18

DIVINE NAMES AND THE MYSTERY OF DIOTIMA

Danielle A. Layne

> Well slave-boys (ὦ παῖδες), serve the rest of us. In all ways you serve up whatever you want, whenever no one is set over you—I have never done this. But now, consider myself and the rest of us subject to your invitation to dinner; so that we may commend you, serve!
>
> *(175b)*[1]

> Hey, Agathon's boy, fetch me the largest cup you possess. Never mind, it isn't necessary. Fetch me, slave-boy, that wine-cooler…
>
> *(213e)*

Ordering Agathon's "hosting" slaves to fetch, like dogs, an oversized goblet, Alcibiades quickly quaffs his cup (214a) and boldly changes the topic from praising Eros to Socrates. Mixing eulogy with fault-finding (μέμφομαι 222a), Alcibiades emphasizes that, while seductive, the philosopher deceives (ἐξᾰπατά 222b), a claim he substantiates by narrating an unbelievable insult the philosopher made against him. But before he begins, Alcibiades makes a demand; only the "initiated" can hear the offense while the "house-hold slaves and those other profane rural-folk," must "secure a large gate over [their] ears (οἱ δὲ οἰκέται, καὶ εἴ τις ἄλλος ἐστὶν βέβηλός τε καὶ ἄγροικος, πύλας πάνυ μεγάλας τοῖς ὠσὶν ἐπίθεσθε)." What the "low-lives," the unusual hosts for Agathon's symposium, are not allowed to hear is that the normally unwashed and seemingly poor Socrates refused to serve the would-be tyrant's desires.[2] For this insult, Alcibiades recasts Socrates as a silenus, specifically Marsyus, who dared to court Apollo's wrath and, as such, the philosopher is roundly flayed, instead of praised, for his duplicity.

Poignantly, in the *Symposium*, Socrates is not the only character to be divinely recast, to be given another title, as Apollodorus, Plato's seemingly untrustworthy narrator, has a penchant for name-play. His narration of the evening's events is continuously peppered with puns and unusual monikers, not least of which is the mysterious Μαντινικὴ Διοτίμα (201d2), where the priestess' name and reference to her city translates as "Zeus honored prophetess of victory." It is the contention of this chapter that Apollodorus' playful way with words, far from stylistic window-dressing, has the potential to dramatically turn the tables on "fault-finding" vainglorious men like Alcibiades. Apollodorus' uncanny ability to wield tautologic speech (ἴσα λέγειν

DOI: 10.4324/9781003047858-20

οὑτωσὶ 185c4–5) allows our narrator the chance to recast the enslaved servants (consistently referred to diminutively as boys/παῖδες) alongside other nameless or dismissed characters, like the flute-girl, and therein, awards them their promised praise. Most importantly, though, he reveals the historical personage and cult of the mysterious, but no less dismissed, Diotima.[3] The following will begin by focusing on those who truly host the party—not Agathon, nor as Nye contended, Diotima.[4] Rather, Apollodorus' mysterious companions (like the demeaned servants) act, despite their anonymity, as the efficient cause that sets the story about "the dinner that brought together Agathon, Socrates and Alcibiades" (172b) into motion. This reading depicts a dramatically new image of Apollodorus, now recast as more than a parrot who fails to truly lead the philosophical life. Rather, our narrator will evidence that he, like a good dialectician, reads the room and, in response to the needs of his companions, combines features of comedy and tragedy (223d), all while playfully hiding in his penchant for name-play, the key to a serious enigma at the heart of his story: *the divine eponym of Socrates' infamous teacher of all things* to erotica—*the name of the wise foreign priestess, Diotima of Mantinea.*

1 The Erotic Frame and the Pun of It All

To commence rather crudely, the comedy of the *Symposium* begins with an elaborate dick joke.

> I believe I am not unpracticed (ἀμελέτητος) about which you inquire. For by chance yesterday I came up to town from my home in Phalerum and one such "notable" (τῶν οὖν γνωρίμων τις) spotted me from behind and called from the distance, at once jokingly summoning (παίζων ἅμα τῇ κλήσει), "Hey you, Phalerian (Ὦ Φαληρεύς)," he said, "yeah you, Apollodorus (οὗτος Ἀπολλόδωρος), can't you wait?"
>
> *(172a)*

Passing momentarily over the first sentence, according to Eleanor Dickey (1996: 156, 176–177), the summons of Apollodorus' acquittance is strikingly informal and boorish. She argues that employing οὗτος when referring to Apollodorus as well as the use of the demotic signifies an unusually low-register for any Platonic dialogue and, overall, has insulting connotations. Further, as David Sansone (2017: 479) notes, the *at present* unnamed individual turns out to be Glaucon, famed for his loquaciousness and urbanity, so "this address is all the more striking." Responding to James Cotter (1992: 133), who suggested that Φαληρεύς be emended to read Φαληρίς so that Glaucon makes an obvious phallic reference, Sansone believes no textual emendation is required. Φαληρεύς *qua* vocative similarity to Φάλης already evokes "the familiar circumstances of the annual phallic procession," where such bawdy taunts were typical of the atmosphere.[5] Since processions of Phales included large statues of erect penises that were associated with Dionysian festivals, the idea seems apt in light of Agathon's dramatic victory at one such festival. So, to translate, the opening lines present the first of many puns on names as Glaucon mockingly calls Apollodorus a "divine dick" because that is what you do in a carnival-like procession celebrating the tawdry bacchic God.

Now, such language would be appropriate during a crowded revelry dancing enthusiastically toward the city, but Glaucon and Apollodorus are not actually in the midst of such a procession; for, at least beyond this possible pun, there is no suggestion of such distraction in Apollodorus' description of their ascent. Rather, Glaucon emphasizes "the road into town is suitable for walking as well as for speaking and listening" (173b). Things seem rather quiet and, so, how are we to explain the vulgarity beyond mere symbolism? This requires that we

ask in what other contexts were free, well-educated and urbane citizens allowed to rowdily deride one another? The obvious answer is the private symposium, feasts where aristocratic men were unencumbered from the constraints of civility and could relax and wag their tongues. Moreover, scholars of Athenian culture like Sean Corner (2011: 66) have argued that symposiums were but the "public brothel brought into the *oikos*," and he further contends, private symposiums mirrored the activities and spaces of public brothels, locations where men were encouraged to indulge not only in sexual liaisons but also, as a kind of cathartic release, irreverent and/or low register banter. Notably, both Apollodorus and Glaucon are walking away from the port cities of Athens, areas known for brothels, sex stalls (*oikema/oikemata*), prostitutes (*pornai/meretrices*) and, yes, even flute-girls at the docks.[6] Further, the choice to name the infamously promiscuous (*Rep*. 474–e) Glaucon as the undisclosed "nobleman," who, humorously, comes up from behind and feels unashamed to loudly use foul language should remind audiences of Aristophanic comedy, wherein such obscenity and tawdry meeting spaces were entirely apt. Indeed, the setting of Apollodorus and Glaucon's encounter is made clearer when Apollodorus names his primary source, Aristodemus the Small (σμικρός)[7] or, as Xenophon refers to him, the Dwarf (μικρόν).[8] Described by Aristophanes in a surviving fragment of *The Banqueters* as so promiscuous and passive (καταπὺγον) that his ass (πρωκτος) could be mistaken for the man,[9] Aristodemus is not bare-foot, as many commentators have supposed, because he emulates (by choice) Socrates' style. Rather, Aristodemus, despite being a citizen by birth, is impoverished and, as his reputed promiscuity and passivity imply, he does what he must to survive.[10] Like Phaedo, Socrates' intimate who was rumored to have once been an enslaved sex worker,[11] Aristodemus, perhaps due to his physical stature, has been relegated to a class of individuals associated with working in the streets or sleeping near bath houses (known sites for sex work); indeed, the very location Socrates finds his favorite on his way to Agathon's.[12]

Further, Apollodorus' descriptions of the value of philosophical discourse in contradistinction to the talk of others also hide some interesting references to the lives of his unnamed companions (in the primary frame).

