature of harmony and rhythm there is no difficulty in discerning love which has not yet become double. But when you want to use them in actual life, either in the composition of songs or in the correct performance of [songs] composed already, which performance is called education, then the difficulty begins, and the good artist is needed. Then the old tale has to be repeated of fair and heavenly love—the love of Urania the fair and heavenly muse, and of the duty of accepting the temperate, and those who are as yet intemperate only that they may become temperate, and of preserving their love; and again, of the vulgar Polyhymnia, who must be used with circumspection that the pleasure be enjoyed, but may not generate licentiousness; just as in my own art it is a great matter so to regulate the desires of the epicure that he may gratify his tastes without the attendant evil of disease. Whence I infer that in music, in medicine, in all other things human as well as divine, both loves ought to be noted as far as may be, for they are both present.

The course of the seasons is also full of both these principles; and when, as I was saying, the elements of hot and cold, moist and dry, attain the harmonious love of one another and blend in temperance and harmony, they bring to men, animals, and plants health and plenty, and do
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43 The good doctor subscribes to the Theory of the Four Humours.
44 God of medicine; his symbol was a snake-entwined staff which is used as a symbol in medicine today.
45 Farming.
46 The very strange predecessor Socrates who taught about the changing universe (no man steps in the same river twice) and the unity of opposites (the paths up and down are one path).
47 The Muse of Astronomy.
48 The Muse of Sacred Poetry and Dance.
49 The ancient Greek version of a gourmand or a foodie.
them no harm; whereas the wanton love,\textsuperscript{50} getting the upper hand and affecting the seasons of the year, is very destructive and injurious, being the source of pestilence, and bringing many other kinds of diseases on animals and plants; for hoar-frost and hail and blight spring from the excesses and disorders of these elements of love, which to know in relation to the revolutions of the heavenly bodies and the seasons of the year is termed astronomy. Furthermore all sacrifices and the whole province of divination, which is the art of communion between gods and men—these, I say, are concerned only with the preservation of the good and the cure of the evil love. For all manner of impiety is likely to ensue if, instead of accepting and honouring and reverencing the harmonious love in all his actions, a man honours the other love, whether in his feelings towards gods or parents, towards the living or the dead. Wherefore the business of divination is to see to these loves and to heal them, and divination is the peacemaker of gods and men, working by a knowledge of the religious or irreligious tendencies which exist in human loves. Such is the great and mighty, or rather omnipotent force of love in general. And the love, more especially, which is concerned with the good, and which is perfected in company with temperance and justice, whether among gods or men, has the greatest power, and is the source of all our happiness and harmony, and makes us friends with the gods who are above us, and with one another. I dare say that I too have omitted several things which might be said in praise of Eros, but this was not intentional, and you, Aristophanes, may now supply the omission or take some other line of commendation; for I perceive that you are rid of the hiccupps.

\textsuperscript{50} Wantonness (usually meaning promiscuous or perverted behavior) is here equated with imbalances and excesses in nature.
“Yes,” said Aristophanes, “the hiccup is gone; not, however, until I applied the sneezing; and I wonder whether the harmony of the body has a love of such noises and ticklings, for I no sooner applied the sneezing than I was cured.”

Eryximachus said, “Beware, friend Aristophanes, although you are going to speak, you are making fun of me; and I shall have to watch and see whether I cannot have a laugh at your expense, when you might speak in peace.”

“You are right,” said Aristophanes, laughing. “I will unsay my words; but do you please not to watch me, as I fear that in the speech which I am about to make, instead of others laughing with me, which is [in] the manner of my Muse\textsuperscript{52} and would be all the better, I shall only be laughed at by them.”

“Do you expect to shoot your bolt and escape, Aristophanes? Well, perhaps if you are very careful and bear in mind that you will be called to account, I may be induced to let you off.”

Aristophanes professed to open another vein of discourse; he had a mind to praise Eros in another way, unlike the manner of either Pausanias or Eryximachus.

[ARISTOPHANES SPEAKS]

Mankind, judging by their neglect of [Eros], have never, as I think, at all understood [his] power. For if they had understood him they would surely have built noble temples and altars, and offered solemn sacrifices in his honour; but this is not done, and most certainly ought to be done, since of all the gods he is the best friend of men, the helper and the healer of the ills which are the great impediment to the happiness of the race. I will try to describe his power to you, and you shall teach the rest of the world what I am teaching you. In the first place, let me treat of the nature of mankind and what has happened to it; for the original human nature was not like the present, but different. The sexes were not two as they are now, but originally three in number; there was man, woman, and the union of the two, having a name corresponding to this double nature, which had once a real existence, but is now lost, and the word ‘Androgynous’\textsuperscript{53} is only preserved as a term of reproach.\textsuperscript{54} In the second place, the primeval

\textsuperscript{51} Both male and female.

\textsuperscript{52} Aristophanes either says “my Muse” (Thalia, Muse of Comedy) or “our Muse” (Polyhymnia, whom Eryximachus has identified as a wanton Muse).

\textsuperscript{53} Man-woman or hermaphrodite. See Fowler’s translation: “not merely the two sexes, male and female, as at present: there was a third kind as well, which had equal shares of the other two, and whose name survives though, the thing itself has vanished. For ‘man-woman’ was then a unity in form no less than name, composed of both sexes and sharing equally in male and female; whereas now it has come to
man was round, his back and sides forming a circle; and he had four hands and four feet, one
head with two faces, looking opposite ways, set on a round neck and precisely alike; also four
ears, two privy members,55 and the remainder to correspond.56 He could walk upright as men
now do, backwards or forwards as he pleased, and he could also roll over and over at a great
pace, turning on his four hands and four feet, eight in all, like tumblers going over and over with
their legs in the air; this was when he wanted to run fast. Now the sexes were three, such as I
have described them, because the sun, moon, and earth are three, and the man was originally
the child of the sun, the woman of the earth, and the man-woman of the moon, which is made
up of sun and earth, and they were all round and moved round and round like their parents.
Terrible was their might and strength, and the thoughts of their hearts were great, and they
made an attack upon the gods; of them is told the tale of Otus and Ephialtes who, as Homer
says, dared to scale heaven, and would have laid hands upon the gods. Doubt reigned in the
celestial councils. Should the gods kill them and annihilate the race with thunderbolts, as they
had done the giants, then there would be an end of the sacrifices and worship which men offered
to them; but, on the other hand, the gods could not suffer their insolence to be unrestrained. At
last, after a good deal of reflection, Zeus discovered a way. He said, ‘Methinks I have a plan
which will humble their pride and improve their manners; humans shall continue to exist, but I
will cut them in two, and then they will be diminished in strength and increased in numbers; this
will have the advantage of making them more profitable to us. They shall walk upright on two
legs, and if they continue [to be] insolent and will not be quiet, I will split them again and they
shall hop about on a single leg.’ He spoke and cut humans in two, like a sorb-apple which is
halved for pickling, or as you might divide an egg with a hair;57 and as he cut them one after
another, he bade Apollo give the face and the half of the neck a turn in order that the man might
contemplate the [bisected side] of himself; he would thus learn a lesson [in] humility. Apollo
was also bidden to heal their wounds and compose their forms. So he gave a turn to the face
and pulled the skin from the sides all over that which in our language is called the belly, like the
purses which draw in, and he made one [opening] at the centre, which he fastened in a knot
(the same which is called the navel); he also moulded the breast and took out most of the
wrinkles, much as a shoemaker might smooth leather; he left a few wrinkles, however, in the
region of the belly and navel, as a memorial of the primeval state. After the division the two
parts of the humans, each desiring his other half, came together, and throwing their arms about
one another, entwined in mutual embraces, longing to grow into one, they were on the point of
dying from hunger and self-neglect, because they did not like to do anything apart; and when
one of the halves died and the other survived, the survivor sought another mate, man or woman
(as we call them) being the sections of entire men or women, and clung to that. They were
being destroyed, when Zeus [for] pity of them invented a new plan. He turned the parts of
generation58 round to the front, for this had not been always their position, and they sowed the
seed no longer as hitherto like grasshoppers in the ground, but in one another; and after the
transposition the male generated in the female in order that by the mutual embraces of man and
woman they might breed, and the race might continue; or if man came to man they might be
satisfied, and rest, and go their ways to the business of life, so ancient is the desire [for] one
another which is implanted in us, reuniting our original nature, making one of two, and healing
the state of humans. Each of us when separated, having one side only, like a flat fish, is but the
indenture59 of a human being, and we are always looking for our other half. Men who are a

