

SECTION TWO:

PLUTARCH

THE CRITICAL SCHOLAR

INTRODUCTION TWC: OTHER PHILOSOPHIES AND PLUTARCH'S RESPONSE TO THEM

The focus of comparison in this second section will be on those non-Platonic philosophers who discussed philosophical issues similar to those with which Plutarch was concerned in the Amatorius - marriage, sex, women and Eros. The comparison has been based largely on writings within the same period, but with some reference made to earlier and later writers, where it appears that their opinions were shared by, or similar to, those of Plutarch's contemporaries.

The detailed nature of this comparison has been made necessary by the frequent appearance of the label 'eclectic' in regard to Plutarch's philosophy. (See Section One p. 2 and pp. 16 - 17, 20.) Such assessments overlook the fact that other writers and philosophers of Plutarch's era likewise demonstrated in their writings the Hellenistic tendency towards syncretism which continued in the cultural fusion of the Roman Imperial age. What appears to be eclecticism was not regarded as such by those so labelled.

At a first reading there appear to be many similarities between the ideas of Plutarch and certain Stoic writers such as Musonius Rufus, Hierocles, and others, but closer analysis reveals certain essential differences in their attitudes. Hence the need for such a large section devoted to the Stoics in comparison to the attention given to other philosophies such as those of the Epicureans or Peripatetics.

Epicureanism will be discussed after Stoicism, even though there seems to be only three references to Epicureanism in the Amatorius, for it was a

major school in Plutarch's time. Also evidence, to be discussed, suggests that the part of the dialogue missing in the major lacuna included a response to Epicureanism. The issue of whether the Peripatetics had any influence on Plutarch will be covered too and Neopythagoreanism is also explored since its writings seem to have had some influence on the shaping of Plutarch's attitudes on women and marriage.

The question of most usefulness for this exploration seems to be this: did Plutarch merely borrow concepts from other schools or did he use their ideas and favourite illustrations thereof to emphasise his own ideas by way of contrast and comparison? If so, what critical response did he make to other popular philosophies that dealt with these subjects?

Non-Platonic philosophies have been discussed in detail because of these allegations of eclecticism. By dealing with Plutarch's critical responses to other writers, whether it is one of seeking commonality or emphasising differences, it will hopefully be easier to discover where, in Plutarch's defence of Eros, difference becomes originality.

CHAPTER FIVE

PLUTARCH'S RESPONSE TO THE STOICS

The purpose of this chapter will be to examine Plutarch's critical response to Stoic ethics and theology in the Amatorius - the theories of the founders of the Stoa, Zeno and Chrysippus, and also of Plutarch's near contemporaries Seneca and Musonius Rufus and other Stoics, such as Antipater of Tarsus of the Middle Stoa and Hierocles of uncertain date (see later discussion) who wrote about marriage and love. There seem to be no direct references by Plutarch that I have been able to detect to other Middle Stoa writers such as Panaetius and Posidonius.

The major characteristics of the Neo-Stoicism of Plutarch's contemporaries are outlined below. (This sketch is largely derived from Reale 1990, p. 54.)

- 1) Unlike the Old Stoa and possibly because of Roman influence, praxis dominates over theory. Ethics is the major interest of Stoic writers and philosophers in the Imperial era.
- 2) Interest in logics and physics has diminished, but interest in theology, originally a branch of physics in the Hellenistic schema of the sciences, has increased.
- 3) There is a new focus on the personal conscience and the inner self. Self-awareness leads to introspection as reflected in the writings of Seneca, Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius and others.

- 4) The influence of Middle Platonism leads to an interest in the union of God and Man. The moral life becomes prescribed as a means for assimilation to and imitation of God.
- 5) There is an increased development in the "preaching", by writing or lecture, of concepts such as all humanity having a common parent in God, universal brotherhood, love of neighbours, social duties etc.
- 6) Accessibility - the Stoics' praxis led to slaves and freedmen becoming philosophers - Epictetus. (See Aulus Gellius 2. 18. 8-10.) Wisdom, virtue and knowledge were not seen as limited to Greeks, Romans and the upper classes. Women studied philosophy too.

It would appear that Stoics, whether Greek or Roman, along with the "Middle" Platonists, shared a common interest in ethics which is reflected in surviving writings from that period. Many of Seneca's letters seem more like sermons or lectures, and other writers created monologues on ethical issues. Like Plutarch, they had an abiding interest in improvement of self and society.

Plutarch's critical response to the doctrine of the Stoics, in the existing version of the Amatorius, both to their ethics in the first part, and their physics and theology in the second part, a major proportion of this work, seems far greater than his reaction to Epicureanism and other philosophies. This may be an illusion created by the lacunae - since there is no certain way to assess the amount of the text missing in the gaps. Our modern editions were compiled from Byzantine manuscripts in poor condition,¹ and

¹ There are two extant manuscripts, E and B, apparently compiled from earlier manuscripts, collected by Planudes or one of his studio.

it may well be the case that in the original version "equal time" and attention was given to both schools. As the text stands, though, Plutarch's critical response to Stoicism is a major component and, in keeping with the importance of ethical issues to Stoics of his time, a critique of Stoic ethics likewise is a major focus of Plutarch's writing in this work.

Plutarch's treatment of Stoic ethics is interwoven through the text, with many scattered references, the majority of which appear in the first section of the discussion between Daphnaeus and Plutarch on one side and Protogenes and Pusias on the other. It would appear from Plutarch's depiction of their arguments that Protogenes, and his ally Pusias, was either a Stoic or a Stoic "fan", one of those individuals whom Tacitus (Dialogus de oratoribus 31.7) described as being a "Stoicorum comitem", since Protogenes used Stoic methodology to define Love as attaching itself to a young, naturally gifted (male) soul and then "completing" that soul into a state of virtue through the means of friendship (750 D):

"Ἔρως γὰρ εὐφυοῦς καὶ νέας ψυχῆς ἀψάμενος εἰς ἀρετὴν διὰ φιλίας τελευτᾷ".

This appears to be a reference to a doctrine of the early Stoa which Zeno in his Πολιτεία, Chrysippus in Book I of his Περὶ Βίων, and Apollodorus in his Ἠθικὴ wrote about, according to Diogenes Laertius (7. 129), - that the wise man will feel affection for a youth who appears to be naturally gifted with an inclination towards virtue.

"καὶ ἐρασθήσεσθαι δὲ τὸν σοφὸν τῶν νέων τῶν ἐμφαινόντων διὰ τοῦ εἶδους τὴν πρὸς ἀρετὴν εὐφυΐαν."

In Diogenes Laertius (7. 130) friendship is further defined as a motivation towards virtue caused by a non-erotic (in that its goal is φιλία not συνουσία) response to beauty.

"Εἶναι δὲ τὸν ἔρωτα ἐπιβολὴν φιλοποιίας, διὰ κάλλος
ἐμφαινόμενον καὶ μὴ εἶναι συνουσίας, ἀλλὰ φιλίας."

Friendship was apparently seen by the Stoics as both an attraction and a means to virtue, for youthful beauty is the flowering of virtue (7.130): "εἶναι τὴν ὥραν ἄνθος ἀρετῆς". Eros in combination with Philia and innate talent leads to virtue.

By contrast Protogenes described heterosexual relations as a physical need for pleasure (750 D):

"οὕτως ἔνεστι τῇ φύσει τὸ δεῖσθαι τῆς ἀπ' ἀλλήλων ἡδονῆς
γυναικας καὶ ἄνδρας,"

and also (750 D) he denigrated an attraction to women as a mere appetite or desire:

"ταῖς δὲ πρὸς γυναικας ἐπιθυμίαις ταύταις,"

and he states explicitly again in 750 E that the "end" or "aim" (= τέλος) of this type of desire was pleasure and enjoyment:

"τέλος γὰρ ἐπιθυμίας ἡδονὴ καὶ ἀπόλαυσις".

Protogenes associated Eros with masculine friendship and virtue, and hence for him the love of boys is the only genuine Eros (751 A):

"οὕτως εἰς Ἔρωτος γνήσιος ὁ παιδικός ἐστιν,"

But the image he uses to support this argument is one of two predators, the "genuine" eagle, "αἰτόν .. γνήσιον", equalling the *real* Eros, which is contrasted with a lesser species, is one easily parodied by Plutarch (Amatorius 752 A) who through the persona of Daphnaeus takes over the image of Love as a hunter to remind his listeners that predators can be scavengers and sneak thieves, not swooping through the skies but creeping through darkness.

Both in the Amatorius and also in another work - Περὶ τῶν κοινῶν ἐννοιῶν πρὸς τοὺς στωικούς (Common Beliefs Against The Stoics or De communibus notitiis adversus Stoicos in Latin, De. comm. not.), Plutarch criticised this "hunting" which is apparently one of the Stoic definitions of Eros. (1073 B = von Arnim 1. 24E)²

"Θήρα γάρ τις, φασίν, ἐστὶν ὁ ἔρως ἀτελοῦς μὲν εὐφροῦς δὲ μεираκίου πρὸς ἀρετήν."

"For love, they (the Stoics) say, is a certain type of hunting after a promising youth still developing towards virtue."

Plutarch's reply in the De. comm. not., a critique of Stoicism via the "character" Diadumenos, to this concept, was that nothing hinders the pursuit of young men by the "wise" being called θήρα, hunting, or φιλοποιία, friendmaking or friendliness, if this interest from the "wise" is not truly a passionate, emotional state, a πάθος. It is stated that 'love' should rather be called what it is understood to be by most people - something which, to be honest, often involves a desire for physical contact and sex.

Protagoras in the Amatorius; had described this hunt with and for young companions as being one in pursuit of virtue (751 A).

"περὶ θήραν νέων πρὸς ἀρετήν...".

So Plutarch (in the Amatorius 751 C - F) uses Daphnaeus' reply to take the image of Love the hunter and change it. If Love is a hunter then it is also a predator. No noble hunter is this Love of Protagoras but a creeping monster who has grown wings after slinking into the gymnasia (751 F)

² On hunting note 757 D - E where Plutarch may be continuing the hunt motif by making a point of arguing that if there are patron divinities of hunting such as Artemis, Aristaeus, and Apollo, then there should also be a god or daimon for helping those who hunt for philia.

"παραδύς εἰς τὰ γυμνάσια καὶ προσανατριβόμενος ἡσυχῇ καὶ
προσαγκαλιζόμενος, εἶτα κατὰ μικρὸν ἐν ταῖς παλαίστραις
περοφυήσας οὐκέτι καθεκτός ἐστιν,"

and also a bastard child of darkness (751 F)

"... καὶ παρ' ὥραν τῷ βίῳ νόθος καὶ σκότιος ..."

and a pretender to friendship, philosophy and virtue, and a thief by night
(752 A).

"δεῖ δέ τινος εὐπρεπείας ἀπομένῳ καλῶν καὶ ὡραίων. πρόφασις
οὖν φιλία καὶ ἀρετή.

... καὶ φιλοσοφεῖν φησι καὶ σωφρονεῖν ...

εἶτα νύκτωρ καὶ καθ' ἡσυχίαν

' γλυκεῖ ' ὁπώρα φύλακος ἐκλελοιπότης '."

Protagoras' eros is a criminal pretending to be something it is not.

Plutarch does not name this Eros as such here but the image he invokes is one of a jackal or a fox, some kind of nocturnal scavenger - not an eagle. This Eros can be a monster. The image of Eros as a monster also appears in Fragment 136 (= Stobaeus iv. 20. 68) of the Περὶ Ἔρωτος ³. In it, to judge by the surviving excerpts, Plutarch gave many different definitions of Eros, including one of Love as a monster like the Sphinx (Loeb Vol.15, pp. 254 - 7). Eros here is τὸ θηρίον, a wild beast yet a child - παιδίον, who can grow into a monster - τελείῳ κακῷ, with teeth and claws - "ὄνυχες καὶ ὀδόντες", and yet one which is also seductive and attractive like the infamous Sphinx -

"ἀλλ' ἔχει τι πιθανὸν καὶ ἀνθηρόν. ἀμέλει καὶ ἡ Σφιγξ εἶχεν
ἐπαγωγὸν τὸ ποικίλμα τοῦ πτεροῦ,"

³ A work not listed in the "Lamprias" catalogue but preserved in quotations by Stobaeus, who attributed this work to Plutarch.

In the same work (Stobaeus iv. 21. 25. = fr. 138, p. 260) Plutarch is also quoted as having written of Love's dangers that, if Love is like fire, then touching and holding the beautiful is not without danger -

"καὶ τοὺς καλοὺς ὄραν μὲν ἐπιτερπέστατον, ἄψασθαι δὲ καὶ λαβεῖν οὐκ ἀκίνδυνον."

Passion and emotion are not so easily avoided as some philosophers would have us believe, nor can sex, desire and love be as neatly separated as Protogenes would have them so, and Daphnaeus responds by calling on Protogenes to consider this fact as truthful - that "feelings" of desire towards both boys and women are one and the same thing - Eros. Separating epithumia from Eros is not truthful - ἀλήθες, rather it seems to Daphnaeus / Plutarch to be sophistry or folly or even dishonesty (751 F).

"Εἰ μὲν οὖν τᾶληθές σκοποῦμεν. ὦ Πρωτόγενες, ἐν καὶ ταῦτόν ἐστι πρὸς παῖδας καὶ γυναῖκας πάθος τὸ τῶν Ἐρώτων."

Protogenes had no answer for this attack. The course of the argument shifted thence, from a general discussion of Stoic hunting for virtue and love for youths versus heterosexual desire and conjugal love, to a more specific focus and attack on marriage to wealthy wives of higher status by Pusias, which leads to Plutarch's Defence of Ismenodora.

After the lacuna (766 D) Plutarch appears to be in the midst of making a reply to some statement of Zeuxippus' about Epicurean physics. He cites a remark made by one Ariston who may have been a Stoic but also possibly a Peripatetic ⁴ (766 E - F).

⁴ Helmbold (p. 413 note e) cites von Arnim S.V.F. 1, p. 390 as favouring him being a Stoic but Wehrli as regarding this Ariston as Ariston of Ceos, a Peripatetic historian. Flacelière 1987 note 3 p. lix notes there was also Ariston of Alexandria, a Peripatetic.

"τί ἂν κωλύοι γίνεσθαι μὲν ἀπὸ παίδων καὶ ἀπὸ νεανίσκων, γίνεσθαι δ' ἀπὸ παρθένων καὶ γυναικῶν, ὅταν ἦθος ἀγνὸν καὶ κόσμιον ἐν ὥρᾳ καὶ χάριτι μορφῆς διαφανὲς γένηται, καθάπερ ὄρθιον ὑπόδημα δείκνυσι ποδὸς εὐφυΐαν, ὡς Ἄριστων ἔλεγεν."

"Why should not sacred passion⁵ come into being from beholding girls and women as much as boys and young men? whenever a pure and disciplined character manifests itself in a beautiful graceful form, just as a well-made shoe displays a shapely foot as Ariston said."

It is not clear whether Plutarch has borrowed just the image of the shapely foot in a well-made shoe or the whole comparison from Ariston. Perhaps it is best to presume that here the image was borrowed for adornment. As O'Neil observed in a more general context about Plutarch's treatment of other writers (In Betz 1978, p. 291 - an article on De cupiditate divitiarum).

"He criticizes when he disagrees, he borrows when he approves."