> For me, whether I am advancing speeches concerning philosophy or listening to others, I commonly find that I take an immense delight regardless of what I think their benefice is for me; whereas the other sorts of speech—especially that of your wealthy money-makers (ἄλλως τε καὶ τοὺς ὑμετέρους τοὺς τῶν πλουσίων καὶ χρηματιστικῶν)—I am not only aggrieved myself but pity intimates like you (αὐτός τε ἄχθομαι ὑμᾶς τε τοὺς ἑταίρους ἐλεῶ), who think you are doing something when you do nothing. Perhaps you think me miserable, and I think your thought true. I, however, do not think it of you but I know it well.
>
> *(173c)*

Often this jeer is interpreted as directed toward Apollodorus' companions, a clear sign of his haughtiness and failure to truly emulate Socrates.[13] Yet, the passage is more complex. Apollodorus' description is directed toward the company his friends *keep*, wealthy money-makers. In contrast to those who enjoy philosophical speeches, his companions must also converse with those who delight in their wealth. Apollodorus pities his intimates for having to sacrifice their time with such braggarts. Keeping in mind (1) the possible setting as just outside a brothel (making Glaucon's dick joke acceptable), (2) the original narrator Aristodemus' association with sex work, and (3) Apollodorus' companions (ἑταῖροι) are forced to spend time with affluent windbags, is it possible that the unnamed ἑταῖροι are a bevy of prostitutes, male or a

combination of male and female? Further, is it possible that they ask after the story of Socrates' insult to Alcibiades because they themselves serviced one such money-bag, possibly Glaucon himself, the day before? Recall that Apollodorus initially referred to Glaucon as "one such 'notable'" (τῶν οὖν γνωρίμων **τις**), where the **τις** signifies the disdain for one in the class "notable" or, translated otherwise, the class of the "well-known/distinguished." Said differently, the ἑταῖροι have just asked Apollodorus about the story while referencing some contemptible renowned figure of Athens. This would explain why Apollodorus does not name Glaucon immediately but waits until he is deeper into his narration (172e) insofar as his companions already know the identity of the *so-called* "notable." Furthermore, recall that Glaucon said he heard his unclear version of the story from *someone* (again also using **τίς** pejoratively) who heard it from Phoenix, son of Phillip, showing that for Glaucon, only persons from distinguished classes deserve mention. Having witnessed Glaucon's dismissiveness, Apollodorus uses similar terms (**τις**) in reference to so-called distinguished man at the opening, therein questioning Glaucon's celebrated status—a joke, or moment of Socratic irony, his companions can share if one of them was the mere "someone" who supposedly told the unclear version. Apollodorus' friends ask after the story because the so-called distinguished, money-grubbing, unphilosophical patron, Glaucon, insulted them for not rehearsing the affairs of Agathon's banquet to his satisfaction just the day before.

So, Apollodorus lambasts the unfortunate company his friends keep as "doing nothing" and concludes that though they may think him an unhappy wretch (κακοδαίμονα), he knows his companions are miserable. Unlike himself, a man with certain privileges (or philosophical talent) allowing him to cease, as he describes, "running about at random (πρὸ τοῦ δὲ περιτρέχων ὅπῃ τύχοιμι)" (173a) (another common euphemism in comedy for sex work or exploiting sex workers), Apollodorus' friends only have time to dabble in philosophy. Responding to Apollodorus, one of the intimates retorts:

> Always the same, Apollodorus, always insulting yourself and others as you think all, starting with yourself but save Socrates, are sincerely miserable. How you came to be called by the nickname (ἐπωνυμίαν) *softy* (μαλακὸς), I personally haven't a clue (οὐκ οἶδα ἔγωγε), for you are always like this, *savage* (ἀγριαίνεις) in your speeches with yourself and others, save Socrates.
>
> *(173d)*

Confused by the context of calling Apollodorus "soft," textual emendations have often lead translators to substitute τὸ μαλακὸς for τὸ μανικὸς[14] but once the erotic frame is taken seriously, we can now imagine Apollodorus lying in bed with his friend(s), sympathizing with their plight, so that the nickname "softy" may gesture (1) to how other sex workers refer to him and (2) to his companions poking fun at Apollodorus for his current state post/pre-coitus. Imagining stage directions, the scene would resemble Aristophanic comedy as the friend coquettishly strokes Apollodorus' flaccid 'softness' before teasingly contrasting it with his savagery (ἀγριαίνεις) in other areas.

To this playful banter, Apollodorus responds affectionately, perhaps even insecurely: "My dearest (Ὦ φίλτατε), so it is clear this notion about myself and others is a foolish madness?" Often read as Apollodorus raving, the use of φίλτατε suggests intimacy and should guide how the following question is translated.[15] If read sincerely, φίλτατε results in a surprisingly tender questioning of his own self-image, a rather Socratic moment where he wonders if he is on the right track. Is he really made better by philosophical discourses? Are others really living the unlivable life? Has he got this wrong? In fact, this may be, like his sobbing in the *Phaedo*, an

instance of Apollodorus' softness. Cleverly, the companion calms him, responding that it is not worth it to contest these things now (173e). The unnamed companions side with Apollodorus (173c); the life of listening to philosophical speeches, regardless of their usefulness, is amusing or at least preferable to the chatter of the wealthy.

Returning to the opening line, "I believe I am not unpracticed in the subject you inquire about." Obviously, there are rich allusions here concerning the difference between knowledge and opinion, memory and the oral transmission of ideas. Many have argued that this elaborate frame and Apollodorus' insistence that he does not remember all the speeches shows that he is an untrustworthy narrator. Yet, if we shift our perspective, noticing the erotic context of the primary frame, we can see why Apollodorus is not unpracticed. He is often asked about that evening in such contexts. As Alcibiades' own speech indicates (215d), what persons of the lower class would not want to hear, repeatedly, the story of an evening wherein a bunch of well-known distinguished men are made fools of when attempting to discuss the erotic? Recall that the primary source for the evening is Aristodemus, the impoverished dwarf associated with promiscuity, who sat rather silently through the evening. Though he was silent, he did not box his ears, as Alcibiades demanded of those he deemed low and profane. Rather outside the setting of Agathon's party, Aristodemus feels comfortable spinning the yarn to every Tom, Dick and Harry, every Phoenix or Apollodorus who request his company. These persons, like Aristodemus, who belong to the lower class, eagerly recite the story in venues described by Alcibiades, settings where persons he considers "low-lives" learn of Socrates' insult. In short, the scene Alcibiades expressly fears and condemns during his praise of Socrates (215d), i.e. the lower class eagerly recounting his insult, is the very setting of the primary frame. This setting accounts for Apollodorus' style geared toward an audience with a taste for low comedy and almost Aristophanic vulgarity and wordplay.

The Phalerian pun, whether it plays with phallic humor or not, is explicitly referred to as a joke (παίζων 172a). Far from an anomaly, puns on names and places repeatedly contribute to the humor of both the frame and affairs of the evening. This penchant for puns is clearly highlighted when Apollodorus makes an aside at the end of Pausanias' speech, saying, "Pausanias paused Παυσανίου δὲ παυσαμένου (185c4)." The alteration causes Apollodorus to poke fun at his own sophistic habit, teasingly confessing to his companions the following: "For the wise have taught me tautologic speech (διδάσκουσι γάρ με ἴσα λέγειν οὑτωσὶ οἱ σοφοί c4–5)." This aside allows readers to hear Apollodorus' sense of humor even when he speaks for Eryximachus. Interestingly, Pierre Destrée has shown that this pun on Pausanias' name is repeated at least six times (185d2, d4, d6, d8, e2 and 188e4) during the doctor's exchanges with Aristophanes.[16] The repetition of the Pausanian pun reflects Apollodorus' compulsion to keep the gag going. Further, Destrée notes the humor of Eryximachus' own name, Belch-fighter, purposefully employed during the hiccup episode at the doctor's expense. Destrée also points out, puns on Agathon's name, both in Socrates' invitation to Aristodemus (174b) and Alcibiades' demand, "lead me to Agathon/the Good" (212b), are clear attempts to alert readers to sharpen their ears so that they heed the important *double entendres* elsewhere in the dialogue. In agreement, the Pausanian pun alerts readers to Apollodorus unusual love of name play and, given the erotic/comedic frame, an audience comfortable with low-register sex/body humor, all repeatedly employed throughout the dialogue. Consider how Socrates continually makes sexualized *double entendres*, some characteristically Socratic while others a bit more lewd than his usual fare. During Socrates' initial conversation with Aristodemus he puns that he goes beautifully to the beautiful, followed up with an invitation to join the symposium by mocking the cuckolded Menelaus for being a "soft spearman" (μαλθακὸν αἰχμητήν 174b), a clear impotency joke, with "soft" drawing attention back to Apollodorus' moniker, "softy."