54 Or insult.
55 Genitals.
56 In proportion (Fowler).
57 That is, use a hair to cut an egg.
58 The genitals.
59 “A tally, or notched stick matching another, is the nearest English equivalent for sumbolon, which
was a half of a broken die given and kept as a token of friendship.” (Fowler)
section of that double nature which was once called Androgynous are lovers of women; adulterous men are generally of this breed, and also adulterous women who lust after men; the women who are a section of the woman do not care for men, but have female attachments; [lesbians] ⁶⁰ are of this sort. But they who are a section of the male follow the male, and while they are young, being slices of the original man, they hang about men and embrace them, and they are themselves the best of boys and youths, because they have the most manly nature. Some indeed assert that they are shameless, but this is not true; for they do not act thus from any want of shame, but because they are valiant and manly, and have a manly countenance, and they embrace that which is like them. And these when they grow up become our statesmen, and these only, which is a great proof of the truth of what I am saying. When they reach manhood they are lovers of youth, and are not naturally inclined to marry or beget children; if [they do], they do so only in obedience to the law; but they are satisfied if they may be allowed to live with one another unwedded; and such a nature is prone to love and ready to return love, always embracing that which is akin to him. And when one of them meets with his other half, the actual half of himself, ⁶¹ whether he be a lover of youth ⁶² or a lover of another sort, ⁶² the pair are lost in an amazement of love and friendship and intimacy, and one will not be out of the other’s sight, as I may say, even for a moment: these are the people who pass their whole lives together; yet they could not explain what they desire of one another. For the intense yearning which each of them has towards the other does not appear to be the desire of lover’s intercourse, but of something else which the soul of either evidently desires and cannot tell, and of which she has only a dark and doubtful presentiment. Suppose Hephaestus, ⁶⁴ with his instruments, to come to the pair who are lying side by side and to say to them, ‘What do you people want of one another?’ They would be unable to explain. And suppose further, that when he saw their perplexity he said, ‘Do you desire to be wholly one; always day and night to be in one another’s company? For if this is what you desire, I am ready to melt you into one and let you grow together, so that being two you shall become one, and while you live, live a common life as if you were a single person, and after your death in the world below still be one departed soul instead of two, I ask whether this is what you lovingly desire, and whether you are satisfied to attain this?’ There is not a one of them who when he heard the proposal would deny or would not acknowledge that this meeting and melting into one another, this becoming one instead of two, was the very expression of his ancient need. And the reason is that human nature was originally one and we were a whole, and the desire and pursuit of the whole is called love. There was a time, I say, when we were one, but now because of the wickedness of mankind God has dispersed us, as the Arcadians were dispersed into villages by the Lacedaemonians. And if we are not obedient to the gods, there is a danger that we shall be split up again and go about like outline-carvings on the tombs, with our noses sawn down the middle, and may thus become like tokens of split dice. ⁶⁵ Wherefore let us exhort all men to piety, that we may avoid evil, and obtain the good, of which Eros is to us the lord and minister; and let no one oppose him; [that man] is the enemy of the gods who opposes [Eros]. For if we are friends of the god and at peace with him we shall find our own true loves, which rarely happens in this world at present. I am serious, and therefore I must beg Eryximachus not to make fun or to find any allusion in what I am saying to Pausanias and Agathon, who, as I suspect, are both of the manly nature, and belong to the class which I have been describing. But my words have a wider application; they include men and women everywhere; and I believe that if our loves were perfectly accomplished, and each one returning to his primeval nature had his original true love, then our race would be happy. And if this would be best of all, the best in the next degree and under
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⁶⁰ Fowler calls them "she-minions," and Jowett, "female companions;” "lesbians" seems more to the point.
⁶¹ As we might say, his “soul mate.”
⁶² A gay male.
⁶³ Lesbian or heterosexual.
⁶⁴ Greek god of the smithy and fire.
⁶⁵ This sentence is from Fowler’s translation.
present circumstances must be the nearest approach to such an union; and that will be the attainment of a congenial love. Wherefore, if we would praise him who has given to us the benefit, we must praise the god Eros, who is our greatest benefactor, both leading us in this life back to our own nature, and giving us high hopes for the future, for he promises that if we are pious, he will restore us to our original state, and heal us and make us happy and blessed. This, Eryximachus, is my discourse of love, which, although different to yours, I must beg you to leave unassailed by the shafts of your ridicule, in order that each may have his turn; each, or rather either, for Agathon and Socrates are the only ones left.
“Indeed, I am not going to attack you,” said Eryximachus, “for I thought your speech charming, and did I not know that Agathon and Socrates are masters in the art of love, I should be really afraid that they would have nothing to say, after the world of things which have been said already. But, for all that, I am not without hopes.”

Socrates said, “You played your part well, Eryximachus; but if you were as I am now, or rather as I shall be when Agathon has spoken, you would, indeed, be in a great strait.”

“You want to cast a spell over me, Socrates,” said Agathon, “in the hope that I may be disconcerted at the expectation raised among the audience that I shall speak well.”

“I should be strangely forgetful, Agathon,” replied Socrates, “of the courage and magnanimity which you showed when your own compositions were about to be exhibited, and you came upon the stage with the actors and faced the vast theatre altogether undismayed, if I thought that your nerves could be fluttered at a small party of friends.”

“Do you think, Socrates,” said Agathon, “that my head is so full of the theatre as not to know how much more formidable to a man of sense a few good judges are than many fools?”

“Nay,” replied Socrates, “I should be very wrong in attributing to you, Agathon, that or any other want of refinement. And I am quite aware that if you happened to meet with any whom you thought wise, you would care for their opinion much more than for that of the many. But then we, having been a part of the foolish many in the theatre, cannot be regarded as the select
wise; though I know that if you chanced to be in the presence, not of one of ourselves, but of some really wise man, you would be ashamed of disgracing yourself before him, would you not?"

“Yes,” said Agathon.

“But before the many you would not be ashamed, if you thought that you were doing something disgraceful in their presence?”

Here Phaedrus interrupted them, saying, “Do not answer him, my dear Agathon; for if he can only get a partner with whom he can talk, especially a good-looking one, he will no longer care about the completion of our plan. Now I love to hear him talk; but just at present I must not forget the encomium on Eros which I ought to receive from him and from every one. When you and he have paid your tribute to the god, then you may talk.”

“Very good, Phaedrus,” said Agathon. “I see no reason why I should not proceed with my speech, as I shall have many other opportunities of conversing with Socrates. Let me say first how I ought to speak, and then speak.”

[AGATHON SPEAKS]

The previous speakers, instead of praising the god Eros, or unfolding his nature, appear to have congratulated mankind on the benefits which he confers upon them. But I would rather praise the god first, and then speak of his gifts; this is always the right way of praising everything. May I say without impiety or offence, that of all the blessed gods he is the most blessed because he is the fairest and best? And he is the fairest, for, in the first place, he is the youngest, and of his youth he is himself the witness, fleeing out of the way of age, who is swift enough, swifter truly than most of us; Eros hates him and will not come near him; but youth and love live and move together, like to like, as the proverb says. Many things were said by Phaedrus about Eros which I agree with; but I cannot agree that he is older than Iapetus and Kronos; not so, I maintain him to be the youngest of the gods, and youthful ever. The ancient doings among the gods of which Hesiod and Parmenides spoke, if the tradition of them be true, were done of Necessity and not of Eros; had Eros been in those days, there would have been no chaining or mutilation of the gods, or other violence, but peace and sweetness, as there is now in heaven, since the rule of Eros began. Eros is young and also tender; he ought to have a poet like Homer to describe his tenderness, as Homer says of Ate that she is a goddess and tender: ‘Her feet are tender, for she sets her steps, Not on the ground but on the heads of men.’ Herein is an excellent proof of her tenderness, that she walks not upon the hard but upon the soft. Let us adduce a similar proof of the tenderness of Eros; for he walks not upon the earth, nor yet upon the skulls of men, which are not so very soft, but in the hearts and souls of both gods and men, which are of all things the softest; in them he walks and dwells and makes his home. Not in every soul without exception, for where there is hardness he departs, where there is softness there he dwells; and nestling always with his feet and in all manner of ways in the softest of soft places, how can he be other than the softest of all things? Of a truth he is the tenderest as well as the youngest, and also he is of flexile form; for if he were hard and without flexure he could not enfold all things, or wind his way into and out of every soul of man undiscovered. And a proof of his flexibility and symmetry of form is his grace, which is universally admitted to be in an especial manner the attribute of Eros; [lack of grace] and love are always at war with one another. The fairness of his complexion is revealed by his habitation among the flowers; for he dwells not amid bloomless or fading beauties, whether of body or soul or aught else, but in the place of flowers and scents, there he sits and abides.

