

Defining Platonic Love in Aneek's Letter to the Wife: Film

Tomas Ceuterick

Portrayal of Platonic Love in the Film

Aneek Chaudhuri's *The Wife's Letter* has been a true example of the depiction what we may call as platonic love and it also shows the transformation from being platonic to getting erotic in the end. The whole story starts in a very subtle note when there is one-sided love from the boy's side and slowly, it proves to be quite platonic to attract the female protagonist as well. In the beginning, things are in place and romance is gaining a certain momentum; however, everything gets hampered when the love for oneself gets transformed into 'loving one's body'. Hence, I can say that *The Wife's Letter* has been a subtle example or, it can also be termed to be a preconclusion of the love being exhibited these days



In order to understand the film better, one must have a better understanding of Plato's concept of love and relationships. The same has been focused upon in the next section.

I. ANALYSIS OF PLATONIC LOVE

First of all, the first which means of "platonic love" comes from Plato's *The Symposium*, where the perfect reasonable love was delineate as a form redirecting the lover's focus from the beloved (and sex with the beloved) to "the divine" or "philosophy," primarily to Associate in Nursing interaction of the mind or some outside pursuit of information. philosopher (and Socrates) failed to mean to exclude gender altogether from this ideal. They condemned the sort of titillating love that keeps 2 individuals captivated with sex and every other's body, to the purpose of neglecting those higher concepts, pursuits, etc, however they failed to quite say that the perfect love is completely neuter. The modern use of the term "platonic love" is clearly Associate in Nursing inaccurate one. it's not faithful Plato's philosophy. In English, we have a tendency to perceive "platonic love" to mean love that's not sexual—and that's problematic for reasons on the far side the disconnect to the first plan (Gould, 1963).



Usually, once individuals use the term "platonic love" to explain love that isn't sexual, a cooccurring lack of romance is implicit too. In alternative words, if you "platonically" love somebody, you don't need to possess sex with them and you don't need to be some either. This usage will fully nothing to acknowledge the complexities of attainable relationships. It conflates romance and sex and makes couplehood or primary partnerships substitutable with a romantic-sexual relationship.

Here's the thing:

You can have a romantic neuter relationship.

You can have a non-romantic relationship.

You can have a non-romantic neuter relationship.

Everybody would most likely agree that the last kind—a non-romantic, neuter relationship—is “platonic.” however what regarding the opposite two? If we have a tendency to use the word “platonic” to mean a neuter relationship, then the romantic nature of the connection makes no distinction, however raise any romantic neuter or cross-orientation sexual person if their neuter romances match into their understanding of “platonic love,” and they’ll possibly say, “No.” Then, there’s the non=romantic relationship. Is that “platonic” as a result of it doesn’t involve romantic feelings, despite the actual fact it’s sexual? the matter you’re possibly to run into if you're keen on somebody you've got sex with however don’t have romantic feelings for them is that nobody will believe that non-romantic love and sex will exist within the initial place. To say, “I ‘platonic’ love this person I’m fucking” simply sounds weird and dishonest, to most of the people. you’ll be able to sleep with with somebody you don’t love in any respect, however if you are doing love that person, the impulse is to label it “romantic” love.

Of course, all 3 varieties of relationships can’t be known as “platonic” if we have a tendency to glide by the first, actual which means of “platonic love.” however as a result of the term has already adopted its incorrect which means on a widespread level, we have a tendency to can’t very return to actuality which means either. “Platonic” most likely got hijacked to explain neuter love as a result of it’s helpful to possess a qualifier for the word “love” in English after we have such a fucked up, poor habit of victimization it to solely mean romantic-sexual love and otherwise, agitated it around within the vaguest ways in which attainable.

It’s nice to possess the way of claiming “I love this person nonsexually and non-romantically” while not really phrasing it like that, just because what I simply wrote is wordy, clunky, etc. individuals adore it once language flows, after we will get our purpose across during a method that’s short and sweet, however once it involves emotions and relationships, this “short and sweet and simple” linguistic approach solely holds U.S.A. back. Emotions, love, and relationships aren’t short, simple, and sweet. There’s nothing a lot of advanced in our expertise. It’s totally fucking ridiculous that we’re therefore reluctant to use a lot of refined language to speak regarding love and relationships, once our actual experiences of them ar often sophisticated as hell. The neuter community unwittingly points out that the “romantic-sexual/platonic” love classification is useless, problematic, and irrelevant for loads of individuals. Romantic asexuals, whether or not they consent to sex or not, love their romantic partners romantically however not sexually. they might not use the term “platonic love” to explain their romantic feelings, even if those feelings stand while not sexual desire/attraction. Cross-orientation sexual individuals will say identical of their romantic attachments (Gould, 1963). Likewise, aromantic sexual individuals run into the matter of labeling their relationships/feelings once they sleep with while not ever feeling romantic love for his or her sexual partners, regardless of what proportion they care. nonetheless clearly, you can’t very reason a nonromantic relationship into identical box as your nonromantic neuter relationships. line of work all “platonic” misses the variations between the 2, each sexually and showing emotion.

Then, there ar the aromantic asexuals and aromantic sexual people that need primary nonromantic partnership, aromantics whose nonromantic love for others are often even as intense as textbook romance. And virtually nobody understands them and what they need or however they feel as a result of within the world’s understanding of affection and relationships, if you don’t love somebody romantically, you're keen on them “platonic,” which suggests that you simply need to be friends and not a “couple,” as a result of solely romantic-sexual pairs are often couples with a primary relationship (Kierkegaard, 1978) “Platonic love” is sometimes equated to friendly relationship in our minds. If you're keen on somebody “as an admirer,” which means you don’t need them sexually or romantically, that love is “platonic.” Except—people do generally love their friends non-romantically however need to fuck them (and do!). And it’s currently a really common factor in twenty first century communicatory societies to envisage the ideal romantic-sexual relationship as inclusive of friendly relationship anyway (which may be a comparatively new idea in civilization and still doesn’t exist in many alternative countries everywhere the world). I additionally happen to assume that you simply will love somebody romantically while not being friends, even as you’ll be able to be sexually attached to somebody WHO isn’t your friend. therefore that relationships are “platonic” and that aren’t? And if they aren’t “platonic” however they aren’t “romantic,” then what are they?(Kierkegaard, 1978) What philosopher was gaining access to within the conference was essentially: the perfect love might embrace sex however the intellectually-based friendly relationship in it’s way more necessary, while not that the connection is base and carnal during a method we have a tendency to shouldn’t accept. the most downside with victimization “platonic love” to mean friendly relationship is that friendly relationship itself is that the most ambiguous reasonably association between 2 individuals within the initial place! I say this as somebody WHO has been finding out friendly relationship and neuter love for years, from literary, historical, and philosophical views. Philosophy above all makes a giant deal

regarding the anomaly of friendly relationship. titillating love is comparatively easy in comparison!(Kierkegaard, 1978)



The “romantic-sexual/platonic” love classification leaves no space for the \$64000 emotional nuances individuals expertise in their attachments, and that I assume that it typically causes U.S.A. to measure with simplified relationships not as a result of we wish to or as a result of we've easy wishes and feelings however as a result of we've no expertise, cultural context, or language to accommodate a posh social life or set of relationships. this is often why language is therefore necessary. this is often why words and labels matter. however are you able to have the sort of relationships you wish with anyone, if you don't even have the words to accurately categorical however you feel? Hell, [*fr1] the time, individuals don't even perceive their own feelings and relationship wishes as a result of what they feel isn't easy in any respect, however the sole relationship framework they apprehend makes everything appear easy and clear cut: romance and sex go along, friendly relationship is break away each of these things, couplehood/primary partnership is exclusive to romance and sex, etc (Gould, 1963).

But if we have a tendency to ar to simply accept the chances and realities of neuter romance, primary nonsexual/nonromantic love, nonromantic sex and sexual friendly relationship, romantic (nonsexual) friendly relationship, queerplatonic neuter relationships and sexual relationships, etc.... we've to drop {this method|this manner|this fashion} of thinking and speaking regarding relationships and love during a romantic-sexual/platonic divided way. None of these “complex” relationships match into that model, that is why the typical romantic-sexual one who has no exposure to something on the other hand normative relationship vogue can nearly always react to those other forms of relationships with total confusion, rejection, etc.nfortunately, I don't have another to “platonic”, for describing nonsexual/nonromantic love or nonromantic love synchronal with sex or primary partners who is neither sexually nor romantically concerned. Right now, I'm simply inquiring the difficulty of claiming “nonsexual” and “nonromantic.” The one factor i prefer regarding victimization those words is their specificity. They clearly communicate what I mean, with no space for confusion on the other hand the sort that may arise once the connection or love in question seems “complicated” to some other person. If a relationship is romantic however neuter, I'll say therefore. If it's non-romantic however sexual, I'll say therefore. If it's non-romantic and neuter, I'll say therefore. Clarity is price a touch verboseness.

II. CONCLUSION

In the Wife's Letter, Aneek has portrayed the female character to be actively involved in making love, however, this also depicts scenes when there is slight aversion from the lady's end when she senses that the love exhibited by the man is slowly turning into a cold affair and is only attached to her body (Chaudhuri, 2016).In end, the lady gets raped when there is a lack of participation from her side or in other words, she hurts the male ego by turning away from him and not giving any favors to his undue advances. This stands against what we may term as platonic love and this film is a true example of the formation and destruction of Platonic Love. Hence after studying this film with a very in-depth approach, one would be able to differentiate between a variety of terms such as asexuality, sexuality, love, lust, and above all, will be successful in determining love according to Plato's philosophy.

REFERENCES

- [1] Chaudhuri, A. (2016). dir. *The Wife's Letter*. India, Film.
- [2] Gould, T. (1963) *Platonic Love*. New York: The Free Press.
- [3] Kierkegaard, S. (1978) *Either/Or*. Part I. In *Kierkegaard's Writings*. Eds. and trans. H. V. Hong and E. H. Hong and others, 26 vols. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.