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It is probably not inaccurate to say that more critical attention has been lavished upon Socrates' speech than all the other speeches in Plato's Symposium put together. Though there is good reason for this it does not follow that the other speeches are without merit or are to be disparaged. However the first two speakers have not been well treated by many commentators, though Pausanias, the second speaker, seems to come off a little better than Phaedrus in their estimation. Often they are treated as merely a warm up for better things to come. Thus A.E. Taylor tells us: 'The speech of Phaedrus is properly made jejune and commonplace for a double reason'. The first is: 'As a point of art, it is necessary to begin with the relatively tame and commonplace in order to lead up by a proper crescendo to the climax to be reached in the discourse of Socrates.' The second is that 'the trivial and vulgar morality' of the speech fits the character of Phaedrus (as depicted). Not only is the content wanting in Phaedrus' speech but also: 'In manner it is a poor and inadroit "encomium" of a commonplace type'. In contrast Taylor claims: 'The speech of Pausanias, unlike that of Phaedrus, really does attempt to take account of specifically Athenian moral sentiment, and is much more elaborately worked out in point of form'. This is a comment not so much about what philosophical issues Pausanias may have raised but, rather, the extent to which his remarks reflect contemporary Athenian views (which, pace Taylor, is open to doubt) and the literary merits of his speech. Later Taylor makes a moral comparison: 'In some respects the speech is morally on a higher level than that of Phaedrus.' But perhaps not much higher, because he shortly adds the qualification that '....Pausanias' conception of the noble Eros is pitched far too low.'
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Taylor says his view is not as disparaging as that of Bury\(^1\) who accuses Pausanias of being a 'relativist', 'a specimen of the results of sophistic teaching' and someone who adopts 'a principle of moral indifference'. In addition Bury follows Jowett in alleging that Pausanias' argument suffers from the 'sophistical vices of inconsistency and self-contradiction'\(^2\). Phaedrus is another product of the sophists whose speech 'although not without merit in point of simplicity of style and arrangement, is poor in substance. The moral standpoint is in no respect raised above the level of the average citizen...'. Bury's judgment is that since he is 'lacking...in native force of intellect, Phaedrus relies upon authority and tradition'\(^3\), referring to mythology and to Hesiod and Homer to build up his case concerning love.

More recent commentators echo these views, though somewhat less harshly. W. Hamilton in the 'Introduction' to his translation tells us: 'The first two speakers, Phaedrus and Pausanias, confine themselves to the treatment of love in its most obvious sense.' But he adds: 'Pausanias, though hardly more profound, is a good deal more subtle...'. Grube seems to echo Taylor when he says of Phaedrus: 'This speech is a thin performance, and thus a good starting point.'\(^5\) In contrast Grube praises Pausanias: 'This is a remarkable speech, far more able and on an altogether higher plane than that of Phaedrus.'\(^6\) Guthrie finds Phaedrus' speech 'a brief trifle' and 'an artificial affair of literary allusions and rhetorical tricks of style and content.'\(^7\) Concerning Pausanias' speech, Guthrie finds that it is a rather feeble precursor of the distinctions that Diotima draws between the various kinds of objects of love; he concludes that it '....arouse[s] the suspicion that Plato is giving a kind of parody of Socrates to show how easily his teaching could be misunderstood or misapplied.'\(^8\)

While Kenneth Dover does not single out the speeches of Phaedrus and Pausanias for special criticism, he does so by implication when he says of the Plato of the *Symposium*;

---
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His distinctive values, attitudes, assumptions, cravings, passions are not mine, and for that reason I do not find his philosophical arguments even marginally persuasive. Much that is written about him is marked, in my view, by an uncritical enthusiasm for the abstract and immutable...¹

This is a harsh judgement about the arguments throughout the dialogue. In a dialogue like the Symposium it is not easy to tell which speeches reflect Plato's 'distinctive values'. Moreover, Dover does not always tell us what he finds unpersuasive about the arguments, explicit or implicit, that Plato puts into the mouths of each speaker. Part of the task of this paper will to be to evaluate Dover's claim in the case of Phaedrus and Pausanias.

Not all writers on the Symposium concur with the negative views listed above. On a more positive note Santas has recently said: 'Though not rich in substance, Phaedrus' speech has some noteworthy features'² which he then lists without subsequently comparing Phaedrus' effort unfavourably to that of Pausanias. Stanley Rosen's earlier booklength commentary³ on the Symposium treats all the speakers with great sympathy. However not all philosophers would find his interpretative stance acceptable. In particular, Rosen does not subject the speeches to the kind of logical analysis which would address a complaint, such as Dover's, that Plato's philosophical arguments are unpersuasive. Much the same can be said of commentators such as Dorter and Penwill⁴; as sympathetic as they are to what Phaedrus and Pausanias (and others) say, their evaluation of the speeches would not touch the points a doubting Dover would want addressed.

Is Phaedrus' speech really as bad as some of the above-mentioned commentators claim? And is Pausanias' speech, while not as bad, not all that much better? Each commentator evaluates the speeches from a number of distinct points of view. First, the speeches may be judged for their literary merits. Perhaps, as

---

³ Stanley Rosen, Plato's Symposium (New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1968; Second Edition, 1987). One reason why philosophers of a more "analytic" approach to their subject would distance themselves from aspects of Rosen's analysis is claims such as '...the Symposium, for reasons to be explained in the text, puts the case for philosophy in poetic terms' (p. xxxviii).
Taylor and Bury allege, Phaedrus' speech is a poor example of an encomium and Pausanias' is only a little better. It might be claimed that Plato intended that the least substantial speeches occur first so that the dialogue builds towards later highpoints. Apart from the fact that it is difficult to account for the placing of Agathon's speech on this view, it does not follow, given this view, that the first two speeches lack any merit. Second, there are judgements about the extent to which each speech either reflects or is at variance with Greek sexual customs, or provides a useful source concerning those customs themselves. Such questions are best addressed by social historians and will not be pursued here. Thirdly, there are moral judgements that can be made either about the historical personages Phaedrus and Pausanias, or about the two characters that Plato depicts under those names in the dialogue. The moral tone of the criticisms of the two speakers is much more marked in earlier commentators such as Bury or Taylor but is largely absent in contemporary writers.

Fourthly, there are philosophical judgements to be made about the two speeches. Both speakers make a number of claims about love but neither makes clear whether these are conceptual points about love or merely empirical claims either about some lovers or about love as it is expressed in a particular social group, gender, or society. One task for a philosophical commentator would be to sort out the conceptual from the empirical claims. Further, such a commentator ought to pay attention to the arguments presented for their claims about love, the nature of love, what love causes, what causes it, and so on. Both speeches are largely devoid of argument, even of a sort much less searching than Socrates' subsequent examination of Agathon. However both illustrate their claims by examples from literature, mythology, history or contemporary custom. What needs to be examined is how well such illustrations support their claims and what considerations, independent of those few mentioned in the dialogue, might give support to what they claim. The task of philosophical evaluation is made more difficult by the mythological context in which the speeches about love are cast. Both talk of Eros and personify love in terms of the god Eros. Considerable demythologizing needs to be done if one is to penetrate to the philosophical kernel of their speeches. In what follows, talk of the god Eros will be taken as symbolic for the love that human beings can have for one another.

Some commentators do not mention any philosophical point in connection with the speeches of Phaedrus and Pausanias, thereby creating the impression that there is nothing philosophical in what they say. Such commentaries are largely devoted to the first three (and other) kinds of judgement about the two speeches. Other commentators disparage what philosophical content they discern there, e.g., Bury who dismisses both speeches as sophistical and self-contradictory, or Dover who finds the dialogue's arguments unpersuasive. Still others find that the philosophical content they discern in both speeches is slight and they pass over it
rather quickly, dwelling longer on other aspects of their speeches. Yet both speakers do make important claims about love which are taken up by later speakers and are either expanded upon, or modified, or rejected in favour of a different view. Important elements of the first two speeches can be found in what Socrates later says on his own, and Diotima's, behalf, though these elements are somewhat transformed given the wider philosophical context in which Plato has subsequently placed them. Both speeches, it will be argued, do have some philosophical merits in their own right, though it requires some effort to tease these out. The contribution of the two speakers might be slight in comparison with the deeper philosophical points advanced later; however when properly appreciated their speeches do not warrant the harsh judgments of many earlier commentators.

Phaedrus' speech (178a-180b) begins with the mythological claim that Eros is a great god who is revered both amongst men and amongst the other gods. Further he cites Hesiod, Acusilaus and Parmenides to establish that Eros is the oldest of the gods. It is hard to discern any philosophical point here, but one begins to emerge when Phaedrus next claims that 'the oldest of gods ... confers upon us the greatest benefits' (178c1-2).\(^1\) \(\text{πρεσβύτατος δὲ ὁ μεγίστων ἄγαθων ἡμῖν αἰτίος ἐστιν.}\) Demythologized, this says that love itself confers the greatest of benefits upon us. Call this Phaedrus' 'major claim'. In support of this Phaedrus cites an example of love in a human context: 'for I would maintain that there can be no greater benefit for a boy than to have a worthy lover from his earliest youth nor for a lover than to have a worthy object for his affection'. Call this Phaedrus' 'minor claim'. The Greek actually reads (178c3-5): \(\text{οὐ γὰρ ἔγω εἴπειν ὅτι μείζων ἐστιν ἄγαθον ἔσθεν νέου ὑπὶ ἔραστής \text{καὶ ἔραστή παιδικά.}\) In translating, Hamilton, in line with the suggestion of both Bury and Dover in their commentaries on the Symposium, suggests that \(\chiρήστα\) be understood at the end. Thus in extolling \(\text{erastes-eromenos}\) male homosexual love as conferring the greatest benefits upon both lover and beloved, Phaedrus requires not only that the older male lover be a worthy lover for the younger boy but also that the younger boy himself be a worthy object of love for the older man. Nehamas and Woodruff seem not to follow the suggestion of Bury and Dover by rendering the passage as follows: 'I cannot say what greater good there is for a young boy than a gentle lover, or for a lover than a boy to love.'\(^2\) The loved boy is not further qualified as worthy (or gentle). This point will be discussed further shortly.

---

1. The translation followed throughout is that of W. Hamilton cited in footnote 8. - Since the translation of one passage is problematic an alternative will be discussed in the text.

Phaedrus does not explicitly claim that such love confers greater benefits than heterosexual love, nor does he, like Pausanias, openly condemn heterosexual love. And, of course, Phaedrus, like Pausanias, is silent about lesbian love. Even though Phaedrus mentions some benefits which arise from such love he does not say why it yields the greatest of benefits (or very great benefits - both equally fit the text). It is left unclear as to whether the benefits that accrue are greater than those from any other sort of love (heterosexual, lesbian) or whether the benefits are greater than, say, those which accrue to a person because of some characteristic they possess which has nothing to do with love, e.g., the virtues they exemplify, or their compassion, or their intellectual powers, and so on. Whether love of the Greek homosexual variety that Phaedrus describes, or homosexual love in general, or heterosexual love, yields the greatest of benefits for lovers is an empirical matter. However if the notion of love is explored a little further, a conceptual point emerges, namely that, necessarily, love between worthy people does yield very great (if not the greatest) benefits. To establish this we need to go beyond the narrow confines of the Greek homosexual love which Phaedrus extols. In fact his claim can be generalised to any pair of lovers whether of the same, or different, sexes.

It is not immediately obvious what is the appropriate generalisation of Phaedrus' minor claim. One reading would be to treat it as the conjunction of two claims (where P, Q, R and S are persons):

1. There is no greater benefit for any P (e.g., a boy, the beloved, the eromenos) than if P has some lover, Q, who is worthy; and
2. There is no greater benefit for R (e.g., a lover, the erastes) than if R loves some S who is worthy.

Note that (1) does not require that P, the beloved, either be worthy or love Q in return; nor does (2) require that R be worthy or that S love R in return. So it is hard to see that in (1) or (2) the greatest of benefits accrue to P or R; moreover, no benefit need accrue to Q or S at all.

There is a possible reading of Phaedrus' minor claim that treats it as an instance of (1). If, like Nehamas and Woodruff, we do not follow the grammatical suggestion of Bury and Dover and so do not require that the beloved eromenos be worthy as well as the erastes himself, then we have a case in which a boy receives a benefit from having a worthy lover but the lover is not benefited by having a worthy beloved in return. Perhaps some erastes-eromenos relationships can be thought of in this way. The older lover is worthy in that he seeks not only to satisfy his sexual desires but also to impart some manly virtues to the boy; in contrast, the younger beloved merely satisfies the older lover's sexual appetite and no more. Is this sufficient for the boy to be a worthy beloved? Perhaps only in the eyes of a man starved of sexual satisfaction. Dover tells what more is needed for the beloved boy to be worthy;
The Greeks did not think of a homosexual love-affair as involving mutual desire on the part of two males of the same age-group. The more mature male, motivated by eros, 'pursues', and the younger, if he 'yields', is motivated by affection, gratitude and admiration.\textsuperscript{1} The \textit{eromenos} would be worthy only if he yields to the \textit{erastes} with quite specific motives.

Xenophon suggests a somewhat different picture of the role of the \textit{eromenos} in his own \textit{Symposium} (viii.21):

A boy does not share the man's enjoyment of sexual intercourse as a woman does: he is a sober person watching one drunk with sexual excitement. In view of all this it is no wonder if he develops an actual contempt for his lover.\textsuperscript{2}

Nothing is said here about the particular motives that Dover suggests the worthy \textit{eromenos} ought to have. The \textit{eromenos} may even become contemptuous of his \textit{erastes}: so, even if the \textit{erastes} is a worthy lover despite being 'drunk with sexual excitement', the \textit{eromenos} will surely be an unworthy beloved. Nehamas and Woodruff emphasize a number of asymmetries in \textit{erastes-eromenos} relationships one of which is that the \textit{eromenos} is not required to love the \textit{erastes} in return.\textsuperscript{3}

This, however, does not preclude the \textit{eromenos} responding to the \textit{erastes} with the appropriate motives, thereby being a worthy beloved. Given this, neither (1) nor (2) capture the correct generalization of the minor claim.

Perhaps Phaedrus' minor claim could be understood in the following way: the lover in (1), the worthy Q, is the same as the lover in (2), viz., R. This would yield:

(3) There is no greater benefit for P than if P has a worthy lover Q; and
(4) There is no greater benefit for Q than if Q loves worthy S.

This still leaves open the possibility that the worthy Q loves both P and S (where P is not the same person as S) but is not loved in return by either. Q could hardly be said to receive the greatest of benefits in a situation in which Q's love is unreciprocated - no matter how worthy Q's love may be.

The inadequacies of the above two interpretations suggest that the most appropriate generalization of Phaedrus' minor claim is the following:

(5) X and Y each have no greater benefit than if X and Y are worthy persons and X loves Y.

\textsuperscript{1} Dover, \textit{op. cit.}, p.4.
\textsuperscript{3} Nehamas and Woodruff, \textit{op. cit.}, p.xv and p.11 footnote 16.
This is to be carefully distinguished from the case of *mutual* love by worthy people:

(5M) X and Y each have no greater benefit than if X and Y are worthy persons and X loves and is loved by Y.

In (5), even though X, the *erastes*, and Y, the *eromenos*, are worthy in their own respective ways, only X loves. In (5M) the love must be mutual; it can be understood to hold between heterosexual lovers and homosexual lovers (other than those of the *erastes - eromenos* kind in which the *eromenos* remains unloving).

There are a number of points to be made about (5) and (5M). Phaedrus' major claim is that love confers upon us the greatest benefits. But which kind of love? The asymmetrical love of (5) or the mutual love of (5M)? Most would opt for the latter; and so does Phaedrus, as I will suggest. Achilles, the *eromenos* of Patroclus, is clearly believed by Phaedrus to have sacrificed his life out of love for his lover (179E-180B). It is not entirely clear from the text whether the army of lovers (178E-179B) fits (5) or (5M); the army would clearly be more efficacious if the soldiers were mutual lovers rather than those of the sort Xenophon describes. Finally there is one important case of love cited by Phaedrus that falls outside the context of homosexual love - the love of Alcestis for her husband Admetus. Clearly Phaedrus thinks of Alcestis as the lover and Admetus as the beloved (this explains the passage at 180B in which the gods rank Achilles above Alcestis since the former is an *eromenos* who also loves his lover). However there is no good reason to think that Alcestis and Admetus do not fit (5M) but rather (5). It would seem that the minor claim understood as (5) at best illustrates the major claim while (5M) captures its content more explicitly given the examples of love Phaedrus cites. The major claim, or its near equivalent (5M), are not so broad as other theses about love developed later in the *Symposium*. Important later are cases in which the objects of love are other than persons, *e.g.*, Pausanias' suggestion that we love the spiritual qualities of a person or Diotima's explicit claim that love is best directed towards beauty itself.

Does mutual love between worthy people yield the greatest of benefits? Let us make the reasonable assumption that the benefits that X and Y receive are joint benefits due to their mutual love and that these benefits are equal to or greater than those each would receive separately from their loving another. It follows that greater overall benefit accrues for both X and Y than in the case of P in (1) and R in (2) where the love is unreciprocated. Whatever benefits are received by P (in (1)) and R (in (2)), most would agree that there are clearly greater benefits to be received from mutual love than unreciprocated love. From this it follows that the mutual love of (5M) yields greater benefits than the asymmetrical love of (5). What (5M) asserts is that the mutual love between worthy people is *sufficient* for the greatest of benefits for each. This is a common enough claim not to be confused with another like it which also has wide assent, *viz.*, that one has missed the greatest of
benefits if one has never loved, and has never been loved by, some other person. What may be disputed is whether this uniquely greatest benefit can be achieved only through love. Is not a person at least equally benefited in life by showing generosity to others, or by showing compassion, or by exemplifying the virtues? In response it could be claimed that a person who led a life which always exemplified the virtues but who had been untouched by love would have missed out on one of life's great benefits. However these difficulties can be side-stepped by noting that (5M) makes a claim only about a sufficient, and not a necessary, condition for receiving the greatest of benefits; other moral, emotional and intellectual features of people may also yield for them the greatest of benefits alongside love. If we were to admit that these other features would yield benefits equal to or greater than those of mutual love then (5M) needs a slight modification. Thus (5M) can admit some looseness as to the amount of benefit that mutual love yields, and some vagueness as to whether it yields the greatest of benefits, without too much damage to the general import of Phaedrus' admittedly imprecise remarks.

Note that (5) and (5M) require that X and Y be worthy. If this is omitted then we have a claim that is hardly likely to be true. If either one of X or Y is not worthy then the other is hardly likely to be the recipient of any benefit let alone the greatest benefit. If one has an unworthy lover then, most likely, one labours under a considerable harm because one is in love with a person who is crude and unfeeling or who is a scoundrel as a person.

But what does it mean to be a worthy lover? In the case of Greek homosexual love some features of worthy lovers and beloved have already been mentioned. But what of worthiness in more general cases of love (as envisaged in (5M))? Does it mean that one has as a lover a person with an all-round worthy character? Or does it mean that one has as lover a person who is worthy _qua_ lover, leaving it open that the lover may be unworthy in some other respect (or in all other respects)? For, a person who is worthy as a lover need not be a worthy person; for example, they may be like Don Juan and be skilled in the arts of love-making, and so be a worthy lover, without being a thoroughly worthy person (_e.g._, the lover is also an incorrigible philanderer). This is a subtlety that goes beyond anything Phaedrus claims. However when we come to the speech of Pausanias we will discover that he has an account of the attributes that those who are 'heavenly' lovers ought to possess.
It is important to note that Phaedrus in his minor claim, understood either as (5) or (5M), talks of a worthy beloved and a worthy lover. A number of commentators have failed to note this when they allege that Pausanias is the first speaker to introduce evaluative notions of love. As we shall see, Pausanias makes much of the distinction between a nobler and a baser kind of love. He differs from Phaedrus in distinguishing between different kinds of objects of love, such as the physical aspects of a person in contrast to their spiritual aspects, claiming that the latter is more worthy of love than the former. But this difference is not sufficient to show that Phaedrus lacks an evaluative notion of love. In both (5) and (5M) he clearly talks of the love of worthy lovers, and thereby has an evaluative notion of love even without recognizing that there can be different kinds of objects of love.

Since they omit the moral aspect of Phaedrus' account of love, some commentators understand his major claim in a more broad way; they omit reference to the worthiness of X and Y and attribute to Phaedrus the claim that any love always yields great benefits no matter who are the lover and the beloved. However it is not obvious that this is the best way to understand him. Certainly if one considers only Phaedrus' major claim that all love 'confers upon us the greatest benefits' then the interpretation just mentioned does fit - but it fails to fit even the minor claim concerning homosexual love. Interpretation (5M) does the most justice to both the major and the minor claim. Looked at in this way Phaedrus' main claim is not obviously as shallow, as commonplace and as devoid of moral content as a number of commentators allege.

Phaedrus' next point (178d-e) is about the causal powers of love. He suggests that if we are to instill in people a sense of shame at what is a disgraceful act on their part and a sense of ambition in striving for noble things, then love will do this more effectively than anything else. Whether love is more effective in this respect than anything else is doubtful: moreover Phaedrus is at variance with Socrates' own viewpoint (admittedly sceptical on some occasions) that we can acquire knowledge of the virtues through learning and thereby avoid shameful acts and pursue the noble. However Phaedrus develops his theme (178e-179b) into an interesting point about the connection between love and the esteem lovers have for

---

1 Thus Taylor tells us that Pausanias '...is dissatisfied with Phaedrus on moral grounds, because he has drawn no distinction between worthy and criminal 'love" (op. cit. p.214). Even Santas tells us that for Phaedrus '...Eros is all good and its effects on man completely beneficial' (op. cit. p.16) without noting the point that Phaedrus' minor claim (and thus (5)) refers only to lovers who are worthy. Each of Hamilton (op. cit., p.14), Guthrie (op. cit. p.381-2) and Grube (op. cit. pp.97-8), while not explicitly claiming that Phaedrus fails to note any moral feature of love, write as if Pausanias is the first speaker to introduce a moral distinction between kinds of love. They, too, fail to note that Phaedrus' claim is strictly only about worthy lovers.
one another, on the one hand, and the avoidance of shame on the other. He invites
us to consider a lover L and a beloved B either of whom is caught in the
performance of some shameful act and then asks whether it is friends, relations or,
respectively, L's beloved or B's lover, that L or B would least like to have observe
that act. The point needs exploring not just in the case of homosexual lovers but
more generally for any pair of lovers.

Does an intense desire to avoid shame and to be seen in a good light at least
constantly accompany love? More strongly, does its presence tell us something
about the nature of love? To test the stronger claim we must ask (a) whether it is
logically possible for at least one of a pair of mutual lovers to love the other and at
the same time fail to desire not to be shamed in front of the other, or, more
positively, fail to desire not to be seen in a good light by the other; and (b)
whether one of a pair of lovers can have desires of this sort and yet fail to love the
other. (b) seems clearly false. A person can desire not to be shamed in front of
others they do not (erotically) love, e.g., those the person esteems or holds in high
regard such as their football coach, local guru or hero, or inspiring teacher. Thus
desire not to be shamed in front of someone captures a wider class of persons than
just those one loves (erotically).

In contrast (a) seems to be true. Normally one desires not to be shamed in front of
anyone. If one is to be shamed at all then one would probably prefer to be shamed
in front of people one does not know and with whom one would not be likely to
come into contact again. Shame is made more poignant when in front of people
one knows and respects, and is quite devastating when in front of one's beloved. It
is not uncommon for one to hide shameful facts about oneself, known, say, to
others in one's distant past but not known to one's current acquaintances or to
those one currently loves. One might try hard to avoid their coming to know
about that past (unless one's trust of one's beloved was such that confession would
be both possible and appropriate). However Phaedrus' claim is not so much about
actually being shamed but, rather, desiring not to be shamed irrespective of
whether or not one actually is shamed in front of anyone (whether unknown,
known or loved). That is, we need to consider whether there is a story which
illustrates the possibility that L and B are mutual lovers, and yet at least one of L
or B fails to desire not to be shamed in any way in front of the other. Perhaps if L
were to use B merely for sexual gratification and L did not esteem B in any way
then L may fail to desire not to be shamed in any way in front of B. If L cares nothing for the
views or feelings of B but merely uses B for sexual gratification then L would treat
B rather like those with whom L hopes in the long run to have little or no contact
- except that L requires B for sexual gratification. Being shamed in front of B is
of little consequence since L has no regard or esteem for B. Or, perhaps one could
imagine perverse kinds of love in which the normal range of desires for and desires
against are absent. Both kinds of example put considerable pressure on whether it can be said that L and B genuinely do love one another while at the same time each lacks any desire not to be shamed in front of the other.

What the above suggests is that if L and B are lovers then each holds the other in considerable esteem and that as a consequence of such mutual esteem each desires not to be shamed in front of the other (if either were to be shamed in front of anyone at all). Thus the desire not to be shamed in front of one’s lover is a logically necessary, but not sufficient, condition for love of one another. Even though this is a logically necessary feature of love it does not tell us much about the nature of love since it concerns only the narrow issue of shame. Still it does show that Phaedrus has latched onto a necessary feature of love. He illustrates it in the case of the homosexual love between soldiers and argues for the efficacy of comradely love in inspiring military prowess on the battle field. This is a stronger point than merely desiring not to be shamed in front of one’s beloved; it is part of the requirement that a lover actively desire to be seen in a good light by their beloved. This is too strong a requirement to impose on all cases of love, but there are occasions when it becomes important. Love, Phaedrus alleges, can inspire valour in dire circumstances - even at the cost of one’s life. However granting that love entails the desire not to be shamed in front of one’s lover, and also that that desire will lead, on the whole, to action rather than inaction in dangerous circumstances, the link between love and the actual performance of valourous action still remains contingent. That love inspires lovers to heroic feats is at best a causal claim about the effects of love, as Phaedrus correctly notes at 179b where he talks of ‘the effect which Love, of his very nature, produces in men [and we should add, women since Phaedrus cites the case of Alcestis] who are in love’. Love, we may say, can enter into an explanation as to why a particular person is courageous without being conceptually linked to the property of desiring to be seen in a favourable light, and, in particular, to being courageous.

The final section of Phaedrus’ speech (179b-180b) concerns the claim that ‘only lovers will sacrifice their lives for one another’ (179b). This is illustrated not only by examples of homosexual love but also the love of a woman for a man, Alcestis for her husband. Though the claim has some examples to its credit they do not show that only lovers will so sacrifice their lives. Complete strangers, such as medical personnel in war-time or rescue-service people, will take considerable risks and do on occasions sacrifice their lives for people who are otherwise unknown to them. Phaedrus’ claim is a narrow and false judgement about those who are willing to sacrifice their lives for others. Perhaps we should attribute to Phaedrus one or other of the closely related claims, viz., (a) that all lovers will sacrifice their lives for one another, or (b) that all lovers desire to sacrifice their lives for one another. Both of these seem false. In the case of (a), that someone fails to rescue their beloved in some fatal situation which involves a
high probability that they too would lose their life, need not be due to an absence of love on their part; mutual love is quite compatible with not sacrificing oneself when one’s beloved is in some fatal situation. Do all lovers desire to sacrifice their life for their beloved, even though they do not always actually do so? (b) is also too strong a claim; one can genuinely love without having such a desire, though in some cases of intense love the desire is (contingently) co-present. Though Phaedrus recognizes that, at best, there is only a causal connection between love and willingness to sacrifice one’s life he does not recognize that in many cases the alleged causal connection does not hold. Love can fail to bring about personal sacrifice in many circumstances, and love can be absent in many cases where personal sacrifice does occur.

Though Phaedrus’ speech is largely couched in mythological terms it is not entirely devoid of interest on the topic of love. We have uncovered (5M) as the central thesis behind the opening sections of his speech: mutual love yields great, if not the greatest of benefits, for lovers. In discussing the benefits that accrue to lovers when placed in threatening circumstances which would test their love, for example, lovers in times of war, Phaedrus notes the causal efficacy of love in producing courageous action and avoiding cowardly retreat. He also makes the logical point that lovers desire not to be shamed in front of one another and uses this feature of love to explain why it is that lovers will be, on the whole, courageous rather than cowardly in threatening circumstances. However not all his causal claims about love are generally true, despite the many examples in their favour; love does not always, nor only, lead to self-sacrifice. Nor does mutual love entail that the lovers have the desire to be self-sacrificing for their beloved, though as an empirical claim there are many cases in which such love does lead to self-sacrifice. Some of these points about love are more than commonplace and, while they are not explored deeply by Phaedrus, they do contribute to a picture of aspects of love even though they do not help delineate the main features of that picture.

Pausanias begins his speech (180c-185c) by distinguishing between two goddesses of love, Heavenly Aphrodite and Common Aphrodite. Demythologized, these represent two distinct kinds of love, heavenly love and common love; these will be referred to respectively as noble love and base love. Base love, we are told, is what baser men feel; their love is directed towards women as much as young men; it is physical rather than spiritual; it is directed towards those who are as unintelligent as possible; base lovers aim only at the satisfaction of desire in any way possible. Noble love, in contrast, arises only in men (though this point arises mythologically from the remark that Heavenly Aphrodite was born from the sea into which the severed member of her father Uranus had been thrown and therefore she ‘has no female strain in her, but springs entirely from the male'
(181c)); it is directed towards the male sex and then only towards those who have matured sufficiently to display their intelligence and fine spiritual characteristics (in contrast, such love may not be directed towards women, and homosexual relations with minors or the immature are condemned); noble lovers must love with the intention of forming a partnership which lasts for life and is not to be a fleeting attraction (this is a partial anticipation of Aristophanes' view of love expressed later in the dialogue); unlike base lovers, noble lovers are to show discretion in their choice of lover and self-control in their loving. Clearly Pausanias has in mind erastes-eromenos male homosexual love as the only proper and praiseworthy kind of love. This would strike most readers, contemporary or not, as hopelessly wrong and limited by a peculiarly exclusive sub-culture of homosexual love.

Still it is possible to set aside the homosexually-oriented characterization of noble and base love and to draw the distinction more widely for any pair of lovers of either sex. Pausanias' base love is that in which the lover desires only to have sexual contact with another person's body, in any manner and by any means possible. If the reasons for the condemnation of this kind of love concern the final clause, then Pausanias clearly has a point. However it is not obvious that love which involves only the desire for casual sexual intercourse with any willing partner, and which is carried out in a manner which is not "rough" but pleasing to the beloved, is necessarily to be condemned. It may be granted that a life in which the only love experienced is that of mere sexual gratification (not necessarily promiscuous), such as that of an accomplished seducer like Don Juan, is devoid of the finer aspects of love; a person who has loved only in this way may have missed one of life's greatest benefits - as Phaedrus would have it. The possibility of casual, but sensitive, sexual relations with willing partners readily shows that the distinction between base and noble love is not exhaustive of the full range of kinds of love that people can experience. Noble love has quite specific features. Stripped of its homosexual overtones it involves at least the following central characteristics: the love must be directed towards the spiritual aspects of a person or their soul; the beloved must be sufficiently mature to display these spiritual aspects; the lover must love with the explicit and honestly held intention to form a partnership for life with the beloved. Thus noble love, so characterized, is to be directed towards a quite specific object and must be accompanied by quite specific intentions.

It is clear why Pausanias condemns base love; one merely satisfies sexual desire 'in any manner and by any means possible'. But as noted the casual satisfaction of sexual desire with a willing partner (or a number of them) in a manner pleasing to both is not obviously to be condemned. Nor is it obvious that such love is

1 These features of base and higher love can be found at 181b-182a. They are followed by an account of sexual customs in Attica and other city-states (182b-183d).
incompatible with noble love. To be sure, the object of love is different and certain specific intentions on the part of the lover(s) are absent. Moreover a person may well love another in the way required by noble love and at the same time love them in other ways which are partly characteristic of base love. It would be wrong to view noble love as only "Platonic" love of a person's soul without any sexual love. This would be one extreme, but there are less extreme cases of noble love. A lover, besides loving the spiritual qualities of their beloved, may love them physically as well (but, presumably, unlike the rough base lover, in a way pleasing to the beloved); and besides having the intention to form a life-long partnership they may also have the intention to satisfy their sexual desires in loving their beloved. However noble love clearly excludes the person who loves only in the manner of a Don Juan philanderer (however expert they may be in the art of seduction), and it excludes the base lover (who is clearly not a Don Juan lover). Pausanias obscures the range of love relationships by starkly contrasting base and noble love. But a careful consideration of the objects of love and the intentions of the lovers yields a range of kinds of love: there is the main contrast between base and noble love but there are a number of intermediary cases of varieties of love that are also important to distinguish.

Phaedrus and Pausanias are in close agreement that the lover and the beloved be worthy persons. But Pausanias is more specific about the features that count for worthiness; he requires that the lover have some quite specific intentions in loving and that the beloved be a sufficiently developed and responsive person. Since Phaedrus does not tell us what is to count as a worthy lover we can, without too much strain, take the above to be at least part of the requirements of worthiness for a lover both qua person and qua lover, thereby filling a gap concerning the way in which we are to understand Phaedrus' claims in both (5) and (5M). However, one way in which they do differ is that Pausanias expands the category of objects of love (thereby foreshadowing Diotima's list of objects of love in the "ascent" passage (210a-212a)). Phaedrus talks only of the love of persons, the most beneficial love being of worthy persons: he does not consider any other objects of love, such as properties like the worthiness of a person. Pausanias, too, talks of love of, and by, worthy persons. But he also talks specifically of other objects of love such as: 'love of intellectual and physical achievement' (182c); 'the common or vulgar lover, who is in love with the body rather than the soul; he is not constant because what he loves is not constant' (183e); and 'the lover of a noble nature [who] remains its lover for life' (183e). Pausanias' range of objects of love is much broader than that of Phaedrus but not as broad as that developed by speakers later in the dialogue. However, distinctions need to be made between kinds of objects of love if Pausanias is to draw the distinction between base and noble love.
One way in which Phaedrus and Pausanias are thought to differ is over the question as to whether love always leads to benefits or not. The question is ambiguous. Is love necessarily beneficial so that, no matter in what circumstances and no matter what persons, love always yields a benefit to the lovers? Or are only certain kinds of love necessarily beneficial? Or is it wrong to speak of love as necessarily having benefits? Should one rather speak of the benefits that as a matter of fact arise from the circumstances of particular lovers - other circumstances and/or lovers yielding less or more benefits? In discussing (5M) we did not ask whether it was a necessarily true claim, or whether it was a contingent claim. To test whether it is necessarily true we need to ask whether it is logically possible that X and Y are worthy persons who mutually love one another but X and Y each have no greatest benefit from their mutual love? If one imagines that X and Y get greater benefits from something other than love (e.g., their compassionate natures) then we would have to answer 'yes'. But if we consider a weakened form of (5M) which concerns not the yielding of a maximum benefit but at least the yielding of some, or a substantial, benefit then matters are not so clear. That is, we need to ask whether it is logically possible that X and Y are each worthy and are mutual lovers yet X and Y receive no (or no substantial) benefit from their mutual love? No matter how dire the circumstances of X and Y may otherwise be, most would admit that at least their mutual love is a benefit and perhaps their sole benefit; so the above is not a possibility. Note that it is important that both X and Y be worthy persons, otherwise if one is not worthy then the other may be the recipient of either no benefits or of considerable disbenefit. Thus a weakened form of (5M) viz.,

(6) If X and Y are worthy persons who mutually love, then X and Y each receive some (or a considerable) benefit is both true and seems to have the status of a conceptual or necessary truth.

Let us now turn to Pausanias' position on this principle. He says that the activities the symposiasts are engaged in, viz., drinking, singing and talking, are not good in themselves: '... the truth about every activity is that in itself it is neither good nor bad' (181a). In arguing on behalf of this he adopts the principle: 'If it is well and rightly used, an activity becomes good, if wrongly, bad'. Loving is an activity no less than drinking, singing and talking, and so falls within the scope of this principle. Thus love is not a good in itself, i.e., it does not necessarily yield benefits. Later he expresses a similar point thus: 'There is, as I stated at first, no absolute right and wrong in love, but everything depends on the circumstances: to yield to a bad man in a bad way is wrong, but to yield to a worthy man in a right way is right. The bad man is the common or vulgar [base] lover, who is in love with the body rather than the soul.' (183d-c) Pausanias' adoption of such a principle would win applause from Socrates who often suggests
that the worth of certain human qualities is not intrinsic but depends on how they are used.\footnote{This point is made by Guthrie (op. cit. p.381), who refers to \textit{Meno} 87e-88a for Socrates' discussion of the status of the worth of health, strength, good looks and wealth.}

The gist of the above is that Pausanias maintains that only for some people in some circumstances does love yield something good, \textit{i.e.}, a benefit; for the same people in different circumstances, or different people in those same circumstances, the outcome could be quite different. Such is the chancy character of the benefits of love! Given that Pausanias draws a distinction between two kinds of love there are, then, two theses that need to be distinguished:

- If either or both of X and Y indulge in base love then either X or Y, or both, receive some (or a considerable) benefit
- If X and Y both indulge in noble love then X and Y each receive some (or a considerable) benefit.

Consider (7) first. One of Pausanias' objections to base love is that 'it is quite random in the effects it produces' and that 'its effect is purely a matter of chance, and quite as often bad as good' (181b). By 'random' or 'chance' we can take it that Pausanias means either that the base lover is not able to anticipate the outcome of his actions due to his ignorance or that base love itself is a pretty chancy matter in what it yields. Thus, either way, base lovers are not able to judge the benefits or disbenefits of their love, or, in many cases, there is simply no benefit to be obtained. Granted this, it follows that Pausanias would reject (7), if we understand it as universally quantified with respect to persons and their temporal, and other, circumstances. But he would presumably agree that for some people in some circumstances their indulging in base love does yield a benefit. Thus base love sometimes yields a benefit but sometimes does not, and this is sufficient to establish the stronger claim that base love is not necessarily beneficial.

Pausanias' position can be supported in other ways. If one puts emphasis in the notion of base love on its being love 'in any manner and by any means possible' then such love can be rather brutalizing and hardly worthy of the name 'love'. It is hard to see what benefits accrue for either of a pair of base lovers. However casual sexual liaisons between consenting lovers, or even some kinds of prostitution, can yield a benefit for both. The benefit may be having a pleasurable though fleeting experience, or, in the case of prostitution, the releasing of sexual tension for the one and the earning of money for the other. What such cases show is that judgements about the benefits or disadvantages of base love arise contingently from
the circumstances of the love and have little to do with the love itself. The benefits which arise are due to, say, the release of sexual tension or the earning of money.

Consider (8). This is, to all intents and purposes, like (6), providing we understand that in (8) 'X' and 'Y' stand only for worthy persons, i.e., they have those characteristics Pausanias requires of lovers who indulge in noble love. Thus, there is no disagreement between Pausanias and Phaedrus over the truth of (8) (= (6)). But do they disagree over its status? Pausanias says: 'It is not Love absolutely that is good or praiseworthy, but only Love which impels men to love aright' (181a). We have agreed that not all love is absolutely good because base love only occasionally yields a benefit. But does all noble love necessarily yield a benefit, or a substantial benefit, for the lovers? We have argued this for Phaedrus' principle (5M) in its modified version (6). (8) seems to say nothing significantly different from (6), so its status is more like that of a necessary than a contingent truth. The issue is an important one for Pausanias as he does force us to see that not all love yields a benefit. Phaedrus does not comment on this, but then the principle he adopted, viz., (5M) (or the modified version (6)), makes no claim about all kinds of love; it is confined to love between worthy persons only. Thus it seems that on the benefits of noble love Phaedrus and Pausanias are in agreement; but neither clearly formulates their view on the status of (8) (= (6)). What they might differ over is whether all love, of whatever sort, yields a benefit; but then, it has been argued, this is not a claim one should properly attribute to Phaedrus.

Two of the other main features of Pausanias' speech are his account of the homosexual customs of various states, including Attica (182b-183d), and the educative role he assigns the erastes-eromenos homosexual relationship (largely at 184a-185b). The former is mainly of interest to historians of sexual customs - no peculiarly philosophical point about love emerges from it. Pausanias describes the entirely open and public character of Athenian homosexuality. The older lover (erastes) wears his passions on his sleeve and his younger lover (eromenos) is suitably coy about his advances. In fact, both are required to observe the rules of a rather formal courtship which is as much public as it is private; as Pausanias says, it is often a public competition to see for how long the lover can pursue his unrequited passion and for how long the beloved can resist the attentions heaped on him. In extolling homosexuality Pausanias is disdainful of other kinds of love. Both Bury and Hamilton view Pausanias as a clever lawyer-like pleader for homosexuality, while Dover suggests that his relationship with Agathon is
reflected in the kind of homosexuality he advocates, in his contempt for love with women or immature boys and in his condemnation of impermanent relationships.  

The idea of permanence plays an important role in Pausanias' account of love. As we have seen, noble love requires that lovers have the intention to form a lasting relationship. Permanence also plays a role in his account of the objects of love. Love of bodies is fleeting because bodies age and will cease to be as attractive as they once were; but love of a person's soul is alleged not to be fleeting because one's nature, when it is fully and properly formed from the onset of maturity, remains constant for life. It is love of the qualities of the soul that leads Pausanias to place strong emphasis on the educative role that ought to accompany homosexual love (a feature which also appears in Diotima's account of the ascent up the scale of the objects of love later in the dialogue). Pausanias insists that in homosexual love the erastes is 'justified in performing any service whatever in return for the favours of his beloved' while the eromenos 'is justified in any act of compliance to one who can make him good and wise'. Then he adds that 'when the lover is able to contribute towards wisdom and excellence, and the beloved is anxious to improve his education and knowledge in general, then and then only, when these two principles coincide and in no other circumstances is it honourable for a boy to yield to his lover'(184d-e). Pausanias imposes quite stringent necessary and sufficient conditions for when lovers ought to yield to one another; both must love with quite specific intentions about intellectual improvement, and both must have quite specific justifications for yielding to one another.

Is this account of love generalisable from its homosexual context to love between any two people of either sex? It seems not. The intentions of the lovers and their justification for yielding to one another are too specifically linked to the case of the kind of homosexual love that Pausanias advocates. It may be the case that some lovers do yield to one another for the reasons Pausanias prescribes, but this would be unusual of most present-day love - and, in any case, it is a highly contingent feature of love that people do, or should, love in this way. However there is the residual point that, since in noble love it is necessary to love with the requisite intentions, one may love correctly but that love may be squandered on a dissembling scoundrel who deceives about his (or her) intentions. No shame accrues in this case due to an honest error in one's choice of partner. However yielding to a lover because of the expectation that they will help increase one's power or wealth is to love with quite the wrong intention. This is shameful enough, according to Pausanias, even if one's lover is successful in providing

wealth or power; it becomes additionally shameful if one's lover turns out to either have no influence in circles of power or is penniless. Mistakes about one's choice of lover are excusable providing one loves with the right intentions; they are inexcusable if one loves with the wrong intentions.

Demythologised, and taken out of their homosexual context, what Phaedrus and Pausanias say about love is not without interest. The main ideas that lie behind what they say are not all that apparent and do need to be teased out. When brought to light they do not give us a full picture of love but, rather, some substantial hints about where to start an investigation into love. Earlier commentators, perhaps by concentrating on the literary, moral and socio-historical aspects of the speeches, have missed some of the philosophical points that underlie what they say. Thesis (5M) is not criticized later in the dialogue and underlies much of what the two speakers say about love. It also foreshadows important aspects of what Aristophanes says about love. Importantly Pausanias' distinction between kinds of objects of love introduces Plato's own view of love of beauty found in Diotima's account of how a lover can open a beloved's eyes to the hierarchy of objects of love.1

---

1 I am indebted to Pat Lacey and an anonymous referee for comments on an earlier version of this paper. In particular, the referee suggested ways in which I could recast some of the material concerning what I have called Phaedrus' 'major and minor claims'.