Concerning the beauty of the god I have said enough; and yet there remains much more which I might say. Of his virtue I have now to speak: his greatest glory is that he can neither do
nor suffer wrong to or from any god or any man; for he suffers not by force if he suffers; force comes not near him, neither when he acts does he act by force. For all men in all things serve him of their own free will, and where there is voluntary agreement, there, as the laws which are the lords of the city say, is justice. And not only is he just but exceedingly temperate, for Temperance is the acknowledged ruler of the pleasures and desires, and no pleasure ever masters Eros; he is their master and they are his servants; and if he conquers them he must be temperate indeed. As to courage, even the God of War is no match for him; he is the captive and Eros is the lord, for love, the love of Aphrodite, masters [Ares],72 as the tale runs; and the master is stronger than the servant. And if he conquers the bravest of all others, he must be himself the bravest. Of his courage and justice and temperance I have spoken, but I have yet to speak of his wisdom; and according to the measure of my ability I must try to do my best. In the first place he is a poet (and here, like Eryximachus, I magnify my art), and he is also the source of poesy73 in others, which he could not be if he were not himself a poet. And at the touch of him every one becomes a poet, even though he had no music in him before; this also is a proof that Eros is a good poet and accomplished in all the fine arts; for no one can give to another that which he has not himself, or teach that of which he has no knowledge. Who will deny that the creation of the animals is his doing? Are they not all the works of his wisdom, born and begotten of him? And as to the artists, do we not know that he only of them whom love inspires has the light of fame? He whom Eros touches not walks in darkness. The arts of medicine74 and archery75 and divination76 were discovered by Apollo, under the guidance of love and desire; so that he too is a disciple of Eros. Also the melody of the Muses,77 the metallurgy of Hephaestus,78 the weaving of Athena,79 the empire of Zeus80 over gods and men, are all due to Eros, who was the inventor of them. And so Eros set in order the empire of the gods and the love of beauty, as is evident, for with ugliness Eros has no concern. In the days of old, as I began by saying, dreadful deeds were done among the gods, for they were ruled by Necessity; but now since the birth of Eros, and from the love of the beautiful, has sprung every good in heaven and earth. Therefore, Phaedrus, I say of Eros that he is the fairest and best in himself, and the cause of what is fairest and best in all other things. And there comes into my mind a line of poetry in which he is said to be the god who “gives peace on earth and calms the stormy deep, who stills the winds and bids the sufferer sleep.” This is he who empties men of [alienation] and fills them with [the desire for intimacy], who makes them to meet together at banquets such as these: in sacrifices, feasts, dances, he is our lord, who sends courtesy and sends away discourtesy, who gives kindness ever and never gives unkindness; the friend of the good, the wonder of the wise, the amazement of the gods; desired by those who have no part in him, and precious to those who have the better part in him; parent of delicacy, luxury, desire, fondness, softness, grace; regardful of the good, regardless of the evil; in every word, work, wish, fear [he is the] saviour, pilot, comrade, helper; glory of gods and men, leader best and brightest, in whose footsteps let every man follow, sweetly singing in his honour and joining in that sweet strain with which love charms the souls of gods and men. Such is the speech, Phaedrus, half-playful, yet having a certain measure of seriousness, which, according to my ability, I dedicate to the god.

72 Ares, the Greek war god, was the lover of Aphrodite, Greek goddess of sex, mother of Eros.
73 Poetry.
74 Apollo’s son Asclepius by his lover Coronis was the god of medicine.
75 Apollo was the god of archery; his first use of the bow and arrow was as an infant, when in defence of his mother Leto he killed the serpent Python.
76 Apollo was the god of prophecy, following his destruction of Python and his subsequent acquisition of the Temple at Delphi and its oracular powers.
77 Goddesses of inspiration.
78 Greek god of fire and the forge.
79 Greek goddess of wisdom and weaving.
80 King of the Greek gods.
When Agathon had done speaking, Aristodemus said that there was a general cheer; the young man was thought to have spoken in a manner worthy of himself, and of the god. And Socrates, looking at Eryximachus, said, "Tell me, son of Acumenus, was there not reason in my fears, and was I not a true prophet when I said that Agathon would make a wonderful oration, and that I should be in a strait?"

"The part of the prophecy which concerns Agathon," replied Eryximachus, "appears to me to be true; but not the other part, that you will be in a strait."

"Why, my dear friend," said Socrates, "must not I or any one be in a strait who has to speak after he has heard such a rich and varied discourse? I am especially struck with the beauty of the concluding words; who could listen to them without amazement? When I reflected on the immeasurable inferiority of my own powers, I was ready to run away for shame, if there had been a possibility of escape. [For his speech so reminded me of Gorgias\textsuperscript{81} that I was exactly in the plight described by Homer: I feared that Agathon in his final phrases would confront me with the eloquent Gorgias\textsuperscript{82} head, and by opposing his speech to mine would turn me thus dumbfounded into stone.]\textsuperscript{83} And then I perceived how foolish I had been in consenting to take my turn with you in praising love, and saying that I too was a master of the art, when I really

\textsuperscript{81} Famous rhetorician (orator or persuasive speaker).
\textsuperscript{82} Socrates is making a play on words: Agathon was as eloquent as Gorgias, and Socrates was afraid of being struck dumb by Agathon’s brilliance as, according to legend, men were petrified by the Gorgon’s head (the head of Medusa which could turn a man to stone).
\textsuperscript{83} Fowler translation.
had no conception how anything ought to be praised. For in my simplicity I imagined that the topics of praise should be true, and that this being presupposed, out of the true the speaker was to choose the best and set them forth in the best manner. And I felt quite proud, thinking that I knew the nature of true praise, and should speak well. Whereas I now see that the intention was to attribute to Eros every species of greatness and glory, whether really belonging to him or not, without regard to truth or falsehood; that was no matter; for the original proposal seems to have been not that each of you should really praise Eros, but only that you should appear to praise him. And so you attribute to Eros every imaginable form of praise which can be gathered anywhere; and you say, “he is all this and the cause of all that,” making him appear the fairest and best of all to those who know him not, for you cannot impose upon those who know him. And a noble and solemn hymn of praise have you rehearsed. But as I misunderstood the nature of the praise when I said that I would take my turn, I must beg to be absolved from the promise which I made in ignorance, and which as Euripides would say was a promise of the lips and not of the mind. Farewell then to such a strain, for I do not praise in that way; no, indeed, I cannot. But if you like to hear the truth about love, I am ready to speak in my own manner, though I will not make myself ridiculous by entering into any rivalry with you. Say then, Phaedrus, whether you would like to have the truth about love, spoken in any words and in any order which may happen to come into my mind at the time. Will that be agreeable to you?”

Aristodemus said that Phaedrus and the company bid him speak in any manner which he thought best. “Then,” Socrates added, “let me have your permission first to ask Agathon a few more questions, in order that I may take his admissions as the premises of my discourse.”

“I grant the permission,” said Phaedrus. “Put your questions.”

Socrates then proceeded as follows, “In the magnificent oration which you have just uttered, I think that you were right, my dear Agathon, in proposing to speak of the nature [or character] of Eros first and afterwards of his works; that is a way of beginning which I very much approve. And as you have spoken so eloquently of his nature, may I ask you further, whether Eros is the love of [some object] or of [no object]? And here I must explain myself; I do not want you to say that Eros is the love of a father or the love of a mother; that would be ridiculous; but to answer as you would, if I asked is a father a father of [somebody]? To which you would find no difficulty in replying, [a father is the father] of a son or a daughter, and the answer would be right.”

“Very true,” said Agathon.

“And you would say the same of a mother?”

He assented.

“Yet let me ask you one more question in order to illustrate my meaning. Is not a brother to be regarded essentially as a brother of [someone]?”

“Certainly,” he replied.

“That is, of a brother or a sister?”

“Yes,” he said.

“And now,” said Socrates, “I will ask about Eros. Is Eros [a love] of something or of nothing?”

“Of something, surely,” he replied.

“Keep in mind what this is, and tell me what I want to know, whether Eros desires [the particular thing that is his object].”

“Yes,” surely.

“And does he possess, or does he not possess, that which he loves and desires?”

“Probably not, I should say.”

“Nay,” replied Socrates, “I would have you consider whether ‘necessarily’ is not rather the word. The inference that he who desires something is in want of something, and that he who desires nothing is in want of nothing, is in my judgment, Agathon, absolutely and necessarily true. What do you think?”

---

84 Socrates’ praise for Agathon as superior in eloquence is tempered here by Socrates’ assertion that Agathon was wrong and that his depiction of Eros was a pleasant fiction.

85 Fowler.
“I agree with you,” said Agathon.

“Very good. Would he who is great, desire to be great, or he who is strong, desire to be strong?”

“That would be inconsistent with our previous admissions.”

“True. For he who is anything cannot want to be that which he is?”

“Very true.”

“And yet,” added Socrates, “if a man being strong desired to be strong, or being swift desired to be swift, or being healthy desired to be healthy, in that case he might be thought to desire something which he already has or is. I give the example in order that we may avoid misconception. For the possessors of these qualities, Agathon, must be supposed to have their respective advantages at the time, whether they choose or not; and who can desire that which he has? Therefore, when a person says, I am well and wish to be well, or I am rich and wish to be rich, and I desire simply to have what I have, to him we shall reply, ‘You, my friend, having wealth and health and strength, want to have the continuance of them; for at this moment, whether you choose or no, you have them. And when you say, I desire that which I have and nothing else, is not your meaning that you want to have what you now have in the future?’ He must agree with us, must he not?”

“He must,” replied Agathon.

“Then,” said Socrates, “he desires that what he has at present may be preserved to him in the future, which is equivalent to saying that he desires something which is non-existent to him, and which as yet he has not got.”

“Very true,” he said.