Clearly, this is Apollodorus' symposium and, as a consequence of the erotic setting, readers are implicitly warned that they must brace themselves for an evening of crass and corny amusement—whether it be sexual innuendo in Socrates' and Agathon's discussion of knowledge transmission (175c–e) or Aristophanes' playful banter with Eryximachus (185d–e, 188e–b) on the effectiveness of a tickle and noise to produce a sneeze (language associated with sex in Attic comedy *and* Plato's dialogues).[17]

Overall, Plato crafts Apollodorus' rhetorical skill so that we see that "unpracticed" does not mean memorized.[18] Apollodorus shocks himself when he makes the Pausanian pun, causing him to make the aside and then a series of similar and almost disruptive alliterations throughout Eryximachus' and Aristophanes' exchanges. He is caught up in his own storytelling, enjoying what he is creating and bringing to bear before his beloved(s). Yes, Apollodorus questioned Socrates about the details of the evening (173b) but asking questions about details is different from reciting a speech *verbatim* or reading one out loud (cf. *Tht.* or *Phdr.*). Rather, the emphasis on having the story "not unpracticed" reminds us of the theater of it all and, more importantly, of Apollodorus' talent to seduce an audience—people from all classes are eager to hear his version of the events. In point of fact, if the erotic frame is accepted, the unique context revolves around Apollodorus' disdain for the well-known members of the wealthy class and how one such braggart dismissed his companion's attempt to tell the story. In the eyes of men like Glaucon, they are nameless, a mere someone (τίς) and so, alongside sex jokes and puns, Apollodorus sees his φίλτατε, taking the time to mention the flute-girls and the activity of the enslaved so that his companions' world is made somewhat visible. A simple gesture, but, in this way, his companions are brought into the theater, highlighting how lowly and lecherous the so-called "notable" money-grubbing class could be. Oddly, this frame may even suggest an alternative reason for why Apollodorus' Socrates dawdles on a neighbor's porch and sends Aristodemus ahead to greet Agathon alone (174e–c). Perhaps the philosopher had an idea, but not a lofty one. Put otherwise, *Apollodorus'* Socrates knows how frustrating it would be for his short-statured lover, Aristodemus, the reputedly promiscuous and dirty sex worker, to show up alone, expecting to join a party meant for more distinguished company. Keep in mind, later in the evening Agathon tells his servants only to invite the source of the noise in his courtyard on the condition that it is "someone suitable" (**τις** τῶν ἐπιτηδείων 212d) but to turn away others. Clearly, Agathon has standards and, so, upon Aristodemus' arrival, the poet frantically and repeatedly orders the slaves to fetch Socrates, orders obstructed by the embarrassing interloper (one that Agathon normally fails to see 174e), inciting the prize-winning *bon vivant* further, thus invoking the *Schadenfreude* Apollodorus may have thought his lovers would enjoy.

2 "Softy" Names the Oversights

We have been pointing out the comedy of the *Symposium* and Apollodorus' playful toying with the names of Agathon, Pausanias, Aristophanes and Eryximachus. Yet, Apollodorus is no mere buffoon when it comes to his "tautological" way with words. He also has serious aims insofar as our narrator consistently gestures toward the dangers associated with names. Names can lose their meaning and scope or be twisted in ways that connote shame or reproach. Socrates' criticism of his companions conception of proper eulogy (198b–d) and Diotima's discussion of the wider scope of *poesis* and *eros* (205b) reflect the problems of names and understanding their precise meaning, while Aristophanes' myth of the androgyne reflects the perversion of particular names. As Aristophanes argues:

> Firstly, there were three kinds of human beings, not as there is now, two, male and female, Rather there was a third kind, having in common a share of both sexes, though only the name survives, the thing itself no longer appears. For the androgyne was *one in both form and name* having in common both male and female; where now *it no longer exists* except only insofar as a *name of reproach* (ἀνδρόγυνον γὰρ ἓν τότε μὲν ἦν καὶ εἶδος καὶ ὄνομα ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων κοινὸν τοῦ τε ἄρρενος καὶ θήλεος, νῦν δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν ὀνείδει ὄνομα κείμενον).
>
> *189d–e*

While a remarkable passage for discussing issues of sex and gender, the theme of the complete disappearance of a natural kind, the androgyne, underscores the gravity of Apollodorus' wordplay. The androgyne exists only in name, erased from reality. Here, we may think again of the ignored Aristodemus, who, once Socrates arrives, sits in silence. Sure, people reference him, but he does not seem actively present. Why, like the androgyne, has he disappeared? Aristodemus' penchant for invisibility is first mentioned when Agathon either feigns having looked for him or when he did look but "failed to see him" (174e). This failure seems odd, particularly when Aristodemus' short stature and appearance would make him hard to miss. Like his servants, for Agathon, Aristodemus was a means to an end, useful (ἐπιτήδειος cf. 212d) only for fetching Socrates. Once Agathon's desire for Socrates' arrival is sated and after Aristodemus bathes, Agathon assigns him a seat next to Eryximachus and forgets the interloper altogether (175a). Nonetheless, Agathon has put Aristodemus in a marked position, entailing that after Aristophanes' speech we were to hear not the poet but Aristodemus. But where is his speech?

While Aristodemus' praise-speech could be one of the forgotten mentioned by Apollodorus (177e–178a), this seems unlikely. Apollodorus explicitly says that those speeches were forgotten by Aristodemus himself. Who forgets their own speech? Moreover, it cannot be one of the speeches Apollodorus skipped as he clearly indicates just before Pausanias' speech that those occurred between Phaedrus and Pausanias (180c). From Pausanias' speech onward, Apollodorus gives no indication, with the exception of Aristophanes' change of position, that there are further lacunae. Some have argued that the omission results from Aristophanes disruption of the speaking order leading to an accidental oversight of Aristodemus. This is also implausible. If Aristodemus sits between Aristophanes and Eryximachus, surely Aristophanes knows it's the interloper's turn but instead of turning to his neighbor, he quickly emphasizes the remaining two—Agathon and Socrates—another impossibility even if Aristodemus' sat on the other side of Eryximachus.[19] In sum, it appears that the symposiasts overtly, rather than accidentally, pass over "The Good People" (Aristo-demus) in favor of "The Good Appearance" (Aristo-phanes).

Cleverly, Socrates, during his turn, begins by admonishing the previously employed methods as they failed to perceive (μὴ γιγνώσκουσιν) the truth by tending only to appearances. They made their subject *seem* beautiful and good, not caring if they were waxing untruthfully. Socrates then describes their speeches as "σεμνός" (190a) which if translated earnestly means "stately/august," but sarcastically "haughty/pompous." Contrastingly, Socrates emphasizes that his depiction will be nothing but the truth, leading eventually to an image that should remind the symposiasts of the man they overlooked.

> First, [Eros] is always poor, far from being soft or beautiful as many believe; but, rather, hard and rough, shoeless and homeless; always on the ground uncovered, sleeping in public in doorways and roads. Possessing his mother's nature, he dwells with need.

