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Introduction.
As the schools were establishing themselves as educational institutions with a clear physical and intellectual identity, they were at the same time working out their pedagogy, for their activities of researching, debating, writing and publishing, were part of their general pedagogical practices. Once established, teaching became one of their most important activity. This was the case with the Academy, Lyceum, Garden, Stoa and their representatives outside Athens.

What were the physical conditions under which philosophers taught, and under what kinds of classroom arrangements did they teach? What were their methods of teaching, and what their curriculum?. That is to say, where, how and what did they teach?

This Chapter reconstructs the teaching of the Athenian schools of philosophy and examines the educative relationship between physical setting and classroom makeup, teaching method and content in the schools of philosophy in the Hellenistic period with some comments on the continuity of the pedagogical tradition in the teaching of philosophy in the centuries a.d..
3.1. The Physical Settings and Classroom Makeup.

(a). Classroom Settings.

...at Athens of all places philosophy should be related as closely as possible to its physical, architectural setting. (1)

By the time the Athenian philosophical schools had established themselves in Athens, they had had a long association with the educational dimension of some of its public buildings which catered to their needs and provided a setting and forum for their pedagogical activities. These were the three gymnasia: the Academy, the Lyceum and the Cynosarges, outside the city walls; the buildings of the Agora and its environs situated in the centre of the socio-economic life of the polis with its Stoa Poikile, Stoa Basileus, the Stoa of Zeus Eleutheros, its Lawcourts, Temples and Shrines; the Odeion of Pericles and multitude of shops and stalls in the marketplace. In the Hellenistic period and in the early Roman Empire additional and more extensive buildings were erected. Two new gymnasia were built within the city walls. These were the Ptolemaion and the Diogeneion serving as social and educational institutions. In the Agora, other structures built included the large southern Stoas (Middle and Southern Stoa II). The little north-eastern Stoa sank into insignificance compared to its neighbour, the magnificent two-storey Stoa of Attalus II with its terrace, colonnades and rooms. The Odeion of Agrippa (c.15 b.c.) could initially seat a thousand spectators. (2) Philosophers and sophists often
held class there. The many shaded *peripatoi*; front street colonnaded walks, shops and terraces constructed in the Roman imperial period: all these architectural settings provided the teachers of the ancient world with a variety of physical settings for their pedagogy. These settings reached their optimum in the second century a.d.. (3) and were to be seen on a grand scale in other cities of the Roman Empire, especially in its capitals, and in the cities of Asia Minor in particular, where they flourished well into late Antiquity. Wealthy individuals duplicated them on a small scale in their private villas and country estates. (4) In Athens itself, Sulla's and the Herulians' partial sack of Athens were the only two events, other than the early sieges of the *diadochoi*, to substantially damage both the gymnasia and buildings of the Agora before barbarian (Visigoth) incursions of the late fourth century and after. Some of the buildings of the Agora never recovered. A gymnasium, for example, was built in place of the destroyed Odeion c.a.d.400 (5) and other infrequent rebuilding took place, although the second century a.d. peak was never again reached.

Thus regarding a public place like a gymnasium, the form of the philosopher's classroom pretty much depended on which part of the building was being used: its *peripatos*, *lesche*, *palaestra*, or *exedra*. As these were public, a philosopher could not claim exclusive rights to the use of any of these places at any given time. In the case of the *peripatos* of the Academy or Lyceum, the usual form of the classroom was that of a small but fluid and informal group
of people who in the course of a discussion mingled, walked about, stood and/or sat down.

The second major physical setting where pedagogy took place was less public. It took the form of the private house and garden. Size, number of rooms, facilities and resources varied. Some private estates could boast small versions of a gymnasium and/or palaestra, and around their courtyards and gardens, they had shaded peripatoi, and little colonaded stoas with steps, etc. The house and adjoining buildings would have sleeping quarters that doubled as informal classrooms in addition to specific rooms intended for storage of materials (library), formal teaching and occasionally a small auditorium for (public and) private lectures.

The private house and garden of the Academy, Peripatos and Epicurus' school had their versions of the exedra, peripatos, stoa, colonnades, shrine, library, etc. Then there was also the andron for the holding of symposia. Not all of these facilities were equally available, so philosophers supplemented the rest by recourse to the use of public buildings. But while the Epicureans restricted themselves entirely to a private setting, the Stoa seems to have done the opposite. Its philosophers monopolised the public buildings of Athens and appear not to have acquired private property for the sole and exclusive purpose of holding school.

Although use of public facilities was not abandoned, and the Stoics are a notable example of this, the trend was increasingly towards the use of private settings; a result.
of the schools' acquisition of private property. The Epicureans are thus at the opposite pole of the Stoics, with Academics and Peripatetics occupying the middle ground. This is clearly reflected in their respective philosophies. Thus Zeno's is in many ways a philosophy of the social and political concerns of the Agora, where he taught daily, while the setting for the teaching of Epicurus squares well with his personalist philosophy based on intimacy. In the privacy of the Garden, the stress was on informality, teaching by association and personal intimacy. Physical space in the form of a classroom was arranged along these lines and this was the case for the Academy, Lyceum and individual teachers in the Hellenistic period and the Roman empire. There was thus an important dimension of influence in physical setting towards classroom makeup and teaching.

(b). Classroom Makeup.

During the educational history of the schools and their representatives, the physical makeup of the classroom is to be found within these two categories of public and private settings. The use of the word classroom to describe the organisation and arrangement of philosophic teaching does not have the same connotations that a Greek elementary class (10) or a modern university lecture room evokes: that is, a room with definite and uniform physical space arranged and divided by rows of desks and chairs, with time regulated by the bell, by set periods, breaks and roll-calls, etc.
Diogenes Laertius provides some interesting details regarding practices in the Eretrian school:

He [Asclepiades] shirked work, it is said, and was indifferent to the fortunes of his school. At least no order could be seen in his classes, and no circle of benches; but each man would listen where he happened to be, walking or sitting, Menedemus himself behaving in the same way. (D.L.II.130. emphasis mine)

The Eretrian school did not resemble an organised classroom like the elementary school run by a grammaticos; the ordered activities of the Academy and Peripatos, or the circular seating and lively discussion of a symposium. Diogenes Laertius was criticising the lack of organised teaching under formal classroom conditions which had become a regular feature in the other schools.

The nature of the philosophic classroom varied in its physical form and makeup, depending on place, number of students and issue at hand. For example, the setting of a gymnasium provided the scene for a philosophic discussion between Socrates and a small group of disciples, (11) as the lesche (lounge) and peripatos of the Academy did for Plato (12) and the peripatos of the Lyceum for Aristotle, etc. (D.L.V.2) Facilities of the gymasia could also be used for large scale lectures delivered in its exedrae (lecture rooms), a regular feature of Academic and Peripatetic teaching. Theophrastus had to deal with two thousand students at a time, if Diogenes Laertius is believed. (D.L.V.37) Zeno, teaching in the Stoa amidst a throng of people, tried to avoid both the crowd and
undesirable students. "Nor indeed would he walk about with more than two or three". (D.L.VII.14) The philosophic symposium was also a small group affair held in the andron, (mens' dining room) for teachers, intimate disciples and friends, and that by invitation only. (13)

The trend that emerged and developed with regard to physical settings and teaching practices in the schools of philosophy was one of the tendency of philosophers and their students to avail themselves of the public facilities that suited their educational needs. Some public institutions like the gymnasia and palaestra had been established with educational purposes in mind, (14) for the association between gymnasia and young men converged in paideia. That is the reason why philosophers taught there. It was also a natural place for intellectuals to congregate in, and the Sophists of the fifth and fourth centuries b.c. who were professional educators, made good use of them as they did of the public buildings of the Agora. (15) Other buildings like stoas, theatres, law-courts, temples, etc. acquired an educational dimension through their historical associations as structures where the socio-political and intellectual life of persons took place, as they were gradually drawn into the educational arena of its statesmen, poets, sophists and philosophers.

In opposition to normal sophistic practice, Isocrates retreated totally within a domestic setting; his own house, and taught there for over fifty years. Socrates himself spent most of his time in the Agora and to a lesser extent in the gymnasia of Athens. His pupil Antisthenes taught
more or less on a permanent basis in the Cynosarges, charging fees for his services. (16) The Cynic Diogenes not only taught, but lived in the public buildings as well, (D.L.VI.22-3) and in this he was followed by his disciples, especially Crates and Hipparchia. (17) The Cynics continued their occupation of public places, of the Agora in particular, and in time became permanent fixtures and an all too familiar sight. Individually, they were an itinerant lot, though there was probably always some Cynic in residence. They did not organise their teaching nor institutionalise their activities into a school.

Of the minor Socratic schools and their physical settings we know very little. Euclides most certainly received philosophers and students in his own house where he also taught (D.L.III.6.) and established a succession (D.L.II.108-12). The school's interest and expertise were in argument and its members were formidable dialecticians. Thus they constantly figured in public places; engaged in debate with rivals and frequented the courts of the diadochoi. (18) During Stilpo's headship, the school was the most powerful in Greece and a real threat to the Athenian schools. (D.L.II.113-4). Stilpo appears to have taught in his house, for his pupils Menedemus and Asclepiades, (the former resided with him in Megara) attended his classes and heard his teachings there. (D.L.II.126) On Phaedo's school in Elis, its setting, teaching and organisation, information is scarce. We can assume that upon his return home to Elis, Phaedo most probably taught in a private setting, probably his house.
Like the Megarians, he and his followers cultivated the eristic side of dialectic and the Eretrian branch of the school engaged in both philosophical and political controversies. (D.L.II.128-44) Aristippus the Cyrenaic travelled a great deal, like an itinerant sophist, lecturing and teaching in public gymnasias (19) and entertaining at the courts of rulers. (20)

As teacher, Plato first held school in the Academy gymnasium. (D.L.III.7) Later he acquired private property, a house and garden, (21) where he and his successors taught on a permanent basis. His lecture On the Good was delivered in the gymnasium. (22) At other times we find him in the lesche and peripatos (23) in the company of senior members and students engaged in research and teaching. The scholarchs and many senior members continued to use the facilities of the gymnasium, especially its exedra, lesche, Lacydeion, and walks. Xenocrates, Arcesilaus, Lacydes, Carneades, and their successors in turn all lectured in the gymnasium. Occasionally, for lack of space or because Academic graduates started to teach in their own right in Athens, we find them teaching in separate private and/or public settings. (24) Thus Cleitomachus taught in the Palladium, Charmadas and later Antiochus in the Ptolemaion. In Rome, Philo taught privately, most probably in his patron's house where Cicero and friends heard him discourse. (Cic.T.D.II.3.9)

The public settings of Aristotle's school were not unlike those of the Academy. Like Plato, Aristotle started by teaching in a gymnasium. This was the Lyceum, a busy
social and educational centre in Athens. The Lyceum had all the standard facilities of a Gymnasium, and Aristotle made good use of them. Aristotle's successor, Theophrastus added to the school private property in the form of a house and garden with its own peripatos, colonnades and adjoining buildings used as lecture-classrooms, storage rooms and living quarters. Theophrastus mentions these structures in his will, (D.L.V.5-2) in addition to places in the gymnasium regularly used by the school: the little stoa next to the mouseion where the school library was deposited, a shrine, a lower stoa used to store maps and an altar. A community of philosophers was in residence and the school passed on to them and their successors who continued in it the study and teaching of literature and philosophy. (D.L.V.52-3) Except for Peripatetics who set up their own schools in Athens and abroad, teachers of the original Peripatos confined their pedagogical activities to the facilities of the Gymnasium and their house and garden. In later generations the school did not expand on its previous labour in the empirical sciences. Rather it restricted itself to arranging, systematising and preserving their accumulated work and therefore found the existing facilities of the gymnasium and its school property sufficient for its purposes of teaching the school doctrine. This was what later Peripatetics were basically known for, for being excellent teachers but poor philosophers. (25)

In contrast to both the Academy and Lyceum and later to the Stoa, too, the educational settings of the school of
Epicurus took place entirely within a private structure: a house and garden for the specific purpose of holding school and where a community of philosophers and students lived together in friendship and harmony. The settings of the house and garden afforded Epicurus and his friends and students the sort of privacy and close intimacy not possible in a gymnasium or Agora. Thus the confining of themselves to the little kepos and house was a logical extension of the close group of friends and associates that he established at Lampsacus previously and of his developing personalist philosophy directed towards individual happiness. This was something which he felt could best be taught in a private environment and not amid the constant activity of the marketplace and gymnasium. Accordingly, Epicurus and his successors restricted their teaching to the house and garden.

In its physical settings and classroom makeup, the Stoic school was in stark contrast to the Epicurean school. Zeno, who had been a pupil of Crates the Cynic and had followed his teaching from one public place to another in the Agora and gymasia, himself chose a public place for his own teaching. This was the Stoa Poikile, the lounge (lesche) and Art gallery of Athens. (26) In the way of facilities the Stoa could not offer much, especially when matched against the resources of its rivals: private property and the use of state gymasia for their teaching. The Stoa Poikile was a simple open colonnaded structure. It was nothing elaborate, and certainly nothing resembling the sophisticated Stoas of the Hellenistic period (eg. the Stoa
of Attalus II) with their double stories, terraces, seats, annexes, steps and rows of colonnades, etc. It is possible that the Stoa Poikile, like the Stoa Basileus, offered a few benches "running along the foot of the walls" (27) to supplement the steps and colonnades for sitting on and leaning against. Diogenes Laertius (D.L.VII.22) relates a story of an unwelcome student in Zeno's classroom who was first made to "sit on the benches that were dusty" (ta kekonomena ton bathron) and later to sit in the place where beggars habilituated in order to get rid of him. A few small rooms, if there were any at all, may have been added later for general public use, but this was the extent of it. Unlike the gymnasium, the Stoa was designed for social and recreational, and not for educational purposes. Thus it did not consciously cater for the latter and would-be teachers had to settle for what there was. Even more than the public gymasia, the Stoa was in constant public use by people from all walks of life to be found in the Agora—from its beggars (D.L.VII.22) and Cynics, to its everyday citizens and rival poets, sophists and philosophers.

To cater for the growing number of students, both successors and other graduates of the Stoa made use of the public buildings of Athens. Aristo of Chios defected and set up a rival school in the Cynosarges, (28) as did Herillus of Carthage and Dionysius Metathemnos. The latter defected to the Cyrenaics (D.L.VII.167). Even Chrysippus, while Cleanthes was scholarch, "withdrew from his school and attained exceptional eminence as a philosopher". (D.L.VII.179) Demetrius (in D.L.VII.185) further informs us
that he held class in the open air in the Lyceum and later as scholarch that "he had his school in the Odeion". (29) After Chrysippus we hear nothing of educational activities taking place in the Stoa which may have progressively been abandoned in favour of other public sites like the Stoa of Atallus II. Clearly the Stoa Poikile in itself was inadequate for sustained and extensive educational activities, and when two new gymasia, — the Ptolemaion and the Diogeneion, were built in the heart of the city and close by the Stoa, (30) the Stoics no doubt found their facilities far more congenial and useful with their walks, exedrae and other rooms, including the large lecture room in the Diogeneion for ephebes, titled: the Ephebeion, where as part of their training the ephebes heard the lectures of philosophers. The 122/1 b.c. inscription (31) names Zenodotus (probably the Stoic of D.L.VII.30) as lecturing to the ephebes in the Ptolemaion and Lyceum. There was certainly no obligation or necessity for any of them to hold their classes at the Stoa when other public places became more suitable. Like their predecessors the Cynics, the Stoic philosophers adapted themselves and their philosophy to external circumstances. Thus their high profile and that of their philosophy was well suited to the public settings they chose as their classroom.

These were the main physical settings that constituted the parameters for the makeup of the philosophic classroom of the schools of philosophy in the centuries b.c.. One should not, however, draw too sharp a distinction between private and public settings when considering the structure
of the classroom. It was not so much a case of conforming
to a pre-existing and set model in the form of, say, a
classroom X metres long by Y metres wide, with tables and
chairs arranged in rows, and the teacher up front adhering
to the same routine of teaching every day. No such model
existed, and like everything else, this too had to be
created. As we have seen above, philosophers were not
constrained by any single type of physical setting for
their teaching. Rather it was more of a case of
philosophers imposing what was an emerging classroom
structure out of their own theorising of what a classroom
should look like and how it ought to be arranged with a
view to the teaching of philosophy on a building like the
gymnasium that was itself originally designed for physical
and not intellectual culture.

Except for the exedra of the gymnasium which through
its size could hold a greater number of people for
lectures, and the greater privacy afforded by the settings
of one's own school, it could not be said that the private
and public settings produced two different types of
classrooms. Whether Plato or Theophrastus held a class in
the peripatos of the gymnasium, or the peripatos of the
school, the classroom setup was pretty much the same. The
difference was thus not so much between public and private
settings in determining classroom makeup, but between
different types of classrooms, whether the setting was
public or private.

The pattern, then, that did emerge as the result of
the schools' systematisation of theory and practice and its
teaching was: (i) the formal lecture class on the one hand and (ii) the informal "seminar-tutorial-symposium" class on the other.

This trend continued after the institutional crisis of the schools in the first century b.c. and in the early Roman empire. (32) In the centuries a.d. the tendency of philosophic teaching within private as opposed to public settings became more uniform, excepting the Cynics whose philosophy and lifestyle was predicated upon keeping a constant public profile. Musonius Rufus, influenced by the Cynic bios, taught in public. Ammonius, the teacher of Plutarch, lectured to the ephebes in the Academy gymnasium at Athens. (33) Rufus' pupil, Epictetus, preferred a private setting for his school, as did Plutarch for his school and association of friends. The former was in Nicopolis, the latter in Chaeronea. The same was the case with the Middle Platonic teachers of Rome, of Alexandria and the cities of Asia Minor in particular. In his account of Taurus' school, Aulus Gellius also provides a picture of the general state of the teaching of philosophy of the day. Taurus' school is a one man show. He is a private teacher holding school in his own house. (34) This is where he taught on a regular basis, (A.C. A.N.I.26.1-3) including the holding of annual symposia. (35) Taurus' school is symptomatic of a general trend. It was the Sophists that monopolised the public buildings and taught within them, while philosophers, as kathgetoi (private teachers), retreated into private life as well as into private teaching. Philostratus and Eunapius' contrasting lives of
the sophists and philosophers more than illustrate this. Philostratus' sophists Polemo, Scopelian, Herodes Atticus, Aristedes, etc. flourished in the light of public teaching and political life. They were courted and showered with imperial, municipal and city patronage, favours, gifts and privileges. (36)

Polemo was so arrogant that he conversed with cities as his inferiors, emperors as not his superiors, and the gods as his equals. (Phil.V.S.535)

So full of self-confidence was Adrian when he ascended the chair of rhetoric at Athens, that in the proem of his address to Athens... he began by announcing: "Once again letters have come from Phoenicia". (Phil.V.S.587)

The activities and teachings of Philostratus' (V.S.490.ff) and Eunapius' (V.P&S.483.ff) sophists were very much public, especially the professional rivalry and infighting during the fourth century, coupled with the Christian reaction to Julian the Apostate's attempted pagan revival which for a time forced them to teach in the safety of their own private houses and lecture theatres. (Eunap.V.P&S.483seq.) Thus by the time of Libanius even the Sophists began to moderate their high public exposure. They could still declaim in public and dazzle the audience by a new variation on an old theme, but it was not uncommon by the later fourth century a.d. for sophists to restrict their teaching to a more private environment. Libanius echoed the sentiment of the times: a state of high anxiety
and worry over personal and professional safety in the face of a corrupt bureaucracy, professional rivalry, the growing antagonism between the Christian state and paganism, and fear of the barbarian hordes pressing on the frontiers. Like Julian and Prohaeresius in Athens, Libanius did not always teach in public and found the privacy of his own house and lecture theatre preferable. (37) Eunapius' philosophers are not to be found teaching in public buildings. The philosophic preoccupation with mystery cults and religions, with magic and mysticism, accompanied the re-assertion of the element of secrecy in teaching as initiation. This type of teaching was therefore not suited to a public setting. Ammonius, the teacher of Plotinus, Origen, Erennius, and others, taught in the privacy of his house. (38) Plotinus himself took up residence in the house of a patroness and held school there. (Porh.V.Plot.9) The life of Sosipatra is a good example of the link between philosophy, mysticism, theurgy and its teaching in private settings in the form of secret and privileged initiation of a few into the sacred mysteries. Sosipatra herself is the epitome of the philosopher-theurgist. She held a chair of philosophy, but taught and practiced theurgy privately in her own house. (39) This was the culture that Julian the Apostate attempted to restore; a pagan culture which was the intellectual culture of Neoplatonic mysticism and theurgy of and for the initiated few. (40)

The later Neoplatonic philosophers completed the withdrawal into private life and were rarely to be seen in the public eye. Hypatia taught in private as did the
Alexandrian and Athenian teachers. Proclus resided with his rhetor Leonas as part of his household. (Mar.V.Proc.9) In Athens he was taken into the house and personal care of his successive teachers, Plutarchus and Syrianus. (Mar.V.Proc.13) This house of Plutarchus, which was not inconsiderable, provided the physical setting for the private teaching of the Athenian school of Neoplatonism for its successors, its community of scholars and intimate disciples for the remainder of the school's history. (41)

What characterises setting and classroom makeup in the centuries a.d. was this progressive move away from public and a withdrawal into private teaching. Most were a one person private venture schools. With the sophists in complete control of public intellectual culture and of its corresponding settings, and with the philosophers' growing preoccupation with and surrender to mystery cults and religions, the practice of philosophic teaching within a private setting became increasingly predominant, even where the teaching of the secular philosophic tradition by salaried professors was concerned. In the late Roman empire Christianity was on the offensive and pagan philosophy, whether secular or religious, was on the retreat.

Given these architectural settings, the physical makeup of the classroom and the form it took was itself to a large extent determined by the particular arrangement of the actual settings which lent themselves to a number of possibilities. The differences between public and private settings varied according to differences in physical space but also according to the specific and differing
arrangements of that space and the various uses to which it was put.

The nature of the classroom that emerged was itself a result of the interplay between settings on the one hand, and the various uses for which they were employed by philosophers for their pedagogy, on the other. The formal lecture, informal "seminar", "tutorial", or "walk-talk" where reading, writing, discussion, debate and conversation took place, including the intellectual conviviality of the symposium, did so out of the fusion of public and private settings of the gymnasium, agora, house and garden and their theorisation towards the structuring of the philosophic classroom and teaching within it. For it should be kept in mind that at the same time that the schools were working out their philosophies, they were necessarily working out how and under what arrangements and conditions to teach them. Thus theorising the classroom was an important aspect of their general theory and practice of education.

It was within the above discussed arrangements and classroom settings that the educational enterprise took place: the teaching of philosophy, its method and content.
3.2. The Schools and the Teaching of Philosophy: Method and Content.

3.2.1. The Academy.

(a). Teaching in the Early Academy.

Controversy still surrounds the problem of Plato's teaching, and that of the early Academy's teaching methods and content. Although scholars have now discarded the once-held view that the dialogues represent an accurate picture of the methods, organisation, and curriculum of the Academy, especially the educational programmes of the Republic and Laws, (1) there is still far from universal agreement regarding Plato's and the Academics' early teaching practices: their methods and curriculum. (2)

How and what did Plato and his associates teach? The Academy was not a closed institution. Nor was it a secret society teaching a sectarian esoteric doctrine whose gates were shut to the public. Association and school membership was voluntary and belief in the philosophy of Plato, a matter of personal choice and conviction. There was no "School Orthodoxy" of Platonic doctrine as such and no one was required to conform to any particular view as a prerequisite for joining the school. The early history of the Academy is characterised by a diversity of views, activities, and interests of its various members that contradict a closed shop view of the school. Thus the picture that Gaiser draws of the Academy, that of an exclusive secret society, cannot be sustained. (3)
Philosophers in the school like Phillipus, Eudoxus (also a physician), Heracleides, were intellectually independent of Plato, and graduates like Speusippus, Xenocrates, Aristotle, and others were far from obedient and blind followers of his views. (4) In these persons and others like Theatetus, Leodamas, Menaechmus, Helicon, Dion, Phormion, Aristonymus, Menedemus and others, the school had its all-rounders and specialists alike: mathematicians, geometers, astronomers, natural scientists, logicians; philosophers interested in physics, rhetoric (Aristotle), etc. There were metaphysicians, would be statesmen, philosopher-kings and politicians. But the Academy was not simply a school of geometry (5) nor an institute for political graduates. (6) These interests were two (though important aspects) of its wider range of activities in which its members engaged. Plato's philosophy, the theory of Forms in particular, was not the official position of the school nor was it readily accepted by Academics. (7) What the philosophy did do, however, was to set the agenda and provide a forum for extended high level debate and discussion of such issues in the school over a long period of time. Other rival views were also presented and debated. Thus the debate between Eudoxus and Speusippus and their respective supporters over the place of hedone in ethics was one such philosophical problem involving controversy and debate in the school in the 350s, as was the teaching of rhetoric by Aristotle. (8)

Plato read his dialogues in public. (9) He also read them in the school to the students and associates. (10)
Members like Aristotle, whose nickname was *The Reader* (Vita Marciana.7), later read and studied them on their own, with other students or with other teachers where the issues raised were subject to further discussion, debate and teaching by philosophers and students alike. Thus Aristotle's own dialogues which he wrote in the Academy reflect these practices, ongoing interests, and preoccupations of the Academics with a cluster of philosophical problems in ontology, mathematics, metaphysics, ethics, politics, that constituted the "curriculum" of the school. (11) But since this was not a "set curriculum" as such, the subjects that Academics studied and taught from within the above sets of fields were often a matter of individual personal interest and preference. Mathematics, geometry, astronomy, eristic, dialectic, rhetoric, politics, etc. appear more than once as subjects which Academics taught. And students were also free to attend and listen to any or all teachers in the school. As Lynch points out (p.57) the only exclusive element of the school, and of most later schools, was that if one could not support oneself financially, one could not afford the leisure time to attend. It was as simple as that. As schools started to charge fees, (12) less well to do students like Cleanthes of the Stoa (D.L.VII.168-70) had to work hard to finance their philosophical education. Furthermore, because teaching often took place in the public facilities of the gymnasium, it would have been rather difficult for them to teach in an exclusive manner, since any male citizen and occasional visitor could be
present. Thus when Plato held class in the lesche of the gymnasium, a visiting doctor from Sicily intruded on his activities. (Athen.59d-f) In the Stoa Poikile, a fishmonger, walking past, stops, listens for a while and then continues about his business. (13) Zeno was irritated by noisy crowds who often disrupted his teaching. (D.L.VII.14)

Regarding formal lectures, public or private, we have evidence of only one given by Plato. (14) Scholars, although they do not agree on the nature of the content of the lecture in relation to Plato's theory of the Good (the problem of the oral, unwritten doctrines), nevertheless view this public lecture as a unique event, never being repeated. (15) Given Plato's stress on the importance of dialectic in education (16) as intimate life long association (pole sunousia) (Laws.12.968c-e) between master and disciple, his reservations about non-dialectical methods of teaching such as formal lectures, (17) and of the efficacy of the written word (Phaedrus.275d-277a), it is thus not likely that he lectured formally even in the privacy of his school, preferring, no doubt, informal methods involving lengthy discussion and debate. (18) Beck (19) suggests that Plato may have lectured in the school, citing Diogenes Laertius (VI.24) where Diogenes the Cynic is said to have called "Euclides' scholen (school) cholen (bile) and ten de Platonos diatriben katatriben". In the Loeb edition, Hicks translates the above phrase: "Diogenes called Plato's lectures [a] waste of time". (20) But diatriben is in the singular and the phrase should either
read: Diogenes called "Plato's school a waste of time", or "Plato's teaching a waste of time". If diatriben is taken to mean Plato's school or his teaching in general and not his lectures in particular, as I think it should, we then cannot infer from this passage that Plato gave formal "lectures". (21)

In view of what little we can gather from the evidence, it seems that Plato's activities and teaching methods were mostly informal. The Academicorum Index represents him as one who "acted as an architect and set problems". (22) We see him in this capacity in the lesche of the gymnasion with Speusippus, Menedemus and a group of students, engaged in biological and botanical inquiries, "making definitions about nature, and separating into categories the ways of beasts, the nature of trees, the kinds of vegetables...". (23) Plato is represented as an observer and guide (Athen.59ff), encouraging his young students who are attempting to define and classify a gourd. The methods of definition, division (dihaeresis), and classification were extensively used in the Academy, especially by Speusippus and Xenocrates, (24) and later in the Lyceum and Stoa. It was part of the process of system building, of its formalisation and reproduction through teaching. Even though the account in Epikrates comes from comedy and is a caricature, it is not pure fabrication. In the privacy of his school and within an intimate circle of disciples and associates, the methods preferred were that of informal dialectical su nousia.

As to other Academics, given their intellectual
independence as philosophers, and as senior members of the school, there is no reason to think that they, like Plato, were also doubtful about the communicative ability of the formally spoken and written word. Aristotle’s course on rhetoric in the Academy meant the use and application of the methods of the rhetoricians in addition to any other methods he may have employed himself. By the time of Xenocrates, in addition to informal classes, it became normal practice for philosophers to give lectures, as Polemo discovered when he entered drunk during one of Xenocrates’ discourses. (25) Converted to philosophy, Polemo imitated the life and teaching of Xenocrates to a fault. (D.L.IV.19-20) He would discourse on themes set to him by his students, "walking up and down", peripatetic fashion. (D.L.IV.19)

The predilection of the early successors was for metaphysical, mathematical and, with Polemo and associates, for predominantly ethical teachings. Polemo was not interested in logic. (D.L.IV.18) The development of a school doctrine in ethics and its teaching under Xenocrates, Polemo, Crates, Crantor, associates and pupils was accompanied by the closest and most intimate teacher-pupil relationships where teaching was personal, private and erotic. (26) Thus Clarke’s claim that "Plato’s informal method of teaching did not survive" (27) because teachers started to give lectures is not true. The two were not exclusive, for both were used.
(b). Scepticism and Teaching in the Academy.

Arcesilaus, the sixth head, and the first teacher of thoroughgoing Scepticism in the Academy, used a variety of teaching methods. According to Diogenes Laertius (IV.28) he revived the Socratic method of Plato's dialogues, although he preferred to use the eristic form of dialectic made so powerful by the Megarian and Elian-Eretrian schools, (D.L.IV.28,33) and was styled: "Plato the head of him, Pyrrho the tail, midway Diodorus" (D.L.IV.33; S.E.P.H.I.234), a parody of the chimaera. Arcesilaus was a formidable dialectician; a master of argument and in total control in discussion or debate. (D.L.IV.37)

Arcesilaus made it a rule that those who wished to hear him should not ask him questions but should state their own opinions; and when they had done so he argued against them. (28)

Refutation of rival dogmatic philosophies became his and the school's main preoccupation. Polemic was the instrument and epistemology the battleground. Thus the study and teaching of logic, dialectic, and the rhetorical devices of argument were at the centre of the schools' activities for the remainder of its institutional history. Arcesilaus made good use of the device of arguing for and against a thesis — (29) the equipollence (isosthenia) argument with a view to suspension of judgement (epoche). Although the method was itself not new, the fact that Academic sceptics made an end (telos) out of it was, for it became the goal of philosophy, not simply its means.

The Stoa, finding itself the main target of the
Sceptical attack, responded by a similar emphasis on logic and physics for its justification of ethics and theory of the wise man and the good life. But according to scepticism, if virtue is knowledge, and knowledge can't be had, then a virtuous life is not possible. This had tremendous consequences for pedagogy in that sceptics rejected the tenet that virtue, which is knowledge, can be taught.

Scepticism as refutation had the whole range of philosophy to deal with and insofar as Academic sceptics spent most of their time attacking others, the study of rival philosophies formed a large part of their curriculum. Arcesilaus, Lacydes, Hegesinus, Evander, and others were intimately acquainted with the philosophical tradition: with the Peripatos, Epicureanism and the philosophy of the Stoa in particular. Carneades spent most of his time in this activity and was especially versed in the doctrines of the Stoa. (30) In the tradition of the school, Carneades was a first rate dialectician, the best the school ever produced, and an extremely popular teacher. (31) Indeed he was so good at arguing pro and con a thesis that not even his closest disciples knew what he really thought or believed at any given time and after his death could not agree on what his real views were. (32) These same followers, however, later each claimed faithful knowledge of his views, although by the first century B.C. the methods of expounding them became more and more rigid and formal, keeping pace with the school's shift towards dogmatism.
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But whereas the pupils of Arcessilus did their best to defend their own position, with the rest of the philosophers the student who has put a question is then silent; and indeed this is nowadays the custom even in the Academy. The would-be learner says for example, 'The chief good in my opinion is pleasure', and the contrary is then maintained in a formal discourse. (Cic.Fin.V.2.3-4)

In the De Finibus (II.1.1) and his Tusculan Disputations, for example, Cicero attempts to set the scene for a genuine Socratic discussion of question and answer in contrast to the formal lecture of a professional philosopher or sophist; but he cannot sustain the method and it is not long before he reverts to the procedure of the formal and lengthy monologue delivered against a proposition made by an interlocutor at the beginning who is then silent. (33)

It seems that as far as formal discourse (public or private, short or lengthy) in teaching was concerned, centuries of use had defined its parameters as a pedagogical method. The formal speech of the sophist or philosopher on any given topic became a great success and a literary topos. There was nothing that could not be proposed or debated. It was the dominant trend in formal educational practice, where in the schools it was a pedagogical device used in the classroom for teaching doctrine as well as technique, and in public, for propaganda and legitimation of that doctrine.

By the time of Philo of Larissa and Antiochus of Ascalon, the debate in the Academy turned upon itself as
Antiochus, Aenesidmus, and others defected. The Academy was moving back into the fold of dogmatism and its well-tried, but by now formulaic, arguments against dogmatism were themselves acquiring an element of dogma; and this was fateful to their whole enterprise leading, ultimately, to self-refutation.

On the issue of esoteric teaching of dogmatic Platonic doctrine under Academic scepticism, scholars have refuted this notion which now no longer holds sway. (34) Although Academic sceptics continued to study the works and views of their Academic predecessors, (35) no doubt they did so as part of their programme of studying the works and views of other school philosophers. It does not mean that they were closet Platonists (therefore dogmatists) who taught Scepticism in public and Platonism in private. They were thoroughgoing sceptics who advanced *epoche* (suspension of judgement) as the philosophic *telos* of the good life. This was "the doctrine" they taught in their school. The sceptics of the "fourth" Academy in particular re-theorised Plato and earlier Academic doctrine into a continuous tradition by stressing the Socratic, aporetic element in the Platonic dialogues (36) and in rejecting the multi-Academy thesis foisted on them by rivals. (see ch.1.2.a).

As an instrument of refutation of positive dogma, its techniques, although numerous and sophisticated, became set and formulaic, and could not in themselves yield positive doctrine or act as a basis for educational practice. Restricting themselves to deflecting attacks and in turn attacking rivals, Sceptics attempted to avoid the
epistemological problem of *epoche* and its consequences for teaching which engendered the paradox of scepticism: namely, that a thoroughgoing negative epistemology makes practice impossible. (37) This was *apraxia*. In their attempts to solve the problem of practice, Sceptics paradoxically conferred on their position an epistemological status and thus became subject to their own refutation. (38) In the Academy's last institutional representatives, Philo, Aenesidemus and Antiochus, the resolution of the paradox led to the dissolution of Academic scepticism as a thoroughgoing negative epistemology and the reassertion of the possibility of knowledge. Philo, by reinterpretation, attempted to salvage Academic scepticism, Aenesidemus, by his defection to Pyrrhonism, to reformulate it, and Antiochus, by refutation, to abandon it. Scepticism as a method was retained, refined and reformulated, (39) but a return to the positive interpretation of Plato and the study of the Platonic tradition dominated subsequent teaching in the schools of philosophy.

In summary, then, the teaching of the Academy under Plato, associates and pupils reflected, at first, the beginnings of the rise of an institution and was therefore necessarily indeterminate and amorphous, and being at this early stage of developing philosophy, it had not yet crystalised into any definite pattern. It was in fact in the very process of intellectual development and formation of that pattern over generations and centuries in the theorising and teaching of philosophy. That is why, even
now, there is still a great deal of confusion in scholarship regarding pedagogy in the early Academy.

Arcesilaus inaugurated the tradition of the teaching of thoroughgoing negative scepticism in the Academy. Scepticism was as much a method of doing and teaching philosophy (perhaps more so) as it it was the official position of the school. It became the primary part of the school's curriculum, although this by no means restricted the range, issues, disciplines and philosophies which Academics studied and criticised. Sceptics certainly did not abandon their past. In fact they made it their business not only to study their own school tradition, thus ensuring its continuity, but that of rival philosophies as well; the latter with a view to refuting and, thus, terminating their continuity.

Like Socrates, for over two hundred years the Sceptics were the gadfly of philosophy, keeping the tradition of debate, argument and inquiry alive when the tendency was towards the construction of absolute dogma and certitude based on an unrelenting logic of reason leaving little room for doubt. Scepticism kept philosophy honest. It was its dynamic. And this was its greatest legacy: a tradition of criticism which continued past the institutional collapse of the Athenian schools and into the centuries a.d..

3.2.2. The Lyceum.

Like the Academy, the Lyceum under Aristotle and his successors was an open and voluntary association (koinonia)
of philosophers and students engaged in study, teaching and research. Also, like Plato's dialogues, Aristotle's educational programme of the *Ethics* and *Politics* is poor evidence for the actual pedagogical practices of the Peripatos itself. As a student and scholar in the Academy Aristotle took part in most of its activities of debating, teaching, writing and publishing. Later, in Assos, Mytilene, and in Macedonia, he applied and extended what he had learned in the Academy. The *Academicorum Index* (1) describes his association at Assos as a place where "they spent their time studying philosophy, coming together at a peripatos". According to Plutarch (*Alex.*7.3) he tutored Alexander at a *peripatos* (a wooded park walk) with its little stone seats and trees for shade. He had thus ample precedent when he selected the Peripatos of the Lyceum as a site for his teaching where "he would walk up and down discussing philosophy with his pupils". (D.L.V.2) When his following grew large he started to give formal lectures. (2) This was the chief method of teaching large groups of students. Aristoxenus, in his report of Aristotle's account of Plato's public lecture on *The Good*, provides an important picture of Aristotle's and the Lyceum's method of teaching via the lecture.

It is surely better to begin by stating the nature of the inquiry, and what it involves, so that with this foreknowledge we may proceed more easily on our chosen way, and recognise what stage we have reached and not unwittingly deceive ourselves about the matter... Hence Aristotle himself, for these very reasons, as he
said, used to give his prospective audience a summary of what he intended to say, and in what manner. (3) This is exactly the method that we find in his extant works. (4) These were lectures delivered in class and written up as treatises; or some of them may have initially been treatises that were read in class as lectures, and later deposited in the school library to be consulted and as well as redelivered in class by other Peripatetic teachers. Aristotle did not share Plato's reservations about the communicative ability of non-dialectical methods such as formal lectures, the written word, empirical investigations, etc. He in fact criticised the Academy's dialectical method of polemousia in favour of an alternative empirical method.

Lack of experience diminishes our power of taking a comprehensive view of the admitted facts. Hence those who dwell in intimate association with nature and its phenomena grow more and more able to formulate, as the foundation of their theories, principles such as to admit a wide and coherent development: while those whom devotion to abstract discussions has rendered unobservant of the facts are too ready to dogmatise on the basis of a few observations. The rival treatments of the subject now before us will serve to illustrate how great is the difference between a 'scientific' and a 'dialectical' method of inquiry. (5) The empirical method was particularly suited to the investigation of the natural world where a collaborative effort was required, (Met.993b 1-7) for as already noted
above, (ch.2.3 Lyceum) the wide range of activities in which the Peripatetics engaged in the natural sciences, historical, political, literary, philosophical and other studies necessitated the use of the various methods of collection of data, arrangement, classification, division and the presentation and exposition of this for storing and teaching purposes in the form of lectures, discussions, treatises, and a library for future reference. These and similar statements of methodology, organisation and procedure (6) illustrate the way in which the school operated, its methods and curriculum.

In his teaching, Aristotle abandoned the lofty style of his literary works and adopted a clear and unassuming prose style. (6) In the list of his works and that of Theophrastus for example we get a good indication of teaching methods and practices. Thus the numerous introductions (eisagoge), summaries (epitomes), handbooks, lecture notes, and the specifically Peripatetic creation: the sunagoge (the compendium) literature which consisted of the collection of information on any given topic. All these were a consequence of the varied and extensive work of the early Peripatets that needed to be organised, collected and made easily accessible for reference and teaching purposes. (8)

In the Academy and later in the Lyceum, Aristotle, according to the ancient tradition, (9) lectured both in the mornings and evenings. Aulus Gellius says that the morning lectures were specialist in nature and meant for advanced members of the school only while the evening talks
were for the general student body and the interested public.

Those were called 'exoteric' which gave training in rhetorical exercises, logical subtlety, and acquaintance with politics; those were called 'acroatic' in which a more profound and recondite philosophy was discussed, which related to the contemplation of nature or dialectical discussions.

(A.G. A.N.XX.V.7-12)

Although the initial exoteric - akroatic distinction was one of general exposition on the one hand, and specialised, extended and involved study and teaching on the other, later tradition transformed the distinction into exoteric = public doctrine, esoteric (akroatic) = secret doctrine. There are no strong reasons to accept this tradition which represented two dissimilar types of teachings taking place in the school, one of which (the latter) was hidden and inaccessible to the public. (10) Rather, what we have here is a loose distinction on the lines of our own university courses of general 'undergraduate' lectures on the one hand, and that of in depth 'tutorial-seminar' or 'honours-postgraduate' work on the other where the same subjects were studied but in much greater length and detail. (11) This was an important pedagogical development which became the standard practice in the schools: general lectures and informal, in depth discussions.

Thus Aristotle dealt with the popular subjects as well as with the problems and concerns of philosophy as he
formulated them. On these he delivered lectures, making use of pedagogical materials and devices such as drawings, charts, maps, illustrations, diagrams, etc. (11) He also held small group classes and discussions.

Theophrastus, who had a great number of students attending his public lectures, complained of the difficulty in arranging his teaching in small groups, not least of all because it required a sustained and continuous effort on the part of the teacher, (D.L.V.37) thus taking extra time from his other interests. Diogenes Laertius (V.37) describes him as a philologos (a lover of discussion), so there is no reason to think that he did not engage in this pedagogical activity with his associates and students. Like Aristotle, and like many first generation Peripatetics, he was also a philographos who wrote a great deal and on a variety of subjects. On these he lectured in the school, ranging over all the philosophic and other disciplines. (13) The school continued its interest in the study and teaching of rhetoric. Aristotle reacted against the Academy's particular emphasis on mathematics, ethics and politics, so that the latter did not dominate the curriculum of the Peripatos. The Lyceum also had strong interests in the physical sciences and in historical, literary, and other investigations. Grayeff argues that: (14)

Andronicus' edition of the Corpus Aristotelicum reflects the teaching, not only of Aristotle, but of the two or three generations of philosophers in the school.
After the initial and extensive work carried out in the early period, the school focused its subsequent energies on the systematisation and preservation of the school tradition; and this it did mainly through teaching. Thus it was no longer the physical, metaphysical and socio-political spheres that were the object of investigation. Instead the previously collected material along with their teaching practices itself became the object of their exegesis, commentary and further teaching. Thus Lyco, fourth scholarch was famous for being an excellent teacher of boys and a top athlete who enjoyed lavish symposia. (D.L.V.56, 67) His predecessor Strato being mainly interested in physics, - hence his nickname, "the physicist" - confined his teaching mostly to this subject. (D.L.V.58) Aristo of Ceos pursued the rhetorical side of the school's teaching tradition, being a master rhetor and stylist.

The Peripatetics of the later second and early first century B.C. were likewise represented as continuing the pedagogical and literary tradition of the school. (15) This was by now the primary activity of all the schools: to transmit a received body of doctrine of cultural capital to the next generation. Andronicus further deliniated the parameters of what was to become the model for the study and teaching of a school philosophy, especially as it was embodied in its original founder. As teaching centred more and more on a particular given and well-defined body of doctrine with the commentary on texts constituting the main teaching activity of philosophers, this model became
increasingly the ruling paradigm of educational philosophical practice. The professional teacher as exegetos took over. Thus, the works of Aristotle, Theophrastus, and a few other Peripatetics became the subject matter for the commentator, whether of Peripatetic or other persuasion. The Corpus Platonicum, the Neopythagorean pseudographia, the commentaries of the Middle Platonists; the philosophical school tradition in general, came under the all-covering aegis of the professional exegetos.

3.2.3. The Garden.

In the case of Epicurus and his school, the teaching methods, content and the general character of his philosophy were well worked out by the time he opened his school in Athens. Having been made unwelcome in the various public places by rivals as a young teacher, these and other early experiences influenced his philosophy and choice of an entirely domestic setting for his school and of the use of predominantly informal, personal and intimate methods of teaching. It led him to reject the current mode of public-political life (1) and the dominant socio-cultural life, (2) as well as the educational practices of the gymnasium, palaestra, and agora. He also rejected the educational methods of practitioners operating within the ambit of these settings. This included the Academy, Lyceum and later the Stoa in Athens along with their representatives abroad.
with their predilection for engaging in politics and public
teaching and the giving of lectures and talks to large
audiences, like demagogues in the assembly. He was even
less interested in the rhetorical culture of the day and
cared nothing for the theatrical speeches of the sophists.
(3) He is not known to have lectured formally as
Theophrastus, his contemporary rival, was wont to do. As
Seneca reports, Epicurus did not equate learning with
lecturing to large groups of students, (Sen. Ep. 7.3),
preferring, instead, informal methods and small groups.
(Sen. Ep. 38.1) Likewise, he rejected the dialectical method
of the Academy (D. L. X. 31) and its dialogue form, in favour
of a clear and dogmatic, therefore non-controversial (non-
dialectic), exposition of doctrine in a plain and
unaffected prose style whose other characteristics were
simplicity and brevity. (D. L. X. 13; Cic. Fin. I. 5. 14–5)

Thus, although his school was, like the other schools,
a private institution based on voluntary association
mediated by friendship, the absence of public teaching
activities made it appear closer to a secret Pythagorean
society. (4) This however was not the case. (5) The school
was not exclusive nor was there anything secret about its
doctrine. It is just that Epicurus chose a non-public way
of teaching his philosophy. It was a conscious decision on
his part and the aim behind it was to offer, through a
rival programme of education, an alternative and legitimate
philosophical culture of the good life for the individual
and community at large. Happiness was found in *hedone*, not
in truth for its own sake. *Hedone* was offered as the
alternative telos, and as far as Epicurus was concerned, this was best achieved by his method of teaching; by his philosophy and not by that of the dominant ruling class culture and its representative schools.

As the Peripatos had done with its use of treatises and compendia (sunagoge) for research and teaching purposes, Epicurus, too, developed a teaching aid based on pedagogical considerations. This was the Epitome: "a clear and concise statement" (D.L.X.84) in the form of a summary of Epicurean school doctrine.

For those who are unable to study carefully all my physical writings or to go into the longer treatises at all, I have myself prepared an epitome of the whole system, Herodotus, to preserve in the memory enough of the principal doctrines, to that end that on every occasion they may be able to aid themselves... I have prepared for you just such an epitome and manual of the doctrines as a whole. (6)

The epitome took the form of open letters, collections of sayings and maxims framed as axioms, (7) and graded treatises of varying length and scope from small manuals and texts to that of the big epitome. Then there were the normal school works such as Epicurus' 37 books on Physis (nature) along with the general range of works on current philosophical issues in logic, rhetoric, ethics and politics, whether as statements and defense of doctrine, or as polemical attack on rivals. Thus the epitome form of school literature was an essential part of the school's pedagogy, and one that was adopted by other teachers.
The principal sayings, along with the short epitomes were meant to be studied and committed to memory, (D.L.X.35) just as boys memorised their Homer, Hesiod and the poets in the elementary schools. This was the principal method of instruction used by the didaskalos and one the virtues of which were not lost on Epicurus. Thus the claim of Atticus that "every good Epicurean has got by heart the master's Kuriai Doxai" was not an idle one. (Cic.Fin.V.6.20) Making use of the clear, deductive style of Euclid's textbook in the stating of theorems, (8) the Epicurean maxims were canonised as the authoritative sayings of the master, Epicurus, who presented them in the form of axioms to be learnt as dogma by initiate and advanced students alike. (9) They were also an alternative form of self-teaching for those who could not attend the school. Their success in propagating Epicurean doctrine is well attested. (10) Seneca constantly quotes them in his letters (11) and calls them philosophic gems, (Ep.33.6) of universal character (12) and therefore common property.

Within the confines of the private settings of the school, a new student was first of all purged from the influences and beliefs in the efficacy (though not of actual knowledge of these things) of the encyclios paideia and any other mathemata of the dominant culture or rival schools, and only then did the initiation into Epicurean doctrine begin. This was by way of personal and informal association between teacher and pupil and between students and teachers in small group settings where education was recreation (schole). (D.L.X.138) As well as Stoics and
Academics, Seneca had Epicurus and his school especially in mind when he equated learning by intimate association with small groups, (13) endorsing Epicurus' advice that the wise man is an educational model to others, particularly to students. (Sen.Ep.11.7-9)

Personal converse, though, and daily intimacy with someone will be of more benefit to you than any discourse... It was not Epicurus' school but living under the same roof as Epicurus that turned Metrodorus, Hermarchus and Polyeanus into great men. (Sen.Ep.6.4)

This went hand in hand with Epicurus' rejection of formal and public discourse as not constituting good teaching, nor did he think it conducive to good learning. (Sen.Ep.38.1)

A cult of respect, reverence, and gratitude towards teachers was theorised and practised. As Seneca further says, the Epicurean school was not interested in constructing an ideal politeia (state), but an ideal sophos (wise man). (Ep.11.7) In the case of Epicurus and other senior members of the school, reverence extended to worship of Epicurus as the ideal wise man, a thing which was fostered in the school through its writings, by monthly gatherings and celebration of birthdays, (14) including the fashioning of images on rings, cups, etc, and by sculpture. (15)

In relation to students, Epicurean teachers operated in loco parentis and on the principle of philia: love and care for their students while undertaking their education. This was the active element in their pedagogy. The
Epicurean methods of teaching were the most successful of all the schools, acknowledged even by rivals, (D.L.IV.43) and loyalty to school doctrine became proverbial.

Since school orthodoxy was established within Epicurus' lifetime, the emphasis in teaching methods was primarily on straightforward teaching of school dogma. Therefore in the teaching process, a good deal of the method focused on correction. (16) Epicurus was himself an example of the self-taught philosopher, (Sen.Ep.54.3) while Metrodorus is noted by Seneca as the type of student who needs a teacher, while Hermarchus belongs to the third class; to those that need to be indoctrinated and impelled towards virtue. (Sen.Ep.52.4) The last procedure was a consequence of the re-programming of students in Epicurean orthodoxy which itself could not be doubted. Criticism, debate, and controversy were reserved for rivals and it is here that Epicureans excelled in displaying their combative intellectual talent/s. (17)

A good part of their curriculum was itself spent on the study and refutation of rivals. It is a mistake to think that the Epicureans were ignorant of their rivals' philosophies, or of the general philosophical and cultural tradition, as they were often portrayed. (18) The reason for this line of thinking lies in Epicurus' wholesale rejection of the dominant culture of the day and its representatives in the encycloiac, sophistical and philosophical paideia. Thus his advice to the young student Pythocles was "to set sail and steer away from all forms of such culture". (D.L.X.6) This meant the Academy, Lyceum and
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later the Stoa, whose philosophy he considered an extension of the ruling class culture. He was an astute and severe critic of the Academy in particular, rejecting Plato's theory of Forms, his study of dialectic and the school's predilection for the mathematical disciplines, astral theology, and its political intrigues at home and abroad. (19) He criticised the Lyceum's practice of public teaching, especially the teaching of rhetoric with which it courted the mob and its preoccupation with polymathia and encyclopaedic research activities. Epicurus was not interested in botanical, biological, or historical investigations as such, or on the variety and scale of such investigations as they were pursued in the Peripatos. Nor was he swayed by any of the popular subjects of the sophists, the vulgar diatribes of the Cynics or the logic-chopping exercises of the Megarians and Stoics. He further divorced ethics from politics and made the latter redundant as a means to the good life.

This does not mean that the Epicurean school was bereft of many of the above disciplines and its members ignorant of them. In fact, Epicurus and his followers specialised in the study of rival philosophies and they were well versed in them. When Epicurus rejected logic, he did not in his curriculum deny the study of logic as such. Rather he rejected the logic of his opponents as it was studied and taught by them. Thus he offered his own alternative form of logic, as well as the study of physics and ethics. The logic (kanonike), which was the epistemology of his philosophy, together with the study of
physics, was designed to lead to knowledge and understanding of the world, and this served as the means to the acquisition of the ethical (happy) life. (D.L.X.78) For Epicurus, *hedone* was, after all, the *telos* of philosophy and the teachings of the school appropriately centred around it. It involved mastery of school (Epicurean) doctrine and its application in practice. In relation to others, it involved both the proselytising aspect of converting people and of defending the philosophy against rivals. This task required a thorough knowledge of one's own philosophy and, in the case of its main rivals, knowledge of theirs.

Thus what was taught in the Garden was, primarily, the teaching of Epicurean doctrine. This was the main pedagogical activity of the school. Knowledge of and instruction in other doctrines was also a regular feature in the school. Through the generations, the school doctrine remained basically unaltered. It was in the area of technique and specific responses to old rivals on the one hand and new, external developments on the other that registered the occasional shift in attitude and practice. After meeting the challenge of the Megarian school, the Academy and the Lyceum, the school had to contend with the rapidly growing Stoic philosophy with its rival systems of logic, physics and ethics, as well as the powerful attack of Academic scepticism with its devastating polemic. The Epicureans saw the educational value in the use of established methods of defense and attack and were not averse to using them. When it was prudent, this meant the
use of Sceptic polemic against Stoic philosophy and in turn the use of Stoic replies to refute Scepticism as a way of further supplementing their defense arsenal. (20) Epicureans of the first century B.C., especially in Italy, made use of pamphlets, letters, poetry and rhetoric to promote and spread the Epicurean philosophy. (21) Its representatives in Athens and abroad continued the tradition of teaching the school philosophy well into the centuries A.D. in substantially the same form as it had been formulated by its founder, for, over five hundred years after him, we find it restated in the inscription set up by a devotee, one Diogenes of Oeonanda.

3.2.4. The Stoa.

As a student, Zeno made the rounds of the schools of philosophy and availed himself of the teachings of the Megarian school, the Academy, and Lyceum. His attachment to Crates the Cynic made him well acquainted with the public face of the teaching of philosophy in the gymnasias and buildings of the Agora, and he imitated Crates as he set up school in the Stoa Poikile. He also adopted the teaching methods of the Cynics (1) and Peripatetics with a view to a public audience. This meant making use of the rough and ready biting satire of the Cynics' diatribe; the sharp edge of Megarian eristic and dialectic; (2) the formal discourses of the Peripatetics and the moral protreptics (exhortations) of a Polemo in the Academy. (3) Having
positioned himself near a large crowd, or after drawing one, he would, like a Cynic, screen his auditors and choose his students carefully. This group of listeners formed his regular student body who attended his more intimate teachings. Thus, classes were probably held in private dwellings also. Zeno shared his house with his pupil Persaeus who later became his associate. (D.L.VII.13) Philosophical gatherings, symposia and other informal after dinner discussions long into the night with a small circle of friends and intimate disciples were a regular feature of such private teaching.

Unlike the Garden, however, the school in the first two generations was a heterogeneous association of philosophers and students, lacking doctrinal orthodoxy and internal organisation. As the school increased in numbers, aspiring students set up their own schools in Athens and abroad. Dionysius, Ariston, and Herillus set up not only separate schools but did so as rivals to the original mother school with each teaching a version of Stoicism. (D.L.VII.37) Aristo was nicknamed the Siren because he drew so many students to his school which at that time was in fact more successful than the Stoa under Cleanthes, Zeno's own successor, (D.L.VII.161) and a serious though passing rival to the other Athenian schools. These heterodox Stoics did not establish a succession or school tradition and thus their teaching did not survive. Restricting themselves to purely ethical concerns they do not appear to have been interested in system building and its justification, having discarded epistemology and physics. (4)
It was with Zeno's orthodox followers, namely Cleanthes, Sphaerus and Persaeus (5) that Stoicism continued; and with their successors in turn, such as Chrysippus, that the Stoic philosophy as a system came to stay. Following Zeno, the Stoics also attended the classrooms of the Megarian dialecticians and benefitted greatly from their methods. Chrysippus studied in the Academy under Arcesilaus and Lacydes, later making use of their methods of arguing pro and con a thesis. (D.L.VII.183-4) The Stoics were disputatious philosophers and Chrysippus was their best representative. (D.L.VII.180) As the list of his writings in Diogenes Laertius (VII.189-202) indicates, over 70% of his works deal with logical matters, and even the ethical issues are framed as logical problems to be solved by proofs, demonstrations, analysis, division, definition, etc. This logical emphasis in the Stoic teaching, coupled with an obsessive preoccupation with etymological studies and allegorical exegesis in physics, theology, politics, and literature took on dangerous proportions, especially in the unfortunate development of the least credible part of the Aristotelian syllogism: the hypothetical syllogism. Their obsession with division led to hair-splitting in logic and the minute compartmentalising of the philosophic enterprise. (6) Locked into a dialectical battle with Academic Scepticism, epistemology was made the centre of philosophy and the debate revolved around the problem of how to justify knowledge and the good life. Thus the methods of instruction were developed along the lines of
argument, polemic and school rivalry. The formalism in logic initiated by Zeno, and his enthusiasm for and invention of new terms, with the use of methods of definition, division and classification, were elaborated into a massive system by Chrysippus and subsequent followers. It became technically very sophisticated and complex rather than clear and simple like that of Epicurus.

The teaching of the Stoic system followed the order in which the divisions in philosophy were made. The basic division of philosophy into logic, physics and ethics, and their further division into a multitude of disciplines and sub-disciplines, was accepted, although individual philosophers varied the order of treatment according to preference, rather than according to the order of preference implied by the system itself.

No single part, some Stoics declare, is independent of any other part, but all blend together. Nor was it usual to teach them separately. Others, however, start their course with logic, go on to physics, and finish with ethics... [such as] Zeno... Chrysippus, Archedemus. Diogenes of Ptolemais... begins with ethics; but Apollodorus puts ethics second, while Panaetius and Posidonius begin with physics. Cleanthes makes not three but six [divisions]. But others say that these are divisions not of philosophic exposition, but of philosophy itself. (7)

How and what did the Stoics teach? They engaged in debates with rivals, and among themselves. They held classes and informal gatherings, including sympoia. They
also delivered formal lectures or discourses with students taking notes. Cleanthes, who was poor, is said to have written his notes of Zeno's talks on oyster-shells and on the blade-bones of oxen; (D.L.VII.174) hardly an efficient method of note taking. Cleanthes also lectured (akroaten) and had Antigonus, king of Macedon, for a listener. (D.L.VII.169) A title of "Two books of lectures" appears in his list of works, (D.L.VII.175) and in Sphaerus' works, there appear "A course of five lectures on Heraclitus", and a "Handbook of dialectic, two books". (D.L.VII.178) Among Ariston's works there is a collection of lectures (scholon, 6 books), dissertations (diatribon) on wisdom (7 books) and another on philosophy, including twenty-five volumes of notebooks. (hypomnemata). (D.L.VII.163) Persaeus lectured on ethics. (D.L.VII.28) Phanias, a pupil of Posidonius, published his notes as: "Lectures of Posidonius". (D.L.VII.42)

For the teaching of new students and to aid others studying on their own, epitomes, (Epicurean influence?) introductions and handbooks were used and became so widespread that in the centuries a.d. in particular they replaced the original treatises which perished as a result. This was the fate of all of Chrysippus' works. Ironically, he himself seems to have made substantial use of introductions and summaries. (8) Students and professionals alike resorted to them for information and they were the main source for people like Cicero, Seneca, Plutarch, Epictetus, and others who found them ready at hand and easy to deal with. Nor was this peculiar to the Stoa. As we
have already noted it was the dominant form of representing and teaching the Epicurean philosophy. This went hand in hand with the need to teach what was now an established body of doctrine which was dogmatic and therefore suited to the textbook form of representing it for simple didactic methods of lecturing or reading in class for exposition, commentary, interpretation, and memorisation. (9) It was the dominant form of educational practice in the schools in general, and not just in the Stoa.

The school's work in language and grammar culminated in Diogenes of Babylon's textbook, The Art of Grammar, which illustrates the pedagogic method of the grammarian at work in the schoolroom. In addition to the standard philosophical subjects, the school had also a long-standing interest in the teaching of rhetoric as well as the study of literature. Towards the end of the first century B.C. and in the Roman empire in particular, Stoic teaching concentrated primarily on theology and ethics. There was a partial but highly selective revival of Cynic elements in ethics coupled by a reaction against the logical part of the Stoic system, and Stoics like Seneca, Musonius Rufus, Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius paid little attention to the Stoic logic. There was no new doctrine as such, only the systematic teaching of some aspect/s of established orthodoxy. The stress was on the pedagogical methods themselves and this is why in Plutarch, Musonius, and Epictetus, for example, we get a very clear picture of teaching practices: of the settings, methods and curriculum.
3.2.5. Teaching and the Schoolrooms of the Philosophers in the Centuries A.D.

The teaching of philosophy in the centuries a.d., despite the institutional collapse of the Athenian schools, continued to function and reproduce the philosophical tradition. Dealing with an established body of philosophic cultural capital, the schools were the arena where this kind of mental culture was kept up through theoretical labour. The direction that schools took in the centuries a.d. was, increasingly, to steer away from both public settings and its teachings. Unlike the classic schools, they were predominantly a one person enterprise run in the comparative safety of a modest domestic setting. Pupils like Cicero jr. attached themselves to individual teachers, often residing with them. (1) Philosophy retreated into private life. In his letters Seneca noted the growing antagonism between public and private life and voiced his revulsion at the spectacle of the Roman arena, in a scathing attack on the sadistic Roman mentality that manifested itself at large public gatherings. (Sen. Ep. 7 passim) With regard to philosophy and its teaching he continually stressed the Socratic model of informal and personal association with a small number of students and in opposition to association with a large audience which involved formal lecturing.

Associating with people in large numbers is actually harmful. (Sen. Ep. 7.3)
Lectures prepared beforehand and delivered before a listening audience are more resounding but less intimate. Philosophy is good advice, and no one gives good advice at the top of his voice. (Sen. Ep. 38.1)

In his treatise On Listening to Lectures, Plutarch makes a distinction between the public lectures of the sophists which are theatre performances and the philosophers' lectures delivered in the classroom to a regular group of students as well as to other interested persons. His description of how philosophers discourse and how students behave is a goldmine of information regarding teaching practices in the philosopher's classroom of the first two centuries a.d.. He criticises the growing influence on philosophy of the sophistic style and method of lecturing which was theatrical, impersonal and wholly concerned with form and appearance. He notes the lecture room of the philosopher with its seats for students and a chair (thronos) for the teacher, who, armed with books, notes, etc. delivers his lecture. Plutarch complains that while the teacher is trying to talk, students fidget, misbehave, interject, quiz and question the teacher to distraction. (2) Aulus Gellius records similar complaints, as related by Calvenus Taurus, of teachers whose students were more trouble than they were worth to a philosopher who, unfortunately, depended on their fees for a livelihood. (3) In the classroom a teacher could invite students to suggest topics for discussion (4) as well as questions and comments during the actual talk itself, (5)
for some philosophers, like sophists, enjoyed speaking extempore on any topic and dealing with questions and criticisms. Musonius Rufus and Plutarch criticised this type of educational practice as mere show and of no real moral value. (6) In his teaching, Musonius usually discoursed on some standard philosophical topic or in response to questions posed by students, (7) placing the value of his teaching on the positive effect it had on his pupils' character, rather than on their verbal abilities in logic, etc. (8) He preferred the Socratic model of teaching by association, (9) but he did not restrict his teaching to conversation only. He also held class and gave lectures and talks on a variety of topics, including logic. (10) In his talks he used the methods of definition, induction and the syllogistic form of argument in his defense or criticism of some problemata or other topic. Ethical questions were, however, by far his main concern, and most of his discourses are on this subject.

Plutarch endorsed the method of the uninterrupted lecture which was followed by a general discussion. (11) This was the usual procedure in Taurus' and Epictetus' schools.

I [Aulus Gellius] once asked Taurus in his lecture-room whether a wise man got angry. For after his daily discourse he often gave everyone the opportunity of asking whatever questions he wished. On this occasion he first discussed the disease or passion of anger seriously and at length, setting forth what is to be found in the books of the ancients and in his own
commentaries... (A.G. A.N.I.XXVI.1-3)

At other times discussions were initiated at informal gatherings (12) or in the school with readings of philosophical works, for example, Plato's Symposium, or extracts from Aristotle's Problems, etc. (13)

In his school Epictetus continued the teaching of orthodox Stoic doctrine, though the emphasis had shifted to the ethical part of the system. We get a good picture of the teaching methods in his school from his discourses preserved by Arrian, a pupil. Epictetus, who does not call himself a philosopher, was primarily a teacher of Stoic ethical doctrine. He held regular class, delivered lectures which were talks, sermons (homiliais) and exhortations; (14) and engaged in discussions, readings, (15) oral and probably written assessments of students. (16) At informal gatherings he conversed with students, correcting and giving advice. (17) He imitated Socrates and the Cynics (Diogenes, Musonius Rufus) and endorsed them as examples of ideal teachers. (18) He was also a severe critic of sham public lecturers, more so if they were philosophers rather than sophists. (19) In his classroom, where the formal exposition of Stoic doctrine took place, we see him, as teacher, at work. The instruction of new students in Stoicism meant the interpretation of the doctrine of the school founders: of Zeno, Cleanthes and Chrysippus. (20) Extensive use was made of introductions and epitomies, by now the standard reference texts on school doctrine. Passages from original Stoic treatises were used in class for exercises in reading, writing and commentary. Students
read in class and were tested verbally. Advanced pupils were at times used as teaching assistants and put in charge of new students. In one instance Epictetus admonished a senior pupil for not being a better teacher to his charge who had done badly in class.

Once when he had disconcerted the student who was reading the hypothetical arguments, and the one who had set the other the passage to read laughed at him, Epictetus said to the latter, "You are really laughing at yourself. You did not give the young man a preliminary training, nor discover whether he was able to follow these arguments, but you treat him merely as a reader". (Epict.Disc.I.26.13)

Epictetus himself was an excellent teacher who was concerned with the moral as well as the intellectual developments of his pupils. (21) In fact his main concern was with moral conduct, and therefore ethical teaching directed towards the formation of character was at the centre of his curriculum. Like Musonius, he engaged in classroom refutations of rival philosophies, and also taught the Stoic logic and physics, (22) but only as a preliminary to the ethics, his primary interest. He did not care for the "end-in-itself" Stoic logic with all its subtleties and conundrums, and criticised students who were preoccupied with it. (23) He laid out his teaching programme in a three-fold division of philosophy which was itself basically a division of the main concerns of ethics designed to lead to the good life, the emphasis being on practice.
There are three fields of study in which the man who is going to be good and excellent must first have been trained. The first has to do with desires and aversions... the second with cases of choice and refusal, and, in general with duty,... the third with the avoidance of error... and, in general, about cases of assent. (Epict.Disc.III.2.1-2)

To this effect he would utilise the form of direct address to admonish, correct or advise his hearers in public and private; he would deliver a sermon or exhortation, and he would subject pupils to Socratic interrogation, introspection and self-analysis.

This pattern of teaching was now well established, and in the Middle Platonist and Neoplatonist philosophers we get a similar picture of individual philosophers busily engaged with their students in the interpretation of and commentary on the ancient tradition. The emphasis was on the contribution of theology and ethics to individual conduct, achieved through a long process of learning, purification, and contemplation leading to epistasis and unity with God. A thoroughly systematic exegesis of the Platonic and Aristotelian corpus was carried out, including the Pythagorean philosophy and mystery religions; providing the schools with the material for their intellectual efforts in teaching and writing. Plato's dialogues were subjected to minute scrutiny and interpretation. For, as philosophers and teachers, this is what they primarily were: interpreters and commentators, bar Plotinus. Ammonius Saccas, of whose teaching we know little, taught
in seclusion and restricted himself entirely to informal conversations with a select group of students whom he made swear not to reveal his doctrine. (24) Plotinus himself was a very reserved person, though his school and teaching were neither closed nor secret. "The meetings of the school... were open to anyone who wished to come", (25) and he had in his company of hearers a cross-section of society: from professionals such as doctors, scholars, poets, and senators, to regular students including women and minors. He established a reputation as the best philosopher of his time. This was Longinus' verdict, a contemporary of Plotinus and the best scholar and critic of the day. (26)

Keeping his word to Ammonius regarding his secret teachings, Plotinus, too, restricted himself to conversation and discussion in the first ten years of his school; "giving lectures and inviting questions from students". (Porphy.V.Plot.3.34-8) When he did start to write, it was "on the subjects that came up in the meetings of the school", (27) and during the six year period that Porphyry was with him he held regular school meetings and discussions. (Porphy.V.Plot.5.6-8) He appears to have preferred informal classroom discussions and was always willing to answer students' queries. On one occasion Porphyry kept him occupied with his questioning and the discussion lasted some three days. (28) Thus there were probably no regular or determined classes in any given day or evening, nor were there set times for them to start and finish. Porphyry calls the school meetings and discussions sunousiai; gatherings where learning took place in
intimate association mediated by friendly discourse. (29) he was so completely free from the staginess and windy rant of the professional speechifier [that] his lectures were like conversations (sunousiais)...

(Porph.V.Plot.18.4-6)

Regular symposia and the annual celebration of Plato's and Socrates' birthdates provided further occasions for conviviality. (30)

The conversion of Porphyry himself involved a lengthy process of debate, oral and written criticism, reply and counter-reply on both sides; finally resulting in Porphyry's written recantation of his former views. (31) The school itself was a community of philosophers and disciples. Plotinus was not the only teacher in it. Porphyry and Aemelius, amongst others, and visiting philosophers, also lectured in the school. There was also writing and publishing. Aemelius, for example, an expert on the writings of the Neopythagorean Numenius, was given the task of refuting charges that Plotinus had plagiarised him. He also took notes of school discussions amounting to some one hundred volumes. (32) Plotinus himself, as his treatises show, followed the long-established classroom practice of refuting rival positions on any given topic or problemata before presenting his own view. (33)

As there were no set times or themes for discussion, either could be initiated by both teacher or pupil. Plotinus was a professional teacher and in his school he dealt with the philosophical tradition of the past, the focus being on interpreting and commenting on that
tradition. The study of Plato's works was at the centre of the curriculum. To a lesser extent, the Aristotelian, Pythagorean, Stoic (34) and Epicurean (35) philosophies were also discussed, deriving mainly from secondary material such as summaries and handbooks. Then there was the study of the written tradition of commentary and interpretation of the earlier school philosophers and their doctrines. Thus the commentaries of the Middle Platonist, Aristotelian, Pythagorean and other exegetoi were read and in turn commented on in the school. (Porph.V.Plot.14.5-20) Porphyry himself wrote commentaries, refutations, and bioi that became authoritative texts and themselves subject to intensive exegesis. The school also responded to contemporary developments, i.e. professional rivals (Porph.V.Plot.10) and especially to mystery cults, Christianity and Gnostic sects. (36) Representatives of the latter were even present in his own school. "Plotinus hence often attacked their position in his lectures... [and writings]... and left it to us [his students] to assess what he passed over. (Porph.V.Plot.16.9-12) There were also correspondence and an exchange of views with other philosophers and scholars. (37)

Although versed in the various philosophic disciplines, he took only a slight interest in them. (38) His real concern was with theology and the contemplative life, and all his teaching was designed to lead to the intellectual and spiritual union with the One; a feat he achieved four times during Porphyry's association with him. For Plotinus there were no short cuts to this end; no easy
paths. The mystic union was an intellectual one achieved with the aid of reason through a life devoted to study, purification, and contemplation.

It was not long, however, before the easy paths and short cuts were either fabricated or resurrected in the form of appeals to the secrets of the mysteries and religious cults (old and new), and in the use of ceremony, ritual and magic: theourgia. Iamblichus and the Syrian Neoplatonists were much preoccupied with these activities and their teachings centred on them. (39) The element of secrecy became prevalent in settings, teaching methods and content, (40) where the emphasis was on shared knowledge between initiates; between teacher and a devoted circle of pupils and friends. Teachers like Aedesius and Sosipatra, even though they held salaried professional chairs of philosophy and expounded the school tradition, (41) nevertheless taught and practised the mysteries in private and in secret. (42) Antoninus, Sosipatra's son, was a priest of the cult of Serapis in Alexandria. While he readily conversed on matters of philosophy, literature, etc. he kept silent about the mysteries themselves which he rated as far more important. (Eunap.V.P&S.471-2)

Iamblichus had elaborated, by way of multiplication, Plotinus' three hypostases and the grades of reality in the great chain of being, opening, in the process, the floodgates to the fantasticalations that followed with Proclus and his school. (43) In Alexandria this tendency was resisted and teachers like Hypatia were not mesmerised by the Orphic verses and Chaldean Oracles. The practice of
expounding the school traditions of Plato, Aristotle and others was maintained, and 'teacher-commentator', rather than 'mystic-theurgist' are the descriptions applied to them. The mathematical, astronomical, medical and other disciplines were still represented in their teaching. (44) As a young student Proclus studied these disciplines in Alexandria. (Mar.V.Proc.10) In Athens Plutarchus read him his commentaries on Aristotle's *Soul* and Plato's *Phaedo* (Mar.V.Proc.13) and under Syrianus he read the works of Aristotle as a prelude to Plato and the lesser mysteries. (45) All this took place on the level of private and intimate association. It was *suneousia* between master and disciple on a personal level. By the time Proclus finished these studies he was well on the way to becoming a teacher and author in his own right as he interpreted, expounded, wrote commentaries and practiced theurgy. (46) A compulsive worker, he was a voracious reader, a voluminous writer and a busy teacher. Marinus himself studied the Orphic mysteries under Proclus and, with other regular disciples, heard his commentaries on and interpretations of Plato, Aristotle, Iamblichus and Syrianus. (Marin.V.Proc.28) In turn, Marinus and company continued the same teaching tradition. (47)

Proclus' ontology was the superimposition of his logic onto reality. Thus, committed to an elaborate logical realism, and locked in a firm belief in the isomorphism between what they said and the nature of reality, they constructed also a correspondingly detailed programme of teaching that system, with set methods and curriculum.
Philosophy itself became a subject in the school curriculum where the works of the philosophers were studied and where the principal activity was lecturing on texts. The *Anonymous Prolegomena to Platonic Philosophy* (48) is a good example of this kind of activity. It turned in upon itself as interpretation and commentary were produced about a certain interpretation or commentary of an interpretation or commentary, *ad infinitum*. Concern for the original text was lost on the battleground between rival interpretations (*scholia*). Caught in a spiral of their own making, and spinning out of control, the more they produced, the less they said. Great energy was devoted to, and a massive volume of ink and paper was spent on, word-by-word, line by line, page by page exegesis; but when all was said and done in response to the problem of knowing and achieving unity with God, Proclus could not do it, and Damascius declared that such knowledge was ineffable. At this stage of the *epistrophe*, the One was beyond discursive reasoning (*Plot. Enn. V.2*); beyond philosophy itself which, as a result, had to be dropped lest it too became an obstacle to further progress. The proper attitude to the *agnostos theos* (the unknown God) became one of silence. (49)
Conclusion to Chapter 3.

The teaching of the Greek schools of philosophy in the Hellenistic period is best represented by the Athenian schools: by the Academy, Lyceum, Garden and Stoa, and by their representatives in the centuries a.d.. The schools were an emerging educational institution of a new kind where association was voluntary, based on interest and mediated by friendship and intimacy, and where in both public and private settings and under specific classrooms arrangements, teaching and learning was systematic, ranging a variety of topics and disciplines in physics, logic, politics, ethics, metaphysics, etc. With succeeding generations, teachers and students engaged in the study and explication of their particular school philosophy; of the works of the original founder, senior philosophers and school successors as they worked out a school philosophy; its classroom structure, method and content, and then engaged in a systematic teaching of that philosophy through a detailed programme of pedagogy. This characterised their intellectual labour for the remainder of their institutional history.

Their representatives in the centuries a.d. elaborated, refined, and reformulated the received traditions of setting, method and doctrine; passing it, in turn, by means of teaching, onto the next generation. Focusing on a predetermined body of doctrine which was referred back to the early founders of the schools for authority, the teachers of the centuries a.d., much like
the Peripatetics, Stoics, Epicureans, Platonists, and, later, the Neoplatonists, settled into an identifiable pattern of educational activity: the systematic teaching of philosophical doctrine which usually took place in a private setting consisting of one teacher and a small gathering of students engaged in discussions, lectures, symposia, conversation, etc. This was the case with the formal and informal gatherings of Plutarch and his circle of students and friends; of Musonius' teachings and the teaching in the schools of Epictetus, Ammonius, Plotinus, Iamblichus, Hypatia and Proclus.