“Then he and every one who desires, desires that which he has not already, and which is future and not present, and which he has not, and is not, and of which he is in want; these are the sort of things which love and desire seek?”

“Very true,” he said.

“Then now,” said Socrates, “let us recapitulate the argument. [First, is not Love directed to certain things of which, in the second place, he has a want or (need)]?”

“Yes,” he replied.

“Remember further what you said in your speech, or if you do not remember I will remind you. You said that the love of the beautiful set in order the empire of the gods, for that of ugly things there is no love. Did you not say something of that kind?”

“Yes,” said Agathon.

“Yes, my friend, and the remark was a just one. And if this is true, Eros is the love of beauty and not of ugliness?”

He assented.

“And the admission has been already made that Eros is [desire] of something which a man wants and has not?”

“True,” he said.

“Then Eros wants and has not beauty?”

“That must be,” he replied.

“And would you call that beautiful which wants and does not possess beauty?”

“Certainly not.”

“Then would you still say that Eros is beautiful?”

Agathon replied, “I fear that I did not understand what I was saying.”

“You made a very good speech, Agathon,” replied Socrates. “But there is yet one small question which I would fain ask. Is not the Good also the Beautiful?”

“Yes.”

“Then in wanting the beautiful, love wants also the good?”

“I cannot refute you,” Socrates, said Agathon. “Let us assume that what you say is true.”

---

86 Here Socrates speaks of the ideals or forms of Good and Beauty.
“Say rather, beloved Agathon, that you cannot refute the truth; for Socrates is easily refuted.”

[SOCRATES SPEAKS]
And now, taking my leave of you, I would rehearse a tale of love which I heard from Diotima of Mantinea, a woman wise in this and in many other kinds of knowledge, who in the days of old, when the Athenians offered sacrifice before the coming of the plague, delayed the disease ten years. She was my instructress in the art of love, and I shall repeat to you what she said to me, beginning with the admissions made by Agathon, which are nearly if not quite the same which I made to the wise woman when she questioned me. I think that this will be the easiest way, and I shall take both parts myself as well as I can. As you, Agathon, suggested, I must speak first of the being and nature of Eros, and then of his works. First I said to her in nearly the same words which [Agathon] used to me, that Eros was a mighty god, and likewise fair; and she proved to me as I proved to him that, by my own showing, Eros was neither fair nor good.

‘What do you mean, Diotima,’ I said, ‘is love then evil and foul?’

‘Hush,’ she cried; ‘must that be foul which is not fair?’

‘Certainly,’ I said.87

‘And is that which is not wise, ignorant? Do you not see that there is a mean88 between wisdom and ignorance?’

‘And what may that be?’ I said.

‘You know, of course, that to have [a] correct opinion, if you can give no reason for it, is neither full knowledge (how can an unreasoned thing be knowledge?), nor yet ignorance (for what hits on the truth cannot be ignorance). So [a] correct opinion, I take it, is just in that position, between understanding and ignorance.’

‘Quite true,’ I replied.

‘Do not then insist,’ she said, ‘that what is not fair is of necessity foul, or [that] what is not good [is] evil; or infer that because love is not fair and good he is therefore foul and evil; for he is in a mean between them.’

‘Well,’ I said, ‘Eros is surely admitted by all to be a great god.’

‘By those who know or by those who do not know?’

‘By all.’

‘And how, Socrates,’ she said with a smile, ‘can Eros be acknowledged to be a great god by those who say that he is not a god at all?’

‘And who are they?’ I said.

‘You and I are two of them,’ she replied.

‘How can that be?’ I said.

‘It is quite intelligible,’ she replied; ‘for you yourself would acknowledge that the gods are happy and fair (of course you would). Would you dare to say that any god was not?’

‘Certainly not,’ I replied.

‘And you mean by the happy, those who are the possessors of things good or fair?’

‘Yes.’

‘And you admitted that Eros, because he was in want, desires those good and fair things of which he is in want?’

‘Yes, I did.’

‘But how can he be a god who has no portion in what is either good or fair?’

‘Impossible.’

‘Then you see that you also deny the divinity of Eros.’

‘What then is Eros?’ I asked; ‘Is he mortal?’

‘No.’

‘What then?’

87 Socrates, in his youth, was apparently an absolutist.
88 Middle ground.
As in the former instance, he is neither mortal nor immortal, but in a mean between the two.

What is he, Diotima?

He is a great spirit, and like all spirits he is intermediate between the divine and the mortal.

And what, I said, is his power?

He interprets, she replied, between gods and men, conveying and taking across to the gods the prayers and sacrifices of men, and to men the commands and replies of the gods; he is the mediator who spans the chasm which divides them, and therefore in him all is bound together, and through him the arts of the prophet and the priest, their sacrifices and mysteries and charms, and all prophecy and incantation, find their way. For God mingles not with man; but through Eros all the intercourse and converse of God with man, whether awake or asleep, is carried on. [Whosoever has skill in these affairs is a spiritual man to have it in other matters, as in common arts and crafts, is for the mechanical]. Now these spirits or intermediate powers are many and diverse, and one of them is Eros.

And who, I said, was his father, and who his mother?

The tale, she said, will take time; nevertheless I will tell you. On the birthday of Aphrodite there was a feast of the gods, at which the god [Resource], who is the son of [Cunning], was one of the guests. When the feast was over, Poverty, as is the custom on such occasions, came about the doors to beg. Now Resource who was drunk on nectar (there was no wine in those days), went into the garden of Zeus and fell into a heavy sleep, and Poverty considering her own straitened circumstances, plotted to have a child by him, and accordingly she lay down at his side and conceived Eros, who partly because he is naturally a lover of the beautiful, and because Aphrodite is herself beautiful, and also because he was born on her birthday, is her follower and attendant. And as his parentage is, so also are his fortunes. In the first place he is always poor, and anything but tender and fair, as the many imagine him; and he is rough and squalid, and has no shoes, nor a house to dwell in; on the bare earth exposed he lies under the open heaven, in the streets, or at the doors of houses, taking his rest; and like his mother he is always in distress. Like his father too, whom he also partly resembles, he is always plotting against the fair and the good; he is bold, enterprising, strong, a mighty hunter, always weaving some intrigue or other, keen in the pursuit of wisdom, fertile in resources; a philosopher at all times, terrible as an enchanter, sorcerer, sophist. He is by nature neither mortal nor immortal, but alive and flourishing at one moment when he is in plenty, and dead at another moment, and again alive by reason of his father's nature. But that which is always flowing in is always flowing out, and so he is never in want and never in wealth; and, further, he is in a mean between ignorance and knowledge. The truth of the matter is this, no god is a philosopher or seeker after wisdom, for he is wise already; nor does any man who is wise seek after wisdom. Neither do the ignorant seek after wisdom. For herein is the evil of ignorance, that he who is neither good nor wise is nevertheless satisfied with himself; he has no desire for that of which he feels no want.

But who then, Diotima, I said, are the lovers of wisdom, if they are neither the wise nor the foolish?

A child may answer that question, she replied; they are those who are in a mean between the two; Eros is one of them. For wisdom is a most beautiful thing, and Eros is a love of the beautiful; and therefore Eros is also a philosopher or lover of wisdom, and being a lover of wisdom is in a mean between the wise and the ignorant. And of this too his birth is the cause; for his father is wealthy and wise, and his mother poor and foolish. Such, my dear Socrates, is the nature of the spirit Eros. The error in your conception of him was very natural, and as I imagine from what you say, has arisen out of a confusion of love and the beloved, which made you think that love was all beautiful. For the beloved is the truly beautiful, and delicate, and

89 Or Daimons, which "represent the mysterious agencies and influences by which the gods communicate with mortals." (Fowler, Plat. Sym. 202e).
90 Fowler, Plat. Sym. 203a.
91 Jowett prefers "Plenty, son of Discretion"; I have used Fowler's translation here instead.
perfect, and blessed; but the principle of love is of another nature, and is such as I have described.’

I said, ‘O thou stranger woman, thou sayest well; but, assuming Eros to be such as you say, what is the use of him to men?’

‘That, Socrates,’ she replied, ‘I will attempt to unfold. Of his nature and birth I have already spoken; and you acknowledge that Eros [desires beautiful things]. But some one will say, “The beautiful in what, Socrates and Diotima?” Or rather let me put the question more clearly, and ask, when a man loves the beautiful, what does he desire?’

I answered her, ‘That the beautiful may be his.’

‘Still,’ she said, ‘the answer suggests a further question. What is given by the possession of beauty?’

‘To what you have asked,’ I replied, ‘I have no answer ready.’

‘Then,’ she said, ‘let me put the word “good” in the place of the beautiful, and repeat the question once more. If he who loves loves the Good, what is it then that he loves?’

‘The possession of the Good,’ I said.

‘And what does he gain who possesses the Good?’

‘Happiness,’ I replied; ‘there is less difficulty in answering that question.’

‘Yes,’ she said, ‘the happy are made happy by the acquisition of good things. Nor is there any need to ask why a man desires happiness; the answer is already final.’

‘You are right,’ I said.