> In accord with his father he preys on all that is beautiful and good—brave, bold and intense, a clever hunter (θηρευτὴς), always weaving (πλέκων) some artifice, desirous of practical wisdom (φρονήσεως ἐπιθυμητὴς), resourceful, a philosopher his whole life; a clever magician (γόης), druggist (φαρμακεὺς), and sophist (σοφιστής).
>
> *(203c–d)*

Many commentators have noted the parallels between Eros and Socrates but as O'Mahoney (2011: 150–151) highlights on this evening Socrates is unusually bathed and wearing fancy shoes marking that "he only conditionally resemble(s) Eros" while Aristodemus does not have the advantage to appear differently. He, like Eros, sleeps uncovered in doorways, shoeless, rough and hard; a life requiring invention, artifice and bravery.[20] Markedly, desirous of practical wisdom and honest (see 174d for Aristodemus' refusal to lie) Aristodemus embraces the erotic reality of need and resource, remaining silent but *porous*, soaking up the events of the evening. If this parallel is intentional, a rather interesting gesture to the opening frame becomes evident. Like Apollodorus' ἐπωνυμία, Socrates' current favorite, his chief lover (ἐραστής 173b) has earned his own appropriate moniker, Eros. In point of fact, Socrates alludes to this possible recasting of Aristodemus in his closing words to Phaedrus.

> On account of this [Love's power] I say that all men should honor Love (πάντα **ἄνδρα** τὸν Ἔρωτα τιμᾶν), as I myself honor the erotic arts with unique reverence, encourage others likewise; both now and always I praise Love's power and bravery (τὴν δύναμιν καὶ **ἀνδρείαν** τοῦ Ἔρωτος) as far as I am able. So that this account, Phaedrus, consider, if you will, as praise toward Love, or otherwise, if it pleases you to give it some other name, name it (ὅτι καὶ ὅπῃ χαίρεις ὀνομάζων, **τοῦτο ὀνόμαζε**).
>
> *(212b–c)*

Give Eros another name, Socrates dares. Embodied in Aristodemus' very presence, Eros sits before them but due to their ignorance and love of appearances, they fail to see.

Interestingly alongside Aristodemus, Apollodorus appears to sneak in eponyms for the other overshadowed characters. The flute-girl and Poverty oddly mirror each other. Like Poverty, she comes during "hours of good cheer" to "hang about the door" (203b), and, like most in need, she develops resources to insure survival. Likely no stranger to devising strategies for manipulating the wealthy, one wonders if Apollodorus' flute-girl actually goes to pipe for the women.[21] Of course not. Said aristocratic women were heavily monitored and so they would not have accepted the presence of a common flute-girl (whose job was to seduce her husband/sons/brothers/father) for fear of their own virtue being questioned.[22] Of course Apollodorus' flute-girl does not follow orders. Rather, she would have taken to the streets, peddling door to door until she found her evening fare. Put otherwise, is it a coincidence that Poverty finds Resource drunk and sleeping in the Garden of Zeus and that a flute-girl arrives with Alcibiades so drunk he needs her support? One wonders if this is the very same dismissed flute-girl who, like desperate Poverty, cleverly takes advantage of an inebriated resource in order to earn her evening fare. As for the house-hold servants or the enslaved "hosts," note that throughout Apollodorus' narration the men diminutively and overwhelmingly refer to them as children, παῖδες,[23] with cognates of δοῦλ—used only by Pausanias to describe an enslaved lover (183a–184c) and Diotima when disparaging the unfortunate folks bound to loving Beauty in one particular body (210d). Contrariwise, Diotima never uses the term παῖς pejoratively. In fact, for Diotima it is only through proper "boy" love (παιδεραστεῖν 211b) and pedagogy (210e) that individuals turn from bondage and toward the vast ocean of Beauty, a turn toward "plentiful philosophy"

and the birth of beautiful and magnificent discourses and thoughts. Children, both in body and soul, are human attempts to bear absolute beauty/good and so, the enslaved hosts, the παῖδες, take Agathon's name, becoming the Good/Beauty persons can bear when they see in *all* souls—beyond particular embodiments—their "bloom however small" (210c). Yet, Diotima knows that most cannot do this as they are "deeply fixed on becoming a name (ὀνομαστοὶ)," seeking fame rather than true beauty (208c). Overall, the flute-girl and Agathon's servants, alongside Aristodemus, know what it means to need, to lack the beautiful, but unlike the vain-glorious symposiasts, the nameless and forgotten cannot cover up or pretend away such want with pompous and pretty speeches. Rather, they exist between seeking and pursuing, struggling for the good/beautiful life rather than digging themselves into pretense. Though Diotima expresses fear that Socrates will not be initiated into this mystery (210a), Socrates' way of life and future company (many disenfranchized as well as several reputed sex workers) seems to imply that he did learn this lesson on love. As Socrates is infamous for confessing, erotic matters are the one thing he knows and because of this Socrates beseeches the men, utilizing ἄνδρες over ἀνθρώποι (the term Diotima prefers), to honor Love. Why? Because he, like Alcibiades, flogs rather than praises their service to Eros, as throughout the evening he has witnessed them continuously turn a blind-eye to the hosts of the party: the servants, the flute-girl and even the small, meager and impoverished wretches like Aristodemus, "The Good People."

3 Mysteries and Secret Names

So, Apollodorus' penchant for name play may have significant consequences, particularly insofar as Diotima seems to name the nameless in her own speech, giving them epithets like Apollodorus' own, "softy." So, as Shakespeare would say: what is in a name, particularly the infamous Μαντινικὴ Διοτίμα (212d)? Well, of course, there is the obvious pun "Zeus honored prophet of victory" suggested in Diotima's deme of Mantinea, the mythical region of Arcadia, famed for both siding with the Athenians during the battle bearing its name but, also, the illustrious terrain of mountains and valley, rivers and marsh populated with daimonic spirits like nymphs and satyrs. Yet, before we discuss this, we should take a moment and ask whether Apollodorus' Socrates is inviting in not just a woman but a specific woman, using, as he did with Aristodemus, an eponym. Put otherwise, does the name Diotima refer to an actual person, someone who, like the other dismissed and ignored individuals, would have been excluded from this space? To answer this mystery, let us make sure to review what we should already know about Diotima, seeing if more information about her life could reveal her name.

First, Diotima is consistently associated with priestcraft. She is reported to have advised Athens on certain sacrifices which prevented plague for ten years. Diotima appeals to the language of purification, initiation, prophesy, and revelation, while also indicating a deep knowledge of the daimonic.[24] Identifying Diotima with priestcraft does not mean, however, that she was some rare woman with power. As scholars like J.B. Connelly have meticulously unearthed, there was a way for women to relate to the divine, on a priestly level, on an almost daily basis. Moreover, unlike our contemporary associations, priestcraft was not necessarily limited to chaste unmarried women or, for that matter, the privileged. There were priestly roles for children, appointments for young women prior to but intent on marriage, alongside functions for mature married women and mothers who could take on temporary positions for festivals. Finally, there were women who donned the mantel of some select and highly esteemed positions, often older and past child-bearing/rearing years who, due to virtue or privilege (or luck), were asked or elected to positions as priestesses, prophets, mystagogues, or

hierophants, permanent attendants to the gods they served. These women attended/managed temples, processions, *pannychis*,[25] and sometimes benefited economically while instructing/developing/overseeing the sacred laws and rites of her cult.

From this, we can surmise that Diotima was plausibly an older woman who likely, due to social expectations, had adult children. We can further infer that she held a tenured, permanent position allowing her to ascend the rungs of her cult from initiation to the final revelation, obtaining eventually, the wisdom/pedagogical skill Socrates repeatedly highlights. Said acclaim for wisdom makes it likely that she held a role similar to a mystagogue or hierophant, becoming one of the first paradigms of a philosopher priestess in antiquity, as such a position would have necessitated years of study as she worked through the mysteries/texts/symbolic intents of her cult.[26] Though Diotima was once a good daughter, wife and/or mother, her golden years were likely spent in prolonged, disciplined service via intense training, contemplation and honing of her own pedagogical initiatory skills. In sum, by clearly identifying Diotima with priestcraft, Socrates has brought "the women within" into the *andron*, reminding the men of the women they seclude. Despite their present hiddenness, whether young or old, the "women within" possess, or have the potential to possess, real power in spiritual matters.

Next, Diotima is a foreign woman (ἡ ξένη). Socrates reiterates this several times while also calling her a sophist (ὦ σοφωτάτη Διοτίμα 208b; σοφισταί 208c1, cf. Eros as σοφιστής 203d). The use of this simple term suggests that she may have been a traveling priestess wandering from city to city, sleeping like Eros in the open air (203c), before offering her services to various cities, including but not limited to Athens. Importantly, as a traveling priestess, this would mean she would be adept at the very skill Apollodorus seems to love, playing with names, i.e. making gods and cultic practices translate from one world to another, doing the syncretic work necessary for convincing each city that the spiritual matters for which she is devoted are necessary for the thriving of the foreign city whose gates she approaches.[27] Indeed, even without the possible recasting of characters like Aristodemus, this syncretic adaptation of divine names, i.e. Eros may signify a different title from her actual cultic devotion, may even be a feature of Diotima's lessons on love, a possibility strengthened by considering Socrates' dare to Phaedrus.

To consider the possibility, we should turn to Arcadia, the region of Mantinea and its common cultural myths and mysteries. While agriculturally impoverished, Arcadia was infamous for being the region of both hunters and shepherds and was the mythological birthplace and home of the bawdy Pan (often associated with Marsyus), the half beast, half humanoid god, whose lusty nature and devious spirit haunts liminal spaces with his piping (Borgeaud: 1988). Clearly a suggestive parallel to Eros, Pan's presence is certainly invoked throughout the *Symposium*, most explicitly in Alcibiades' appeal to Marsyus but, strikingly, he is also the god to whom Socrates and Phaedrus pray at the end of their own erotic intercession (*Phdr.* 279b–c).

The Aracadian Pan is associated with another cult of the region focused on Demeter and her daughter, but not Persephone. Rather, this illegitimate daughter was an unnamed mysterious goddess referred to merely as Despoina (her true name a mystery reserved for initiates).[28] The cult of Despoina was the Arcadian parallel to the Eleusinian Mysteries but dedicated to an even darker, more impoverished Demeter. According to lore, Demeter wandered desperately in search of her abducted daughter, Persephone. Yet, as she traversed the mountains and valleys of Arcadia, she attracted the attention of Poseidon. Attempting to escape his unwanted pursuits, Demeter futilely transformed herself into a mare. Not fooled by her disguise, Poseidon raped Demeter, resulting in a divine pregnancy. Grieving and righteously angry, the goddess transforms into Demeter Erinys (Wrathful One) as well into Demeter Melaina (Black),[29]

withdrawing into a cave, refusing to give birth to the product of her violation. Eventually with the help of the always resourceful and clever Pan, Demeter was appeased and bore the unnamed goddess, transforming once again into Demeter of Lousia (Bathing), purifying herself in the nearby river. The two children born by this Demeter (sometimes depicted with a horse's head) were Anytus, the horse, and Despoina.

While the divine name of this Arcadian goddess was heavily guarded, remarkably, in this region, she was often associated/identified with the other popular goddess of the area, Artemis.[30] Mistress of Animals (Potnia Theron), goddess of the wilds (Agrotera), who rejoices in "the nursing young of every wild creature,"[31] Artemis is not merely the goddess of the **hunt** but also **childbirth.** She is Hegemone, Kourotrophos and, even, Savior of Mariners. Artemis, one who runs with dogs and rejoices in having "many names,"[32] is sometimes associated with Hecate insofar as Iphigeneia (strong in birth), the sacrificial daughter of Agamemnon, was transformed by Artemis into the illustrious key-bearing goddess associated with magic and ritual.[33] More often, Artemis is depicted during childbirth with **Eileithyia** and **Moira**, where she carries a torch in her role as **Phosphoros** (or Amphirpyron), symbolizing both her purgative power but her activity of lighting the way in darkness (the time most often associated with hunting and labor). To the Arcadian mind, she, like Pan, can be found in the liminal spaces, roaming borderlands like rivers, mountain ranges with her faithful and loyal dogs as well as with her feminine companions, most often nymphs. Artemis' favorite—the tragic **Kallisto—** was seduced by Zeus when he disguised himself as Artemis (reminding us of the often dismissed eroticism between women). In many ways, the Arcadian Artemis is both masculine (hunter) and feminine (midwife), whose object of desire is the exceedingly beautiful Kallisto.[34] Tragically, Artemis' beloved is transformed, either by her own hands or by another jealous god, into a bear. This transformation forces Kallisto either to give birth to her son, Arkas, as a bear or, in other accounts, she is killed by her son unwittingly and, in still other accounts, she gives birth to twins, Arkas, the first good king of Arcadia and Pan, the shepherd of the wilds, that daimonic-like spirit who assisted Demeter in giving birth to Despoina/Artemis.[35] In all accounts of the Kallisto myth, Artemis or Zeus is said to have secured the nymph and her child's place in the heavens, a constellation indicating her friendship with the gods. Finally, Kallisto's mythological tomb rests just outside of Mantinea where it is recorded that priestesses of Artemis, typically older women who "were done with men,"[36] i.e. married or widowed women past child-bearing, would ritually beg before festivals—"a good luck rite for women seeking successful childbirth."[37]

Now, obviously, many of these images of Arcadian Artemis abound in Diotima's speech, from Poverty's begging and consequent birth of Eros paralleling the priestly rite, to Diotima's emphasis that Eros is skilled in **hunting/preying,** (203c–d: ἐπίβουλός/θηρευτὴς). Eros, as hunter, is depicted in similar terms as Artemis qua scheming and contriving, clever in entrapping that which he needs, while Diotima repeatedly uses examples of animals to reference the fierceness by which individuals will protect their children, ready to fight hard battles and to sacrifice themselves so as to nurture their own offspring (207a–b). When Diotima discusses Eros' role in pregnancy and giving birth, Diotima culminates in naming three figures associated with Artemis: "Beauty/ **Καλλονή** is Fate/**Moira** and Labor/**Eiletheia** for birth (Μοῖρα οὖν καὶ Εἰλείθυια ἡ Καλλονή ἐστι τῇ γενέσει 206d)."[38] Here, two divine eponyms typically associated with Artemis' role as one who tends over childbirth and in the same breathe Artemis' great love, Kallisto (the nominal form of the superlative Καλλιστή). The seeming turn in Diotima's account from discussing the Good to the Beautiful takes on richer significance insofar as the practitioner of proper erotic love becomes, like Artemis' Kallisto, friends with the gods (θεοφιλεῖ). Moreover, Eros stands—like Artemis' first priestess, Hecate/Iphigenia (good birth)—in doorways and is

explicitly described as a magician (γόης) and a druggist (φαρμακεὺς) who is, like Diotima, a medium between mortals and the divine (202e–203a). Interestingly, even this association with Iphigeneia, the legendary maiden sacrifice, unpacks Diotima's advice to the Athenians regarding the plague. The cult of Brauron, which came to be more pronounced during the Peloponnesian wars, was established at Athens to appease Artemis who sent (in the mythical past) a plague that was only abated on the condition of a maiden sacrifice, ritualistically enacted by sending select young girls to serve the goddess as little bears for one year. Typically, the ages of said girls were approximately, like Diotima's sacrifices, ten years old.[39] Overall, while it is beyond the scope of this essay to definitively track all the references to the Arcadian Artemis, possibly the unnamed secret goddess Despoina, the above suffices to claim that Diotima appears to be a Mantinean priestess of a cult devoted to the liminal matron of birth and the hunt, Artemis, the lover of the exceedingly beautiful Kallisto.

So with the priestess's possible cult revealed, the question of "Who is Diotima?" still troubles us. In response Diotima might say, "Clearly, a child would know by now!" (204b) All teasing aside, let's reiterate Artemis' role in the Greek pantheon as one who presides over birth. She is, if you will, the patron saint for midwifery, the reported *techne* of Socrates' mother. As he reports to Theaetetus:

> I am the son of a midwife, the very noble (μάλα γενναίας) and dignified Phaenarete? And haven't you heard that I practice the same craft? But see well, *you must not reveal* (κατείπῃς) *me to the others*. This craft of mine, my companion, has escaped notice for they do not know (οἱ δέ, ἅτε οὐκ εἰδότες). They only say of me, that I am the strangest and that I make people perplexed. […] Consider all the things of midwifery, and then my purpose is more easily understood. As you know, no one who is still able to become pregnant or give birth (κυϊσκομένη τε καὶ τίκτουσα) practices midwifery but only those no longer able to give birth. ***It is said that this is because Artemis***, the one of safe delivery, is unwed. For she did not give the art of midwifery to those who are barren, for human nature is too weak to grasp that which they can't experience. So she commends those at the age no longer able to bear, honoring (**τιμῶσα**) those like herself. Both likely probable and necessary, midwives know better than others who is pregnant and who is not? Midwives via drugs (φαρμάκια) and incantations (ἐπᾴδουσαι) can arouse and soften (μαλθακωτέρας) labor at their will, assisting the suffering of labor pains or if they think the child is stillborn, performing abortions (καὶ ἐὰν νέον ὂν δόξῃ ἀμβλίσκειν, ἀμβλίσκουσιν). Also, have you noticed that they are clever matchmakers (προμνήστριαί), most wise concerning which union of men and women produce the best of children. Let me say that this is their greatest practical wisdom (φρονοῦσιν), more than cutting the umbilical cord. Consider this. Is it not the same art which attends and harvests in the fruits of the earth, will it know in what soils the seeds should be planted. Is it otherwise, my friend, with wisdom, one harvesting the other attending. But because of those who join men and women together unjustly and without skill, which they call pimping, midwives, most revered, avoid association with matchmaking, fearing that in this way they will bring on slander; but correct matchmaking belongs assuredly only to the midwife. Well, then, much is the work of midwives, but less than my drama. For they do not deliver women sometimes from phantoms and sometimes of truths (μὲν **εἴδωλα τίκτειν,** ἔστι δ' ὅτε **ἀληθινά**), difficult to distinguish. For I think if they could distinguish between the true and the false, midwifery would the greatest and most beautiful work (μέγιστόν τε καὶ κάλλιστον ἔργον).
>
> *(149a–150b)*

This passage should give us pause. Not only does Phaenarete's craft make her an explicit devotee of Artemis in the practice of assisting women in birth, but also she, like Diotima, is wise in many other things (τε σοφὴ ἦν καὶ ἄλλα πολλά 201d), including medicine (φαρμακεὺς 203d) and incantations/charms (like Artemis' double Hecate; cf. *Phd.* 77e, 114d and *Chrm.* 155e, 157b for Socrates' appeal to both charms/drugs). Further the skill of matchmaking is, like Aristophanes' androgyne, often confused with a vulgar practice, i.e. pimping/sex work, but in reality is the highest part of her art. This matchmaking is a tending to seeds and harvesting or bringing to bear, reminiscent of Socrates' remarks concerning philosophical pedagogy in the *Phaedrus*. Socrates even confesses that his association with his mother's craft shouldn't be revealed, suggestively drawing a parallel to mystery practices but also the common reproach such work would bring to her and by extension Socrates' name.[40] Furthermore, like Diotima who urges initiates not to bear phantoms (**τίκτειν οὐκ εἴδωλα**) but true virtue (**ἀρετὴν ἀληθῆ**) (212a: full text below), Socrates' verbatim use of Diotima's speech while discussing his mother's craft shows that he is recalling the lessons he learned from the priestess.

Diotima and Phaenarete, possibly two wise and noble women whose work in service of Artemis and giving birth, would be most beautiful (κάλλιστον) if it could test, as Diotima does with Socrates' original conceptions of eros, the true from the false. Are we expected to believe that this is an empty parallel, or is it entirely possible that Apollodorus' Socrates has not just symbolically included and recast the slaves, the flute-girl and the lowly Aristodemus in Diotima's speech but, in point of fact, has brought out from seclusion and given a new name to a particularly noble (μάλα γενναίας) mother? At the close of *Theaetetus* Socrates not only reminds Theaetetus of his craft of midwifery but also goes further than merely associating a likeness to his mothers' skills. In fact, he identifies them as the same art received from the same divine source, saying, "My mother and I were allotted this art of midwifery from God, she for women and myself for the young, the noble and all the beautiful" (210c). While Socrates emphasizes that Phaenarete directs her midwifery to women, is it not possible that Phaenarete, under the eponym Diotima, makes an exception for her son, letting him into mysteries that men are normally inclined to care less about? Recall that Socrates knows his association with midwifery would surprise Theaetetus and how the philosopher asks the youth not to popularize said association. Could this be a playful secret, perhaps a mystery, like the Arcadian Despoina who has a hidden name, that Socrates only reveals to promising philosophers like Theaetetus or Apollodorus? If this is the case, is it possible that Plato/Apollodorus/Socrates hides her name before the profane men, deeming her, as Artemis was, Zeus-honored (Diotima) or as the etymology of Zeus also indicates, the shining, as Artemis, the shining torch-bearer, honors (τιμῶσα, *Tht.* 149b) ones like herself, those who no longer bear children but assist others in delivery. Or further, consider the *Cratylus* where Socrates playfully suggests the etymology of Zeus derives from two titles, Zena and Dia, so that "The god is correctly named as through whom (δι'ὂν) all things have their gift of life (ζῆν)" (396a). Transferring this to Diotima, her name means "honor" the one "through whom" we receive "life." Perhaps, these are just interesting coincidences.

Yet, to be sure, Apollo-dorus—literally, that clever and creative gift of Apollo, twin brother of Artemis and mirror of Dionysus—finds a way with his uncanny gift for words to reveal the mystery into which he has been initiated. Discussing the final stage of ascent and the vision of the beautiful, Apollodorus' Diotima describes the revelation (φαντασθήσεται 211a; θεωμένῳ 211d2; θεᾶσθαι 211d7; θεωμένου 212a) of true virtue, **ἀρετὴν ἀληθῆ**, a vision which leads practitioners to become, like Kallisto, a friend to the divine (**θεοφιλεῖ**), seized (**ἐφαπτομένῳ**) not by idols or phantoms (**οὐκ εἴδωλα**) but kindled by truth immortal (212a). Keeping in mind that ἐφαπτομένῳ in the passive can translate to "kindle," alongside the constant references

to seeing the sight (**βλέποντος; ὁρῶντι ᾧ ὁρατὸν 212a**) of true virtue, bearing not phantoms (**τίκτειν οὐκ εἴδωλα ἀρετῆς**), is it possible that Phaenarete (Phaenarete/Φαιν-αρέτη), **revealer of virtue**, has been delivered over to the "father of the discourse" (178d), Phaedrus, the radiant, the bright? Put otherwise, the shift in emphasis at the close of Diotima's speech to a revelation or sight of virtue (212a) rather than the pursuit of Beauty/Good as it had heretofore been, allows Apollodorus to playfully name Phaenarete as the highest mystery embedded in Diotima's lessons on love. Ultimately, then, Diotima's initiation of Socrates on proper boy-love or child love (παιδεραστεῖν) may say something more about the relationship between the foreigner of Mantinea and a philosopher of Athens while also advancing another criticism of the symposiasts. Diotima speaks to the love, a mystery, they have forgotten, the love of a mother for her child. Diotima gestures to this while invoking the language of Artemis' arrows, reminding her dear Socrates (ὦ φίλε Σώκρατες 211a), "Don't be amazed if everything honors its own offshoot (μὴ οὖν θαύμαζε εἰ τὸ αὑτοῦ **ἀποβλάστημα** φύσει πᾶν **τιμᾷ**)?" (208b)

Of course, one could ask, would not Diotima/Phaenarete have to have been an Athenian citizen for Socrates to have been a citizen? No. Socrates was born well before Pericles' decree of 451 BC where both parents had to be citizens. But, despite her noble lineage, in Athens she is still a widowed foreigner and one who works outside the home as a priestly traveling midwife, a kind of matchmaker and druggist, partaking of a reputation and trade(s) the men would reproach. And so, Socrates conceals her name from the uninitiated/profane, from the truly savage (ἄγροικος). By the dog (Socrates' inexplicable catch phrase), this identification of Diotima with Phaenarete, the midwife in service of Artemis, may not only unpack the *Symposium*'s obsession with parental lineages, i.e. the constant gainsaying over Eros' birth parents, and Socrates' own spontaneous curiosity about said lineage when learning from Diotima (203a), but also other curiosities throughout the dialogues, not least of which being the equality of men and women in the guardian class of the *Republic* or why Socrates, despite being attached to Athens, is so unusually disposed to outside customs and cults and the value of being in-between, both citizen and outsider. In the end, it seems his mother may have taught him to be open to the foreign,[41] the feminine, the poor, to see all those who occupy liminal spaces, so that he learns from all arenas (his only other professed teacher being another foreign woman associated with sex work, Aspasia) the value of the erotic life. Transgressing the patriarchal taboo, Phaenarete/Diotima, the wandering sophist priestess, inspires/initiates Socrates into the tradition of the philosophical hunt, teaching him the art of giving birth to the beautiful in the beautiful and, like any adept initiate, Socrates, and by extension Apollodorus, can reproduce the mysteries in "semblance of the original" (208b). Unlike the men in the room who do not think or even see the need for the wisdom of the priestly midwife, Socrates and Apollodorus see and care for all kinds, recasting the seemingly low, small and/or weak, be it the "woman within" or the common sex worker, the enslaved or the flute-girl, seeing their power to light the torch and reveal virtue. Phaenarete, mother and teacher to Socrates, her immortal child both in body and soul.

Notes

1 Translations of Plato's *Symposium* are, for the most part, my own, but where needed Lamb (1925) and Bernadete (2001) were consulted and adapted. For παῖς as adult slave see Golden (1985) and Benitez (2016).

2 See Nightingale (1993).

3 See Nye (1989/1994) who argues against Irigaray's (1984/1994) image of Diotima as a Platonic appropriation. See footnote below as well.

4 Nye (1989/1994).
5 See Aristophanes' *Archanians* (253–261); Sansone (2017: 481) and Henderson (1975: 15–16).
6 Phalerum was the original port city of Athens. For port cities and prostitution see Kapparis (2018: 272) and Halperin (1990: 91). Theopompus, *FGrH* 115 F290 = Demetrius, *Eloc.* 240, Aristophanes *Peace* 165, *Knights* 772, Aeschines I. 40. For Greek prostitution see Davidson (1998), Cohen (2003), (2006), and (2015), Kapparis (2011) and (2018), Glazebrook (2011) and Corner (2011).
7 *Symp*. 173b.
8 *Mem*. 4.2.
9 F242.
10 On dwarfs in ancient Greece see Dasen (1993). As sexualized, Aristotle *HA* 577b.
11 See Duáanic (1993) and Nails (2002: 231). Cf. DL 2.105.
12 Cf. Xenophon, *Symp*. 4.59 for Socrates as brothel matron. Also, *Mem.* 1.6.13. Consider also, *Mem.* 3.11.1 where Xenophon, in fact, clearly depicts Socrates as one who had no qualm visiting and conversing with sex workers like the beautiful and charming Theodote or even Plato's depiction of Socrates as learning from Aspasia, Pericles' consort, in the *Menexenus*.
13 e.g. Nightingale (1995: 118).
14 Skemp (1970).
15 As H. Tarrant pointed out to me, this vocative is found only three times in Plato (*Crat.* 434e and *Hip. Min.* 370e) and according to Dickey (1996, 138) φίλτατε "is far more likely to be used between family members or lovers" and expresses "genuine, deep, affection."
16 See Destree (2015).
17 See *Phdr.* 253e and *Phil.* 46d7–47b7. See Dover (1978, 124n38), Davies (1982), Adams (2021), O'Mahoney (2011).
18 Contra Halperin (1992: 112).
19 O'Mahoney (2011: 149).
20 While in agreement with O'Mahoney (2011) concerning Socrates' deployment of Aristodemus' likeness, the following draws radically different conclusions.
21 With the exception of ritual practice, the situation of most women in classical Athens (though also prevalent throughout Greece) was one of seclusion.
22 Anderson (1994: 143n54): "Greek art never shows a respectable woman playing the aulos."
23 For παῖς as slave see Golden (1985) and Benitez (2016).
24 See Evans (2006: 10).
25 For detailed accounts of the priestly duties of women see Connelly (2007) and Dontas (1983).
26 Garland (1984) and Connelly (2007).
27 Nye (2015: 79).
28 Jost (2003: 143–169) and Larson (1995) and (2007), Bremmer (2014) and Bernard (1962).
29 See Borgeaud (1988: 57–59), Larson (1995), Jost (2003: 143–169), Iles-Johnston (2013). See also Zolotnikova (2017) and Jost (2003).
30 For Artemis' connection to Despoina and Pan in Arcadia, see Borgeaud (1988) and Larson (1997). For more generalized information on Artemis, see Larson (1995) and (2007). For the classical source for Arcadian Artemis, Pausanius 8.37.4–5. See also Vernant (1991).
31 Aesch. *Ag*. 140–143
32 Callimachus *Hymn to Artemis, Orphic Hymn to Artemis*.
33 See Hesiod *Catologue of Women* frag. 71, Cypria frag. 1 and Pausanius 1.43.1. See also Borgeaud (1988: 157) and Viscardi (2021).
34 Budin (2016: 39).
35 Ovid *Met*. 2.409–507, Apollodoros *Library* 3.8.2, and Pausanias 8.3.6–7.
36 Pausanius 8.5.11–12, 8.38.7.
37 Budin (2016: 110–111).
38 For the Eleusinian associations see Evans (2006: 14).
39 *Iphigeneia in Tauris* 1226–1229, Aristophanes *Lysistrata* 644–648. See also Simon (1983: 86) and Faraone (2003).
40 See Kennedy (2014: 122–163) for how work outside the home, particularly manual labor would have earned Phaenarete a reputation associated with foreigners and even sex-work.
41 For the foreign in Plato, see LeMoine (2020). Cf. Brown (1994).

Work Cited

Adams, D. (2021) “Aristophanes’ Hiccups and Erotic Impotence,” *Philosophy and Literature*, 45.1: 17–33.
Benitez, R. (2016) “Boy? What Boy?” *Ancient Philosophy*, 36: 107–114.
Bernadete, S. (2001) *Plato’s Symposium*, Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.
Bernard, D. (1962) “Demeter, Erinys, Artemis,” *Hermes*, 90: 129–148.
Borgeaud, P. (1988) *The Cult of Pan in Ancient Greece*, (trans.) Atlass, K. and Redfield, J., Chicago & London: The University of Chicago.
Bremmer, J. (2014) *Initiation into the Mysteries of the Ancient World*, Berlin: de Gruyter.
Brown, W. (1994) “Supposing Truth Were a Woman: Plato’s Subversion of Masculine Discourse,” in Tuana, N. (ed.), *Feminist Interpretations of Plato*, University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 157–180.
Budin, S. (2016) *Artemis*, New York: Routledge.
Cohen, E. E. (2003) “Athenian Prostitution,” in Bakewell, G. W. and Sickinger, J. P. (eds.), *Gestures: Essays in Ancient History, Literature, and Philosophy Presented to Alan Boegehold*, Oxford: Oxbow Books, 214–136.
Cohen, E. E. (2006), “Free and Unfree Sexual Work,” in Faraone, C. and McClure, L. (eds.), *Prostitutes and Courtesans in the Ancient World*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 95–124.
Cohen, E. E. (2015) *Athenian Prostitution: The Business of Sex*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Connelly, J. (2007) *Portrait of a Priestess*: *Women and Ritual in Ancient Greece*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Corner, S. (2011) “Bringing the Outside In: The Andron as Brothel and the Symposion’s Civic Sexuality,” in Glazebrook, A. and Henry, M. (eds.), *Greek Prostitutes in the Ancient Mediterranean, 800 BCE–200 CE*, Madison: Wisconsin University Press, 60–85.
Cotter, J. (1992) “The Joke on Apollodorus’s Demotic,” *Classical Philology*, 87.2: 131–134.
Dasen, V. (1993) *Dwarfs in ancient Egypt and Greece*, Oxford: Claredon Press.
Davies, M. (1982) “The Tickle and Sneeze of Love Author,” *American Journal of Archaeology*, 86.1: 115–118.
Davidson, J. (1998) *Courtesans and Fishcakes: The Consuming Passions of Classical Athens*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Destrée, P. (2015) “The Allegedly Best Speaker: A Note on Plato on Aristophanes (*Symp*. 189a7),” *Classical Philology* 110.4: 360–366.
Dickey, E. (1996) *Greek Forms of Address*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Dontas, G. (1983) “The True Aglaurion,” *Hesperia*, 52: 48–63.
Dover, K. (1978) *Greek Homosexuality*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Duáanic, S. (1993) “Phaedo’s Enslavement and Liberation,” *Illinois Classical Studies*, 19: 83–97.
Evans, N. (2006) “Diotima and Demeter as Mystagogues in Plato’s *Symposium*,” *Hypatia*, 21.2: 1–27.
Garland, J. (1984) “Religious Authority in Archaic and Classical. Athens,” *BSA*, 79: 75–123.
Glazebrook, A. (2011) “Porneion : Prostitution in Athenian Civic Space,” in Glazebrook, A. and Henry, M. (eds.), *Greek Prostitutes in the Ancient Mediterranean, 800 BCE–200 CE*, Madison: Wisconsin University Press, 34–59.
Golden, M. (1985) “Pais, «child» and «slave»”, *L’antiquité classique*, 54: 91–104.
Goldman, M. (2015) “Associating the Aulêtris : Flute Girls and Prostitutes in the Classical Greek Symposium,” *Helios*, 42.1: 29–60.
Faraone, C. (2003) “Playing the Bear and Fawn for Artemis: Female Initiation or Substitute Sacrifice?” in Dodds, D. and Faraone, C. (eds.), *Initiation in Ancient Greek Rituals and Narratives: New Critical Perspectives*, London: Routledge, 43–68.
Halperin, D. (1990) *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality: And Other Essays on Greek Love*, London: Routledge.
Halperin, D. (1992) “Plato and the Erotics of Narrativity,” in Klagge, J. and Smith, N. (eds.), *Methods of Interpreting Plato and His Dialogues Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*, Supplement 2, 93–129.
Henderson, J. (1975) *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
Howland, J. (2007) “Plato’s Dionysian Music? A Reading of the *Symposium*,” *Epoché*, 12: 17–47.
Iles-Johnston, S. (2013) “Demeter, Myth and the Polyvalence of Ritual,” *History of Religions, 52*(4): 370–401.

Irigaray, L. (1994) "Sorcerer Love: A Reading of Plato's *Symposium*, Diotima's Speech," in Tuana, N. (ed.), *Feminist Interpretations of Plato*, University Park: Penn State Press, 181–195.
Jost, M. (2003) "Mystery Cults in Arcadia," in Cosmopoulos, M. (ed.), *Greek Mysteries: The Archaeology and Ritual of Ancient Greek Secret Cults*, London: Routledge, 144–164.
Kapparis, K. (2011) "Terminology of Prostitution in the Ancient Greek World," in Glazebrook, A. and Henry, M. (eds.), *Greek Prostitutes in the Ancient Mediterranean, 800 BCE–200 CE*, Madison: Wisconsin University Press, 222–255.
Kapparis, K. (2018) *Prostitution in the Ancient Greek World*, Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.
Kennedy, R. (2014) *Immigrant Women in Athens: Gender, Ethnicity, and Citizenship in the Classical City*, London: Routledge.
Lamb, W. R. M. (1925) *Plato*: *Symposium*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Larson, J. (1995) *Greek Heroine Cults*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
Larson, J. (1997) "Handmaidens of Artemis," *The Classical Journal*, 92: 249–257.
Larson, J. (2007) *Ancient Greek Cults: A Guide*, London: Routledge
Le Moine, R. (2020) *Plato's Caves*: *The Liberating Sting of Cultural Diversity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Nails, D. (2002) *The People of Plato: A Prosopography of Plato and Other Socratics*, Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.
Nussbaum, M. (1986) *The Fragility of Goodness: Luck and Ethics in Greek Tragedy and Philosophy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Nightingale, A. (1993) "The Folly of Praise: Plato's Critique of Encomiastic Discourse in the Lysis and Symposium," *The Classical Quarterly*, 43.1: 112–130.
——— (1995) *Genres in Conflict: Plato and the Construct of Philosophy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Nye, A. (1994) "The Hidden Host: Irigaray and Diotima at Plato's Symposium," in Tuana, N. (ed.), *Feminist Interpretations of Plato*, University Park: Penn State Press, 197–216.
——— (2015) *Socrates and Diotima: Sexuality, Religion, and the Nature of Divinity*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
O'Mahoney, P. (2011) "On the "Hiccupping Episode" in Plato's Symposium," *Classical World*, 104.2: 143–159.
Sansone, D. (2017) "Getting the Joke at Plato Symposium 172A," *Classical Philology*, 112.4: 479–482.
Simon, E. (1983) *The Festivals of Attica: An Archaeological Commentary*, Madison: University Wisconsin Press.
Skemp, J. B. (1970) "The Philosopher's Frenzy," *Mnemosyne*, 23: 302–304.
Usher, M. (2002) "Satyr Play in Plato's *Symposium*," *American Journal of Philology*, 123.2: 205–228.
Vernant, P. (1991) *Mortals and Immortals: Collected Essays*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Viscardi G. (2021) "Artemis, the Bear and the Mothers of Engyon," in Casadio, G. and Johnston, P. (eds.), *Artemis/Diana in Ancient Greece and Italy: At the Crossroads Between The Civic And The Wild*, Cambridge, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 90–118.
Waithe, M.E. (1987) *A History of Women Philosophers: Volume I: Ancient Women Philosophers, 600 B.C–500 A.D*, Hingham, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
Zolotnikoca, O. A. (2017) "Becoming Classical Artemis: A Glimpse at the Evolution of the Goddess as Traced in Ancient Arcadia," *Journal of Arts and Humantities*, 6(5): 8–20.

19

SEXUAL DIFFERENCE AND WHAT IT MEANS TO BE HUMAN IN *TIMAEUS*

Jill Gordon

At the end of *Timaeus*, we get a brief account of a strange fact about the cosmos: the entire first generation of humans in this cosmogony are men, and women emerge only in a second generation—as punishment for those men of the first generation who were not virtuous. After what must have been hours, dramatically speaking, during which Timaeus spun out his lengthy tale, his likely story concludes by telling his audience that when those who were born men (*tōn genomenōn andrōn*) live cowardly and unjust lives, they will be regenerated as women (90e–91a). And at this precise time and for this reason (*kai kat'ekeinon dē ton chronon dia tauta*), the gods create women, along with the bodily equipment both men and women need for sexual reproduction, and the desire for procreative sex that each has (91a–d), all of which did not exist in the first generation of "humans."[1] Timaeus also waves away this astounding revelation as relatively unimportant, telling us before he has actually revealed it that there is no need to speak at length about it (*ho mē tis anangkē mēkunein*, 90e). Timaeus claims that it is suitable (*emmetroteros*) to give only a brief account about such things (90e), implying a parallel between its brevity and its relative unimportance, using a term that more literally means "in proportion" or "in due measure." This account of sexual differentiation in Timaeus' cosmogony, especially in its bodily aspects (90e–91d),[2] generates what we might call aporias, paradoxes, inconsistencies, or anomalies, in a variety of guises, and they motivate a deeper look into their details and implications.[3] I do not argue that these anomalies are small nuggets Plato leaves for the reader to puzzle over nor to resolve, nor do I argue that they are intended to convey something about the character of his narrator, Timaeus.[4] And any claims that the strange account of women is myth, parable, or part of a mere "likely story," while perhaps true, do not bear on my argument. My aim here is not to resolve these incoherencies surrounding sex difference or to explain them away, but rather to draw them out *as such*, to put us in a position to think about what it means for this specific text to have these specific incoherencies about sex difference. Regardless of their source, their epistemic status, or their genre, the paradoxes and anomalies themselves reveal a troubling exclusion of women at the heart of what this dialogue tells us it means to be human.[5]

I begin with an account of the bodily configurations of men in the first and following generations. Focusing primarily on sexual organs, I identify in the first four sections here four specific anomalies that result from Timaeus' account, and I draw the curtain back on the utter

DOI: 10.4324/9781003047858-21