



Confessions of Love

The Ambiguities of Greek *Eros* and Latin *Caritas*

Edited by CRAIG J. N. de PAULO,
BERNHARDT BLUMENTHAL,
CATHERINE CONROY de PAULO,
PATRICK A. MESSINA, and
LEONID RUDNYTZKY

Confessions of Love: The Ambiguities of Greek Eros and Latin Caritas includes a collection of essays by internationally renowned scholars such as Phillip Cary, Roland Teske, and Leonid Rudnytzky, tackling some historic, controversial “confessions” of love. Inspired by the Augustinian tradition, this volume focuses on the ambiguous nature of love, especially with regard to some of the conflicting aspects of Greek *eros* and its ancient Latin rival, *caritas*, in great thinkers like Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Marsilio Ficino, Freud, and Max Scheler. This volume will be of interest to humanities, philosophy, theology, history, and classics departments seeking a new way to approach the Western tradition through the historic controversy in the West over *eros* and *caritas*. Finally, its focus on the retrieval and disclosure of sensuality and eroticism in these great texts will also be of special interest to postmodernism and hermeneutics.

Craig J. N. de Paulo is a distinguished scholar in Augustine and the Augustinian tradition. Some of his books include *The Influence of Augustine on Heidegger: The Emergence of an Augustinian Phenomenology*, *Ambiguity in the Western Mind*, *Being and Conversion* as well as a forthcoming book titled *Augustinian Just War Theory and the Wars in Afghanistan and Iraq: Confessions, Contentions and the Lust for Power*.

Bernhardt Blumenthal is Professor of German at La Salle University in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Catherine Conroy de Paulo is Lecturer in English Composition at Pennsylvania State University.

Patrick A. Messina is Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Gwynedd-Mercy College in Pennsylvania.

Leonid Rudnytzky is Professor Emeritus of Slavic Languages at La Salle University in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

A M E R I C A N
U N I V E R S I T Y
S T U D I E S

Confessions of Love

AMERICAN
UNIVERSITY
STUDIES

SERIES VII
THEOLOGY AND RELIGION

VOL. 310



PETER LANG

New York • Washington, D.C./Baltimore • Bern
Frankfurt • Berlin • Brussels • Vienna • Oxford

Confessions of Love

The Ambiguities of
Greek *Eros* and Latin *Caritas*

Edited by Craig J. N. de Paulo,
Bernhardt Blumenthal,
Catherine Conroy de Paulo,
Patrick A. Messina, and Leonid Rudnytzky



PETER LANG

New York • Washington, D.C./Baltimore • Bern
Frankfurt • Berlin • Brussels • Vienna • Oxford

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Confessions of love: the ambiguities of Greek eros and Latin caritas /
edited by Craig J. N. de Paulo ... [et al.].
p. cm. — (American university studies VII: Theology and religion; v. 310)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
1. Love—History. 2. Love—Religious aspects—Christianity—
History of doctrines. I. De Paulo, Craig J. N.
BD436.C589 241'.4—dc22 2010046757
ISBN 978-1-4539-0171-7
ISSN 0740-0446 (Print edition)

Bibliographic information published by **Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek**.
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the "Deutsche
Nationalbibliografie"; detailed bibliographic data is available
on the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de/>.

Cover image: "The Ecstasy of St. Theresa" by Gian Lorenzo Bernini
in the Chiesa della Vittoria in Rome, Italy.

The paper in this book meets the guidelines for permanence and durability
of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity
of the Council of Library Resources.



© 2011 Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., New York
29 Broadway, 18th floor, New York, NY 10006
www.peterlang.com

All rights reserved.
Reprint or reproduction, even partially, in all forms such as microfilm,
xerography, microfiche, microcard, and offset strictly prohibited.