‘And is this wish and this desire common to all? And do all men always desire their own good, or only some men? What say you?’

‘All men,’ I replied; ‘the desire is common to all.’

‘Why, then,’ she rejoined, ‘are not all men, Socrates, said to love, but only some of them? Whereas you say that all men are always loving the same things.’

‘I myself wonder,’ I said, ‘why this is.’

‘There is nothing to wonder at,’ she replied; ‘the reason is that one part of love is separated off and receives the name of the whole, but the other parts have other names.’

‘Give an illustration,’ I said.

She answered me as follows. ‘There is poetry,92 which, as you know, is complex and manifold. All creation or passage of non-being into being is poetry or making, and the processes of all art are creative; and the masters of arts are all poets or makers.’

‘Very true.’

‘Still,’ she said, ‘you know that they are not called poets, but have other names; only that portion of the art which is separated off from the rest, and is concerned with music and metre, is termed poetry, and they who possess poetry in this [more narrow] sense of the word are called poets.’

‘Very true,’ I said.

‘And the same holds of love. For you may say generally that all desire of good and happiness is only the great and subtle power of love; but they who are drawn towards him by any other path, whether the path of money-making or gymnastics or philosophy, are not called lovers—the name of the whole is appropriated to those whose affection takes one form only; they alone are said to love, or to be lovers.’

‘I dare say,’ I replied, ‘that you are right.’

‘Yes,’ she added, ‘and you hear people say that lovers are seeking for their other half,93 but I say that they are seeking neither for the half of themselves, nor for the whole, unless the half or the whole be also a Good. And they will cut off their own hands and feet and cast them away, if they are evil; for they love not what is their own, unless perchance there be some one who calls

92 Here Diotima, as did Agathon previously, broadens the meaning of poiēsis, which can be translated as both “poetry” and “creation” (Fowler 197a; Bury 205b). Through Diotima, Socrates is critiquing, appropriating, and correcting previous speakers.

93 As did Aristophanes in his speech.
what belongs to him the Good, and what belongs to another evil. For there is nothing which men
love but the Good. Is there anything?’

‘Certainly, I should say, that there is nothing.’

‘Then,’ she said, ‘the simple truth is, that men love the Good.’

‘Yes,’ I said.

‘To which must be added that they love the possession of the Good?’

‘Yes, that must be added.’

‘And not only the possession [now], but the everlasting possession of the Good?’

‘That must be added too.’

‘Then love,’ she said, ‘may be described generally as the love of the everlasting possession of
the Good?’

‘That is most true.’

‘Then if this be the nature of love, can you tell me further,’ she said, ‘what is the manner of
the pursuit? What are they doing who show all this eagerness and heat which is called love? And
what is the object which they have in view? Answer me.’

‘Nay, Diotima,’ I replied, ‘if I had known, I should not have wondered at your wisdom, neither
should I have come to learn from you about this very matter.’

‘Well,’ she said, ‘I will teach you. The object which they have in view is birth in beauty,
whether of body or soul.’

‘I do not understand you,’ I said; ‘It wants some divination to make out what you mean.’

‘I will make my meaning clearer,’ she replied. ‘I mean to say, that all men are bringing to the
birth in their bodies and in their souls. There is a certain age at which human nature is desirous
of procreation, procreation which must be in beauty and not in ugliness; and this procreation is
the union of man and woman, and is a divine thing; for conception and generation are an
immortal principle in the mortal creature, and in the inharmonious they can never be. But the
ugly is always inharmonious with the divine, and the beautiful, harmonious. Beauty, then, is the
destiny or goddess of parturition who presides at birth, and therefore, when approaching
beauty, the conceiving power is propitious, and diffusive, and benign, and begets and bears
fruit: at the sight of ugliness she frowns and contracts and has a sense of pain, and turns away,
and shrivels up, and not without a pang refrains from conception. And this is the reason why,
when the hour of conception arrives, and the teeming nature is full, there is such a flutter and
ecstasy about beauty whose approach is the alleviation of the pain of travail. For love, Socrates,
is not, as you imagine, the love of the beautiful only.’

‘What then?’

‘The love of generation and of birth in beauty.’

‘Yes,’ I said.

‘Yes, indeed,’ she replied.

‘But why of generation?’

‘Because to the mortal creature, generation is a sort of eternity and immortality,’ she replied;
‘and if, as has been already admitted, love is of the everlasting possession of the Good, all men
will necessarily desire immortality together with goodness: Wherefore Eros is the love of
immortality.’

All this she taught me at various times when she spoke of love. And I remember her once
saying to me, ‘What is the cause, Socrates, of love, and the attendant desire? See you not how
all animals, birds, as well as beasts, in their desire of procreation, are in agony when they take
the infection of love, which begins with the desire of union; whereto is added the care of

94 Fowler 206b.
95 “The argument requires the application of ‘begetting’ and other such terms indifferently to either
sex” (Fowler 206c).
96 Lady of Travail (Fowler 206d); the goddess who eases pain in childbirth.
97 Agreeable or fortunate.
98 Overflowing.
99 Creation.
offspring, on whose behalf the weakest are ready to battle against the strongest even to the uttermost, and to die for them, and will let themselves be tormented with hunger or suffer anything in order to maintain their young. Man may be supposed to act thus from reason; but why should animals have these passionate feelings? Can you tell me why?’

Again I replied that I did not know.

She said to me, ‘And do you expect ever to become a master in the art of love, if you do not know this?’

‘But I have told you already, Diotima, that my ignorance is the reason why I come to you; for I am conscious that I want a teacher; tell me then the cause of this and of the other mysteries of love.’

‘Marvel not,’ she said, ‘if you believe [that love is desire for immortality], as we have several times acknowledged; for here again, and on the same principle too, the mortal nature is seeking as far as is possible to be everlasting and immortal: and this is only to be attained by generation, because generation always leaves behind a new existence in the place of the old. Nay even in the life of the same individual there is succession and not absolute unity; a man is called the same, and yet in the short interval which elapses between youth and age, and in which every animal is said to have life and identity, he is undergoing a perpetual process of loss and reparation, hair, flesh, bones, blood, and the whole body are always changing. Which is true not only of the body, but also of the soul, whose habits, tempers, opinions, desires, pleasures, pains, fears, never remain the same in any one of us, but are always coming and going; and equally true of knowledge, and what is still more surprising to us mortals, not only do the sciences in general spring up and decay, so that in respect of them we are never the same; but each of them individually experiences a like change. For what is implied in the word "recollection," but the departure of knowledge, which is ever being forgotten, and is renewed and preserved by recollection, and appears to be the same although in reality new, according to that law of succession by which all mortal things are preserved, not absolutely the same, but by substitution, the old worn-out mortality leaving another new and similar existence behind, unlike the divine, which is always the same and not another? And in this way, Socrates, the mortal body, or mortal anything, partakes of immortality; but the immortal in another way. Marvel not then at the love which all men have of their offspring; for that universal love and interest is for the sake of immortality.’

I was astonished at her words, and said, ‘Is this really true, O thou wise Diotima?’

And she answered with all the authority of an accomplished sophist: ‘Of that, Socrates, you may be assured; think only of the ambition of men, and you will wonder at the senselessness of their ways, unless you consider how they are stirred by the love of an immortality of fame. They are ready to run all risks greater far than they would have run for their children, and to spend money and undergo any sort of toil, and even to die, for the sake of leaving behind them a name which shall be eternal. Do you imagine that Alcestis would have died to save Admetus, or Achilles to avenge Patroclus, or your own Codrus in order to preserve the kingdom for his sons, if they had not imagined that the memory of their virtues, which still survives among us, would be immortal? Nay,’ she said, ‘I am persuaded that all men do all things, and the better they are the more they do them, in hope of the glorious fame of immortal virtue; for they desire the immortal.

‘Those who are pregnant in the body only, betake themselves to women and beget children; this is the character of their love; their offspring, as they hope, will preserve their memory and giving them the blessedness and immortality which they desire in the future. But souls which are pregnant (for there certainly are men who are more creative in their souls than in their bodies) conceive that which is proper for the soul to conceive or contain. And what are

100 Phaedrus mentioned these two couples in his speech.
101 “A legendary king of Athens who exposed his life because an oracle had said that the Dorian invaders would conquer if they did not slay the Athenian king” (Fowler 208d).
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these conceptions? Wisdom and virtue, in general. And such creators are poets and all artists who are deserving of the name inventor. But the greatest and fairest sort of wisdom by far is that which is concerned with the ordering of states and families, and which is called temperance and justice. And he who in youth has the seed of these implanted in him and is himself inspired, when he comes to maturity desires to beget and generate. He wanders about seeking beauty that he may beget offspring (for in ugliness he will beget nothing) and naturally embraces the beautiful rather than the ugly body; above all when he finds a fair and noble and well-nurtured soul, he embraces the two in one person, and to such an one he is full of speech about virtue and the nature and pursuits of a good man; and he tries to educate him; and at the touch of the beautiful which is ever present to his memory, even when absent, he brings forth that which he had conceived long before, and in company with him tends that which he brings forth; and they are married by a far nearer tie and have a closer friendship than those who beget mortal children, for the children who are their common offspring are fairer and more immortal. Who, when he thinks of Homer and Hesiod and other great poets, would not rather have their children than ordinary human ones? Who would not emulate them in the creation of children such as theirs, which have preserved their memory and given them everlasting glory? Or who would not have such children as Lycurgus left behind him to be the saviours, not only of Lacedaemon, but of Greece, as one may say? There is Solon, too, who is the revered father of Athenian laws; and many others there are in many other places, both among Greeks and barbarians, who have given to the world many noble works, and have been the parents of virtue of every kind; and many temples have been raised in their honour for the sake of children such as theirs; which were never raised in honour of any one, for the sake of his mortal children.

