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Chapter 4. The Educative Eros: Teacher-Pupil Interaction and the Social Relations of Succession.

Introduction.

One of the most important aspects of the educative enterprise in the schools had to do with forms of teacher-pupil interaction. The social relations between teachers and pupils in general developed in the context of the exchange of the dominant cultural goods mediated by paideia - formal teaching in schools. The schools, were private institutions, and, like private individuals who were professional teachers, charged fees. This was their means of subsistence. In return they initiated their students into the general culture through instruction in philosophy. Most students, like Cicero, spent anything between several months to several years studying, and like Cicero, most then returned home where they took their place within the ruling class in one form of political office or another. Thus for most it was schooling for ruling. Some, like Polemo, were converted to philosophy altogether, and along with those other talented few of the less well-to-do classes, who through higher education saw a mechanism to social mobility, made a profession out of it and developed it as a lifestyle.

For the former, i.e. the bulk of the students, the acquisition of higher culture was part and parcel of the process of initiation into the dominant class culture and its perpetuation. For the latter, i.e. the professional educators, it involved the continuation of the school.
tradition. This was through teacher-pupil succession which was characterised by relations of intimacy. It must not be forgotten that in the Ancient world the spoken word was by far superior to the written word as a mode of communication and transmission of information. Plato reminds us of this (*Phaedrus*. 275c) including the point that *paideia* was not a matter of book learning but the personal instruction in *pole sounousia* (extended lengthy association) between students and teachers in an intimate and interpersonal setting. (*Plato. Ep.VII. 341c; Laws.XII. 986c-e*) This was taken for granted. A pupil studied under his teacher and in time became the custodian of the received doctrine. Thus, being initiated in school doctrine, he in turn added to, defended and passed the teaching on to another. This was the mode of succession (*diadoche*) of both teachers and school philosophy, for this was how the educational process of the transmission of knowledge (school doctrine) from master to pupil took place.

This chapter focuses on the specific form of teacher pupil relations of school succession which was one of intimacy. The *Educatve Eros*, was the theorisation of *Paideia* in the practice of *Paiderastia* among the leisured, propertied ruling class of the symposium, gymnasium and palaestra. It was appropriated by the schools of philosophy, the Academy in particular, as the ideal educative relationship. The Stoa took up the model as justification for its own educational practices of teacher-pupil relations. The theory of friendship (*philia*) as an educative principle based on male companionship put forward
by Aristotle in the Nichomachean Ethics, and endorsed by his successors, was the theorisation of the exclusively male composition and association of teachers and pupils in the Lyceum. In the Garden, the extension of philia across class, sex, free and unfree persons was the kind of friendship that bound the whole community, and was constitutive of the network of social relations, especially its educational activities. It was rigorously defended by Epicurus and his school. This was his alternative form of paideia and lifestyle.

Thus the concern of this chapter is with these practices of teacher-pupil interaction and their theorisation in the schools of philosophy. That is, it is concerned with the theory and practice of paiderastia as eros paideutikos, and in the conception of an educative dimension to philia when friends, teachers and pupils are engaged in the study and teaching of philosophy. This is what characterised the social relations of the community of scholars and their intimate circle of disciples. It was not likely to have been extended to all pupils in general (with the possible exception of the Garden), where relations were more like that of the formal lecture theatre than an intimate exchange of ideas in a private setting. The latter was reserved for those who would one day take over, and as professional philosophers and teachers disseminate it elsewhere, for it was training of the rank and file as well as training of diadochoi.

But paiderastia as a sexual activity in the schools of philosophy had to be legitimated, for the intimate
association with youths could not be justified simply on an erotic level. Thus it was seen as being educative and paiderastia: the love of boys was incorporated within paideia: the education of boys. This is the ideology of the educative eros which Plato constructed in the erotic cosmology of the Symposium and Phaedrus and a model which was taken up in the Academy and Stoa as the theoretical representation of the practice of paiderastia. In time the theory itself became an object of further theory; that is, it became in turn ideology concerned with thinking about an ideology. In the Lyceum, relations between both teachers, and teachers and pupils were understood in terms of philia as an expression of the intimate, though not necessarily sexual, relations existing between male friends as a justification for the activities in which they engaged - the study and teaching of philosophy. Epicurus was forced to widen the range of meaning of philia, which informed and structured the social relations between members of the school as legitimation for the inclusion of women (mostly hetairai), slaves (mostly owned by school members), and freed-persons into the community.

The practices of teacher-pupil interaction and their justifications became part of the elaborate systems of the schools of philosophy and their teachings, and in the centuries a.d., informed the philosophy and teaching of the Middle Platonists and Neoplatonist schools of the Roman empire. At the same time they provided the material for their educational practices in the form of intellectual labour, thus ensuring the process of continuity of the
school tradition.

By reference to Greek culture and an analysis of the social relations of teacher-pupil succession this chapter also offers an explanation of: (i) general teacher-pupil interaction as an instance of class domination in the transmission of the dominant general culture to the next generation of rulers who were the bulk of the students of higher education: (ii) the social relations of the educative eros as an instance of pedagogic domination in the schools of philosophy where the social relations of class and gender operating in society were reproduced in the schools, reflecting the dominant relations in Greek patriarchy and its division of power, knowledge and privilege.
4.1. The *Educative Eros* in Greek Culture and Philosophy.

The Greeks did not lack pedagogic sexual friendships which were an integral part of their general culture; a culture devoted to the love of the outdoors, physical beauty and sensuality; a culture of aesthetic morality and penetrating mind. However, the Greek idea that a genital relationship between two persons of the same sex (in this case male) should be considered the ideal form of education has by and large been either misrepresented or neglected altogether by modern historians of Greek education. (1)

I must now speak of pederasty for it affects education. (Xen. *Lac.*II.12.)

The relationship between education (*paideia*) and the love of boys (*paiderastia*) was an intimate one. (2) In fact *paiderastia* became an important part of the process of *paideia*. It was considered to *orthos paiderastein* (the right way to educate boys through love). Today it is hard for us to realise and understand that the Greek educational ideal of the teacher-pupil relationship was based on a love ideal of *eros paideutikos*. (3) This love ideal was the high level theory produced in the leisured class and in the schools of philosophy with a view to explaining actual sexual practices of same sex eroticism by an appeal to *paideia*. The principal setting of *paiderastia* was the gymnasium, palaestra, schoolroom and symposium. (4)

The ideal of teacher-pupil relationship was that of *erastes* (lover) and his *eromenos* (beloved). (5) It was the language of teacher-pupil intimacy and permeated the socio-
cultural fabric. It was also central to the Greek cult of
the naked, physical body; the ideal of the beautiful body
and sexual pleasure. It was a relationship based on the
cult of kalos eros where the group ideal was the kalos
pais. This ideal of the kalos kai agathos was the class
ideal (6) of the educative eros where the lover was the
educator of his boyfriend. Much like the terms hoi
gnorimoi, hoi kaloi, or hoi agathoi, the phrase
kalokagathoi (a fusion of the latter two) was a standard
referent to the ruling class: the good and the beautiful.
It is therefore a mistake to think of paiderastia as simply
the Greek practice of sexual inversion. Rather, a
particular aspect of the general practice of sexual
inversion, namely paiderastia, found ruling class
expression in the form of education and became part of that
institution as the educative eros. The paiderastic
relationship was deemed educative since the erastes was
considered to be the teacher of his eromenos. This was its
justification; a justification that was extended in the
schools to include both sexual and non-sexual forms of
friendships and intimacy between persons. Thus Aristotle
reacted against the Academy when he chose philia over eros
to describe the range of friendships and associations
obtaining in his Poitics, and his school in particular.
In the Epicurean school, philia was extended to humans in
general.