Printed in Germany

Dedicated to

**Our *Alma Mater*,
La Salle University,
and to all of the Christian Brothers
who have taught there over the years.**

Contents

Acknowledgments	ix
Foreword	
Craig J. N. de Paulo.....	xi
Introduction	
Craig J. N. de Paulo and Leonid Rudnytzky.....	1
The Ambiguity of Love in Augustine of Hippo	
Roland J. Teske, S.J.....	16
Love and Tears: Augustine’s Project of Loving without Losing	
Phillip Cary.....	39
Love Lost and Found: The Ambiguities of <i>Amor</i>, <i>Caritas</i> and <i>Concupiscentia</i> in St. Thomas Aquinas’ <i>Summa Theologiae</i>	
Patrick A. Messina.....	55
Marsilio Ficino’s Neoplatonic Ascent of the Soul in Relation to his Augustinian Notion of Friendship	
Catherine Conroy de Paulo.....	74
Francisco Gómez de Quevedo y Villegas: How Laughter Replaces <i>Eros</i> in “<i>Apolo siguidendo a Dafne</i>”	
Luis Gomez.....	91

The Ambiguity of <i>Eros</i> in Thomas Mann's <i>Death in Venice</i> and Other Writings	
Bernhardt Blumenthal.....	106
<i>Eros</i> and Ambiguity in Ukrainian Literature: The Case of Ivan Franko (1856-1916)	
Leonid Rudnytzky.....	113
Divided Loyalties: <i>Eros</i> and Ambiguity in Freud; Attempts at Resolution and their Discontents	
Bruce Lapenson.....	140
A Deceptive Ambiguity: Revisiting Scheler's Philosophy of Love and Religious Activity	
Thomas Carroll.....	156
A Mystagogical Ascent of Love: A Spiritual Reflection on the Sensuality of the Byzantine Divine Liturgy	
Craig J. N. de Paulo.....	209
<i>Eros'</i> Ambiguity: A Philosophical History of Male Love	
Pieter Adriaens.....	220
Index.....	241

Acknowledgments

First of all, we would like to express our sincere gratitude to Dr. Wayne Huss, Professor of History and Chair of the Division of Humanities at Gwynedd Mercy College, for his gracious support and encouragement. We would also like to thank Dr. Lisa McGarry, Interim Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences at Gwynedd Mercy College, for her gracious support of our scholarly endeavors. We are most grateful to Dr. Denise Wilbur, formerly the Vice President for Academic Affairs at Gwynedd Mercy College, for her kind encouragement and the generous research grant her Office awarded in support of this project. We must also acknowledge the kindness of Dr. Kathleen Owens, President of Gwynedd Mercy College, and Dr. Robert Funk, Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs at the College.

We must also acknowledge our sincere thanks to the contributors of this volume, and especially to the Rev. Professor Roland Teske, S.J. and Professor Phillip Cary.

Finally, we gratefully acknowledge the support and encouragement of the Rev. Dr. William J. Geisler, whose learned conversation greatly contributed to this volume.

Foreword

Craig J. N. de Paulo

What could be closer to philosophy than the experience of love? Of course, the very word philosophy is founded upon the two Greek terms “*philia*” (love) and “*sophia*” (wisdom) since it is the “love of wisdom.” How interesting that, unlike other disciplines and sciences, the word philosophy does not use the Greek term “*logos*” as a suffix in order to indicate that it is a discipline of reason that “studies” some topic. Despite its exalted position among the Greeks, or perhaps because of it, philosophy is most of all, a love. And, unlike all the other disciplines, it does not love anything in particular since it is in love with wisdom, which involves all things. It could also be said that there is a kind of symmetry to love and wisdom since both appear to be infinite, something observed by Plato in his magnificent *Symposium* where the great philosopher argues that the ascent of the soul begins with its craving (*eros*) for beauty, which moves the soul from the beauty of a body to the beauty of bodies in general, to the beauty of a soul, to the beauty of ideas and onward to wisdom and philosophic ecstasy. As Plato points out, by having Socrates scandalize his company, love is also an experience of coming to understand one’s neediness or lack; and since *eros* lacks, it cannot be a god! But, the fall of *eros* from divinity, in Plato’s reckoning, leads to the near deification of his mentor and his ancient love. Indeed, the

Greeks viewed philosophy as divine activity. So, returning to Plato's dialogue on love, we discover that it is the philosopher who is very aware of his or her lack of wisdom, and the one who *craves* what he or she lacks, namely wisdom.

So powerful an experience this was and remains, that philosophy has frequently inspired love between master and disciple, as with Socrates and Plato, for instance. It has also fathered many great friendships throughout the ages, which has inspired schools like Plato's Academy and Aristotle's Lyceum, communities like Augustine's in Fifth-century Roman North Africa and, to some extent, the early Christian monasteries and also the first universities in medieval Europe.

But, let us return to love again. Aside from the powerful experience of love that we find in ancient, classical Greece, it was the rise of the Christianity no doubt that brought the credibility of love to its summit where God is revealed as love (*agape*) and the teaching of Jesus in the New Testament *Gospels* will boldly command the ancient world "to love God and love one's neighbor." And, who would have thought then that a religion dedicated to love and meekness would conquer the mighty Roman Empire and convert it as well? Needless to say, Christianity's message of love changed the ancient world—indeed, the whole world—so that today we may speak of human and civil rights, the freedom of religion, care for the poor, the sick and the disabled, all of which are directly the result of love. Nevertheless, poverty, neglect and war continue to plague the world, and the tender message of love is often assailed by those who are more enamored with power. Of course, this is quite simply of war of loves. As the Apostle Paul has written, "The flesh lusts against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh." But, perhaps, Augustine of Hippo put it more clearly, by his powerful description of the spiritual warfare that exists, both cosmically and in our hearts, between the city of God and the city of man? And, are these two loves not also too very different *confessions*?

This volume is rightly entitled "Confessions of Love: The Ambiguities of Greek *Eros* and Latin *Caritas*" because there appears to be a kind of battle between these two ancient loves for the place of divinity. In *Eros*, there is the memory of the pagan god and its

chaotic love, but it is also the love preferred by Christian mystics and thinkers like Origen, Pseudo-Dionysius and Marsilio Ficino to mention a few, in their discussion of God. Yet, the New Testament writers neglected *eros* in preference for *agape* in their description of God. Thus, in the West, Greek *agape* is translated into the Latin *caritas*, but many scholars would argue that *caritas* would be soulless without its philosophical connection to the more sensual *eros*.

Finally, what could be more timely than a collection of essays on the topic of love at a time in history when we seem to be losing our humanity more and more? The so-called advances in technology have resulted, for instance, in online classrooms that do away with the natural relationship between the teacher and the student, and so what love could possibly result from this? Cell phones seem to ring everywhere in the world today, on the street, in the park, interrupting our conversations and even our worship; and virtual conversations and cell phone calls often take precedence over real conversations in the presence of actual persons, our friends, our family and colleagues. Students today do “google” searches instead of research in the dusty stacks, finding books and journal articles, in libraries. The question is, however, can this kind of “research” inspire love for a book, or a discipline? Our relations with one another have deformed into virtual encounters through email, instant messaging, texting and even sexting!

So, following Augustine who wrote, that we can find “truth through love,” our volume is focused on the question of love in order to find truth. Thus, our love is always a kind of confession of some truth. What are *our* confessions of love today? And, what do our loves *confess*?

Introduction

Craig J. N. de Paulo and Leonid Rudnytzky

T HE RETURN OF EROS IN THE WEST

Without a doubt, love is something very near to us, and yet it remains a mystery. While love is clearly the most appealing of all things, it also reveals our vulnerability, which can turn the rapture of bliss quite quickly into intense sorrow and despair. As Socrates indicates, recalling the words of the Oracle at Delphi in Plato's *Symposium*, love (*eros*) is something wealthy and impoverished, something utterly needy and ultimately rich, and something that fulfills us, while remaining a consuming desire. What could be more simple, more tender and more ambiguous than love?

While the experience of love is often ecstatic, intense and ultimately transcendental, it is also, perhaps, the most common of happenings. Further, love is not only an experience between persons, but also an experience that persons have with other living things such as animals and nature. We can also love music, art, literature, philosophy, poetry, history, and mathematics, for instance, with profound intensity, turning our natural *libido* into a spiritual and deeply interior romance with these disciplines and their histories, texts and ideas. Of course, this is an elite type of love, which inevitably enkindles only a few, especially since this love begins with an intellectual apprehension and knowledge of

the other, which seems endless, and only deepens the affections of the lover. In this case, while the beloved (such as philosophy) is unmoved, it has the capacity to move the lover forever. So, the philosopher, as we know, is a “lover of wisdom” whose involvement with philosophy is always between reason and love, throwing the will into play with the intellect, making the philosopher question even *himself*. To the philosopher, it is not mere ideas that he or she loves, but something *real* in his or her relentless search for being. It might be said that the only thing that could further intensify such an experience of love would be to share it, as a teacher does with a student—that is, a real teacher with a real student, or, perhaps, with another lover of the same discipline, where two scholars can enjoy each other’s company in their common love for wisdom. Nevertheless, such a love—a scholar’s love—is always and inevitably a singular kind of love whose commitment is often unintelligible to most, yet it is this peculiar love, and these lovers in particular, that constitute the hope of their disciplines, preserving them and helping them to endure the neglect of generations and the contempt of a materialistic society.

Another intense, and much overlooked love today, is the love of friendship, termed “*philia*” in ancient Greek. As Aristotle writes in his *Nichomachean Ethics*, true friendship is a rare experience since there are so few good men. True or perfect friendship, for Aristotle, is a state of blessedness, a gift from the gods, reserved for serious men of virtue. Following Socrates’ lead in Plato’s *Symposium*, where the old sage denies the advances of the lovely Alcibiades, Aristotle purifies the *philia* between men, preferring the intellectual bond of their souls instead of one that might also include the love of bodies, which was common in Ancient Greece, as exemplified by the relationship between the great warrior, Achilles, and his lover, Patroclus. In Classical Latin literature, too, we can also cite Cicero’s *De Amicitia*, his captivating treatise in praise of friendship, which describes in great detail the romance and spiritual depth of this profound love between men of virtue. Yet, even this noble love, as unique as it may be, can also turn for the worse, as St. Augustine forlornly warns us, “How often do we mistake a friend for an enemy, and an enemy for a friend.”

So profound is this experience that the Evangelist St. John finds no word more apt to describe God than love (*agape*). Needless to say, in the *Gospel of St. John*, the teaching of Jesus is focused on the two-fold meaning of love: *agape* is the love of God *and* the love of one's neighbor. Jesus himself taught, "What you do for the least among you, you do for me," which reveals the imperative of love in the Christian community in addition to the notion that love of others is a divine act. And, as for terminology, we find that the Johannine *agape* is translated into the Latin "*caritas*" by St. Jerome, which develops and even converts, one might say, the old pagan Roman term into a new Christian one that will reign over all other kinds of love for the entire history of the Church in the West.

Probably because of the Latinization of the Church and its liturgy on the Italian peninsula beginning around the fourth century, the Ancient Greek loves of *eros*, *philia* and *agape* were abandoned in the West in favor of Latin terms like *amor*, *caritas*, *cupiditas*, *amicitia*, etc. But, what of *eros*? What happened to erotic love? In the Augustinian tradition, which has dominated the Latin Church ever since the fifth century, *eros* is essentially confused with lust (*concupiscentia*) and doomed in its association with the biblical fall of Adam and Eve; and therefore, conceived as evil desire. Aside from mention in some of the Greek tradition of the Church, such as Origen, St. Gregory of Nyssa, Pseudo-Dionysius and the Medieval mystics, in the West *eros* becomes associated more with paganism until a brief revival in Florence during the Italian Renaissance, with figures like Marsilio Ficino, commenting on Plato's great dialogue on love. In point of fact, however, the experience of *eros* has never left us. One can easily see it in the monastic ideal throughout the Middle Ages; and of course, in the scholar's love that moved Scholasticism into being. Nevertheless, the term *eros* was lost in Western discussion in favor of the Latin and seemingly more noble and grace-filled *caritas*, something perhaps akin to what happened to philosophy in its subjugation to theology during the centuries between Albertus Magnus and someone like the Jesuit theologian Karl Rahner. Ironically, it appears that *eros* has been rehabilitated by none other than a pope—Benedict XVI, in fact, has restored the ecclesiastical credibility of

Greek *eros* in his first Encyclical, *Deus Caritas Est*.¹ In this work, in his apparent desire to reconcile the disparity between the Greek and Latin traditions, the pontiff argues that God is *eros* as much as *caritas*.² Thus, *eros* returns to the West not only as a divine love, but as God Himself.

EROS, AMBIGUITY AND CHRISTIANITY

Now any classical scholar would affirm that the term *eros* is certainly an equivocal term, which can be used for divine love, friendship and sexual love. The ambiguity of *eros* is certainly intriguing, which makes this ancient term particularly appealing in a postmodern context. Thus, our retrieval of *eros*—and particularly within theology—is definitely controversial. It was Anders Nygren, in his well-known work, *Agape and Eros: A Study of the Christian Idea of Love*, who in 1932, had argued that *eros* was essentially a pagan love.³ More recently, the Dominican theologian Fergus Kerr has also argued that (platonic) eroticism “has had fateful effects in the development of Christian spirituality and asceticism.”⁴ Without doubt, the restoration of *eros* reveals one of the central tensions in the Western Mind—that is, the convergence of Jewish and Greek thought that appears in the New Testament Gospels, the Letters of St. Paul and in theological themes and concepts further developed by the great Augustine of Hippo. Further, since the term “*eros*” is not used explicitly by the evangelists to describe God or divine love, some scholars may well argue that the restoration of this term might return us to a pre-Christian context. As such, in ancient Greek, pagan literature and philosophy, *eros* can describe everything from the sacred to the profane, from the love of wine to the divine, heterosexual, homosexual or bi-sexual love. In fact, the term could also be viewed as an attempt to return to the pagan orgiastic. Thus, the use of *eros* in Western discourse remains ambiguous; and therefore, an intriguing problem for Christianity, especially with regard to the Augustinian tradition and its fundamental dichotomy of love: with *caritas*, on the one hand, and *concupiscentia*, on the other. Thus, the question remains: can the Western mind ever reconcile these two ancient loves, Greek *eros* and Latin *caritas*?

EASTERN (BYZANTINE) EROS

There is no doubt, however, that our recent retrieval of the term *eros* has been imported to the West from the East—that is, as we have already seen, from the ancient Greek tradition. Yet, this time, with Benedict XVI's retrieval of *eros*, we must focus primarily on the early Greek Christian heritage and its place within Byzantine Christianity. Here, we find in Christian orthodoxy and in Greek Christianity in general a greater openness and appreciation for the term *eros* simply because it belongs to this cultural and linguistic heritage. Whereas, in the Western Latin tradition, *eros* experiences a definite fall from grace, so to speak, translating it almost exclusively with terms like *libido*, *concupiscentia*, and even *perversio* without any mention of its more divine, elusive and mysterious origins. Aside from philosophical and artistic attempts during the Italian Renaissance to rehabilitate it, *eros* has almost always been confused with sensual sin in the Western Church. Perhaps, *eros* was simply too erotic for the West and especially for our beloved Augustine, who struggled so much with it in his own spiritual journey? And, without *eros*, the West has long contended that our loves seem to be more pure and more neatly divided up into intelligible parts, good love and bad love. Unfortunately, this division in love may also neglect to capture the existential connection between our own human longings and our divine aspirations for a love greater than ourselves, which leads us to question whether our own capacity for love, even when it is fallen, can be converted to something better? Or, is it rather that our love is simply doomed for failure, for pride and perversity, and we require a higher love and divine assistance to turn our fallen love away from ourselves and to the other? But, the ancient Greek philosophers would certainly reply, "What love could be higher than *eros*?" And, so, we must now question again if these loves are, indeed, so completely different, belonging to two different worlds and arising from two fundamentally different desires and aspirations, as Augustine powerfully describes by his use of the two cities—the city of God and the city of man? But, is there any connection between these two cities and these two

loves? Where would *eros* be in this Augustinian schema of love? Is it simply condemned to the perverse love of the city of man? Or, can it somehow be conceived as a bridge between these two worlds and their two loves, as Benedict seems to suggest? Again, Greek *eros* is equivocal; and therefore, it is an ambiguous experience. It can be everyday love and it certainly has the potential for divine love, as Plato, Plotinus and Gregory of Nyssa will affirm. Nevertheless, terms have histories and they belong to their own cultural, philosophical and historical contexts so when we employ a Greek term like *eros* within the Western (i.e. Latin) tradition we are inevitably left with ambiguity. And, since we cannot change history, this current retrieval of *eros* points us toward the future and a new direction for philosophical speculation requiring a new synthesis of Greek thought and Christianity, which we already see bearing fruit within Catholic moral theology and also in the recent development of the theology of the body and specifically with regard to the contemporary theology of marriage and conjugal love and its newfound appreciation for pleasure. Needless to say, however, this development is a departure from the ancient apostolic and patristic tradition that associated pleasure with paganism. Yet, in this new synthesis, we find that the sensual pleasure associated with conjugal love belongs to that *eros* that connects us, and specifically the married couple, to God, who is love itself. However, Augustine along with many of the Fathers of the Church would certainly question whether this pleasure is a fruit from above or below despite its noble association? Thus, our retrieval of *eros* provides us with a new kind of methodology whereby in our turning back to the Greek term, we may also be retrieving some of the ancient Hebrew assumptions about love and marriage. Again, we find ourselves surrounded by ambiguity since the Hebrew idea of conjugal love is, to a great extent, abandoned by the Apostle St. Paul, who greatly inspires the Christian patristic tradition.

So, in the end, the question of *eros* appears to be a problem for the West *again*, and Western philosophers and theologians will have to continue to wrestle with it. And, despite modern attempts to import *eros* into Western discourse by philosophy, psychoanalysis, art, music and literature, *eros* remains very Eastern and

exotic to us in the West. *Eros* is attractive *and* elusive. It opens up old wounds and ancient controversies, and it throws us face to face with our fundamental assumptions and provokes us to question the mysterious realm of love in all of its ambiguity. Ultimately, it seems, any attempt to define *eros* inevitably leads us to the experience of mysticism, which has also been a great problem for the West in its insatiable desire to grasp all things with the *mind*. Nevertheless, in a word, *eros* leaves us breathless and speechless in our desire to love, and fully content with the experience of beauty in our pursuit of the truth.

REVISITING ANCIENT EROS AND ITS LITERARY AND MYTHOLOGICAL GENEALOGY

EROS AND THANATOS

“*Agnosco veteris vestigia flammae*” – “I recognize the vestiges of an old flame.” These words uttered by Aeneas to Dido upon their initial encounter, reveal the powerful, primeval force of *eros* and its connection with *libido*. Aeneas senses, or rather recognizes the unquestionable, all-consuming power of love which leaves an indelible imprint on the human soul and which is intrinsically intertwined with sexual attraction. The reference to flame is, of course, of special significance; it is both a reminder of a past consuming erotic encounter as well as a foreshadowing of Dido’s ultimate demise through immolation. Thus, *eros* and *thanatos* are often inextricably linked together forming a special dimension to human love and sexuality.