‘These are the lesser mysteries of love, into which even you, Socrates, may enter; to the greater and more hidden ones which are the crown of these, and to which, if you pursue them in a right spirit, they will lead, I know not whether you will be able to attain. But I will do my utmost to inform you, and do you follow if you can. For he who would proceed aright in this matter should begin in youth to visit beautiful forms; and first, if he be guided by his instructor aright, to love one such form only; out of that he should create fair thoughts; and soon he will of himself perceive that the beauty of one form is akin to the beauty of another; and then if beauty of form in general is his pursuit, how foolish would he be not to recognize that the beauty in every form is one and the same! And when he perceives this he will abate his violent love of the one, which he will despise and deem a small thing, and will become a lover of all beautiful forms; in the next stage he will consider that the beauty of the mind is more honourable than the beauty of the outward form. So that if a virtuous soul have but a little comeliness, he will be content to love and tend him, and will search out and bring to the birth thoughts which may improve the young, until he is compelled to contemplate and see the beauty of institutions and laws, and to understand that the beauty of them all is of one family, and that [physical] beauty is a trifle; and after laws and institutions he will go on to the sciences, that he may see their beauty, being not like a servant in love with the beauty of one youth or man or institution, himself a slave mean and narrow-minded, but drawing towards and contemplating the vast sea of beauty, he will create many fair and noble thoughts and notions in boundless love of wisdom; until on that shore he grows and waxes strong, and at last the vision is revealed to him of a single science, which is the science of beauty everywhere. To this I will proceed; please to give me your very best attention.

‘He who has been instructed thus far in the things of love, and who has learned to see the beautiful in due order and succession, when he comes toward the end will suddenly perceive a nature of wondrous beauty (and this, Socrates, is the final cause of all our former toils), a nature which in the first place is everlasting, not growing and decaying, or waxing and waning; secondly, not fair in one point of view and foul in another, or at one time or in one [context] or at one place fair, at another time or in another [context] or at another place foul, as if fair to
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some and foul to others, or in the likeness of a face or hands or any other part of the bodily frame, or in any form of speech or knowledge, or existing in any other being, as for example, in an animal, or in heaven, or in earth, or in any other place; but beauty absolute, separate, simple, and everlasting, which without diminution and without increase, or any change, is imparted to the ever-growing and perishing beauties of all other things. He who from these ascending under the influence of true love, begins to perceive that beauty, is not far from the end. And the true order of going, or being led by another, to the things of love, is to begin from the beauties of earth and mount upwards for the sake of that other beauty, using these as steps only, and from one going on to two, and from two to all fair forms, and from fair forms to fair practices, and from fair practices to fair notions, until from fair notions he arrives at the notion of absolute\textsuperscript{105} beauty, and at last knows what the essence of beauty is. This, my dear Socrates,’ said the woman of Mantinea, ‘is that life above all others which man should live, in the contemplation of beauty absolute; a beauty which if you once beheld, you would see not to be after the measure of gold, and garments, and fair boys and youths, whose presence now entrances you; and you and many a one would be content to live seeing them only and conversing with them without meat or drink, if that were possible; you only want to look at them and to be with them. But what if man had eyes to see the true beauty, the divine beauty, I mean, pure and clear and unalloyed, not clogged with the pollutions of mortality and all the colours and vanities of human life, thither looking, and holding converse with the true beauty simple and divine? Remember how in that communion only, beholding beauty with the eye of the mind, he will be enabled to bring forth, not images of beauty, but realities (for he has hold not of an image but of a reality), and bringing forth and nourishing true virtue to become the friend of God and be immortal, if mortal man may. Would that be an ignoble life?’

“Such, Phaedrus—and I speak not only to you, but to all of you—were the words of Diotima; and I am persuaded of their truth. And being persuaded of them, I try to persuade others, that in the attainment of this end human nature will not easily find a helper better than love. And therefore, also, I say that every man ought to honour him as I myself honour him, and walk in his ways, and exhort others to do the same, and praise the power and spirit of love according to the measure of my ability now and ever.

“The words which I have spoken, you, Phaedrus, may call an encomium of love, or anything else which you please.”

\textsuperscript{105} Or the ideal of Beauty.
When Socrates had done speaking, the company applauded, and Aristophanes was beginning to say something in answer to the allusion which Socrates had made to his own speech, when suddenly there was a great knocking at the door of the house, as of revellers, and the sound of a flute-girl was heard. Agathon told the attendants to go and see who were the intruders.

“If they are friends of ours,” he said, “invite them in, but if not, say that the drinking is over.”

A little while afterwards they heard the voice of Alcibiades resounding in the court; he was in a great state of intoxication, and kept roaring and shouting, “Where is Agathon? Lead me to Agathon,” and at length, supported by the flute-girl and some of his attendants, he found his way to them. “Hail, friends,” he said, appearing at the door crowned with a massive garland of ivy and violets, his head flowing with ribbons. “Will you have a very drunken man as a companion of your revels? Or shall I crown Agathon, which was my intention in coming, and go away? For I was unable to come yesterday, and therefore I am here today, carrying on my head these ribbons, that taking them from my own head, I may crown the head of this fairest and wisest of men, as I may be allowed to call him. Will you laugh at me because I am drunk? Yet I know very well that I am speaking the truth, although you may laugh. But first tell me; if I come in shall we have the understanding of which I? Will you drink with me or not?”

The company were vociferous in begging that he would take his place among them, and Agathon specially invited him. Thereupon he was led in by the people who were with him; and as he was being led, intending to crown Agathon, he took the ribbons from his own head and held them in front of his eyes; he was thus prevented from seeing Socrates, who made way for him,
and Alcibiades took the vacant place between Agathon and Socrates, and in taking the place he embraced Agathon and crowned him.

"Take off his sandals," said Agathon, "and let him make a third on the same couch."

"By all means; but who makes the third partner in our revels?" said Alcibiades, turning round and starting up as he caught sight of Socrates. "By Heracles," he said, "what is this? Here is Socrates always lying in wait for me, and always, as his way is, coming out of all sorts of unsuspected places: and now, what have you to say for yourself, and why are you lying here, where I perceive that you have contrived to find a place, not by a joker or lover of jokes, like Aristophanes, but by the fairest of the company?"

Socrates turned to Agathon and said, "I must ask you to protect me, Agathon; for the passion of this man has grown quite a serious matter to me. Since I became his admirer I have never been allowed to speak to any other fair one, or so much as to look at them. If I do, he goes wild with envy and jealousy, and not only abuses me but can hardly keep his hands off me, and at this moment he may do me some harm. Please to see to this, and either reconcile me to him, or, if he attempts violence, protect me, as I am in bodily fear of his mad and passionate attempts."

"There can never be reconciliation between you and me," said Alcibiades; "but for the present I will defer your chastisement. And I must beg you, Agathon, to give me back some of the ribbons that I may crown the marvellous head of this universal despot; I would not have him complain to me for crowning you, and neglecting him, who in conversation is the conqueror of all mankind; and this not only once, as you were the day before yesterday, but always. Whereupon, taking some of the ribbons." He crowned Socrates, and again reclined. Then he said, "You seem, my friends, to be sober, which is a thing not to be endured; you must drink (for that was the agreement under which I was admitted), and I elect myself master of the feast until you are well drunk. Let us have a large goblet, Agathon, or rather," he said, addressing the attendant, "bring me that wine-cooler." The wine-cooler which had caught his eye was a vessel holding more than two quarts; this he filled and emptied, and bade the attendant fill it again for Socrates. "Observe, my friends," said Alcibiades, "that this ingenious trick of mine will have no effect on Socrates, for he can drink any quantity of wine and not be at all nearer being drunk." Socrates drank the cup which the attendant filled for him.

Eryximachus said, "What is this, Alcibiades? Are we to have neither conversation nor singing over our cups; but simply to drink as if we were thirsty?"

Alcibiades replied, "Hail, worthy son of a most wise and worthy sire!"

"The same to you," said Eryximachus "but what shall we do?"

"That I leave to you," said Alcibiades. "The wise physician, skilled our wounds to heal, shall prescribe, and we will obey. What do you want?"

"Well," said Eryximachus, "before you appeared we had passed a resolution that each one of us in turn should make a speech in praise of Eros, and as good a one as he could. The turn was passed round from left to right; and as all of us have spoken, and you have not spoken but have well drunken, you ought to speak, and then impose upon Socrates any task which you please, and he on his right hand neighbour, and so on."