When Plutarch does use ideas from other philosophies he plays off one concept against another to reveal new aspects of both and to reveal flaws. Another example of this process in the Amatorius is the discussion of beauty as a flower of virtue (767 B).⁶ It appears to follow a lacuna in which Stoic "signs" of virtue were the subject.⁷

⁵ Note "sacred passion" is a 1 insertion of a phrase in 766 E "καὶ τὰς καλὰς ταῦτας καὶ ἱεράς" to which the quoted passage seems to be referring.

⁶ Helmbold commented (footnote C, p. 415 Loeb edition) on this passage as evidence that Plutarch enjoyed parodying Stoic jargon.

"Καίτοι τήν γ' ὥραν ἄνθος ἀρετῆς εἶναι λέγουσι, μὴ φάναι δ' ἀνθεῖν τὸ θῆλυ μηδὲ ποιεῖν ἔμφασιν εὐφυΐας πρὸς ἀρετὴν ἄτοπόν ἐστι."

"Certainly they say that beauty is the 'flower of virtue,' yet to deny the 'female' makes flowers or 'presents' an inclination towards virtue is absurd. "

Diogenes Laertius 7.130 recorded that the Stoics described beauty as the flower of virtue - "εἶναι δὲ καὶ τὴν ὥραν ἄνθος ἀρετῆς." This is part of an argument like the previous quotation from 766 E which defends the concept that spiritual beauty - the kind that motivates Platonic recollection of the divine realms - can be found in both sexes. Perhaps in the lacuna someone had argued that spiritual beauty could only be found in males?

Plutarch however points out that spiritual beauty is not to be found in males alone. The true philosopher-lover must not be a bigot (767 A) focused on one kind of beauty to the exclusion of other forms.

"ὁ δὲ φιλόκαλος καὶ γενναῖος οὐ πρὸς τὸ καλὸν οὐδὲ τὴν εὐφυΐαν ἀλλὰ μορίων διαφορὰς ποιεῖται τοὺς ἔρωτας."

"The noble lover of beauty loves beauty and talent without having any preferences in regard to physiological differences in form in lovers."

Plutarch seems to have used parody and comparison as a part of the process of criticism to uncover the absurdity of his opponents' arguments.

⁷ See p. 415 Note C again. Helmbold cites Rabinowitz in support of his view of there being a lacuna after "... ἀνδρῶν;"

Plutarch had previously commented on the Stoic commonplace of hunting for virtue and he ties his defence of the feminine to this, allying philosophy with practice (767 A):

"καὶ θηρατικὸς οὐ τοῖς ἀρρεσι χαίρει μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ Κρήσας τρέφει καὶ Λακκαίνας σκύλακας."

"Hunters do not favour male hounds but also rear and use Cretan and Laconian bitches."

The lover of human beauty should be fair to both kinds of beauty.

STOIC THEOLOGY AND EROS

During Plutarch's Apology for Eros which dominates the second part of the Amatorius, Chrysippus is mentioned by name once only - as part of a discussion which contains references to both Stoic and Platonic theology! This is noteworthy, as Plutarch generally throughout the Amatorius avoids using Chrysippus' or Zeno's name, even when referring to doctrines attributed directly to them by other writers on Stoicism.

Chrysippus' description of Ares is cited and used by Plutarch to introduce a change of subject from the defence of Aphrodite and the existence of Eros to a criticism of atheism and the Stoics' belief in gods as being some kind of elementals, psychic forces or emotions personified. He cites Chrysippus' definition of Ares as inviting an identification of "warlike" emotions with the god Ares himself (757 B):

"ὁ δὲ Χρύσιππος ἐξηγούμενος τοῦνομα τοῦ θεοῦ κατηγορίαν ποιεῖ καὶ διαβολήν. Ἀνδρῆν γὰρ εἶναι τὸν Ἄρην φησὶν, ἀρχὰς διδοὺς τοῖς τὸ μαχητικὸν ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ διάφορον καὶ θυμοειδὲς Ἄρην κεκληῖσθαι νομίζουσιν."

It would also appear that Plutarch wanted his audience to be absolutely certain that the 'others' referred to ("ἕτεροι δ' αὖ φήσουσι" 757 B) are indeed the Stoics, by offering the r founders as prime examples of this belief.

Stoic theology can seem contradictory when first studied. It is not consistently theism or exactly pantheism, yet compasses elements of both. Its central themes were summarised by Cicero as four statements (N.D. 2. 3)

"primum docent esse deos, deinde quales sint, tum mundum ab iis administrari, postremo consulere eos rebus humanis."

"To begin with they teach that there are gods, next what gods are, then that the world is governed by them, and finally that they guide human affairs."

That there are gods, "esse deos", seems to be the only consistency in Stoic discussions of theology, for a great many other definitions were offered. On the one hand, some of the Stoics believed in a Monad,⁸

"καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Στοᾶς ἐν πλῆθος οὐκ ὄκνουσιν καλεῖν."

Others called the One Zeus or saw divinity as one power with many forms - a kind of all-pervading pneuma or mana or chi (D. L. 7. 147) immanent within humans and matter

"καὶ τὸ μέρος αὐτοῦ τὸ διήκον διὰ πάντων".

On this belief Plutarch commented elsewhere (De Iside et Osiride 376 C) that Stoic theology ("... τῶν Στωικῶν θεολογουμένοις") described

⁸ von Arnim 1960 Vol. 2, 490 cites Syrianus in Aristot. *Metaphys.*
- Aristot. *Acad.* 5. 991 a 28

Dionysus as a spirit of fostering and generation ("γόνιμον πνεῦμα καὶ τροφίμον") and Demeter and Korē as pervading ("διήκον") the earth, just as Poseidon does the sea. Many Stoics seem to have perceived divine forces as moving through reality, like air through the sky or breath through the lungs, essential yet unseen elements.

Diogenes Laertius cited Zeno (7. 148) as having taught that God's being was the whole world and heaven

"οὐσίαν δὲ θεοῦ Ζήνων μὲν φησι τὸν ὅλον κόσμον καὶ τὸν οὐρανόν"

and Cicero cited Cleanthes as also stating that God was the world (N. D. 1. 14. 37) "Cleanthes ipsum mundum deum dicit esse" but cites Zeno and the majority of Stoics as believing that god was the aether (Academica 2. 41. 126)

"Zenoni et reliquis fere Stoicis aether videtur summus deus."

The Stoics also apparently believed in individual gods as well as one immanent deity but more as forces personified by human perception than as superhuman personalities. Aetius⁹ classified the Stoic pantheon into classes, first of planetary powers, stars and planets together, then father sky and mother earth, next Hindrances and Benefits - τὸ βλάπτον and τὸ ὠφελοῦν into which categories are placed the goddess of Vengeance and the Furies and Ares as Harms, then, as Beneficial - Zeus, Hera, Hermes, Demeter, and then finally "τοῖς πράγμασι καὶ τοῖς πάθεσι," the Powers and Passions with the Passions being Eros, Aphrodite and Pothos, Desire or Yearning, and the Powers, Hope, Justice and Good Order.

⁹ Aetius in Plac. 1.6. Πόθεν Θεῶν ἔννοιαν ἔλαβον ἄνθρωποι, once attributed to Plutarch.

Directly after a reference to Ares (757 B) Plutarch began to discuss, then criticize those others who said that the gods were mere personifications.

"τὴν Ἀφροδίτην ἐπιθυμίαν εἶναι καὶ τὸν Ἑρμῆν λόγον καὶ τέχνας τὰς Μούσας καὶ φρόνησιν τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν."

"Aphrodite (is) desire and Hermes rational thought or eloquence, and the Muses the arts and Athena practical wisdom or prudence."

Plutarch being a priest and initiate, as well as a philosopher, refuted this, stating that such beliefs went against traditional religion, and were incompatible with the traditional beliefs of their ancestors, unlike his beloved Platonism. At the beginning of his reply to Pemptides he stated (756 B):

"ἄρκει γὰρ ἡ πάτριος καὶ παλαιὰ πίστις, ...
ἀλλ' ἔδρα τις αὐτῆ καὶ βάσις ὑφεστῶσα κοινὴ πρὸς
εὐσέβειαν,"

"For it is enough, the ancient beliefs of our forefathers ... but it is a common seat and foundation underlying our reverence (for the gods)"

Plutarch was defending Eros and the other gods against what he called (757 C) ἀθεότητος" - ungodliness. He did this by reversing the Stoic argument and pointing out that if Ares is a god rather than just an emotion then likewise Eros is a god too! (757 C).

"τὸ μὲν μαχητικόν, ... πολεμικόν καὶ ἀντίπαλον θεὸν ἔχει, τὸ δὲ φιλητικόν καὶ κοινωνικόν καὶ συνελευστικόν ἄθεόν ἐστι: "

"What is warlike, ... hostile and antagonistic has a god while that which urges affection and joining and being sociable has no god?"

This is but one part of a defence of Eros which Plutarch supported by historical examples and digressions into Platonic doctrine. In summary Plutarch goes on to describe Eros' effects on humans as proof of his divine

power. He also states (763 C) that there are perhaps three sources for belief

-

"τὰ μὲν μύθῳ τὰ δὲ νόμῳ τὰ δὲ λόγῳ πίστιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἔσχηκε."

"Myth, Law and Reason", and described a second triad of their agents -

"ἡγεμόνες καὶ διδάσκαλοι γεγόνασιν ἡμῖν οἳ τε ποιηταὶ καὶ οἱ νομοθέται καὶ τρίτον οἱ φιλόσοφοι,"

"the poets, lawgivers and the philosophers who have been guides and teachers for us".

Plutarch furthermore claimed that poets, philosophers and lawgivers all believed that there were gods, even if they varied in their definitions of the divine and of the number, ranks, nature and function of the gods (763 C):

"τὸ μὲν εἶναι θεοὺς ὁμοίως τιθέμενοι. πλήθους δὲ πέρι καὶ τάξεως αὐτῶν οὐσίας τε καὶ δυνάμεως μεγάλα διαφερόμενοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους."

He then goes on to mention the Stoics in an indirect manner, which confirms for us something of their theology in his choice of terms, though he was probably referring to both the Pythagoreans and Stoics here (763 D)¹⁰

"... φιλοσόφων ἰδέας τινὰς καὶ ἀριθμοὺς μονάδας τε καὶ πνεύματα θεοὺς ποιουμένων,"

"the philosophers make gods of 'certain' concepts and numbers, monads and spirits."

Plutarch states in conclusion that despite other differences in opinions, all three factions,¹¹ philosophers, legislators and poets, as represented by the

¹⁰ See Helmbold p. 393 Note e.

(See discussion in Neopythagoreanism chapter in this section also) "Ideas" is a Platonic concept. The "Numbers" and "Monads" seem to be a reference to Pythagoreanism, or its "Platonized" form, and that the "Pneumata" are the Stoic "gods" seems probable..

¹¹ Perhaps also there is a pun here on the three major schools or groupings of philosophers of Plutarch's time, the Stoics, Epicureans and Platonists?

examples of Plato, Solon and Hesiod, agree about the status of Love as a god (763 E - F).

"... περὶ ἑνὸς βεβαίως ὁμογνωμονοῦσι καὶ κοινῇ τὸν Ἔρωτα συνεγγράφουσιν εἰς θεοὺς "

MUSONIUS RUFUS - USING THE NEW AGAINST THE OLD

Plutarch further exposed the double standards of Protogenes and Picias by using the writings of another Stoic against them - the teachings of his eminent contemporary in the field of ethical philosophy - the Roman Musonius Rufus. Picias had supported Protogenes' condemnation of sexual love for women and focused his attack on Ismenodora's wealth and status, depicting it as something that the youth Bacchon had to be on guard against (752 E).

"ὅτι τῆς γυναικὸς ὁ πλοῦτός ἐστι φυλακτέος τῷ νεανίσκῳ."

Plutarch responded to this attack on Ismenodora by noting how Picias and Protogenes focused on what could be regarded as positive characteristics. Plutarch started his defence with a string of questions (753 D) which are not immediately answered (depending on whether or not there is a lacuna after καὶ ἔνδοξος) but are used to list the charges against Ismenodora. She loves Bacchon and is wealthy, so wealthy that her lifestyle and herself are described as being (753 C) "βαρεῖα γὰρ καὶ πλουσία" - one of grandeur and opulence. She is still young and beautiful (*ibid.*) - "καλὴ καὶ νέα" and has a distinguished family background (*loc. cit.*) "γένει σοβαρὰ καὶ ἔνδοξος".

Plutarch then cites a list of examples of women whose behaviour differed considerably from Ismenodora's. He described women who were slaves,

Hellenic and barbarian, concubines, prostitutes and professional entertainers - all social inferiors to the masters they had enslaved through desire (753 D - F). The ironic contrast here is one of "bad" women of inferior social rank to weak men of superior status who have allowed themselves to lose their masculine authority. It is notable that Plutarch emphasized the difference between the sexes here as being one of both rank and virtue. After this historical digression (754 A - B) he summarized his defence with an observation which is so similar to one of Musonius Rufus' tenets that Plutarch's phraseology appears to be structured and designed to remind the reader of Musonius' style and writings.

"πλοῦτον δὲ γυναικὸς αἰρεῖσθαι μὲν πρὸ ἀρετῆς ἢ γένους ἀφιλότιμον καὶ ἀνελεύθερον. ἀρετῇ δὲ καὶ γένει προσόντα φεύγειν ἀβέλτερον."

"Choosing a woman for wealth rather than for virtue or family background is ignoble and vulgar but if virtue and good breeding are added to wealth to snub her would be foolish."

Wealth should not be a major concern or objection for a Stoic when selecting a partner but rather the presence of virtue or the potential for its development.

In Musonius Rufus Fragment 13 B (Lutz 1947, pp. 90 - 91) there is the following statement about marriage from a Stoic viewpoint (ll. 4 - 6).

"διὸ χρὴ τοὺς γαμοῦντας οὐκ εἰς γένος ἀφορᾶν εἰ ἐξ εὐπατριδῶν, οὐδ' εἰς χρήματα εἰ πολλὰ κέκτηνται τινες, οὐδ' εἰς σώματα εἰ καλὰ ἔχουσιν."

"Those who plan to marry (cf either sex) ought not give regard to the family background (to see) if it is aristocratic, nor to the dowry if the family is wealthy, nor to the physical beauty of the prospective partner."

Family wealth and beauty should not be important for a Stoic. What should matter the most, as a physical condition, is good health and strength, and of prime, or greater importance, are the characteristics of the soul of the partner to be, whether they have self control, modesty, justice, and a natural disposition towards virtue (ll. 12 - 13).

"ψυχὰς δὲ ἐπιτηδαιοτάτας εἶναι νομιστέον τὰς πρὸς σωφροσύνην καὶ δικαιοσύνην καὶ ὅλως πρὸς ἀρετὴν εὐφροσύνης."

Εὐφροσύνη - the quality sought by earlier Stoic writers in young men - must be present in both sexes. Musonius Rufus stated that it should be present in both partners so that there would be (ll. 13 - 16) 'sympathy'. (Although perhaps 'empathy' is a better translation of ὁμόνοια.)

"ποῖος μὲν γὰρ γάμος χωρὶς ὁμονοίας καλός; ποία δὲ κοινωνία χρηστή; πῶς δ' ἂν ὁμοιοῦσιν ἄνθρωποι πονηροὶ ὄντες ἀλλήλοις; ἢ πῶς ἀγαθὸς πονηρῷ ὁμοιοῦσιν ἂν:"

Musonius Rufus seems to have perceived marriage as a partnership in virtue for producing companionship and children, for Fr. 13A: Τὶ Κεφάλαιον has as a subtitle these words:

"βίου καὶ γενέσεως παίδων κοινωνίαν κεφάλαιον εἶναι γάμου"
 "the purpose of marriage is sharing life and the production of children".

For Plutarch however *κοινωνία* is linked to Eros as well - he criticises Protogenes' claim that paederastic friendships were not "sexual" with Daphnaeus' response (752 B).

"πῶς Ἔρως ἔστιν Ἀφροδίτης μὴ παρούσης. ἦν εἴληχε
θεραπεύειν ἐκ θεῶν καὶ περιέπειν. τιμῆς τε μετέχειν καὶ
δυνάμεως ὅσον ἐκείνη δίδουσι . ."

"How can Eros be there if Aphrodite is not also present, being one appointed from amongst the gods to serve and attend her and of her honours and powers sharing whatever she grants?"

Protogenes and Pisisas had tried to separate Eros from Aphrodite so Plutarch emphasized the association, for one Stoic at least did see a connection between the two deities. In Fr. 14 (Lutz p 94) Τί ἐμπόδιον τῷ φιλοσοφεῖν γάμος - Musonius describes and links the roles of Eros, Aphrodite and Hera, as gods who watch over marriage (ll. 20 ff.)

"Ὅτι δὲ μέγα καὶ ἀξιοσπουδάστον ὁ γάμος ἐστί, καὶ ταύτη
δῆλον θεοὶ γὰρ ἐπιτροπεύουσιν αὐτόν. καθὸ νομίζονται
παρ' ἀνθρώποις, μεγάλοι. πρώτη μὲν Ἥρα, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο
ζυγίαν αὐτὴν προσαγορεύομεν. εἶτα Ἔρως, εἶτα Ἀφροδίτη."

Musonius always uses the term *φιλία* and this passage is the only one that mentions Eros at all. Plutarch, however, describes Eros' role differently from Musonius' depiction of a guardian power. For him Eros is a guide aiding married lovers who truly love one another to achieve, not only a partnership in virtue through sympathy, but a special kind of unity only Eros can create, for Eros brings not only partnership but also unity (769 F):

"ἐνότητα ... ὅταν Ἔρως ποιῆ γαμικῆς κοινωνίας ἐπιλαβόμενος."

It would appear that Plutarch, throughout the section (Ch. 4 750 C - 754 E) where he defends Ismenodora, is using one "true" Stoic to refute a mere philosophizer, Protogenes, and his ally, Pisiias. He goes on to add a twist of irony and humour to the thread of his counter-argument with a reference to child-bearing (754 B - C)

"Καὶ μὴν ἡλικία γε πρὸς γάμον καὶ ὥρα τὸ τίκτειν ἔχουσα καὶ τὸ γεννᾶν εὐάρμοστός ἐστιν. ἀκμάζειν δὲ τὴν γυναῖκα πυνθάνομαι. καὶ ἅμα τῷ Πεισίᾳ προσμειδιάσας, οὐδενὸς γάρ, ἔφη, τῶν ἀντεραστιῶν πρεσβυτέρα. οὐδ' ἔχει πολιᾶς."

Again Plutarch has made an iron c comparison. Ismenodora like Bacchon is still young, no older, and perhaps even far younger, than some of Bacchon's gray-haired suitors.

Marriage may have been one of Musonius Rufus' favourite topics if the selection of quotations preserved by Stobaeus is a balanced portrait and does not merely reflect Stobaeus own interests. In Fr. 3 he described the ideal life mate for a Stoic as an educated, female, philosophy student who will be a good helpmate (Lutz p. 40, ll. 25 - 8 N.B. The combination of initial optative verb and ironic use of negatives ἄν εἴη)

"δικαία δ' οὐκ ἄν εἴη γυνὴ φιλοσοφοῦσα, οὐδ' ἄμεμπτος βίου κοινωνός, οὐδ' ὁμονοίας ἀγαθῆ συνεργός, οὐδ' ἀνδρός γε καὶ τέκνων ἐπιμελῆς κηδεμών . . . ;"

The ideal Stoic wife would be a heroine for Musonius mentions courage as also a necessary virtue in women. In Fr. 3 (Lutz p. 40) ll. 33 - 4 he stated a female philosopher would be braver than ordinary women

"certainly it is to be expected that the educated woman who has studied philosophy will be more courageous than the uneducated lay woman."

"καὶ μὴν καὶ ἀνδρειότεραν εἶναι προσήκει γυναῖκα τῆς ἀπαιδεύτου τὴν πεπαιδευμένην καὶ τὴν φιλόσοφον τῆς ἰδιώτιδος."

and in Fr. 4, ll. 31 - 33 (Lutz p. 44) he asks why should women not need courage and cites the Amazons (l. 33) as a positive example.

"πῶς οὖν οὐκ ἂν ἀνδρείας αἱ γυναῖκες δέοιντο; ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἀλκῆς τῆς δι' ὀπλων μέτεστιν αὐταῖς, ἐδήλωσε τὸ Ἀμαζόνων γένος ἔθνη πολλὰ δι' ὀπλων καταστρεψάμενον."

It is noteworthy how Plutarch seems to have responded to and made use of the teachings of the oldest and of the most recent, of his Academy's Stoic opponents - Chrysippus and Zeno, on the one hand and Musonius, on the other, in defence of Ismenodora. While Protogenes contrasted "spiritual Eros" between men to physical desire between the sexes, Plutarch emphasized and discussed the gap between theory and practice, the ideal of masculine friendship and the realities of physical desire and sexual relationships.

Both Protogenes and Pisiae had denied any connection between women and Eros. Protogenes stated that Eros has no real share in the women's rooms (750 C):

"ἀληθινοῦ δ' Ἔρωτος οὐδ' ὅτι οὖν τῇ γυναικωνίπιδι μέτεστιν."

Pisiae goes further (752 B - C) with an image drawn from canine intercourse emphasizing the physicality of sex in a very negative way and ending his attack by stating that "chaste" women could never love or be loved with

propriety. "Proper" (σώφρονες) women should not be capable of Eros (752 C).

"ἐπεὶ ταῖς γε σώφροσιν οἷτ' ἐρᾶν οὔτ' ἐράσθαι δήπου
προσηκόν ἐστιν."

Daphnaeus' defence of conjugal love as natural (751 D) "ἔρωτα τῇ φύσει χρώμενον" only provoked P'isias to sally forth into the battle of words with heavier charges which Plutarch steps in to deflect. He attacked what he considered to be the false distinction between male love and heterosexual relations and the concept that women could or should not invoke passion. Since Protogenes based his argument on certain doctrines of the Old Stoa, and P'isias attacked the ethics of the current situation, Plutarch chose by way of contrast to use against them the teachings of a contemporary Stoic noted for his focus on ethics.

P'isias attacked Ismenodora's wealth and status and implied her character was domineering (752 E)

"ταύτην δ' ὀρώμεν ἄρχειν καὶ κρατεῖν δοκοῦσαν."

and that hence she was unfit as a bride. Plutarch throws this severity of judgement right back at him. He points out that Ismenodora had all the necessary characteristics - good breeding, wealth, excellent character and a beautiful healthy body fit for childbearing for the ideal wife.

In Fr. 3 (Lutz p. 40) Musonius had stated that the necessary qualities for a woman to lead a good life were (ll. 8 - 10)

"...τῶν προσηκόντων γυναικὶ τῇ ἐσομένῃ ἀγαθῇ"

and these could be gained through philosophy

"ἀπὸ φιλοσοφίας ... ἅν αἰτῇ περιγινόμενον."

The qualities listed are first household management (l. 10 οἰκονομική), being the control and management of slaves and accounts, and second (l. 17 σώφρον), perhaps here best translated as self control rather than chastity or modesty, given its coupling with "economics". Musonius' definition states that the woman would not be a slave to pleasure, vanity or desire. His third desirable quality is justice (l. 25 δικαία), and his fourth is (l.33) courage. Again in Fr. 13 B Musonius Rufus lists the qualities of a good partner (Lutz p. 90) and gives for those of the female partner (some of these also apply to the male) the physical qualities of having a healthy "normal" body, capable of hard work and childbearing, and for the soul (ll. 12 - 14).

"... πρὸς σώφροσύνην καὶ δικαιοσύνην καὶ ὅλως πρὸς ἀρετὴν εὐφροσύνης."

Justice, self control and an inclination to virtue are qualities that Ismenodora has already been depicted as possessing in the introductory narrative (749 D)

"Ἰσμηνοδώρα γυνὴ πλούτῳ καὶ γένει λαμπρὰ καὶ νῆ Δία τὸν ἄλλον εὐτακτος βίον."

Every virtue a Stoic could ask for is included in the description of Ismenodora's character. Furthermore in the narrative-interlude, we discover that she is also a skilled commander who had organized her friends, male and female, to carry off Bacchus (754 E)

"τῶν οὖν φίλων τοὺς μάλιστα τοῖς βίοις νεαροὺς καὶ συνερῶντας αὐτῇ καὶ τῶν γυναικῶν τὰς συνήθεις μεταπεμψαμένη καὶ συγκροτήσασα παρεφύλαττε τὴν ὥραν."

Plutarch's final summary of Ismenodora's character comes through Anthemion's lips (755 D - E)

"ἐπεὶ τί κοσμιώτερον Ἰσμηνοδώρας ἐν τῇ πόλει: πότε

δ' εἰσηλθεν ἢ λόγος αἰσχρὸς ἢ πράξεως ὑπόνοια φαύλης ἔθιγε τῆς οἰκίας..."

"Since when has anyone had more 'orderly' behaviour than Ismenodora in this city? And when did any ugly rumour enter her house or shameful gossip touch it at all?"

Her character is portrayed as being beyond reproach. She is indeed a philosopher's ideal heroine, for she has nobility of character - the very thing which Musonius Rufus had stated to be the essence and product of philosophical training in one of his works, Fr. 4 (Lutz p. 48).

"ἐπειδὴ καὶ φιλοσοφία καλοκάγαθίας ἐστὶν ἐπιτήδευσις καὶ οὐδὲν ἕτερον."

There remains the possible objection that Plutarch does not mention Musonius Rufus by name, but neither does he name Chrysippus save once, nor Zeno at all, as a source even when seemingly responding to their doctrines. This appears to be a deliberate choice on his part, for Chrysippus' writings seem to have been a primary source for the Stoics of his time. If the texts were standard references for beginners, detailed reference would have seemed pointless to Plutarch for what were to him, well-known works. (See Hershbell 1992, pp. 3336 - 52 for a discussion and review of Plutarch's knowledge of the Stoics.) Given the portrait he creates of Ismenodora's excellence of character, and its similarities to Musonius Rufus' description of the ideal Stoic wife, surely Musonius' updating of Stoic ethics is being referred to as a defence against Protogenes' and Pisisias' misogyny? Plutarch has reversed Pisisias' misogynistic arguments with a weapon built of Stoic arguments themselves and in doing so revealed the flaws in both sets of arguments.

But why the importance given to the Stoics over the Epicureans or Peripatetics or Cynics (bearing in mind of course the problem of the lacunae)? Two possible reasons were suggested by Van Geytenbeek (1963, p. 57).

"On the whole it might seem improbable that in Stoic ethics women should have been highly estimated, and this for two reasons: first, because in Stoic theories everything that is smaller and weaker was called "feminine"; second, because the Stoic doctrine of apathy was hostile to the rich emotional life of women."

He was commenting on Musonius' innovative statements about the equality of women compared to the writings of other Stoics like Seneca who regarded women's particular virtue as being *pudicitia* (Hier. adv. Jov. 320 A = fr.xiii 79 Haase) "mulieris proprie virtus pudicitia est "

Certainly Seneca's view of women in general does not seem to show the same respect he does towards close, female relatives in his letters of consolation, for while Seneca wrote to one female relative, Helvia, in the De consolatione 17.4., encouraging her to resume her studies -"Nunc ad illas revertere:", he also described uneducated, non-Stoic women as being like ignorant brutes without Stoic discipline, in the De constantia sapientis (also known as the Nec iniuriam nec contumeliam accipere sapientem Ch. 14. 1)

"Aequè imprudens animal est et, nisi scientia accessit ac multa eruditio, ferum, cupiditatum incontinens."

Musonius may have been the "exception that proves the rule", for his ideas seem to confirm, by way of contrast, the general bias against women of other writers, particularly those moralists who only stressed childraising as a virtue for women. However, though Musonius was a radical in this area

of ethics, in regard to the divinity of Eros, this god was defined by him as an external guardian or a divine overseer and other Stoics seem to have equated Eros as an emotion with desire - ἐπιθυμία - a mere pathos and hence not a positive advantage. Perhaps Musonius' radicalism is due to Cynic influence.

Dudley (1967, p. 99) has commented that

"Cynicism was, therefore, introduced into the Stoic system by its founder, and a Cynic element formed a left wing - the ἀνδρωδεστάτη Στωική - in the school throughout its history."

Diogenes Laertius recorded (6. 11 - 12) that Antisthenes had taught that a wise man would marry and have children with women possessing to the maximum the quality of εὐφυΐα

"γαμήσειν τε τεκνοποιῆα χάριν, ταῖς εὐφυεστάταις συνιόντα γυναίξι."

and also that virtue was the same thing for both sexes.

"ἀνδρὸς καὶ γυναικὸς ἡ αὐτὴ ἀρετή."

However whatever the source of his radicalism was it would appear that possibly Musonius, more so than Seneca, both practised and taught "facere docet philosophia, non dicere."

ANTIPATER ON MARRIAGE

Another Stoic who wrote on the topic of women and marriage was Antipater of Tarsus, a scholar of the Middle Stoa ¹². Plutarch may have read and written in response to some of his works or the one of which Stobaeus has preserved two fragments dealing with love and marriage. ¹³

¹² Probably during the second century B. C.

¹³ von Arnim pp. 254, 57 vol. 3.

Fr.62 (= Stob. fl. lxx.13) of Antipater's Περὶ γυναικὸς συμβιώσεως advises against rushing into a courtship for the sake of wealth (πλοῦτον) or becoming part of an illustrious family (εὐγένεια) or the beauty (κάλλος) of the bride. Rather Antipater states that the first consideration should be to investigate the character (ἦθος) of the parents - both of them, the father first and then the mother, and not only their characters or personalities but their whole way and style of living. The would-be suitor is advised to inquire into whether the father is civic-minded (πολιτικός), just (δίκαιος), temperate and moderate (σώφρων) and likewise the mother, and to check if the daughter shares the best aspects of her parents' characters and is not a spoilt brat. Antipater even suggests and recommends that inquiries should be made amongst their friends, relatives, dependants, servants, free and slave, regular household visitors, be they close friends of the family or hired workers, indeed the whole neighbourhood should be checked to find out just what the family's reputation is!

Plutarch also emphasized and described Ismenodora's local reputation. He had begun by describing Ismenodora as being wealthy and wellborn (749 D)

"γυνὴ πλούτῳ καὶ γένει λαμπρὸν καὶ νῆ Δία τὸν ἄλλον
εὐτακτὸς βίον."

and leading an orderly life. She is a widow of blameless reputation (749 D "ἄνευ ψόγου,") despite still being young and attractive ("οὐσα νέα καὶ ἱκανὴ τὸ εἶδος"). If there existed some kind of genre of Stoic marriage

These fragments perhaps were part of a marriage advice manual. One wonders if there may have existed an anthology of Stoics' ethical essays or of general philosophical writings on Love and Marriage that Stobaeus used to compile his own work.

manual Plutarch's target may possibly be the paragons of virtue presented as ideal wives in these manuals who are apparently allowed none of the foibles of real persons.

Ismenodora is again criticised for her wealth and status in 752 E by Pisisas who refers to her "πλοῦτος", and to her household as being characterised by "ὄγκω καὶ βάρει" and he alleges that Bacchon will end up being dominated and overwhelmed by Ismenodora's superior status. Antipater also warned against marrying aristocratic women without checking their character first lest they (Fr. 62) "ὄγκον καὶ δεσποτικὸν ἦθος" and in Fr. 63 (Arnim p. 256 = Stob. flor. eg. LXVII 25 περὶ γάμου) Antipater seems to make a pun by reversing the Stoic concept of hunting for beauty. If men can be hunted or caught by beauty - "ὑπὸ τοῦ κάλλους τεθηρευμένους," they may end up with women who are useless and self-indulgent. However, Antipater does also remark here that the man who chooses the right wife will find that she is the sweetest and lightest "burden" -

"... τῶν ἡδίστων καὶ κουφότατον εἶναι βάρος γαμετῆ γυνῆ
δόξειε."

Likewise Plutarch uses weight as a metaphor in Amatorius 754 B but to refer to the husband's rather than the wife's character, being that which balances the scales of power in a relationship between seeming unequal partners

"ὥσπερ ἐπὶ ζυγοῦ ροπήν τῷ ἦθει προστιθέντα καὶ βάρος"

and he also refers (754 D) to Ismenodora not only being useful to Bacchon but also sweet - "ἡδεῖα" and affectionate towards him.

Another image which Plutarch uses (769 F) ¹⁴ which seems to have been used by other Stoics as well, is the wine and water image. Antipater

¹⁴ Helmbold note c p. 431 see also Mor. 142 F.
Note Flacelière's comment 1987 p. cxlix.

refers to the mixing of husband and wife as being like that of water and wine
- one that produces a mutual amalgamation of the whole (Fr. 63 p. 255)

"... δι' ὅλων κράσειν, ὡς οἶνος ὕδατι καὶ τοῦτο ἐπιμένων
μίσγεται δι' ὅλων"

so that when a couple share affection and children, both spiritually and
physically their relationship becomes fellowship.

"... καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν σωμάτων οὗτοι μόνοι
κοινωνοῦσι."

For Plutarch the union of husband and wife is a fusion not a mere
mixing. Protagoras (Amatorius Ch. 7 752 E) refers to wine mixed with water
as being lessened in quality. Later in the Amatorius (769 A) Plutarch
comments on the physical union of man and wife as being a sharing of
mysteries "ἱερῶν μεγάλων κοινωνήματα", that is not only the beginning of
a fellowship, but of friendship as well. While Plutarch agrees with the Stoics
that (769 F) the process is like the "ἡ δι' ὅλων ... κράσις", and that
married couples living together do blend their lives like liquids mixing, he
adds that the end-result is not a lessening of either partner but a unity -
"ἐνότητα" and after a while, a stability (769 F)

"εἶτα χρόνῳ καταστάς καὶ καθαιρεθεὶς τὴν βεβαιοτάτην
διάθεσιν παρέσχευ."

that will have been caused by *Eros* not just "ethos".

"L'union integrale est une expression typiquement stoïcienne".

Russell 1993 p. 381 comments that what he translates as
'total integration' is 'a phrase used especially in Stoic physics of the
complete interpenetration of two substances.'

HIEROCLES

Another Stoic who wrote on marriage amongst other subjects was Hierocles. There is a problem of dating and identity with Hierocles, as there appear to have been two philosophers who bore this name.¹⁵

Like Musonius and Epictetus, Hierocles (Περὶ γάμου p. 502 Stobaeus vol. 4) used *κοινωνία* to describe marriage and wrote of it as a benefit (*σύμφορον*) and referred to husbands and wives as being "united by destiny" (*συγκαθειμαρμένων*) (Guthrie 1987, p. 282) which suggests a belief in Stoic providence, as this is a term used by other Stoic writers. Like Antipater and Musonius he also discussed the importance of a careful choice of marriage partners and of making inquiries into the character and training of the bride and her parents so that the husband does not bring a tyrant home instead of a woman - this phrase is very like Antipater! "τύραννον ἀντὶ γυναικὸς." Also in a manner similar to Musonius, he referred to marriage and children as being a civic duty (*καθήκον*) - one of a wise man's obligations to society as a greater whole and in his ἡ οἰκονομική to the sharing of household responsibilities, resulting in a strengthening of the bonds in a relationship of man and wife, so that the sharing and dignity of labour becomes more important than the division.

¹⁵ One was a Neoplatonist of the 5th c. A. D. , the other a Stoic. See Aulus Gellius Attic Nights 9. 5. 8 "Hierocles Stoicus, vir sanctus et gravis". On this Stoic Hierocles see Inwood (in Annas 1984, p. 151) who thinks he was probably Hadrianic. On the differences between the two Hierocles see Praechter (1901) p. v, pp. 12 -14 and p. 105 and Reale (1990, p. 53 , p. 465).

Hierocles was no radical though, and the content and style of his writings suggest they were intended not to challenge students but to be (Inwood 1984, p. 152) "appealing to a wider non-specialist audience" through the readability of their style which Inwood (1984, p. 152) described as "fluent, rhetorical, and sophisticated," so as to appeal to an educated audience expecting philosophy delivered with skill. They are displays of ethics, by persuasion not force, being preached by a professional, if moralistic, sophist. Hierocles may be a moralist like Plutarch but less diverse in his (known) interests. Also his writings do not mention Eros as part of the marriage bond nor discuss the spiritual or physical aspects. They echo Musonius in their discussion of similar subjects but this may be due to them sharing a common vocabulary and focus on ethics as Stoic writers. Plutarch wrote in reaction to such ethical writings as those of the Stoics Antipater, Musonius and Hierocles. He did not merely borrow from them but responded thoughtfully to them as a critical philosopher.

Epictetus' teachings have barely been, and Dio's writings not at all, referred to in this section because they, while having taught and written about moral issues, do not seem to have written about Eros and marriage. Epictetus writes much on *φιλία* and *φιλεῖν* but only once refers to Eros and not as a god. He used the words "ἔρωτα προσέθηκεν" to describe falling in love as an example of an involuntary (*ἀκούσιος*) action. Dio Chrysostom has been continually redefined as a Stoic or a Cynic by scholars, who have also questioned whether he should be called a Sophist or a Philosopher. His major focus when writing about ethics was more on the political level than the personal.

Babut (1969, p. 108) observed that many commentators had considered the possibility of the *Amatorius* as having "une source

stoïcienne" as, like the Stoics, Plutarch had defended conjugal love

"l'Amatorius fait l'apologie de l'amour conjugal,"

but Plutarch's use of Stoic doctrine appears to me to be a deliberate strategy, a case of turning the enemy's own force of attack against him. If there is any copying of Stoic doctrines, it is for the purpose of humour and criticism. Babut also commented (pp. 108 - 9) that Musonius did not make use of the most important idea of the Amatorius - the central concept and continual focus of Plutarch's work (p. 109)

"l'une des idées importantes de l'Amatorius,"

that a woman just as well as a young man can inspire "la passion amoureuse".

This concept was not and could never have been Stoic for one of the central tenets of Stoicism was apatheia - emotional detachment. Zeno (D. L. 7. 110) had defined passion as an irrational unnatural movement in the soul - impulse in excess

"ἔστι δὲ αὐτὸ τὸ πάθος κατὰ Ζήνωνα ἢ ἄλογος καὶ παρὰ φύσιν ψυχῆς κίνησις ἢ ὁρμὴ πλεονάζουσα."

Diogenes Laertius stated that the Stoics thought that a wise man would be passionless (7.117) "ἀπαθῆ εἶναι τὸν σοφόν." Plutarch in the De virtute morali (449 D) claimed that for the Stoics every emotion was regarded as an error, whether it arose from grief, fear or desire:

"πάθος ἀμαρτία κατ' αὐτούς ἐστι, καὶ πᾶς ὁ λυπούμενος ἢ φοβούμενος ἢ ἐπιθυμῶν ἀμαρτάνει".

Babut (p. 114 in note 2) quotes from R. M. Jones' study - The Platonism of Plutarch (p. 21).

"Notwithstanding Plutarch's use of certain ideas found also in the Stoics, mostly commonplaces of practical morality, his attitude towards the sect is one of opposition "

His attitude towards the Stoics is constantly polemical not eclectic. Perhaps the Amatorius might well be added to the list of works by Plutarch that criticize Stoicism.

Plutarch criticizes Stoic attitudes to Eros, love and marriage in the following ways and places in the Amatorius. First there is the debate between Daphnaeus and Protogenes (750 B - 752 B) in which Daphnaeus defends marriage and Protogenes presents Eros as being something intellectual and masculine, a quest for virtue and friendship for men only. Secondly there is Pusias' attack on Ismenodora to which Plutarch responds (753 B - 754 E) by citing pro-marriage Stoics with what might be called a "resonance" methodology by deliberately using Stoic phrases (the flower of virtue theme (767 B) being another example) combined with historical examples. Musonius described the ideal wife as almost a heroine so Plutarch presents the "real" character of Ismenodora as having heroic qualities and scatters references to women's heroism and courage throughout the Amatorius. The defence of Eros as a god is the third part of Plutarch's critique during which he criticizes Stoic theology and a fourth aspect is technical, in that Plutarch uses an example from Stoic physics, that of integral amalgamation (769 F), to support an ethics argument, a technique he also used to exploit Peripatetic science and Epicurean theories in defence of Eros.

Plutarch is foremost a Platonist, despite his interest in other sects and schools. Raised in an era from which many of the surviving philosophical writings came from Stoic writers, he probably felt obliged to make a defence

of Eros against those who would lessen his powers. After all his "opposition" included contemporary figures like Seneca, Musonius, Epictetus and Dio Chrysostom (see Russell 1973, p. 63), politicians, millionaires, philosophers, radicals, exiles, sophists, ex-slaves, a broad cross-section of the literary and philosophical movements of his era.

What Plutarch does in the Amatorius is to defend Eros the god, from those who would strip him of his wings, and Ismenodora as a person, from people ¹⁶ who were using Stoic ethics to attack her. Turning the Stoics' commonplaces, "classical" or contemporary, back against them was an essential part of this defence of both beings and further a credit to his scholarship and thorough knowledge of the philosophy and handbooks of Stoicism. A greater part though is played by his own originality of style in the way he used Platonic and other philosophies to develop and defend his own ideas to add to the growth and spread of his school.

¹⁶ Regardless of whether Prctogenes and Pusias were Stoics or not - they could be Antiochian eclectics - they appear to be basing their theory of a masculine only Eros on an interpretation of "old" Stoa ethics. If they were not Stoics it seems strange that the opening section of the debate discusses ideas that Diogenes Laertius attributes to Chrysippus and Zeno.

PLUTARCH'S RESPONSE TO EPICUREANISM

It is difficult to estimate fully from the evidence in the Amatorius exactly what Plutarch's response was to the philosophy of Epicurus, as practised by Epicurus' successors, however despite the lacuna in the text, a partial reconstruction is possible. Most of the few references in the Amatorius that seem to be a response to Epicurean doctrine (765 C, 766 E, 767 C, 769 C) involve the use of images drawn from Epicurean physics, which incorporated the atomistic theories of Democritus and others. It is not impossible, though perhaps unlikely, that Plutarch may have been actually citing Democritus and other atomists like Leucippus directly, given the broad nature of his studies and his general interest in scientific matters which is more often attributed to Peripatetic influence on Plutarch.

What is surprising is that there seems to be such a limited refutation of Epicurean doctrines in this dialogue, although there was considerable criticism of the teachings of the "Garden" in other extant writings of Plutarch, unless the majority of critical response was in the missing sections of the work, such as the lacuna in 766 D) before what is now labelled chapter 21. The other polemical works in the Moralia, in which Plutarch criticized Epicureanism, were the Adversus Colotem (Πρὸς Κωλώτην), the Non posse suaviter, ("Ὅτι οὐδ' ἡδέως ζῆν ἔστιν κατ' Ἐπίκουρον), and the De latenter vivendo (Εἰ καλῶς εἴρηται τὸ Λάθε Βιώσας), plus six works listed in Lamprias' catalogue but no longer extant¹⁷. Flacelière (1964, p. 28

¹⁷ The other lost polemics against Epicureanism, judging from their titles, were these titles in the "Lamprias" catalogue.

80. A Reply to Epicurus' Lecture on the Gods, Πρὸς τὴν τοῦ Ἐπικούρου ἀκρόασιν περὶ θεῶν, 129. On Epicurean Inconsistencies, Περὶ τῶν Ἐπικουρείων ἐναντιωμάτων, 135. A Reply to Epicurus on the subject of

and p. 33) has also drawn attention to possible polemical elements in Plutarch's *De tranquillitate animi* (*Περὶ εὐθυμίας*), having suggested that Plutarch was offering εὐθυμία as an alternative to the Epicurean ἀταραξία, and also that defending traditional religion against Epicurean criticism thereof was a possible motivator for the Delphian dialogues (1964, p. 9 and pp. 19 - 20)

As Plutarch does for the Stoics, likewise when dealing with the Epicureans, the name of a philosopher is only given once, when the founder of the school, Epicurus, is mentioned (769 F). Possibly Plutarch presumed that his readers would have been familiar with those others of his own dialogues in which the Stoics and Epicureans were criticized and that it was unnecessary to repeat those arguments again. However, it may also have been the case that the Epicurean doctrines he was criticizing were so well known and popular that Plutarch felt no need to cite "chapter and verse". A third possibility may be that this sole reference by name to a founder of each school, Chrysippus and Epicurus was a matter of technique, a deliberate paralleling on Plutarch's part, and a method for balancing arguments.

Hershbell (1992 pp. 3353 - 3383, pp. 3361-2 in particular) has suggested that one of the primary reasons for Plutarch to have written polemics against Epicureanism is that the works of Colotes, which were being used as a reference by Epicureans of the first century A.D., directly attacked Plato and other philosophers such as Empedocles, Democritus, Parmenides and Socrates, all of whom were regarded as respected

Freewill, *Περὶ τοῦ ἐφ' ἡμῖν πρὸς Ἐπίκουρον*, 143. That the Epicureans talk more paradoxically than the Poets, "Ὅτι παραδοξότερα οἱ Ἐπικούρειοι τῶν ποιητῶν λέγουσι, 148. Extracts from, and Refutations of, Stoic and Epicurean authors. *Στωικῶν καὶ Ἐπικουρείων ἐκλογαὶ καὶ ἔλεγχοι*, 159. A Reply to Epicurus on the subject of Ways of Life. *Περὶ βίων πρὸς Ἐπίκουρον*.

authorities by the Academics and Plutarch himself. Although Hershbell did not discuss Plutarch's criticism of the Epicureans in the Amatorius, he did observe (p. 3370) that Plutarch's criticism of atomistic theory in other dialogues may have been due to Plutarch's belief that the Platonic-Aristotelian, four element theory was superior to that of atomism because in Plutarch's view an explanation of nature and reality based on moving particles did not explain how these units became stable objects.

De Witt (1954, p. 340) commented that Stoicism seemed limited to the upper classes and elite, whereas to judge from artifacts, such as inscriptions and statues, Epicureanism was widespread throughout the empire. Chilton (1971, p. xxii) also commented on this physical evidence and stated (p. xxi) that he believed Epicureanism to have been one of the most influential sects of Plutarch's era. Cicero, a century and a half before Plutarch's era, finished the De Officiis with a complaint about the popularity of Epicureanism (Book 4, Ch. 116) "florebat Epicurus" - that Epicureanism was flourishing, despite one of his best friends Atticus being either a member or a supporter.

Another remark of Cicero's in the De Finibus Book 5, 1. 3.

"... nec tamen Epicuri licet poculisci, si cupiam,
cuius imaginem non modo in tabulis nostri
familiares sed etiam in poculis et in anulis habent."

appears to confirm that the artifacts that Chilton and De Witt mention were indeed associated with Epicureans, for Cicero observed that Epicureans were carrying around the likeness of Epicurus as pictures on cups and rings.

Cicero also commented in the De Finibus (Book 1, 9. 29) that Epicurus found pleasure to be the chief good and pain the chief evil

"Hoc Epicurus in voluptate ponit, quod summum bonum esse vult
summumque malum dolorerī;"¹⁸

a doctrine disagreeable to a Platonist such as Plutarch who would have regarded the highest good or τέλος of human existence to be the quest for the divine. Likeness to God (see De sera num. vin. 550 ff.) was the object of, and reason for, striving for σοφία and the best purpose for living, not the quest for happiness through pleasure, which was the aim of Epicurus and his followers.

About A.D. 200 (see Chilton 1971, p. xi, p. xx) we find Diogenes of Oenoanda sponsoring the construction of walls and porticos with the master's doctrine engraved on them for all to read - an activity which presupposes both literacy and an active interest in philosophy on the part of the general population of a small city. It is hard to judge whether this action should be interpreted as evidence of the widespread influence of Epicureanism or of eccentricity on Diogenes' part. However the artifact-evidence, coupled with that from literature, would tend to support the theory that Epicureanism was indeed widespread in the Empire.

Plutarch needed to defend Eros against the appeal of Stoic apatheia to the elite and also against the popularity of Epicureanism. The attitude of the Epicureans to Eros was entirely negative (D. L. 10. 118).

"ἐρασθήσεται τὸν σοφὸν οὐ δοκεῖ αὐτοῖς."

The wise man should not fall in love and love was not divinely inspired (D. L. 118) "οὐδὲ θεόπεμπτον εἶναι τὸν ἔρωτα," and as for sexual love, well

¹⁸ On pleasure as the prime good see D. L. 10. 129

"ταύτην γὰρ ἀγαθὸν πρῶτον καὶ συγγενικὸν ἔγνωμεν."

also D. L. 10. 139 on pleasure as the opposite to pain

and D. L. 10. 142 on freedom from pain as equal to being free from evil.

Epicurean pleasure (D. L. 10. 13?) was the absence of physical pain and a troubled soul and emphatically not from sexual pleasure obtained from either sex "ἀπολαύσεις παίδων καὶ γυναικῶν", rather pleasure obtained from reasoning (λογισμός) and prudence (φρόνησις) the source of all virtues.

In the Amatorius (765 C) the first definite reference to Epicureanism is also one to Democritean atomism which is introduced by the phrase "ὥς τις εἶπε" - as someone said. That someone may have been Democritus, though Usener thinks this was derived from one of Epicurus' statements and classifies it as Fragment 311. One wonders if Plutarch was being sarcastic about the absorption of Democritus' ideas into Epicurean physics. Perhaps the successors of Epicurus did not acknowledge their debt to Democritus.

Cicero had commented on Epicurean physics being an unacknowledged version of that of Democritus in De Finibus (Bk. 1, 17. 6).

"primum totus est alienus. Democritea dicit, perpauca mutans ..."

In De Finibus (1. 21) Cicero also stated that he thought that, where Epicurus had altered Democritus' ideas, it was a change for the worse,

"ita quae mutat ea corrumpit; quae sequitur sunt tota Democriti,"

and in De Natura Deorum (1. 120) a speaker comments that Democritus' philosophy had been the fountain head from which Epicurus had watered his little garden,

"Democritus ... fontibus Epicuros hortulos suos inrigavit,"

The reference to Epicurean physics described (765 C) "κινούσης ἐπὶ σπέρμα κατ' ὄλισθον ἀτόμων", 'movement of seed caused by the friction of atoms', a concept which Plutarch refuted, arguing for a more organic image, that of plant growth in response to warmth, the warmth being that of

Eros as a stimulating force like fire or light (765 B). Lucretius in Book 4 also discusses this doctrine in detail, most particularly in ll. 1037 - 41 where he discusses the movement of seed from the body. Plutarch contrasts the unseen and abstract imagery of Epicurean physics with a visual organic image of active growth.

Again in the Amatorius (766 E) at the start of Chapter 21 which comes after a lacuna in which Epicurean ethics may well have been cited and discussed, the theory of the movement of atoms producing seed is mentioned and denied.

"καὶ γὰρ εἶδωλα δήπουθεν ἐνδύομενα τοῖς ἐρωτοῖς κινεῖν καὶ γαργαλίζειν τὸν ὄγκον εἰς σπέρμα συνολισθαίνοντα τοῖς ἄλλοις σχηματισμοῖς οὐ δυνατὸν μὲν ἀπὸ παίδων, ἀδύνατον δ' ἀπὸ γυναικῶν"

It is claimed by Plutarch that the Epicurean doctrine (see D. L. 10. 46 ff.) is that this process is started by "εἶδωλα", visual images or shapes (perhaps psychic projections is a better term) which enter bodies and that this process is only invoked in true lovers by young men, παίδων. Plutarch contrasts this with the Platonic doctrine of ἀναμνήσεις, the recollection of divine beauty, love triggered by echos in the flesh of the soul's beauty.

This remarks appear to be a response to some lost statement made by Zeuxippus, for further along in chapter 21, at 767 C, there appears to be a reference to Epicurean ethics, during which Plutarch tells the reader that he is contesting the recent arguments of Zeuxippus " τοὺς λόγους, οὓς ὁ Ζεύξιππος ἀρτίως διήλθεν." although it may equally well be a condemnation of misanthropes in general. Flacelière (1980) regarded it as a reference to Epicureanism, stating about Pemptides (Ch. 12, p. 17 of introduction) that

"Ce Thébain est un sceptique, probablement un Épicurien,"
and also that (p. 18) Zeuxippus was at least a sympathiser of the Garden if not a member. (Zeuxippus also appears to speak of Epicurean ethics in the Non Posse Ch. 4 1088 D.)

One of his reasons for this statement is the preference of the Epicureans for using ἐπιθυμία over ἔρωσ. ¹⁹ As Flacelière observed (1954, p. 69)

Ἐπιθυμία est un terme fréquent et caractéristique du vocabulaire épicurien, tandis que le mot ἔρωσ est extrêmement rare."

Plutarch claimed that Zeuxippus' definition of Love was one which identified it as an uncontrolled desire producing debauchery in the soul (767 C)

"... ἐπιθυμία τὸν Ἔρωτα ταῦτὸ ποιῶν ἀκαταστάτῳ καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἀκόλαστον ἐκφερούσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν,"

" 'Love' [is] an unstable desire bringing the soul into a state of wantonness"

and that Zeuxippus had heard this from certain men who according to Plutarch were ill-tempered and unloving ("ἀνδρῶν δυσκόλων καὶ ἀνεράστων"). Helmbold (note A - p. 417 Loeb) suggested that these men were probably Cyrenaics as much as Epicureans and, while this seems quite possible, Plutarch follows up the remark with comments (767 D) on men who marry women only for their dowries or to bear children and have

¹⁹ In Bailey's work (1926) in his Index of Principal Terms of Epicureanism (pp. 426 ff.) Eros is NOT even listed though ἐπιθυμία has several entries and also ἀταραξία.

marriages in which there is neither loving or being loved - " ἐρᾶν οὐδ' ἐρᾶσθαι".

This definition given by Zeuxippus could have been derived (or perhaps rather distorted) from Epicurean doctrine. Diogenes Laertius (Bk. 10. 118, ll. 13 - 14) recorded this statement as being from Epicurus or Metrodorus,

"συνουσίαν δέ φασιν ὀνήσασθαι μὲν οὐδέποτε, ἀγαπητὸν δὲ εἰ μὴ καὶ ἔβλαψε."

Usener Fr. 62 provides a variant of this quote "συνουσίη ὤνησε μὲν οὐδέποτε, ἀγαπητὸν δ' εἰ μὴ ἔβλαψε". Bailey (1926 pp. 114 -115) gives another variation on this particular saying as part of a longer passage,

"ἀφροδίσια γὰρ οὐδέποτε ὤνησεν. ἀγαπητὸν δὲ εἰ μὴ ἔβλαψεν."

"... for the pleasures of love never profited a man and he is lucky if they do him no harm."

Fr. 221 (= Porph. Ad Marc. 31, Bailey 1926, p. 164 - 65) also states that there is no use in philosophy if it does not drive passions from the soul,

"κενὸς ἐκείνου φιλοσόφου λόγος. ὑφ' οὗ μηδὲν πάθος ἀνθρώπου θεραπεύεται ... εἰ ... ὥσπερ ... οὐδὲν ὄφελος ... φιλοσοφίας, εἰ μὴ τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐκβάλλει πάθος "

and Fr. 483 (Bailey 1926 p. 305) that Eros is equivalent to a intense desire for intercourse that brings with it madness and anguish

"σύντονον ὄρεξιν ἀφροδιείων μετὰ οἴστρου καὶ ἀδημονίας"

Plutarch himself stated (Table-talk 653 C) that in Epicurus' Symposium Epicurus instructed the young men with him to restrain from desire because it always brought harmful effects. Overall the Epicurean view of both Ἔρως and ἐπιθυμία seems to have been negative.

The Epicurean attitude to the gods of traditional Greek religion has been summarised by Flacelière as being one of atheism in practice and deism in theory (1987 p. cxxxiii note 2),

"Les Épicuriens étaient athéistes pratiquement,, de façon théorique, ils étaient déistes".

Epicurus himself (D. L. 10. 123) advised a follower that, as well as one divinity, there were other gods who were immortal beings but they were not the gods of the masses (πολλοί). To him denying the existence of the Olympian pantheon was not an impious (ἀσεβής) action. Impiety rather was acceptance of the traditional religion. Epicurus advised another follower Pythocles to escape from myth, "τοῦ μύθου ἐκβήση" (D. L. 10. 123). For the Epicurean Eros was probably a thing to be avoided not a divinity of any kind. Given the presence of a story of Eros as Avenger just before the lacuna starts and the criticism of Eros from Zeuxippus in the missing sections judging from Plutarch's response, it is possible that other arguments of Zeuxippus, now missing, presented Epicurean theology as well as ethics, paralleling earlier discussions at the beginning of the dialogue.

A further piece of evidence that it is Epicurean ethics being criticized is Plutarch's reference (767 D) to Zeuxippus' use of the Epicurean term "ἀκατάστατος" ²⁰ in association with desire. As Flacelière notes (1987 p. cxlix) for the Epicureans Eros was something to be opposed, being a "sentiment passionné de l'amour", a passionate feeling of love that would be "fort dangereux pour l'ataraxie du sage." Instability and disturbance was to be avoided as a possible cause of evil and pain.

²⁰ Dillon 1993 p. 197 also views this as a typical Epicurean term.

Metrodorus, Epicurus' immediate successor also made a similar statement (Bailey 1926, Fragmen: a Epicurea Vatican Collection Gn.V. LI p. 144)

"ἀφροδίσια γὰρ οὐδέποτε ὄνησεν. ἀγαπητὸν δὲ εἰ μὴ ἔβλαψεν." and Diogenes of Oenanda on his "famous" wall (Fr. 280) described desire which exceeds natural bounds as one of the disturbing emotions which are the root of all evil.

"... ἐπιθυμία πολὺ τοὺς φυσικοὺς ὅρους ἐκτρέχουσα ... ρίζαι κακῶν ..."

Although Diogenes wrote in a period later than that of Plutarch, as his intention was to record and immortalize his master's doctrine, and most of the divergences from other writers' quotations are very minor deviations when compared to other sources quoting Epicurus, it would appear that his statements can be used as valid evidence despite the difference in time.

Lucretius, a Roman follower of Epicureanism, also commented on desire bringing recurring pain (Dei Rerum Natura Book 4 1073 - 1120 specially l. 1117), where love is depicted as a burning madness: "inde redit rabies eadem et furor ille revisit," that recurs.

Plutarch goes on to criticize those men who had married women for their dowries or simply to produce children as not valuing the giving or receiving of love (767 D), "οὐδ' ἀξιούσιν ἐρᾶν οὐδ' ἐρᾶσθαι." Epicureans were supposedly against marriage. Both Diogenes Laertius (Bk. 10. Ch. 119, l. 1 - 2) a sympathizer, and Epictetus, a Stoic and hence an opponent of Epicureanism (1. 23. 7), cited Epicurus as speaking against philosophers having wives and children. Diogenes cited Epicurus as saying

"καὶ μηδὲ καὶ γαμήσειν καὶ τεκνοποιήσειν τὸν σοφόν.
... κατὰ περίστασιν δέ ποτε βίου γαμήσειν."

that the wise man would neither marry nor bear children except in special circumstances. Epictetus (1. 23. 7) who promoted and encouraged marriage and the raising of children (1. 11. 31, 1. 23. 38 - 39) quoted Epicurus as stating "μὴ ἀναϊρώμεθα τέκνα". Do not raise children!

Perhaps Plutarch's purpose here was more social commentary than criticism of Epicureanism. The target of his criticism would appear to be Epicureans who were compromising their master's doctrines by marrying in response to family pressure to continue the lineage but not treating their wives as true, Epicurean "friends", and hence partners in pleasure.

Diogenes Laertius (10. 120 I. 25) gave a definition of Epicurean friendship.

"καί τὴν φιλίαν διὰ τὰς χρείας ... συνίστασθαι δὲ αὐτὴν κατὰ κοινωνίαν τοῖς ταῖς ἡδοναῖς ἐκπεπληρωμένοις."

"Friendship arising from mutual need . . . becoming sustained and fulfilled by partnership in pleasure."

Plutarch may have been criticising the hypocrisy of some sect members who treated marriage as a mere necessity through physical need for a housekeeper and children, and did not extend to the women, with whom they lived, the friendship of equals that they should have as members of the Garden.²¹ He may have felt they were betraying what many writers have judged to be the strongest point of Epicurean ethics - the primacy given to friendship along with pleasure.

It would appear from Plutarch's response that Zeuxippus' missing arguments in the lacuna were largely based on Epicurean ethics and their views on marriage, sex, and Eros. The lacuna starts with the beginning of a

²¹ D. L. cites Epicurus as teaching on friendship that friends should be shown favour by both words and actions (10. 118) and that an Epicurean should be willing even to die for a friend (10. 120) τεθνῆξασθαι.

story about Eros as an avenger and, given Plutarch's technique of balanced arguments, as a counter point to the discussion of Eros as a positive force in the first parts of the Amatorius, at least part of the discussion would have been focused on the negative aspects of Eros. Just as Protogenes and Pistas had spoken against marriage and in defence of a masculine philosophical Eros perhaps likewise Zeuxippus had attacked marriage and Eros but on the basis that passions disturbed the soul.

In chapter 24 Plutarch perhaps had in mind such statements when he advised Zeuxippus not to fear that pain at the beginning of marriage which is like the grafting of plants - a wound with fruitful results (769 E).

"Τὸ δ' ἔμπαθὲς ἐν ἀρχῇ καὶ δάκνον, ὧ μακάριε Ζεύξιππε, μὴ φοβηθῆς ὡς ἔλκος ἢ ὀδαξισμὸν ... ὥσπερ τὰ δένδρα συμφυῆ γενέσθαι ..."

Plutarch appears to be suggesting that pain is necessary, even beneficial for growth, not an evil to be avoided²² as Epicurus believed (Diogenes Laertius Bk. 10. Ch. 131, ll. 13 -14).

"ἀλλὰ τὸ μήτε ἀλγεῖν κατὰ σῶμα μήτε ταραττεσθαι κατὰ ψυχὴν."

"but do not be troubled by the body nor disturbed in spirit."

Were these "dyscholic" men Epicureans who married and had children?

Was Plutarch labelling Epicureans as misanthropes?

Plutarch advises Zeuxippus not to be afraid "μὴ φοβηθῆς" and Epicureans sought freedom from fear. He uses the verb "ταράττει" which comes from the same root as the favourite Epicurean term "ἀταραξία" and refers to Eros as first causing a "τάρραξιν", and then a settling "καταστάς"

²² Note also D. L. 10. 129 all pain is evil - "ἀλγηδῶν πάσα κακόν,".

into a state of stability. He speaks of the necessity of pain in contrast to the Epicurean quest for quietude.

Plutarch does finally refer to Epicurus' theories of atomic motion directly by name (769 F)

"ταῖς κατ' Ἐπίκουρον ὀφαῖς καὶ περιπλοκαῖς ἔοικε"

using this atomic movement of colliding and intertwining particles as the image of those who merely live together for sex "συμβιούντων" in contrast to those who are truly lovers sharing their lives -

"ἀληθῶς ἢ δι' ὅλων λεγομένη κρᾶσις, ἢ τῶν ἐρώντων."

those who experienced the unity created by Eros that could make marriage a real partnership (769 F)

"ἐνότητα δ' οὐ ποιοῦσα τριαύτην, οἷαν Ἔρωσ ποιεῖ γαμικῆς κοινωνίας ἐπλαβόμενος"

As he had earlier in the Amatorius, (766 E) he uses imagery taken from ancient "physics" to discuss and criticise (contemporary - for him) morality, comparing the random movements of atoms to the wanton associations of those not truly bonded into stable relationships, such as the Stoic *krasis* or his own Platonic unity.

Plutarch also expressed a similar idea in a longer definition in the Coniugalia Praecepta (142 F Ch. 34).

"γάμος ὁ μὲν τῶν ἐρώντων ἠνωμένος καὶ συμφυῆς ἐστίν, ὁ δὲ τῶν διὰ προῖκας ἢ τέκνα γαμοῦντων ἐκ συναπτομένων, ὁ δὲ τῶν συγκαθευδόντων ἐκ διεσπύτων, οὓς συνοικεῖν ἄν τις ἀλλήλοις οὐ συμβιῶν νομίσει."

"Marriage is, for those who love each other, an intimate union, but those who for dowries or children mate, are merely joined together, and those, who simply sleep in the same bed, may be co-habiting with each other, but are not really living together."

It would appear that Plutarch drew upon Epicurean images from their theories of physics and ethics to illustrate and strengthen his own arguments by contrasting their "friendship" which lacks the spiritual dimension added by Eros, with his own theory of conjugal love. He used the same tactics, as he had against the Stoics, of invoking a resonance of their terminology in his selection of words and phrases, and of turning their own doctrines against them by criticising the founders of the school and comparing their original teachings to the behaviour of contemporary followers.

As well as contrasting the practices of contemporary Stoics and Epicureans to the teachings of the founders of their respective schools, he also compares their arguments and doctrines to those of his own form of Platonism. Stoic apatheia and Epicurean ataraxia are counter-balanced and conquered by Platonic metriopatheia. What Plutarch sets up as an alternative to both the suppression by the Stoics of emotions and the avoidance of the Epicureans of passion that might bring pain is a different ideal, a relationship which should produce a true partnership of body, heart and spirit, transcending yet partaking of friendship.

His ideal of marriage (770 A) as a unity created by Eros allows the lovers involved therein to have great pleasure "ἡδονὰ μείζονες" in their fellowship, and respond to each other's needs "χρεῖαι συνεχέστεραι πρὸς ἄλλους". These were also aims for Epicurean friendships (D. L. 10 . 120) but

the Epicureans would have regarded Eros as a hindrance to wisdom or virtue. In Platonic relationships, as described and defined by Plutarch, there is the added benefit of the beauty of friendship in a relationship "φιλίας τὸ καλὸν" whose primary aim was not just virtue, as it was for the Stoics, but a creative unity of which Eros is the cause

ARISTOTLE -THE PERIPATETIC SHADOW

While Plutarch's response to Stoic and Epicurean doctrine, dealing with the subjects of Eros and marriage, appears to have been largely critical, his response to the writings of the Peripatetics, whether Aristotle or later Peripatetics, is different in the Moralia. This is particularly obvious in the Amatorius. The problem here is whether Plutarch was incorporating any ideas borrowed from Peripatetic ethics, or just using Peripatetic writings on history and science as references and if so, why there is a less critical response to the Peripatetics than to other schools.

R. M. Jones (1980, p. 20) has commented that -

"The influence exerted by Aristotle on Plutarch was largely in the field of ethics and psychology. ... But beyond these elements ... few things indicate his occupation with Aristotle except technical terms, a few scattered allusions, and a considerable number of citations from his scientific works."

Zeller (1886, p. 311) noted that Plutarch was open to the influence of the Peripatetic school and Sandys (1921, p. 303) while calling Plutarch "a strong adherent of the Platonic philosophy," observed that Aristotle's influence on Plutarch seems to consist of a shared methodology of research.

"Of the strictly philosophical works of Aristotle he seems to have read little; but, in the collection and classification of facts and in the encyclopaedic pursuit of knowledge, he shows the influence of the Peripatetic school;"

There may however have been no Peripatetic school or Lyceum in Athens in Plutarch's era due to the destruction of both schools' buildings by Sulla's forces in 86 B.C. Plutarch may have read and studied Aristotle's works, possibly under a Peripatetic teacher, in Rome or Alexandria if the arguments of Glucker (1978), Grayeff (1974) and Lynch (1972) concerning the history of the Lyceum and Academy are correct. Glucker has pointed out (1978, p. 121) that from 44 BC up to Ammonius' time there are no descriptions of philosophers living in Athens who are referred to as Academics or Platonists but some individuals such as Ammonius himself, the tutor and friend of Plutarch, are called (pp. 126 - 7) *καθηγητής*, a "professor" and never scholar or leader of a school. There may have been no physical Lyceum or Academy, no lecture halls, only a meeting place (Glucker p. 271) until (see Lynch 1972, p. 169) Antoninus Pius reorganized the schools in the second century AD.

There was significant influence from Aristotelian teachings onto Middle Platonism. Dillon (1990 *passim*) has drawn attention to the frequent use of Peripatetic terminology by those Middle Platonists, whom he described as "Peripatetic" (p. xxiii) in sympathy. Furthermore (p. xxv) he has noted that Alcinous' discussion (1990 Ch. 33) of *philia* "actually follows Aristotle's order of subjects in the *Nicomachean Ethics*. Gottschalk (ANRW 2. 36. 2, pp. 1143 - 48) has also commented on the pro-Peripatetic wing within Middle Platonism, starting with Antiochus and including Philo, Plutarch himself, Alcinous and Apuleius.

The illusion of eclecticism in, and major Aristotelian influence on, Plutarch's writings, and in other Middle Platonic works, may simply have been caused by a course of study and method of teaching developed in the school of Antiochus. Cicero stated (*De Fin.* Bk. 5, 3.7) that Antiochus in his

"old" Academy taught both peripatetic and early academic views rather than the mixture of platonism and skepticism popular in the period.

"... non ii soli numerantur qui Academici vocantur, Speusippus, Xenocrates, Polemo, Crantor ceterique, sed etiam Peripatetici veteres, quorum princeps Aristoteles "

and further that the school taught all arts and sciences.

"omnis doctrina liberalis, omnis historia,".

If Plutarch studied with some of Antiochus' followers in Alexandria, where Glucker (pp. 112 - 3) argues his successors moved, he would have perhaps learnt a combination of Platonic philosophy and Aristotelian science.²³

What we may perceive as eclecticism was to him simply using variations of Platonic beliefs. Aristotle was just one of his sources, particularly useful for natural philosophy, which we now call science, and Aristotle's methodology of research, something he was taught to consider as a method of the old Academy, since some Platonists of this time, following Antiochus' teachings, regarded Aristotle as a Platonist.

In the Amatorius itself, there are a couple of citations possibly taken from Aristotle's Historia Animalium, used as illustrations, and a few historical allusions drawn perhaps from the Politics, or possibly from some historians, and some remarks which appear to be as much critical reactions to Aristotle's ethics as allusions or borrowings. As with the Stoics and

²³ While there may not have been an organized school in Alexandria, it is possible there were Peripatetic teachers with some sort of connection to Antiochus or his students. Index Acad. Herc. col. 35 10 ff., notes that Ariston and Cratippus, who were known students of Antiochus, along with Dion, who also worked in Alexandria, abandoned the Academy and became peripatetics. " Ἀριστων [μὲν] καὶ Κράτιππος ... ἐγένοντο Περιπατητικοὶ ἀποστατήσαντες τῆς Ἀκαδημείας"

See Mekler, p. 112 and Göttschalk, p. 1094.

Epicureans, Plutarch "echoes" Aristotle's terminology to criticize his beliefs by a method of parody through resonances.

Both Jones (1980, p. 12) and Taylor (A. E. 1924 p. 8²⁴) have discussed the relationship of Platonic and Aristotelian ethics in Plutarch's writings and agreed on the role of Aristotelian ethics, as being subordinate, or having a lesser role, in the synthesis of ethical systems found in Middle Platonism. Jones interpreted this influence on ethical works, like Plutarch's De Virtute Morali, as being one in which (1980, p. 12) Plutarch uses Aristotle's ethical theories as a framework reinforcing Platonic ethics. Taylor (Platonism and its Influence p. 8) also describes the interaction of Platonism and Aristotle's ethics -

"... all through the first and second centuries A.D., there was a strong current of popular Platonism which preserved the main popular doctrines of Plato though with modifications in an Aristotelian sense."

Any eclecticism or borrowing would be a relationship in which Platonism had the dominant role. (See Donini in Dillon and Long 1988, p. 144 on Aristotelian influence in De Facie) Gottschalk has also commented on Plutarch's ethics and their connection to Peripatetic teachings, stating that (ANRW 2. 36. 2 pp. 1146 -7)

"the peripatetic teaching on moral virtue and metriopatheia were in full accord with his outlook on life. But these Peripatetic elements are found for the most part in his popular ethical works."

Helmbold has noted in his Loeb edition²⁵ and his work on Plutarch's Quotations (1959) many citations, throughout Plutarch's writings as a whole,

²⁴ I believe this Taylor edition to be that of 1924 but am uncertain due to the copy I had access to being an undated wartime edition.

²⁵ Hubert's Teubner 1938 edition was consulted as well.

and in the Amatorius, where he considered it possible that Aristotelian allusions and references were being made or used in the Amatorius. What however was Plutarch's methodology for these possible quotes? Plutarch seems to make use of the writings of Aristotle and other Peripatetic writers in several ways.

Firstly, he uses him as a reference source. The first such reference (751 A) may be directly cited from Homer (Iliad 21. 252, 24. 315 f.) rather than Aristotle (Hist. Animal. 9. 2, 618 B 25 ff.). This is the discussion of the two kinds of eagles in which the speaker, Protogenes, compares his view of "true" love to a mountain eagle, and a lesser kind of love, to a different species of eagle that sought for its prey in marshlands. The problem here is whether Homer is being quoted directly, or indirectly, for while Aristotle's interest was biological observation it seems possible the image could have been borrowed for philosophical debate.

In Amatorius (754 A, Ch 6.16) there is the reference to a custom involving mares being shorn before they are mated with donkeys to create mules which also occurs in Historia Animalium (6. 18, 572 B 7). Here the speaker is Plutarch comparing "humbled" mares to humiliated ill-treated wives. These references are of a type frequent in Plutarch, the using of other works as source-material, which demonstrates his encyclopaedic reading of material, scientific and historic, no longer available to modern scholarship, save as fragments. Jones (1980, p. 20 note 75) cited Volkmann as counting 50 citations overall from Aristotle's scientific works in Plutarch.

There may also be indirect references to Aristotelian ethics. Aristotle often discusses power in terms of authority and subordination, hierarchies of greater and lesser in his Ethics whereas Plutarch (Amat. 754 D) notes that

no-one is his or her own master "οὐδείς δ' ἀναρκτός" for the nurse rules the infant, the teacher a boy, and gymnasiarchs, lovers and generals have control over teenagers and young men. Likewise in his view there can be no sincere objections to Ismenodora being superior in experience and wisdom to Bacchon and hence no barrier to their relationship (754 D).

"τί δεινὸν εἰ γυνὴ νοῦν ἔχουσα πρεσβυτέρα κυβερνήσει νέου βίον ἀνδρός, ὠφέλιμος μὲν οὖσα τῷ φρονεῖν μᾶλλον ἢ δεῖα δὲ τῷ φιλεῖν καὶ προσηνής;"

"What's so terrible about a sensible older woman guiding a younger man? She will be useful because of her superior intelligence and sweetly affectionate to him because she loves him."

This would have horrified any well-read follower of Aristotle, for in Aristotle's world view women are always subordinate to men, and the relationship of husband and wife, one of ruler and ruled, as discussed in the Nicomachean Ethics (Bk. 8 Ch. 7 1158 B 13 - 14)

"ἀνδρὶ τε πρὸς γυναῖκα καὶ παντὶ ἄρχοντι πρὸς ἀρχόμενον" and the marriage relationship is further compared to an aristocracy (N. E. Bk. 8. 10. 5, 1160 B 33 - 1161 A 2).²⁶

"ἀνδρὸς δὲ καὶ γυναικὸς ἀριστοκρατικὴ φαίνεται. κατ' ἀξίαν γὰρ ὁ ἀνὴρ ἄρχει, καὶ περὶ ταῦτα ἃ δεῖ τὸν ἄνδρα. ὅσα δὲ γυναικὶ ἀρμόζει, ἐκείνη σποδίδωσιν. ἀπάντων δὲ κυριεύων ὁ ἀνὴρ εἰς ὀλιγαρχίαν μεθίστησιν. παρὰ τὴν ἀξίαν γὰρ αὐτὸ ποιεῖ, καὶ οὐχ ἧ ἀμείνων. ἐνίοτε δὲ ἄρχουσιν αἱ γυναῖκες ἐπὶ κληροῖ οὖσαι. οὐ δὴ γίνονται κατ' ἀρετὴν αἱ ἀρχαί, ἀλλὰ διὰ πλοῦτον καὶ δύναμιν, καθάπερ ἐν ταῖς ὀλιγαρχίαις."

²⁶ The greek is from Bywater's O. C. T. edition. (1896 p. 171)

"The relationship between man and wife seems like an aristocracy. The man rules by merit of his natural role over masculine affairs and whatever is fitting to a woman he grants control over to the wife. If his authority is not based on merit but his control over everything the relationship is like an oligarchy. Sometimes women rule because they are heiresses. This situation is also like an oligarchy for it is not through virtue they rule but through having wealth and power."

Aristotle also states in the Politics (Bk. 1. 5. 1. 1259 A 24 - 27) that ruling over the wife is part of the science of household management, "μέρη τῆς οἰκονομικῆς ...καὶ γὰρ γυναικὸς ἄρχειν", whereas Plutarch in his Conjugal Precepts (139 C) described this as hegemony by agreement and mutual consent and (142 E 33) as a rule through sympathy. The use of the shorn mare image in the Amatorius was as part of a criticism of men who allowed women no control within the household which is their "proper" realm.

Plutarch further (770 A) observed that there were no greater pleasures (ἡδοναί) or continuous benefits (χρεῖαι) given to others nor more beautiful friendships than those which exist in a marriage in which man and wife keep perfect harmony. This came directly after Plutarch's statement (769 D) that Eros created Unity by his involvement in a marriage which is a partnership. -

"... ἐνότητα δ' οὐ ποιοῦσα τοιαύτην, οἷον Ἔρως ποιεῖ γαμικῆς κοινωνίας ἐπιλαβόμενος."

This may well be a response to a statement in Aristotle's Oeconomica of which part of the second book survives as Fr. 184 (Rose 1886, pp. 140 - 7) in a mediaeval Latin translation. This discusses the relationship of

husband of wife and control of househouse management. It opens with the statement

"Bonam mulierum eorum quæ sunt: intus dominari oportet,"

Once again the woman's dominion is over the household but the final authority belongs to the husband whose approval and permission is needed for any expenses (p. 140, ll. 5 - 15) and a woman's special virtue or arete is described as modestia (used 4 times in this passage and here apparently equivalent to σωφροσύνη). Aristotle cited as historical models of good wives, Alcestis and Penelope, and although both the husband and the wife are co-guardians and educators of the children and household (p. 143) the wife is depicted as focusing and directing her virtues towards her husband and, while both should have respect for each other, one gains the impression Aristotle thought the husband's main task was to choose a good wife who would be a subordinate housekeeper. However this subordination to male authority had to be willing for there to be any joy in the relationship. Rose (p. 146, l. 17 - 18)

"Nihil enim maius bonum ipsa in hominibus ait esse quam cum concordet vir et uxor in voluntatibus domum regunt."

"For nothing is a greater good amongst humans, she says, than when with samemindedness in their wills husband and wife rule the home."

This seems similar to Plutarch's statement, in the Amatorius (770 A), concerning the physical union of marriage as the beginning of friendship, but for Aristotle pleasure was not amongst the benefits of such a relationship, though there can be joy shared by friends "amicis vero gaudia multa;" and there is friendship and partnership, yet there is no mention of Eros as an agent that encourages this harmony between superior and subordinate.

Plutarch's married couple, however, do not just become friends because they are in harmony with each other but become a partnership of friends because they love each other (769 A). They achieve "κράσις" through being lovers (τῶν ἐρώντων 769 F) and this leads special pleasures and benefits (770 A).

"Οὔτε γὰρ ἡδοναὶ μείζονες ἀπ' ἄλλων οὔτε χρεῖαι συνεχέστεραι πρὸς ἄλλους οὔτε φιλίας τὸ καλὸν ἐτέρας ἔνδοξον οὔτω καὶ ζηλωτόν, ὡς ὅθ' ὁμοφρονέοντε νοήμασιν οἶκον ἔχητον ἀνὴρ ἠδὲ γυνή" ²⁷.

There is not simply good, benefits from services (χρεῖαι), but also pleasure (ἡδονή), and the beauty of friendship comes also as a result of Eros's actions when he has a role in a relationship.

Plutarch described this friendship in marriage as being threefold in characteristics and Aristotle's model of friendship is also threefold. For Aristotle friendship results from Utility (χρήσιμον), Pleasure (ἡδονή), or Virtue (ἀρετή), but for Plutarch these causes of Aristotles are results, and Love - Eros is a cause, not a consequence or result like Aristotle's philia, though philia can also be a result.

Aristotle's model for relationship was based on philia not Eros and he classified friendship and various other social alliances as being of three types based on -

UTILITY - profit, usefulness, advantage	τὸ χρήσιμον
PLEASURE - delight, joy shared	ἡ ἡδονή
VIRTUE - excellence, the good shared	ἡ ἀρετή

²⁷ The last two lines are a quote from Homer Odyssey vi. 183 - 4.

Friendship was described by Aristotle (N. E. Bk. 8. 3, 1159 A 27) as an active kind of sharing - "δοκεῖ δ' ἐν τῷ φιλεῖν μᾶλλον ἢ ἐν τῷ φιλεῖσθαι εἶναι" and in the Magna Moralia ²⁸ (Bk. 2. 11. 1210 B 6)

"ἔστι δὲ βέλτιον τὸ φιλεῖν ἢ τὸ φιλεῖσθαι".

Marriage can be a kind of friendship but it is that of ruler and ruled (M. M. Bk. 8. 11. 4. 1161 A 23 - 25).

"καὶ ἀνδρὸς δὲ πρὸς γυναικῶν ἢ αὐτῆς φιλίας καὶ ἐν ἀριστοκρατίᾳ."

and there is no passion involved. Relationships seem very business-like in these categories, based on needs, however mutual.

Not so for Plutarch whose model for marriage combined eros and philia differently. He discussed (739 A) marriage as a friendship and partnership and (769 E) explicitly stated and emphasized the role of Eros

"τὸ γὰρ ἐρᾶν ἐν γάμῳ τοῦ ἐρᾶσθαι μείζον ἀγαθὸν ἔστι."

"Passionate loving is a greater good in marriage than merely to be loved".

The Aristotelian lover (Nussbaum 1986, p. 357) however

"is not erotic in the sense given that word by the Symposium".

Indeed Aristotle appears in his writings to replace Platonic usages of the words ἔρως and ἐπιθυμία with the word ὄρεξις to distance himself from Platonic terminology. Nussbaum (p. 371) has further observed that Aristotle's avoidance of writing about erotic relationships seems to show a blind spot in Aristotle's world-view. She alleged that Aristotle failed to apply his own methodology to this problem preferring to focus on philia and his

²⁸ If the Magna Moralia is not by Aristotle it is by a Peripatetic writer. For a discussion of the authenticity of the Magna Moralia see Guthrie 1981 ch. 3 p. 51.

avoidance of the word Eros does seem rather odd given its frequent use in other philosophical writers.

The difference between Aristotelian philia and Platonic Eros has been described by Nussbaum (p. 357) as

"Philia, loving the whole world of another person for that person's own sake, loves humanity and mutability as well as excellence. Platonic eros seeks wholeness; philia embraces the half."

In Plutarch the half is fused and joined into the greater whole with both partners becoming lovers and differences dissolved into unity.

Plutarch seems to have deliberately inverted Aristotle's model of friendship to establish and support the importance of Eros in relationships. Friendship was not simply a subject for ethical discussion of hierarchies but in the Amatorius has been described as an active connection between two lovers, not just a lover and beloved. The partnership in Plutarch's model of marriage is reciprocal or becomes so because of Eros' help.

Aristotle tended to support certain traditional sexual biases and a hierarchical paradigm of stronger-weaker, superior-subordinate, and wrote in the Physiognomica (Ch. 5 809 A 26 - B 14) ²⁹ that males are generally braver than females who have less "spirit"

"ἀθυμότερα τῶν ἀρρένων ... δοκεῖ δέ μοι καὶ κακουργότερα γίνεσθαι τὰ θήλεα τῶν ἀρρένων, καὶ προπετέστερά τε καὶ ἀναλκέστερα."

²⁹ D. L. lists a Φυσιγνωμονικά amongst Aristotle's writings (5. 25) but although the work extant under this title is spurious in regard to being a work of Aristotle it is still useful as an example of Peripatetic views.

Plutarch refuted this by historical references to women's courage when inspired by love and discussed (Amatorius 761 F also in the Mulieres Virtutes 257 E) how love inspired courage amongst other virtues, citing the story of Alcestis and the tales of Camma the Galatian priestess (Ch. 22 768 B - D) and Empona the Gaulish aristocrat (Ch. 25 770 D - 771 D) as barbarian examples. Other historical references that Plutarch shared with, or derived from, Aristotle in the Amatorius are firstly the story (761 A) concerning Chalcis³⁰ and then there are the references to the tyrants, Crateas and Periander (768 F) which may also be from the Politics (Crateas 1311 B 8 ff., Periander 1311 A 39 ff.). Aristotle used these historical references to illustrate the idea that (1139 A 39) a tyrant's aim is pleasure and a king's honour, but by Plutarch they were used to illustrate how Lust is destructive and Love inspires courage and creates virtue (Amat. 761 F ff.).

Plutarch wrote about mania and how enthusiasm could produce courage, but Aristotle would never have regarded Love's madness as a kind of divine possession. Ross (1952, p. 26) has translated a fragment of Aristotle from Arabic (Al-Dailami <: cod. Tübingen Weisweiler 8). In it Aristotle in response to a student's question defined the essence of love as a process that began as an impulse (presumably ὁρμή) which as it grew could eventually lead to hopeless passion, sorrow and destruction of the mind.

But even for Aristotle Eros existed as something generated from intimate contact between friends and associates (Bk. 2. 22 Analytica Priora 68 B 3 - 4)

³⁰ This Aristotle may be a Chalcidian historian rather than the Peripatetic founder (see Loeb edition note A p. 377).

"τὸ ἄρα φιλεῖσθαι τῆς συνουσίας αἰρετώτερον κατὰ τὸν ἔρωτα.
μᾶλλον ἄρα ὁ ἔρως ἐστὶ τῆς φιλίας ἢ τοῦ συνεῖναι."

However Aristotle did not mention Eros in connection with the relationship between man and wife, although he did mention affection as a product of marriage. According to Cicero (De Fin. 4. 7), Aristotle and Xenocrates both taught that marriage was natural and a source of affection in families.

"ut coniugia virorum et uxorum natura coniuncta esse dicerent, qua ex stirpe orirentur amicitiae cognationum."

Partnership and pairing between the sexes for Plutarch was not, as it was for Aristotle, a mere expression of a natural impulse from the political animal (M. M. Bk. 8. 12. 7 1162 A 16).

"ἀνδρὶ δὲ καὶ γυναικὶ φιλία δοκεῖ κατὰ φύσιν ὑπάρχειν.

ἄνθρωπος γὰρ τῇ φύσει συνδυάστικον μᾶλλον ἢ πολιτικόν."

To him it was a sacred union (769A) arising from friendship between the sexes.

"Ἄλλὰ γυναιξὶ γε γαμετεῖς ἀρχαὶ ταῦτα φιλίας, ὥσπερ ἱερῶν
μεγάλων κοινωνήματα."

Aristotelian ethics play little or no role in the Amatorius, although Plutarch's knowledge of them was impressive, leading Flacelière to comment that Plutarch (1987 p. cxxiv) was "admirablement informé" regardless of how the Peripatetics may or may not have influenced other works of Plutarch's. Jones commented (1980, p. 12)

"... we have of course, no reason for supposing that Plutarch, in taking over the framework of ethical theory from Aristotle, rejects Platonic ethics. We find throughout his writings numerous Platonic ethical ideas."

An example of this is how in the De virtute morali Aristotle's doctrine of the Mean is used to reinforce Platonic ideals of moderation as part of a critique of Stoic apatheia. However Aristotle's views on Eros were not compatible with Plutarch's Platonism although there may be some oblique references to Peripatetic schema of friendship within certain of Plutarch's definitions of marriage as a form of friendship. The Platonic Eros comes first.

Plutarch's basic Platonism is the foundation of the theories presented in the Amatorius. Any other philosophies that seem to appear are only used for colouring, or a contrast to strengthen Plutarch's own arguments. Aristotle's model of friendship, being based on needs shared, is certainly not a major, or indeed, any source for Plutarch's model of married friendship in the Amatorius. Plutarch's methodology may be a tool borrowed from the Peripatetics, but if so it is being used to add to his own Platonism, just as Plutarch made use of Aristotle's other researches for references to support his arguments. Considering the differences between Aristotle's and Plutarch's views of Eros and marriage, this very borrowing of material may be a process of very Platonic irony.

Aristotle's works as a whole are used only as a source of material for illustrations not as a model to form a basis for Plutarch's personal philosophy. Gottschalk (ANRW 2. 36. 2 p. 1143) has noted that the Platonists were the only other school to make creative use of Aristotelian ideals. Plutarch makes creative use of Peripatetic researches into history and science to support his own writings. Let us allow Aristotle the last word on Plutarch's methodology. Plutarch quoted Aristotle in the Table Talk (8. 10, 734 D = Fr. 62) as stating great learning gives many starting points for discussions,

"τὴν πολυμάθειαν πολλὰς ἀρχὰς ποιεῖν. "

NEOPYTHAGOREANISM AND ITS INFLUENCE ON PLUTARCH

A possibility that should not be overlooked is that Neo-Pythagoreanism also influenced Plutarch's development as a philosopher. Plutarch himself admitted to an interest in Pythagoras' theories in his youth (De apud Delphi 387 F). There are indications not only within the Amatorius but in other of the Moralia that he was interested not just in their theories of mathematics, harmonics and cosmic numbers, but also may have read certain treatises, on women and marriage, in circulation at the time. Given the signs of Pythagorean influence on both Middle and Neo-platonic writers and on Plato himself it is a topic worth investigating.

Pythagoreanism had a long and uneven relationship with Platonism. Cameron (1938) commented on Platonism's relationship to Pythagoreanism (p. 94), that Plato took what had been "a loosely woven fabric of inherited doctrines and ideas" and reworked them into a tighter weave of his own design. Aristotle and other Peripatetics wrote studies of Pythagorean theories (see Freeman 1953, pp. 245 - 6), from which Plutarch may have gained knowledge of Pythagoreanism. Rowe however (1984) has described Aristotle's remarks in the Metaphysics as

"misleading on Plato's connections with the Pythagoreans" and concluded (p. 205) that, what Plato did with Pythagorean ideas, was to see certain "possibilities" and "make creative use of them". Pythagoras wrote nothing himself. Much of the evidence for whatever were Pythagoras' actual theories is imbedded in later writings by Platonists or survives as fragments and quotes in Diogenes Laertius and other writers on philosophy.

In Plutarch's time there were Pythagoreans, and "Pythagorizers", within Platonism as a movement, for the doctrines of both schools during the Middle Platonic period were beginning to fuse into one. This fusion seemed to have started in first century B. C. Alexandria, judging from evidence within the writings of Eudorus and Philo, followers of a type of Platonism which according to Dillon (1977, p. 183) was

"heavily influenced by Pythagorean transcendentalism and number mysticism, which, rather than the Stoicizing materialism of Antiochus, is the true foundation of Middle Platonism."

Bevan (1927, p. xxvi) also has commented on this first century B.C. revival and its eclecticism,

"...there was a revival of those views about Soul and Body for which the Orphics, the early Pythagoreans and Plato had stood."

and (p. xxvi) on the fusion of the schools, that

"Neo-Pythagoreanism really drew more from Plato than from Pythagoras."

Certainly something had revived interest in Pythagoreanism. We know of at least one Roman Pythagorean, Nigidius Figulus, a friend of Cicero, who was referred to by later writers as "Pythagoricus et magus" and who seems to have been somewhat of a polymath, being an astronomer, philosopher, politician and a grammarian (Aulus Gellius 2. 4. 9 called him "homo ... doctissimus"). Cicero claims his friend revived the Pythagorean school from (near) extinction. Cicero (Tim. 1. 1.)

"Denique sic iudico, post illos nobiles Pythagoraeos, quorum disciplina extincta est quodammodo, cum aliquot saeculo in Italia Siciliaque viguisset, hunc extitisse, qui iam revocaret."

(see also Lucan 1. 638 ff., Cic. ad Fam. 4. 13. 2, and 2. 2. 3).

Eudorus seems to have played a major role in this incorporation, or revival, of Pythagorean doctrines within Platonism during the first century B. C. Tarrant (1985 p. 3) notes that Eudorus will probably remain "a mystery figure", yet a key figure also within Academic Platonism in Alexandria, though, unlike Dillon, he views Eudorus (p. 138) as an Academic not a "pythagoro-platonist"³¹. Dillon (1990, p. xxii) views Eudorus as being representative of the "Pythagoreanizing wing of Platonism" and having contributed (p. xxviii) to the revival of interest in Pythagoreanism by his studies of Plato's Timaeus and notes the influence on Alcinous who appears to have (indirectly) drawn material from Eudorus via Arius Didymus' works for his own writings.

Eudorus' interest in Pythagoreanism (see Dillon p. xxxii) leads him to develop a theology of a supreme One and a transcendent monad and dyad, which combined the ideas of the Old Academy and Pythagoreanism. He also seems to have been the first Middle Platonist to promote the ideal of Plato's Theaetetus (176 B) "ὁμοίωσις θεῷ" as the aim of philosophers³². This replaced Antiochos' telos, taken from the Stoics, of living in accordance with nature, and remains the Platonic telos to late antiquity and beyond (see Dillon 1990, p. 171 - 72). Dillon has also suggested (p. 115) that Eudorus may have been a student of Dion (pupil of Antiochus). If so, then one can construct a hypothetical lineage, from Antiochus' era, and presence in Alexandria, via Dion, then Eudorus, then an unknown teacher of Ammonius, to Ammonius, and then finally Plutarch himself.

³¹ Tarrant 1983 also sees Eudorus as the "only serious candidate" for authorship of the Anon. Corin. In Theaetetus due to this writer's use of sceptic/academic ideas.

³² Likeness to God is seen as the Platonic equivalent of the Pythagorean saying - Follow God "ἔποϋ θεῷ". See Dillon 1990 p. 4 and p. 55.

What was the actual extent of Pythagorean influence on Plutarch himself? Plutarch himself mentions (Table Talk 727 B) Lucius the Etrurian, as one of many pupils of a contemporary Pythagorean called Moderatus of Gades, and (728 D) also described the beliefs of pupils of another near-contemporary Pythagorean called Alexicrates, concerning taboos on fish eating. In his work the E at Delphi (De E apud Delphos - Περὶ τοῦ Εἰ τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖς 387 F Ch. 8), during a discussion of number theories, Plutarch made a remark that emphasizes his interest at that earlier time in Pythagoreanism - i.e. before he joined the Academy

"ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ τῆνικαῦτα προσεκέειμην τοῖς μαθήμασιν ἐμπαθῶς, τάχα δὴ μέλλων εἰς πάντα τιμήσειν τὸ 'μηδὲν ἄγαν' ἐν Ἀκαδημείᾳ γενόμενος."

He felt he had been studying mathematics to excess until he became a "Platonist" and changed the emphasis of his studies. His emphasis on the Academy as a position of moderation suggests he saw the Pythagorizing faction as a more extreme group.

R. M. Jones (1980, Ch. 1, p. 77 note 1) stated that

"There can be no doubt, ... that Plutarch is to be classified with the Platonists;"

but he regarded (p. 9) De E apud Delphos as showing eclecticism and possible Neopythagorean influence (387 F - 391 E) and furthermore commented that (p. 9)

"I see no good reason why we should not accept Plutarch's statements as evidence that at one time he was not a follower of the Academy and that he tended towards a form of eclecticism in which Pythagorean number theories played a great part." (see 387 F where he states that soon after he became an "adherent of the Academy").

Flacelière (1964, p. 18, see also 1987, p. lxxiv) also commented on Plutarch's interest in Pythagorean number theory in this dialogue that

"Plutarque est imbu de la << mystique des nombres >>"

and also that (1987, p. lxxiii) two essential principles of Pythagoreanism were Number and Harmony.

In the Amatorius Plutarch mentions φιλόσοφοι διδάσκαλοι who made deities of the following concepts, numbers, monads, "breath" (763 D),

"φιλοσόφων ιδέας τινὰς καὶ ἀριθμοὺς μονάδας τε καὶ πνεύματα θεοὺς ποιουμένων,"

which seems to be a reference to Pythagoreans, along with a reference (765 A) to teachers of geometry who are not described as Platonic or Pythagoreans, only as those who offer models to children

"ὥς δὲ γεωμέτραι... μιμήματα σφαιρῶν καὶ κύβων καὶ δωδεκάεδρων κροτείνουσιν"

The two schools had become so similar it is hard to distinguish which one, if not both, is being referred to here.

It is possible that Pythagoreans viewed God as a Monad, according to Diogenes Laertius's evidence (8. 25 "ἀρχὴν μὲν ἀπάντων μονάδα") and Flacelière (1987, p. 147 note 5 to p. 86) commented on this section, citing Festugière (REG 65, 1952, p. 258, note 1),

"Ceux qui considèrent les nombres comme des dieux sont les Pythagoriciens".

Flacelière (1987, p. 154 note 4 to p. 97) also commented that the Platonic saying "κοινὰ τὰ φίλων" from Lysis (207c 4), cited by Plutarch (Amat. 767 E), had (D. L. 8. 10) a Pythagorean origin, in addition to its Platonic context in the Amatorius.

Plutarch in Quaestiones Convivialium (BK 8 Question 2, 718 C) in a discussion, the subject of which is "ἀεὶ γεωμετρῆιν τὸν θεόν", noted that this alleged quote from Plato was in keeping with his character, although it was not to be found in any of his writings,

"γέγραπται μὲν ἐν οὐδενὶ σαφῶς τῶν ἐκείνου βιβλίων, ἔχει δὲ πίστιν ἱκανὴν καὶ τοῦ Πλατωνικοῦ χαρακτήρος ἐστίν,"

and in this same dialogue in which Plato's interest in geometry is discussed Florus (719 A) claimed that Plato was influenced by both Socrates and Pythagoras equally

"ἄτε δὴ τῷ Σωκράτει ...ἀναμιγνύς οὐχ ἦπτον ἢ τὸν Πυθαγόραν".

The Neopythagorean treatises which survive (Zeller lists 90 treatises) "were nearly all pseudonymous," and as some of these treatises bore the names of famous Pythagorean women³³ who were said to have both practised and written about philosophy, they may have influenced Plutarch's views on marriage.

In the Coniugalia Praecepta of Plutarch, perhaps an earlier work than the Amatorius³⁴, there are definite signs of Pythagorean influence including some ideas which carry over into his later work the Amatorius. Marriage (138 D) is described as a concord, a "ἁρμονία". Harmony was a keyword for Pythagoreans of any era. Iamblichus in the De Vita Pythagorica (1975 ch.

³³ See Guthrie (1987, p. 122) for a translation of several writings on Pythagoras, including Iamblichus and others.

Iamblichus listed 17 prominent Pythagorean women (ibid.) :
Timycha, Philtis, Byndacis, Chilonis, Cratesiclea, Theano, Myia, Lasthenia, Abrotelia, Echecratia, Tyrsenis, Pisirrhonde, Nisleadusa, Bryo, Babelyma, Cleaechmas.

³⁴ See Jones 1966 for a chronology of Plutarch's writings. He dates the Amatorius as being written post 96 and the P. C. as between 96 -100. There could be up to 20 years difference.

18 p.47) records this as one of the questions Pythagoreans studied: "What (is) most beautiful? Harmonia. (τὸ καλλίστον; ἀρμονία.)". Diogenes Laertius (Bk 8, Ch. 33) quoted Theano the wife of Pythagoras as having described harmony as a virtue -

"τὴν τ' ἀρετὴν ἀρμονίαν εἶναι καὶ τὴν ὑγίειαν καὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἅπαν καὶ τὸν θεόν"

and Thesleff (1965) in his index noted the high proportion in Pythagorean texts of usage of the words ἀρμονία, 36 times, συναρμόζω, 21 times, and of sun compounds in general - 27. The importance of harmony is further emphasized in the C. P. in 144 C (Loeb ed. p. 333)

"εὖ τοίνυν ἡρμοσμένον τὸν οἶκον εἶναι δεῖ τῷ μέλλοντι ἀρμόζεσθαι πόλιν καὶ ἀγορὰν καὶ φίλους."

"A man therefore ought to have his household well harmonized who is going to harmonize State, Forum, and friends."

and in 139 D (p. 305 - 306)

"οὕτω πᾶσα πράξις ἐν οἰκίᾳ σωφρονούσῃ πράττεται μὲν ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων ὁμονοούντων, ἐπιφαίνει δὲ τὴν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἡγεμονίαν καὶ προαίρεσιν "

"in like manner every activity in a virtuous household is carried on by both parties in agreement, but discloses the husband's leadership and preferences."

Plutarch illustrates this by saying that the hegemony of a husband over a wife should be like two sounds in harmony - there is a difference in scale and tone but both parties agree "ὁμονοούντων" (139 D).

Perhaps the concept of harmonia used in the C. P. evolved into the fusion and krosis of the Amatorius where Eros and virtue are in alliance and balance. Plutarch may be avoiding Pythagorean terminology in the Amatorius precisely because he was aware of Pythagoreanism's influence

on his earlier writings, and wished to distance himself from these, and to emphasize he was a true Academic or Platonist, or to distance himself as a moderate, from the Pythagorizers within Platonism.

Plutarch (139 C) advocated the concept of a chaste housebound woman, σώφρονα γυναικα, and used also the term ἡ σώφρων. A Pythagorean writer also wrote on σωφροσύνη for women. One extant fragment from a Pythagorean, allegedly³⁵ by Phintys of Sparta, (Thesleff 1965, p. 151) from a work named Περὶ γυναικὸς σωφροσύνας, contains the statement that this was the virtue most appropriate to women "γυναικὸς δὲ μάλιστα ἀρετὰ σωφροσύνα."

In the Amatorius (753 B) Prctogenes criticised Ismenodora for deviating from the ideals of being a modest, orderly woman who should sit at home and wait for suitors,

"εἰ δ' αἰσχύνεται καὶ σωφρονεῖ, κοσμίως οἶκοι καθήσθω περιμένουσα τοὺς μνωμένους καὶ σπουδάζοντας"

³⁵ Why "allegedly"? There exists an ongoing debate about the authenticity of Neopythagorean treatises from the Hellenistic era. Some claimed to be written by founders of the school. Waithe (1987, p. 44) has commented firstly, that if the fragments said to be from women writers were forgeries, they were well-done with limited signs of eclecticism, and secondly, why, if pseudonyms were used, were the names those of famous, female members of the school; and thirdly, in support of their possible authenticity, that the documents consistently used the Doric dialect. Guthrie however (1987, p. 39) commented on this debate that if the documents are "pseudepigrapha" they were attributed to earlier individuals out of reverence and were not necessarily forgeries in our modern sense of the word.

A further possibility is that perhaps some documents were written by women of the Hellenistic/Imperial era, named after the heroines of the school and that later scholars confused the two names. If there were two Hierocles, there well may have been two Theanos or Perictiones. Certainly we know of several Plutarchs, apart from the author of the Amatorius and possibly two Platos if the poems by a writer of that name are not the work of a young philosopher.

In response to this criticism Ismeriodora was described by Plutarch (753 C) as being "αἱ δὲ σώφρονες." one of those women who are modest or moderate in their behaviour

Perictione wrote (Guthrie p. 239, Waithe p. 33, Thesleff p. 143) in her Περὶ γυναικὸς ἀρμονίας (= Stobaeus 4. 28. 19 p. 688 Hense) on the importance of training the body to moderation τὸ μέτρον, good or due measure and proportion, arguing for choosing simplicity over vanity, which is a form of excess.

"σκῆνος δὲ ἄγειν χρὴ πρὸς μέτρα φύσιος τροφῆς τε πέρι καὶ ἱματίων καὶ λουτρῶν καὶ ἀλειψίων καὶ τριχῶν θέσιος καὶ τῶν ὀκόσα ἐς κόσμον ἐστὶ χρυσοῦ καὶ λίθων ...".

Phintys of Sparta (Waithe 1937, p. 27 Thesleff p. 152) wrote that, along with the study of philosophy, virtue was common to both sexes, or rather that the ability to practise and develop wisdom and virtue was something shared by both.

"κοινὰ δὲ φαμί ἀνδρείαν καὶ δικαιοσύναν καὶ φρόνασιν.

"But I say that courage and justice and wisdom are common to both "

Plutarch (Amat. 769 C) rebuked men who think women had no share in virtue and went on to list virtues that both sexes shared, such as prudence and justice.

These writings, whether they were by female or male writers, and regardless of when they were created, may well have influenced the development of Plutarch's own philosophy, as expressed in the Amatorius, given the interflow of ideas between the two schools and his admitted interest in their theories of mathematics. If he studied their number theories,

might not he have studied some of their ethical treatises as well as those of the Stoics? However, for the Pythagoreans, control is the important virtue. It is σωφροσύνη and ἁρμονία that are in alliance in their paradigm of virtues. As Eros is the primary subject of the Amatorius, the Pythagorean echoes are minor here, and like Peripatetic ethics, a set of ideas which Plutarch showed knowledge of, but which remain secondary to Plutarch's Platonic ethics of moderation in emotions.

In the Amatorius we see a slight flavouring or echo of an earlier Neopythagoreanism phase in the development of Plutarch's own personal philosophies, but this only serves to emphasise how much Plutarch had evolved his ideas. His knowledge of mathematics, Platonic and Pythagorean, is drawn on to support or illustrate various arguments. The interest in social harmony promoted in the Coniugalia Praecepta, seems to have Pythagorean "resonances", just as there are echoes of Peripatetic ethics and a use of their scientific and historical researches, in the Amatorius but this is primarily a methodology which draws attention to the doctrine of spiritual fusion via the power of Eros found in the Amatorius.

CHAPTER NINE

PLUTARCH'S ECLECTIC METHOD OF CRITICAL RESPONSE

Plutarch seems to have developed a regular methodology of using other philosophies and viewpoints as tools to strengthen his own arguments. Rather than merely borrowing ideas his actual technique in the Amatorius seems to have been to contrast two or three different viewpoints to each other and his own. To the Stoics and Epicureans he made a critical response to theories differing from his own, firstly by comparing their theories to each other as opposite extremes and then to his own Platonism, and secondly, in the case of the Stoics, he further contrasted differing opinions within Stoicism, as a movement, to reveal the deficiencies in the views of both the founders of Stoicism and near contemporary figures.

Plutarch had little or limited sympathy with the views of the Stoics and Epicureans, however considerable his display of knowledge of their philosophies was. Dealing with the Peripatetics and Pythagoreans he draws on their views on ethics and scientific researches where he can make use of them but they are relegated to a minor role in the Amatorius. These schools had negative or limited doctrines of Eros which Plutarch criticised and contrasted to his own Platonism, discussing his predecessors within Plato and other schools, and then opening and extending that critical discussion of theory into a revelation of his own insights into Eros.

The Stoics, Peripatetics, and Pythagoreans, as well as those Platonists who encouraged marriage, wanted wives to become or be already paragons of virtue, harmony, empathy, moderation and common sense. The Epicureans appear to have been the sole exception to this. Plutarch, rather

than just stating what people should be, described how they could come to be partners in love and virtue and life.

Only Plutarch, however, allied passion with virtue in partnership, for he was primarily a Platonist; however, he responded to other philosophies including those of his predecessors in the school. Like Plato he took other schools' ideas as starting points for development and discussion. What distinguished Plutarch's model of marriage from those of the other schools is the role of Eros. Eros fuses all the virtues into one transcendent force for spiritual growth that made marriage more than mating to gain a housekeeper and children or to fulfill one's duty to society or the gods. The presence of Eros allows both partners to become a greater unity not a mere alliance.