This relationship between love and death and its ultimate consummation in fire is found in many literary works. In his mystical period, Goethe set it a lasting monument in his poetry, especially in the two ballads, written partially in praise of the old pagan religion and as a condemnation of excessive Christian asceticism: “*Die Braut von Korinth*” and “*Der Gott und die Bajadere*,” in which the flames bring about the end of life, the promise of ultimate salvation and, in the latter, divinity. The ubiquitous *Liebeshod* motif popularized by Wagner in his operas, is another example of the

love-death connection, which, *mutatis mutandis*, in a more vulgar version, is found in the French expression for orgasm: “*le petit mort*.” But perhaps the most poignant poetic capturing of the love-death relationship and its intrinsic connection to beauty has been achieved by Goethe’s epigone, August Count von Platen-Hallermünde (1796-1835). Von Platen was an ardent admirer of the Greeks, especially of Pindar, and a lover of classical literature, whose own poetic oeuvre is characterized by remarkable lucidity, restraint and harmony. His poem “Tristan” (1825), of which we offer here the first stanza in the original as well as in a rather prosaic translation, is a good example of semiotic encoding in the *eros-thanatos* relationship:

Wer die Schönheit angeschaut mit Augen
Ist dem Tode schon anheimgegeben,
Wird für keinen Dienst auf Erden taugen,
Und doch wird er vor dem Tode beben,
Wer die Schönheit angeschaut mit Augen!
He who beheld Beauty with his eyes
Is already doomed to death.
No longer will he be of any use on this earth,
And yet he will tremble in the face of death,
He who beheld Beauty with his eyes!

EROS AND ECSTASY

Of course, not all manifestations of love in European letters have this deathlike Dionysian nature as first expostulated by Friedrich Nietzsche. Sometimes the Apollonian view, initially conceived by Johann Joachim Winckelmann (1717-1768) in his dictum that underlying all of Greek art is “a noble simplicity and a quiet grandeur,” takes the upper hand. The Austrian poet Hugo von Hofmannsthal (1874-1929) in his brief yet incomparably powerful poem “*Die Beiden*” (“The Two”), offered here in a plain prose translation taken from *The Penguin Book of German Verse* (first published in 1957), is an excellent example of this Apollonian attribute of *eros*:

She carried the cup in her hand – her chin and mouth were like its
rim –

Her gait was so light and assured, not a drop spilled out of the cup.
 His hand was equally light and firm; he rode on a young horse,
 And with a careless movement he made it stand still, quivering.
 But when he was to take the light cup from her hand,
 it was too heavy for both of them; for both trembled so much that
 no hand
 found the other hand, and dark wine flowed on the ground.

Another example of the Apollonian nature of *eros* is found in Boris Pasternak's Nobel prize winning novel *Dr. Zhivago* (1957). Here *eros* enables the two lovers, Zhivago and Lara, to escape, albeit momentarily, the sufferings and ravages of war which is destroying their world. In a typically romantic manner (and *eros*, lest we forget, finds in Romanticism its most popular expression), the two lovers experience fleeting moments of peace and tranquility. They become a part of the cosmos, a link in the great chain of being, which makes them impervious to the violence and ugliness surrounding them. *Eros*, in its Apollonian incarnation, is not simply unbridled passion that robs people of tranquility driving them to destruction; rather it is the source of beauty and salvation:

They loved each other, not driven by necessity, by the 'blaze of passion' often falsely ascribed to love. They loved each other because everything around them willed it, the trees and the clouds and the sky over their heads and the earth at their feet. Perhaps their surrounding world, the strangers they met in the street, the wide expanses they saw on their walks, the rooms in which they lived or met, took more delight in their love than they themselves did. Ah, that was just what had united them and had made them so akin! Never, never even in their moments of richest and wildest happiness, were they unaware of a sublime joy in the total design of the universe, a feeling that they themselves were a part of that whole, an element in the beauty of the cosmos.⁵

Eros becomes a powerful antidote to the evils of ideological depravity that attempt to restructure the world. Love is the inner sanctum of lovers, a fortress in which they become unassailable: "Their love was great. Most people experience love without becoming aware of the extraordinary nature of this emotion. But to them – and this made them exceptional – the moments when passion visited their doomed human existence like a breath of eter-

nity were moments of revelation, of continually new discoveries about themselves and life.”⁶

This power of *eros* to change the individual and his world is also fittingly captured by Mario Puzo in his bestseller *The Godfather* when Michael Corleone first encounters Apollonia:

he found himself standing, his heart pounding in his chest; he felt a little dizzy. The blood was surging through his body, through all its extremities and pounding against the tips of his fingers, the tips of his toes. All the perfumes of the island came rushing in on the wind, orange, lemon blossoms, grapes, flowers. It seemed as if his body had sprung away from him out of himself.⁷

Eros often strikes like a thunderbolt (a word used by the Puzo himself in describing this event, p. 334) and its effects are life-changing and ever-lasting. Indeed, the two quoted passages, taken from authors from two different worlds, demonstrate this power of *eros* not only to change human beings, but also to change their perception of their surroundings, indeed to change the nature surrounding them and the world in which they live.

SOME ANCIENT TALES OF *EROS*

While these selected passages provide us with revealing glimpses into the power of *eros*, its beguiling ambiguity and its ubiquity in literature, they offer little information on its genesis and origins. And indeed, the origins of *eros* are shrouded in mystery. Born of Chaos, *Eros* in his primal and primeval incarnation is the Greek god of love. He is not mentioned in Homer, but Hesiod refers to him as the fairest of divine entities whose allure is irresistible to both gods and humans. According to Hesiod, *Eros* is not merely a god who evokes deep passion and unbridled sexual frenzy, but a primordial force, which forms and reforms the world by uniting its disparate inner elements. There are also a number of other tales in later Greek lore which present him as a son of Aphrodite by Ares or Hermes, the youngest among the gods, willful, capricious and often cruel. However, perhaps the best known story about him appears in “*Eros and Psyche*” found in Apuleius’ book *Metamorphoses*, which dates to the second century.

Briefly told, this story begins with *Psyche*, the youngest of three daughters of a royal couple. Her beauty is such that people believe her to be an incarnation of Aphrodite. However, her beauty is also a curse; it inhibits suitors from asking for her hand in marriage and invokes the wrath of the gods upon her. Her father consults the oracle of Apollo and is told that that she must be placed on a mountaintop as a sacrifice to a horrifying monster-serpent. She is saved from this terrible fate by a gentle wind that carries her to safety. Walking in the woods she finds a magnificent, magic palace. A voice tells her that she is to be married. A magic wedding feast is held, and her bridegroom, *Eros*, whom she cannot see but only feel, visits her after midnight. Following a passionate night, he leaves her before sunrise. *Psyche* lives in the castle enjoying the moments of love but longing for human companionship. Her husband continues his nocturnal visits but never reveals himself to her. She begs him to allow her to see her sisters. He relents but orders her never to tell them anything about him, informing her that she is pregnant and that their child will be a god if she keeps their secret. She enjoys the subsequent visit of her sisters, tells them of her happiness and gives them precious gifts but, in responding to their prying, tells them contradictory stories about her husband. They become suspicious and envious suspecting that she has never seen him and that he may be a god. On their third visit they convince her that, as predicted by the oracle, her husband is a monster who will devour her and her child. The following night, *Psyche* does look at her husband when he is asleep and is overwhelmed by his beauty. She suffers terrible pangs of remorse and attempts unsuccessfully to kill herself. *Eros* awakens and tries to fly away. She clings to him; they soar into the sky but eventually his strength ebbs and they come down to earth. *Eros* informs *Psyche* that he has disobeyed Aphrodite's command by marrying her instead of making her fall in love with an unworthy mortal man. He tells her that he will leave her and punish her sisters for what they have done. *Psyche* is terribly distraught, she attempts suicide but is saved by Pan, who urges her to live and to try to regain *Eros'* love. She tricks her sisters into believing that they have a chance of marrying *Eros*, and both sisters die in their respective attempts to get to his magical palace.