"That is good, Eryximachus," said Alcibiades, "and yet the comparison of a drunken man’s speech with those of sober men is hardly fair; and I should like to know, sweet friend, whether you really believe what Socrates was just now saying; for I can assure you that the very reverse is the fact, and that if I praise any one but himself in his presence, whether God or man, he will hardly keep his hands off me."

"For shame," said Socrates.

"Hold your tongue," said Alcibiades, "for by Poseidon, there is no one else whom I will praise when you are of the company."

"Well then," said Eryximachus, "if you like praise Socrates."

"What do you think, Eryximachus?" said Alcibiades. "Shall I attack him and inflict the punishment before you all?"
“What are you about?” said Socrates. “Are you going to raise a laugh at my expense? Is that the meaning of your praise?”

“I am going to speak the truth, if you will permit me.”

“I not only permit, but exhort you to speak the truth.”

“Then I will begin at once,” said Alcibiades, “and if I say anything which is not true, you may interrupt me if you will, and say ‘that is a lie,’ though my intention is to speak the truth. [Still, you are not to be surprised if I tell my reminiscences at haphazard; it is anything but easy for a man in my condition to give a fluent and regular enumeration of your oddities].

[ALCIBIADES SPEAKS]

And now, my boys, I shall praise Socrates in a figure which will appear to him to be a caricature, and yet I speak, not to make fun of him, but only for the truth’s sake. I say, that he is exactly like the busts of Silenus, which are set up in the statuaries’ shops, holding pipes and flutes in their mouths; and they are made to open in the middle, and have images of gods inside them. I say also that he is like Marsyas the satyr. You yourself will not deny, Socrates, that your face is like that of a satyr. Aye, and there is a resemblance in other points too. For example, you are a bully, as I can prove by witnesses, if you will not confess. And are you not a flute-player? That you are, and a performer far more wonderful than Marsyas. He indeed with instruments used to charm the souls of men by the power of his breath, and the players of his music do so still, for the melodies of Olympus are derived from Marsyas who taught them, and these, whether they are played by a great master or by a miserable flute-girl, have a power which no others have; they alone possess the soul and reveal the wants of those who have need of gods and mysteries, because they are divine. But you produce the same effect with your words only, and do not require the flute; that is the difference between you and him. When we hear any other speaker, even a very good one, he produces absolutely no effect upon us, or not much, whereas the mere fragments of you and your words, even at second-hand, and however imperfectly repeated, amaze and possess the souls of every man, woman, and child who comes within hearing of them. And if I were not afraid that you would think me hopelessly drunk, I would have sworn as well as spoken to the influence which they have always had and still have over me. For my heart leaps within me more than that of any Corybantian reveller, and my eyes rain tears when I hear them. And I observe that many others are affected in the same manner. I have heard Pericles and other great orators, and I thought that they spoke well, but I never had any similar feeling; my soul was not stirred by them, nor was I angry at the thought of my own slavish state. But this Marsyas has often brought me to such a pass, that I have felt as if I could hardly endure the life which I am leading (this, Socrates, you will admit); and I am conscious that if I did not shut my ears against him, and fly as from the voice of the siren, my fate would be like that of others; he would transfix me, and I should grow old sitting at his feet. For he makes me confess that I ought not to live as I do, neglecting the wants of my own soul, and busying myself with the concerns of the Athenians; therefore I hold my ears and tear myself away from him. And he is the only person who ever made me ashamed, which you might think not to be in my nature, and there is no one else who does the same. For I know that I cannot answer him or say that I ought not to do as he bids, but when I leave his presence the love of popularity gets the better of me. And therefore I run away and fly from him, and when I see him I am ashamed of what I have confessed to him. Many a time have I wished that he were dead, and yet I know that I should be much more sorry than glad, if he were to die, so that I am at my wit’s end.
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And this is what I and many others have suffered from the flute-playing of this satyr. Yet hear me once more while I show you how exact the image is, and how marvellous his power. For let me tell you; none of you know him; but I will reveal him to you; having begun, I must go on. See you how fond he is of the fair? He is always with them and is always being smitten by them, and then again he knows nothing and is ignorant of all things; such is the appearance which he puts on. Is he not like a Silenus in this? To be sure he is; his outer mask is the carved head of the Silenus; but, O my companions in drink, when he is opened, what temperance there is residing within! Know you that beauty and wealth and honour, at which the many wonder, are of no account with him, and are utterly despised by him; he regards not at all the persons who are gifted with them; mankind are nothing to him; all his life is spent in mocking and flouting at them. But when I opened him, and looked within at his serious purpose, I saw in him divine and golden images of such fascinating beauty that I was ready to do in a moment whatever Socrates commanded; they may have escaped the observation of others, but I saw them. Now I fancied that he was seriously enamoured of my beauty, and I thought that I should therefore have a grand opportunity of hearing him tell what he knew, for I had a wonderful opinion of the attractions of my youth. In the prosecution of this design, when I next went to him, I sent away the attendant who usually accompanied me (I will confess the whole truth, and beg you to listen; and if I speak falsely, do you, Socrates, expose the falsehood). Well, he and I were alone together, and I thought that when there was nobody with us, I should hear him speak the language which lovers use to their beloveds when they are by themselves, and I was delighted. Nothing of the sort; he conversed as usual, and spent the day with me and then went away. Afterwards I challenged him to the palaestra,114 and he wrestled and closed with me several times when there was no one present; I fancied that I might succeed in this manner. Not a bit; I made no way with him. Lastly, as I had failed hitherto, I thought that I must take stronger measures and attack him boldly, and, as I had begun, not give him up, but see how matters
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stood between him and me. So I invited him to sup with me, just as if he were a fair youth, and I a designing lover. He was not easily persuaded to come; he did, however, after a while accept the invitation, and when he came the first time, he wanted to go away at once as soon as supper was over, and I had not the face to detain him. The second time, still in pursuance of my design, after we had supped, I went on conversing far into the night, and when he wanted to go away, I pretended that the hour was late and that he had much better remain. So he lay down on the couch next to me, the same on which he had supped, and there was no one but ourselves sleeping in the apartment. All this may be told without shame to any one. But what follows I could hardly tell you if I were sober. Yet as the proverb says, 'In vino veritas,' whether with boys, or without them; and therefore I must speak. Nor, again, should I be justified in concealing the lofty actions of Socrates when I come to praise him. Moreover I have felt the serpent's sting; and he who has suffered, as they say, is willing to tell his fellow-sufferers only, as they alone will be likely to understand him, and will not be extreme in judging the sayings or doings which have been wrung from his agony. For I have been bitten by more than a viper's tooth; I have known in my soul, or in my heart, or in some other part, that worst of pangs, more violent in ingenuous youth than any serpent's tooth, the pang of philosophy, which will make a man say or do anything. And you whom I see around me, Phaedrus and Agathon and Eryximachus and Pausanias and Aristodemus and Aristophanes, all of you, and I need not say Socrates himself, have had experience of the same madness and passion in your longing after wisdom. Therefore listen and excuse my doings then and my sayings now. But let the attendants and other profane and unmannered persons close up the doors of their ears.

When the lamp was put out and the servants had gone away, I thought that I must be plain with him and have no more ambiguity. So I gave him a shake, and I said: 'Socrates, are you asleep?'

'No,' he said.

'Do you know what I am meditating?'

'What are you meditating?' he said.

'I think,' I replied, 'that of all the lovers whom I have ever had you are the only one who is worthy of me, and you appear to be too modest to speak. Now I feel that I should be a fool to refuse you this or any other favour, and therefore I come to lay at your feet all that I have and all that my friends have, in the hope that you will assist me in the way of virtue, which I desire above all things, and in which I believe that you can help me better than any one else. And I should certainly have more reason to be ashamed of what wise men would say if I were to refuse a favour to such as you, than of what the world, who are mostly fools, would say of me if I granted it.'

To these words he replied in the ironical manner which is so characteristic of him, 'Alcibiades, my friend, you have indeed an elevated aim if what you say is true, and if there really is in me any power by which you may become better; truly you must see in me some rare beauty of a kind infinitely higher than any which I see in you. And therefore, if you mean to share with me and to exchange beauty for beauty, you will have greatly the advantage of me; you will gain true beauty in return for appearance, like Diomede, gold in exchange for brass. But look again, sweet friend, and see whether you are not deceived in me. The mind begins to grow critical when the bodily eye fails, and it will be a long time before you get old.'

Hearing this, I said, 'I have told you my purpose, which is quite serious, and do you consider what you think best for you and me.'

---
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'That is good,' he said; 'at some other time then we will consider and act as seems best about this and about other matters.'