For I cannot remember a time when I was not in love.
(Socrates in Xen.Symp.8.2)
The educative eros of the Socratic circle and Plato's
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Academy was grounded in an underlying structure of functional sexuality which became explicit linguistically and in practice. It found expression in the *agon* (contest) for beautiful youths (eg. *Lysis*) and students, and competition was keen. (7)

Socrates, who by his physical appearance contradicted the Greek ideal *erastes* - a beautiful mind in a beautiful body - was nevertheless the representative model of the philosophic *erastes* and continued to figure thus in subsequent tradition (8) where falling in love with youths went hand in hand with association and interaction with youths. This was taken for granted, and is the normal relationship of persons in Plato's erotic dialogues and Xenophon's *Symposium*. Pausanius is the lover of Agathon, (9) Hippothales, amongst others, the would be lover of Lysis, Phaedrus of Euriximachus; Ctesippus of Cleinias in the *Euthedeimus*. Socrates fully accepted the pederastic relationships among his pupils as a normal state of affairs; in fact he was often giving advice to the would be lover (as in the *Lysis*) on how to go about it. His own relation to his students was itself basically erotic (10) and Diogenes Laertius cites Aristoxenus regarding the tradition of teacher-pupil intimacy in the case of Socrates and his own teacher Archelaus. (11) The wording in Diogenes Laertius clearly suggests an erotic relationship and Hicks' translation: "Aristoxenus asserts that Archelaus was very fond of him" (D.L.II.5.19) is not accurate. Rather the statement: "οὐ καί παιδίκα γενεσθαι ἰεσίν Aristoxenos", should read: "whose beloved, Aristoxenus says, he became".
Whatever the truth of the story, for it was more than likely an Aristoxenean invention, the fact that an erotic relationship was assumed as a matter of course, even in the case of the youthful Socrates, is indication enough of the perception of the teacher-pupil relation in terms of erotic intimacy. This was taken for granted, and where there may have been no such relation (as in the case of Archelaus and Socrates), one was simply invented; so strong was the prevailing tradition of representing teacher-pupil relations in terms of sexual intimacy.

Nevertheless, one must not get the impression that Greek attitudes to paiderastia and its mental representation in the form of the educative eros were uniform. This is not so. Attitudes regarding sexual practices and their legitimation ranged the social spectrum. (12) In the case of the educative eros, conflicting and competing attitudes were part and parcel of the dialectical nature of the social relations of the practice of paiderastia. The internal antagonisms and contradictions to be found in the social relations of the practice represent conflicting interests and it was the interests of the dominant propertied classes which prevailed. (13)

4.2. The Educative Eros in the Academy.

There is only one genuine love, the love of boys... you will see it in the schools of philosophy. (Plut.Erot.451a).
Academic: I am a lover of boys (paiderastes) and wise in matters of love.

Buyer: How am I to buy you, then? What I wanted was a tutor for my son, who is handsome.

Academic: But who would be more valuable than I to associate with a handsome lad?

(Lucian. Philosophies for Sale.15-19).

Wise men say that heaven and earth, Gods and men, are held together by communion and friendship.

(Plato. Gorgias. 507e-508a).

The classical model of the educative eros was taken up in the Academy and confirmed in the form of paiderastic adoptions and erotic successions. * Plato, who in his Symposium, Phaedrus, and other dialogues, provided a sophisticated philosophical legitimation of it, was himself a confirmed paiderastes, and single passage of the Laws (636e), which by the way scholars love to quote, (1) can refute the erotic dialogues and evidence stacked against it. In fact, there are strong reasons to believe that Plato, who from childhood to death, always in the society of men and their culture of paiderastia, had very limited experiences of women, (2) and that his paiderastic leanings were abnormally intense. (3) This I think explains his misogynist attitudes. (4) He never married and it is unlikely that, given his sexual preferences, he ever formed a long term emotional attachment with any woman. (5) He was a passionate paiderastes all of his life who greatly loved his brothers and uncles. Among his disciples whom he loved were Aster, who studied geometry with him; (6) Alexis and
Phaedrus (7) and his life long passion, his disciple, Dion of Syracuse. (8) The language of the epigrams, the report of our sources and later tradition are clear enough and even Marrou, (9) whose Christian sensibilities are offended, does not deny the erotic dimension of the relationships, claiming that they were far from "Platonic" in the strict sense of: "purely mental".

Plato's successor in the Academy was his nephew Speusippus and good friend of Dion of Syracuse. (10) The ancient tradition represents him in an unfavourable light as the usual range of charges are levelled against him, (11) most of which are false, including the charge that he was a pleasure lover when we know that his philosophy was one of anti-hedonism. (12) Even his retort to a *paiderastes* (13) to stop chasing a youth (who was not even handsome), and that for ten talents he would find him a bride, echoes the charge of *philonumisma*; of demanding fees for his teaching and advice.

The erotic succession, initiated by Plato, properly continued with Xenocrates, third scholarch and from his early youth a devoted pupil and later constant companion (hetairos) of Plato. (14) As scholarch he seems to have confined much of his activity to the school, teaching and spending much of his time in the company of his students. (D.L.IV.6) According to Diogenes Laertius, his aversion to women was such that even the celebrated courtesan Phryne (15) failed to seduce him. Saying no to Phryne was like saying no to Aphrodite, and this was no mean feat; not unless one was exclusively a *paiderastes*. As in the case of
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Plato, this is highly probable of Xenocrates too for he also spent most of his time in the company of males, first as Plato's student and companion, and then as resident teacher of the Academy and lastly as its head. He certainly did not marry and his converting of Polemo from a life of dissipation and pleasure to philosophy (16) led to a relation of intimacy; for Xenocrates had fallen in love with him. (17) Polemo in turn took him as his role model of living (D.L.IV.17-19) and succeeded him in the school. Although married, Polemo took up residence in the Academy with his students living nearby in little huts. (D.L.IV.19) He also formed an intimate association with his successor, Crates, "a pupil and at the same time his beloved". (D.L.IV.21, 22) Inseparable in life, they were buried in the same tomb. (18) The two, along with Crantor, Polemo's other student who was also deeply influenced by him, (D.L.IV.17,24) and Crantor's own student-beloved, Arcesilaus, lived together in intimacy and friendship in their study and teaching of philosophy. (D.L.IV.22,30) Arcesilaus himself was converted by Crantor in a classic case of pederastic conversion, due mainly to erotic attraction. (D.L.IV.24,29) Having fallen in love with him, Crantor lured him away from Theophrastus of the Lyceum and the two lived together. (D.L.IV.30) Crantor, having died, however, before both Polemo and Crates, Arcesilaus succeeded Crates in the school. He, too, followed tradition by forming pederastic relationships, being a philomeraikos (lover of young men). Diogenes Laertius names a Demetrius and a Cleochares as his eromenoi. (D.L.IV.41) In the
tradition of Socrates "he was accused by Ariston of Chios, the Stoic, and his followers, who called him a corrupter of youth and a shameless teacher of immorality"; (D.L.IV.40) a charge that was to become "mandatory" between rival teachers and schools. (19) Diogenes also preserves encounters between teachers and youthful students where the subject of the educative eros becomes a standard *topos* eliciting a witty retort from the philosopher. (20) Arcesilaus was not however an exclusive *paiderastes* and formed liaisons with the opposite sex; namely, *hetairai*. (D.L.IV.40) Nor did he marry or have children. (D.L.IV.43) He provides further evidence of the educative eros in the Academy in his epigram on "Menodorus, the *eromenos* of Eugamus, one of his fellow-students". (21) Nothing further is known of these Academics, or how influential the practice became outside the close knit community of scholars and disciples in the general student body.

Another member of the Academy, for a short time at any rate, was Bion of Borysthenes, Cynic, itinerant sophist, atheist, and bogus philosopher. In his association with youths, Bion dispensed with the Academy's ideology of the educative eros and even criticised it, especially the Socratic tradition of the *Symposium*. (D.L.IV.49) Thus according to Diogenes Laertius, he did not theorise his *paiderastia* into *paideia*; rather his relationships with youths were based on sexual gratification and personal protection. (22) For this reason he is not credited with any students, despite numerous intimates, (D.L.IV.53-4) presumably on the grounds that the relationships were not
considered to be educative as were those between teacher-pupil in the Academy. In other words Bion did not bother to theorise his relationships with his students beyond the sexual level to an educative relationship and was accordingly perceived as their exploiter. This was not so easy to detect in a school like the Academy where the practice was backed up by a full blown ideology legitimating and giving it currency. Following Plato's Symposium and Phaedrus, it became a standard topic for philosophical treatises and debates in the Academy and other schools. (23) Thus Heracleides' work Erotikos (24) on the history of lovers, Speusippus' and Xenocrates' Peri Philias, etc. (D.L.IV.4)

None of the successors are known to have married in the remaining two hundred years of the school's existence. Some like Carneades may have kept concubines (D.L.IV.63) and associated with hetairai. Spending most of their time in the school teaching, researching, writing, etc., philosophers interacted mainly with their pupils and fellow scholars. It was an institution comprised of males bound by intimate ties of friendship, and the Academy was "he ton philon diatribe" as the Suda (s.v. Academia) describes it.

4.3. The Educative Eros and the Social Relations of Friendship in the Lyceum.

What is the so-called love of friendship? Let us have recourse to the teachers of virtue, the philosophers.
(Cic.T.D.IV.33.70)
Hence some friends drink of dice together, others practice athletic sports and hunt, or study philosophy, in each other's company. (Arist.N.E.IX.12.1-3)

As in the Academy, the association of teachers and students at an informal, personal and intimate level was an integral part of the educational activities of the Lyceum, its day to day business of pedagogy. Aristotle's account of friendship in Books VIII and IX of the Nichomachean Ethics, especially that of friendship based on virtue between good men, was the theorisation of the ideal association (koinonia) (1) between persons and this served to inform the structuring of social realations among members of the Lyceum. In the form of friendship (philia) it involved affection, erotic and intellectual intimacy arising out of the educational activities in which school members engaged. Friendship which was the bond of the state, was here the bond of the school which was itself a community of friends; of scholars and pupils, for "all friendship... involves community". (Arist.N.E.VIII.12.1) This is how Aristotle conceived of, and organised the school - by ties of personal friendship which was to be fostered between members. Thus Theophrastus, his successor, bequeathed the school to his philoi which they were to own and live in "on terms of familiarity and friendship". (D.L.V.52-3) In turn Strato, in leaving the school to Lyco enjoined "the others to co-operate" with him (D.L.V.62) and Lyco made the same request for co-operation based on friendship and love in order that the school may continue. (D.L.V.70) The school
continued to operate with various degrees of vigour into the first century B.C. and in the process constructed a sophisticated representation of teacher-pupil interaction. One has to search carefully in the ancient tradition of the biographer, doxographer and hagiographer, through which most of it is presented.

In that tradition for example, Diogenes Laertius reproduces the gamut of conflicting accounts. Thus the story that the relationship between Aristotle and the tyrant Hermeias of Atarneus was one of teacher and his paidika. (D.L.V.3, 8) Who is the boy Myrmex mentioned in his will? (D.L.V.14) Buffiere (p.160) considers, but rejects the notion that he was his paidika. The youth Myrmex, along with his property was, as his will indicates, placed in the guardianship of Aristotle and he in turn made similar provisions for the boy. (D.L.V.14) What can one make of the Suda's statement that a certain Palaiphatos, (2) a disciple of Aristotle, was also his paidika or the slander that Aristotle was in love with a pupil from Phaselis as Socrates was of Alcibiades? (Athen.566d-e) And this in view of the fact that Aristotle was one of the few philosophers who married. After the death of his first wife he kept a concubine and had children by her. (3) All things considered, he was most likely not even a paiderastes, and no doubt had the Academy in mind as well as existing cultural practices when he criticised paiderastic relationships as constitutive of unequal social relations between its participants and therefore not representing true friendship. (4) Aristotle talks of his friendship with
members of the Academy, being himself a member for twenty years, but unlike them is not willing to put friendship above truth. This refers to a debate in the Academy between Eudoxus and other Academics regarding *hedone*, where Eudoxus prevailed, not because he was right but because of his character and the affection the disputants had for him. (5)

The above tradition that makes a *paiderastes* out of Aristotle is not to be trusted. It is most likely to be false, though it does demonstrate that it was nothing extraordinary to perceive the relationships between teachers and their pupils in the model of the educative *eros*. This had now become commonplace and was in fact expected, and Aristotle, the long-time member of the Academy and one of Plato’s best pupils was logically cast into the framework theorised in that school. The fact that he was married made no difference. Other members of the Lyceum were also fair target for the scandal writers as well as professional rivals. Theophrastus, his successor, was accused of being in love with his student Nichomachus, the son of Aristotle. (6) Diogenes Laertius reproduces the theorisation of the equation between *paiderastia* and friendship in the form of *paidaia* as the study of philosophy and the acquisition of knowledge through wisdom and credits it to Aristotle.

In another definition of friendship he defined it as that of lovers... The end of love was not merely intercourse but also philosophy. According to him the wise man will fall in love. (D.L.V.31)

Thus some of his students like Palaiphatos and the
anonymous pupil from Phaselis were transformed into his paidika.

When Aristotle talks of friendship, companionship and love it is mostly about and between males; the most legitimate form being between free male citizens. Thus it was important for philosophers of the Lyceum, as of the Academy, to offer a convincing justification of the intimate relationships existing in the schools between teachers, teachers and pupils and young men themselves as part of the educative process of initiation and acquisition of knowledge, as well as of power, privilege and its exercise. It was the initiation of youths into the ruling class culture. Apart from school discussion and debate it took form in the written word, as treatises became normal school practice. Aristotle wrote on it (7) and so did Theophrastus. (8) Note his will where Theophrastus commends a youth to the community of scholars.

"Aristotle, the son of Metrodorus and Pythias, shall have the right to study and associate with them [the community of scholars] if he so desires. And the oldest of them shall pay every attention to him, in order to ensure for him the utmost proficiency in philosophy". (D.L.V.53. emphasis mine)

Here is the educative eros at work. It was educative in the wider sense of paideia, intimate and highly personal with a view to teaching and learning (a method), and not just erotic. Following Aristotle's treatment of philia, it became a standard topic for discussion, lectures and writings. Most works are now just titles or fragments.
Aristoxenus in his life of Socrates reported (or fabricated) the erotic tradition regarding Socrates' relation to his teacher Archelaus. (9) Dichaearchus wrote on Alexander the Great, the philopais, (10) and a critique of Plato's Phaedrus. (11) Hieronymus wrote a history of paiderastia in Greece, (Ath.602a-e) and Praxiphanes On Friendship. (12) And then there were Clearchus of Soli's treatises on love and friendship; (13) Demetrius of Phalerum's Peri Erotikos (D.L.V.81 = fr.85 W.), and Lyco's Erotikai Diatribai (Lyco.fr.9 W.) along with Aristo of Ceos' Erotikai Homoiai (14) regarding the history of lovers and love affairs.

All these treatises: historical accounts, polemics, school apologies, etc. were part and parcel of the educational practices of the school and their justifications. Philosophers frequently refused to marry and participate in the reproduction of private property through the family, instead associating with youths and male adults outside the normal activity of socio-political life. This cultural gambit, as Frischer calls it, (15) of the philosophers' sexuality was at the same time an embodiment and a defense of their educational practices and personal lifestyles. (16) Locked into a school tradition they were obliged to continue it, for it was their means of existence. Sometime in the 80s b.c. it came to an end in Athens for the Lyceum, but where the philosophers left off, the commentator took over.
4.4. The Educative Eros as Philia in the Garden.

Yet Epicurus in a single house and a small one at that maintained a whole company of friends united by the closest sympathy and affection; and this still goes on in the Epicurean school. (Cic.Fin.I.20.65)

For Epicurus and his school philia educates, and the association of friends bound by intimacy in the pursuit of philosophy is the best form of social arrangement leading to the good life. An additional and important dimension which characterised the social relations of teacher-pupil interaction in the school was the inclusion of both sexes: men and women, including slaves. (D.L.X.7,10) Thus the philosophies of the other schools endorsing the purely male social relations were here insufficient in informing, organising and structuring the Epicurean community of friends and in serving as the educational dynamic needed to mediate the educational exchange and transmission of knowledge between teacher and pupil. Plato's conception of the purely male educative eros was rejected by Epicurus and his school. Aristotle's view that true friendship and the exchange of knowledge and pursuit of philosophy is legitimate only between free male citizens was also limiting and inadequate for the purposes of the Garden where men, women, and slaves also represented the non-citizen, non-male and non-free category. Epicurus was offering an alternative community comprised of all its human subjects revolving around paideia. Thus for him the doctrine and practice of the educative eros as philia,
which "he not only commended... by his eloquence, but far more by the example of his life and conduct", (Cic.Fin.I.20.65) required a broader expression to include the wider range of social relations among humans in general. Friendship in the form of affection, intimacy and love became one of the most important parts of the school's philosophy and its teachings. (1) Epicurus discovered this when as a novice teacher and for lack of friends he faced considerable difficulty and opposition from rivals. The setting up of the Garden in Athens itself was made possible by the initial and later continued support of friends and students he converted in Ionia, in the cities of Lampsacus and Mytilene in particular. (2) Thus the maxim that the wise man will love his friends. (Cic.Fin.I.20.70)

The extension of his view of friendship to all human beings went against the current of Greek thinking and that of the other schools since it challenged unequal and exploitative social relations existing between persons. As a result it was subject to constant criticism by its rivals. Thus the Academics criticised the school (Cic.Fin.I.20.69), as did almost everyone else. (D.L.X.3-8) His relation with members of the school were misrepresented, especially with the women of the Garden. Attacked from all sides the Epicureans responded in kind.

As to his relations with his male disciples, he was on intimate terms of friendship, as with all members of the school. Wallace (p.53) describes Metrodorus' conversion at twenty by Epicurus as love at first sight. Seneca (Ep.79.15) draws attention to the close friendship between
Epicurus and Metrodorus, a friendship representative of the
general social relations among members of the school. 
Diogenes Laertius (X.22.) also notes the intimacy and close
association between the two throughout their lives. The
youth Colotes showed particular affection, adulation and
even worship of Epicurus which he in turn reciprocated. (3)
This was part of the social relations of teacher-pupil
interaction in the school where Epicurus was revered by his
students who were placed in his debt for being educated.
(4) In his letter to the youth Pythocles he illustrates the
genuine affection which existed between teacher and pupil.

Epicurus to Pythocles, greetings.
In your letter to me... you continue to show me
affection (philophronoumenos) which I have merited by
my devotion to you. (D.L.X.84)

His affection for Pythocles, who was a beauty, was genuine,
but professional opponents and later tradition, which is
mainly hostile and is therefore not to be trusted,
reproduced a negative account of Epicurus as the vulgar
hedonist seducing youths and using the women of the Garden.
(5) This is not true. Nowhere in Diogenes Laertius' account
is any pupil of Epicurus termed: eromenos or paidika. There
is no solid evidence that he was a paiderastes or that his
relations with his pupils were sexual, though they were
intimate. (6) From what we know of his life, he did not
marry, though many of his associates did, and mostly to the
women of the Garden. Thus Metrodorus and Leontion lived in
a de-facto marriage. (D.L.X.23) Epicurus made provision for
their daughter, who, when of age, was to be married to a
school member. (D.L.X.19-20) Metrodorus gave his sister Batis to Idomeneus as wife. Polyaenus had a son and there were Leontius and Themista, his patrons from Lampsacus who named their son Epicurus. (D.L.X.26)

The cult of friendship, permeating the network of relations of school members, was all the more effective in that members actually lived in the little garden school itself. (7) Here teachers and students were in constant interaction and the school philosophy of gratitude and reverence for teachers, as well as friendship and affection between teachers and pupils, was encouraged in practice and justified in theory as a legitimate mode of social interaction. (8) And as Cicero said "this still goes on in the Epicurean school". (Fin.I.2065) Loyalty to Epicurus and the school became legendary. Defectors were rare. (D.L.IV.43; X.6)

Perhaps it was this doctrinal and interpersonal unity as integral to the specific nature of the Epicurean school in the way in which it prosecuted its teachings and organised itself, that enabled it to survive after its Athenian rivals collapsed, and that carried it into the second and possibly the third century a.d. through teacher-pupil succession and the personal salvationist message of its philosophy of friendship and community. Sometime in the middle of the third century a.d. and far from Athens, Diogenes of Oeonanda erected an inscription, offering, once again, the Epicurean message to the local inhabitants and its passers-by.
4.5. The Wise Man and Pederasty in the Stoa.

Further, they say that the wise man will love youths who by their disposition show natural endowment for virtue... Their definition of love is an effort towards making friends, due to the appearance of physical beauty, its sole end being friendship, not intercourse.
(D.L.VII.129-30)
Friend: Yes, for love, they say, is a kind of chase after a stripling who is undeveloped but naturally apt for virtue. (1)

This ideal did not readily translate in practice, however, and here the relationship between pederasty and paideia in the Stoa with regard to teacher-pupil interaction and succession was expressed in the language of teacher-pupil intimacy and sanctioned by the ideal of the Stoic wise man, its strongest justification. The Stoics, too, appealed to paideia in general and to eros paideutikos in particular to justify their pederasty. Eros is the principle governing deity in Zeno's Republic. (2) In line with Cynic influence of "life according to nature" on the early Stoa, Stoics reproduced and elaborated the Cynic's alternative form of politeia in opposition to existing customs on the one hand and its rivals on the other. This alternative form of social organisation ranged across the whole social spectrum: from the institutions of private property, marriage, sexuality and family, to religion, laws and tradition. (3) Much of this early Cynic influence in
their philosophy (e.g. views on incest, cannibalism, the rejection of religion, private property, etc.) was toned down and later rejected by the Stoa (4) in favour of an ideological acceptance of existing institutions and their modes of interaction.

As to teacher-pupil interaction in the school and its theorisation, Zeno himself is represented in tradition as an exclusive paiderastes (5) who formed intimate relationships with his students. Diogenes Laertius reports that he was in love with Chremonides, (6) that he forced Herillus, his young and handsome pupil to shave his head because he attracted too many admirers. (7) Diogenes also preserves a piece of advice to a philopaidē, drawing on the similarity to a didaskalos: to the effect that both tend to "lose their common sense by spending too much time with boys", (D.L.VII.18) and a retort to a youth arguing against the Stoic view that the wise man will fall in love. (8) Diogenes Laertius reports these conflicting and contradictory accounts and anecdotes about Zeno the paiderastes on the one hand, and Zeno the apathēs on the other, without any attempt to explain that what we have here is a case of Zeno the paiderastes sublimating his sexuality by repressing the emotions, as in the case of Chremonides when he got up and walked away after being sexually aroused by the youth. Not all Stoics were consistent however. Persaeus, a disciple, also of Citium, and who resided with Zeno, (D.L.VII.13) is used by Athenæus (607a-b, d-f) as an example illustrating the Stoics' inconsistency in life. Here Persaeus is made to
forsgo the insensibility of a Stoic philosopher when enticed by the charms of a flute girl at a symposium whom he buys and takes home with Zeno's blessing. This echoes an earlier and more vicious attack on Zeno and the Stoics' paiderastia.

oglers of boys you are, and in that alone emulating the founder of your philosophy, Zeno the Phoenician, who never resorted to a woman, but always to boy-favourites, as Antigonus of Carystus records in his Biography of him. For you are always repeating that one should not love bodies but soul; you who say that favourites should be retained until twenty-eight years old (Athen.563d-f) [and]... take your favourites with their chins shaven. (9)

One of Cleanthes' own pupils, Sphaerus of Bosporus was himself a notorious paiderastes, who according to later tradition was, along with his associates, a vulgar one, and therefore the object of derision and criticism. (10) That is to say, much like Bion of Borysthenes, he did not justify his paiderastia by an appeal to paideia and eros paideutikos as other Stoics did. (D.L.VII.129)

Other than Cynic teaching, Zeno was probably influenced by Plato's Symposium and Phaedrus, and by the Academy's subsequent philosophy of the educative eros, for he attended, according to Diogenes Laertius' source, (D.L.VII.1.) the lectures of Xenocrates and Polemo in the Academy. In any case, the problem was not left untreated in the Stoa itself, for after Plato's high level theorisation, the philosophical treatment of eros had become a
philosophic genre. This was the Peri Erotos literature of the schools. Zeno wrote on it. (11) Persaeus treated it, (D.L.VII.36) as did Cleanthes, the next head, in his works: Peri Erotos, Erotike Techne, Peri Philias and Symposium. (D.L.VII.175) So did Ariston in his Erotikai Diatribai, (D.L.VII.163) Crysippus in On Love and Apollodorus in his Ethics; (12) all theorising the Stoic practice of paiderastia, and where in the education of youths, they dealt with such traditional topics as boys and physical culture (dress, bearing, exercise, etc); boys and intellectual culture (music, poetry, learning, etc.) as well as on the mythology and history of lovers and friends who were emulated as educative models.

Little is known of teacher-pupil interaction in the the succeeding generations of the school from Zeno of Tarsus to its last known heads in the first century b.c.. Certainly none are known to have married, although they did not reject that institution. (D.L.VII.121) Frischer's claim that "their status was generally too low to enable them to attract and support wives" (13) may have been true of the rank and file philosophers as such, but it was not so of most of the known school philosophers of the Academy, Lyceum, Stoa and Garden who as individuals were more than well off. (14) A reading of their wills in Diogenes Laertius reveals considerable personal wealth and school property. Here royal patronage also played an important part.

What can one make of the tradition regarding the Stoics on teacher-pupil intimacy in the educative eros?
There is no need to reject the tradition that many of the Stoic philosophers were paiderastes and that they formed associations with pupils on an erotic level and theorised them as paideia. Intellectual and sexual preferences for males over females on the part of philosophers is not surprising given: (i) cultural practices endorsing paiderastia as a legitimate and superior form of association between human beings, (ii) the specific conditions of the institution of schooling where the practice of education in the schools of philosophy excluded women (except the Garden) from its teaching and where as a result, social relations were formed between males only; (iii) the sophisticated educational justifications of those practices as being proper and just. The argument was that it was the paideusis of youths towards virtue. (D.L.VII.10-11) Diogenes preserves favourable sayings and advice of Zeno to young men, illustrating the point.

One of the most interesting aspects of the educative eros in the Stoa was its distinctive conception as embodied in the Stoic paradoxes regarding the wise man, namely, that only the Stoic wise man is capable of love and friendship generally and of being a lover of youths in particular and therefore their only proper educator. (15) Although in the Stoic system, paiderastia belongs to the category of the indifferent being neither good nor evil, (16) it belongs to the sub-class of indifferent things that are to be preferred (D.L.VII.103-7) and not rejected. Why? Because in this way the Stoics justified their educative eros in practice - the association with their pupils, whom they
undertook to educate. It was thus a response to a problem
having to do with practical pedagogy, for here they could
not remain indifferent. Stoics did not claim to be perfect
wise men and since as philosophers they engaged in the
teaching of youths, it was thus necessary for them to
justify their pedagogy. The Stoics sublimated eros by
attempting to extripate the pathes (the emotions). Although
it looked good in theory, it did not work in practice.

Like the Greeks who could in theory make things like
poverty and slavery appear a godsend, modern scholars, in
taking only the theory as the object of their
investigations, have all to often in their praise of the
Greek genius for abstract thought neglected and left behind
the real practices producing such abstractions; practices
that did not measure up to their ideals and were as such
unjust and unfair, leading to exploitation and inequality.

The education of youths was theorised as the main part
of the intellectual work of the Stoic school and reproduced
in later tradition. Thus in the De Natura Deorum Cicero
says: "We, who with the sanction of philosophers of old,
are fond of the society of young men". (17) Seneca,
(Ep.123.15) Musonius Rufus, and Epictetus, (18) kept the
tradition alive and active in classroom teaching and in
philosophical writing long after the Stoic school came to
an end in Athens.
4.6. The Educative Eros and the Schools of the Centuries

A.D.

The collapse of the Athenian schools of philosophy did not mean the collapse of schools and their teaching as such. The extension of higher education reached beyond Greece in the Hellenistic period and later, encompassed the Roman empire. Most major cities could boast a school or schools of philosophy and many minor poleis had resident philosophers of one persuasion or another. Their form of continuity was in the transmission of school doctrine through teacher-pupil succession mediated by an intimate network of social relations and by reaching as large an audience as teaching ability and material conditions permitted.

The dominant model of the educative eros as practiced and theorised in the early schools was dutifully, and by now as a matter of course, reproduced, as our sources indicate. Plutarch wrote on it in his: The Education of Children, and in his Eroticus, drawing on the Platonic-Academic tradition. Musonius Rufus (fr.XI.p.85 Lutz) endorsed this educative model of teachers and pupils working, residing and studying together in intellectual intimacy and friendship. The Middle Platonists, attempting to construct a system out of the philosophical tradition and its institutional collapse in the first century b.c., did not neglect to justify their own activities by constant appeal to the "authority of the Ancients". In respect to the educative eros, we have in Albinus
(Didaskalikos.chs.23,33) and Apuleius (De Plat.chs.13-14) treatments of the nature of love and friendship; the former, as Dillon (1) points out, harking back to Plato's Laws (837b-d) and Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics while employing Stoic terminology. Lucian in his satires was unrelenting in ridiculing the philosophers' sexual practices and their corresponding justifications, especially in their failure to observe theory in practice. (2) The correspondence between Fronto and Marcus Aurelius conforms to the tradition of intellectual teacher-pupil intimacy and no doubt testifies to the genuine affection between them. (3)

In the school of Plotinus, the philosophy of Neoplatonism contains a strong element of the role of Eros in the contemplative life. (4) The Eros Ekstatikos of the treatise On Love (Enn.III.5) harks back to the Symposium and Phaedrus of Plato where Plotinus retheorises the journey of the lovers from the sensible to the intelligible world in their contemplation of beauty and union with the One. In On the Good (Enn.VI.7.30-1) the image of lovers is employed to demonstrate the intimate relationship among the three Hypostases, for the ecstasy of the transport of love is the analogy that comes closest to expressing the mystic union with the One. (Enn.6.7.35-3) This was part of the sophisticated theory of the nature of contemplation and its teaching in the school as Plotinus came down squarely on the side of the purely intellectual relationship of the educative eros. In his philosophy, the eros between lovers of the intelligible world that does not admit of physical
intimacy and generation is self-sufficient and superior to the physical eros between lovers in the sensible world which is inferior and needs to generate in order to perpetuate itself. ([Enn.III.5.1,2]) Thus when at a symposium, the rhetorician Diophanes read a defense of physical intimacy between teacher-pupil "for the [latter's] sake of advancing in the study of virtue", (Porph.V.Plot.15) Plotinus commissioned his favourite student Porphyry to write and deliver a refutation, one with which he was greatly pleased. This was in perfect keeping with Plotinus' low opinion of the nature of the sensible world in the great chain of being and the relations that obtain between its objects, especially sexual relations which involve the coming into being of things even further removed from reality: the One. For this reason, Plotinus, so Porphyry reports, "seemed ashamed of being in the body" (Porph.V.Plot.1) and would not have a portrait made of himself; it being a distortive image of an image. (Porph.V.Plot.1)

The ideology of the educative eros became part of the elaborate system of later Neoplatonism and its rituals. The theory of eros as a creative force and as reversion to the One was further expanded upon. Thus in the great chain of Being of Iamblichus, Proclus and followers, there is the great chain of Eros: the erotikē seira as procession. (5) Its by-product is salvation, via the saving grace of eros. (6) In the process of late Neoplatonist mysticism it became far removed from initial teacher-pupil interaction in practice and theory. The pupils of the Neoplatonist
theurgists are represented by Eunapius as spellbound devotees of their revered masters who initiate them into their secrets. (7) This is the relationship between the emperor Julian and Maximus, for example. In a fictitious letter to Iamblichus (who was probably dead before Julian was even born) Julian addresses him with the remarks "I admit that I am your erastes", (Jul. Ep. 79) where erastes here means admirer or devotee. This is also how Synesius describes his relation to his teacher Hypatia. (see ch.5.3) In his life of Proclus, Marinus says that Proclus was part of the household of his teacher, the rhetorician Leonas who treated him as a son. (Mar. V. Proc. 10) He later attended Olympiadorus in philosophy and Hero in mathematics and religion, becoming the latter's "constant companion". (Mar. V. Proc. 11) When he went to Athens, Proclus became the intimate disciple of Plutarchus and later Syreanus. Both became intimate with him and took him into their household as student, adoptive son and companion. (8) Marinus also speaks of the intimate relations Proclus maintained with the families of his teachers and his fellow students, especially with Archiadas; a friendship which Marinus terms Pythagoric, (9) and one that was characterised by mutual affection. Marinus, like Plotinus and most school philosophers, did not marry or have children. (Mar. V. Proc. 18) The intimacy between teacher and pupil formed the basis for the transmission of knowledge from master to favourite initiate; of succession in the school; and of school property and doctrine in the form of sacred mysteries. (Mar. V. Proc. 13-16) This succession was
considered to be the result of the union of intellects between teacher and disciple.

But Syreanus, when he had received Proclus as his pupil, not only much assisted him in learning, made him his domestic as to other concerns, and the companion of his philosophic life, having found in him such an auditor and successor as he had for a long time sought for and one who was adopted for the reception of a multitude of disciplines, and divine dogmata. (Mar.V.Proc.13)

This was passed on to Proclus' own student and successor Marinus and others for two more generations (see App.II.) when towards the later sixth century a.d. the school itself came to a natural end.


(a). The Class Basis of the Educative Eros.

There exists a material connection of persons with one another, which is determined by their needs and their mode of production, and which is as old as persons themselves. (1)

Teacher-Pupil interaction in the form of the educative eros in the Greek schools of philosophy can best be explained not by appeal to any theory of human nature, the will of Deity or Platonic Idealism, but by reference to and analysis of the institution of the school itself and its relation to other institutions within the state such as the family, courts of law, patriarchy, and formations in class.
and gender relations in the division of labour, power, knowledge and privilege which in turn go towards constructing the social relations of teacher-pupil interaction. The educative eros was the theorisation of a network of practices between persons in Greek society, namely, the relations between males in socio-political life where it translated into *paideia* as general culture, and in the schools of philosophy *paideia* at its highest level of schooling and education. The by-product was that it was a form of pedagogic domination based on an elitist (class) ideology and patriarchal society concerned with the maintenance of power over others: the women, slave population and the non-leisured, non-propertied classes. It was grounded in an inequality (of age; political and economic status, emotional and epistemic development) not favouring the pupil - the object of the exercise. The social relations of these divisions were predicated upon, and reproduced social antagonisms that took the form of domination and exploitation (sexual, emotional, pedagogic, epistemic, political, etc.) based on a functional inequality and rule of the few. The masking and legitimation of these practices translated in the schools of philosophy into forms of educational ideology of which the educative eros was an instance; an instance of the reproduction of specific class and gender relations through the mechanism of education towards the maintenance of the status quo.

The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas. The class which is the ruling material
force of society is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. (2)

The relationship between the educative eros and other institutions in Greek society was intimate and dynamic. Greek culture in general endorsed and idealised it in its mythology and religion, art and literature; in its secular institutions of the gymnasium, palaestra and symposium, as well as in law and tradition. In the army it was accepted and encouraged. The most famous instance is the army of the three hundred Thebans, composed entirely of pairs of lovers. Other examples abound. It was also dialectical and causal. The educative eros was itself a consequence of class society and an important part of its reproduction for if we keep in mind that there was a sharp division of classes, between free and slave on the one hand and between the propertied (leisured) few and the manual workers in general on the other, (free or servile) then we can place the educative eros in proper perspective in society in general and education in particular. Greek education corresponds to the leisured class, a thing which we are reminded of by the translation of the word leisure from the Greek, schole, into our English, school. (3) Leisure was not a luxury which all citizens could afford, however, it was the privilege of the free male citizen who had sufficient wealth to dispense with manual work to live. (4) The educative eros was one such activity in which male members of the propertied class engaged. It was an expensive, time consuming business. (5) Most everyone in the Socratic circle was of the leisured class where the
educative eros represented the expression of a relationship between an adult and a youth of that class. Thus when I claim that the educative eros was peculiar to the ruling class, I do not mean to say that its practice, paiderastia, same sex eroticism in general, was peculiar to this class. Individuals from all classes engaged in the practice, but in respect to its representation, only the leisured class gave it theoretical expression in the form of an educational ideology. The schools appropriated this, developed and refined it so as to suit and justify their own pedagogy and teacher-pupil relations. High level theoretical expression of paiderastia was thus mainly a ruling class activity. For the average Greek citizen it did not transcend the sexual level. Why? Simply because the average citizen was too busy working for a living under conditions of exploitation of his labour power by the ruling class and just did not have the leisure time to theorise his extra marital sexual activities which would be either with his slave or bought, and in which case neither would be worthy of an encomium. On the other hand, vindication for not doing manual work and for subsisting on the surplus wealth of those who did by recourse to elaborate metaphysical constructions, is to be attributed to the elite male segment of the propertied class, who like our school philosophers, had an overabundance of leisure time.

The production of theory involved the masking of such practices and this has to do with the class basis of society which was patriarchal: That is, a dominant class
where power was vested in the adult male citizen population and where the domination of others (women, slaves, children) was a condition for the exercise of that power. (6) The social relations of patriarchy were based on a number of important divisions. The most basic was that of the sexes, and corresponding divisions of power, labour, knowledge and privilege. It was arché (rule) of the pater (father); a relationship based on an inequality and exploitation characterising its internal-external contradictions and antagonisms. (7) Gouldner characterises these antagonisms as a crisis of intimacy occasioned by the agon system. (8) The argument is that the agon system generated mutually incompatible relationships since the object was domination at any and every cost. This tended to alienate the participants from each other and mechanisms such as paiderastia served to accommodate and diffuse the resulting tensions. In a paiderastic relationship there was no competition between the lover and his favourite; the teacher and his student. They did not compete against each other for power or glory; they competed together against others, or else teachers competed against teachers for favoured students. This is how Crantor "stole" Arcesilaus from Theophrastus.

The segregation and in some places (Classical Athens) the seclusion of middle and upper-class women went hand in hand with their exploitation: the loss of most political privileges, economic power, physical and emotional exploitation. (9) That is, within the ruling class, men, who were in control, exploited women on a gender basis.
The institution of marriage involved most of the inequalities between the sexes. Men were not expected to marry before the age of thirty, and then to a girl between twelve to sixteen; a girl who had spent all of her life at home and was well versed in domestic science only. Socrates knew the answer when he asked one such husband: "Are there any people with whom you have less conversation than with your wife?". (Xen.Oecon.III.12) It is then hardly surprising that men sought the company of liberated women (hetairai) who were highly educated (10) or other men and youths, the latter which they undertook to educate. Since access to women of the same class was almost impossible and recourse to slaves, concubines and prostitutes offered no social recognition or status and conferred no power or privilege, the only respectable alternative was a youth of the same sex and class. There was thus greater opportunity for physical and intellectual interaction between males than between the sexes, and this is why paiderastia competed so successfully with heterosexuality which was primarily limited to marriage with a view to procreation and the maintance of private property. Most of the school philosophers took it a step further by not marrying at all and by resorting to hetairai for their sexual needs, thus eliminated the need to associate with women on a regular basis within marriage. An ideology based on paideia was the legitimation.

(b). The Pedagogic Authority and the Sublimation of Eros.

Paideia, too, represents a relationship of domination,
and because this relationship, the pedagogic authority, too, is not possible without an ethical justification; for the will of the educator, if it is to be imposed upon the one who is to be educated, has to be proven to be just. (11)

Anyone who reads Plato's dialogues cannot fail to notice how utterly Socrates vanquishes his opponents. Thus, for example, in the Symposium he reduces his host to shambles and forces him to concede. (Symp.201c) He does the same with everyone else - he humbles, refutes and makes them look like idiots. And in the process of doing so, he overpowers, conquers and finally dominates them. It was utter destruction and in keeping with Greek sentiments where, like revenge, victory was sweet, but not enough in itself. Rather, it was knowing that one had completely annihilated one's opponents. Thus Socrates' comfort in his knowledge of his own ignorance, a claim he insists upon with pathological dogmatism. Thus his comfort in his annihilation of the knowledge claims of others and in his knowledge of their ignorance.

Was this sublimation of eros Socrates' will to power, his desire to dominate others? I do not think so. Rather his will to power was his will to constant questioning and searching for the truth; whether in people or the physical-spiritual world. When he came across persons who claimed knowledge, in his desire to know also, he invariably came into conflict with them; ended up by opposing them and in the process dominating them by destroying the foundations on which they claimed knowledge. His goal was not
domination itself, rather domination was a by-product. In the final instance he wanted to liberate people from domination, especially the domination of false knowledge. (12)

With Plato on the other hand, the sublimation of eros into will to power was his desire to rule, to be philosopher-king, but failing this to rule over his students as teacher. This equation between teaching and ruling which is the exercise of power over others was never lost on the ancients.

There is the instance of the tyrant Dionysius II who after his expulsion from Syracuse became a schoolmaster at Corinth; so complete was his inability to do without the right to rule. (Cic.T.D.III.22.27)

Thus just as the Gods need the Cosmos in order to rule and exercise power, teachers need students and speakers need an audience. In educational practice, the relationship between teachers and pupils was one of differentiation of power. The teacher-erastes was dominant, the pupil-eromenos subservient. The former was active, the latter passive. The roles were not interchangeable. (13) The former was older, the latter younger. (14) The social relations of active-passive, dominant-subservient are the same for that of teacher-pupil relations operating in our mass school systems functioning today. In Greece, this relationship was sexual as well as educative; a form of initiation and male bonding into the dominant institutions of society, its forms of knowledge and cultural goods. Submission on the part of the pupil was meant to have no basis in sexuality.
That is, the pupil did not submit out of sexual desire. (15) He submitted as part of the process of being initiated. (16) It is not difficult to realise that these social relations lent themselves to forms of domination and exploitation. The fact that all genital acts between two or more individuals of the same or opposite sex express a power relationship needs no argument here. In the social relations of the educative eros, sexuality is clearly the demonstration of superiority by the elder active partner over the younger passive student. In the social relations of the educational exchange (that is in the exchange and transmission of knowledge from teacher to pupil), pedagogic authority resides with the teacher who transmits his knowledge to his disciple. The pupil has to submit in order to participate.

Plato sublimated eros as a form of sexual domination, at first in the political sphere; but, not finding success as statesman or philosopher-ruler, (17) he became a teacher and as head of the Academy ruled over his students. Thus in the Symposium, eros becomes a daimon who initiates the lovers on a journey of spiritual procreation. (18) The desire for immortality induces the lover to become a teacher in search for a beautiful youth. Plato's erotic cosmology is the philosophical justification of pedagogic domination. It is at the same time an epistemology where sensible eros is projected into a metaphysical world of Ideas and Essences, then brought back into the physical world as justification and legitimation of his will to power in sexual, pedagogic and socio-political life. In the
process of becoming a philosopher-king one could and did graduate from the Academy in techniques of duplicity, tyranny and assassination. (19)

(c). The Educative Eros: The Production of Knowledge and Its Transmission.

Before the advent of schools of philosophy, paiderastia was the activity of the hunt, riding, battle, gymnasion, wrestling-school, symposium, etc. Having appropriated these cultural goods of paiderastia, and transferred them within the confines of the schools of philosophy, the educative eros became part of the general activities of the educational process and a central part of the curriculum: the lecture, debate, conversation, walks and talks, research, writing and publishing. It became the mechanism for interaction on an intimate level where the master transmitted his skills and knowledge to his students in general and his favourite in particular and thus perpetuated his and the school's doctrine. The epigone provided material and theoretical continuity where the business of the school in general was the production and transmission of knowledge to the next generation of students who were also the next generation of the ruling class. Finally, it backed up social practices such as slavery, patriarchy and the rule of the few, and legitimated them. The offshoot of this was that it involved a form of domination: domination intimately linked with the male model of knowledge as intellectual labour and contemplation.
The model was that of the wise man and his claim to wisdom. It had its roots in the Sophists and Socrates and the new kind of agon which they discovered: the problem of whether virtue (arete) in the form of knowledge can be taught; whether anyone has a claim to wisdom. The answer that knowledge can be got and taught, therefore transmitted from knower to uninitiated pupil and thus reproduced, became axiomatic, and the primary justification for an educational exchange based on an intimate teacher-pupil relationship. The contest for who has the right claim to knowledge, to its possession and therefore its reproduction, became the battleground and major educational preoccupation of the conflicting schools and their philosophies. These philosophies were at the same time offering competing and conflicting apologies regarding social life based on antagonistic class interests. In view of this, it was imperative that each should attempt to prevail in the education contest. The best way to do this was to play the game. This entailed their material reproduction, and the best mechanism available was teacher-pupil succession. What better way was there to guarantee success than if that teacher-pupil relationship were to be supplemented by a deeply interpersonal dimension, one based on eros and philia. This explains its full-blown justification and the schools as institutions which were maintained by a network of intimate social relations. The account in Diogenes Laertius who reproduces the ancient tradition is clear enough. The Stoics invested their teaching in their philosophy of the wise man as ultimate
justification of their pedagogy over their rivals and for its inculcation in their students. Garrison (21) characterises the Stoic sublimation of eros away from the pathes as a "sanitised view of love"; the result of the desexing of eros and its repression by the logos. As we have noted, however, the Stoics did not usually practice their ideal of the eros apathes. The Epicureans, bound by the most intimate ties of philia, purged their students of the dominant and rival cultures before engaging in their thoroughgoing re-education and indoctrination. Arcesilaus, of the Academy, likened this to a kind of castration. (D.L.IV.43) The Academy and the other schools were in the business of knowledge. It was a highly valuable commodity, for it justified the way in which they lived, or did not live. It was not just any knowledge, it was a contest for true knowledge. But since they all thought they were in possession of it, then logic dictated that they preserve it. It was in their interest to do so much the same way as it was in the interest of the Homeric warrior to transmit his arete to his favourite, who would succeed him. In the schools of philosophy, it was still a kind of excellence, valour or manliness, to be sure, but it was of a different kind. It was wisdom rather than a practical demonstration of fighting ability. In the Archaic period, arete and the Olympic victor's crown went hand in hand, while in the Classical period it became entirely political. In the Hellenistic period and under Roman rule in particular, with its professional army and civil bureaucracy, the average citizen survived more by the use of his tongue than by the
sword. In the centuries a.d. the philosophies behind the practices of teacher-pupil interaction themselves became objects of theory. That is, they became reproductive ideology, when under an increasingly repressive society that was becoming Christianised, (21) the schools restricted their activities more and more to pure intellectual labour.

With the ruling class it was the theorisation of an elitist practice for the maintenance of rule over the many. In the schools of philosophy, the social relations of patriarchy, class and gender in teacher-pupil interaction and succession were transformed into an educational ideology where the educative eros as paideia, like politeia, was a form of epistemic production and transmission of arete as privileged knowledge from master to pupil; from school to society.