Whereupon, I fancied that he was smitten, and that the words which I had uttered like arrows had wounded him, and so without waiting to hear more I got up, and throwing my coat about him crept under his threadbare cloak, as the time of year was winter, and there I lay during the whole night having [this truly spiritual and miraculous creature] in my arms. This again, Socrates, will not be denied by you. And yet, notwithstanding all, he was so superior to my solicitations, so contemptuous and derisive and disdainful of my beauty (which really, as I fancied, had some attractions) hear, O judges; for judges you shall be of the haughty virtue of Socrates; nothing more happened, but in the morning when I awoke (let all the gods and goddesses be my witnesses) I arose as from the couch of a father or an elder brother.

What do you suppose must have been my feelings, after this rejection, at the thought of my own dishonour? And yet I could not help wondering at his natural temperance and self-restraint and manliness. I never imagined that I could have met with a man such as he is in wisdom and endurance. And therefore I could not be angry with him or renounce his company, any more than I could hope to win him. For I well knew that Ajax could not be wounded by steel, much less could Socrates be weakened by money; and my only chance of captivating him by my personal attractions had failed. So I was at my wit’s end; no one was ever more hopelessly enslaved by another.

All this happened before he and I went on the expedition to Potidaea there we messed together, and I had the opportunity of observing his extraordinary power of sustaining fatigue. His endurance was simply marvellous when, being cut off from our supplies, we were compelled to go without food; on such occasions, which often happen in time of war, he was superior not only to me but to everybody; there was no one to be compared to him. Yet at a festival he was the only person who had any real powers of enjoyment; though not willing to drink, he could if compelled beat us all at that, wonderful to relate! No human being had ever seen Socrates drunk; and his powers, if I am not mistaken, will be tested before long. His fortitude in enduring cold was also surprising. There was a severe frost, for the winter in that region is really tremendous, and everybody else either remained indoors, or if they went out had on an amazing quantity of clothes, and were well shod, and had their feet swathed in felt and fleeces: in the midst of this, Socrates with his bare feet on the ice and in his ordinary dress marched better than the other soldiers who had shoes, and they looked daggers at him because he seemed to despise them.

I have told you one tale, and now I must tell you another, which is worth hearing, 'Of the doings and sufferings of the enduring man' while he was on the expedition. One morning he was thinking about something which he could not resolve; he would not give it up, but continued thinking from early dawn until noon; there he stood fixed in thought; and at noon attention was drawn to him, and the rumour ran through the wondering crowd that Socrates had been standing and thinking about something ever since the break of day. At last, in the evening after supper, some Ionians out of curiosity (I should explain that this was not in winter but in summer), brought out their mats and slept in the open air that they might watch him and see whether he would stand all night. There he stood until the following morning; and with the return of light he offered up a prayer to the sun, and went his way. I will also tell, if you please, and indeed I am bound to tell, of his courage in battle; for who but he saved my life? Now this was the engagement in which I received the prize of valour, for I was wounded and he would not leave me, but he rescued me and my arms; and he ought to have received the prize of valour which the generals wanted to confer on me partly on account of my rank, and I told them so,
(this, again, Socrates will not impeach or deny), but he was more eager than the generals that I and not he should have the prize.

There was another occasion on which his behaviour was very remarkable, in the flight of the army after the battle of Delium, where he served among the heavy-armed, I had a better opportunity of seeing him than at Potidaea, for I was myself on horseback, and therefore comparatively out of danger. He and Laches were retreating, for the troops were in flight, and I met them and told them not to be discouraged, and promised to remain with them; and there you might see him, Aristophanes, as you describe, just as he is in the streets of Athens, stalking like a pelican, and rolling his eyes, calmly contemplating enemies as well as friends, and making very intelligible to anybody, even from a distance, that whoever attacked him would be likely to meet with a stout resistance; and in this way he and his companion escaped; for this is the sort of man who is never touched in war; those only are pursued who are running away headlong. I particularly observed how superior he was to Laches in presence of mind. Many are the marvels which I might narrate in praise of Socrates; most of his ways might perhaps be paralleled in another man, but his absolute unlikeness to any human being that is or ever has been is perfectly astonishing. You may imagine Brasidas and others to have been like Achilles; or you may imagine Nestor and Antenor to have been like Pericles; and the same may be said of other famous men, but of this strange being you will never be able to find any likeness, however remote, either among men who now are or who ever have been, other than that which I have already suggested of Silenus and the satyrs; and they represent in a figure not only himself, but his words. For, although I forgot to mention this to you before, his words are like the images of Silenus which open; they are ridiculous when you first hear them; he clothes himself in language that is like the skin of the wanton satyr, for his talk is of pack-asses and smiths and cobblers and curriers, and he is always repeating the same things in the same words, so that any ignorant or inexperienced person might feel disposed to laugh at him; but he who opens the bust and sees what is within will find that they are the only words which have a meaning in
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them, and also the most divine, abounding in fair images of virtue, and of the widest comprehension, or rather extending to the whole duty of a good and honourable man.

This, friends, is my praise of Socrates. I have added my blame of him for his ill-treatment of me; and he has ill-treated not only me, but Charmides the son of Glaucon, and Euthydemus the son of Diocles, and many others in the same way, beginning as their lover he has ended by making them pay their addresses to him. Wherefore I say to you, Agathon, ’Be not deceived by him; learn from me and take warning, and do not be a fool and learn by experience, as the proverb says.’
When Alcibiades had finished, there was a laugh at his outspokenness; for he seemed to be still in love with Socrates.

“You are sober, Alcibiades,” said Socrates, “or you would never have gone so far about to hide the purpose of your satyr’s praises, for all this long story is only an ingenious circumlocution, of which the point comes in by the way at the end; you want to get up a quarrel between me and Agathon, and your notion is that I ought to love you and nobody else, and that you and you only ought to love Agathon. But the plot of this Satyric or Silenic drama has been detected, and you must not allow him, Agathon, to set us at variance.”

“I believe you are right,” said Agathon, “and I am disposed to think that his intention in placing himself between you and me was only to divide us; but he shall gain nothing by that move; for I will go and lie on the couch next to you.”

“Yes, yes,” replied Socrates, “by all means come here and lie on the couch below me.”

“Alas,” said Alcibiades, “how I am fooled by this man; he is determined to get the better of me at every turn. I do beseech you, allow Agathon to lie between us.”

“Certainly not,” said Socrates, “as you praised me, and I in turn ought to praise my neighbour on the right, he will be out of order in praising me again when he ought rather to be praised by me, and I must entreat you to consent to this, and not be jealous, for I have a great desire to praise the youth.”

“Hurrah!” cried Agathon, “I will rise instantly, that I may be praised by Socrates.”

“The usual way,” said Alcibiades, “where Socrates is, no one else has any chance with the [beautiful men]; and now how readily has he invented a specious reason for attracting Agathon to himself.”

Agathon arose in order that he might take his place on the couch by Socrates, when suddenly a band of revellers entered, and spoiled the order of the banquet. Some one who was going out having left the door open, they had found their way in, and made themselves at home; great confusion ensued, and every one was compelled to drink large quantities of wine. Aristodemus said that Eryximachus, Phaedrus, and others went away; he himself fell asleep, and as the nights were long took a good rest; he was awakened towards daybreak by a crowing of cocks, and when he awoke, the others were either asleep, or had gone away; there remained only Socrates, Aristophanes, and Agathon, who were drinking out of a large goblet which they passed round, and Socrates was discoursing to them. Aristodemus was only half awake, and he did not hear the beginning of the discourse; the chief thing which he remembered was Socrates compelling the other two to acknowledge that the genius of comedy was the same with that of tragedy, and that the true artist in tragedy was an artist in comedy also. To this they were constrained to assent, being drowsy, and not quite following the argument. And first of all Aristophanes dropped off, then, when the day was already dawning, Agathon. Socrates, having laid them to sleep, rose to depart; Aristodemus, as his manner was, following him. At the Lyceum he took a bath, and passed the day as usual. In the evening he retired to rest at his own home.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Profession/Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phaedrus</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Aristocrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pausanias</td>
<td>Middle-aged; older than Agathon</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eryximachus</td>
<td>Middle-aged</td>
<td>Physician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristophanes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Comedic playwright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agathon</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Tragic Playwright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socrates</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcibiades</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7 Figure 11 Cosroe Dusi, Alcibiades amongst the hetaerae, 19th c.
Figure 8 Jean-Baptiste Regnault, Socrates dragging Alcibiades from the Embrace of Sensual Pleasure, 1791.
Figure 9 Jean-Léon Gérôme, Socrates seeking Alcibiades in the house of Aspasia, 1861.
Figure 10 Louis-Jean-François Lagrenée, Alcibiades on his Knees Before his Mistress, 1781
Figure 11 Alcibiades (standing) with Socrates (seated left) and Aspasia, depicted in the painting Socrates and Alcibiades at Aspasia by Nicolas-André Monsiau, 1801; in the Pushkin Fine Arts Museum, Moscow.

Figure 12 Antonio Canova, Socrates saves Alcibiades in the Battle of Potidea (1797), Accademia Nazionale di San Luca (Rome)
Figure 16 Pederastic couples at a symposium, as depicted on a tomb fresco from the Greek colony of Paestum in Italy.

Bibliography

Commentaries and Translations:


Plates:

