

Politics and Education in Ancient Western Philosophy

Umut Arat

Born in Ankara in 1988, Umut Arat completed his undergraduate degree at Hacettepe University and his master's degree at Dokuz Eylül University, both in philosophy. Awarded the YLSY (Foreign Postgraduate Education Fellowship), he completed his studies at the Ohio State University in philosophy and history of education. Umut Arat continues to work for the Board of Education of the Ministry of National Education of Türkiye as a national education specialist.

Politics and Education in Ancient Western Philosophy

Umut Arat

ÇİZGİ
KİTAP E Vİ

Çizgi Kitabevi Publishing: 2065
Philosophy

©Çizgi Kitabevi
May 2026

ISBN: 978-625-396-884-7
Certificate No: 52493

- Cataloging in Publication Data (CIP) -
ARAT, Umut
Politics and Education
in Ancient Western Philosophy

Preparation for Printing
Çizgi Kitabevi Publishing
Tel: 0332 353 62 65- 66

Printig: Sebat Ofset
Certificate No: 74481

ÇİZGİ KİTABEVİ

Sahibiata Mah.
M. Muzaffer Cad. No:41/1
Meram/**Konya**
(0332) 353 62 65

Konevi Mah.
Larende Cad. No:20/A
Meram/**Konya**
(0332) 353 62 66

Siyavuşpaşa Mah.
Gül Sk. No:15 B
Bahçelievler/**İstanbul**
(0212) 514 82 93

www.cizgikitabevi.com
📞📧 / cizgikitabevi

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	7
Chapter 1 Introduction	9
Conservatives and Radicals.....	13
Historic Background.....	17
Traditional Education.....	20
Key Questions and Method.....	22
Chapter Breakdown.....	25
Chapter 2 Pythagoreanism	29
The Life, Education and General Thought of Pythagoras.....	31
Pythagoras' Political Thought and Practice	35
The Downfall of Pythagoreanism	41
The Origins of Pythagorean Gender Philosophy.....	45
Pythagorean Education for Women after Theano.....	51
Pythagoras the Educator: From Tutor to Preacher	56
Pythagorean Educational Theory and Practice.....	62
Conclusion.....	71
Chapter 3 Socrates and his Predecessors	73
The Athenian Predecessors of Socrates.....	77
The Women Who Taught Socrates.....	84
Socratic Social Thought and the Influence of Euripides	94
Political Philosophy of Socrates.....	101
Socratic Utopias.....	108
Socrates the Teacher?	117
Socrates' Educational Method and Practice.....	122
Socrates' Students	130
Educational Philosophy of Socrates.....	135
Conclusion.....	142

Chapter 4 Plato and Platonism.....	145
Political Philosophy of Plato.....	147
Educational Philosophy of Plato	160
Early Platonism	169
Neoplatonism	182
Conclusion.....	191
Chapter 5 Cynicism	195
The Predecessors of Cynicism.....	197
Diogenes: Founder of Cynicism	206
Crates and Hipparchia: The Ideal Successors.....	224
Late Cynicism	235
Conclusion.....	243
Chapter 6 Stoicism.....	247
Early Stoicism.....	249
Realizing the Stoic Utopia.....	264
Generalizations About Early Stoic Theory	270
Middle Stoicism	274
Late Stoicism.....	281
Conclusion.....	301
Chapter 7 Conclusion	303
References	313

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my advisors who have guided my academic life: Çetin Türkyılmaz who supervised my undergraduate dissertation, Özlem Duva Kaya who supervised my graduate dissertation and Bryan Warnick who supervised my doctoral dissertation.

I also want to thank my friend Sadiye Cankurtaran not only for her strong support, but also for her critical interest in and helpful comments on my studies; and my friends and colleagues Alex Nikolaidis and Julie Fitz, who always encouraged me whenever I consulted them about my work.

Lastly, I would like to thank my parents Ayşe Pervin Arat and Mehmet Rıza Arat for their constant support.

Chapter 1

Introduction

What is the relationship between politics and education? Some philosophers have recognized a tight relationship between these fields. Jean Jacques Rousseau's (1712 – 1778) educational theory, for instance, reflected his political thinking critical of civilization, both in being based on the child's natural capacities, and in involving the teaching of Rousseau's own social doctrine in the final stage (Bertram). In contrast, G. F. W. Hegel (1770 – 1831) argued that the teacher represented the world of reason as opposed to the child's reason, and saw the function of education as replacing the child's nature with the values of civilization (Hegel). In turn, John Dewey (1859 – 1952) emphasized the importance of education as a factor in the progress of a civilization (Dewey, 241). In short, regardless of their political perspectives on education, these major philosophers all saw its relationship with civilization. This being said, there has been political philosophers who have largely ignored the question of education. John Rawls (1921 – 2002), for example, limits his discussion of education to educational opportunity, and has little else to say about the political content of education and its relationship to civilization (Wenar). Nevertheless, it can be concluded that the general trend in modern philosophy is to see some sort of link between these concepts.

In contemporary scholarship, some advocate for a sharp division between education and politics. Education professor P. L. Thomas argues that politicians are not fit for running education, and is alarmed by their meddling in this field. Although Thomas considers at least public education to be an extension of the political system, he believes a political conception of schooling causes schools to be reduced to vehicles for implementing political mandates. While Thomas believes it necessary for educational reform to address political issues such as poverty, he believes it is teachers rather than politicians or bureaucrats who should be on the wheel, and allowed “to do that which they know how to do” (Thomas). Teacher educator Betsy Warner, on the other hand, emphasizes that education itself is political even though many educators stray away from this idea. Warner cites the example of history curricula, which portrays historic figures such as Columbus to be heroes, while omitting the accomplishments of indigenous peoples. Warner adds that being neutral in a subject like racism amounts to taking a political position in itself (Warner). Paula McAvoy and Diane Hess agree with Warner and acknowledge that schools are and should be political sites, though they add this does not necessarily mean being partisan. McAvoy and Hess specifically highlight that the political function of education in a democratic society is to teach youths how to participate in the democratic system of their country (McAvoy and Hess, 4). It can be concluded from the examples of contemporary approaches on the relationship between politics and education cited that education has a dual political role: carrying the values of the establishment to future generations, and potentially being an agent of change.

The relationship between politics and education is an ancient one, as old as the fields of politics and education themselves. Accordingly, my study aims to examine this relationship at its ancient roots. In antiquity, politics and

education were studied as part of the same universal intellectual discipline, philosophy. The modern perception of ancient Western philosophy, however, emphasizes neither its political nor its educational content. A look at *the American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* sheds light at the contemporary and popular understanding of ancient philosophy. Of the philosophical movements studied in this work, Pythagoreanism is primarily remembered for describing reality in terms of arithmetical relationships, and in particular for the famous Pythagorean geometric theorem (Soukhanov, 5899). The term Socratic is distinguished from the others for its educational connotations, related to the Socratic method and Socratic irony (Soukhanov, 6810-1). The term Platonic is associated with a tendency towards the spiritual and the ideal that transcends physical desire, often used to describe a form of love (Soukhanov, 5556). The term Cynic has come to mean someone who believes humanity is motivated by selfishness, and is associated with scorn, bitterness and mockery (Soukhanov, 1907-8). Lastly, Stoicism has come to be understood as indifference to pleasure or pain, in other words impassiveness (Soukhanov, 7037). Of course, these are not the only meanings listed for these philosophical movements, however they are significant because they express the most common understanding.

This work will be a study in the history of political and educational philosophy, which necessarily makes it a study in the history of politics and education, as well as a study of political and educational philosophy. In antiquity, I will argue that the phenomenon of politicians or statesmen running education is seen far less than educators being political, and having political theories themselves, influencing or trying to influence politics through education and education through politics. While maintaining these educators were often failures in reaching their self-declared final goals in varying

degrees, I will examine the difficulties they encountered but also their relatively small but nevertheless significant successes. Given that I will examine a variety of currents categorizable under the labels conservative and radical, the difficulties encountered by these different currents are not identical. Using education as their main tool, conservative philosophical schools aimed to create and preserve a society that lived according to traditional laws, values and morals. Though they succeeded in taking power more than once, they had difficulty preserving their rule. Moreover, they were figures who lived by rigid philosophical principles and who therefore struggled to survive in the world of mainstream politics. Nevertheless, they were generally more successful in realizing their political aims than their radical counterparts, whose aim was to change the direction of society completely by establishing the rule of philosophers. The difficulty posed by the fact that their ideas were strange and often alien to the values of the general public was often an insurmountable obstacle for radical currents. To be sure, simply having existed for centuries as political and educational movements is by itself a great success of all the ancient philosophical schools of thought, but it is certainly a more difficult thing to do for the radical schools. In any case, it will be seen as a result of my study that social and political change without education is impossible, but education alone is insufficient for causing social and political change.

I will investigate the relationship between the metaphysics of the various philosophical currents of antiquity and their political and educational views. It will be seen, on the one hand, that political, educational and metaphysical views of philosophers tend to be more or less coherent parts of their whole philosophy, and on the other, that their metaphysics do not necessarily dictate political and educational views. An idealist philosopher can be in favor of a teacher-centered

education or a student-centered education, or a materialist philosopher may be patriarchal or opposed to patriarchy. The point, however, is that the ancient schools of philosophy put forward systematic worldviews, and trying to relate metaphysics to political and educational philosophies can help to better clarify the worldview. Although such movements did not start with Socrates but with Pythagoras, it was the former who had an undeniably strong influence on the movements that came to be after him rather than the latter, to the extent that the movements in question saw themselves as Socratic. Thus, I will focus on Socratic movements, though it was also necessary for me to examine the Pythagoreans, who provided a model for political and educational philosophical movements, as well as others who influenced Socrates.

Conservatives and Radicals

To explain ancient politics, I will use a simple political spectrum of conservatives and reactionaries on one side, and radicals and extremists on the other, these terms being broad in meaning rather than strictly defined. I will use conservative and radical as general categories, opposed to each other over the question of traditions and customs. I will use reactionary and extremist to imply being so conservative, or so radical, that a subcategory is needed to distinguish them from the conservative or radical norm. Almost universally, the philosophical movements of the antiquity were broadly conservative or radical. Yet mainstream politics was dominated by another tendency: the moderates. Pure politicians rather than philosophers or educators, among the great figures of this unorganized tendency, Pericles (495 – 429 BC), Alexander (356 – 323 BC) and Julius Caesar (100 – 44 BC) can be counted. Conservatives who moderated the original doctrine such as the Pythagorean Archytas (428 – 347 BC)

and the Stoic Marcus Aurelius (121 – 180), as well as mature Plato (427 – 347 BC) who moderated Socratic teachings also deserve to be mentioned. Regardless of the political system they favored, however, most moderates were the ordinary politicians at various levels of the government. Although moderates did not have philosophical theories of their own about politics or education, thanks to being in political power they could benefit from mainstream educational practices as well as the wealth of philosophical knowledge created by the conservatives and the radicals. A famous example is Alexander, who was no philosopher but benefited from being open to figures as opposite as Aristotle (384 – 322 BC), and Diogenes (412 – 323 BC). Thus, according to P. A. Brunt, he followed Aristotle in considering the distinction between slaves and masters natural, but did not apply the same principle to barbarians. Although Brunt explains the latter position with Alexander's own experiences (Brunt, 50), the cosmopolitanism of Diogenes may well have had an effect too. Needless to say, both positions suited the interests of Alexander's new empire.

I will conceptualize conservative and radical positions as they relate to three primary issues: gender, slavery, and socioeconomic relationships. Firstly, a significant aspect of the relationship between politics and education can be seen regarding the question of gender relations and sexuality, a subject of political as well as educational philosophy. Accordingly, this issue will be investigated in every chapter. The question of gender is at the roots of civilization itself, with which politics and education as we understand it came into being. Hence any account of the relationship between politics and education would be incomplete without studying gender. It will be seen that the question of gender features in the political and educational philosophies of almost every philosophical current or philosopher of the antiquity I will

examine. Moreover, it will be seen that the position of every different current on gender contributed in a different way to its successes and failures. Regarding gender relations, I will talk about the roles of men and women, as well as how homosexuality was viewed. Traditional views of gender and sexuality emerged from the authority of the lawfully designated inheritor within a household according to Max Weber (1864 – 1920), and further developed as the patriarch obtained an administrative staff and a military force (Weber, 346-7). According to Sebastian Kraemer, males thus dominated herding and agricultural societies, and religious and political life with it. Kraemer dates the traditional, presumably monogamous family, with marriage rites and adoption, to these events (Kraemer). Accordingly, the patriarchal tradition will be considered conservative, and deviations from this tradition will be considered radical in the field of gender.

The second issue is slavery. Slavery, an important part of life in antiquity, can be defined as a class relationship that came into being after patriarchy (Fortunati, 29). Gerda Lerner underlines the relationship between the institutionalization of slavery and the enslavement of the women and children of conquered groups (Lerner, 58). Slavery developed as an alternative to slaughtering the captives after a war. Eventually, even the men were enslaved rather than killed, which led to further militarization of ancient civilizations to keep them in check (Lerner, 79). Slaves were often raped or forced to become prostitutes (Lerner, 87). As slavery became the dominant system, being a slave began to imply being an inferior kind of human, a stigma which was passed from generation to generation (Lerner, 95). Moreover, according to Benjamin Isaac, writers belonging to the Roman civilization often made racialized distinctions between peoples they fought, conquered and enslaved. Thus the Gauls were respected for fighting for their freedom since subjection to

Rome would have meant servitude whereas Eastern peoples were described as “born for slavery” (Isaac, 414). Eventually this early form of racism became the law. In *the Edict of Aediles*, it was stated that the nation or origin of each slave had to be declared at the slave auction as this was a factor encouraging or deterring the buyer (Josiah). While the mainstream ancient world considered slavery just and natural, this was an issue which deeply divided the intellectual world of the age. The racialization of slavery made different philosophers positions on cosmopolitanism and slavery related. Moreover, the educational capacity of slaves became a question of debate.

The third issue is regarding economic and social relationships. The philosophical movements of the ancient Western world defended various forms of socioeconomic organizations in line with their general perspectives. Accordingly, conservative schools of thought argued for a return to older, more traditional economic practices based not just on slavery but also on stricter class divisions between the nobility and the plebeians to the extent that the latter had little representation in the political system, and the preservation of such conditions where they existed. Matthew Simonton notes that the elite played the leading role in archaic Greece, and the participation of the demos in political life was expected to be limited to shouts and cheers. With the emergence of democracy, common male citizens’ role in the system became much more extensive, and Simonton argues that this led to the stance of the elite towards the demos to harden into oligarchy (Simonton, 10-11). In turn, radicals and extremists proposed new, communal forms of economic and social organization inspired by the memory of the distant past of the human species, which either envisaged a different kind of civilization or hoped for a return to the state of nature that preceded civilization.

Historic Background

The anthropological question of the social origins of humanity itself is a politicized one, with modern conservative and radical authors putting forward extremely different visions of the prehistory of the species. For instance, Lewis Henry Morgan (1818–1881) concluded that the descent was in the female line and children belonged to the gens of their mother for primitive peoples (Morgan, 50). Johann Jacob Bachofen (1815 – 1877) went as far as to describe this social order as matriarchy (Lerner, 26). In contrast, Bronislaw Malinowski (1884 – 1942) wanted to present the norms of society such as the individual family to be eternal. According to Malinowski, the thesis that held the maternal clan to be the primitive domestic institution was not only “entirely incorrect” but “positively dangerous”. Malinowski considered the idea that collective parenthood and group marriage had dominated the prehistory of humankind so dangerous to the individual family, the pivotal element of modern society, that the upheavals of recent times were insignificant in comparison (Malinowski, 76). Nevertheless, later anthropologists claimed there were other significant differences between primitive peoples, or hunter-gatherers, and civilization. For instance, Pierre Clastres noted that the position of chiefdom did not exist in certain communities, and in some, there was not even a word which carried its meaning (Clastres, 28). Clastres’ observations point to the strikingly egalitarian nature of most hunter gatherers, who knew no slavery or oppression. Thus, it is impossible to claim politics existed as power struggle before civilization.

Peter Gray notes that egalitarian hunter-gatherers’ approach towards their children rests on the same principles as their approach towards adults. Child or adult, methods based on a show of force are not used to control the behavior of any individual; regardless of the age, all individuals are

presumed to know what their own needs are and the needs of everyone is considered to be equal. Adults are not dependent on other people, and children are not either. This prevents individuals, including mothers and fathers, from establishing relations of domination over children. When a child is in need, any member of a hunter-gatherer community and even members of neighboring communities do whatever they can to help the child. Children are free to sleep in any hut they like and change where they sleep as they please. The direct consequence of these practices is that hunter-gatherer children do not have any problems regarding their self-confidence. Free play is the basic educational activity of the hunter gatherer child. Children have the opportunity to observe the numerous activities of adults and their games are shaped by their lives. Games that start by imitating adult activities evolve in time to actually doing what the adults do (Gray, 508-9). In short, in communities where politics did not involve power struggle, education and politics did not have a close relationship like they did under civilization.

Although the first civilization in the Greek geography was the Mycenaeans, the origins of the ancient Greek civilization as it is understood today are in the eighth century BC. According to Bella Vivante, the polis, or the city state, emerged in this tumultuous period, which left the mainstream Greek political scene with three systems: tyranny, oligarchy, and democracy. Writing, borrowing the Phoenician script, and use money reemerged in this period. Some of the first written works of Greek civilization were patriarchal (Vivante, 225-6). The first legal restrictions on slaves were passed by the democratic politician Solon (630 – 560 BC) according to Plutarch (46 – 119), banning them from practicing gymnastics and male homosexuality (Plutarch). The progress into the classical period brought further restrictions on women, notes Vivante, above all in democracies such as Athens, while women

retained some of their traditional power in societies like Sparta (Vivante, 227). The Hellenistic period, which started with Alexander, in turn gave women of upper classes more opportunities than before (Vivante, 227). In the meanwhile, Rome, founded in 753 BC, and made into a representative republic in 509 BC (Hallett, 260), was a patriarchy “in the most literal sense” according to Judith Hallett: the patriarch had absolute power within the household (Hallett, 263). In short, ancient Greek and Roman civilizations were based on patriarchy and slavery from the start, and continued to be so.

The traditional morality of the Greek civilization was based on two people: Homer (fl. 8th Century BC) and Hesiod (fl. 8th - 7th Centuries BC). According to Vivante, Homer’s epics reflected the oral tradition and women were portrayed positively. Even if they were sometimes depicted as booty, the constraints experienced by Mycenaean women were exposed as well (Vivante, 226). Still, Homer’s works also put forward a moral outlook fit for an emerging civilization. Terence Irwin notes that according to Homer, being born into a good family, as well as being rich and strong, are what’s needed to be a good person. Even if such a person behaves badly, they remain good. According to Irvin, Homer further suggests that a person loses half their goodness when they become a slave. Regarding the aspect of morality that is up to a person’s behavior, Homer limits it to being a brave warrior and charismatic leader (Irvin, 7). As for Hesiod, he writes from the perspective of a farmer, and promotes a farmer’s work ethic as a path to wealth, arguing against the seizure of wealth and base gain, and considering God-given wealth much better. Hesiod is critical of women for being wanton, and men for being feeble in his *Works and Days*, and he notably introduces sexism to Greek written discourse, saying “the man who trusts womankind trust deceivers” (Hesiod). The traditional moral values of the Greeks, emerged during

the formative period of the evolution of their civilization. By the classical period, these early works had gained immense importance, but were also fairly new traditions, which made it easier to disagree with them for those who looked up to the more distant past.

Traditional Education

Mark Griffith explains that initially, education in ancient Greek societies was conducted in the family and consisted of the transmission of the family crafts to children; along with Hesiod's *Works and Days* which was orally taught (Griffith, 29-30). Institutional schools, staffed by foreigners and slaves for the most part, emerged in the 6th Century BC, and were usually modeled on their Near Eastern counterparts in their curriculum (Griffith, 33). Overwhelmingly, the function of official, institutional Greek schools was the education of the male children of the elite segments of society (Griffith, 56-57). This being said, alongside professional training in the family and institutional schools which provided basic education, there existed quite a complex system of socialization. Ancient Greek civilization was still new, and still bearing the marks of a tribal society. People of the same ages and genders had special organizations with their own educational processes and rites of passage. Religious cults, craft guilds, military mess hall groups, drinking societies and cult choruses can be counted among such organizations. The organizations, sometimes supported directly by the city state and sometimes sponsored by families or groups of friends, provided education at different levels to help individuals perform various rites of passage, the completion of which meant the acquisition of a certain status in society. Some of these organizations allowed the participation of individuals who were not citizens of the city or even foreigners while others

attempted to create a feeling of equality among rich and poor members. There also existed groups which were open only to the rich or noble families. The organizations which provided the most comprehensive education were also the pickiest when it came to membership (Griffith, 36-41). Overall, this educational social structure must have been a factor that made the philosophical movements possible.

H. I. Marrou (1904 – 1977) notes that in the Hellenistic era, education became subject to official control on a large scale. It was the remnant of the old city state rather than the new empire that was put in charge of education. Accordingly, Marrou guesses that the Hellenistic cities would not have a common curriculum, given they could not even agree on a common calendar (Marrou, 103-4). Children below the age of seven were educated at home by women, either their mothers or their nannies, and then school began (Marrou, 142-3). As for higher education, its most important subject was rhetoric, followed by medicine (Marrou, 194). Compared to the highly civilized Greeks, Marrou claims the Romans were basically barbarians: consequently, the Romans were a peasant people, and Roman education a peasant education modified for nobles. The point of this educational was preparing children for the traditional way of life. (Marrou, 229-31). The basis of Roman education was the family, where the mother was more influential in raising the child than in Greece. At the age of seven, the child would then be entrusted to the father rather than a school. At the age of sixteen came a year of apprenticeship to a public figure, followed by military service (Marrou, 232-3). Yet, as Marrou quotes Horace (65 – 8 BC), following the Roman military conquest of Greece, Greece conquered Rome intellectually and the Romans adopted Hellenistic ways in education (Marrou, 242). First, Greek teachers, many of them slaves, started giving private lessons, then actual schools emerged (Marrou, 246). The principles, the

syllabus and the methods used in Roman schools were copied from their Hellenistic precursors (Marrou, 265). Hellenistic education was adopted by the Romans not because they were culturally inferior to the Greeks, but because such a system of education was most useful for running an empire. Like the social education in Greece, the conservative and traditionalist Roman education had to make room for state organized, systematic education.

Key Questions and Method

According to Marrou “philosophy was a minority culture for an intellectual elite prepared to make the necessary effort,” which “meant breaking with the usual culture” (Marrou, 206). My study examines almost all the major movements of the ancient West¹ that made up the heterogeneous philosophical elite of the antiquity under the titles Pythagoreanism, Socrates and His Predecessors, Plato and Platonism, Cynicism, and Stoicism. Only one major philosophical current is not covered by my study: Epicureanism². The reason for this is because although Epicureanism too was an educational movement, it was not a political one. According to Diogenes Laertius (fl. 3rd Century), Epicurus (341 – 270 BC) did not advise his followers to get involved in politics or efforts to change laws, either by trying to gain power like tyrants or opposing the social system of civilization like the Cynics (Laertius, 531). Although this withdrawal from politics is itself a political position, it nevertheless prevents Epicureanism from being considered a

¹ In the ancient East, we see similar movements in Chinese philosophy, with its schools that can be interpreted as conservative, radical and extremist: Confucianism (Csikszentmihalyi), Mohism (Fraser), and Taoism (Xuyet).

² Other than the Epicureans, I examine the Sophists only briefly among the predecessors of Socrates. This is because the Sophists are so loose and heterogeneous that it's debatable whether they constituted a movement. The Academic branch of Skepticism I examine under Platonism, although I wasn't able to examine Pyrrhonian Skepticism as well as the Cyrenaic and Megarian school due to the insufficiency of sources on their political and educational views.

movement with political goals³. According to Elizabeth Asmis, Epicurus saw a positive function in education only as a tool in acquiring the wisdom to reach happiness, which could only happen by being taught his own doctrine. “Flee all education, hoisting sail” was his advice to his students (Asmis, 215). Thus, Epicurus not only rejected politics, he rejected political education. For this reason, Epicureanism does not belong together with the movements I will examine.

As I look at the relationship between politics and education in each philosophical school, I will be searching for answers to a set of particular questions:

1. What were the political views of each important figure in the traditions I study, particularly related to gender, slavery, and social and economic relationships?
2. How did each figure engage in real-world politics, if they did?
3. What was the political legacy of each tradition?
4. What were the educational philosophies of each figure?
5. What were the educational practices of each figure and tradition? How did they teach? Who did they teach? What did they teach?
6. How did the political and educational thought connect and how did it relate to the overall metaphysics of the tradition?
7. Overall, I will be asking how the political and educational views intersect and what influence this had in history.

To answer the questions listed above, I first of all examined the existing primary and other ancient sources regarding the philosophical movements of the antiquity,

³ Nevertheless, according to the Inscription of Diogenes of Oinoanda (fl. 2nd Century), Epicureans did have a utopia of their own where the wise philosophers would live among other humans without need for laws, castles or slavery, working the land close to nature with their own hands and continuing their philosophical investigations without fear of death, pain or the Gods (Diogenes).

focusing on anything regarding politics, both in the narrow sense of real-world politics, and in the broad sense of gender, slavery and utopias, along with anything regarding all aspects of education, from curriculum to student profile and educational system designs. I took all primary and ancient sources seriously, even when they were anonymous works, as I considered them all to express important clues that would advance our understanding of the ancient world. As for the secondary sources, they were most useful in providing various interpretations of the ancient material which allowed me to discuss the issues with more clarity, as well as providing research on the subject which enriched my historical narrative. Although there are numerous secondary sources that contributed to various chapters of this study, Eduard Zeller's and Doyne Dawson's interpretations of ancient Western philosophy were the ones most central to my work in general. Zeller meticulously covers and interprets numerous ancient philosophical schools from an honest conservative perspective, while Dawson dares to describe the utopias of the ancients without fear of being labeled anachronistic. Although I used numerous secondary sources regarding education, unfortunately I've found none to be as central to my work as these two have been regarding politics and metaphysics.

Realizing the extent of the ancient works that did not survive is necessary for an accurate understanding of the era. This means that we will never get a full picture of the ancient Western world and its numerous philosophical movements. Consequently, all interpretations of ancient political and educational philosophy too will have to be inaccurate in one way or another. The only remedy for this problem is to take the surviving texts seriously, relating them to one another as well as to other historic accounts. Unfortunately, this is an insufficient remedy, there are particular reasons why

certain types of texts tended to survive and certain types of texts did not beyond the importance of the texts in question. This situation, which we can call the bias of history, can only partially be dealt with by taking the few surviving texts and accounts that are contrary to this bias even more seriously.

The work of many educators is tied to larger political projects today. While in the classroom, teachers may hope to do their best to create meaningful improvements in the lives of students, whether these efforts can actually contribute to social change is often determined at the level of policy. It is my hope that this study not only offers the teachers in the classroom level inspirational ideas about helping their students, but also puts efforts at the policy level into historical context, and links these two aspects of education with one another. How has social change been related to education at the dawn of human civilization? How have political ideas related to educational practice? Can educational influence lead to significant social change? Are there limits to what can be achieved through education? Perspectives on these questions might help as teachers as well as policy makers seek a better tomorrow through their educational efforts.

Chapter Breakdown

The first chapter, Pythagoreanism, starts with the life, education and general thought of Pythagoras (570 – 490 BC) (De Vogel, 24), moves on to the political thought and practice of Pythagoras, the downfall of Pythagoreanism in Magna Graecia, and its consequent revision at the hands of Archytas, the last Pythagorean who was the ruler of a city. Then the Pythagorean attitude towards women and the emergence of the female Pythagorean tradition is examined, followed by the writings of Pythagorean women philosophers which shed light to what sort of an education was seen fit for Pythagorean

women and children. Lastly Pythagoras is examined as an educator, from his early days as a tutor to his later practice as a preacher, along with the educational philosophy and practices of Pythagoras and Pythagoreanism as well as the revised educational views of Archytas. Pythagoreanism was a conservative school of thought which practiced a teacher-centered pedagogy. The history of Pythagoreanism reveals the difficulties of a philosophical movement keeping political power after conquering it, and the insufficiency of education alone in realizing political goals on a relatively permanent basis.

The second chapter, *Socrates and His Predecessors*, starts with the predecessors of Socrates (470 – 399 BC) in Athens: the natural philosophers and the Sophists, followed by his teachers Aspasia of Miletus (470 – 400 BC) and Diotima of Mantinea (fl. 5th century BC). Then the social thought of Socrates on questions such as patriotism, wealth and slavery are examined, with a focus on the influence of Euripides, a contemporary and friend of Socrates. This is followed by a study of Socrates' political philosophy, and specifically what ruling means according to the philosopher, as well as his analysis of existing types of regimes, and the primitive and civilized utopias he puts forward in Plato's *Republic*. Afterward, the debate around whether Socrates can be considered a teacher and Socrates' famous elenctic educational method and its application is examined. Lastly the different kinds of students Socrates had, and his educational philosophy, and the ideal or utopian understanding of how education should be are studied. Socrates was the originator of ancient philosophical radicalism and practiced an extremely student-centered pedagogy. The life of Socrates reveals that even a philosopher whose only political activity was education can be considered a major threat by the ruling elites.

The third chapter, *Plato and Platonism*, begins with the political philosophy of Plato as the founder of the most important and long lived Socratic current whose philosophy was nevertheless distinct from that of his teacher, followed by the educational philosophy of Plato as the founder of academia, once again taken as a philosopher distinct from Socrates. I then turn to early Platonism in relation to politics and education, starting with the immediate succession of Plato at his Academy, the phases of the school and renegades like Aristotle, followed by Middle Platonism represented by Plutarch above all and Neoplatonism, the last incarnation of Platonism in antiquity which carried it through the ages, which included a number of philosopher women, the most famous of whom was Hypatia (370 – 415) who ended up a martyr for the cause of philosophy are examined. Though far more conservative than his teacher, thus closer to the moderates, Plato was still a radical even in his old age, and defended a moderated version of Socratic student-centered pedagogy. As for the Platonists, while they continued Platonic educational practices for the most part, some of them were far more radical than Plato while others were basically conservative. The study of late Plato and Platonism reveals that even a current that is not favored by the spirit of time politically can establish itself as an extraordinarily long-lived educational and intellectual tradition.

The fourth chapter, *Cynicism*, begins with the subjects of politics and education in the predecessors of Cynicism, covering figures such as Anacharsis the Scythian (fl. 6th Century BC), Heraclitus (535 – 475 BC), Socrates (470 – 399 BC), Simon (fl. 5th Century BC) and above all Antisthenes (445 – 365 BC). Then, the philosophy of Diogenes, the founder of the Cynic movement is examined. This is followed by political and education views of Crates (365 – 285 BC) and Hipparchia (fl. 4th – 3rd Centuries BC), the successors of Diogenes. Lastly

the trajectory of late Cynics such as Demetrius (fl. 1st Century) and Dio Chrysostom (40 – 115), and also including more minor figures such as Metrocles (fl. 4th – 3rd Centuries BC), Monimus (fl. 4th – 3rd Centuries BC), Menippus (fl. 3rd Centuries BC), and Teles (fl. 3rd Century BC) are examined. The Cynics were an extremist political movement who defended a teacher-centered pedagogy. The history of Cynicism demonstrates that a tiny, unpopular movement which never had even the smallest opportunity of realizing its political goals can nevertheless not only maintain its existence but maintain an orthodoxy for centuries.

The last chapter, Stoicism, begins by focusing on the origins and the early period of Stoicism, including Zeno (334 – 262 BC), the founder of the Stoic school and following the succession of his students, including Cleanthes (330 – 230 BC) and Chrysippus (279 – 206 BC). Then, the relationship between Chrysippus' student Diogenes of Babylon (230 – 140 BC), and his student Antipater of Tarsus (fl. 2nd Century BC), and above all the life of the latter's student Gaius Blossius (2nd Century BC) is examined. This is followed by generalizations made about Stoic theory by ancient authors Plutarch (46 – 120) and Diogenes Laertius (fl. 3rd Century), as well as Eduard Zeller. Lastly middle and late Stoicism is examined, covering figures such as Panaetius (185 – 110 BC), Poseidonius (135 – 51 BC), Cato (95 – 46 BC), Seneca (4 BC – 65), Musonius Rufus (fl. 1st Century BC), Epictetus (55 – 135) and Emperor Marcus Aurelius. The early Stoics were an extremist movement with a teacher-centered pedagogy, while middle and late Stoics were a conservative current that preferred a student-centered pedagogy. The history of Stoicism reveals that it was possible for different incarnations of the same philosophical movement to wage an abolitionist struggle against Rome and conquer power in Rome, still using education as the main though not the only means of political activity.

Chapter 2

Pythagoreanism

Pythagoreanism, as a philosophical, political, religious and ethical movement which had at its heart education, was the first of such movements in the ancient Mediterranean world and thus was a precursor of the Socratic movement and its various offshoots despite having vast differences in the content of their philosophy, politics, ethics and educational practices. As I will argue, the Pythagorean movement, as opposed to the radical movements that followed it, was not only staunchly conservative, but also deeply patriarchal and stubbornly traditionalist. This is exemplified in its teacher-centered educational practices which gave different degrees of education to different segments of the society, reserving the most important teachings however to the select few. This system of education both reflected the Pythagoreans' political vision, and was an important part of their political functioning.

Although Pythagoreanism was a more significant factor in historic progress than radical currents, nevertheless they too failed to dominate the direction of progress. Typical of conservative movements throughout history, Pythagoreanism wanted to conserve the values of the past, but was an outsider in the world of present, which was dominated by moderates. Eventually it was the moderates, spearheaded by democrats who ended the brief political power of the Pythagorean

movement. Nevertheless, the regulated, arguably benevolent version of patriarchy defended by Pythagoreanism should not be considered at fault with the general failure of the movement. In fact, it is rather a factor that made possible its brief particular success. Moreover, while the elitist educational practices and extremely teacher-centered nature of Pythagoreanism were among the causes of its downfall, taken as a whole, Pythagorean education system, certain aspects of which continued to live in religious and above all cult education, contributed more to the main success of Pythagoreanism in emerging as a philosophical current capable of taking power than its failure.

The major ancient sources on the life and thought of Pythagoras (570 – 490 BC), such as Iamblichus (245 – 325), Porphyry (234 – 305) and Diogenes Laertius (fl. 3rd century) have all lived centuries after Pythagoras. Iamblichus was a Neoplatonist who disagreed with Pythagoreanism to a degree, but nevertheless had a great amount of respect for it. He knew the remnants of Pythagoreanism enough to consider there to be a difference between them and the original movement (Iamblichus, 1). Iamblichus' source for the speeches of Pythagoras he transmits to our age is known to be Sicilian Greek historian Timaeus of Tauromenium (350 – 260 BC) (Minar, 106), which shows that he actually tried to reach the oldest sources he could find in his study of the original movement. The accounts of Porphyry, another Neoplatonist, and Diogenes Laertius, an Epicurean, only support Iamblichus' account despite not being as detailed. Moreover, all the accounts on Pythagoras's life and thought form a coherent picture. Among primary sources, *the Golden Verses* is traditionally attributed to Pythagoras and reflects what is known of his philosophy, but its real author is unknown. The writings of Archytas (428 – 347 BC), and the corpus of the works of Pythagorean women philosophers, on the other

hand are considered genuine. All these sources were taken seriously in this study. Perhaps they do not paint as fully accurate a picture of Pythagoreanism as would be available if we could conduct our research in antiquity, but they give a much better idea than what we would have without taking them seriously.

The Life, Education and General Thought of Pythagoras

Porphry, a Neoplatonist philosopher, wrote in his *Life of Pythagoras* that Pythagoras' father Mnesarchus was either from Samos or a Syrian from Tyr who came to Samos later as a trader and was naturalized as a citizen (Porphry, 2). In the section of his *Lives and Opinions of Eminent Philosophers* about Pythagoras, Diogenes Laertius says Mnesarchus was either a Samian or a Tyrrhenian, in any case a Greek instead of a Syrian, and that by profession he was a gem engraver (Laertius, 321). Pythagoras' mother was Pythais according to Iamblichus, and both his parents were of the house and family of Ankaios the colonist. (Iamblichus, 2). Mnesarchus was a rich man and "he gave his son a many-sided education in the most important subjects" (Iamblichus, 3-4). Nevertheless, according to Edwin Minar, the possibility that Mnesarchus was a member of the landed nobility of Samos is at best unlikely: rather he probably made a place for himself in the councils of the mighty thanks to having grown rich (Minar, 3-4). In any case, it can safely be concluded that Pythagoras spent his childhood in privilege, and in all likelihood part of this privilege was as decent an education as one could get in Samos. Consequently, what Iamblichus says about Pythagoras' early education is not hard to believe and must have influenced his thirst for knowledge.

Pythagoras was eighteen years old when he left Samos to further his education and he spent the first four years in Greece (De Vogel, 20). According to Diogenes Laertius, he first

went to the island of Lesbos to study under religious thinker Pherecydes of Syros (Laertius, 321). Diogenes Laertius adds, citing Aristoxenus (4th Century BC), a student of Aristotle, that Pythagoras learned most of his moral doctrines from the Delphic priestess Themistoclea (Laertius, 327). This teacher of Pythagoras, although we know nothing about her, is significant for it shows that Pythagoras was open to learning from a woman, at least a woman clad in the authority of Apollo. Iamblichus counts two other figures considerably more famous than Pherecydes and Themistoclea among the teachers of Pythagoras in Greece. These are the natural philosophers Thales of Miletos and Anaximander. According to Iamblichus, Pythagoras spent time with each of their teachers who shared their thoughts with them. The teacher student relationship described above has the characteristic of love as the teachers take Pythagoras “to their hearts”. Eventually, Iamblichus recounts, Thales, after teaching Pythagoras all he could, cited his old age and told Pythagoras he must go to Egypt where he would come to surpass all others in wisdom (Iamblichus, 5). It has been claimed that Thales himself had studied mathematics and geometry in Egypt and astronomy in Babylon and was seen as a student of Egyptians and Chaldeans (Boyer, 49-50). Consequently, it can be said that if Thales indeed was Pythagoras’ teacher in old age, he may well have directed Pythagoras to become an international student.

According to Iamblichus, Pythagoras traveled to Egypt via Phoenicia and studied the rites peculiar to Byblos, Tyre and other Phoenician cities. When he eventually reached Egypt he visited all the sanctuaries. The priests and prophets of Egypt responded to Pythagoras’ arrival with admiration and affection and they went on to teach him all they could. All in all, he spent twenty-two years in Egypt, learning from all the priests and not neglecting any doctrine, renowned man or rite.

Afterward he was captured by the expedition of the Persian ruler Cambyses and was taken to Babylon where he studied with the Persian Magi, learning mostly theological knowledge in the twelve years he spent with them (Iamblichus, 6, 8) Porphyry is more exact regarding the nature of Pythagoras' studies. According to Porphyry, Pythagoras learned the mathematical sciences from the Egyptians, Phoenicians and Chaldeans. In particular, the Egyptians were masters of geometry, the Phoenicians of numbers and proportions and the Chaldeans of astronomy, divine rites and worship of the gods; "other secrets concerning the course of life he received and learned from the Magi" (Porphyry, 3). Various accounts paint a clear picture: Pythagoras spent decades of his adult life receiving a truly remarkable and unique education. Such an education would be impossible to receive in the Greek world alone where civilization had developed rather recently.

Undoubtedly, the international education he received contributed greatly to Pythagoras' unique metaphysical and ethical doctrine. According to Porphyry, Pythagoras and his followers held that numbers were first principles, and explained their teachings symbolically using numbers. Moreover, Pythagoras believed in the immortality and transmigration of the soul. He observed that after certain periods, events repeated themselves and as such nothing was entirely new. All animated beings, he held, were kin and should be considered to belong one great family, hence cosmopolitanism can be inferred from his thought. Porphyry holds that Pythagoras was the first to introduce these teachings into Greece (Porphyry, 5). According to Diogenes Laertius he defended a particular sort of diet: he forbade eating red mullet, black tail, animal hearts and beans (Laertius, 339). In fact, the diet changes according to the ancient author. In Iamblichus, we find Pythagoras banning eating all living creatures as foods that are unnecessary and unjust

(Iamblichus, 48), making Pythagoreanism an ancient example of ethical vegetarianism. The stricter diet found in Iamblichus is more in line with the belief that all animated beings are kin. In addition, Pythagoras condemned any murder and held that every feud and enmity had to be ended as soon as possible (De Vogel, 121). Pythagoras' general condemnation of murder is certainly in line with his vegetarianism, displaying an ethical objection to harming living creatures.⁴ According to Diogenes Laertius, Pythagoras would punish neither slave nor free man in anger (Laertius, 339). Iamblichus states that Pythagoreans were known to follow this rule (Iamblichus, 85). Nothing else is directly known about Pythagoras' views on slavery: however, it can be inferred that Pythagoras did not have a problem with punishing slaves as long as the punishment was not given in anger, and in general saw slavery as a natural and normal institution.

The Golden Verses, traditionally attributed to Pythagoras, starts by calling for the worship of the Gods, but even that is because they are established and ordained by the Law, demonstrating how important being lawful is. The principle to follow is for one to honor their parents and to befriend only the virtuous. Being good, healthy and patient are seen as virtues, as opposed to being evil, gluttonous, lazy, lustful or angry. Accordingly, it can be concluded that Pythagoreanism defended a traditional morality. All going well, Pythagoras expects nature to reveal to men the most hidden mysteries (Anonymous). Hence, it can be argued that for Pythagoras, polytheistic religion, traditional morality and scientific discovery were connected: thus nature had the agency to reveal her mysteries, and would do so only to the moral. Pythagoras can thus be described as a pioneer for religious philosophy, putting forward a framework bringing together

⁴ Iamblichus says that according to Pythagoras not killing animals makes it harder to kill humans (Iamblichus, 81-82).

metaphysics, ethics and science. Once such a framework was put forward, historic progress may improve this aspect or disrupt that aspect but such the framework as a whole could only be truly advanced by being realized.

Pythagoras' Political Thought and Practice

Politically, Pythagoras held that most allegiance was due to one's ancestors and the law. The laws which were to be respected were those of one's ancestors. The glorification of the law and the ancestral tradition can be seen as giving the nobles a divine right to rule, as argued by Minar. Pythagorean thought harbored a horror of the unregulated, untamed and irregular. What is regulated was held as good, and what is unregulated as evil. Civilization meant harnessing man's impulses rather than releasing his potential. Trust in the government was based on the claim that those who made up the government were the ones who alone could properly interpret the will of the Gods. The rulers needed to be wise lovers of mankind while the ruled had to be not only obedient but lovers of rulers (Minar, 100-102). Pythagoreanism thus taught a doctrine which was completely in line with the interests of the traditional elites, that is the nobility, and suited what they wanted to see in the world.

Pythagoras was no revolutionist. According to Iamblichus, Pythagoreans held anarchy to be the greatest of all evils, for someone had to be in control if human beings were to be saved. Iamblichus elaborates how they were opposed to changing existing, ancestral customs, conventions and laws and suspicious if not outright hostile to innovation. The existing laws were good as they were (Iamblichus, 78). Iamblichus compared ruling to education. The function of the ruler was like that of a teacher and as such required the cooperation of the population, which corresponded to

students. For learning to happen, both the teacher and the pupil had to want it and the same went in ruling (Iamblichus, 80-81). The analogy of Iamblichus above comparing governance with education is significant and could well have been made by an original Pythagorean given Pythagoreanism was an educational movement which managed to acquire state power. In general, as seen above, the political views of Pythagoreanism were quite conservative, traditionalist and elitist, aiming to conserve the land-owning elite's traditional control over government, while opposing other social strata in their quest for power. In turn, these political views were matched nicely by Pythagoras' strictly defined and teacher-centered pedagogy.

Pythagoras returned to Greece when he was, according to Iamblichus, fifty-six years old. He brought with him weights and measures, introducing them to the Greek world (Laertius, 333). This can well be counted as an example of his contribution to scientific progress in his homeland. He first went to his hometown of Samos and then he visited all the oracles around the country, and lastly he stayed in Crete and Sparta to study the laws of these cities. Then, when he returned to Samos, he had a lecture room built in the city which was still called Pythagoras' Semicircle and used by the Samians to discuss their public affairs in Iamblichus' day. Outside the city Pythagoras adopted a cave as his home and conducted his philosophical work there day and night. Here he "perfected his knowledge of heavenly matters" in particular (Iamblichus, 10). Porphyry gives a less detailed yet identical account of the Semicircle and the cave. However, he differs from Iamblichus in regards to why Pythagoras left Samos. According to Porphyry this was because of the tyranny of Polycrates, which Pythagoras considered was becoming so violent that "soon a free man would become a victim of his tyranny" (Porphyry, 3). This version is interesting because

it shows Pythagoras in opposition to the ruler of his native city and afraid for the members of his class, regardless of his views on the importance of obedience to the rulers. It is even possible to conclude that Pythagoras was against tyranny in general from this account.

In Iamblichus, the reasons for Pythagoras' departure are quite different. Iamblichus says that Samians dragged Pythagoras to every embassy and made him share in all their civic duties to such an extent that Pythagoras considered it would be hard for him to do philosophy if he continued to stay. He also wished to avoid mainstream political business so he left the city. Another possibility, also mentioned by Iamblichus, was that he objected to the contempt for education shown by those who lived in Samos (Iamblichus, 11). According to Iamblichus' first story, we see a Pythagoras bored of the attention shown to him because he could not focus on philosophy; according to the second story we see a Pythagoras leaving Samos in reaction to the population or a part of it because they were not interested in education and in all likelihood, receiving the education he wanted to provide. This highlights a critical attitude towards the willing ignorance of people. Iamblichus' first account is idealized and contradicts Porphyry, whereas the second is more realistic, and complements Porphyry. Moreover, the second account demonstrates the importance of being able to educate for Pythagoras, so much that if he could not educate the population of a city, he saw no point in staying with them.

From Samos, Pythagoras sailed to Croton, a colony in Magna Graecia, Italy founded around the 8th century BC, and arrived as a recognized religious and moral teacher. According to Minar, he was perhaps a fanatic at this point and already may have had some experience as a reactionary political agitator (Minar, 7). Minar's choice of the term reactionary to describe Pythagoras' politics is perhaps understandable

given the contemporary political connotations of the term, but nevertheless, as far as we know, rather than reacting to any existing regime and wanting to return to a previous social situation, he wanted to conserve traditional governments. Moreover, even in his patriarchal or pro-slavery views, he defended traditional ideas rather than pushing them to an extreme. Hence, the term conservative is more appropriate to describe Pythagoras' politics. One aspect of Pythagoreanism that was neither reactionary nor conservative, however, was regarding property. According to Iamblichus, Pythagoras ruled that property should be held in common. The followers he soon acquired in Croton followed the will of their master (Iamblichus, 35). Of course for the slaves there must not have been a great difference between belonging to individual masters or collectively to a group of masters. Nevertheless, the Pythagorean dictum of "friends have all in common" was not in line with civilized tradition.

Pythagoras was well received by the citizens of Croton and soon found himself at the center of a movement carried forward by his disciples. The period was one of ferment in religion and the Orphic doctrine had gained a foothold in Magna Graecia, providing fertile ground for the spread of Pythagoreanism (Minar, 8). According to Porphyry, Pythagoras made such a great impression in Croton that he won over the elder magistrates by his many discourses who then asked him to deliver speeches to the youths of the city, followed by the children and the women (Porphyry, 5). According to Roman historian Justin (fl. 2nd century), Pythagoras "frequently gave instruction to the women apart from the men, and to the children apart from their parents" (Justin, 20.4). On the one hand, this shows that Pythagoras acknowledged that men, women, and children experienced different conditions and accordingly had different needs. On the other hand, it can be speculated that Pythagoras

considered these three groups to have inherent, irreconcilable differences. In any case, according to C. J. De Vogel, here was the great achievement of Pythagoras: “the education of the people of Croton as a whole” (De Vogel, 62). Pythagoras certainly seems to have engaged in a systematic effort to educate the Crotonian people including women and children in his basic doctrines according to the ancient sources cited. This systematic educational effort was to play a vital role in the Pythagoreans coming to power and holding it, and seems to have been the principle form of Pythagorean political activity.

De Vogel holds that there was no Pythagorean rule in the sense of a government directly controlled by the Pythagorean Society even if the Society indirectly exercised great influence through government figures who happened to be members (De Vogel, 190). Minar disputes this interpretation, citing that a large number of ancient authors, such as Roman orator, lawyer and philosopher Cicero (106 – 43 BC), Diogenes Laertius, and Iamblichus are in agreement that the Pythagorean Society if not Pythagoras himself gradually came to exercise official, formal control of the city of Croton as well as other cities (Minar, 16). According to Diogenes Laertius, so well did the Pythagoreans govern the city of Croton that its government was in effect a true aristocracy, that is government of the best (Laertius, 323). Of course, the theorization of aristocracy as a form of government had not happened yet in Pythagoras’ time. More importantly, Pythagorean politics preferred the rule of those who traditionally held power to a system of determining those who would rule best from all segments of society. Nevertheless, Diogenes Laertius’ description shows how much Pythagorean statesmanship was respected in the philosophical community throughout the centuries.

According to Iamblichus, Pythagoras “filled with the spirit of freedom through his disciples” in order to rescue

and liberate Sybaris, Katana, Rhegion, Himera, Akragas, Tauromenion and others after Croton. Pythagoras made laws for these towns which, according to Iamblichus, gave them excellent government for years to come. Iamblichus positively states that Pythagoras abolished factions and disagreements, which is divergence of opinion in the lands that were ruled by the Pythagoreans (Iamblichus, 13-14). For the Pythagorean Society to directly become the ruling organ of the state would have violated the ancestral constitution. This would thus have been a violation of the Pythagorean political philosophy too. True to their principles, the Pythagoreans retained the ancient patriarchal form of government with the council of elders as the ruling body. It is rather more likely that a majority of the council of elders as well as most if not all the magistrates belonged to the Pythagorean Society (Minar, 18). In this sense, it can be inferred that the Pythagorean Society was in power like a conservative and traditionalist political party which at the same time happened to be a religious cult as well as a philosophical society. Among the factors explaining the rise of Pythagorean political power, the interests of the nobility, the education of the whole population to respect these interests, and accordingly being in line with what we must presume to be the conservative spirit of the time in the region can be counted. An obvious requirement for the success of the monolithic Pythagorean project, as well as an ambitious aim, the abolition of the differences of opinion could have made it possible for Magna Graecia to unite behind the Pythagorean Society, and establish a regime that would be long-lived, and that could perhaps even extend its philosophy. Unfortunately for the Pythagoreans, as we will see successfully abolishing factions or divergence of opinion was to prove quite difficult.

The Downfall of Pythagoreanism

Clubs with political affiliations already existed in Magna Graecia as well as Greece and according to Minar, it can be presumed that the Pythagorean Society was organized in such lines even if the religious orientation of the society separated it from such clubs. Minar finds it difficult to believe that a purely religious, mystical cult can appear and soon enough come to power and start ruling over quite a large domain (Minar, 24). Minar is undoubtedly correct in that the Pythagorean Society was not just a religious cult; yet the religious aspect of the society likely contributed to its political power. After all, history is full of examples of faith supporting political power. As for the comparison with Greek political clubs, another difference is that the Pythagoreans had a comprehensive political and moral as well as religious doctrine which can be seen as analogous to the ideology of a political party. In contrast, political clubs in Greek cities such as Athens were small bodies which pursued political power. They tended to prefer oligarchy as a form of government but lacked developed social, religious or philosophical aspects. Nor, it should be added, were they interested with education of the public, instead being ill disposed against the people (Minar, 26-27). As such, the clubs in question represented the moderate center rather than principled conservatism.

An elitist movement, the Pythagoreans tended to choose their members from among those with high social status. This being said, they were open to members of all ages. The Society originated among the young men of Croton and its members were called youths. The gymnasium was a place the Pythagoreans were active (Minar, 25). Again, it can be said that Pythagorean Society was like a political party in having a youth wing, preparing and educating young men to positions of wealth and power. Oligarchic groups through Magna Graecia saw great advantage in joining together

in the Pythagorean Society (Minar, 38). Croton expanded during the period the Pythagorean Society was in power and Pythagorean societies that existed in the cities that joined it undoubtedly worked for Croton's expansion. However Croton's rule in other cities preserved their individuality.⁵ In line with Pythagorean political doctrine, it was the local landed elites who maintained power in these cities, and the ancestral constitution was respected. Pythagorean chapters in cities beyond Croton's control were supported and instructed by the center in Croton. (Minar, 27). The centralized nature of the Society, its youth organization and activities demonstrate it to be a true political party.

According to Minar, the Pythagoreans had always been known as foes of democracy. From the start, Pythagoreanism triggered a universal and concerted series of attacks by the democrats (Minar, 17). The man who would come to lead the attack against Pythagoras in Croton was called Cylon. He came to be known in antiquity as Pythagoras' great enemy and had a "tyrannical character" according to Aristoxenus (Minar, 53-54). Pythagoras' enemies declared Pythagorean philosophy to be "a conspiracy against the common people" (Minar, 65). The democratic reaction against Pythagorean philosophy is perhaps understandable given the elitism of Pythagoreanism, however it is nevertheless to an extent unfair. Enmity against common people or even the slaves is not a part of Pythagorean doctrine even if identifying with and preferring landowning elites undoubtedly is. It would be in order to remember that Pythagorean practice involved frequent public speeches aiming to educate the people as a whole. Hence there is no ill feeling against the demos like the oligarchs who swore "I will be evilly disposed towards the demos, and will contrive against it whatever ill I can" as

⁵ It has been claimed that the expansion of Croton was simply military conquest. However Minar disputes this claim (Minar, 38).

Minar quotes Aristotle (Minar, 26). Quite the contrary, though not explicitly stated, the Pythagorean movement probably favored a harmony of social classes as long as each knows its place in line with their general philosophy, rather than conspiring against the demos.

Pythagoreanism eventually arose a great reaction to the extent that Pythagoras himself was expelled from Croton (De Vogel, 25). This reaction to Pythagorean conservatism, spearheaded by the democrats, can be explained with certain sections of society rejecting the role given to them by Pythagoras in his system of social harmony. Despite being led by democrats, it was a moderate rather than radical reaction, triggered by the perception of Pythagorean conservatism as excessive. According to Porphyry, Pythagoras went to Locri where he was refused entry because the Locrians did not want to change their laws. Then he tried Tarentum, was also rejected and eventually he managed to take refuge in Metapontum. Everywhere he went, great riots against him took place which were still remembered in Porphyry's day. Pythagoras died in Metapontum after fasting for forty days (Porphyry, 14). The biggest blow to Pythagoreanism, however, was the setting on fire of the house of Milon, husband of Pythagoras' daughter Myia in Croton, where all the Pythagorean leaders debating political matters were burnt alive. This ended the Pythagorean rule as the city showed no concern for the event and the ablest rulers among Pythagoreans perished (Iamblichus, 104-105). According to De Vogel, this catastrophe happened in the middle of 5th century or a little later (De Vogel, 5) however Porphyry holds that Pythagoras was still alive when it happened (Porphyry, 14). Members of a non-violent movement being burnt alive shows how much hatred Pythagorean elitism had aroused.

As the turbulent political conditions drove Pythagoreanism from Italy, Archytas alone remained and held power in his

native city of Tarentum (Minar, 86). According to Diogenes Laertius, Archytas was the generalissimo of the city for seven times, while law excluded all others from a second term – a violation of original Pythagorean philosophy no doubt. He was never defeated during his military service, however he at one point resigned command and lost the command of the army to his enemies. He was on friendly terms with Plato and the two exchanged letters (Laertius, 393, 395). Archytas followed the Pythagorean dictum of never punishing slaves or rebuking free men in anger. According to Iamblichus, he once became angry with his slaves for doing a bad job, and told them they were lucky he got angry, or else they would not have escaped punishment (Iamblichus, 85) Archytas wrote on numerous subjects, however particularly relevant here are his political writings which show the evolution of Pythagorean political thought. Here Archytas, after defining the characteristics of the aristocratic, oligarchic, democratic and tyrannic constitutions from a neutral standpoint, comes to the conclusion that “the best law and constitution must be a composite of all other constitutions and contain something democratic, oligarchic, monarchic and aristocratic” (Archytas, 87). The quote above demonstrates that Archytas was a different kind of ruler than other Pythagoreans and, without neglecting the elite, did not favor them exclusively. This shows that the Pythagorean movement had drawn some lessons from its experiences and possibly could hold power only by compromising. Nevertheless Archytas was the last of Pythagorean rulers after whom Pythagoreanism continued as a small movement without involvement in governments. Nevertheless, for not following original Pythagorean teachings and the direction he took them, Archytas moved towards the moderate camp, hence he was an imperfect Pythagorean who proved that even the strictest teacher-centered educational system could not prevent revisions of the doctrine.

The Pythagoreans had a detailed political philosophy. As a conservative political movement, Pythagoreanism wanted to preserve civilization by preserving its ancient laws. For a time, the star of Pythagoreanism shone, and favored by both the socioeconomic interests of the nobility and the spirit of the time, it managed to rapidly expand as the ruling power of Magna Graecia. Although the Pythagoreans failed in making the Greek world, let alone the world as a whole according to their doctrine, or even keeping Magna Graecia in their hands, the echo of the limited success of their political theory reflected in their political action set an important example for the philosophical movements that came after them. Nevertheless Pythagorean political philosophy itself failed to advance because it failed to win, and even the most prestigious later Pythagorean ended up significantly revising the doctrine and even abandoning conservatism to a large degree.

The Origins of Pythagorean Gender Philosophy

According to Aristotle, the Pythagorean movement considered male and female to be essential to understanding the structural categories of the cosmos (Huizenga, 11). According to Genevieve Lloyd, femaleness was linked to the unbounded, which is the indeterminate or the vague in the Pythagorean table of opposites, formulated in the sixth century BC. According to the Pythagorean understanding, the universe was a mixture of principles associated with the male determined form which was good, and the female formlessness, which was inferior. Hence, due to the association with the contrast between form and formlessness, Pythagorean cosmology took a hierarchical view to the relationship between the male and the female (Lloyd, 3). The political and educational philosophy of Pythagoras rested on this metaphysics. The cosmos was organized in an

orderly fashion, with male and female elevated to the point of cosmic principles. The male represented order, and in turn ruled over female, bringing order to society in doing so. The hierarchically gendered cosmology of Pythagoreanism reflected the generally patriarchal outlook of the school of thought, which determined what sort of an education it saw fit for women.

Considering that even the cosmology of Pythagorean philosophy is hierarchically gendered, it is perhaps surprising to find that the largest number of known women philosophers in the antiquity belong to this movement. Twenty-six Pythagorean women philosophers has been counted, as opposed to twenty four belonging to other movements, including Platonists, Cynics, Epicureans, Stoics and others (Pomeroy, 56). It should be remembered that these numbers indicate those women whose names are known. Plenty of other Pythagorean woman, often wives and daughters of male Pythagoreans, must have existed, just like other schools of thought may well have had women among their ranks whose names did not survive until today. It should be stated, however, that the high number of known women in the Pythagorean movement compared to other philosophical movements does not mean Pythagoreans had the most favorable position on women's rights. There are two important factors explaining the high number of women among the Pythagoreans. The first is that the Pythagoreans managed to take political power in a significant geographical area, containing numerous cities, and had to find a way to rule over women like they ruled over the men. The second is that Pythagoras considered women capable of receiving an education, and thus his way of ruling over them was to educate them.

Two of Pythagoras' speeches in Croton retold by Iamblichus are worth examining: his speech to the children

and his speech to women. Pythagoras told the children never to start a fight or fight back against those who do. He advised the children to work hard at their education. A good child would easily stay good for life, but one with a bad disposition would hardly do well from a troubled start. Pythagoras told the children that the Gods loved them the best and explained why that was so with religious stories (Iamblichus, 20). Pythagoras' speech to children, like his previous speeches, is educational, particularly aimed at promoting a certain type of behavior and character. According to Sarah Pomeroy's linguistic analysis, it is likely Pythagoras' audience included not just boys but also girls: Pythagoras addressed women as well, so there would not be any reason why he would exclude the girls from among the children (Pomeroy, 26-27). Pythagoras' address to the children is not gendered, supporting Pomeroy's claim. The conclusion is that he must not have favored gender segregation at childhood. If Pomeroy is right, it could further be claimed that Pythagorean metaphysical principles of the male and the female did not apply to children.

According to Iamblichus, Pythagoreans trained their children to behave properly in everything, in a way they realize order and decorum are good things and their opposite, disorder and out of place behavior are disgraceful (Iamblichus, 87). In matters of sexuality, Pythagoreans considered many aspects of human existence better learned late. This meant making sure precocious childbearing would be avoided for girls. Boys had to be brought up so that they would not look for sexual intercourse before the age of twenty, or until they reached youth according to Pythagoras' four periods of life (Iamblichus, 89). It can be said that the Pythagorean attitude towards children's education was protective, especially from the risk of an early pregnancy and facing the responsibility of raising a child while still a child, and paternalistic, considering the lives of children would

be tightly controlled by the behavioral norms established by the ultimate patriarch, Pythagoras. Since the point of a relationship was procreation according to the Pythagorean view on sexuality, heterosexuality was assumed (Pomeroy, 23). Sexual intercourse for pleasure, homosexual or not, was out of the question as pleasure was rejected in principle: “a human being should never be allowed to do as he likes” (Iamblichus, 89). Hence Pythagoreanism was anti-hedonistic and homophobic.

After addressing the children, Pythagoras spoke to the women of Croton according to Iamblichus. After starting with the subject of sacrifices, Pythagoras moved on to women’s relationship with their husbands. Pythagoras preached that it is natural that a woman loves her husband more than her father, adding that women should not oppose their husbands but consider their husbands’ victories as their own. According to Pythagoras, a woman who had sex with her husband was clean enough to go to the temples instantly, but she would never be clean if she had sex with someone else. Lastly he urged women to speak little (Iamblichus, 21-22). This speech is the only reported address to women given by a male Pythagorean (Huizenga, 14). Pythagoras’ speech to women shows him to be a conservative and patriarchal defender of monogamy. Reflecting his metaphysics, as a man Pythagoras is bringing order to formless and inferior women who need this guidance to behave morally. Nevertheless, it would be hard to claim Pythagoras a hard-line misogynist given he attempted to educate women with his speeches. Like previous examples, Pythagoras’ speech to women is educational, promoting a behavioral norm for them.

Pythagoras compared the governance of the household with the governance of the city state. Moreover, according to Pythagoras the relationship a man had with his wife, children, siblings and other relatives had to be characterized

with friendship. Even older people had to respect and be kind towards younger people (Pomeroy, 25). Thus, while favoring men over women and elders over youths, that is while favoring the patriarch, he wanted relations between everyone to be benevolent and peaceful. This benevolence was reflected on women in numerous ways. First of all, Pythagoras forbade violence against women and wife abuse. Secondly, he extended the time the wife was treated as a suppliant from the initiation of a marriage to its entirety. Last but not least, when asked by the women of Croton to urge self-restraint on their husbands, meaning they give up their concubines, Pythagoras told the men what their wives asked him to (Pomeroy, 19-20) and according to Iamblichus, the men agreed (Iamblichus, 59). All this show early Pythagorean patriarchy to be benevolent, regulated and receptive towards the input of women while at the same time being strictly monogamous and heterosexual. It can be further claimed that the harmonious relationship between genders in Pythagoreanism reflects the cosmic harmony of its metaphysics.

The first Pythagorean woman philosopher was Theano of Croton, who first became Pythagoras' pupil and later his wife⁶ (Waithe, 11). Theano tried to clarify the Pythagorean cosmology which saw the universe as an orderly and harmonious whole where everything was mathematically related. It was in her work that the concepts of the immortality of the soul, transmigration of the soul and divine justice were linked for the first time. Moreover, Theano tried to clarify that in Pythagoras' cosmology, everything was according to numbers rather than being made up of numbers (Waithe, 11-12). Theano was a strong supporter of monogamy and had a generally patriarchal perspective. Stobaeus quotes several of

⁶ There is some confusion about whether Theano was Pythagoras' wife, or that of the Pythagorean Brontinus of Metapontum or Croton who according to other accounts is her father (Pomeroy, xx).

her apothegms which say married women could not have other lovers and women who broke their marriage vows could never be pure. Theano defined the duty of a married woman as “pleasing her husband”. In her view romantic love was “the natural inclination of an empty soul” (Waithe, 14). Moderation was the backbone of women’s behavior according to Theano. Besides, she taught her students not to be jealous of their husbands, to be harmonious with them and not to spoil their children (Rullman, 36-37). Theano was an important figure in Croton as she led the wives of the Crotonians (Huizenga, 93). Theano of Croton became famous even among the neighboring barbarians as well as kings and rulers as a wise woman (Pomeroy, 6). The Pythagorean movement aimed to have women in their ranks with speeches to women, and Theano must have played a leading role in the education of women who were attracted to Pythagoreanism. Her views completed those of Pythagoras and there is no reason not to consider her as important an educator of her time as her husband was.

The education Pythagorean women received in the early days of the movement likely was similar to the one received by the men, but probably focused much more on womanly tasks and how a woman was to behave properly. Nevertheless, we know that at least Theano and Pythagoras’ daughters were educated in more than that. For example, Arigotne defined the eternal essence of number to be the most providential cause of the sky, the earth and all that is in between (Waithe, 12). Another of the couple’s daughters, Damo was entrusted with all the secret writings of Pythagoras after his passing, a vital task which would only be entrusted someone deemed worthy of it by the Pythagorean Society (Rullman, 36). What is certain is that with Pythagoras’ efforts to reach out to women which lead to female disciples such as Theano who became an influential member of Pythagorean Society, a female

tradition of Pythagorean philosophy was born even though it was patriarchal from the start. Given there was no ultra-patriarchal backlash against the Pythagoreans' benevolent patriarchy, the existence of a female Pythagorean tradition was certainly a factor that contributed to the limited successes of the movement rather than its general failure.

Pythagorean Education for Women after Theano

Dating from 425 BC to 100 AD according to Mary Ellen Waithe (Waithe, 19) and late second century to early second century AD according to Anette Huizenga, Pythagorean woman following the footsteps of Theano and her daughters left twelve complete texts, nine of which are letters and the remaining three discourses. The authors are Pinthys, Perictione, Melissa, Theano II and Myia (Huizenga, 12). Another author, from whose book on *Human Nature* only fragments remain, is Aesara of Lucania, who put forward a natural law theory based on an introspection into the nature of the human soul. Aesara's theory investigated three applications of moral law: individual morality, laws governing the family and laws governing social institutions (Waithe, 19). Aesara's complicated theory is surely as educational for those who want to study it as any philosophical tract, however it lacks the particularly pedagogical aspect of some of the other Pythagorean women's texts.

The discourse of Phintys, from a Spartan family of Tarentum and daughter of Callicartidas who died in battle in Arginusae in 406 BC, titled *On the Moderation of Woman*, is one where the author clearly aims to educate her audience. Phintys argued that moderation was the most appropriate virtue for woman, on account of which she would be able to honor and love her husband. Like other Pythagoreans before her, the question of adultery was important to Phintys but in

particular, unlike other Pythagorean woman who wrote on the subject, she focused on the adultery of women and had nothing to say about the adultery of men. Phintys, though not very strongly, defended the idea that women could become philosophers, and wisdom was common to both sexes, though it belonged more to men than to women whereas political activity and public speaking belonged to men and staying at home and indoors and welcoming and serving her husband belonged to women. Lastly, Phinthys advised women not to indulge in mystery rites and celebrations of Cybele in order to be moderate. (Pomeroy, 103-105). Given people of both sexes came together to enjoy music and dance in celebrations for Cybele, an Anatolian goddess of nature whose priests were transgender (Roller, 149-151), it is telling that Phintys had no tolerance for such an area where pre-patriarchal relations still existed. In addition, it would not be surprising if the author was transphobic. In Phintys' text we see the original patriarchal positions of Pythagoras and Theano further developed, while Phinthys' assertion that woman can be philosophers is a position in line with the Pythagorean tradition. The education offered by Phintys is in effect teaching women their place.

Positions different from what we see in Phintys can be found in Perictione's discourse titled *On the Harmonious Woman*, written in the fourth to third century BC. According to Perictione about whom we have no information other than that she was a Pythagorean philosopher, a harmonious woman was full of wisdom and self-control. Self-sufficiency was among the qualities a woman needed to be harmonious. A harmonious woman who knew goodness would do well for her household, husband and children and if she ruled a city, she would do well by the city too. Perictione too was opposed to extramarital relationships but she mostly dealt with the bad consequences such affairs would have for

women. Nevertheless, Perictione too preached that a woman had to bear all that her husband bears and endure his temper, stinginess, complaining, jealousy and abuse (Pomeroy, 72-73). Perictione's approach is different from Phintys' in that she can positively consider a woman ruler, showing that women taking part in public life could be acceptable to some Pythagoreans. Also, Perictione seems to have emphasized the interests of the household rather than the interests of the man. Hence she taught a less patriarchal approach with her discourse even though she was still patriarchal.

The letter of Theano II, a different Theano than Pythagoras' wife, to Eubole aimed to educate not on how to behave as a woman but a practical subject: motherhood. Theano II was decidedly against raising children in luxury, instead arguing that the mark of a good mother is "education with a view to temperance". Indulging the child's pleasure would make the child undisciplined according to Theano II, and then the upbringing of the child would be their downfall. The aim was to prevent the child from becoming a slave of their feelings, greedy for pleasure and shrinking from pain. It was wrong for a mother to take pride every time her children laughed, to take alarm every time they cried out and to keep them unnaturally cold in summer and hot in winter. Theano II gave the example of poor children who, lacking all those niceties, still manage to grow up and indeed become stronger. Theano II advised the nourishment of children to be austere rather than sumptuous, arguing that they should suffer hunger and thirst, cold and heat and even shame before their peers or superiors. Hardships served as tools for hardening children, which lead to them being virtuous (Pomeroy, 78-79). The Pythagorean teaching about motherhood is notably not gendered, in line with the general Pythagorean attitude towards children. Otherwise, Theano II advises Eubole to be a hard mother, caring not for the daily happiness of children but

for their future. Given the Pythagorean approach to pleasure, it is hardly to surprising that Theano II wants children shaped by hardship.

In another letter Theano II educated young women on managing the household. According to Theano II the primary authority of woman in the household was over the slaves, whose good will was “the greatest thing”. This quality in slaves was not their own but was brought about by intelligent mistresses. Theano II acknowledged that slaves were human in nature. According to her, maltreatment of slaves, overburdening them with too many tasks and depriving them of their needs was the most unprofitable thing that could be done, leading to ill will and the worst treacheries. Reasoning, rather than cruelty, was the effective means of controlling the slaves (Pomeroy, 85). Theano II’s approach towards slaves is benevolent, and develops the Pythagorean principle of never rebuking a slave in anger. Notable is the basic observation that slaves are human and lacking is a general questioning of slavery because of this observation. Pythagorean women, who we understand were rich enough to own slaves, were educated with arguments appealing to their self-interest when it came to treating their slaves well.

Lastly, there is the letter of Myia, named after one of the daughters of Theano and Pythagoras, addressed to Phyllis, dating from the third or second century BC. Myia’s letter included advice on motherhood, including how to choose a nurse for the child. According to Myia, choosing the nurse was the responsibility of the woman. Myia advised Phyllis to choose a well-disposed, modest and clean nurse who is not excessively sleepy and who does not drink too much. Judging how to bring up the children was best left in the hands of such a nurse. Myia’s advice on motherhood was particularly about newborns, and involved much softer conditions for the baby than what Theano II advised for children, such

as holding off altogether from wine or adding it sparingly in the mixture of evening milk, occasional baths at a mild temperature and keeping the air at a suitable balance of heat and cold (Pomeroy, 111, 113). Myia's letter is the most striking example that the education she offered came to be from a need to transmit knowledge on matters vital to society such as motherhood. This education was of course only available for the elites favored by Pythagoreans.

The Pythagorean women's letters survive materially as a corpus, rather than as individual letters. This shows that it has been possible for ancient readers interested in these letters, most likely Pythagoreans, to read, study and discuss the letters as a single entity, as a part of a collection would not be read by itself (Huizinga, 47). The Pythagorean women's collection of letters was considered valuable (Huizinga, 52), which means that it would be difficult for women from the lower classes to access them. The authors of the letters wanted to reach an audience of elite women. The authors took the part of teachers with the authoritative tone of their discourses and letters beyond their lives and the totality of their texts made up a real curriculum. (Huizinga 30-31). This was, overwhelmingly, a curriculum of womanhood, being taught by women, which included practical skills, patriarchal values and some disagreements. Despite the latter, unlike Pythagorean political philosophy in general, Pythagorean views on gender do not show signs of a significant revision of the original doctrine. For the most part, they reflect a collective Pythagorean voice, and if it was not for the few disagreements, the voices of individual Pythagorean women would be difficult to discern. In any case, for the intellectual life of the women of a certain socioeconomic strata, these teachings must have had a significance beyond the confines of the Pythagorean movement. This being said, it was not possible for both the strict and the benevolent aspects of

Pythagorean gender theory to be realized on a large scale in ancient society due to the general defeat of Pythagoreanism.

Pythagoras the Educator: From Tutor to Preacher

According to Diogenes Laertius, Pythagoras wrote three books that did not survive to our day, *On Education*, *On Statesmanship* and *On Nature* (Laertius, 327). Yet his image is not that of an educator, a politician or a scientist. De Vogel says that contemporary evidence portrays Pythagoras as a kind of shaman and asks if a shaman can be a scientist at the same time (De Vogel, 1). Scientist, at least in the modern meaning, Pythagoras may not be, however we have to answer the question of whether a shaman can be an educator in the affirmative. Iamblichus gives “several examples of Pythagoras’ ability to give rational education to beasts and non-rational animals”. That Pythagoras’ instruction could reach non-humans is given as a testimony of his power to educate. Iamblichus has Pythagoras train a bear not to eat meat by feeding her bits of bread and fruit. Pythagoras can communicate with the animal, and takes an oath from the bear that she would never attempt to catch living creatures. In another example, we see Pythagoras whispering into the ear of an ox to successfully stop the animal from eating beans (Iamblichus, 24-25). Even when he is talking to animals, that is even when he is actively being a shaman, we find Pythagoras focused on educating his audience. The stories of Iamblichus depicting Pythagoras as such have the purpose of showing how great an educator Pythagoras was considered.

Pythagoras gave two sorts of education: the education of his students, and public education of various sections of society. His life as an educator, however, started with the former. Herodotus (484 – 425 BC) retells a story he has heard told on the shores of Hellespont and Pontus about Pythagoras

and his slave Zalmoxis in Samos. After obtaining his freedom, Zalmoxis left Samos and went back to his homeland of Getae, taking with him all he had learned from Pythagoras and other Greeks. According to the story retold by Herodotus, there Zalmoxis taught the doctrine of immortality, in all probability inspired by Pythagoras' doctrine of the immortality of the soul. Zalmoxis then retreated to a chamber he had built underground, leaving his countrymen to think he was dead. After three years he reappeared, proving his doctrine of immortality. Zalmoxis had become the God of the Getae by Herodotus' time. Herodotus, while neither disputing nor accepting the story about Zalmoxis, comments that Zalmoxis lived earlier than Pythagoras (Herodotus). Nevertheless, in Porphyry, we see Zalmoxis described as not only the slave but also a disciple of Pythagoras. According to Porphyry, Pythagoras instructed Zalmoxis "in sublime speculations concerning sacred rites, and the worship of the Gods". Porphyry adds that barbarians worshiped Zalmoxis as Hercules (Porphyry, 4). We will never know how much truth there is to these accounts, but a student of Pythagoras who has learned not only his metaphysical doctrines but also the art of politics, ruling his people as a God is not an altogether implausible story. This story demonstrates the influence of Pythagoras as a teacher of individual students.

Another early student of Pythagoras, though this time unrelated to supernatural powers, was Astraeus, entrusted to Pythagoras by his father Mnesarchus. Pythagoras first studied the physiognomy and body motions of Astraeus and consequently decided to accept him as a student and started to instruct him. The student was first of all taught "the science about the nature of man," that is he began to discern the disposition of everyone he met. No one was allowed to become Astraeus' friend without his facial expressions and disposition being examined (Porphyry, 4). We can interpret

this as an education in social relations, which without a doubt would benefit Astraeus' future career. We do not know what else Astroeus was taught by Pythagoras. Like with Zalmoxis, Porphyry does not tell us the exact period Pythagoras had these students. Nevertheless, given the setting for both cases is Samos as Zalmoxis was a slave there and Astraeus was entrusted to Pythagoras by his own father, we must imagine Pythagoras must be quite young when he had these students as they probably date from before his own studies abroad.

After Pythagoras returned to Samos from his studies, he had to make more of an effort to have students according to Iamblichus. He chose a talented and well-coordinated ball player at the gymnasium who also happened to be called Pythagoras. His student was athletic and muscular but lacked financial resources. Pythagoras asked the young man if he would become his student and learn teachings Pythagoras had learned from foreigners when he was young but which he was forgetting due to old age, in exchange for a generous financial subsidy. Pythagoras' educational motto was to teach "in installments, painlessly, consistently, so as not to be overburdened". Pythagoras set out to teach his student arithmetic and geometry. Using a drawing board, he demonstrated every point and he paid his young student three obols per geometric figure. Pythagoras taught this young man for a considerable time and arose in his student a passion for education. When Pythagoras was sure his young student would not abandon his studies willingly, he pretended to be poor and stopped paying the three obols. His student said he did not mind but Pythagoras responded that he needed to be paid now as he could not pay for the necessities of life. His student responded that he would pay his teacher three obols per figure now. According to Iamblichus, this young Pythagoras followed his teacher when he left Samos for Croton (Iamblichus, 9-10). How Pythagoras

uses money as an incentive to arouse a student's interest in education is interesting. Pythagoras does not actually seem to care about making money or breaking even, but uses money for the sake of getting a student interested in the things he himself has learned. Pythagoras is portrayed as an excellent teacher in having aroused his student's interest sufficiently that the student is willing to pay for the courses he was paid to receive. This way, Pythagoras' educational effort does not end up a loss for the educator and through the repayment, the student's appreciation of his education is expressed.

As mentioned earlier, from the time Pythagoras arrived in Croton, he started giving public speeches. Examples of these speeches can be found in Iamblichus. Iamblichus source for these speeches is Sicilian Greek historian Timaeus of Tauromenium, and the same or similar speeches are referred to by the Aristotelian philosopher Dicaearchus (350 – 285 BC). Hence, it can be inferred that the source material these authors used for the speeches at least must have existed in the fourth century if not earlier. Indeed it has been claimed that the speeches are the work of a Pythagorean of the fifth or fourth century who summarized the moral doctrines of Pythagorean Society (Minar, 106). However, if there's to be speculation about the possible source of the speeches, it can also be speculated that they are based on original speeches by Pythagoras which were transmitted, either in a now lost written form or orally until they were put to writing whenever they did. In any case, the fact that we read them today in the work of Iamblichus is no reason to consider the speeches anything but genuinely representative of Pythagoras' philosophy.

According to Iamblichus' account Pythagoras speech to the young men of Croton took place on the gymnasium spontaneously as the youths of the city gathered to hear Pythagoras. The philosopher first of all urged them to respect their elders because in areas of existence what comes before was considered more honored than what comes later. Thus

the youths had to value their parents highly. Pythagoras extended those deserving of respect to the ancestors who, with the parents, were the reason young men came to be. Elders in general were to be respected. Next, Pythagoras spoke of friendship and said that the key to successful relationship was to treat friends in such a way that they would never become enemies. Self-control was alone among virtues to deserve the efforts of boys and girls, women and old people and above all young men (Iamblichus, 15-16). It should be noted that Pythagoras' speech is thoroughly educational in that it has the clear aim of installing a certain kind of behavior on the young men of Croton, one which would make them obedient not only their own parents and elders, but to the elders who ruled the city in general. Pythagoras also said natives were more honored than newcomers (Iamblichus, 15), effectively arguing for nativism and mild xenophobia, again showing the influence of his politics. Thus it can be said that the behavioral education of Pythagoras had a political content too, and besides, Pythagoras hoped to spread his political views with his speech to the young men of Croton.

Pythagoras' speech to the young men is also interesting for including Pythagoras' philosophy of education. Upbringing, according to Pythagoras, separated humans from animals. Hence, Pythagoras saw education as the primary reason for the human civilization. Iamblichus says Pythagoras gave the youths many arguments from history and philosophy to show that "education is the collective genius of those outstanding in every subject, for their discoveries have become the education of others". The quote above shows that studying the discoveries of the polymaths was an important aspect of Pythagoras' conception of education. One particular characteristic that made education so important was that other objects of praise either could not be received from someone else or could not be kept if given away, education could be given without loss. If the young men were educated, they

would take up the country's business not for self-conceit but because of their education (Iamblichus, 17). As it can be seen, Pythagoras' educational philosophy was distinctly political in that political activity was seen as the result of education, and education determined the nature of consequential political activity. Here, it's clear that end goal is a society based on law, reflecting the orderly cosmos of Pythagorean metaphysics.

In another one of the speeches found in Iamblichus, Pythagoras addressed the Thousand who governed the city of Croton. The elites of the city were happy with Pythagoras' speech to their sons and asked Pythagoras if he had any advice for them. Iamblichus says Pythagoras started by giving some religious advice about temples that should be built. Then, the subject came to politics as Pythagoras told his listeners they should see their country as a deposit made by the mass of citizens to rulers which would one day be inherited by their descendants and had to be preserved for that occasion. As it can be seen, while the masses had the role of depositing, rule was seen as being justly seated in the hands of Pythagoras. Here Pythagoras is making political propaganda rather than educating. Nevertheless, the speech has some aspects of moral and behavioral education even towards the elders of Croton. For instance, Pythagoras preached that the rulers of the city should not swear oaths by the Gods but be trustworthy without having to swear oaths. Pythagoras put forward an early conception of the slogan stating that the personal is political. Men had to manage their households in such a way that their political principles could be seen in their private conduct. Children were to be treated generously while wives should be treated considering their contract with the men was sealed in the children. Men had to know only their wives, and were to set an example of discipline and self-control both in the household and in the city (Iamblichus, 18-19). As it can be seen, the educational aspects of Pythagoras' speech to the ruling elite of the city aims at developing behavior according

to the moral aspect of his doctrine, not only as rulers but also in their family life. Men's rule of family reflected the inferior position of the female principle in the Pythagorean metaphysical hierarchy. Lastly, the speech is also interesting in that it can be inferred from it that Pythagoras saw no age limit to learning.

In all these examples, as well as the ones cited earlier, it has to be concluded that Pythagoras' public speeches firmly demonstrate that at the center of his educational philosophy was a classic example of the teacher-centered method. Accordingly, the philosopher transmits wisdom to the public through a lecture designed according to their social position. The students have no initiative. They should not question let alone disagree; all they need to do is to listen and follow Pythagoras' advice for the teaching to be successful. Designed to meet the most basic needs of different social segments, Pythagoras' public teachings are to be swallowed like a pill. It should of course be added that considering the political philosophy of Pythagoreanism envisaging everyone to know their place in a well ordered metaphysical cosmos, Pythagorean philosophy of education could not be anything but teacher-centered. Regardless of whether one approves of it results, this philosophy of education has to be acknowledged as extremely effective in the short term. The Pythagorean movement itself shows that thanks to such a system of education, it was possible for a philosophical current to take over and run a country.

Pythagorean Educational Theory and Practice

According to Diogenes Laertius, Pythagoras made a periodization of life which, considering he was an educator, is quite interesting for his time. The first twenty years of a man's life was spent as a boy, the next twenty years as a youth, the next twenty years as a young man and the last twenty years as an old man. The periods corresponded to

spring, summer, autumn and winter. A youth was someone who was considered not yet grown up, while a young man was considered a mature adult (Laertius, 329). Lacking an understanding of adolescence, Pythagoras included that part of a person's life in childhood rather than adulthood. This could be seen as a pedagogically protective attitude towards those who were considered older children. Moreover, that maturity is not considered reached until the age of forty shows Pythagoras to have a conservative attitude to who gets to be considered mature. Then again, it may be speculated that Pythagoras simply observed people start obtaining the privileges that come with a mature age at around forty. In any case, Pythagoras' periodization of different aspects of a man's life reflects his traditionalist politics, and is also in line with his pedagogical approach of educating different segments of society separately.

Given he's known to have had female disciples, Pythagoras must have accepted male as well as female students to his society. Nevertheless, according to Iamblichus, Pythagoras did not believe in educating everyone who wanted to learn from him. Pythagoras would put his would-be students through an examination and then make a judgment. He first asked the would-be students how they got on with their parents and other relatives. Then he observed if they laughed at the wrong moment, whether they could remain silent and whether they talked too much. Afterward he asked them what their desires were, how they spent their days and what made them happy and sad. He also asked them if they knew any of his students and what their relationship was like in what can be described as an ancient form of references. Lastly Pythagoras took into consideration their physical form, walk and general coordination as according to him physical characteristics were visible evidence of the habits of the soul that were otherwise unseen (Iamblichus, 31). He considered whether they could "hold their peace," whether they could

learn all they heard and keep it secret, and whether they were modest, peaceful and friendly. Lastly he looked at their ability to learn and their memory (Iamblichus, 42). Reflecting Pythagoreanism's teacher-centered nature, the philosopher notably had full authority in this process, and the student had none. Moreover, though the educational value of Pythagoras' behavioral criteria seen above for testing character is debatable, given an irreplaceable part of Pythagorean education was behavioral, this criteria is not irrelevant to the education he was providing even if judging character from physical traits in an examination would not be considered acceptable by the standards of today for good reason. This superficial restrictiveness of Pythagorean education can well be seen as a fatal mistake which contributed to its downfall.

Those who were examined thus were then sent away and ignored for three years. This was done to test the initiate's constancy and genuine love of learning. Then came a five year silence to test the self-control with the control of the tongue, considered the most difficult form of self-control. During this time, students started to hold their property in common, which was entrusted to particular students called civil servants. These students managed the finances and made the rules for other students. If the candidate students were seen worthy, they could join the inner circle after five years which meant they could now see Pythagoras rather than hear him teach behind a veil. Students who failed this years-long test of character were given double their property and treated like they were dead by their fellow hearers, as Pythagorean students were called after the period of silence (Iamblichus, 31-32). Not only was admission to the Pythagorean Society difficult and limited, but the stages of admission resulted in a hierarchy of grades and ranks within the society⁷ (Minar, 29). However, beyond any hierarchical

⁷ There were exceptions to how the admissions and educational advancement system worked according to Iamblichus, who describes Abaris the Scythian who,

organization, these practices of initiates during the first eight years of their education in the Pythagorean Society certainly resemble practices that could be seen in a religious cult, most notably being ignored for three years, the five year period of silence and seeing the cult leader from behind the veil. Such practices certainly contributed to the mystical aura and esoteric nature of the Pythagorean Society although ignoring the students for three years or forcing them to be silent for the first five years of their studies cannot be described as good educational practices even if they probably produced the desired results in the students who passed the tests. Specifically, it can be speculated that the period of silence may have had an effect beyond self-control, reinforcing the teacher-centered Pythagorean educational practice by creating unquestioning discipline among the students. The Pythagorean political movement may well have been aided by such disciplined behavior and devotion displayed by the members of the movement. This being said, though initially very effective in creating a strict hierarchical mechanism when the teacher was the great Pythagoras, it proved difficult for the movement to continue to be successful exactly due to its teacher-centered pedagogy without such an educational leader. The Pythagorean teacher-centered approach does not seem to have produced strong successors, and it is telling that the only major Pythagorean political leader after Pythagoras revised rather than followed the original doctrine.

In Iamblichus' time, the Pythagorean school had long been neglected because their unfamiliar doctrines and secret symbols hid them from view (Iamblichus, 1). Pythagoras rejected the idea that one should philosophize in public, instead striving to "keep the teaching safe". Hence those who shared the teaching with mere adherents who had not

with no experience of Greek education and being advanced in age, skipped the five year silence, the long period of being a hearer and other trials. Pythagoras elaborated his philosophy and taught Abaris theology and natural science in summary form (Iamblichus, 41-43).

been properly instructed and thus lacked learning were reproached (Iamblichus, 32). It's not surprising that the most necessary form of teaching was teaching by symbols according to Pythagoras. Pythagorean symbols, derived from the Egyptians, had a riddling form and concealed the content of the teachings as much as possible. Only those who could perceive the meaning and unspoken content of these symbols could actually understand the Pythagorean doctrine, and to those who did not, hearing or reading a Pythagorean would seem absurd and full of nonsense. The purpose of the use of symbols was to exclude the uninitiated and to protect the doctrine (Iamblichus, 46). Pythagoras gave his lessons in a symbolic form unless, of course, he faced a larger audience, in which case he explained mythological data and ancient legends in an ethical and allegorical way (De Vogel, 161). The esoteric nature of Pythagorean philosophy made the study of symbols an important part of the curriculum offered by the Society. These practices makes it possible for Pythagorean education to be considered an education in becoming a member of a highly sophisticated cult. Unlike the other aspects of Pythagorean education cited as its weaknesses, the practices described above cannot be considered as such. This is so because they represent more classical aspects of esoteric education which has survived even to our day in religious cults.

According to Iamblichus, the starting point of Pythagoras' system of education was recall of the past lives one's soul lived before entering the current body. This had to be understood before the truth could be learned in other matters according to Pythagoras. He aroused in many of his encounters a strong remembrance of an earlier life, and gave "indisputable proofs" of his own past lives (Iamblichus, 25-26). Perhaps by today's standards, the practice described above is empty superstition which has nothing to do with education. Yet if it's considered that the transmigration of the soul is an essential Pythagorean

doctrine, the practice in question becomes completely educational in a Pythagorean curriculum which was, after all, religious in the sense that it required students to have faith. Accordingly, this aspect of Pythagorean education cannot be considered a weakness. Nevertheless, it certainly emphasized the central role of the teacher in education, and in particular of Pythagoras as the teacher. An educator like Pythagoras, capable of recalling the past lives of the student, sets up a very difficult example to emulate. Consequently, when considered as a factor contributing to the teacher-centered nature of Pythagorean pedagogy, educational practices like this certainly contributed to Pythagoreans' failure in continuing to exist as an influential movement.

The next step was training the senses, and by doing this Pythagoras further educated his students. In particular, Pythagoras made use of beautiful shapes and forms as well as beautiful rhythms and melodies. In Iamblichus' words, Pythagoras "restored the souls of his associates through music," healing their human temperaments and passions. He orchestrated what was called arrangements and treatments for his students with which he, according to Iamblichus, turned grief, anger, pity, misplaced envy, fear, all sorts of desires, appetite, wanting, empty conceit, depression and violence into their opposites (Iamblichus, 26-27). Thus, it can be seen clearly that not all aspects of Pythagorean education were spiritual. The training in shapes was most likely a precursor to education in arithmetic and geometry while musical education was used to treat all sorts of psychological problems the students may have had. This also shows that students were not necessarily turned down for having psychological problems.

Pythagoras established a daily regime for his students to observe. The day at the Pythagorean Society started with a morning walk in isolation in a peaceful and quiet location. After the morning walk, students met each other in sanctuaries

or similar places. The time after the students got together was spent with teaching, studying and with the amendment of character. After the study time was over, students turned to care for their bodies. A common practice was getting oiled and running races. Some wrestled, some jumped with weights or shadow boxed. Students choose their own exercise. After lunch, the students spent time dealing with the affairs of the Society as well as with politics, in writing laws to settle the affairs of outsiders. In the evening again they took walks, but this time with other students rather than alone, recalling what they had learned during the day. After their bath, dinner and libations, they read as the final activity of the day (Iamblichus, 43-44). Here we can observe a balanced educational plan for the day, aimed at producing multifaceted members of the school. Moreover, it's notable that Pythagorean education leaves certain choices to the student despite being teacher-centered.

One of the main subjects Pythagorean students studied was philosophy. The hearers' study of philosophy consisted of the study of maxims of Pythagoras without demonstration or argument. The maxims were preserved as divine teachings. Hearers made no claim to speak for themselves and did not think it was right to speak. Those who have acquired the most axioms were considered best equipped for wisdom. The maxims were in question and answer form and were of three kinds, starting with "what is?," "what is the most?," and "what is to be done or not done?". Some examples can be found in Iamblichus such as "What is finest? Harmony," "What is best? Happiness," "What is the most just? Sacrifice," "One must have children" and "Do not seek to have children by a rich woman" (Iamblichus, 36-37). The way Pythagorean hearers studied philosophy reflects on the dogmatic nature of Pythagoreanism as a philosophical tradition. After all, if the Ionian tradition of natural philosophers which preceded Pythagoreanism is considered, it has to be concluded that

philosophy was a richer area than what the Pythagorean hearers were studying. Moreover, in the philosophical study described above, there is no room for discussion given the divine nature of the maxims.

According to Iamblichus, Pythagoras was the first to call himself a philosopher. Iamblichus takes the term to mean someone who studies that which is the finest as opposed to other traditions (Iamblichus, 23). However, the Socratic meaning of philosopher as in someone who loves wisdom but does not claim to have it yet as opposed to a sage who already has wisdom is lost on Pythagoras who certainly comes across more as a sage and less as a philosopher in this sense. Thus we have in Pythagoreanism a current characterized with following what “the Master said” (Iamblichus, xviii), that is the doctrine of the founder of the Pythagorean school of thought. As an educational movement, Pythagoreanism was dogmatic to the core, however this dogmatism seems to have served the movement well politically. In De Vogel’s words, Pythagoras teaching his students was “a form of indirect education of the masses,” which was supplementary to his “direct pastoral teaching” (De Vogel, 67). Without a doubt, having a multitude of students dogmatically dedicated to his divine personality and doctrine made Pythagoras as powerful a political actor as an educator could become. The fact that his political and educational philosophy was backed by a lawful metaphysics capable of answering cosmological questions only added more to that power.

Lastly, a look at the educational views of Archytas is in order so that the evolution of Pythagorean thought can be estimated. The only treatise of Archytas where he goes into educational subjects is titled *On Disciplines*. In this treatise, the ruler of Tarentum starts by advising his reader to become scientific. There are two ways this can be achieved: either by learning from a teacher or by discovering them alone. Archytas estimates the latter better than the former

for what is learned from someone else is foreign, yet what is learned through discovery belongs to the discoverer. In addition, Archytas stresses that discovery will be easy if one investigates however if one does not know how to investigate, discovery will be impossible (Archytas, 181). Archytas does not answer the question of how one can learn how to investigate, however it's likely his answer would be that this could be learned from someone else, otherwise Archytas would be rejecting education completely. Archytas stresses the importance of science, signifying a change from the early Pythagorean movement. Moreover, Archytas' approach to education is apolitical. These changes are likely a result of reflections following the defeat Pythagoreanism suffered in Magna Graecia. Given Archytas' political philosophy is a revision of Pythagoreanism; it's not surprising that his educational philosophy also constitutes a revision.

The descriptions of Pythagorean education analyzed above clearly constitute a system of education, with a clear line separating education for the masses and education for the elite. This was a teacher-centered education which situated wisdom at the hands of the philosopher. It was this tightly controlled system of education that the Pythagoreans conveyed their gendered metaphysical and political doctrines to the people as well as those considered worthy of being their students. The success of Pythagorean education in uniting the nobility and convincing the people for a moment, although remarkable, does not match its failure in losing the masses and the remaining Pythagorean nobility revising the political and educational doctrine. This failure was due to a moderate backlash spearheaded by democrats to what was seen as the excessive elitism of Pythagorean conservatism. This elitism may have been Pythagorean education's most major weakness too. Limiting the teaching of their core doctrine to a small elite, and the education of the people to the subject of ethics may have contributed to the downfall of

the movement. This did not prevent Pythagoreanism from being an intellectual force which deeply influenced other, rival philosophical currents of antiquity, and which had to be dealt with by all. The contribution of Pythagoreanism to historical progress is thus relatively large, but ultimately small, because the socioeconomic factors that initially favored it did not stand by it, and as the times changed, so did their spirit, leaving Pythagoreanism outdated.

Conclusion

The Pythagorean movement was a major philosophical, political, religious and moral movement of antiquity and it was the first of ancient philosophical movements. Like the rest of these movements, Pythagoreanism was also an educational movement, and it educated its members as well as the general public. Although in Pythagoras' speech to the young men, he saw education as a good in itself, the Pythagorean movement used education as a tool to instill a particular set of political values as well as a particular mode of moral behavior in their students and to a lesser degree the public. Education was essentially the main and most important political activity of the Pythagorean movement. The teacher-centered system of education developed by the Pythagoras and continued by his followers had its faults, but it contributed to the successes of the movement more than it did to its failures.

Unlike most movements that followed it, the Pythagorean movement was staunchly conservative, stubbornly traditionalist and deeply patriarchal. Pythagorean patriarchy was benevolent and regulated while at the same time it put women in an extremely submissive role and defended a strict form of monogamy. Pythagorean education aimed to put both men and women in a certain behavioral mold according to its worldview. The benevolently regulated patriarchy of Pythagoreanism must be considered a factor in

its success rather than its failure, for it enabled a loyal female Pythagorean tradition, and there is no record of a backlash against Pythagoreanism for not being patriarchal enough. Given at least one of Pythagoras' slaves is counted among his students, it can be argued that Pythagoreanism may have provided certain members of the slave class an opportunity for education, even if Pythagoreanism was not particularly favorable towards slaves. Moreover, although the teacher-centered and elitist nature of Pythagorean education did contribute to its loss of political influence, overall the Pythagorean system of education helped rather than hindered the school's early success. Pythagorean education was not determined by the politics of the movement, but it was in line with it, and specifically with the culture of following the master. Similarly, Pythagorean metaphysics did not directly determine either the political or the educational philosophy of the movement, though it too was certainly in line with both.

Typical of conservative movements throughout history, Pythagoreanism wanted to conserve the values of the past, but was an outsider in the world of present, which was dominated by moderates. Eventually it was the moderates who ended the brief political power of the Pythagorean movement. Pythagoreans made their mark by becoming minor contributors to the historic progress of human civilization they worked so hard to preserve in the traditional form of their day, to the extent that they had the backing of a socioeconomic section and were in line with the spirit of time. Moreover, although they could not prevent civilization from evolving, the Pythagoreans can be considered more successful in their attempt to preserve civilization than radicals in their effort to change it. Nevertheless, the failure of Pythagoreanism shows that while education was necessary and effective as the primary form of political activity, it proved insufficient when it came to realizing the political goals of the movement by itself.

Chapter 3

Socrates and his Predecessors

The indisputable importance of Socrates (470 – 399 BC) to the history of philosophy is only enhanced when his thought is examined in a holistic way. Thus, we see a philosopher actively following an agenda, an educator, and through education, the unexpected leader of a loose political and ethical movement. Radical in most ways, extremist or conservative in others, though rarely if at all moderate, systematic critique of patriarchy starts with Socrates' thought. Nevertheless, it should be noted that Socrates' views on not only gender but also slavery and xenophobia have contradictory aspects. These contradictions should be interpreted as connected to Socrates' attempts to reconcile his radicalism with the reality of the society of his time rather than a contradiction between his political and educational philosophy. Socrates and the movement he started can only be understood if its political and educational basis is understood together. Reflecting his politically radical and extremist ideas, in the field of education Socrates deserves credit as the originator of student-centered pedagogy. Moreover, Socratic pedagogy cannot be described as elitist as Socrates was willing to converse with anyone, even if he had a taste for a particular kind of student.

Socrates failed in his ambitious goal to cause a dramatic shift in the course of civilization according to his philosophy and dominate the direction of progress. Indeed, Socrates

failed so spectacularly that it is safe to assume he did not have a chance to start with. His followers were always a small minority with no real chance of taking power, making the Socratic movement at most an undercurrent. An ardent critic of the civilization of his time, his thought was subversive towards traditional civilized values to the extent that he had to base his views on the times before the emergence of civilization. The moderates at the helm of the slow historic progress of civilization had no time and eventually no tolerance for Socrates. That they considered him such a threat, however, shows that there is nevertheless reason to think his movement was favored by the spirit of time to a degree. Socrates' egalitarian position on gender may have been a factor in the stigmatization of the philosopher and his movement. Nevertheless, not ignoring the intellectual heritage and potential of half of humanity must have benefited Socrates and his movement more. The same cannot be said of Socrates' pedagogy, which was so student-centered that soon after his death, all Socratic currents significantly revised Socrates in one way or another. Nevertheless, taken together, the offshoots of the Socratic movement constitute a massive heritage, which shows that Socratic pedagogy had its advantages compared to its rivals too. Moreover, Socrates remained a vitally important predecessor of and influence on the offshoots of his movement despite all the revisions.

Before moving on further, however, it is necessary for me to explain the perspective I used in this study on what has been called the Socratic problem. As is well known, Socrates did not write anything⁸ and is known from what others wrote representing his views. Hence, Bertrand Russell notes that the uncertainty at the heart of the Socratic problem is how much

⁸ In Plato's *Phaedrus*, a middle dialogue, Socrates likens writing to painting, noting its stillness compared to speech (Plato 1, 453). He must have considered the living oral tradition to be more important than writing or painting.

we know about Socrates (Russell, 82). My approach to this issue involves taking ancient sources seriously. According to some, such as Jakub Filonik, any dialogue of Plato (427 – 347 BC), or in fact any work on Socrates is certainly not historical and should be treated as literary fiction (Filonik, 57). This position has been voiced by many others. John Burnet warns his readers against this approach which claims we really know nothing of Socrates. According to him, Plato can be compared to Shakespeare in ability to suppress his own personality while writing (Burnet, 149-150). A. E. Taylor too rejects the idea that Plato used Socrates as a mask or as an imaginary ideal of a philosopher. According to Taylor, the fact that Plato, in his later dialogues, shifts the central figure from Socrates to others, such as Pythagoreans, an unknown visitor from Elea or an anonymous Athenian, shows that his historical sense prevented him from associating his own doctrines with Socrates (Taylor, 26-8). Taylor makes a strong argument that Plato was trying to convey an accurate portrayal of Socrates in his dialogues. One does not have to consider that Plato's Socratic dialogues offer a completely accurate portrayal of Socrates or is free from bias in order to take them to be major historical and philosophical documents about Socrates written by a student. Moreover, for instance as Avi Mintz reminds us, Aristotle refers to the system described in *the Republic* as Socrates' rather than Plato's (Mintz, 10). Thus, in this study, all the early and middle dialogues of Plato were taken to be sources on Socrates as well as his teachers Aspasia of Miletus (470 – 400 BC) and Diotima of Mantinea (fl. 5th century BC).

Another problem that confronts those who attempt to develop a solution to the Socratic problem is the difficulty of separating Socrates from Plato (Guthrie 1971, 5). Luckily, there is another major source depicting Socrates: the writings of Xenophon (431 – 354 BC). According to Taylor, "except one or two points of detail" Xenophon does not contradict anything

Plato says: he only leaves certain things out and in fact at times confirms Plato's account in remarkable ways (Taylor, 21, 24). In fact, a more recent study has shown that the contradictions are not as few as Taylor makes them: Louis-Andre Dorion's partial list includes seventeen important differences between Plato and Xenophon's accounts of Socrates (Dorion, 95-6). It can be said that these differences contradict those who claim that Xenophon simply copied Plato. W. K. C. Guthrie also notes that despite differences, Plato and Xenophon's accounts coincide (Guthrie 1971, 5). It can be concluded that Plato's and Xenophon's accounts differ and coincide as the accounts of two people with different worldviews about the same person they both cherished might. Accordingly, it is necessary to take Xenophon's Socratic works too as historical and philosophical documents which are not completely free from bias. In this study, all the Socratic works of Xenophon were taken to be sources on Socrates.

Plato, according to Taylor, was the inventor of the Socratic dialogue as a literary form (Taylor, 32). In fact, according to Diogenes Laertius (fl. 3rd century), Simon the Shoemaker (fl. late 5th century), an Athenian artisan and friend of Socrates started the tradition of writing dialogues by making notes of all he could remember on the subjects Socrates talked about when he was in his shop to meet youths to discuss. Simon wrote thirty three dialogues, which were extant on Diogenes Laertius' day though none of them remain today (Laertius, 119-20). There are, however, fragments of another friend and student of Socrates whose name was Aeschines of Spettos (425 – 350 BC). (Zeller, 245). These fragments, which are very few compared to Plato and Xenophon's works, were taken to be sources on Socrates, and more importantly, Aspasia in this study.

Other than the four mentioned, Susan Prince lists ten other writers of Socratic dialogues⁹ (Prince, 75). The dialogues

⁹ These are Crito (469 - 4th Century BC), Antisthenes (445 – 365 BC), Glaucon (445 - 4th Century BC), Aristippus (435 – 356 BC), Euclides (435 – 365), Simmias (fl.

written by some of these authors were questioned in the antiquity: Diogenes Laertius reports that the conservative Stoic philosopher Panaetius (185 – 110 BC) considered the dialogues of Plato, Xenophon, Anthisthenes and Aeschines to be genuine while he was in doubt about those written by Phaedo and Euclides and he rejected the rest (Laertius, 95). In fact even Plato was disputed in the antiquity, and according to Diogenes Laertius it was claimed that the first who accused him of putting words into his mouth was Socrates himself (Laertius, 151). H. I. Marrou correctly notes that much more about Socrates would be known if the lost dialogues were available (Marrou, 62), even those written by authors who were born after the death of Socrates, but heard about his deeds and thoughts from his students who were their teachers. In lack of these dialogues, I have also taken the relevant parts of the Cynic Epistles to be a source on Socrates, thinking that even if they are not considered authentic, they represent the memory of Socrates transmitted by a major Socratic movement as an important influence.

The Athenian Predecessors of Socrates

Socrates, who would grow up to be the first major philosopher of plebeian background, was born as the son of a stonemason and a midwife (Laertius, 70). His father traced his lineage to Daedalus, the legendary craftsman, as doctors traced theirs to Asclepius. According to Guthrie, it is likely that Socrates was first taught and practiced his father's craft, before he deserted it for education (Guthrie 1971, 58-9). In Plato's *Symposium*, a middle dialogue, his appearance was likened to a satyr (Plato 1, 532). So his physical appearance certainly did not correspond to upper class norms of beauty, yet what he lacked in appearance he made up for in character.

5th – 4th century BC) and Cebes (430 – 350 BC), Phaedo (fl. 4th century BC), Stilpo (360 – 280 BC) and Theodorus (340 – 250 BC).

According to Russell he was known to dress in old clothes and go barefoot. Additionally, he could resist hot, cold, hunger and thirst like no one could. He seldom drank wine but when he did, no one could out-drink him (Russell, 90-1). These qualities, which Socrates probably acquired gradually, made him a truly unique and attractive personality, unlike anyone witnessed by the Athenians.

The most important of Socrates' predecessors, Pythagoras, was not an Athenian. The conservative movement led by Pythagoras had conquered and lost Magna Graecia more than two decades before Socrates was born, however without a doubt the story of the rise and fall of the Pythagorean movement was still fresh in philosophical circles in Socrates' time. There are both metaphysical and political connections that can be seen between the philosophies of Pythagoras and Socrates. The most notable metaphysical idea the two philosophies have in common is the immortality of the soul, while politically common property is the most important point of convergence. In both cases, naturally it was the Pythagorean doctrine that influenced Socratic thought. Moreover, the Pythagorean experience with taking power has to be seen as an inspiration for the Socratic idea of philosopher rulers.

Discounting Anacharsis the Scythian (fl. 6th century BC), the outspoken barbarian philosopher who visited and lived in Athens, and was later killed in his homeland for being considered subversive (Laertius, 49), the first philosophers who came to Athens were natural philosophers. According to Marrou, initially natural philosophers were pure scholars who had no interest in teaching. Their first step into education was writing their doctrines which started with Anaximander (610 – 546 BC) (Marrou, 46). It was probably Anaxagoras (510 – 428 BC) who brought natural philosophy to Athens¹⁰. He became

¹⁰ Or, alternately, it was Archelaus, his student (Laertius, 69).

the teacher of the politician Pericles (495 – 429 BC) (Taylor, 62) who, according to Plutarch, was the leader of democratic Athens for forty years (Plutarch). In Plato's *Phaedrus*, Socrates says that Pericles applied what he learned of Anaxagoras' philosophy of the mind to the art of speaking (Plato 1, 445). Diogenes Laertius gives several conflicting accounts of the fate of Anaxagoras. In all the accounts Anaxagoras is tried for impiety in Athens for declaring the sun to be a red hot mass of iron; in most Pericles comes forward to save his life; in one he kills himself because of the shame brought by the trial and in others he is exiled (Laertius, 67-8). Thus, persecution of philosophers did not start with Socrates in the ancient world, as it did not start in Athens.

In *Phaedo*, a middle dialogue by Plato, Socrates talks about how interested he was in natural philosophy when he was young (Plato 2, 227). Diogenes Laertius reports that according to some, Socrates may have studied with Anaxagoras¹¹. Taylor claims Anaxagoras had a school in Athens, and Archelaus (fl. 5th century BC) replaced him after his condemnation. According to Taylor, Socrates was a member of this school (Taylor, 69). According to Burnet, Socrates and Archelaus had a relationship which lasted for many years¹² (Burnet, 124-5). Eduard Zeller states that Socrates had a general acquaintance with the different views of almost all the other natural philosophers too (Zeller, 57). Eventually, however, Socrates ended up disappointed in natural philosophy, concluding that he had "no head for it" (Taylor, 68). In Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, we see Socrates criticizing speculations about the cosmos, declaring these problems to lay beyond mortal understanding and instead proposing to focus on human

¹¹ This is contradicted by Socrates account of getting hold of a book of Anaxagoras, studying it and being disappointed by it in *Phaedo* (Plato 2, 227).

¹² Though Burnet denies it, an interesting detail to note is the claim by Aristoxenus (fl. 4th century BC), transmitted by Diogenes Laertius, that Socrates and Archelaus were lovers (Laertius, 71)

matters (Xenophon, 7-8). In his rejection of natural science, or at least how it was practiced (Zeller, 135), Socrates thus delved into the humanities. The natural philosophers likely had a teacher-centered method of education which was not flexible enough to keep a student like Socrates among them with his fundamental disagreements. Nevertheless, in all likelihood, it was natural philosophers who introduced Socrates to philosophy, and in this capacity they deserve to be counted among his predecessors. It should be noted that it was not natural philosophy alone that Archelaus was interested in according to Diogenes Laertius: he discussed laws, goodness and justice too, and held that the just and the shameful existed not by nature but by convention (Laertius, 69). In all these, Archelaus seems to have been a particularly significant early influence on Socrates beyond natural philosophy.

In the lifetime of Socrates, another important intellectual tendency arose in ancient Greece. They were called the Sophists (Guthrie 1977, 35). According to Guthrie, who cites the use of the term to describe people like Pythagoras (570 – 495 BC) and Solon (630 – 560 BC), originally, sophist had been synonymous with sophos, or sage. (Guthrie 1977, 28). In Socrates' day, the term was used to describe a particular kind of professional educator who sold his services for a price. Taylor notes that the humanities have their origins in works of the Sophists, or "paid educators of men" (Taylor, 61). According to Guthrie, they were rivals with each other and thus cannot be considered a school (Guthrie 1977, 47). Guthrie also notes that though it has been said that the Sophists had nothing in common, in fact there are important similarities between them other than them being paid teachers. For one, all of them taught rhetoric. Almost all of them claimed to teach virtue as well (Guthrie 1977, 44-45). Taylor adds that other than teaching ethics, the Sophists also taught politics, or how to conduct the affairs of the city well (Taylor, 61). According

to Marrou, they were not philosophers at all, but simply and purely educators (Marrou, 48). Marrou later describes the Sophist attitude to philosophy, seeing it as a good thing within limits, to the extent that it aids the mind and leads to a proper education (Marrou, 57). It can be easily concluded that the Sophists were educators first, most probably using a teacher-centered approach, however it should not be forgotten that they had numerous views beyond what has been described above which can well be described as philosophical. Simply because they mostly came out of natural philosophy, were critical of it, and pioneered the humanities, they deserve to be considered among the predecessors of Socrates. This being said, it should not be forgotten that Socrates was very critical of the Sophists.

It would be in order to briefly mention the leading Sophists. Perhaps the first and most famous of the Sophists (Guthrie 1977, 263), Protagoras, a student of Democritus¹³ (460 – 370 BC) the atomist (Aulus Gellius, 154), was not from Athens but visited the city and befriended Pericles (Guthrie 1977, 263). He was the first to teach for a fee, and Marrou says the sum he demanded was so high that it would be impossible to afford on a qualified worker's salary (Marrou, 49). Protagoras was an agnostic and he openly said he did not know whether the Gods existed or not (Guthrie 1977, 234). Moving from his principle that man is the measure of all things, he considered that there were two sides to every argument (Guthrie 1977, 24). Protagoras divided his students into two: those who were studying to enter politics and those studying to become Sophists (Guthrie 1977, 37). Protagoras shared the philosopher's fate in the end, and was tried in Athens and later either killed or exiled. His books were burnt by the Athenians (Filonik, 36). After Protagoras, the most major Sophist was Gorgias of Leontini (483 – 375 BC) who,

¹³ Democritus was also a strong supporter of democracy (Russell, 72).

according to Guthrie, was a student of Empedocles (Guthrie 1977, 269). Gorgias held that nothing exists, that if something existed it cannot be known, and that if it can be known, it cannot be communicated (Higgins). Wolfsdorf states that, in his speech at the 408 BC Olympic Games, Gorgias called for Pan-Hellenic unity against the threat of the barbarians (Wolfsdorf, 67). In *Meno*, an early dialogue of Plato carrying the name of a student of Gorgias, the title character defends a patriarchal view of virtue. Accordingly, the virtue of a man is to know how to administer the state whereas a woman's virtue can be described in that her duty is to order her house and keep what is indoors and obey her husband. Young and old, male and female, bond and free all have a different kind of virtue according to *Meno* (Plato 2, 22-23). Another student of Gorgias, Alcidas (fl. 4th Century BC), opposed slavery with the following words: "God has set all men free: nature has made no man a slave" (Guthrie, 159). Another Sophist worth mentioning is Prodicus (465 – 395), whose lectures were more affordable compared to those of Protagoras. According to Guthrie, Prodicus gave an anthropological explanation to the question of the origin of religious belief, which he saw in gratitude. (Guthrie 1977, 238-9) Of the Sophists, Socrates respected above all Prodicus, as well as Protagoras and Gorgias to a lesser extent, but more importantly his exposure to the heterogeneous influence of Sophist philosophy contributed to the sharpening of his own views.

Politically, however, it is difficult to consider the Sophists to be an influence on Socrates. Marrou, who discusses the relationship between the rise of the Sophists and democracy, warns against seeing too close a connection and presuming the Sophists rose to meet the needs of a new class of democratic politicians. Marrou notes that Greek democracy tended to recruit its leaders from among old noble families, and that among the wealthy clientele of the Sophists, there were

members of the nobility as well as the newly rich (Marrou, 47). Marrou is right in that there is no indication that the Sophists openly declared for democracy or opposed oligarchy. That nobles too wanted to learn from the Sophists, however, does not disprove the connection between the Sophists and democracy: in fact, since, as Marrou says, nobles tended to become leaders of democracies, it would be expected that the Sophists taught them too. Moreover, Protagoras' views have been described as democratic by Guthrie (Guthrie 1977, 24), and Robinson has gone as far as calling him a democratic political theorist (Robinson, 113), while adding that Gorgias too was probably from a democracy and traveled to other democracies to teach his art, which he had developed to be practiced in courtrooms, popular assembly meetings, council sessions and anywhere the masses needed to be convinced (Robinson, 115-6). Nevertheless, we should not forget that the art of Sophistry could be used by anyone who could afford it, and it was not only democracies in which students of the Sophists became leaders but also oligarchies. Zeller says that in both kinds of regimes, students of the Sophists tended to fail to be successful statesmen (Zeller, 218). Though they taught for politics, there is no indication that the Sophists had a detailed political philosophy. This may have been why their students ended up as they did.

Though it is well known that Socrates was at least as critical of the Sophists as he was of natural philosophers, some have claimed Socrates himself to be a Sophist. Zeller, for example, says that if Sophist means a public teacher educating youth for practical life, Socrates, was the true type of Sophist (Zeller, 208). Socrates even enjoyed lessons from Prodicus on the distinction of synonyms according to Ritter (Ritter, 17), although in Plato's *Meno* he says Prodicus educated him poorly (Plato 2, 75), and he says he did not take lessons from Prodicus because he could not afford them in

Plato's *Cratylus*, an early or middle dialogue (Plato 1, 277). In any case, according to various dialogues of Plato, Socrates took the Sophists seriously, respected them and spent time discussing with them as a young man. He must have learned from these encounters. Nevertheless, according to Socrates, it was deeply problematic for the Sophists to be so focused on rhetoric. In *Gorgias*, an early dialogue of Plato, Socrates makes the point that rhetoric creates a belief about things just and unjust without actually teaching about justice (Plato 2, 299). Socrates has no use for creating a belief about justice, but every use for actually learning about justice. This hollowness was an important weakness in Sophistry according to Socrates. The end result of rhetoric was that the rhetorician who did not know about a subject would have greater power over it than the actual practitioner who knew, but did not know how to speak because it was with rhetoric that the ignorant were persuaded. (Plato 2, 303-4). In my view, simply because Socrates rejected the Sophist focus on rhetoric, as well as other central characteristics of the Sophist current¹⁴, Socrates cannot be considered a Sophist. Moreover, although the Sophists, like the natural philosophers, were the immediate predecessors of Socrates, their views and approaches were so different that Socrates negated their thought rather than advanced it.

The Women Who Taught Socrates

Two woman philosophers of antiquity deserve to be counted not only among the predecessors of Socrates, but as his teachers. Though they are rarely mentioned in accounts of Socrates' education, these philosophers, if accounts of their relationship with Socrates are taken as seriously as they deserve to be, are the ones who influenced him the most. The first of these two philosophers is Aspasia of Miletus, who,

¹⁴ The Sophists were not just public educators of youth but paid educators, for one, and Socrates had an issue with their claim to teach virtue.

possibly around 450 BC, immigrated to Athens as a metic or resident alien. Around the time she moved to Athens, Pericles lead a famous law on citizenship, restricting it to persons who had two Athenian parents (Henry, 10-11) so the path to citizenship was closed to Aspasia. Madeleine Henry says that she was portrayed as a hetaera, or a concubine, and a pornai or a prostitute in comedies of 5th century BC (Henry, 10). It is possible that she was the former, though extremely unlikely that she was the latter. Hetaerae tended to have a small number of clients, with whom they formed intellectual as well as romantic and sexual relations (Kurke, 107-8). According to Henry, sometime after her move to Athens, Pericles himself fell in love with Aspasia, and they even had an extramarital child (Henry, 13) According to Charles Kahn, when Aspasia was tried for impiety as it was common for philosophers in Athens, Pericles pleaded her case in tears and begged the judges for her acquittal (Kahn, 99). Again, according to the comedies of her time, Aspasia influenced Pericles' political policies¹⁵ (Henry, 10). In Henry's view, Aspasia, traditionally described as a highly intelligent woman, probably greatly benefited from the love of a powerful and wealthy man who gave her the opportunity to develop her mind in ways not open to most women of her time (Henry, 13). Aspasia had no known teachers, though we should assume that she must have received a decent education as she became a teacher herself.

According to Henry, because of Aspasia's longstanding reputation as a teacher and member of the intellectual elite, it has been customary to categorize her with the natural philosophers and the Sophists (Henry, 5). Indeed, as Mary

¹⁵ Nevertheless, it seems Aspasia did not manage to influence Pericles views on women as Thucydides reports Pericles saying that women should "cause least talk among males for either praise or blame" (Thucydides, 96). While Pericles' remark shows that he expressed the patriarchal views of his time, Aspasia certainly was talked about for good and otherwise among men, and presumably women too.

Ellen Waithe notes, like the Sophists, Aspasia taught rhetoric (Waithe, 78). A hetaera was expected to be well equipped in speech and conversation (McClure, 265), and if Aspasia was a hetaera she must have mastered the practice. In Plato's *Menexenus*, an early dialogue, Aspasia is described as the teacher of Socrates as well as Pericles in the art of rhetoric (Plato 2, 550). It would be wrong to think Socrates' criticisms of the Sophists' use of rhetoric applies to Aspasia. As can be seen in *Phaedrus*, Socrates was not actually against rhetoric in itself, which he compared to medicine, saying medicine focused on the body whereas rhetoric focused on the soul (Plato 1, 445). It should be added that Aspasia was not interested in rhetoric alone. In Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*, Socrates promises to introduce his interlocutor to Aspasia, who can explain matters of domestic management in a far more scientific way than he can. After citing Aspasia to base his views on hers, Socrates states that a good wife must be her husband's "counterpoise and counterpart," who are to manage the affairs of the household together (Xenophon, 27). First of all it can thus be concluded that Aspasia taught more than rhetoric, and her teachings included household management. Secondly, it needs to be said that Socrates citing Aspasia for what can be described as equivalent if not equal roles for the husband and the wife shows that Socrates' radical views on gender may well have had their origins in the teachings of a woman philosopher.

One of the most major works about Aspasia is Aeschines' dialogue carrying her name. According to Kahn, this dialogue is thought to have been written around the same time Plato was writing some of his earliest dialogues (Kahn, 105). Henry notes that Aeschines' portrayal of Aspasia differed radically from the portrayal seen in comedy. Henry discusses whether Aspasia was represented as a hetaera in the dialogue as it has been claimed, and concludes that this is unlikely because

wives of respectable men associated with her in the dialogue (Henry, 41-2). It can be speculated that Aspasia was originally a hetaera whose probably monogamous relationship with Pericles changed the perception of her for some. In any case, Kahn reports that in the dialogue, Callias, who has spent more money than everyone else on the Sophists, asks Socrates to recommend a teacher for his son. In response, Socrates recommends Aspasia. Callias is shocked, so Socrates goes on to define Aspasia as a follower of two other great women, the fictitious Amazon-like Persian queen Rhodogyne and the Milesian hetaera Thargelia who married a Thessalian prince and after his death ruled for thirty years afterward (Kahn, 95-6). Then Socrates goes on to praise Aspasia for her role in Pericles' political career (Kahn, 97) something which one of his own students, Antisthenes, was vocally critical of (Henry, 32). Socrates is thus praising Aspasia not only as an educator, but a political figure comparable to the most glorious leaders of her sex remembered by the ancient Greeks.

Aspasia's ability in teaching rhetoric and politics, both to Pericles and to Lysicles whom she married after Pericles' death and transformed from being a humble sheep dealer to one of the most important men and best speakers in Athens, is given as an example of her ability as an educator (Lampe, 91). In a fragment of the dialogue preserved by Cicero (106 – 43 BC) in his work titled *On Invention*, we see Aspasia instructing Xenophon and his wife in their marriage. Trying to teach them to be happy with each other by posing numerous questions, Aspasia treats the husband and the wife as equal partners. Her method of instruction, according to Cicero, is the same as the one used by Socrates (Cicero). Kahn claims Aspasia must have died before Xenophon was old enough to be married (Kahn, 100), however considering Xenophon was around thirty years old in 400 BC (Nails, 301) when Aspasia is thought to have died, the encounter is not necessarily unlikely

(Nails, 58). If we take this evidence seriously, we have to conclude that Aspasia is not just at the origins Socrates' radical views on women but also what has been called the Socratic method. Accordingly, Aspasia is among the first philosophers who we see use a student-centered rather than a teacher-centered approach, though the teacher nevertheless retains an important role in the educational process as well as a political agenda. Thus, she can well be described not only as an educator, but a political figure who used education as her main tool, and whose political and educational views were in line with one another.

Another important work that features Aspasia is Plato's *Menexenus*. In this dialogue, Socrates recounts a speech Aspasia wrote for Pericles which elaborates her philosophy. In this dialogue, Aspasia says that earth is the mother of men, and has taken care of human beings like a mother would. According to Aspasia, earth being a mother does not mean earth is an imitation of woman but, quite the contrary, woman is an imitation of earth. Even the Gods were given to human beings by earth to be their rulers and teachers, and to order their lives, says Aspasia. Gods taught humans the arts to supply daily needs and to use weapons "for the defense of the country" (Plato 2, 552). It should be noted that though this speech has been considered an example of Aspasia's rhetoric, she also puts forward a form of natural philosophy with the earth as *arkhe* or first principle. The conclusion to draw here is that Aspasia was not only familiar with the doctrines of the philosophers from her homeland, she was also critical of them and had her own answer the problem of *arkhe*. Socrates must have agreed with this view for not only does he report Aspasia's speech uncritically, but he also says, in Plato's *Cratylus*, that earth is a mother (Plato 1, 324). Also, her association of Gods with crafts and war can be seen as similar to the anthropological approach of Prodicus, with the

difference that her approach is not atheistic, but instead sees Gods to be subordinate to nature or earth. As with natural philosophers, Aspasia was probably aware of the doctrines of the Sophists and had her criticisms of them too. If we take the views attributed to Aspasia to be her own, we need to admit that we have at hand an original and remarkable philosopher and educator.

From her speech in *Menexenus*, we can see that Aspasia not only had a natural philosophy but also a political philosophy. In her speech, Aspasia defines government as the nurture of men. According to her, the government of good men is good and of bad men is bad. She describes the Athenian government to have always been an aristocracy, including when it is called a democracy, which is nothing but a government of the best which has the approval of the many. Kings, says Aspasia, we've always had, though they were hereditary first and elected later. She goes on to paint a rather idealized picture of Athens of her time, where no one is rejected for weakness or poverty or obscurity of origin, nor honored for the opposite reason. She rejects tyrannies and oligarchies, where one part of citizens are slaves and others masters. Aspasia expresses belief in the principle of natural equality of birth and thus legal equality, and recognizes no superiority except in virtue and wisdom (Plato 2, 552-3). Aspasia can be considered a meritocratic democrat. Her views are notable both for influencing the political views of Socrates, such as defending the ideal system as aristocracy and opposing oligarchy and tyranny; but they are also notable for their difference in being basically supportive of democracy to the extent of idealizing some of its features. This can be seen as a reason not to see Aspasia's original views as a reflection of Socrates' in a literary fiction created by Plato. At the end of *Menexenus*, Socrates promises to recite more speeches by Aspasia (Plato 2, 560), and it is not unlikely that Socrates kept

this promise, though unfortunately there is no record of it elsewhere.

Henry notes that *Menexenus* has been called a spurious dialogue or a genuine one that was an ironic joke (Henry, 33). That a woman like Aspasia playing such an important role in a Platonic dialogue must have seemed shocking to many. Waithe, however, who says that the ancients took Aspasia's speech very seriously, has also demonstrated that many of the historical events mentioned in Aspasia's speech, battles, peace agreements, civil wars and so on, can also be seen in Thucydides the historian (460 – 400 BC) (Waithe, 75-6), further adding to the credibility of the dialogue and the speech. Yet her conclusion that Aspasia was perceived as a threat by Plato and Aeschines (Waithe, 80), the very people thanks to whom we can be acquainted with Aspasia's philosophy, is baseless. That the influence and importance of Aspasia has been recorded favorably, in the words Socrates, a strong supporter and loyal student, by all three writers whose works on Socrates survived to this day, shows that not only Socrates, but many of his students too must have respected Aspasia.

The second of the two philosophers mentioned is Diotima, a priestess from Mantinea. Nothing is known about Diotima's life, and the only source that mentions her is Plato's *Symposium*, a middle dialogue. This being said, according to Waithe, Socrates, who was a deeply religious man, took priests and priestesses very seriously, such as the priestess of Delphi mentioned in Plato's as well as Xenophon's *Apology*, and consulted them often as he says in *Meno*. Hence there is nothing unlikely about the conversation he reports having with Diotima in *Symposium* (Waithe, 102). Additionally, Waithe demonstrates that of all the ancient writers who mention Diotima, there was not anyone who considered her to be anything but a historical person (Waithe, 105-6). In fact, Waithe notes that it took almost nineteen hundred

years for someone, the Italian renaissance Platonist Marsilio Ficino (1433 – 1499) to claim Diotima was not a real person. Waithe says that according to Ficino, Diotima could not have existed because it was absurd to think a woman could be a philosopher. Waithe adds that Ficino’s patriarchal approach was universally accepted in the next half a millennium¹⁶ (Waithe, 106). Considering the fact that a woman can be a philosopher, that a priestess would be more in position to learn philosophy than most women of ancient Greece, and that Socratic dialogues are not known for including imaginary characters, there is no reason to doubt the existence of Diotima or her relationship with Socrates. It is not surprising, given she was not a celebrity like Aspasia, that there is only a single source on Diotima. The source in question deserves to be taken seriously.

In *Symposium*, Socrates introduces Diotima as his teacher in the art of love, and “a woman wise in this and many other kinds of knowledge” (Plato 1, 522). As with Aspasia, we hear the views of Diotima through the words of Socrates. Diotima too seems to be using a student-centered method similar to that of Aspasia, questioning her student to teach him. She uses more conventional forms of teaching too, and does not hesitate to offer long explanations. Diotima sees philosophers

¹⁶ In fact, taking a closer look at Ficino’s take on Diotima reveals his attitude to be more complicated than what Waithe claims. In his *Commentary on Plato’s Symposium on Love*, for example, Ficino mentions Diotima without questioning whether she’s a real person (Ficino, 108). Later in the same work, he asks his readers to imagine Diotima addressing them, and then he infers conclusions about Plato from Diotima (Ficino, 141-2). While this may perhaps mean Ficino thinks Diotima is a fiction created by Plato, Allen shows that Ficino nevertheless has great respect for her, referring to her as Sybil, or prophetic priestess Diotima, who taught Socrates secrets of love and beauty that men could not manage to master hitherto (Allen, 56). According to Reeser, however, for Ficino Diotima is a divine figure rather than a woman, and represents a source of divine inspiration for Socrates (Reeser, 111). Thus, one can agree with Waithe in that Ficino indeed did not think a woman could be a philosopher like Diotima, but this is because someone as divine as Diotima in her teachings could not be an actual woman. Consequently, even if Ficino does not blatantly deny Diotima’s existence, Ficino’s attitude towards her can be inferred to be misogynistic.

as people in a mean between those who are ignorant, and thus have no interest in wisdom, and the wise, who already possess wisdom and have no need to search for it. (Plato 1, 523-4). If these views are to be taken seriously, the implication is that the Socratic understanding of wisdom and philosophy have their origins in Diotima. In Diotima's philosophy, the mortal creature finds immortality in generation (Plato 1, 525). As Waithe notes, Diotima's conception of immortality is significantly different from that of Socrates in other dialogues: it is metaphorical instead of metaphysical. The soul is not immortal at all (Waithe, 89). This is an important difference which shows Diotima to be an original philosopher rather than a plot device or a reflection of Socrates or Plato. According to Diotima, those who are "pregnant in the body only" beget children and hope to achieve immortality by the preservation of their memory by their children. "Souls which are pregnant," however, who are concerned with the governance of states and families with temperance and justice, look for worthy students to educate. This sort of immortality is not limited to a particular race. Diotima says there are many who have achieved it among Greeks as well as barbarians by giving to the world great works and being parents of all sorts of virtue (Plato 1, 527). The difference between Diotima's metaphorical conception of immortality and the Socratic immortality of the soul can be explained by the influence of Pythagorean metaphysics.

As for love, there are different levels to it according to Diotima, starting from the beauties of earth, which is not rejected but seen as a necessary step, and going up to the essence of beauty (Plato 1, 528). It's notable that love for physical, earthly beauties is not rejected, even if it is located at the bottom of the ladder. Also, the essence of beauty is what has been called a Platonic form, and the implication is that according to Plato, the theory of forms, possibly the

most important aspect of Socrates and Plato's metaphysical epistemology, had their origins in the thought of a Mantinean philosopher priestess. In fact, this point signifies a difference between the philosophies of Diotima and Aspasia. While Aspasia sees the earth as it is as the supreme being that is even above the Gods, Diotima is more interested in the perception of "a nature of wondrous beauty" that is everlasting rather than growing or decaying like earth (Plato 1, 528). This is exactly the nature of essences, or forms. According to Aristotle (384 – 322 BC), who could not be expected to acknowledge the existence of, let alone give credit to a philosopher woman, the theory of forms is an invention of Plato himself even if Socrates looked for the universal and searched for definitions (Aristotle, 15). Guthrie cites numerous scholars who see no evidence to charge Aristotle with inaccuracy regarding the origins of the theory of forms (Guthrie 1971, 36-7). It may have been that Plato systematized the theory in his writings, but still saw the origins of the theory in Diotima and Socrates and wanted to give both credit.

Though Socrates came to reject the teachings of the natural philosophers and the Sophists, he took both currents seriously and learned from them. However, it was from the two philosopher women that he was influenced the most to the extent that it can be said that had it not been for Aspasia and Diotima, Socratic philosophy would have been fundamentally different. Aspasia and Diotima, like Socrates, relied on oral culture, and because there was not a literate group of dedicated students around them, we can only know of their philosophy from the students of their student. What we know of them is groundbreaking for the history of philosophy. Nevertheless, as we have seen, Socrates differed from Aspasia and Diotima's philosophy in some ways. Even as a student of people he seems to have considered the best educators, Aspasia and Diotima, Socrates maintained a critical

mind, which was encouraged by his teachers' educational method. The unusual education of Socrates which truly enriched his thought, coupled with his critical mind, lead him to develop an original philosophy. Socrates was certainly the successor of Aspasia and Diotima, yet it is difficult to make the likely claim that Socrates advanced their philosophy simply because what little we know of the two philosophers is overwhelmingly from Socratic sources, which nevertheless indicate that the student for the most part followed in the footsteps of his teachers despite having certain disagreements with them too.

Socratic Social Thought and the Influence of Euripides

A sensible place to start investigating the social thought of Socrates is his life. As a citizen, Socrates honored his duties, including military and political services. Taylor, basing himself on Plato, reports that Socrates participated in four military campaigns. Taylor notes that Socrates' record for military courage and self-command was particularly high (Taylor, 98-9). The military expeditions must have been important experiences for Socrates as Diogenes Laertius says that Socrates never went abroad except for them (Laertius, 72). At one point, as Xenophon records in his *Memorabilia*, Socrates served as a member of the Council or the Senate, thus participating in the ruling organ of Athenian democracy. His most notable act as Senator was to oppose the demand to put a group of generals to death by a single vote. According to Xenophon, Socrates risked the anger of the people rather than doing something which he considered would break the senatorial oath¹⁷ (Xenophon, 9). Despite his above mentioned

¹⁷ Taylor notes that the generals were responsible for a victory that cost four thousand lives, and the demand put forward by the prosecution that all the generals' fate would be decided by a single vote was a direct infringement of constitutional procedure. In the end, the six generals held by Athenian authorities were promptly executed (Taylor, 103-4).

participation in political life, Socrates never became a politician. In Plato's *Apology*, an early dialogue, the reason he gives for this is the fact that since childhood, he had been hearing a voice in his head. Socrates adds that if he had entered the political arena, he would have perished long ago (Plato 2, 135-6). This should not be taken as a complete rejection of politics, a subject Socrates was very much interested in, but it can certainly be taken as a cautious and perhaps even a critical attitude towards mainstream democratic politics of Athens.

Art can be political, and a person's taste in political art can be indicative of their social thought. Socrates was an admirer of the works of Euripides (480 – 406 BC) the tragedian. Christian Wildberg quotes Aelian (175 – 235) to show that Socrates went to the theater only when Euripides competed. Wildberg adds that Socrates was not a silent spectator but responded to the lines of the actors as if they were addressing him (Wildberg, 24). As Kurt Lampe shows, the fact that Euripides is featured in a dialogue of Aeschines as a companion of Socrates further confirms their association (Lampe, 63-4). Diogenes Laertius, basing himself on older sources, asserts that not only did Socrates and Euripides know each other, but that some believe Socrates contributed to his works (Laertius, 70). According to Diogenes Laertius, like Socrates, Euripides had been a student of Anaxagoras (Laertius, 86), where they may have first met. Wildberg mentions a number of jokes about the relationship and possible intellectual partnership between Socrates and Euripides made by the ancients (Wildberg, 25-6). Taylor explains these claims of collaboration by saying Euripides was inspired by Socrates (Taylor, 91). This is the most likely possibility in my view as well, given Socrates and Euripides had their differences too.

Guthrie notes that Euripides saw law as a guarantee of equal rights and a bulwark against tyranny (Guthrie 1977, 23). Characters in his plays question the importance of noble

birth: extramarital children are considered equals to marital children and good men are defined as noble and the wicked base-born even if their father is greater than Zeus (Guthrie 1977, 154). These sentiments made Euripides a sympathizer of democracy as he championed the concept of equality, which united friend to friend and city to city, giving everyone an equal share (Guthrie 1977, 151). Euripides generally put discriminatory remarks against slaves on the mouths of unsympathetic characters. He thought being a slave would not corrupt a good man and that many slaves were better than the free. Only the name of slave brought shame upon slaves according to Euripides. In all else, if a slave was a good person, they were no worse than the free (Guthrie 1977, 157-9). Guthrie says Euripides was the only man of his century who claimed slavery to be unnatural (Guthrie 1977, 24). Additionally, in an age when pseudo-scientific claims were made that the Greeks were the master race and anti-barbarian feeling was rampant, Euripides rejected the distinction between Greeks and barbarians. In a fragment quoted by Guthrie, Euripides says that a good man, even if he lives in a faraway land, is a friend of his (Guthrie 1977, 161). Moreover, Musonius Rufus (fl. 1st Century) quotes Euripides saying all the earth is the fatherland of a noble man (Rufus, 44). This shows him to have been a cosmopolitan as well as an opponent of slavery.

According to Martha Nussbaum, Euripides, who often cast women as central characters, was very interested in the hardships they had to endure because of their social position (Nussbaum, 413). In addition, Euripides' plays had vocal and strong female characters. For instance, in *Medea*, the title character declares: "They say we lead safe, untroubled lives at home while they do battle with the spear. They are wrong. I'd rather take my stand behind a shield three times than go through childbirth once" (Euripides, 13). Euripides was radical in other ways too: for example, according to Guthrie,

the playwright, noting that incest was practiced among non-Hellenic peoples, and no law forbade it, concluded that no behavior is shameful if it does not seem so to those who practice it (Guthrie 1977, 16), a view shared by later Socratic schools like the Cynics. Considering all these views, we have to categorize Euripides as a radical democrat with extremist tendencies. That Socrates was an ardent follower of Euripides' works shows that he was open to all these ideas politically, and was not shocked by any of them. In the end, according to Filonik, Euripides too was tried for impiety, allegedly for portraying Heracles as mad in a play (Filonik, 51). Afterward, he probably went to Macedonia and spent his final years as a court poet (Mitchell-Boyask, xii), which shows that if affiliating with rulers was against his political principles, this principle could be flexed when necessary.

Socrates' views on slavery may have been influenced by Euripides, and vice versa, however their views were by no means exactly the same. In *Lysis*, an early dialogue, Socrates comments, in the form of a question, that those in the condition of a slave, who cannot do as they like, cannot be happy (Plato 1, 61). Socrates must have wanted to avoid any personal involvement in such unhappiness, as he is never recorded as owning any slaves. In fact, according to Diogenes Laertius he rejected the offer of being given slaves to profit from (Laertius, 78). Nevertheless, in *Memorabilia*, Socrates claims that enslavement, like deception, can be just in a war (Xenophon, 158-9). In *Oeconomicus*, he observes how some slaves who are chained keep trying to run away while others who are not chained do not (Xenophon, 24-5). The conclusion that can be drawn from this seems to be that he was for better treatment of slaves, so that they do not run but work willingly. Later in *Oeconomicus*, Socrates favorably quotes Ischomachus, who compares training slaves to training animals, while pointing out their differences. Ischomachus wants to show slaves it

is in their interest to obey, and proposes appealing to their appetite with meats and drinks and if necessary appealing to their ambitions with praise (Xenophon, 100). It's clear that in all this, Socrates did not question slavery as an institution as much as Euripides did. This does not necessarily mean he would not agree with many of his friend's statements on slavery: however, it is clear that he at least did not consider it unnatural.

That he considered slavery to be normal, however, does not mean Socrates looked down on slaves. In *Ion*, an early (Kahn, 105) dialogue of Plato, Socrates says that slaves as well as spinning women have more knowledge in their fields than rhapsodes (Plato 1, 479). In a famous section of *Meno*, Socrates attempts to guide a slave boy to solve a complex geometric problem by asking questions (Plato 2, 43-57). According to Socrates, the slave boy solves the problem by recollecting knowledge present in his soul (Plato 2, 56). This has quite radical implications: namely that slaves too have immortal souls like everyone else, and are capable of learning or recollecting anything. In other words, Socrates does not consider slaves to be inferior by nature. Besides, in *Oeconomicus*, Socrates says that many nobles are slaves too: they are slaves to luxury, lust, intemperance and wine (Xenophon, 13). Moreover, in Plato's *Euthydemus*, an early dialogue, Socrates states that there is no dishonor in being a slave if the enslavement leads to wisdom¹⁸ (Plato, 417). Lastly, according to Burnet, Socrates described himself as a fellow slave of Apollo's swans (Burnet, 137). It can be concluded that Socrates universalized the condition of the slave in various ways, using it to describe himself as well as people he disapproved of, while rejecting discriminatory attitudes towards the actual slaves. In all this, Socrates had a radical

¹⁸ It should be noted that Jowett's translation of the same passage does not include the term slavery but "service" and "ministration" (Plato 1, 200).

attitude on slavery, at least for his time, although he was not an abolitionist.

In the epistles of Socrates, which are part of *the Cynic Epistles* and probably date from the 1st century or earlier (Malherbe, 27), Socrates targets rich people who are ridiculed for their lack of education. In contrast, Socrates says friends share everything they have with each other and that he has no time to guard his money (Anonymous, 221). Socrates believes that it is wisdom and virtue that can bring happiness, not wealth (Anonymous, 235). In Diogenes Laertius, Socrates is portrayed observing he can do without commodities (Laertius, 74). Thus he was against the consumerism of his time, a logical extension of his critical position about wealth. In *Oeconomicus*, he says he has no need of any further wealth, and is in fact richer than his interlocutor whose property was at least a hundred times more than his (Xenophon, 17). In *Meno*, Socrates concludes that the acquisition of gold and silver is no more virtue than lack of them (Plato 2, 38). Socrates' rejection of wealth and consumerism put him in an undeniably radical position. Of course capitalism did not exist back then, however, as we have seen, various sources agree that Socrates was against the mentalities and practices in the ancient Greek world where the roots of capitalism can be traced.

In *Tusculan Disputations*, Cicero claims that when Socrates was asked his city, his response was that he was a citizen of the whole world (Cicero 1886, 314). Zeller, however, states that apathy and indifference to country was entirely alien to Socrates (Zeller, 117). The Cynic portrayal of Socrates in the epistles, despite the Cynics' well known cosmopolitanism, does not negate Socrates' patriotism as he shows concern for the needs of his country (Anonymous, 221). The epistles also depict him rejecting the offer of a king to rule together, the formal reason for his refusal being that he does not know how

to rule (Anonymous, 225). If there is any truth to the story, it can be speculated that Socrates was modestly and politely turning the king down rather than actually having no idea how to rule. Diogenes Laertius tells us that Socrates rejected gifts from rulers and refused to visit their courts (Laertius, 75). We do not know why Socrates turned down the rulers. It can be speculated that Socrates did not want to associate with a state other than Athens, or that he was critical of the rulers in question, or that he refused to be associated with rulers in general. In any case, Plato's *Crito*, an early dialogue, makes Socrates' regard for the laws and his patriotic duties as a citizen clear in his refusal to choose exile over death (Plato 2, 158). Zeller notes the importance Socrates gave to the state which he saw as a necessity for living amongst other human beings. For this reason, says Zeller, Socrates required unconditional obedience to the laws, even enduring death rather than breaking the law (Zeller, 167). In *Memorabilia*, Socrates says the lawful and the just should be synonymous (Xenophon, 186). All this is not to say Cicero is necessarily wrong on Socrates being a cosmopolitan: after all, Euripides, his favorite playwright and a close associate, was one too. Nevertheless, if Cicero is right, Socrates must have been a cosmopolitan and a patriot at the same time. This is possible because Socrates was not a blindly obedient patriot, and expressed criticism of individual laws as seen in Plato's *Apology* (Plato 2, 138) as well as the whole Athenian constitution which, according to Zeller, he considered a failure (Zeller, 223). Euripides was perhaps the first cosmopolitan artist, and if Cicero is right, Socrates may well have been one of the earliest cosmopolitan philosophers, making his intellectual circle pioneers from early on. Cosmopolitanism is an idea which can be repeated but which has to be realized in order to be advanced. The accounts of Socrates' idea about how to realize them alone demonstrate this to be an impossibly utopian task.

Political Philosophy of Socrates

In *Euthydemus*, Socrates defines politics, or the kingly art as the source of good government¹⁹. (Plato 1, 211). In *Gorgias*, Socrates makes the assertion that he is the only one who practices the political art and thus the only politician of his time (Plato 2, 414). This is a truly bold claim, rejecting every other politician and declaring them to be ignorant of the political art. Diogenes Laertius holds that Socrates discouraged some of his followers from involvement in politics while encouraging others, depending on their talents (Laertius, 77). Nevertheless, according to Zeller, although some of his pupils from the upper classes had oligarchic sympathies, most of his adherents had no decided line in politics (Zeller, 225). It's likely that Socrates did not consider any of his pupils to be true practitioners of the political art, given his assertion in *Gorgias*, even if he encouraged some of them for political careers and tried to prepare them as much as he could. For Socrates, however, politics was not a question of career.

In *Memorabilia*, Socrates says that the function of a leader is to make the people he leads happy (Xenophon, 97). This means political leadership is a selfless duty according to Socrates. Yet Socrates acknowledged that leaders tended to be quite far from this. In the epistles, Socrates declares that the "greatest evil of all for cities is the wickedness of their rulers" (Anonymous, 243). In a similar statement in *Gorgias*, Socrates, citing Homer, says that it is kings, tyrants, rulers and public men who are authors of the greatest crimes because they have the power. The most evil men come from the class of those who have power according to Socrates, and even if there are good members of the same class, they are quite rare (Plato 2, 417). In the same dialogue, Socrates discusses

¹⁹ He later adds that he does not, however, expect this art to make everyone wise in all respects or to teach them all the arts (Plato 1, 213).

Pericles. Socrates acknowledges the initial worth of Pericles, describing him as glorious. Nevertheless, Socrates criticizes Pericles for giving pay to the people and encouraging them in the love of talk and money. Moreover, he says, Pericles was not a good political shepherd for he made the people more savage than he received them, and this savageness was shown towards himself, when he was convicted of theft, and almost put to death (Plato 2, 406-8). Socrates does not side with Pericles or with the Athenian people who've turned against him: however, to him the whole situation is a proof of bad leadership. That even Pericles, despite ruling for forty years, despite receiving an education from Anaxagoras, Aspasia and Protagoras and being a friend of philosophy in general, does not qualify as a good leader, is telling of how high Socrates' political standards are.

Because of his refusal to go along with the oligarchic Thirty Tyrants, Diogenes Laertius asserts Socrates was a supporter of democracy (Laertius, 73). Diogenes Laertius' claim is contradicted by a number of facts. As noted earlier, Socrates considered the democratic constitution of Athens to be a failure (Zeller, 223). In *Memorabilia*, Socrates says that holding the scepter, or being chosen by the people, or being appointed by lot, or stepping into office by violence or by fraud did not make the ruler. What mattered was having the special knowledge of how to rule (Xenophon, 129). These views can only be described as meritocratic: only those who are qualified should rule, nothing else matters. In fact, it can be inferred that Socrates saw little difference between the various common ways of holding power described above. Hence, it is not surprising that, as Dawson mentions, Socrates was accused of teaching to overthrow Athenian democracy (Dawson, 59). The accusation has to be seen as groundless, as even when he was opposed to Athenian laws, Socrates followed them and would not teach anyone not to follow

them, let alone unlawfully overthrow the democratic regime. Nevertheless, the truth in the accusation is that Socrates was opposed to democracy, and conveyed his ideas about a regime he considered superior to others.

In *Memorabilia*, Socrates starts elaborating his views on forms of government by distinguishing between a kingdom, “a government over willing men in accordance to civil law,” and a tyranny, a “government over unwilling subjects not according to law”. Here it should be noted that by a kingdom, Socrates does not necessarily mean a hereditary monarchy. In any case, Xenophon’s Socrates adds that there are three forms of regimes: aristocracy, or rule of the best, where magistrates are appointed by meeting legal requirements, plutocracy, or rule of wealth, where title to office depends on rated property, and lastly democracy, or rule of the people (Xenophon, 200). Xenophon’s Socrates sounds quite neutral when describing these regimes, whereas Plato draws a different and much more elaborate picture. In *the Republic*, a middle dialogue, Plato’s Socrates sees a historical succession of different regimes or constitutions. The earliest regime is aristocracy, which Socrates favors, calling those who answer to it “just and good” (Plato 3, 384-5). It should be clear that by aristocracy Socrates does not mean rule of a feudal nobility but a meritocratic regime, the rule of the most qualified. Before further examining the ideal regime according to Socrates, however, it would be in order to investigate the other regimes he defines²⁰.

In *the Republic*, Socrates says the first regime to follow from aristocracy is timocracy, or government of honor.

²⁰ The simplest explanation for the difference between Xenophon and Plato’s accounts on Socratic political theory is that Xenophon interpreted Socrates in a more simplistic manner reflecting his own politics. Of course, Plato may have similarly interpreted his teacher’s political theory according to his own convictions, however the complexity and coherence of his account, as well as the fact that he later distanced himself from the views he himself had attributed to his teacher makes it more likely that his account is at least more accurate than that of Xenophon.

An aristocracy is a hard government to shake according to Socrates, but no constitution lives forever. A timocratic regime fears admitting philosophers to power and turns to more passionate characters suited to war rather than peace. The result is for the timocratic state to wage everlasting wars. A fierce secret longing for gold and silver along with a spirit of contention and ambition consumes the militaristic rulers of timocracies. Socrates sees an example of this kind of government in Sparta (Plato 3, 384-7). The critical description of Spartan style governments as timocracy is strangely missing in Xenophon. This could be because of Xenophon's own sympathies for Spartan style government, which are plain in his *Polity of the Lacedaemonians*, even if he did not support the Spartan regime of his time (Xenophon, 60). In this work Xenophon notes that the Spartans banned gold and silver, although they had coinage. It is important to note that the Spartans differed from the rest of Greeks in that the work done by free women were left to female slaves, and the highest function of free women was seen as the bearing of children. For this reason, women had to train their bodies like the men, and they competed in sports as well (Xenophon, 28-9). Thus, though still extremely patriarchal, the Spartan system gave more freedom to free women. The slaves, or helots as they were called in Sparta were another story. In *Lycurgus*, Plutarch says that members of the Cryptia, which can be described as a state security organization, could massacre the helots without consequences²¹ (Plutarch). Although Socrates does not mention Spartan policies towards women and slaves, because he rejects timocracy, it can be assumed that he would be critical of these policies.

²¹ In turn, of course, the helots rebelled when they found the chance. Plutarch mentions a slave insurrection in *Life of Lycurgus*, and Xenophon, in *the Greeks*, tells the story of how Cinadon, a very successful military officer, conspired with helots to make a failed coup and change Sparta forever. Upon capture, Cinadon, who did not come from the upper classes, said he was involved with the rebellion because he wanted to be equal with everyone in Sparta (Xenophon 1876, 361-4).

The ruin of timocracy, according to Socrates, comes from the accumulation of gold in the treasury of private individuals. Everyone become rivals in a race to get richer and richer, and “the great mass of citizens become lovers of money”. To the extent that riches and rich men are honored in the state, virtue and the virtuous are dishonored. Socrates asserts that a great defect of oligarchy is that a poor man cannot rule even if he is better qualified to rule. An oligarchy means constant class struggle, with the poor and the rich always conspiring against each other. (Plato 3, 290-3). Eventually, continues Socrates, the poor conquer their opponents, killing some, exiling others, and they establish democracy, giving the remainder an equal share of freedom and power (Plato 3, 398). It should be noted that as mentioned earlier, Xenophon claimed Socrates called the system described above plutocracy rather than oligarchy. Though plutocracy defines the system described in the Republic better, there may be a political reason for Xenophon’s preference. Xenophon had oligarchic sympathies as he openly says oligarchy is more just than democracy in *the Polity of the Athenians* (Xenophon, 19). On the other hand, Plato’s Socrates, by defining oligarchy with the rule of the wealthy few, rejects an actual political ideology which had its defenders, rather than pejoratively define a system of government no one openly defended in order to reject the state of affairs in certain regimes.

The only good thing Socrates says about democracy is how it provides fertile ground for those who have utopian political ambitions of establishing a state (Plato 3, 398). The criticisms Socrates makes of democracy in *the Republic* are controversial. It’s questionable whether the way Socrates depicts democracy actually reflects the democracy of his time. According to Socrates, democracy gives so much freedom and equality to citizens that he equates it with anarchy. The young and old, says Socrates, become equals; metics become equals

with citizens; men and women become equals as well, and slaves are just as free as their purchasers. Even animals are infected with this anarchy (Plato 3, 405). These criticisms are rather out of character for Socrates, who converses with youth as if their equal himself, has had women and metic teachers and slave companions as well as radical views on women and slaves himself. Because of all this, one might suspect Plato's bias may have had some influence in how Socrates' critique of democracy was portrayed. Nevertheless, it is clear that Plato's Socrates has conservative rather than radical reasons in criticizing democracy.

Xenophon too, in *the Polity of the Athenians*, criticizes democracy for giving what he calls an extraordinary amount of license to slaves and metics. Unlike Socrates, the reason Xenophon gives for this is quite concrete: the Athenian law against striking a slave because it may be an Athenian citizen who receives the blow by mistake, as slaves and metics are dressed the same as Athenian citizens. Xenophon also complains about slaves being allowed to indulge in luxury. According to Xenophon, Spartan type of slavery is preferable to the Athenian type²² (Xenophon, 8). According to Josiah Ober, that the Athenians were willing to grant some equality to slaves and metics has its rationale in the economic requirements of being a naval power. Metics provided necessary skills, and slaves were encouraged to make money, a percentage of which was appropriated by the city (Ober, 19). However, this apparent equality did not actually mean slaves were freed, or the metics and women were given the status of citizenship: these would be reasons to criticize ancient democracies from the radical side. Plato's Socrates rather criticizes democracy for conservative reasons, but in doing so, he seems to be painting the picture of a sort of democracy that did not actually exist yet.

²² It should be added that Xenophon does not say anything about the equality of men and women in Athens.

Socrates' radical criticism of democracy, however, is that it leads to tyranny. "Excess of liberty," according to Socrates, "only passed into excess of slavery" (Plato 3, 406). Class struggle continues in a democracy, which, according to Socrates has three classes, the wealthy, the plebeians and the drones or spendthrifts. The latter are the entire ruling power in a democracy even if the plebeians are the most powerful class when assembled. (Plato 3, 407) In this state of conflict, an individual arises as the champion and protector of the people. The champion of the people becomes a tyrant as he starts finding ways to kill his opponents (Plato 3, 408-9). In the early days of his reign, the tyrant is "full of smiles," however as time passes he starts to stir up conflict after conflict so that the people still need him as a leader (Plato 3, 410). Thus the tyrant starts to change due to the effects of having power: he becomes more jealous, more faithless, more unjust, more friendless, in short, miserable (Plato 3, 424). And thus liberty turns into the "harshest and bitterest form of slavery" (Plato 3, 413). It should be added that tyrannies were established by individual tyrants and their supporters rather than movements that defended tyranny as a political system, so the term is used as a pejorative definition of a category of regimes lead by tyrants.

One of the most significant aspects of Socrates' theory of regimes is that Socrates theorized and rejected all the different forms of regimes that existed in his day, for the sake of a system of government that did not exist. No one had done that before in the history of philosophy as we know it. Thus, Socrates was a pioneer in political philosophy. This being said, if the rejection of all existing regimes was relatively easy to emulate, the replacement of even a single regime by the ideal government was certainly extremely difficult to put into practice. Thus, consequent rejections of existing regimes may have been equals to the original Socratic rejection, but they could not make meaningful advances over it

Socratic Utopias

The Republic has been accused of being reactionary or conservative (Dawson, 64), however, despite the fact that many of his arguments against democracy can well be described as conservative and *the Republic* even has certain reactionary aspects, overall the political philosophy put forward is certainly radical, and even has numerous extremist aspects. That Socrates wanted a radically different social order than what existed can be seen in *Charmides*, an early dialogue of Plato. In this dialogue, Socrates clearly expresses his desire for wisdom to order the government of the house as well as the state (Plato 1, 46). The implication, of course, is that the house and the state lacked wisdom. In *the Republic*, a regime built on the principle described above is described in detail. It is this conjured regime which makes Socrates, in Dawson's words, the founder of utopianism (Dawson, 53). This is not to say that Socrates saw this utopia as an unrealizable fantasy and was merely making a point as some of the later writers of utopias. The ideal regime that did not exist was the meritocratic model of government Socrates defended politically. Nevertheless, in my view, the description of utopian is accurate because Socrates does not explain how his ideal system of government, projected into the future from a mythical past, will be realized²³. This being said, he must have hoped his political, philosophical, and educational activity would bring the existing society closer to what he considered the ideal state of affairs.

It is well known that the concept of the state had a very important part in Socrates' political philosophy. In Plato's *Republic*, Socrates states that the state arose out of the needs of humanity. Since no one is self-sufficient and everyone has wants, people start helping each other out and become

²³ Socrates does say his point is not to prove the best city can exist but to put forward a model to imitate (Plato 3, 312)

partners. When such a group gathers in a single habitation, the body of inhabitants are termed a state. (Plato 3, 197). Socrates' explanation regarding the origins of the state is anthropological. The main dynamic of the state is solidarity; it dates from the transition from nomadic to sedentary life. The first citizens' division of labor starts early on according to Socrates, with the development of crafts such as farming, building, weaving, shoe-making, carpentering, smiting and trading. As the population grows, there emerges the need to use money tokens for exchange. Then emerges hired workers, who are a class of servants that sell their labor because of their physical strength (Plato 3, 198-201). This state is the primitive utopia of Socrates: he considers it the true and healthy constitution of the state. As we have seen, it is peaceful and communal, and Socrates does not even define a class of rulers. It is a class society with two classes, artisans, including farmers, and workers. It is a state of craft, labor and a simple way of life²⁴.

Because the utopian state newly transitioning to sedentary life lacks luxury, Socrates has to devise a "state at fever-heat" for the multitude who want perfumes, incense, courtesans, and cakes among other things. This new state will require poets and dancers, tutors and nurses, barbers and cooks and so forth. In short, the luxurious state is civilized rather than primitive. In order to be what it is, it must enlarge its borders (Plato 3, 202). "So we shall go to war," says Socrates, "whether war does good or harm". (Plato 3, 203). Socrates can hardly be

²⁴ Socrates' primitive utopia historically would correspond to a point now called the Neolithic revolution, an important turning point in the period of transition from hunter-gatherers' primitive communism to patriarchal civilizations based on slavery. Though of course it does not exactly correspond to what Socrates is describing, one example of such a settlement can be seen in Çatalhöyük, a Neolithic settlement which existed between 7500 and 5700 BC. Bernhard Brosius who has described Çatalhöyük as an example of communism, notes how it was a peaceful society without a ruling class, and with complete equality between the sexes.

considered a pacifist, though since he preferred the peaceful primitive utopia to the luxurious civilized utopia, he cannot be considered a militarist either. Because he considered war to be the price to pay for luxury, the need for which he did not consider justified, it may be said that he had a realistic and critical attitude on the connection between war and civilization. Practice showed that civilized states tended to be rivals of each other, even when they did not have completely different social orders. War was an evil necessitated by an unnecessary evil.

The luxurious and civilized utopia of Socrates has its ideological basis in a propaganda tale told to every citizen. Members of all three classes of society, guardians or rulers, auxiliaries or soldiers, and the people or plebeians are told that their youth, the education and training they've received was a dream whereas in reality during this time they were being formed and fed in the womb of the earth. When they are ready, the earth, or their country, that is their mother, sent them up. The citizens of their country are fellow children of the earth and thus their siblings. Yet, God has framed the natures of the citizens differently: some have the power of command, associated with gold; some are fit to be soldiers, associated with silver, and others are fit to be artisans and farmers, associated with brass and iron. Socrates adds that children of parents from one class may belong to another, though he does not expect this to occur often. Nevertheless, gold and silver parents must not pity their child if it is brass or iron, and a gold or silver child of an artisan is honored (Plato 3, 249-50). Socrates is of course honest about the tale above not being the truth, however what he's proposing is a systematic diffusion of state propaganda to convince the population that they are all siblings – and thus to treat each other like siblings would – and to convince the population of a class system that is flexible in assigning an individual to a

class but strict once the individual is assigned. It should be added that Socrates openly says it is acceptable for rulers to lie to their subjects, but it is not acceptable for the subjects to lie to rulers. Socrates is honest about this because he sees a lie as useful only as a medicine (Plato 3, 220). The ideological basis of the propaganda tale is to prevent social conflict and class struggle among the citizens, using lies as a medicine against the social disease of disunity.

Socrates talks about the strictness of the division of labor in his luxurious utopia. "In our state only," says Socrates, a craftsman is only a practitioner of their craft and nothing else (Plato 3, 229). Besides, the people are not paid in addition to their food and other needs, so they cannot take a journey of pleasure, and have no money to spend on a mistress or another luxurious fancy. This is not for the benefit of the guardians over the plebeians. The aim is the greatest happiness of the whole, even if the guardians are likely to be the happiest of mankind (Plato 3, 252). Indulging into luxuries is not the way to happiness according to Socrates, even if access to luxuries are his civilized utopia's reason for existence. Socrates wants to avoid wealth and poverty, both of which he considers causes discontent. Accordingly, none of the citizens are permitted to have silver and gold (Plato 3, 253). Here we see Socrates's rejection of greed and love of money translated into state policies. It has to be admitted that this is as much an ascetic stand as it is political²⁵. Doyne Dawson notes that Socrates does not describe an ordinary constitution but is raising the prospect of total communism (Dawson, 71). I also believe many features of Socrates' political doctrine are communistic, however the term meritocratic socialism is a more appropriate description of his civilized utopia²⁶.

²⁵ Interestingly, Socrates shared this attitude with conservatives, though probably not so much with the ordinary members of the far larger moderates.

²⁶ Of course, Socrates' political doctrine cannot be expected to correspond to a particular kind of modern socialism or communism. Socialism has been used

In the Socratic political doctrine, the guardians, or rulers are selected according to their nature. Socrates likens the nature he's looking for to brave, well-bred dogs. They are supposed to be dangerous to their enemies and gentle to their friends. Especially so that they can be the latter, Socrates looks for the qualities of a philosopher in the guardians, such as love of learning and love of wisdom²⁷ (Plato 3, 204-6), for the perfect guardian must be a philosopher (Plato 3, 343). Socrates thinks women as well as men should be guardians as well as auxiliaries, sharing in the toils of war and defending their country. In short, women's duties are to be the same in all respects, except they are assigned lighter labors because they are considered weaker by nature. Moreover, the individual family is abolished in what is called the community of women, children are held in common, and no parent knows their child (Plato 3, 293). Dawson underlines that the phrase "community of women" can with equal accuracy be described as "community of men," and that "Plato's patriarchal labels should not blind us to the radicalism of the content"²⁸ (Dawson, 8). It should be noted that Socrates' position in favor of the abolition of the individual family and for women to rule alongside men was unprecedented in hitherto political literature. Having two women as his teachers, if not directly

synonymously with communism, it has been used to describe a stage on the way to communism, and it has been used to define systems different from communism. Because of this, socialism is a more flexible term than communism, which has a more fixed definition. It is for this reason that I believe Socrates' civilized utopia, as well as general doctrine is best considered socialist.

²⁷ Here too Socrates continues the analogy with the guard dogs and says that a dog who is angry at a stranger but welcomes an acquaintance is a philosopher for he can distinguish a friend and an enemy (Plato 3, 206).

²⁸ Dawson also discusses whether Plato was the original feminist (Dawson, 88). I would argue that if anyone is seen as the original feminist, the choice is between Aspasia and Socrates. Plato deserves credit for writing what he did on the question of gender; he certainly contributed to the wording and argumentation of a historically significant position which otherwise would not have reached today. However, to argue that he's the inventor of this position is to ignore Socrates who is the one voicing it according to Plato, and Aspasia who probably not only shared but greatly influenced Socrates' views on the question.

determine his position, surely must have influenced it. In addition, the guardians are not to have houses or lands or any property: like the people their pay is their food, and they have no private expenses. The community of families, says Socrates, along with the community of property makes the rulers more truly guardians, so that they are not worried about what's theirs and what is not theirs (Plato 3, 302). These two policies are among the most solidly communistic aspects of Socrates' doctrine. The guardians are subject to a very similar, but stricter lifestyle than that of the people.

Socrates was affected by the dominant gender norms of his society and did not preach his followers to live according to his radical doctrine. He himself committed to a monogamous marriage, and in *Memorabilia*, he discusses marriage in quite patriarchal terms, as something that results from a search for a wife who will bear the finest children, although he does describe the hardships and dangers of the process of childbearing for women in some detail (Xenophon, 60). In turn, in the ideal civilized state, legislators select the men and women with the most similar natures. Marriages exist in polygamous form, and they are strictly planned with brides and grooms being united in public festivals²⁹. According to

²⁹ Socrates' views on gender relations certainly do not question the gender binary in any way. Thus, it would be in order to briefly examine Socrates' view of homosexuality. According to Guthrie, pederasty common in ancient Greece is condemned in the Republic. (Guthrie 1971, 76) In the passage from the Republic cited by Guthrie, Socrates prohibits sex between the male lover and his beloved, saying that there needs to be a law that the lover should show his love for the beloved as a father does for his son, and still the beloved needs to give his consent (Plato 3, 236). This prohibition seems discriminatory if taken to mean homosexual intercourse in general; though it can also be read as a law specifically against pederasty rather than homosexual intercourse between adults. One way or the other, Socrates is famous for his interest in beautiful youths himself. Zeller claims Socrates never acted on his own homoeroticism (Zeller, 75-6). We do not know if Zeller's right on this, given the claims of a love affair between Socrates and his teacher Archelaus the natural philosopher. In any case, Socrates is famously open about his homoerotic inclination, for example he praises the beauty and body of a boy in Xenophon's *Symposium* (Xenophon, 16). There is no mention of female homosexuality in any of the sources on Socrates.

Socrates, childbirth has to be planned; so that the population does not become too large or too small. After the age to make children has passed, both men and women are allowed to have intercourse with whoever they like, as long as they abide by the incest taboo³⁰ and do not bring children to birth³¹ (Plato 3, 296-8) Socrates proposing free love for those old enough for it, even if it can only be defined as limited, is an example of his radical views on gender relations compared to the gender norms of Greek society. However there is not necessarily a contradiction between Xenophon's practical Socrates and Plato's utopian Socrates here: it is possible Socrates wanted gender relations to be different but also tried to show people the way to a normal life in his society.

Socrates' communal marriage scheme involves eugenics too, uniting those considered the best of each sex with each other as frequently as possible, while making sure those considered inferior unite as seldom as possible. In accordance, a policy of discrimination is applied to babies according to their parents or whether they are deformed. Discriminated babies are "put away in some mysterious, unknown place" (Plato 3, 296-7). Dawson notes that the system of sexual relations defended by Socrates in Plato's *Republic* is inspired by the sexual communism of the barbarians as well as Spartan eugenics (Dawson, 87-8). Although there has been modern communists who were in favor of eugenics³², certain aspects of Socrates' eugenics scheme in the *Republic*, namely discriminating against certain babies, including deformed babies, can only be described as reactionary. The eugenics

³⁰ Which prohibits intercourse between parents and children, and grandparents and grandchildren, but not siblings.

³¹ Of course there were ways to make that happen. In Plato's *Theaetetus*, a middle dialogue (Taylor, 19), Socrates notes that midwives can kill an embryo if they see it necessary (Plato 4, 168). Carrick notes that most natural philosophers commented on embryology, and the first written method of contraception, though a questionable one, can be found in Aristotle (Carrick, 119).

³² The most prominent example being Leon Trotsky (1879 – 1940) in *If America Should Go Communist* (Trotsky).

scheme is a conclusion of hierarchically categorizing the natures of the citizens into three social classes. Nevertheless, its reactionary aspects aside, the eugenics scheme itself is not necessarily an obstacle to calling the civilized utopia a form of socialism.

Though we know Socrates was a patriot, the pro-slavery Greek nationalism in *the Republic* carries things to another level, and is contradicted by more than Cicero's claim that Socrates was a cosmopolitan. In *Memorabilia*, Socrates declares how desirable it is for states to reconcile their differences, and wars to end (Xenophon, 180). An international perspective can be found in Plato's *Republic* too, where Socrates says that only with philosopher rulers can the human race have rest from evil (Plato 3, 313). This shows that Socrates believes the philosopher rulers have a global importance, and hopes that one day the entire world will be filled with cities like his utopia. It can be inferred from this, together with Diotima's point that there were barbarians who gave the world great works and brought forth all sorts of virtue mentioned in the first section, that Socrates believed there could be barbarian philosopher rulers too. Greek nationalism, then, may be seen as an expression of Plato's political bias, if not a contradiction in Socrates' doctrine itself.

Socrates notes that in his luxurious utopia in *the Republic*, the rulers and the subjects call each other citizens, and moreover the rulers call the people their foster fathers. This differs radically from all other states. In some the rulers are called masters, in democratic states they are simply called rulers. According to Socrates, in all, however, the rulers call the people slaves (Plato 3, 300). Realistically, of course, a radical state like Socrates' utopia has to consider all other regimes, which Socrates rejects as we have seen, as potential enemies. According to Dawson, the utopia is tied to the real world through war (Dawson, 84). The policy towards war in

the Republic has its orientation in Greek nationalism. Socrates says that Greeks should not enslave Greeks, or burn each other's houses and fields, or think the whole population of a city are equally their enemies. Barbarians, however, are to be dealt with as the Greeks now deal with one another (Plato 3, 308-11). This means Plato's Socrates considered it was acceptable to do all the things listed above to barbarians, including enslaving them and seeing their entire population as the enemy. Although Socrates never explicitly says there will be slaves in his utopia, it is likely he thought there would be barbarian slaves. Today, of course, this would be a reactionary idea, however in Socrates' time it would pass as a conservative one. It has to be admitted that due to the progress of history, certain consequent serious utopias may seem to have shed themselves of such aspects, but these do not constitute substantial advancements over the Socratic utopia so long as the political utopias in question remain unrealized.

Meno, in Plato's dialogue carrying his name, says Socrates is wise not to go away from home, because if he acted in other places as he did in Athens, he would be thrown into prison as a magician (Plato 2, 41). We can tie this very true statement with Socrates' radical politics, and conclude that he greatly exploited the freedoms of Athenian democracy to defend a doctrine opposed to it. Of course, though he was protected by the laws for a long time, as Zeller states, Socrates was attacked through his life (Zeller, 193). The prosecutors of his trial were Anytus (5th – 4th Centuries BC), a major democratic politician, Meletus (5th – 4th Centuries BC), a tragic poet, and Lycon (5th – 4th Centuries BC), a rhetorician (Russell, 85). Anytus was with Thrasybulus (440 – 388 BC) during the fall of the Thirty, and he later he took a forgiving attitude towards the members of the oligarchic regime (Rhodes, 431). According to Zeller, Anytus can well be seen as the power behind the prosecution. Zeller notes that Socrates' anti-democratic views were not really a

question of discussion during the trial, although “the interests of the democratic party did come into play” (Zeller, 211, 213). Thus we can conclude that Socrates’ radical utopianism was persecuted by the moderate establishment, spearheaded by the democrats, just like Pythagorean conservatism before it.

Aside from corrupting the minds of the youth, a political charge regarding his educational activity, the most important charge against Socrates was the charge of impiety. Ritter notes that though Socrates tended towards monotheism, he was completely respectful towards the national deities (Ritter, 27-8). Among them, he followed Apollo in particular as we have seen, and possibly subscribed to the idea that the earth came before the gods like Aspasia, who had been accused of impiety herself. However, in my view, it was not really for his religious views that he was charged: accusations of impiety had been the common charge against philosophers after all. Rather, he had to die for being a philosopher, an educator and influential political civilian. Diogenes Laertius reports that following the death of Socrates, the Athenians “immediately felt such remorse” that they decided to shut down the wrestling arenas and gymnasiums; banished Anytus and Lycon; sentenced Meletus to death; and erected a bronze statue of Socrates (Laertius, 84). Perhaps, however, what honored Socrates the most was for his companions to start writing the dialogues based on various conversations he had, so that his doctrine would live on.

Socrates the Teacher?

Aristophanes the playwright, a decided enemy of Socrates, puts him at the head of a school (O’Connor, 78). According to Burnet, Aristophanes confirms Plato by distinguishing between Socrates’ “disciples,” his permanent associates in a scientific school, and the youths who “frequented his

society” or were sent to him by their parents (Burnet, 146). We should, however, keep Taylor’s important warning about Aristophanes in mind: as a hostile playwright, Aristophanes’ job is to distort the truth (Taylor, 14). Heinrich Ritter, for example, thinks that we must not understand a close society, a sect or even a school of philosophy in the proper sense from the school of Socrates (Ritter, 78). In Zeller we find a more nuanced description. As his discourse was attractive, Zeller says, Socrates started gaining followers and for his part, he was anxious to educate these new friends as well as to give them advice. This society was loosely connected though gradually a nucleus of close followers were formed with whom Socrates frequently had common meals. The Socratic school, according to Zeller, was united not by a common set of doctrines but by a common love for Socrates (Zeller, 68). We may thus conclude that Socrates’ school was not formally a school, but was a loose movement. Its nature was more educational than political, although if *the Republic* is to be believed, Socrates discussed his political doctrine with his associates, who agreed with him in varying degrees.

Zeller notes how Socrates refused to appear as a public teacher like the Sophists. Not only did he refuse being paid, but he also did not give methodical lessons. He did not even profess to teach, “but only to learn in common with others”. Accordingly, he did not force his convictions upon his associates but tended to prefer to examine theirs (Zeller, 67). Thus, Socrates subscribed to an extremely student-centered approach to say the least. Whether he taught at all or not is quite relevant to his refusal to accept money for education. In the epistles, Socrates explains how he refuses to make money out of philosophy and gives his philosophical instruction in public for free, rather than shut up inside a closed community like the Pythagoreans (Anonymous, 219). Here, Socrates’ point can be generalized into a political statement that education

should be free. In *Memorabilia*, Antiphon the Sophist notes that the consequence of not charging students is to live in a way no slave under a master would put up with³³ (Xenophon, 40). Does Socrates embrace these conditions because he believes education should be free or is it rather an ethical matter of refusing to be paid for what is mistakenly taken to be teaching? The ancient sources disagree on this question.

In Plato's *Apology*, Socrates responds to the report that he is a teacher, and takes money for it by saying that if a person can really instruct humanity, receiving money for the service would be an honor for them (Plato 2, 125). It is unclear to what degree Socrates considers this possible. In any case, in the same work, Socrates, in no unclear terms, declares that he has never taught nor claimed to teach anything to anyone (Plato 2, 136). Kahn quotes Aeschines to show that in his *Alcibiades*, Socrates claims to know no science or skill that he could teach anyone, though he keeps company with friends thinking he could make them better (Kahn, 92). Lastly in Xenophon's *Apology*, Socrates quite freely admits being in the field of education, and explains certain people's fondness for him with him being an adept of education, "the greatest treasure men possess" (Xenophon 2014, 8-9). The first, and perhaps easiest explanation of this contradiction is to consider Plato's Socrates to be ironic in rejecting that he is a teacher. Accordingly, Socrates knows that he has taught others, but thinks whatever he's taught to be so little that it amounts to nothing. As for Xenophon's account, perhaps because the irony is lost to him, or perhaps because he thought it would be lost to his readers, Xenophon omits it. This is a plausible interpretation, but there are other explanations that should be considered.

³³ "Your meat and your drink are of the cheapest sort, and as to clothes, you cling to one wretched cloak which serves you for summer and winter alike... Then again, you are not for taking or making money," says Antiphon. In response, Socrates explains that he's doing fine (Xenophon, 40).

O'Connor attempts to reconcile Plato and Xenophon's accounts with the assertion that Socrates was not a teacher but an educator (O'Connor, 40). Of course, the distinction between an educator and a teacher is not just semantics; Socrates could have been an educator but not a teacher if he, for example, had only been an educational theorist. The crux of the matter is whether Socrates' method of dialectical cross-examination, or elenchus, can be defined as teaching. Donald Morrison rejects the idea that the disagreement between Plato and Xenophon's accounts of Socrates on whether the process of dialectical disputation can be described as teaching to be merely verbal despite the fact that the process is described in very similar terms in the works of both authors (Morrison, 207). In my view, if the elenctic method is to be defined as educational, it has to be seen as a form of teaching; and though it is radically different from conventional forms of education, it is nevertheless educational, as it has, according to Aeschines, the task of improving people. Nevertheless, it is important to understand the reasons Plato's Socrates does not consider it as such, and it would be a grave mistake to neglect what he has to say about the elenctic method and Socrates' educational philosophy.

The example of Socrates guiding a slave boy to solve a complex geometric problem in *Meno* deserves our attention not only for its political implications but also for its educational importance. Socrates first claims he is not teaching the boy anything but only asking questions, as a result of which the boy thinks he knows how to solve the problem (Plato 2, 46). Then, as a result of Socrates' questions, the slave boy comes to realize that what he did not know in the first place, he still does not know, although now he knows that he does not know (Plato 2, 51). Yet, soon enough, the slave boy solves the problem. Only by being asked questions, instead of being taught directly, the slave boy recovers the knowledge (Plato

2, 56). Socrates believes that “the truth of all things always existed in the soul,” and draws from this the conclusion that the soul is immortal (Plato 2, 58). In *Phaedo*, Socrates voices support for the theory of transmigration of souls, or living again (Plato 2, 200). Accordingly, people possess the knowledge of equality, beauty, goodness, justice, holiness and all other essences before and when they are born (Plato 2, 204). Plato’s Socrates’ metaphysical theory of recollection, or anamnesis has radical educational implications. The theory of recollection is a powerful critique of conventional education, and makes a hierarchy of knowledge impossible by defining learning as an act of recovering something within one’s soul, and claiming that all souls possess the same crucial knowledge. This is an absolute rejection of the traditional one sided teacher–student relationship. Socrates and the slave boy are basically equals, except the slave boy still needs Socrates’ guiding questions. Nevertheless, though Plato’s Socrates’ is coherent to reject that this guidance amounts to teaching, to someone who does not adhere to Socrates’ metaphysical theory of the soul, there is no reason not to consider it to be a form of teaching, though radically different from conventional education of the time. In general, this is at the heart of the strength as well as the weakness of Socratic education. On the one hand, it makes it possible to realize the potential of everyone as students while the educational process is catered according to the needs of the student. Thus Socrates’ student-centered education has the interests of the student rather than the teacher at heart. The teacher has no formal authority, to the extent that it is not immediately clear whether they’re a teacher at all. The teacher is in charge only by virtue of their mastery of conversation. Thus, unsurprisingly, this education has produced too many successors, each of whom eventually proved more interested in their own doctrines than that of their teacher, regardless of the doubtless sincere affinity they have for him.

Socrates' Educational Method and Practice

In *Theaetetus*, Socrates famously says that he practices the craft of his mother: midwifery (Plato 4, 167). Socrates considers regular midwifery very important, but his midwifery is more important than the actual craft. The difference between Socrates' art and normal midwifery is that Socrates looks after souls rather than bodies; and he examines the mind of youths to see if it brings forth a false idol or a true birth. Socrates leaves the greatness to the youths, for he considers himself barren like midwives, and cannot intellectually bring forth inventions (Plato 4, 169-70) This intellectual midwifery can easily be defined as teaching: accordingly, the role of the teacher is to aid the students' mind, using the method of dialectical cross-examination, to give birth if the consequences of this birth will be good. Nevertheless, Socrates' self-description as intellectually barren is unfair. If we simply consider all the sources available on the philosopher, we see an intellect which has given birth to plenty of inventions. That Socrates is saying this in the presence of a youth he is educating shows that he is engaging in conversation with him basically as an equal, even if his role is different from the role of the youth.

Socrates' method is not asking random questions but asking questions and engaging in conversation according to the art of dialectic or disputation. In *Phaedrus*, he says that this art is not confined to the courts and the assembly but can be used everywhere. Socrates traces it to Zeno (495–430 BC), who he calls the Eleatic Palamedes. He explains that Zeno had an art of speaking by which he made the same things seem as like and unlike, one and many, and at rest and in motion. Socrates' description of the art is that it finds a likeness of everything to which a likeness can be found, and clarifies likenesses and disguises (Plato 1, 430-1). We find a similar description of the dialectic in *Memorabilia*, where Socrates explains the art as selecting things according to their kinds. Socrates expresses

his conviction that if a person knew what each reality is, they can transmit this knowledge to others. Thus, according to Xenophon, Socrates fosters this dialectic capacity among those close to him (Xenophon, 192-3). Again in *Memorabilia*, we witness Aristippus dialectically cross-examining Socrates like Socrates does to him (Xenophon, 123-5). In *Oeconomicus*, Socrates describes Ischomachus as the teacher and himself as the student (Xenophon, 119). Ischomachus' method of teaching mirrors that of Socrates, as well as Aspasia and Diotima. Socrates asks whether teaching consists of asking questions, before going on to describe Ischomachus' method as follows: "You lead me through the field of my own knowledge, and then by pointing out analogies to what I know, persuade me that I really know some things which hitherto, as I believed, I had no knowledge of" (Xenophon, 133). Taking the above quote to accurately represent dialectical cross examination, there can be no dispute that it is an educational method with the purpose of teaching a person something they did not know before.

One of the most important educational disputes of the ancient Greek world took place around the question of whether virtue could be thought. On this question, Plato's Socrates was decidedly against the claims of conventional education, represented by the Sophists. In *Meno*, in response to the assertion that virtue can be taught, Socrates responds that he knows nearly nothing about virtue, let alone being able to teach it (Plato 2, 21-2). Nevertheless, Socrates knows that virtue is the same in men, women and children: anyone can be temperate and just, or intemperate and unjust (Plato 2, 24-5). According to Socrates, for anything to be taught it needs to have teachers and disciples. Socrates then inquires who the teachers of virtue are (Plato 2, 65), and eventually, citing the inconsistency of the Sophists themselves on whether they can teach virtue, he concludes that they are not even teachers in

any true sense, and if there are neither teachers nor scholars of virtue, it cannot be taught (Plato 2, 74-5). Instead, according to Socrates, virtue comes by gift of God (Plato 2, 83). The implication is that no one can make another person virtuous, which is a radical though questionable assertion. Xenophon disagrees with the point argued by Plato's Socrates above: in *Memorabilia*, he declares that Socrates himself taught virtue, though he did so not like the Sophists but by example (Xenophon, 11). As with his elenctic method, Plato's Socrates is modest about his ability to teach virtue due to metaphysical reasons while Xenophon points out that in practice, Socrates certainly gave moral education.

It's important to note that even Plato's Socrates does not reject education itself. In *Gorgias*, Socrates says that happiness consists of justice, which can be taken to represent his politics, and education (Plato 2, 327). That he considers education as important as justice thus shows that even in Plato's works, Socrates makes the subject a central part of his doctrine. In *the Republic*, Socrates notes that youth rather than old age is the time for education. (Plato 3, 377) Two dialogues of Plato give an example of Socrates' interest in the youth. At the beginning of *Charmides*, he inquires about "the present state of philosophy, and about the youth" and asks if there are any youths remarkable for wisdom and/or beauty (Plato 1, 24). At the beginning of *Theaetetus* too, he says he is interested in the Athenian youth and wants to know who among them shows promise. Socrates adds that he observes the youth as much as he can (Plato 4, 156). Both dialogues carry the names of such youths, with whom Socrates speaks. Socrates' attitude can be described as that of an educator searching for students to teach.

In *Lysis*, we see an example of Socrates counseling a youth on his troubled relationship with his parents, who he says do not allow him to be free. The youth complains that his

tutor, who belongs to his family as a slave, is his master. He adds that other teachers rule over him as well. In response, Socrates cites the abilities his education has gained him, such as writing and reading or tuning the lyre. Moreover, Socrates points out that the youth has a deficiency of knowledge rather than years, and that people, including his father, will trust him when he understands more (Plato 1, 61-3). In *Memorabilia* too, Socrates counsels a youth on his relationship to his mother. Socrates first inquires if the mother has used physical violence, to which the youth responds that she uses her words instead. Soon, Socrates gets the youth to admit that his mother is not ill disposed towards him, and concludes that the youth should be happy to have such a mother (Xenophon, 61). In both examples, Socrates cross-examines the youths, listens to them, and attempts to reconcile them with their parents. It can be argued that he's acting like a guidance counselor in both examples, which demonstrate the mentoring aspect of his educational practice.

In *Memorabilia*, Socrates hears of a youth called Euthydemus, who is defined by Morrison as just the sort to interest him. A very beautiful youth, Euthydemus prides himself on being the wisest of his age group, having gathered a large collection of the writings of poets and sages. Socrates seeks this youth and finds him in a leather-worker's shop (Morrison, 185). First Socrates attracts the youth's attention, then starts to cross-examine him and soon manages to show him his own ignorance (Morrison, 186-7). As a result, Euthydemus is in agony of self-contempt, convinced that he is no better than a slave, and Xenophon notes that many who were reduced to a similar condition by Socrates refused to approach him again. Euthydemus, however, becomes a follower of Socrates for, according to Xenophon, he understands that he has to associate with Socrates in order to be worthy of account. In turn Socrates initiates him into all he

needed to know or practice in the simplest manner (Xenophon, 167). For Xenophon's Socrates, teaching is a coveted activity: he goes after students, starts by using cross-examination to show them they did not know what they thought they knew, and in doing so, wins over the students he can, so he can continue to educate them.

The example of the allegory of the cave in *the Republic* is a striking metaphor of Socratic education. According to this allegory, human beings are living in an underground cave as prisoners, chained and unable to move, they can only see the wall opposite the entrance of the cave. In accordance they believe the shadows dancing on the wall to be real. Then, a prisoner is liberated and faces real existence, realizing that the shadows everyone believes to be real are mere illusions. When the liberated prisoner thinks of his fellow prisoners, he pities them. Yet the multitude of prisoners, upon seeing that the liberated prisoner, having been accustomed to the light outside, cannot see well in the cave, decide they will never leave the cave, and will try to kill anyone who wants to take them outside (Plato 3, 354-6). Socratic education corresponds to the liberation of the prisoner, which brings a change so great that the entire worldview of the prisoner is altered. Socrates is pessimistic about the popular masses' willingness to undergo such a challenging education to the extent that he thinks they will want to kill whoever tries to take them outside. Here we see Socrates' meritocratic views come into play: according to Socrates, only a small percentage can be intellectually liberated. The free prisoner realizes that all they had known was false, and is thrown into a new world they know nothing about. Of course, Socrates, as the educator, guides his students and companions in this new world between ignorance and wisdom, thus this education presumably includes the political, ethical and metaphysical doctrines of Socrates. Thus, the goal of education is "the turning round of

a soul," says Socrates in *the Republic*, from a false perception based on becoming to one based on true being. (Plato 3, 360-1). This metaphor can be interpreted as using education in order to convert the student. Socrates states in *Lysis* that those who require a teacher have not attained wisdom yet (Plato 1, 65), which also means those who have not attained wisdom yet require a teacher.

In Plato's *Apology*, Socrates explains the negative definition of a wise man according to the multitude as someone who practices natural philosophy (Plato 2, 124). Xenophon's *Apology* has the Oracle at the temple of Apollo in Delphi declare Socrates to be the most liberal, upright and temperate of all human beings, but not wise. (Xenophon 2014, 7). It can be considered that Xenophon may be trying to protect Socrates from being associated with the popular conception of being wise. If this is the case, then I have to agree with Burnet who says Socrates would not be killed if Xenophon's *Apology* was fully accurate (Burnet, 149). In contrast, according to Plato's *Apology*, the Oracle declares that there is no man wiser than Socrates. Socrates finds this hard to believe because he believes that he has no wisdom, so he embarks on a quest to find someone wiser than he is. He goes to politicians, teachers of wisdom, poets and artisans and concludes that none of them are wise because they think they know what they do not know. In contrast, Socrates neither knows nor thinks that he knows (Plato 2, 126-7). This, Socrates believes, is the message of Apollo: the wisest human is the one who knows his wisdom is not worth anything, for only God is wise, and the wisdom of human beings is worth little or nothing (Plato, 128). The sincere intellectual modesty of Socrates once again is a position strongly against the establishment of a hierarchy of knowledge. Even from a perspective considering Socrates to be a teacher, it is necessary to note that the teacher has very little authority over the student if at all.

In *Laches*, an early dialogue written by Plato, Socrates is defined as a good teacher, and does not dispute the label (Plato 1, 97). Moreover, when asked if he will give assistance in the improvement of certain youths, he declares that he would be very wrong to refuse to aid in the improvement of anybody. Nevertheless, he tells his interlocutors that there is no reason why he among them should teach the youths, and they should all seek the best teacher, first for themselves and then for the youth. In short, Socrates proposes to “make the education of the youths our own education” (Plato 1, 120). Socrates thus argues for the importance of the education of those who would be educators. Even if Socrates is to be considered an educator, it has to be admitted that he is always a student first, and only then a teacher. In *Euthyphro*, an early dialogue of Plato, while waiting for his trial, Socrates encounters Euthyphro, a prophet who is suing his own father. Euthyphro claims to be pious and to know piety. Socrates thinks it would be a good idea to learn from this man for his trial as he’s accused of impiety (Plato 1, 91-93). In the end, Socrates expresses disappointment that he learned nothing on piety from this encounter (Plato 1, 115). Socrates’ entire approach is that of a conscious student. It is of course out of question for a man like Euthyphro who already thinks he has knowledge to learn anything from Socrates.

In *Charmides*, we see Socrates distinguishing between facility and difficulty in learning, and associating the difference with whether one learns quickly, or quietly and slowly. Teaching too, according to Socrates, needs to be done quickly and energetically, rather than quietly and slowly (Plato 1, 30). In the same dialogue, Socrates says there should be different expectations about what a young person can understand as opposed to someone older and more educated (Plato 1, 34). These examples show that even in Plato, educational practice is something Socrates is very interested

in. In *Memorabilia*, Xenophon says that Socrates dealt with different kinds of youths, such as those who had good natural ability but despised learning, or those who shunned education because they were so proud of being rich, or those who were persuaded that they received the best education and were proud of their wisdom, differently, and tried to win them over³⁴ (Xenophon, 152-153). These categories of students can be seen as different types of resistant learners, in that they are all resistant to the kind of learning Socrates wants to pass over. Because he does not give up, and comes up with different kind of approaches to teach these students, Socrates can be described as a stubborn educator.

Understandably, however, given his meritocratic tendency, the resistant learners are not the ones Socrates is most interested in. In *Charmides*, Socrates considers modesty to be a desirable quality in young people (Plato 1, 28). Modesty, of course, must have made it easier for his students to recognize their ignorance. Additionally, in *Memorabilia*, Socrates describes the students he prefers as souls disposed towards virtue. Their three characteristics are that they are quick learners, have a strong memory, and desire every kind of knowledge to manage city and home. According to Socrates, such people only need to be educated to become happy themselves, happy administrators of their households and capable of making other human beings and in fact states happy (Xenophon, 151). This proves that Socrates indeed saw a close connection between his educational activity and politics, since he preferred his students to have an interest in politics and hoped that they could, with the proper education, cause happiness through their political activity. Certainly, having the youth educated in such a way would bring the world closer to Socrates' meritocratic socialist utopia, however his educational activity can only be expected to be

³⁴ Euthydemus, mentioned earlier, for example, is a youth of the third type.

centered on the views and needs of the students rather than the doctrine of the teacher. And, again, as Socrates says in Plato's *Alcibiades*, Socratic education is a process where both the teacher and the student are improved because education is necessary for everyone (Plato 2, 504). However because of this, Socratic education could only lead to a loose political movement, compared to its teacher-centered Pythagorean predecessor which resulted in a strict political organization.

Socrates' Students

Clay cites a fragment from a comic poet of Socrates' time for a description of Socrates' followers as people with long hair, who went hungry, refused to take baths, carried walking sticks and "Socratized". These followers, such as Chaerephon (460 – 399 BC) and Apollodorus (429 – 4th Century BC), were faithful imitators of Socrates in that they left no record of their views in writing. Most of the other students of Socrates, however, produced written materials of Socrates' thought before as well as after Socrates' death (Clay, 25). O'Connor notes that common readings were a characteristic activity of the Socratic circle (O'Connor, 81). Moreover, in Plato's *Phaedrus*, we witness Socrates teaching the rules of writing and speech (Plato 1, 427). Hence, it is safe to conclude scholarship in the form of reading and writing as well as debating was encouraged among the followers of Socrates.

In Plato's *Apology*, Socrates talks about the interest young men of richer class show in him (Plato 2, 128). Plato himself was one of these young men, however not all who followed Socrates came from the privileged class. Diogenes Laertius notes that his student Antisthenes was the son of a metic mother, and when he was insulted for it, Socrates defended his student and companion saying "But did you imagine so noble a man could have been born of two Athenian parents?"

(Laertius, 78) This example shows Socrates looking out for his pupil, and defending him from xenophobic abuse. According to Diogenes Laertius, Phaedo, another student of Socrates, was a slave, who had been taken captive in a war. When Socrates met him, he was being forced to stay in a brothel. He would close the brothel's door and take part in conversations with Socrates, who eventually arranged that Alcibiades (450 – 404 BC) or Crito bought Phaedo's freedom. Having regained his freedom, Phaedo dedicated his life to the study of philosophy and became a writer of Socratic dialogues (Laertius, 112). Phaedo's strong affection for his is teacher can be seen in Plato's dialogue carrying his name, where he says it a delight to even remember Socrates (Plato 2, 185). Another student of Socrates, and writer of Socratic dialogues, was Aeschines, who, according to Laertius, acknowledged that he was poor, and offered Socrates himself, as he had nothing else to offer. This, Socrates responded, was the greatest gift of all (Laertius, 80). All these examples demonstrate the affection and loyalty Socrates could inspire in the members of the loose movement he had started.

Not all of Socrates' followers were Socratics. Burnet notes that there were Pythagoreans among the students of Socrates, and that there may have been a certain time when Socrates was seen as the head of the Pythagorean school (Burnet, 151-3). Of course, despite having certain similarities which undoubtedly resulted in Pythagoreans developing an interest in him, Socrates' radical philosophy has important differences, especially in the fields of politics and education, from Pythagoreanism, which was essentially a conservative and patriarchal movement. Since Socrates did not have a formal definition of a student and accepted anyone to the extent that they wanted to be involved with him, he cannot be expected to treat the Pythagoreans any differently. As for his Pythagorean students, Burnet describes how shaken they

were when Socrates did not share some of their views and how ready they were to accept the main doctrine of Socrates as soon as they heard it. In turn, according to Burnet, it may be that the Pythagorean elders were annoyed at Socrates for corrupting their doctrine (Burnet, 153), and probably also for attracting their students. Although two of these Pythagoreans, Simmias and Cebes, wrote Socratic dialogues, it is likelier that the majority of Pythagoreans considered the Socratics to be a rival movement.

Not all of Socrates' followers remained Socratics. According to *Memorabilia*, the infamous Alcibiades and Critias (460 – 403) had once been students of Socrates, and he was blamed for being associated with them for life. Xenophon says Alcibiades and Critias were a democrat and an oligarch respectively (Xenophon, 13). In fact, the political alignments of these two figures is complicated. According to Thucydides, Alcibiades famously defected to the Spartan side during the Peloponnesian War. In a speech to the Spartans he describes his previous conduct as that of a democratic moderate, and denounces democracy (Thucydides, 355). Thucydides nevertheless portrays Alcibiades as an ally to democratic general Thrasybulus, who recalled him from exile, only for Alcibiades to come back and take power in a coup d'état as the leader of the pro-Sparta oligarchic group known as the Four Hundred. (Thucydides, 455-6). The regime of the Four Hundred did not last, however, and Alcibiades was exiled again, only to be recalled, and exiled yet again. In this period, Critias was the most important ally of Alcibiades, and probably followed his younger fellow student into exile (Morison). In any case, according to Xenophon, Critias was involved in a democratic rebellion in Thessaly when he was away from Athens, organizing peasants against lords with "Prometheus" (Xenophon 1876, 331). Returning from exile, however, Critias became a leader of another pro-Sparta

oligarchic regime, that of the Thirty, known for its brutal reign of terror which included summary executions, property confiscations, and the exile of thousands of democrats and metics. Alcibiades, already exiled, was assassinated on his former friend and fellow student Critias' orders. In turn, the democrats lead by Thrasybulus were soon victorious against the Thirty, reestablishing democracy in Athens. Critias died fighting against them (Morison).

Given their opportunism throughout their political and military careers, it is difficult to figure out whether Alcibiades and Critias became figureheads of oligarchic reaction out of conviction or ambition. Despite being a Spartan sympathizer and a supporter of oligarchy, Xenophon distances Socrates from Alcibiades and Critias using the strongest words against them in *Memorabilia* (Xenophon, 13). Xenophon's words cannot be doubted here: regardless of whether his infamous students acted out of political conviction or greed and ambition, they're definitely at odds with the morality and politics of their teacher. Xenophon quotes a dialogue between Socrates, Critias and his associate Charicles, where Socrates openly criticizes the regime of the Thirty, Charicles threatens Socrates, and Critias mocks his affinity for "shoemakers, carpenters, and coppersmiths" (Xenophon, 18). Nevertheless, Xenophon claims that when Alcibiades and Critias were Socrates' students, they were temperate out of conviction rather than fear of punishment, and lost their morality as they were separated from Socrates (Xenophon, 14-5). While Xenophon successfully absolves Socrates from any blame for the conduct of these two students, it is clear that he lost these students, and they in turn lost their way. Thus, politically, the example of Alcibiades and Critias demonstrate a failure of Socratic pedagogy.

Were all of Socrates' students male? In *Theaetetus*, Socrates declares that as a midwife of the soul rather than a midwife

of the body, he attends men, not women (Plato 4, 170). The line above may have been written by Plato this way merely to distinguish between the two kinds of midwifery. In any case, not attending women is inconsistent with Socrates' views on gender. "Women's nature is nowise inferior to man's," says Socrates in Xenophon's *Symposium*. "All she wants is strength and judgment," which is a reason why husbands should teach their wives who are their associates. Then, Antisthenes asks Socrates why he does not tutor Xanthippe who is the most shrewish of all wives. Socrates responds that he does not want to change Xanthippe. In fact, ever the student, he learns from her spirited nature how to tolerate and attach himself to every other human being (Xenophon, 15). "You die unjustly," Xanthippe commented on Socrates' death sentence according to Diogenes Laertius. Socrates responded that it was better than dying justly (Laertius, 80), yet this does not negate Xanthippe's point which is that Socrates did not deserve this unjust death sentence. Being quite younger than Socrates, Xanthippe must have conversed with Socrates often and learned a lot from him. It's probable she knew Aspasia too. Given Socrates did not formally define his students, everyone he conversed with who was open to learning from him can be considered his student. Accordingly, Xanthippe can be counted among Socrates' students.

There is another ancient woman who can be counted among Socrates' students. Her name is Theodote, and she is only mentioned in *Memorabilia*. Theodote was a hetaera who is described by Xenophon as ready to consort with any suitor who might win her favor. According to Socrates, she was so beautiful that painters flocked to draw her. So Socrates decided to meet Theodote. Characteristically, Socrates starts by asking a number of questions to Theodote and is soon discussing with her how she can catch her friends and lovers. According to Socrates, it is important to keep human

relationships natural as one cannot capture or keep a friend by force but with kindness and pleasure. Socrates says he has many good friends and followers who never leave him, which he keeps with diverse love charms, incantations and magic wheels. Theodote, impressed, asks for his magic wheel so that she can use it first of all to make Socrates her friend. Socrates, however responds that he does not wish to be drawn to her but rather wants her to come to him. Theodote responds that she will come (Xenophon, 137-41). Socrates makes it clear that he is not interested in being a client of Theodote but wants her to come to him as a companion and a student. Xenophon does not say whether Theodote visited Socrates, however, judging from her eagerness to befriend him, there is no reason to think Theodote did not continue the relationship. In addition, the encounter with Theodote shows Socrates' willingness to engage with a hetaera and teach her to be better at her art. This not only shows Socrates to be respectful of the work of a hetaera, rather than seeing it as anything shameful, but also demonstrates his eagerness to covet female students. Overall, it is safe to assume that Socrates' students must have been considerably more numerous than what has been recorded, considering women's and lower classes' tendency to disappear from the historic accounts.

Educational Philosophy of Socrates

Despite being extremely student-centered in his approach, Socrates guided his students. The educational process was shaped according to individual qualities of the student, where the teacher often feigned ignorance in order to encourage the student to express themselves. It also certainly involved winning the student over to Socrates' views. Thus, Socratic education was certainly political in that it aimed to convert students, yet it was also personal, starting the student

on a never-ending journey in search of wisdom. The means of Socratic education, that is dialectical cross-examination, left the student with the feeling that they knew nothing before. Only then could they be convinced of the utopian state, or another part of the Socratic doctrine. The educational strategy was to create as much critical thinking as possible, ideally causing both a political and an epistemological rejection of all that existed. Only then could a truly different civilization, based on truly different gender relations be imagined.

In *Oeconomicus*, Socrates makes the education of women a general principle, emphasizing the husband's role in this education like in Xenophon's *Symposium*, and declares that husbands who do not educate their wives are responsible for their mistakes (Xenophon, 26). Socrates' attitude might be seen as paternalistic; however, it should also be remembered that women's means of education were extremely limited in the ancient Greek world. Later, Socrates describes the education of Ischomachus' wife in detail. Ischomachus believes the body of a man has a greater capacity than the body of a woman. He bases his belief that God imposed on women the indoor works because of this basic inequality. The education Ischomachus gives his wife is for the management of domestic affairs. The wife, or the queen bee, is to stay at home and prevent anyone from being idle, send those who work outside to their labors, store what they bring home and distribute a just share to everyone and lastly she is to supervise the nursing and rearing of children (Xenophon, 53-6). Ischomachus' unnamed wife eases her husband's worry that teaching her the need of minding family property was imposing a painful burden on her. The wife considers her tasks to be same as attending to her own domestic happiness, and finds them to be easy (Xenophon, 74). Socrates praises Ischomachus wife for her words and her "brave and masculine intelligence" (Xenophon, 78). Socrates retells his conversation

with Ischomachus approvingly. It could be that this was what he expected of women's education by their husbands. If this was all there was to Socrates' views on women's education, his doctrine would have to be considered moderately patriarchal.

Plato's utopian Socrates takes a much more radical position than Xenophon's practical Socrates, and his patriarchal tutor Ischomachus, regarding the question of women's education. In Socratic political thought, good constitutions stem from good nurture and education. In Socrates' utopian state nurture is not in the hands of the individual family, which no longer exists based on the general principle that friends have all things, including husbands, wives and children in common (Plato 3, 256). In *the Republic*, Socrates argues for the equality of men and women by asking if dogs are divided into hes and shes, instead of sharing the duties of a dog equally even if the female dogs tend to be weaker. According to Socrates, leaving the females at home, under the idea that taking care of their young is enough for them, for dogs and humans, is a waste. Accordingly, women and the men have the same duties in the ideal state, which means "they must have the same nurture and education" (Plato 3, 286-7). The fact that women bear and men beget children does not prove that women's education should be different from a man's according to Socrates. Women are not rewarded for their gender, just like men are not for theirs in the administration of the state. Hence women can be philosophers and guardians, as well as warriors, healers, musicians and so on. All this being said, Socrates repeatedly emphasizes that women are inferior to men overall, even if there are areas where women are better than men, such as weaving and cooking (Plato 3, 290-1). Despite the prejudiced talk of women's overall inferiority, which could be expected to disappear with such an egalitarian system of education just as women's superiority in weaving and cooking might, what Socrates is defending is a revolutionary change in the field of education in regards to gender.

In the civilized utopia of Socrates, education is strictly regulated by the state. Children start by doing what they naturally do: playing. This is seen as the beginning of their education. According to Socrates, if amusements become lawless, the youths themselves become lawless and cannot grow up into virtuous citizens. Hence games children play need to be lawful (Plato 3, 257). Though regulating children's play to develop lawful behavior may be a controversial idea, Socrates deserves credit as an educational philosopher for noticing the educational importance of play. Other than regulating play, the state directs education by establishing a censorship of writers of fiction which filters the good from the bad so that the nurses tell the children the authorized stories only. Homer and Hesiod, though they are the great storytellers of humanity according to Socrates, deserve the censorship of some of their works because Socrates considers the representations of the Gods in their work to be false as they give the youth wrong messages (Plato 3, 208-9). Tales in Homer and the other poets risk the danger that especially the guardians who hear them become too excitable or effeminate (Plato 3, 217). Poets who live in Socrates' civilized utopia too have to abide by the censorship and express the image of the good in their works, under the penalty of exile if they fail to do so. Otherwise, Socrates fears, the citizens will be corrupted. (Plato 3, 234). Censorship is a tool in Socrates' luxurious utopia for the state to dominate art and culture with the ultimate purpose of shaping the coming generations. This educational censorship is perfectly in line with Socrates' meritocratic socialism even though it is an idea which has appealed to and was practiced by all sides of the political spectrum, from radicals and democrats to conservatives and reactionaries throughout the centuries.

The segment of his ideal society whose education is most important to Socrates are the guardians, or the rulers.

Their education begins with music, which includes literature, and continues with gymnastic (Plato 3, 207). Socrates is conservative when it comes to the content of these two educational fields: music, he says, and gymnastic must be preserved in their original form, without any innovations made (Plato 3, 256). Simple musical education prevents legal disputes, and simple gymnastic education keeps the body healthy, rendering law and medicine necessary only in extreme cases. Nevertheless, for the most part, music and gymnastic are both for training the soul. Together, they are to prevent hardness and ferocity as well as softness and effeminacy³⁵. The correct education of the philosopher turns ferocity into courage, and prevents gentleness from turning into softness (Plato 3, 243-4). As for the auxiliaries, Socrates thinks that a good education is necessary for them too in order to prevent them from becoming tyrants (Plato 3, 250-1). Nevertheless, it is clear that rulers receive a better education than everyone else in the Socratic utopia (Plato 3, 359). This is clear not only in Plato but in Xenophon too, where Socrates defines the education of two people, one of whom will rule, in very asymmetric terms in *Memorabilia* (Xenophon, 46-7). As for the people, Dawson wonders whether they will receive an education in music (Dawson, 85). Nowhere in *the Republic* do we learn when the youths are sorted into classes, so we may only speculate about this. It would, however, be a logical educational system if everyone receives some musical and even gymnastic training so it can be seen whether they are any good at it. It should be remembered that an important feature of the Socratic system of education is that it cannot be forced (Plato 3, 377). It can be inferred from this principle that those who become artisans and farmers instead of guardians and auxiliaries chose to do so when they are young enough

³⁵ It could be argued here that Socrates is thus rejecting excessive masculinity as well as excessive femininity.

by declining education in music and gymnastic in favor of an education in a craft. If this is the case, it can be claimed that Socrates' ideal system of education was based on equal educational opportunity.³⁶

Socrates defines a higher sort of education beyond music and gymnastic for the guardians in *the Republic*. This higher education for the guardians include arithmetic (Plato 3, 265), geometry, astronomy³⁷ (Plato 3, 267-8) and harmonics (Plato 3, 371). The sciences, Socrates says in *the Republic*, need to be studied differently from how the natural philosophers or the Pythagoreans studied them. The aim is for them to reach the point of connection with one another (Plato 3, 372). Lastly dialectic, which alone goes directly to the first principle, is a part of the higher educational curriculum of the civilized utopia as an art that is gradually acquired by advanced students (Plato 3, 373). A further selection among the guardians is made to see who are assigned to study this subject that is the coping-stone of the sciences. Socrates counts the gifts required in a dialectician as having a good memory, strength of character, being hard-working, loving truth and being virtuous (Plato 3, 375-6). Thus, higher education mirrors the selective meritocracy in the rest of Socrates' ideal

³⁶ Mintz gives an excellent summary of the debate on whether the third class receives an education in Plato's *Republic*. In the affirmative position, he quotes Cornford, who says without such an education, the system described cannot promote the most promising children; Barrow, who says certain aspects of education will not be common to all, yet there will be a common base, and Murphy, who says that some sort of common education is necessary not only for meritocratic purposes but for creating solidarity and ensuring the happiness of everyone (Mintz, 5). In turn, he cites Popper, who cited Plato's hostility towards the third class; and Hourani and Reeve who argues that Plato was instead neglectful towards the third class (Mintz, 8-9). As Mintz notes, however, the system proposed by Socrates makes some sort of common education a logical necessity (Mintz, 9). Mintz goes on to make the interesting suggestion that Plato was trying to open a discussion on the education of the people (Mintz, 17). A counter explanation, however, could be that Plato was rather playing down this logical necessity which had to be a part of Socrates' system out of his negligence towards the third class.

³⁷ In *Memorabilia*, too, Socrates considers geometry and astronomy ought to be taught (Xenophon, 205).

state and educational system. It's not a system where all segments of society receive the same education. This being said, if Socrates' educational practice is seen in connection to his ideal education, it is a society that is heavily exposed to what is considered the highest of arts, dialectic.

The final favor Socrates asks from his friends in Plato's *Apology* is for his children to be "punished" and "troubled" with the same sort of education he inflicted on friends and foes, and reproved if they care about riches more than about virtue, or pretend to be something when they are nothing (Plato 2, 142). Socrates, of course, must have conversed with his own children like he did with other young students of his, so his request is for their education to continue in the same manner rather than start anew, so that his children do not stray from the path. The epistles report Socrates as content to leave not gold but good friends to his children (Anonymous, 237), so it is probable that his wishes were respected by his followers. For himself, his children, and everyone else, both the practical and the theoretical aspects of Socrates' philosophy of education can be summarized by the motto from Plato's *Apology*: "the unexamined life is not worth living" (Plato 2, 139). Socrates lived by this motto, never forgetting that he was above all else a student, and encouraged all he could to be the same. This marked the kind of teacher he was, as he tried to make others examine life, hoping to bring forth social and political change through education, using methods consistent with his philosophy. Although his educational efforts did not result in an attempt to realize his political utopia, they must have had an effect enough to be considered a threat above all by the moderates, who sentenced him to death because of the critical movement he had created by educating others, and himself.

Nevertheless, the educational philosophy of Socrates was a political failure. The first factor in this failure was due to

Socrates' refusal to write down his own doctrines, and relying completely on oral culture. Because of this, the transmission of his doctrine to the generations too young to meet him were left to his followers, who were personally very devoted to Socrates, yet very heterogeneous due to Socrates' extremely student-centered pedagogy. It has to be added about this heterogeneity that it resulted in a large and important heritage when taken together, however, making Socrates more successful than Pythagoras in this sense. The second factor for this failure was the fact that the spirit of the time was behind the Socratics only to the extent that they were an undercurrent. The mainstream political stage of Athens was dominated by the struggle between the democrats and the oligarchs in Socrates' time: unlike the Pythagoreans, the Socratics never had a chance to take power. As for the last factor for this failure, Socrates' insistence on educating women and the general rejection of patriarchy which must have shocked the Athenian status quo so much that they do not even mention it in line with Pericles' advice that women should not be mentioned for good or bad (Thucydides, 96), it can also be counted as a factor that contributed to the successes of the Socratic movement, given the intellectual heritage and educational potential of women.

Conclusion

Using all the primary sources available, this chapter has followed the trajectory of Socrates from his education to his political and educational philosophies. According to the most important extant ancient sources on Socrates, his most notable and influential teachers were Aspasia and Diotima, two women who had original philosophies. Particularly Aspasia influenced Socrates' views on gender, and Socrates in turn voiced radical views on the general equality of men and

women, and equal education for men and women, despite, it is suggested by the sometimes contradictory sources, holding certain patriarchal views himself. The Socratic attitude on gender has significance for the history of philosophy, being the first time patriarchy was challenged by a systematic doctrine. As such Aspasia and Socrates deserve the titles of first feminists. On slavery, Socrates did not hold the most advanced views for his time: nevertheless, his attitude towards slaves was not discriminatory. Without a doubt, Socrates was a lawful patriot, however it is not unlikely that he was some sort of a cosmopolitan at the same time. In general, Socrates' political views can be described as meritocratic socialism and as such were radical, even though the sources indicate certain aspects of his doctrine were conservative and even reactionary.

Educationally, Socrates opposed the creation of hierarchies of knowledge, considering the wisdom of mortals to amount to little. He was a student first and he emphasized student-centered learning. He was also an educational theorist, and in multiple cases, his use of the method of cross-examination can only be defined as a form of teaching. The Socratic political and educational philosophy did not directly determine each other though they were not contradictory either, forming an apparently mostly coherent whole with the rest of what we know of Socrates' philosophy according to various sources. In fact, Socrates hoped education, the main and essentially only political activity it could pursue, would bring forth political change, while hoping to politically reshape education for society as a whole. The Socratic movement never came near realizing its ambitious goals as it had the spirit of time behind it only in a very limited sense and largely did not fit the reality of the society it emerged within. This being said, despite remaining a marginal undercurrent, the Socratic movement was perceived as a real threat by the ruling moderate elites

of Athens, evidenced by the trial and conviction of Socrates. Although we cannot talk about Socrates' direct influence, many of his interwoven political and educational ideas, such as the equality of men and women, equal education for men and women, rejection of democracy and other forms of government, abolition of property, abolition of the family, education based on dialogue and creating political change with education among others were still discussed thousands of years after his passing.

Socrates failed in his ambitious goal to shape the world according to his philosophy and dominate the direction of progress more spectacularly than Pythagoras. Socrates' egalitarian position on gender may have been a factor in the stigmatization of the philosopher and his movement. Nevertheless, not ignoring intellectual heritage and potential of half of humanity must have benefited Socrates and his movement more. The same cannot be said of Socrates' pedagogy, which was so student-centered that soon after his death, all Socratic currents significantly revised Socrates in one way or another. Nevertheless, taken together, the offshoots of the Socratic movement, many of which were more influential than Pythagoreanism after its heyday, constitute an obviously far larger heritage than that of Pythagoreanism. This shows that the Socratic pedagogy had its advantages compared to its rivals too, even if it not only proved insufficient in realizing the philosopher's ambition to reshape the world, something unachievable by education alone, but also in creating a lasting doctrine.

Chapter 4

Plato and Platonism

Although Plato (427 – 347 BC) is the most important source on Socrates (470 – 399 BC), and his school of thought is understandably seen as Socratic, important differences exist between the philosophies of the teacher and the student. Plato's philosophy has to be considered more patriarchal, conservative, and less radical compared to that of his teacher for the most part, although Plato nevertheless never became a moderate but rather remained a radical figure for his time. More so than the difference between Socrates and Plato is the difference between Plato and Platonism as it developed through the ages. Nevertheless, it goes without saying that Plato remained an important source of inspiration for the movement bearing his name. Often more, sometimes less conservative and patriarchal than Plato's own philosophy, Platonism maintained itself as a political and educational movement throughout the centuries. Plato and the current he inspired has to be considered in both these aspects.

Its extraordinary longevity as an influential educational movement with political aspirations alone is reason to consider Platonism to be the most successful of the movements that originated in antiquity. Platonism developed as a series of contradictory incarnations rather than in a succession, in other words it took various forms with contradictory views on certain key issues, each negating previous forms.

Hence Platonism advanced Plato's thought no more than Plato advanced that of Socrates. Like the other movements of its time, Platonism certainly failed to politically dominate the progress of civilization by realizing its utopian vision, making it further impossible to advance. The success of the movement rather lies in its educational activity. On numerous occasions, Platonism, favored by the spirit of time, came to dominate the intellectual life of its parent civilization with educational institutions belonging to the movement. When this was not possible, Platonists dominated intellectual life through mainstream educational institutions. Moderating the extreme educational teachings of Socrates, and situating them in a framework of academic study certainly contributed to the longevity of the Platonic movement. Similarly, tuning down Socratic opposition to patriarchy, while retaining key practices such as the education of women, protected the movement from patriarchal reaction while allowing it to make use of the intellectual abilities of women. The heterogeneous nature of the movement, however, made it unable to become a political force capable of resisting the historic changes that affected it.

Following A. E. Taylor's interpretation (Taylor, 26-8), the later works of Plato, especially dialogues where the main character is not Socrates have been taken to represent the views of Plato as a mature philosopher distinct from his teacher, whose views on many philosophical, political and educational matters are featured in depth through his earlier works and have been covered in the previous chapter. As for Platonism, Diogenes Laertius (fl. 3rd Century) is a particularly important source on the Platonic Academy; middle Platonism is represented by the works of Cicero (106 – 43 BC) and Plutarch (46 – 120), and Neoplatonism is represented by the works of Plotinus (205 – 270), Porphyry (234 – 305) and others, as well as ancient and modern secondary sources.

Political Philosophy of Plato

Unlike Socrates who came from a plebeian background, Plato was of high birth. His mother traced her descent from Solon (630 – 560 BC), the democratic lawgiver of Athens, and his father traced his from Codrus (fl. 11th Century BC), the last king of Athens (Guthrie 1975, 10). Due to his privileged background, Plato was well educated. Diogenes Laertius notes that he was taught letters at the school of an Athenian orator, after which he started working on painting and writing poems. Additionally, he studied gymnastics with a wrestler, and competed in games (Laertius, 135). Plato first encountered philosophy in the form of the teachings of Heraclitus (535 – 475 BC), a natural philosopher. According to Eduard Zeller, the philosophy of Heraclitus had an effect on Plato's views, though this influence pales in comparison to that of Socrates (Zeller, 9). Diogenes Laertius reports ancient authors as describing young Plato as so reserved and serious that he never laughed excessively (Laertius, 146). Nevertheless, there is some evidence that Plato did not always live according to conservative morality. Diogenes Laertius quotes love poems from Plato written for a hetaera as well as a young man who joined him in his study of astronomy among others (Diogenes Laertius 147-8). These aspects of Plato's life shed light to what may have appealed to him in Socrates' thought.

Zeller notes that several of Plato's nearest relatives were spokesman of the "aristocratic" party and his family regarded the current democratic constitution of Athens with discomfort (Zeller, 7). Here, the term aristocratic must be understood as oligarchic rather than aristocratic in the Socratic sense as the latter was not represented in mainstream politics. According to Zeller, the dreadful actions of the political faction his family supported in power must have contributed to Plato's rejection of not only democracy but other regimes, and his adoption of utopian politics (Zeller, 7). Here, Zeller fails to

cite an obvious source of this utopianism, Socrates himself, undoubtedly the most important teacher of Plato. As the story reported by Diogenes Laertius goes, Plato appeared to Socrates in a dream, as a newborn swan in his lap, and Socrates recognized him from his dream when the two met for the first time the next day. (Laertius, 136). This story, though certainly unlikely to be true, nevertheless indicates that Plato was recognized as a very important student of Socrates. In turn, Plato loyally dedicated his earlier and middle works to his teacher, providing the main material on his views. Plato was not just a student of Socrates, but, having become one, he had also joined a movement. After the death of Socrates, Plato continued his relations with certain members of the Socratic movement, such as Euclides (435 – 365 BC), whom he joined in Megara. Yet Plato was open to other influences as well such as Heracliteanism³⁸, Pythagoreanism³⁹ and Egyptian medicine. He even wanted to study with the Iranian Magi, yet wars prevented him from doing so (Laertius, 136-7). Returning from his travels, Zeller says, Plato settled in Athens where he focused on education (Zeller, 19). The international education Plato received after the death of Socrates must have been a factor in Plato's development as a mature philosopher.

Diogenes Laertius reports the claim that Plato distorted Socrates' views and even put words in his mouth, allegedly

³⁸ Heraclitean influence in Plato's *Timaeus*, a late dialogue, can be seen in the description of being and becoming, which is tied to Plato's conclusion that everything must be created by some cause, the universe has a creator, and that he is the best of causes (Plato 3, 541-2). This metaphysical difference between Socrates and Plato might account to the latter being more conservative politically.

³⁹ Again in *Timaeus*, we see Pythagorean numerological cosmology connected to the idea that the Creator formed the soul and within it, the universe (Plato 3, 545-6). It can be concluded that both Heraclitean and Pythagorean philosophies were utilized in Platonic cosmology to argue for a Creator. Although Plato claims the Creator does not contradict the traditional, polytheistic conception of the Gods (Plato 3, 549-50), he is nevertheless making an innovation on Socratic philosophy. It should be noted Plato's religious account is not without its dose of skepticism, as it is admitted that it is probable but not certain. This metaphysical difference between Socrates and Plato might also account to the latter being more conservative politically.

causing him to be condemned by Socrates (Laertius, 151). Moreover, according to Diogenes Laertius, Plato did not have good relations with a number of Socratic dialogue writers, such as Antisthenes (445 – 365 BC), Aristippus (435 – 356 BC), Xenophon (431 – 354 BC), and Aeschines (425 – 350 BC) (Laertius, 150-1). There is no way of determining who was the most orthodox of these Socratic philosophers. This being said, while Plato was certainly closer to the views of his teacher in his early and middle periods, Benjamin Jowett notably observes in his *Introduction to the Sophist*, a late dialogue, that Plato indicates he's passing beyond the limits of Socrates' teaching (Jowett, 280). Doing so amounts to diverting from Socratic philosophy. The conscious choice of not having Socrates as the main character and putting forward views different from his Socratic works demonstrates how Plato was being honest about moving away from his teacher's philosophy.

Plato's practical political life differs from that of Socrates, above all in that the former had direct connections with certain rulers. Among Plato's disciples was Dion of Syracuse (408 – 354 BC) who briefly became the tyrant of his hometown near the end of his life. According to *the Seventh Letter*, a late work, Plato met Dion as an ambitious young man, and educated him in his utopian politics, having the best interests of the Syracusan tyranny at heart. Dion wanted to win over Dionysius I (432 – 367 BC), tyrant of Syracuse to the cause of virtuous living, and invited Plato to Sicily (Plato, 9). Yet Plato was no toady, and not only did he offend Dionysius I with his talk on virtue, but he also called him a tyrant to his face according to Diogenes Laertius. As a result, the tyrant arranged that the philosopher was sold into slavery. Plato escaped the fate of slavery thanks to an admirer who happened to be present and paid his ransom (Laertius, 143). Plato was not done with Sicily, however, and as Dionysius I was replaced by Dionysius II (397 – 343 BC), he tried his

luck with a second visit, asking the new tyrant for a territory and men to live according to his political system. Dionysius II gave his promise but did not keep it, and as relations soured, this time Archytas (428 – 347 BC), the Pythagorean ruler of Tarentum and friend of Plato, had to intervene to save him. Plato visited Syracuse for a third time, this time to stop the feud between Dionysius II and Dion. He failed, and once again could return to Athens only thanks to Archytas. Also worth mentioning regarding Plato's political practice is that, when the Arcadians and Thebans were founding Megapolis, they asked Plato to be their lawgiver. Plato, however, true to his principles, refused, because the founders of the city were opposed to the idea of equality of possessions (Laertius, 144-5). Overall, Plato's political practice can be safely considered a complete failure. Arguably, intervening directly in politics by trying to influence rulers not only as an educator but also as a political theorist was an idea with potential, however evidently the spirit of time was against Plato to the extent that the practice proved futile if not quite dangerous. In the end, Plato died a philosopher and educator rather than a statesman, and was buried in the Academy "where he had passed most of his life in the study of philosophy" (Laertius, 152).

Like his political practice, Plato's political philosophy in his later works passed beyond the limits of Socratic teachings. In *the Laws*, one of his late works, Plato takes on the concept of authority: authority of parents over children, of nobles over commoners, of the old over the young, of masters over slaves, of the strong over the weak, of the wise over the ignorant, and lastly the authority awarded by lot⁴⁰ (Plato 5, 244-5). These are not defined critically, nor are possible contradictions between these forms of authority considered. Quite the

⁴⁰ It should be noted that patriarchal authority, the authority of men over women, has been left out by Plato.

contrary, they are defined approvingly and imperatively, even the last one referring to Athenian democratic practice. In fact, according to Plato, democracy, as in Athens, is one of the two original types of states, along with monarchy, as in Persia (Plato 5, 249). This is not to say Plato has renounced all criticism of democracy: in *the Seventh Letter*, he talks about how tyranny, oligarchy and democracy rotates (Plato, 7). In *the Statesman*, however, Plato elaborates his political theory by defining kinds of government: aristocracy, in the common understanding of the term rather than the meritocratic rule of the ablest seen in Socrates (Plato 3, 384-5), and monarchy are taken to be healthy forms of government, their respective unhealthy variants being oligarchy and tyranny. Democracy, however, whether lawful or not, always has the same name (Plato 4, 533-4), regardless of whether it is healthy or unhealthy. Plato retains the idea of the perfect state, distinct from the others, not abandoning Socratic utopianism (Plato 4, 552). Nevertheless, the political theory is noticeably different from Socrates' in *the Republic* where all the possible regimes other than the ideal one are completely rejected, and none defined as healthy. Also noticeably missing is the definition and rejection of timocracy seen in *the Republic* (Plato 3, 384-7), from which it can be inferred that mature Plato did not share his teacher's criticisms of the Spartan system anymore.

Despite being much softer than Socrates on existing forms of government, Plato nevertheless expresses in *the Seventh Letter* his view that all cities of his time are governed poorly. One part of the Socratic doctrine not scrapped by Plato is the solution: bringing philosophy to power to end humanity's wallowing in evil (Plato, 7). Plato particularly emphasizes philosophy and politics uniting in a single ruler (Plato, 31). We see the same idea pushed even further in *the Statesman*. Plato prefers the rule of a wise man to rule of law. In fact Plato puts forward a critique of law, which cannot perfectly

comprehend what is most just for all, and which therefore cannot enforce what is best. The reason behind this is that the irregularities of human beings do not allow any universal rule. Plato sees no ill intent behind laws: in fact his is a very limited critique which presumes the legislator is doing what he can for the best interests of the general public (Plato 4, 538-40). Nevertheless, Plato expresses the natural limits of what laws can accomplish, while noting these limits do not affect wisdom. This being said, Plato attaches great importance to improving laws. In fact, according to Plato, even if a just reformer uses "some gentle violence for their good," there is no harm in it (Plato 4, 542). In other words, the use of violence is acceptable, and at times even necessary for Plato to bring about political change. This can be taken to mean the violence of a ruler against his opposition, as well as the violence of the opposition to take power. Though Socrates does not directly express this view in Plato's early works or elsewhere, it needs to be said that this does not contradict him in any way either so long as violence is shed lawfully.

Some aspects of Plato's political philosophy further rather than diverts from the Socratic doctrine. In *the Statesman*, Plato expresses the view that politics is not only separate from and above other arts such as rhetoric, generalship and administration of justice, but it also binds the others together in a web (Plato 4, 559). Plato sees a direct link between the royal science of politics and the field of education. In accordance, the political art determines education in a way which prevents the production of characters unsuited to the political constitution. The desired results of Platonic political education is manliness, temperance and other virtuous inclinations while godlessness, insolence and injustice are to be avoided by death and exile (Plato 4, 566). This political education is not just for shaping citizens; it is also for shaping the ruler. Plato in particular emphasizes that for the ruler,

being temperate, and being courageous, by themselves, is not enough. It is necessary for the ruler to be educated in such a way that they would be both (Plato 4, 571). As it can be seen, the Socratic link formed between politics and education, the idea of using education as a political tool to shape individuals according to a code of morality tied to the constitution of a state has been retained by Plato. Nevertheless, it was no more possible to put this into practice for Plato than it was for Socrates.

Plato further elaborates his political philosophy in *the Statesman* by declaring that the royal science, a science of the mind rather than the body, is not something that's possessed by kings and statesmen alone but also by masters of households since he considers a large household comparable to a small state (Plato 4, 472-3). Nevertheless, according to Plato, no education can make the majority attain political science: only a small number of people can be said to possess it (Plato 4, 536-7). Politics is related to commanding according to Plato, which require a large majority of the population to be commanded. There is an economic basis to Plato's theory: according to him, commanding is done for the sake of production (Plato 4, 476-7). Of course, rulers are not concerned with producing lifeless objects like workers do, but they manage, control, and fundamentally produce the workers themselves as well as other living beings. (Plato 4, 478). The production of living beings, of course, refers to education determined by politics described earlier, and thus highlights the link between education and a utopian political economy made up of a small ruling elite and a large working class.

In *the Laws*, Plato examines what he earlier described as the two mother forms of government: Persian monarchy, and Athenian democracy. According to Plato, Cyrus (600 – 530 BC), founder of the First Persian Empire was a great

and patriotic general, but gave no mind to education of his children, a subject he entrusted to women who spoiled them. Darius (550 – 486 BC), the fourth Persian monarch, though he benefited from not receiving a luxurious education, and became an excellent ruler, nevertheless also neglected the education of his children (Plato 5, 250-1). Soon, Persian governments grew worse and worse due to the excesses of slavery and despotism (Plato 5, 255). As for the Athenians, Plato says their constitution was excellent at the time of the Persian invasion, when it was a properly limited form of government by others instead of total freedom and absence of all superior authority (Plato 5, 256). The degeneration in Athens started with the poets “who introduced the reign of vulgar and lawless innovation”. As not all the citizens were educated in the democratic polity, this led to consequences such as the very harmful freedom to disobey the rulers (Plato 5, 258). In short, Plato considered too much rule to be the ruin of the Persians, and too much liberty to be the ruin of the Athenians (Plato 5, 257). This being said, Plato counted freedom along with harmony and understanding as the main goals of legislation (Plato 5, 259). Plato’s political evaluations on Persia and Athens can be considered to be an application of the Socratic doctrine. What is lacking in the original doctrine according to the extant material about the problem of having too little freedom, Plato here completes quite coherently.

Although Socrates is not the main character in Plato’s late dialogues, he is featured in some of them. *Timaeus* is an interesting example where Socrates summarizes his views on the perfect state. Socrates repeats all the main aspects of the ideal state of *the Republic*: separation of society into guardians, and farmers and artisans; the possibility of children belonging to different classes than their parents; division of labor; the passionate and philosophical nature of the guardians; their education in gymnastic, music, and other subjects; abolition of

private property for the guardians; women sharing the duties of men; community of women; eugenics, or mating the best with the best and the worst with the worst (Plato 3, 532-4). Another character, Critias (460 – 403 BC), a cousin of Plato's mother, responds to Socrates with a tale of ancient Athens from nine thousand years ago, supposedly told to Solon by an Egyptian priest. According to Critias, the laws of Socrates' ideal city and ancient Athens are very similar (Plato 3, 538). In another late dialogue of Plato, *Critias*, the character carrying the name of the dialogue counts among these similarities the existence of classes such as the warrior class and the artisans and farmers and common property among the warriors (Plato 3, 599). Though not all the qualities of the ideal state are matched in either of Critias' accounts, it is clear that Critias, and Plato as well, are trying demonstrate that Socrates' ideal state has a historic precedent in Athens itself.

Plato's interest in the history of the human species and its connection to politics can be seen in *the Laws* too. Plato accepts the traditional idea of humanity surviving numerous catastrophes including the famous deluge. Plato pictures the survivors as having lost arts and sciences: humanity is reduced to a few shepherds (Plato 5, 223-4). Yet these few poor shepherds spring cities and governments, arts and laws, and vice and virtue (Plato 5, 225). First a primitive form of civilization arises: this simple minded society knows no wars, no enmities, no poverty, no gold and silver, no insolence, no injustice, no laws, and no letters (Plato 5, 227-8). Overall, it can be said that Plato holds the primitive society in a positive light, though not as much as Socrates does his primitive utopia in the *Republic* (Plato 3, 197-201). From this primitive society arises governments in the form of patriarchal rule over women and children (Plato 5, 229). Thus Plato correctly, but uncritically situates patriarchy at the historic origin of civilized society. Soon the rise of chiefs, legislators and

magistrates, and the emergence of some sort of aristocracy or perhaps monarchy follows (Plato 5, 231). What is defined as a negative process, a departure from the ideal state of affairs in *the Republic*, is analyzed as a neutral if not positive process in *the Laws*.

That Plato's historical understanding does not start with the ideal state does not mean he has given up on Socratic utopianism. The Athenian, Spartan and Cretan interlocutors of *the Laws* imagine a colony of which they are the original founders (Plato 5, 260). Early on, a very realistic question comes up of how to form this perfect state. The easiest way is to transform a tyranny into the ideal state, followed by monarchy, democracy and oligarchy. The reason tyrannies are favored by Plato for such a great change is that in tyrannies, change is speedily effected by the power of the tyrant (Plato 5, 569-70). This approach explains Plato's political adventures in Sicily. Plato seems to consider the different characteristics of various regimes in regards to this question regardless of whether he defines them as healthy or not. Plato nevertheless expresses political principles beyond what he says about different kinds of regimes. The common definition of justice as the interest of the stronger is rejected in *the Laws* (Plato 5, 274) in favor of an approach which considers it just for those who are most obedient to the law, and most virtuous to rule instead of the richest, or noblest of birth (Plato 5, 276). This should be considered an example of Plato's political radicalism inherited from Socrates.

Plato's ideal state in *the Laws* features legislations that are similar to as well as different from Socrates' in *the Republic*. Money exists, but no one is allowed to possess gold and silver. Lending money upon interest is banned, as are dowries. Plato specifically warns against the pursuit of money replacing the pursuit of education. All this, according to Plato, stem from the principle that the state, like the individual, can be rich or

good, but not both, and should prefer to be the latter (Plato 5, 298-9). In these issues, Plato clearly seems to continue his teacher's dislike of riches. Yet Plato holds very different views than Socrates on property. According to Plato, full equality of property is not possible so he proposes a system of regulated inequality of four classes of unequal property (Plato 5, 300). More is distributed to the superior and less to the inferior for according to Plato, masters and servants can never be friends. Here Plato deviates from Socratic meritocratic socialism, moderating it into what might be called a social meritocracy. Additionally, the mode of election of officials is a mean between monarchy and democracy (Plato 5, 309). Plato's ideal city has a caste of wardens or secret police, who have common meals and live together during their two-year term. Wardens are elected from men of influence who have leisure to take care of public interest, though any man can thus propose a warden from among the highest class (Plato 5, 313-4). Lastly, unlike Socrates, Plato completely excludes artisans from his system, banning citizens and their servants from engaging in crafts because they have more important tasks. This being said, artisans are required to abide by a strict division of labor, and practice only a single craft (Plato 5, 397). This last point can also be found in *the Republic* (Plato 3, 229). Nevertheless, Plato's social meritocracy and mixture of monarchy and democracy has to be seen as a realistic concession from Socratic radicalism, which without a doubt made Plato more acceptable than Socrates for the moderate and conservative elites.

Plato's views on women are considerably more patriarchal than those of his teacher. Timaeus, in Plato's dialogue named after him, expresses the view that first emerged men, and cowardly and unjust men became women. No one, including Socrates who is present, opposes this origin story (Plato 3, 589), from which we can infer that Plato himself agrees with

it. In *the Statesman*, the purpose of marriage is described as being for procreation of children, instead of wealth, power or rank (Plato 4, 569). Finally, in *the Laws*, we see Plato describe the Socratic communion of women, children, and property to be the first and highest form of state and government, only before casting doubt on whether this form of government exists or will ever exist. In fact, such a state, according to Plato, can only have divine rulers. Hence, *the Laws* focuses on a state second to the Socratic utopia (Plato 5, 296), one which must have seemed more realistic to Plato. This realistic utopia compromises with patriarchy in significant ways. Plato openly disagrees with his teacher's doctrine in *the Laws* by claiming women are inferior by nature to men in capacity for virtue: the conclusion he draws from this is that women should be particularly regulated (Plato 5, 329-30). Also, Plato differs dramatically from the Socratic eugenics scheme and makes a rule out of the unity of opposite qualities in marriage.⁴¹ Marriage itself is promoted, and the unmarried are fined and dishonored (Plato 5, 222-223). This is not the marriage of the community of women, or men: In the system Plato describes in *the Laws*, no man can ever touch a woman except her wedded husband, and homosexuality is prohibited as well (Plato 5, 393). Lastly, Plato defends a patriarchal system of inheritance, favoring sons and son-in-laws over daughters (Plato 5, 478). It can be easily concluded that the doctrine of mature Plato is considerably more patriarchal regarding women than the philosophy of Socrates. These are serious concessions to the moderate and conservative elites which no doubt made Plato less of a threat and more tolerable to the patriarchal establishment.

Plato followed Pythagoreans in refusing to flog slaves in anger: Diogenes Laertius reports that he asked others to do the

⁴¹ In fact, unlike Socratic eugenics, which I defined as reactionary even for the antiquity, I believe Platonic eugenics is not particularly reactionary.

flogging instead (Laertius, 152). Plato deals with the question of slavery in some detail in *the Laws*. There, he distinguishes between good slaves, who are “better in every way than brethren or sons,” and bad slaves who are like wild beasts. These categories correspond to the perception of the slaves in the minds of slave-owners. Plato thinks people who see their slaves brutish torture them, and cause the soul of the slaves to be worse than they used to be. Plato is aware of the potential dangers of slavery for the slave-owners, and consequently advises them to prevent the slaves from being of the same country, and to treat them justly, meaning they should be punished as they deserve. The utopia Plato described in *the Laws* has every citizen provided with a sufficient number of suitable slaves (Plato 5, 525-7). Food is divided into three parts: one for freemen, one for slaves and one for foreigners (Plato 5, 398). This means, of course, quite an unequal distribution, as the slaves and foreigners greatly outnumber the freeborn. Being as pro-slavery as Socrates, if not more so, surprisingly, mature Plato is apparently more cosmopolitan than Socrates, who is a cosmopolitan according to other sources, but not Plato. In *the Statesman*, Plato vehemently rejects the idea of a division between Greeks and barbarians, as well as the concept of a barbarian itself (Plato 4, 480). This can easily be counted among mature Plato’s most radical political positions even if Plato, like Socrates, is a patriot even when a cosmopolitan.

Since Plato’s political philosophy deviates from Socrates, his thought cannot be considered an advancement of that of Socrates. Certainly, Plato was deeply influenced by Socrates, but the whole trajectory of his writings as a mature philosopher clearly differentiates his political philosophy as well as metaphysics as something separate from that of Socrates, even in the form expressed in Plato’s earlier works. Plato’s moderation of Socrates’ radical positions, along with his ties to Archytas the Pythagorean, may have helped him

avoid a fate similar to that of his teacher, however they did not make his political life more successful, or his less radical utopia more appealing. Without these political concessions, above all the concessions regarding gender, however, even the limited opportunities Plato found to pursue his political philosophy into the realm of practice would likely not have been available.

Educational Philosophy of Plato

Returning from his travels, Zeller says, Plato started teaching a closed circle in Athens before eventually opening his school at the Academy (Zeller, 19). Zeller notes Plato's many deviations from the Socratic way of life, and explains it with Socrates, despite his anti-democratic politics, being a man of the people; while Plato, a more elitist character, loving to shut himself up in his own circle (Zeller, 41-42). It must be added that both educational practices can well be considered a departure from Socrates' informal philosophy of education where everyone who was interested was taught instead of just a closed circle, but they were not taught in a school setting. As an educator, Plato followed a different path. In the words of Diogenes Laertius, he was the first to recognize the importance of scholarship (Laertius, 145). In great contrast to Socrates, of course, Plato left volumes of works. When it comes to Plato's scholarly method, however, Socrates' influence on Plato is greater than what separates them. As is well known, during his trial, Socrates claims to know that he does not know, yet is wiser than others who think they know but do not (Plato 2, 51). Plato's statement in *the Sophist* about the importance of questioning oneself as one has questioned others (Plato 4, 394), which gives us an important hint about his scholarly method, can be read as a scholarly application of Socrates' proclamation of ignorance.

Plato gives it a theoretical background in *the Sophist*, where he asserts that true and false thought, opinion, and imagination exists in our minds (Plato 4, 429). Thus everyone has the potential to be right or wrong on this or that subject, and it is necessary to have a critical outlook.⁴² It is not for nothing that the academia is named after the Academy.

W. K. C. Guthrie asserts that Plato's Academy did not correspond entirely to any modern institution. Universities of modern foundation certainly do not resemble the Academy, although Guthrie allows that the collages of the earliest universities, tracing their characteristics to the medieval world, might well be the nearest parallels. One point these institutions had in common was the ideal of a common table. At Plato's school, these meals united healthy and moderate eating, and educational and philosophical conversation. Guthrie goes on to elaborate that the Academy was the name of a site outside the walls of Athens by a mile, which included a grove of trees, gardens, and a gymnasium among other buildings. It was obligatory to register a society to exist in the Academy as a cult association of a deity, and Plato's choice was the Muses, patrons of education (Guthrie 1975, 19-20). Hence Guthrie considers the Academy to be a school with a religious basis (Guthrie 1975, 8). Given Plato wrote about his religious views, as we have seen, there is no reason to doubt that he taught them in his school as well. Besides, although the main purpose was the study of philosophy, philosophy

⁴² We have already seen that Plato does not spare Socrates from this approach. To give an example, Parmenides, a late dialogue can be cited. In this dialogue, a young Socrates debates an old Parmenides (fl. 6th - 5th Century BC), and Zeno (495 - 430 BC), who is in agreement with Parmenides' central thesis that all is one (Plato 4, 33). Parmenides then goes on to test and reject Socrates' - and Plato's? - theory of the forms using cross-examination. He observes that Socrates lacks an education in dialectics (Plato 4, 42). The dialogue ends affirming Parmenides' central thesis (Plato 4, 98). Quite unlikely to be accurate, the Parmenides dialogue nevertheless shows Plato's willingness to criticize the views he not only attributed to his teacher, but once defended himself as well. This example is also important because it shows that Plato diverged from Socrates metaphysically as well as methodologically.

itself was not recognized as a secular activity disconnected from religion.

H. I. Marrou explains that Plato's Academy, an educational establishment and a school of higher studies, was a strongly built institution. It was not a commercial enterprise but a sect. All of its members were supposed to be friends. As for the link between teacher and student, Marrou defines it as "emotional if not amorous" (Marrou, 67). Zeller notes that we know almost nothing about Plato's manner of instruction, however basing himself on Plato's opposition to rhetoricians who made long speeches but could not answer questions, and his way of developing thought via dialogue in his writings, he concludes that Plato's oral teaching must have remained true to these principles (Zeller, 26). Marrou also notes that Plato must have used active methods, as he considers the ancient dialectical method the exact opposite of passive indoctrination (Marrou, 67). Indeed, in *the Sophist*, Plato, in the person of the Eleatic stranger expresses his preference for the method of questions and answers to giving a long oration, without dismissing the latter, and conditional on whether the responses are pleasant (Plato 4, 317-9). Thus it can be concluded that Plato is also student-centered, though he is not as extremely student-centered as his teacher. In fact, it may be added that Plato situated student-centered education within an institutional framework. The first political consequence of this shift was that the teacher now had a significant degree of formal educational authority compared to Socratic education where the teacher had no formal authority. The second political consequence of this revision is that Plato aimed for a more organized movement compared to the looseness of the original Socratic current. To the extent that Platonism was a political as well as an educational movement, it can be concluded that especially the head of the Academy had a political authority that stemmed from his educational authority.

Marrou also underlines that the Academy was not just a school of abstract philosophy but also of politics, and numerous councilors and lawgivers came from its ranks (Marrou, 64). This shows that, more so that his adventures in Syracuse, Plato succeeded in his political activity as an educator. This was of course a very limited success, since Plato's students, like Socrates' students, did not contribute to the realization of the goals of the movement but to their own political careers. Other than politics, the Platonic curriculum was heavily influenced by the Pythagorean quadrivium of arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and acoustics. In fact, Plato included new discoveries of the day, such cubic geometry, in his teachings (Marrou, 75). In other words, aside from studying philosophy and politics, the Platonic Academy investigated scientific matters within an independent institutional framework as well. The Platonic curriculum gave Plato's movement the power to understand and explain the world philosophically and scientifically, which must be seen as why it was so effective at training youth in politics too.

Plato does not neglect educational theory in his later works. In *the Sophist*, he defines the arts which take away the evils of the body as medicine and gymnastic; and the arts which take away the evils of the soul as correction and instruction (Plato 4, 346). We can infer from this the importance Plato gave to correction, and above all instruction as a tool to shape and control the individual and society spiritually and intellectually, just as gymnastics and medicine shapes and controls them physically. The kind of instruction which corresponds to the worst kind of ignorance, that is supposing one knows what they do not know, is termed education by Plato, and he particularly distinguishes it from teaching the handicraft arts (Plato 4, 347-8). In turn, Plato divides education into two: rougher education, which corresponds to

admonition, and smoother education, which corresponds to cross-examination. Refutation is the greatest of purification according to Plato. Sophists⁴³, and the masters of the art of refutation are similar like wolves and dogs (Plato 4, 349-50). It can be inferred that Plato restricts his concept of scholarly education to the philosophical current he was leading, and would not agree to define a current like the Sophists, similar though in a sinister way, as educational. The Platonic movement's ongoing attempt at having its own educational institution thus rests on the rejection of other schools.

In *the Laws*, Plato puts forward a wide understanding of education. The point of education is to produce good men according to Plato, and an important element of education are rightly ordered feasts which provide ample opportunities to learn about music, which orders the drinking (Plato 5, 176-7). Plato emphasizes that gymnastics is a very important part of education too, and connecting it to music, he specifically underlines the educational value of dancing (Plato 5, 219). Plato offers fresh arguments but he is not innovating as music and gymnastics make up the bulk of Socrates' education system in Plato's *Republic* too (Plato 3, 207). Plato attributes a political role to education, claiming that education in virtue not only makes men fit for success in life, but also makes perfect citizens out of them (Plato 5, 179). Plato defines this training in virtue in detail. He considers that when instincts such as pleasure, friendship, pain, and hatred first appear in a soul, the person is not yet capable of understanding their nature. Virtue is the harmony of the soul, and education is the training of the instincts listed above. Moral education is not cut off from other aspects of Platonic education. In fact it is, for instance, at the basis of whether one will dance and sing well, because figures and melodies are expressive of the virtue of

⁴³ According to Plato, a Sophist differs from a philosopher in that he is an ignorant imitator of the wise (Plato 4, 440-1).

soul or body (Plato 5, 191-4). In short, Plato puts forward a holistic theory of education which has its basis in the Socratic doctrine. Like Socrates, Plato defines an entire educational system, however Plato carries things further in his utopia, by naming the greatest administrator of the state “the minister of the education of youth, male and female”. This minister, who holds office for five years, rules over the two type of directors of music and gymnastic: instructors and judges. (Plato 5, 315-6). This very influential position demonstrates Plato’s desire for the top educator of his utopia to be higher than all other administrators of the state, thus indicating how important the concept of education was for the philosopher.

Another aspect of Plato’s educational theory is the emphasis he makes on entertainment. Everyone, man and boy, slave and free, both sexes, and the whole city should be entertained according to Plato (Plato 5, 207). He anticipates that very small children will prefer the puppet show, older children will favor comedy, “educated women, and young men, and people in general” will advocate tragedy and the older men will demand Homer and Hesiod (Plato 5, 199). Plato deviates from the Socratic doctrine when he states that there needs to be different songs produced for men and women (Plato 5, 353). This segregation on educational entertainment can be seen as an example of mature Plato’s increasingly patriarchal viewpoint. This being said, precisely because Plato recognizes the educational and propaganda value of entertainment, he retains the Socratic idea of censorship discussed in *the Republic* (Plato 3, 234), and restricts the poets to ideas approved by the state (Plato 5, 351). All songs are to be approved by the guardians of law, and regulations about liberty of speech in poetry apply equally to men and women (Plato 5, 379-80). State control of the educational material is part of what makes education a political tool of shaping society in Plato.

Plato further elaborates his pedagogy in *the Laws* as he goes on to define the beginning as the most important part of education. According to Plato, the three early years of the child should have as little of sorrow, fear and pain as possible, so that his soul is more gentle and cheerful. This being said, procuring pleasures would ruin a child (Plato 5, 341). Between the ages three and six, all the children, including the slaves and the foreigners start meeting at the temples, under control of matrons and nurses (Plato 5, 343). It can be inferred that Plato wants to socialize the three to six age group with these temple crèches. Like Socrates in *the Republic* (Plato 3, 257), Plato expresses the idea that the games played by children should be regulated, in order to prevent the youth from becoming revolutionists (Plato 5, 346-7). Six is the year of separation not only based on class but also based on sex, despite the fact that like the boys, the girls too are supposed to learn to use weapons (Plato 5, 343). A strict division of labor based on sex can be seen in the Platonic system of education in that women superintend the nursing and amusements of the children, and men superintend education (Plato 5, 344). These are factors that make Platonic pedagogy considerably more patriarchal than the Socratic in that unlike the latter, the former aims to create a society segregated on sex. Being put on a secondary position clearly is not in line with women's interests, but limiting women's potential in such a way does not benefit society in general. Plato's idea of sexual segregation has to be seen as a concession made to traditional patriarchal values, which made Platonism less threatening if not more appealing to the status quo.

Yet, despite the fact that mature Plato's educational philosophy was significantly more patriarchal than that of Socrates, Plato retained one vital principle of his teacher: compulsory education for boys and girls who, though separate, were to go through the same exercises, trained by

paid foreigners. According to Plato, without this principle which is contrary to the custom of existing states, the state would be reduced to a half (Plato 5, 355). Thus all women as well as men are to learn gymnastics and fight for their young in Plato's utopia (Plato 5, 364). Male or female, students are subjected to strict discipline. Plato sees the student as a freeman but also a slave, controlled by tutors and teachers. The Platonic utopia declares any student, tutor, and teacher punishable by any freeman if they did anything considered wrong (Plato 5, 358). Plato's curriculum is regulated by the laws of the state, leaving little choice to the students, who are to learn how to read and write between the ages of ten and thirteen, and music between thirteen and sixteen (Plato 5, 359). This much education Plato sees as necessary for all freeborn men and women inhabitants of his utopia. Not abandoning the concept of women's education is for the most part to the advantage of Platonism, making it possible for women to be present in educational institutions.

Plato puts forward the question of how the minister of education is to be trained (Plato 5, 359) as the minister of education himself has to be a product of the Platonic educational system, which, consequently, has to be equipped to produce men for this position. Plato envisages the necessity of a higher sort of education, the most important subject of which is arithmetic, as the city has in all things a numerical order (Plato 5, 302) This emphasis on arithmetic can be seen as an expression of Plato's lifelong relationship with Pythagorean mathematicians mentioned by Zeller (Zeller, 20-1). In any case, other than arithmetic, Plato lists geometry and astronomy as the subjects of higher education, omitting harmonics from *the Republic* (Plato 3, 371). In line with his intellectual elitism, Plato expects only a small few to reach the higher level of studies (Plato 5, 368). Plato does not mention whether women will participate in this higher education.

Though Plato's views on gender are more patriarchal than those of Socrates, given Plato still believes in education for women, it is not hard to guess that he expects a part of the select few to be women, even if this is a small part.

Plato significantly revised Socratic educational philosophy, and above all the adoption of the scholarly method based on studying texts and the moderation of Socrates' extreme student-centered method by regulating it and situating it in an academic framework was to have a great impact on the success of Platonism as an educational movement. It is because of these revisions that Platonism could exist as a movement throughout the centuries, and the Academy alone existed for over three hundred years. Plato's educational philosophy would not protect his thought from revisions either, as the student-centered approach would continue to allow a great heterogeneity, however for the most part it was possible for this heterogeneity to be preserved within a movement thanks to the institutional nature of Platonic education. Moreover, thanks to the doctrine being in writing, returning to the original material, including the early works of Plato, would always remain an option for new Platonists. The conflict between Socrates, or early and middle Plato, and mature Plato, observable in the fields of political and educational philosophy, had its roots in a change in the metaphysical doctrine in late dialogues. Mary-Louise Gill notes that late Plato is "more down to earth" in metaphysics as well as politics, going so far as to reject the theory of immaterial forms (Gill). The same approach can be seen in his educational philosophy as well. Metaphysically, and thus politically and educationally, mature Plato moderated the radical and at times extremist Socratic philosophy he had defended in his earlier works. This philosophical conflict that resulted from this moderation would continue to impact Platonism throughout the ages.

Early Platonism

Plato had numerous students, though only two of them were women: Lastheneia of Mantinea (fl. 4th Century BC) and Axiothea of Philus (fl. 4th Century BC). Diogenes Laertius reports an ancient author who claimed that Lastheneia and Axiothea wore man's clothes (Laertius, 155). It can be inferred from this act of cross-dressing that they aspired to the Platonic concept of masculine virtue, and maybe that they were thus considered equals of the male students. Nothing else is known about these two students, hence we do not know if they made any contribution to Platonism, except setting a very important precedent for the future. In turn, early Platonism was determined by Plato's male students. According to Zeller they were men of various ages, and many more of them were foreigners rather than Athenians. The greater number were from the Eastern portion of the Greek world, as Pythagoreanism dominated the West, preventing, according to Zeller, further spread of Platonism (Zeller, 553-6). Zeller notes the very important fact that although the members of the Old Academy claimed to defend the Platonic doctrine as a whole, they really adhered to its later form (Zeller, 565), preferring mature Plato over Socrates, or younger Plato. This is without a doubt understandable, as the Academy was dominated above all by mature Plato.

Before going into the Old Academy, however, it would be in order to examine Plato's most famous student, Aristotle (384–322). Once the most faithful of Plato's students, Diogenes Laertius reports that Aristotle "kicked" his teacher "away just as colts kick away their mother" in Plato's words, and left the Academy (Laertius, 212). John Dillon quotes Aelian to show that Aristotle was quite vicious towards Plato after he left the Academy, ambushing a very old Plato with his students, bombarding him with questions in order to embarrass him, and causing Plato to retreat (Dillon, 3-4). Diogenes Laertius

continues that after Plato died and was succeeded by another as the head of the Academy, Aristotle gathered a number of students and started his own school in the Lyceum, a complex including a sanctuary dedicated to Apollo and a gymnasium like the Academy (Laertius, 212-3). Aristotle's school was a formally established one like Plato's, and Aristotle followed the evolution of Plato's school, for instance making it a rule at his school that a new official, ranking below the scholarch, would be appointed to administer the school every ten days (Laertius, 214). According to Diogenes Laertius, Aristotle was a supporter of Hermias the eunuch (fl. 4th Century BC), the ruler of Atarneus and his lover and/or father in law (Laertius, 213-4). Because he praised a eunuch who used to be a slave, Aristotle was ridiculed (Laertius, 218). He was in King Philip's (382 – 336 BC) court in Macedonia, and Philip's son Alexander (356 – 323 BC) became his student. Philip had razed Aristotle's hometown, but Aristotle petitioned with the king that his native city be restored. This petition was accepted and Aristotle was even tasked with making the laws of the reestablished city. When he thought he stayed for long enough with Alexander, Aristotle returned to Athens. (Laertius, 214). He led his school for thirteen more years. Eventually he was accused of impiety and fled to Chalcis, where, according to Diogenes Laertius, he probably died of disease rather than suicide (Laertius, 215-7).

It is possible to see a continuity between mature Plato and Aristotle's views on gender, and politics in general, however it needs to be stated that the latter carried the former's conservative innovations to the Socratic doctrine further than the former ever intended to the extent that the Aristotelian doctrine cannot be considered to be a continuation of the Socratic⁴⁴. In *Politics*, we see Aristotle complaining about the hazards of the limited amount of rights and influence women

⁴⁴ Nor did it ever claim to be.

have in Spartan society, arguing that these rights devastated Sparta and should not be allowed (Aristotle). In *On the Generation of Animals*, Aristotle bases his hostility against women beneath the cover of science. According to him, male and female differ in their essence by each having a separate ability or faculty aside from having certain anatomically different parts, according to which men impregnate, and women are impregnated. (Aristotle 2015, 8) Accordingly, the effective cause of existence is male, and men are superior to women and separated from them as much as possible (Aristotle 2015, 53). In *Politics*, Aristotle repeats the view that men are by nature superior to women, thus men by nature rule over women. The same principle applies to slaves as those who are slaves are slaves by nature, and it is right that they are under the rule of their superiors. According to Aristotle, barbarians are societies made up of male and female slaves, and it is just for Greeks to rule over them (Aristotle). Overall, Aristotle's views on gender, and politics in general, seem to be heavily influenced by the innovations of mature Plato, although Aristotle, neither a radical nor a utopian, carries them to more patriarchal, elitist, and in fact often reactionary conclusions. In doing so, Aristotle did not advance Platonism but left it altogether, pioneering his own current.

In *Nichomachean Ethics*, Aristotle, very similarly to mature Plato, considers that there are six forms of government, three being healthy and three unhealthy. The healthy governments, best to worst, are monarchy, aristocracy, and timocracy, and their corresponding unhealthy governments, worst to best, are tyranny, oligarchy, and democracy (Aristotle 2004, 155-6). Randall Curren interprets aristocracy, defined above, as the rule of the best (Curren, 550), however it is very difficult to claim that that Aristotle was actually calling for a meritocracy in a Socratic sense. Curren states that according to Aristotle, the true political community must be socially unified, and of

one mind. In a fashion rather idealizing Aristotelian politics, Curren adds egalitarianism to the qualities listed above. This being said, since as Curren also notes, this political community not only does not include foreigners or slaves, and considering Aristotle's views on women, them too, but artisans, traders and farmers in general (Curren, 549-50), it can hardly be described as egalitarian. Even if the children of the excluded social segments have a greater capacity than those of the citizens, they have no opportunity to rise.

Diogenes Laertius reports Aristotle attaching great importance to education. According to him, Aristotle considers studies that constitute general education to be of service for the attainment of virtue (Laertius, 223). Aristotle believes that the educated differ from the uneducated as much as the living does from the dead. Education is an adornment in prosperity, and a refuge in adversity. Parents who educate children deserve to be honored more than those who engender them, for parents make them live but teachers make them live well. Aristotle acknowledges that the roots of education are bitter, yet this bitterness is worth it as its fruit is sweet. Practically, Aristotle sees three things as necessary for education: natural ability, study, and practice. In line with his worldview, Aristotle expects students to make progress by pursuing front runners instead of waiting for those who lag behind (Laertius, 220-1). In *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle compares education on an individual basis with education in common, and concludes that the former is preferable to the latter, or at least that individual students require special care (Aristotle 2004, 202). Curren emphasizes Aristotle's statement that education should be public and "one and the same for all" (Curren, 543). Here, all should be taken to mean the male children of all citizens in line with Aristotle's political philosophy. After all, as Curren says, Aristotle sees education as preparation for leisure spent in intellectual activity instead

of work (Curren, 551). Moreover, Curren notes that Aristotle sees in education the function of unifying the city's diverse children into a political community (Curren, 549). Segments of the society excluded from this community are thus excluded from so-called common education. It is through education that future citizens are shaped to suit the status quo (Curren, 552). While Aristotle's educational philosophy has certain student-centered elements, since his understanding of education is far more conventional, it is more likely his perspective was rather teacher-centered. Lastly, in *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle acknowledges the influence of Platonic educational philosophy in his views on the subject, especially Plato's idea that education has to start at an early age so that one can find enjoyment or pain in the right things as a result of right education (Aristotle 2004, 26). While one might be tempted to consider Aristotelian education more apolitical, Aristotle's educational philosophy certainly reflects his elitist political outlook and without a doubt, he taught politics along with other subjects. This being said, unlike Socrates and Plato, Aristotle probably did not see education as a tool for a particular political agenda.

After Plato's death, his nephew Speusippus (408 – 338 BC) succeeded him as the head of the Academy. According to Diogenes Laertius, Speusippus adhered to the same doctrines as Plato. One of his students was a woman, although Diogenes Laertius does not record her name. Diogenes Laertius' account disproves the idea that Speusippus was a completely faithful follower of his teacher. Speusippus had accompanied Plato in his last visit to the court of Dionysius II in Syracuse, and according to Diogenes Laertius, the tyrant later criticized the philosopher for diverting from Platonic practice and demanding fees for education in a letter (Laertius, 178). Zeller notes that in Speusippus' philosophy, numbers occupied the place ideas (Zeller, 573). Zeller adds that while mature Plato

made many concessions to Pythagoreanism, his successor's doctrine was more Pythagorean than Platonic (Zeller, 575-6). According to Zeller, Speusippus' political views are known from his argument to prove that the law deserves respect, and that the wise man should not withdraw from rule (Zeller, 580). Based on the little evidence we have, it can be concluded that Speusippus continued the Platonic political doctrine for the most part, although perhaps Pythagorean influence had an effect on his politics too. The fact that there is no mention of his educational philosophy could be taken as an indication that he did not add anything to the teachings of his uncle in this regard.

The next head of the Academy was Xenocrates of Chalcedon (396 – 314 BC). According to Laertius, Xenocrates studied with Plato from an early age, and accompanied his teacher to Sicily like his predecessor (Laertius, 181-3). He was an extremely dedicated student to his teacher: when the tyrant of Syracuse threatened to cut Plato's throat, he replied: "Not before you cut mine" (Laertius, 184). Diogenes Laertius reports that when he was unable to pay the foreigners' tax, the Athenians put Xenocrates up for sale. Xenocrates was saved only thanks to Aristotelian orator Demetrius of Phalerum (350 – 280 BC) who resolved the situation by buying his freedom (Laertius, 186). Unlike his predecessor, two of Xenocrates' works listed by Diogenes Laertius are on education: *On the Child*, and *On Students* (Laertius, 184-5). Unfortunately, these and many other works of Xenocrates did not survive to our day. Politically, Xenocrates is known to have opposed Alexander, and his work titled *Elementary Principles of Monarchy* dedicated to the ruler may have been polemical. (Laertius, 186) Zeller notes that while Xenocrates, like his predecessor Speusippus, had a strong tendency towards Pythagoreanism, he did not venture to abandon Platonism and was therefore a more genuine Platonist (Zeller,

581). Xenocrates was head of the Academy for twenty-five years (Laertius, 186), and it can be reasonably supposed that since he had more time as scholarch, he had greater influence in the school.

Dillon transmits Aetius' writings on Xenocrates' theological and cosmological views which gives us an idea about his views on gender. According to Xenocrates, there are two main Gods: Monad, also called Zeus, a father figure associated with the intellect, and Dyad, a mother figure associated with the soul (Dillon, 102). While considering a female figure worthy of such a great if secondary role, Xenocrates' approach is based on the gender binary, and can be considered an ancestor of the attitude identifying manhood with reason and womanhood with emotion. Unfortunately, nothing further is known about Xenocrates' views on politics or education, which can be taken to indicate that he more or less faithfully followed Plato on these issues. Guthrie mentions that among Xenocrates' students were Zeno of Citium (334 – 262 BC) and Epicurus (341 – 270 BC), who went on to found Stoicism and Epicureanism respectively. According to Guthrie, having such major figures as these students at the Academy is a testimony to the importance of the institution (Guthrie 1978, 469), though they don't demonstrate the loyalty of his students to Xenocrates' doctrine. Of course Xenocrates had loyal students as well, the most important one being Polemon (fl. 4th Century – 3rd Century BC) who, according to Diogenes Laertius, broke into the Academy drunk but decided to become a student after hearing Xenocrates' lecture on temperance. Eventually, following Xenocrates' death, Polemon succeeded him as the scholarch (Laertius, 187).

The next major figure who came to be the head of the Academy was Arcesilaus (316 – 240 BC), who inherited the title from Crates of Athens (fl. 4th Century – 3rd Century BC), a student of Polemon. Diogenes Laertius notes that Arcesilaus

significantly modified the system handed down by Plato. According to Diogenes Laertius, due to these changes, Arcesilaus initiated a new period in the history of the Academy called the Middle Academy. In particular, he brought to the Academy the influence of Pyrrho (360 – 270 BC) the Sceptic. He was the first to attempt to argue both sides of a question (Laertius, 193-4). In line with his open-minded skepticism, he advised his students to hear other philosophies, but he was hostile to Epicureanism, calling them eunuchs (Laertius, 199). Arcesilaus was originally a student of Theophrastus (371 – 287 BC), successor of Aristotle, yet he fell in love with Crantor (fl. 3rd Century BC), an Academic philosopher, and he abandoned Theophrastus to join his lover at the Academy (Laertius, 193). Arcesilaus did not share the Platonic distrust of pleasure: he was known for living with Elean courtesans, being fond of young men, and quoting Socrates' hedonistic student Aristippus to defend his conduct (Laertius, 198). Nevertheless, in a number of ways, Arcesilaus continued Platonism faithfully. For one, he complains about living with the offspring of slaves (Laertius, 196), which shows that like mature Plato he did not have a favorable attitude at all towards them. Moreover, his academic skepticism, though certainly influenced by Pyrrho, arguably had its roots in Plato's scholarly method⁴⁵. In any case, Cicero in his *Academica notes* that Arcesilaus' system was initially not all approved of, and was only gradually accepted (Cicero, 30). The Middle Academy nevertheless constitutes the first major revision in the history of Platonism.

Cicero says Arcesilaus' successor Lacydes (fl. 3rd Century), closely followed his master's teachings (Cicero, 30). Lacydes, after heading the Academy and lecturing for twenty-six years, retired and handed out the school to Telecles and Evander

⁴⁵ Gersh lists, aside from Plato's own influence, and that of Pyrrho, a reaction against Stoic and Aristotelian influences as among the possible causes of Arcesilaus' skepticism (Gersh, 56).

of Phocaea, (fl. 3rd – 2nd Century BC), who in turn were succeeded by Hegesias of Pergamon (fl. 2nd Century BC). It was with Hegesias' student Carneades (214 – 129 BC) that the New Academy begun (Laertius, 206). According to Stephen Gersh, Carneades too attacked the claim to epistemological certainty, made mostly by Stoics, with as much zeal as any skeptic. However, Gersh notes that Carneades modified the purely negative approach of Arcesilaus' skepticism, arguing that while absolute certainty was impossible via sensation, obtaining degrees of probability was possible, and understanding the weight of these probabilities was the duty of a philosopher (Gersh, 57). Thus, with Carneades, the Academy moderated its skepticism. Diogenes Laertius describes Carneades a scholar so devoted that his hair and nails grew long, and so good a teacher that orators canceled their classes to hear him lecture (Laertius, 207). The change in the course of the Academy continued with the next scholarch, Carthaginian Hasdrubal Clitomachus (187 – 110 BC), who became eminent in Platonic, Peripatetic and Stoic schools according to Diogenes Laertius (Laertius, 208-9). As Gersh notes, Clitomachus' successor Philo of Larissa (153 – 83 BC) was still a skeptic Platonist, though Philo's student Antiochus of Ascalon (125 – 68 BC) was a dogmatic Platonist (Gersh, 55). Overall, the variation in the teachings of Academic scholars seems to have logically developed from the school's original educational principles.

The educational institution that was called the Academy came to an unfortunate end in 83 BC at the hands of the Roman dictator Sulla (138 – 78 BC), who ravaged it, as well as the Lyceum according to Plutarch's *Life of Sulla* (Plutarch). The destruction of these institutions was a great loss for the educational life of the ancient world. This being said, the loss of the Academy did not eradicate Platonism. Philo had already carried his teachings to Rome in 87 BC. A young Cicero was one

of his students (Rawson, 18). Cicero was faithful to traditional skepticism, disapproving of the dogmatic innovations of Antiochus, whose lectures he attended according to Plutarch in his *Life of Cicero*. Cicero nevertheless became an eclectic Platonist, admiring Aristotle as well as Plato. Cicero also went on to become a conservative senator, participating in the opposition to moderate populist Julius Caesar (100 – 44 BC) and later Caesar's lieutenant Marcus Antonius (83 – 30 BC), who ended up ordering Cicero's murder (Plutarch). Cicero wrote a dialogue titled *On the Republic* which partially survived. In this work written to figure out the best path forward for Rome, different political systems of the ancient Mediterranean are discussed without a hint of utopianism. Moreover, Cicero defends father's care, mainstream liberal education, which is education for the free born, along with education in modesty, especially for women (Cicero), in other words education based on Roman traditions. The effects of the Romanization of Platonism at Cicero's hands are so deep that it is appropriate to begin what has been called middle Platonism with him.

Other than Cicero, the most important representative of middle Platonism is Plutarch, a Romanized Greek. According to Frank Cole Babbitt, Plutarch was well educated, and his most famous teacher, Ammonius of Lamptrae (fl. 1st Century), although an Aristotelian, was also "deeply imbued with the religious idealism of the Academy". Babbitt adds that Plutarch must have received instruction in rhetoric too (Babbitt, x) Like many philosophers before him, Plutarch traveled widely in Greece, Egypt, Asia Minor, and lived in Rome for fifteen years. When in Rome, he made many friends among prominent men, including consuls, proconsuls and praetors. Plutarch spent many years as a lecturer, from his early days in his hometown, to his days in Rome, and his days back home (Plutarch 1, xi). Hence, beyond being one of the

most major representative of Middle Platonism, Plutarch was a philosopher who was involved with politics and education.

In *That a Philosopher Ought to Converse Especially with Men in Power*, Plutarch elaborates his political views on the relationship between philosophers and rulers. A dignity befitting leadership and power needs to be coupled with moderation and culture in a man so that a philosopher can start a relationship with a leader. Such a leader, in fact, even a philosopher who abstains from public life will not avoid, while one who does not will run to them (Plutarch 10, 39-41). This being said, in *To an Uneducated Ruler*, Plutarch bluntly says that most kings and rulers are foolish (Plutarch 10, 55). According to Hugh Liebert, he idealizes ancient Sparta, and defends it against Plato's homophobic, and Aristotle's misogynistic accusations against it (Liebert, 110). Additionally, in *Precepts of Statecraft*, he expresses pro-Roman sentiment (Plutarch 10, 241). Liebert quotes Plutarch's definition of the Roman Empire as a "hearth for all mankind" (Liebert, 204), which is probably the first to employ philosophical cosmopolitanism directly in defense of an existing multinational state. Nevertheless, being a patriot and a cosmopolitan at the same time, Plutarch is certainly not outside Platonic tradition.

True to his Platonic philosophy, Plutarch is critical not just of kings and rulers but of democracy as well. In *Precepts of Statecraft*, he notes that there is a spirit of malice and fault finding against men in public life in every democracy. This creates a dangerous situation because many desirable measures are considered to be done by conspiracy if there is no expression of dissent (Plutarch 10, 233). Plutarch's instinct seems to be to sympathize with the wrongfully accused public men instead of the mob: in this sense his critique of democracy is in line with Platonic thought. In *On Monarchy, Democracy and Oligarchy*, we see an approach closer to the Platonic rather than Socratic approach. Like mature Plato as

well as Aristotle, Plutarch believes the three main forms of government are healthy, except when they degenerate into their unhealthy forms. Thus tyranny happens when royalty engages in violence and irresponsible action; when great families predominate, arrogance and presumptuousness dominates an oligarchy, and lastly, democracy breeds anarchy, equality, and excess, resulting in mob rule (Plutarch 10, 307-9). Plutarch is closer to Aristotle rather than Plato in not listing the ideal state among other forms of government. Thus Plutarch can be defined as a non-utopian, thus a moderate rather than radical Platonist.

Being an educator, Plutarch is interested in educational philosophy. Plutarch's answer to the classical question of *Can Virtue Be Taught?* in his essay carrying the same title is strongly affirmative. Education in general promotes virtue according to Plutarch, and its prevention destroys virtue (Plutarch 6, 5-7). In *On the Education of Children*, he emphasizes above all the importance of the teacher as a moral example for the students to imitate. Accordingly, teachers must be "unimpeachable in their manners" so that they can guide the character of their students to be upright (Plutarch 1, 19). Though it is debatable whether this is enough to categorize Plutarch as a teacher-centered pedagogue, it nevertheless demonstrates first of all that he considered the teacher had a vital role in education, and that being a teacher involved meeting high moral standards. Plutarch is above all concerned with the education of free-born children. Moreover, he cites the importance of the class background of the students, defining lowly birth as a misfortune, and high birth as a treasure (Plutarch 1, 5). According to Plutarch, being uneducated is the same as being a slave (Plutarch 1, 21). Moreover, Plutarch associates an uncorrupted education with the pleasure of the wise, and the displeasure of the multitude (Plutarch 1, 27). Under the influence of Pythagorean educational practices, he considers

it necessary for young students to avoid associating with “base men” (Plutarch 1, 59). This being said, Plutarch’s identification of educational corruption with the masses does not mean he wants the multitude to be uneducated. Even the poor, according to Plutarch, must give the best education for their children (Plutarch 1, 41). Plutarch follows Socrates and Plato in advocating regulation of children’s stories (Plutarch 1, 17). Devoid of the utopian context, educational censorship essentially becomes a policy suggestion for the Roman Empire. In general, too, Plutarch’s approach can be considered an enlightened but realistic educational plan for the establishment which, while favoring the elites, also promotes education for the poor.

In Plutarch’s view, freeborn children need to have a taste of every branch of general education, but should honor philosophy above all else (Plutarch 1, 33). Plutarch, considers philosophy for the soul to be what gymnastics is for the body in education (Plutarch 1, 35). Here Plutarch’s formula, though not exactly the same as Plato’s, nevertheless puts forward a completely Platonic approach. In *On Listening to Lectures*, Plutarch writes on the practice of being a student of philosophy. He notes the importance of listening to speakers without envy, but as if the student was a guest at a dinner party (Plutarch 1, 217). Moreover, it is necessary to set aside the repute of the speaker, and focus on the philosophical content of what is being presented (Plutarch 1, 223). In addition, Plutarch suggests the students asking questions playing to the strengths of the speaker. Particularly, the questions should be related to the speaker’s field (Plutarch 1, 233). Lastly, Plutarch emphasizes the importance of cultivating independent thinking as a necessary precondition of acquiring a habit of mind that is deeply ingrained and philosophical. According to Plutarch, right listening is the beginning of right living (Plutarch 1, 259). Plutarch’s views

certainly presume a teacher-centered educational setting even if he wants students to participate in this educational setting as effectively as they can. Without doubt, Plutarch's contributions, dealing with areas of philosophical education previously unexplored, have advanced Platonic educational philosophy, and scholarly method while remaining within its limits. It may be added that abandoning Platonic utopianism has made Plutarch more interested in the daily practice of education than designing the educational system of a utopia. Overall, Plutarch was an original philosopher rather than a faithful follower, and middle Platonism constitutes another major revision of Platonism on numerous issues, while remaining faithful to it in other aspects.

The history of early Platonism demonstrates that the educational revisions to Socratic doctrine made by Plato were successful in resulting in a continuous movement, but unsuccessful in keeping the doctrine intact. While it is notable that the destruction of the Academy did not put an end to Platonism, it is also true that the incarnation of Platonism that arose after this event gave up all its utopian political aspirations for the sake of realism, as well as its insistence on Platonic educational institutions and even its student-centered method in order to conform with the educational practice of the time and thus all the radicalism that was left in Platonism as well. Overall, we see no progress in the early period of Platonism, but rather one incarnation after another, revising Plato's original doctrine in various ways.

Neoplatonism

The last great variant of Platonism that developed in the ancient Western world was Neoplatonism. This philosophical current was founded by Plotinus, who received an education in philosophy for ten years in Alexandria (O'Meera, 13-4).

Plotinus studied under Ammonius Saccas (175 – 242)⁴⁶. Like numerous philosophers before him, Plotinus' studies took him out of his native Egypt, as he went to Iran, India and finally Rome, where he opened his informal school at the house of a Roman woman called Gemina. His students included three women: Gemina, her daughter, and Amficlea, as well as two senators. In the *Enneads*, Plotinus argues against a mechanistic identification of femininity with matter, stating that this is only a metaphor. Moreover, he rejects the Aristotelian conception of seeing the mother as a mere container, and the father as the sole determinant of the child (Plotinus, 210-11). Unlike many previous Platonists, especially Plutarch, Plotinus took Platonic utopianism seriously. Dominic O'Meera notes that with the help of his senator students, he approached Emperor Gallienus (218 – 268) and Empress Salonina (fl. 3rd Century) with plans to build a "city of philosophers," to be called Platonopolis and to be run according to Plato's *Laws*. Though Plotinus won over Gallienus and Salonina, opposition in the court, however, blocked the project (O'Meera, 14-16). Plotinus' attempt to create the Platonic utopia by influencing rulers can be seen as a direct repetition of Plato's own efforts. In both cases it can be argued that the philosophers in question were aware that education alone was not sufficient to realize their political goals, but they were powerless to pursue another path than pleading with rulers. In both cases, the spirit of time were not behind the philosophers, and the utopia they wanted to see realized was not tolerated by the elites. Accordingly, within the historical course of Platonism, the founder of Neoplatonism has to be described as a radical Platonist, who was more faithful to the original doctrine than most if not all of his predecessors.

⁴⁶ Claimed to be of Indian origin though raised in a Greek Christian family (Seldeslachts, 156), Ammonius Saccas was a philosopher who tried to reconcile the views of Plato, Aristotle, Moses, Jesus and all other systems of philosophy he knew (Reyes, 213). He accepted Pagans as well as Christians in his school where he taught for over fifty years (Johnson, 147).

Porphyry, a student of Plotinus, expresses the first direct example of the Neoplatonist attitude towards women in his famous letter to his wife. The reason Porphyry chose to marry his wife Marcella, a mother of seven children, is because he considered her to be inclined towards philosophy. Because of this, Porphyry has never asked Marcella to do any housework, and taught her the philosophical doctrines that would shape her life instead. Porphyry considers the education of Marcella's children their mutual responsibility, with the aim that the children reach true philosophy one day. According to the letter, Marcella in turn values the truth over all else, and sees their marriage as a gift from heaven. (Porphyry, 53-5). Given the respect and adoration Porphyry feels towards Marcella, this is hardly a surprising reaction to expect from a woman from the patriarchal world of the Roman Empire, even if the husband is, or at least initially was in a much more dominant role in the relationship. Also, Porphyry, while he does not think it a misfortune to be born a man or a woman, advises Marcella not to see herself as a woman, and flee from all that is feminine in her soul (Porphyry, 77-8). This shows that Porphyry shared Plato's philosophical hostility to femininity. This is connected to his opposition to pleasure, which goes as far as rejecting masturbation (Porphyry, 78). Lastly, Porphyry advises his wife to refrain from harming her slaves, or correcting them when angry (Porphyry, 78). This shows him to have a softer take on slavery than most Platonists including Plato, even if he does not challenge the institution of slavery.

Porphyry is known to have influenced famous Christian philosopher St. Augustine (354 – 430) (O'Meera, 15), and Christian Neoplatonism went on to produce woman philosophers such as Makarina (fl. 4th Century) who saw no distinction between a male and a female soul (Waithe, 7-8). Nevertheless, the dominant tendency within ancient

Neoplatonism was the Pagan one, which first developed in Syria. Queen Zenobia (240 – 274) was the head of the rebellious state of Palmyra, and her teacher in philosophy, and chief adviser was Cassius Longinus (213 – 273), a student of Ammonius Saccas, and a friend of Plotinus. Zenobia also supported the efforts of Amelius (fl. 3rd Century), a student of Plotinus, in starting a Neoplatonist school in Apamea (Stoneman, 129-32). Amelius was succeeded by Iamblichus (245 – 325), a student of his, as well as Porphyry, and Amficlea. In line with the tradition of philosophical reconciliation started by Ammonias Saccas, Iamblichus synthesized the views of philosophers like Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, and Plotinus with Chaldean and Egyptian philosophies (O’Meera, 16-17). O’Meera notes that Iamblichus thought it was necessary for children to be educated in ethical virtue in the form of a moral upbringing through habitation before they were old enough to understand rational, that is political virtue (O’Meera, 47). Iamblichus is also our main source regarding the educational system of Pythagoreanism, which he reports favorably (Iamblichus, 25-27). Had Zenobia succeeded against Rome, without a doubt we would have seen a significant Neoplatonist political influence. The failure of her rebellion should not be considered a failure of Neoplatonism, which continued to exist beyond the state of Palmyra, however the defeat of the philosophically inclined rebel queen demonstrates the spirit of time was not behind Neoplatonism to the extent that it could be associated with political power for long let alone realize its utopia.

Among the most important students of Iamblichus, Sospater, Aedesius and Theodorus of Asine (fl. 3rd – 4th Century) can be mentioned. Sospater is known for joining the court of Constantine (272 – 337), hoping to control and reform the Emperor through reason. Eventually, however, he fell victim to court intrigue, and was executed, demonstrating

once again the dangers of the Platonic practice of attempting to influence rulers. Aedesius established a Neoplatonist school in Pergamon, and Theodorus of Asine also started a school of his own too (O'Meera, 17-18). One of Aedesius' students was Maximus of Ephesus (310 – 372) (Eunapius), who went on to become one of the teachers of Emperor Constantine II's (317 – 361) successor, Emperor Julian (331 – 363), who followed him in his Neoplatonism (Luck, 451). Julian's short lived reign did not bring Neoplatonism any closer to its goals, demonstrating that even if a ruler of the empire was converted to the doctrine through education, lots of other factors effected the political fortunes of a philosophical movement.

Another of Aedesius' students in the Neoplatonist school of Pergamon was a remarkable woman philosopher called Sosipatra (fl. 4th Century). According to Eunapius (fl. 4th – 5th Century), educated by Chaldean sages at an early age, Sosipatra, "by her surpassing wisdom made her own husband," Eusthathius of Cappadocia who was an important student of Aedesius, and an accomplished philosopher in his own right, "seem inferior and insignificant". Sosipatra taught at the Neoplatonist school in Pergamon, and her lectures are said to have attracted as much as interest as those of Aedesius himself (Eunapius). Sosipatra is the first woman philosopher associated with Platonism who is known to have definitely taught in public. Given what we already know about Neoplatonism up until this point, it has to be said that this is certainly not a coincidence. Despite falling short of its political ambitions, Neoplatonism is remarkable for its ability to conquer power even if very briefly while having women teach at one of its most prestigious schools.

The first Neoplatonist philosopher to take a detailed look into the question of gender, however, is Theodorus of Asine, a student of Iamblichus, and perhaps Porphyry as well. O'Meera notes that Theodorus based his views regarding

women on the Republic, and wrote a work specifically on this subject. According to Theodorus, differences in gender are merely a product of different modes of life. The social division of labor between sexes is not caused by nature but by tradition. Theodorus gives the example of historical women who fought wars, and commanded warriors. He gives the example of the Goddesses to claim that women can perform all sorts of occupations. He believes the divine virtue of someone like Diotima (fl. 5th century BC), teacher of Socrates cannot be denied. He repeats Socrates' idea that there can, and should be philosopher rulers who are women (O'Meera, 84). Theodorus is thus clearly closer to Socrates rather than mature Plato, and on the question of gender deserves to be called a feminist as well as the most radical of the Neoplatonists, who collectively have to be considered the most radical of Platonism on this question.

As O'Meera explains, the views of Theodorus were not uncontested within Neoplatonism. Proclus of Constantinople (412 – 485), thanks to whom we are aware of Theodorus' views, rejects them as strongly as he can. Although Dirk Baltzly notes that he does not disagree with Theodorus on whether there can be philosopher queens (Baltzly, 17), according to O'Meera, he focuses on the “conservative and conventional aspects of Plato's attitude towards women,” and argues there are natural differences between men and woman, going back to the difference between Monadic and Dyadic causes (O'Meera, 86). Proclus' patriarchal response to Theodorus' Socratic position is influenced by Xenocrates as well as mature Plato, and it is Proclus rather than Theodorus who is more in line with Platonism as a historical tradition. This being said, because Theodorus lived before Proclus, his position may have been more common among Neoplatonists than the position expressed by Proclus. Especially if this was the case, it has to be concluded that Proclus' position

constitutes a conservative reaction to Theodorus' radicalism on this question.

Neoplatonism was brought to Athens by a student of the school in Pergamon, Priscus of Epirus (305 – 395). The first important member, and perhaps the founder of the school in Athens was Plutarch of Athens (350 – 430), probably Priscus' student. This school traced its philosophy back to Iamblichus (O'Meera, 19). The most famous student of this school was Hypatia (370 – 415) according to the Suda, the medieval Byzantine encyclopedia of philosophy (Anonymous). A native of Alexandria, Hypatia brought Neoplatonism back home.⁴⁷ According to O'Meera, the Athenian and Alexandrian Neoplatonist schools maintained close relations: "the Alexandrians were often trained in Athens, and the Athenians often studied in Alexandria" (O'Meera, 23-24). Although none of her philosophical works survived, Mary Ellen Waithe tells us that Hypatia taught the philosophies of Pythagoras, Plato, Xenophon, Aristotle, the Cynics, perhaps even the Stoics, and lastly, of course, Plotinus, and his followers (Waithe, 175). We do not know if Hypatia had Socratic views on gender like Theodorus, however we know that she was a Socratic in practice: she would walk around Alexandria wearing her philosopher's robe, and discuss philosophy with anyone interested, hinting a student-centered educational approach. According to Christian historian Socrates Scholasticus of Constantinople (380 – 439), people came from far lands to listen to her, and she would often talk to rulers as well. Yet, continues Socrates Scholasticus in *Ecclesiastical History*, she also drew the hatred of Christian reactionaries, who brutally murdered her (Socrates Scholasticus). The murder of Hypatia can well be considered as important a moment in the history of ancient philosophy as the death of Socrates.

⁴⁷ Hypatia was the daughter of Theon (335 – 405), who taught mathematics, and astronomy at the Museum (Waithe, 170).

Hypatia's death did not prevent other women from joining the Neoplatonist movement. Asclepagenia (430 – 485), daughter of Plutarch of Athens, continued her father's form of Neoplatonism synthesized with Greek Pagan magic (Waithe, 201). Aedesia (fl. 5th Century), was yet another woman who studied in Athens and returned to take an important part in the school in Alexandria (Dzielska, 143-4). Another Neoplatonist woman philosopher was Theodora of Emesa (fl. 5th Century) who was interested in grammar, poetry, arithmetic, and geometry (Dzielska, 146). After Hypatia, Heirocles (fl. 5th – 6th Century) who, like Hypatia, studied in the Athenian school, played an important role in the Alexandrian school (O'Meera, 24). Contrary to the Athenian and Near Eastern Neoplatonist schools, Hierocles is known to have rejected the practice of magic (Lawrence). There are different ways to read this rejection. This position may be Hierocles' own innovation. If this is so, it may carry elements of a concession to patriarchy, given Hypatia was accused of witchcraft. It may also be a position shared by Hypatia herself, given her scientific background. Either way, at this period Neoplatonism was an educational movement which brought together science and magic in scholarly discussion, and which included significant women teachers at the same time. The Athenian school soon came under the influence of Proclus, however, who was to become its most important philosopher (O'Meera, 20), which could not have been encouraging for women. By the 6th Century, the fact that Pagans taught in Neoplatonist schools was seen as too much by Eastern Roman Emperor Justinian (484 – 565), who closed down the school in Athens (Lindberg, 70).

O'Meera notes that for Neoplatonists, the philosophical school was more than just an institution that taught. It often constituted a community of life united by a common moral

education. The curriculum of the Neoplatonist schools was designed in a way that the student would live a different life, a life that was as divine as possible. Accordingly, the books used in the curriculum were given a special importance. They were not simply sources of information but had to be seen as instruments for the formation of the soul. Their purpose was to lead the student to higher modes of life (O'Meera, 50 – 51). Among the subjects studied by the Neoplatonists, aside from philosophy, science, and magic, we can add rhetoric. As we can see in O'Meera, rhetoric was not considered a tool for politics for that was what political philosophy was for, but for communicating with the community and persuading them to act as they should (O'Meera, 209). Overall, it can be said that Neoplatonism retained many features of Platonic education.

Neoplatonism can easily be considered the most successful incarnation of Platonism. Politically, they managed to have an influence in rival states and even convert an emperor. Yet their political success is little compared to their educational success. Neoplatonism proved that it was possible to bring magic and science, rhetoric and philosophy, men and women in the best academic institutions of their time. All this, they did with rediscovering the Platonic and even the Socratic doctrine, and mixing it with seemingly opposite doctrines, Greek and foreign, without letting go of their utopianism and gender radicalism for the most part. Educationally too, judging by the account of Hypatia's life as a teacher, it can be concluded that Neoplatonism continued the student-centered approach, basing it on but not limiting it to an academic framework. It is difficult to claim that Neoplatonism advanced Platonism as it too did not faithfully realize mature Plato's doctrine, but in itself, Neoplatonism certainly progressed, synthesizing Platonism with the philosophies of different peoples one after another.

Conclusion

This chapter has followed the trajectory of Platonism as a philosophical, political, and educational movement, starting with Plato himself, and moving on to the Old, Middle, and New Academies, Middle Platonism, and Neoplatonism, covering about eight centuries. When examining Plato, I preferred to focus on his mature works where his teacher Socrates does not play a central role or is not featured at all, and where Plato expresses views deviating from the Socratic doctrine expressed in his earlier work. While Plato certainly adhered to the Socratic doctrines when he was writing his earlier works, his maturation as an original philosopher came in later works. The views of mature Plato are considerably less radical than those of Socrates on politics, gender and education. Because of this moderation on gender and politics, Plato's ideal system, as opposed to Socrates' meritocratic socialism, can only be defined as a social meritocracy. As for education, the same moderation of Socratic views and practices caused Plato to settle down in a formal school with a cult of followers rather than engaging with everyone informally, and put forward a scholarly method which, though greatly influenced by Socrates, is nevertheless original. Plato's political and educational views were in general in line with each other although it would be difficult to claim one determined the other. Similarly, Plato's political and educational philosophy was in line with his metaphysics. In all these fields, Plato's philosophy was marked with the moderation of the Socratic doctrine, though not so much as to make Plato a moderate.

Aristotle, the most gifted and later famous student of Plato, established a rival school on reactionary political grounds. As for Plato's Academy, it was the works of mature Plato that they followed after his death, although they followed these works imperfectly, often making innovations. Heads of the Academy, such as Arcesilaus who initiated

Academic skepticism, seriously deviated from numerous Platonic positions. Plutarch of the Middle Academy completely scrapped Platonic utopianism while advancing Plato's scholarly methods with works on how to educate children, and listen to lectures. Neoplatonism, while having original features itself, returned to many original positions of Platonism. There was in fact a Neoplatonist, Theodorus, who defended the Socratic position on gender, earning himself the title of first Platonic feminist, and other Neoplatonists may have shared his position as well. The influence of Aristotelianism, however continued to exist within Neoplatonism. Like Plato's original doctrine, the later incarnations of Platonism, no matter how innovative, were more or less coherent in terms of their political, educational and metaphysical views. Overall, it has to be said that Platonism constitutes an extremely important tradition of political and educational theory due to the richness of the original material, and later innovations alike. Its history is one of an internal conflict between radical and conservative approaches.

Its extraordinary longevity as an influential educational movement with political aspirations alone is reason to consider Platonism to be the most successful of the movements that originated in antiquity. Moreover, the role it played in the politics of the ancient Western world, though perhaps not as major as Pythagoreanism and Stoicism, was in any case certainly not negligible. Platonism developed as a series of contradictory incarnations rather than in a succession, hence it advanced Plato's thought no more than Plato advanced that of Socrates. Like the other movements of its time, Platonism certainly failed to politically dominate the progress of civilization by realizing its utopian vision, and its attempts to influence political life to the effect fell short of their ambitions. The success of the movement rather lies in its educational activity. On numerous occasions, from the

original Academy to the Neoplatonists, Platonism came to dominate the intellectual life of its parent civilization with educational institutions belonging to the movement. When this was not possible, Platonists dominated intellectual life through mainstream educational institutions. Thus, it can be concluded that Platonism was often favored by the spirit of time, or in other words was appealing to the ancient society, in the intellectual sphere more so than in politics. Moderating the extreme educational philosophy of Socrates, and situating it in a framework of academic study contributed to the longevity of the Platonic movement. Similarly, moderating Socratic opposition patriarchy, while retaining key practices such as the education of women, protected the movement from patriarchal reaction while allowing it to make use of the intellectual abilities of women. The heterogeneous nature of the movement, however, made it unable to become a political force capable of resisting the historic changes that affected it.

Chapter 5

Cynicism

Cynicism, which was an extremist continuation of the Socratic movement, retained the characteristic of being a political and educational movement with very radical yet still contradictory views on gender. Contrary to its Socratic roots, Cynic education was teacher-centered and portrayed the teacher as an example to be imitated. The Cynic teacher was a superstar of education, consciously setting an example with every word and every act. Cynic education was tough, but it was open to all. The teacher-centered pedagogy of the Cynics was unique in considering the child to be a fellow Cynic, thus an equal, from a very early age, however, thus avoiding a teacher-student relationship based on formal authority. Cynic education served the political goals of the movement in producing new Cynics if possible, and if not bettering humanity. Although Cynicism was revised by some of its more famous late adherents, an orthodox Cynic current continued to exist as well.

In terms of approaching its goals, let alone reaching them, the Cynics were undoubtedly the greatest failure of all the philosophical movements of antiquity. The spirit of time never favored them, as they were against progress and civilization. Despite their blatant extremism, they were never influential enough to be considered a threat, and consequently they were never seriously repressed. The victory of the Cynics lied in

their long existence, which in any case did not exceed the antiquity. The manliness and social misogyny of the Cynics seems to have prevented the Cynic movement from attracting more Cynic women, at least from the upper classes. Moreover, the gender radicalism of the movement must have made it difficult for men with moderate and conservative leanings to swallow the Cynic doctrine. In short, the contradictory nature of the Cynic position on gender probably did not serve the movement. Nevertheless, the Cynics position in favor of women's education allowed them demonstrate their views on gender in practice. As a result, Cynicism produced one of the most important woman philosophers of the antiquity who went on to become one of the role models of the movement. In general, Cynic educational efforts were successful to the extent that they were what carried the movement until the end of the antiquity. In particular Diogenes (412 – 323 BC) deserves credit as the ancient educator with the worthiest successors to his teachings. While Cynic education suffered from certain limitations of the teacher-centered method and could not prevent the rise of revisionists to fame as Cynics, it also deserves credit for maintaining an orthodoxy faithful to the original doctrine, even though little is known about this orthodoxy.

It would be an understatement to say that ancient sources on Cynicism are scarce. There is, however, one collection of source material that stand out: *the Cynic Epistles*, made up of letters attributed to a number of philosophers, most of them being Cynics or their predecessors. Most scholars, like Doyne Dawson, have preferred to focus on the undoubtedly spurious nature of this collection which had various authors over centuries. Dawson considers these works so obscure, even in their purpose, that he believes they can at best be used as sources on late Cynicism (Dawson, 115-6). While it is true enough that these letters obviously cannot be taken to be

original, the letters attributed to Cynic philosophers and their predecessors at least represent how these philosophers were perceived by those who followed in their footsteps. As for the purpose of the epistles, it can be described as comprehensively elaborating Cynic philosophy. Abraham Malherbe goes as far as to define the epistles of Diogenes as Cynic propaganda (Malherbe, 17). Thus it is necessary to take *the Cynic Epistles* seriously as a major source material on the Cynic movement in general. Other than *the Cynic Epistles*, the works of Dio Chrysostom (40 – 115), and above all Diogenes Laertius (fl. 3rd Century) are the most prominent ancient sources on the Cynic movement.

The Predecessors of Cynicism

In his oration addressed to the uneducated Cynics, where he criticizes the Cynics of his day for not being worthy of what Cynicism stands for, the Roman Emperor Julian (331 – 363) puts forward a quite interesting origin story of the Cynics (Julian). Julian was a Neoplatonist rather than a Cynic, although he was open to Cynicism because of the Socratic roots shared by Platonism and Cynicism (Luck, 451). Yet, the way Julian sees it, there were Cynics among Greeks and Barbarians before even Heracles. Julian portrays Cynicism as a universal philosophy which demands no special study, since, following Heraclitus, they asserted that much learning does not teach understanding. Nor does the emperor believe it necessary to go through a discipline as with other philosophical movements. Following the Delphic “Know thyself” and “falsify the currency” are enough. Hence, Julian concludes, it is Apollo, the god of Delphi himself, who is the founder of Cynic philosophy (Julian). Indeed, Julian is not alone in having a wider definition of Cynicism. According to Donald Dudley, Onesicritus (360 – 290 BC), an extremely

well-traveled student of Diogenes, notes that he saw Cynics in foreign lands as far as India, as well as among “savage races” (Dudley, 39-40). This tendency to see Cynicism beyond the boundaries of the small Cynic movement shows that the Cynics saw themselves as a larger, global phenomenon. This being said, there is actually more to being a Cynic than what these romanticized accounts imply.

Dated at 300 – 250 BC, the epistles of Anacharsis the Scythian (fl. 6th Century BC) are probably the earliest of *the Cynic Epistles* (Malherbe, 6-7). Diogenes Laertius, portrays Anacharsis, a Scythian with a Greek mother, as an early proponent of cosmopolitanism in Athens, who eventually returns home and is killed by his brother the King for subverting Scythian customs with his Greek ways (Laertius, 49-50). Anacharsis’ cosmopolitanism is emphasized in the epistles (Anonymous, 37-9), and more importantly an early version of the Cynic uniform symbolizing freedom is attributed to him (Anonymous, 43). Another philosopher the Cynics were inspired by was Heraclitus (535 – 475 BC), who famously remarked that much learning does not teach understanding (Heraclitus, 31). Like Anarcharsis, Heraclitus is portrayed in the epistles as being content with little, which is why he refuses to visit King Darius (550 – 486 BC). Additionally, Heraclitus defends cosmopolitanism in the epistles, arguing nurture rather than birth determines how a person will turn out to be (Anonymous, 211). Moreover, he even opposes slavery, countering the saying of the Ephesians, “Let not a slave sit with me nor dine with me,” with “Let a good man sit with me and dine with me”. According to Heraclitus of the epistles, evil, and being a slave to desires makes a person truly a slave, whereas the virtuous are free no matter what (Anonymous, 213). Without a doubt, these views reflect the Cynic doctrine.

Cynicism was exceptionally influenced by Socrates (470 – 399 BC). In fact, Eduard Zeller notes that Cynic philosophy

claims to be the genuine successor of Socrates' teachings. Zeller disagrees with the claim: according to him, the many-sidedness of the Socratic doctrine is lacking in Cynic thought. Zeller believes Cynicism is above all influenced by Socrates' independent character and self-control⁴⁸ (Zeller, 291). Dating from the first century or perhaps even earlier (Malherbe, 27), the epistles of Socrates gives us a good idea of Socrates according to the Cynic tradition. Politically, Socrates rejects the idea of private property, arguing that friends have all things in common. Socrates has no time to guard money. This being said, Socrates also shows patriotic concern for his homeland (Anonymous, 221). This shows that the anonymous Cynic authors of the epistles, perhaps out of respect for historical truth, did not censure views when it appeared to contradict theirs. Educationally, the epistles emphasize that Socrates refused to demand money to teach philosophy, or to teach only to a closed circle or cult like the Pythagoreans (Anonymous, 219). It can be claimed that as an educator, Socrates was a role model for the Cynics. The Cynics may not have been the perfect Socratic current – it is debatable to say the least if there has ever been one – however it is clear that they have been influenced not only by Socrates' character, but by his political and educational doctrines. Moreover, Socrates' student Simon the Shoemaker, who wrote numerous Socratic dialogues based on his notes of his teacher's conversations (Laertius, 119-20), is depicted as almost a Cynic in the epistles, expressing anger at those who claim to be disciples of Socrates but live in luxury, like Socrates' hedonist disciple Aristippus (435 – 356 BC) (Anonymous, 251).

The first philosopher, according to Zeller, who has been described as the founder of Cynicism as a philosophical movement, is Antisthenes (445 – 365 BC) (Zeller, 284).

⁴⁸ It should be noted that Zeller's argument is mainly based on criticizing Antisthenes in comparison with Socrates.

Diogenes Laertius quotes an older author, Diocles (2nd or 1st Century BC), who says Antisthenes was the first to invent the Cynic uniform (Laertius, 265). Dudley, however, believes that Antisthenes was not the founder of Cynicism. Despite admitting that there are similarities between the teachings of Antisthenes and Diogenes, to him the differences are too important to qualify Antisthenes as a Cynic (Dudley, 1). Dudley goes on to say that while Antisthenes significantly influenced Cynicism through his ethics and his representation of Socrates (Dudley, 13), and can thus be considered a precursor of Cynicism, the true founder of the movement was Diogenes (Dudley, 15). Luis Navia adds that not only is Antisthenes' role in the history of Cynicism disputed, but so is how important a Socratic philosopher he is. Navia himself defends a nuanced position between those who elevate Antisthenes' importance for the Socratic and Cynic movements, and those who downplay it (Navia, 39). In my view, Antisthenes' importance as a Socratic philosopher is clearer than his relation to Cynicism, and indeed he cannot be considered the founder of Cynicism, though he is certainly its most important precursor.

According to Diogenes Laertius, Antisthenes was the son of an Athenian father and a Thracian mother, and thus was not a citizen of Athens. He started his journey with philosophy as a student of Gorgias (483 – 375 BC), only to later become a follower of Socrates (Laertius, 260). Navia notes that he has been described as the member of the Socratic movement who stood closest to Socrates himself (Navia, 37). Diogenes Laertius claims that Antisthenes brought about the banishment of Anytus (5th – 4th Centuries BC) and the execution of Meletus (5th – 4th Centuries BC), accusers of Socrates (Laertius, 264). Navia notes that while Antisthenes indeed did not flee Athens after the death of Socrates, it is unlikely that he caused the fates of the accusers since they were pure-bloods and he was not

(Navia, 54). While Navia is certainly right to take Athenian xenophobia into consideration, the story is still significant in showing how courageous and faithful a Socratic Antisthenes was perceived to be by the ancients.

Zeller emphasizes that Antisthenes had a lower class style like Socrates himself (Zeller, 316). In Xenophon's (431 – 354 BC) *Symposium*, Antisthenes defines himself as a beggar and explains that in all his poverty, he is the possessor of great wealth. The reason behind this is that he considers wealth and poverty not to lie in someone's estate but in their souls. Antisthenes notes that there are monarchs who massacre and enslave entire peoples for the sake of wealth: individuals who he can only pity as they are plagued by a cruel malady (Xenophon, 38-9). Antisthenes credits his teacher Socrates as the source of his wealth that gave him freedom to spend whole days in pure scholarly intercourse, his favorite activity (Xenophon, 40). Yet, according to Diogenes Laertius, Socrates was not completely in favor of Antisthenes' interpretation of his thought, as he criticizes his student for having his love of glory visible through the holes in his cloak (Laertius, 263). Zeller notes how the Socratic independence of wants becomes, with the Cynics, a renunciation of them (Zeller, 315). Thus, Antisthenes bridges the historical gap between the Socratic and Cynic movements, and in this respect appears closer to the Cynics than to Socrates.

Antisthenes' political radicalism has its roots in his ethics. According to Zeller, Antisthenes believes that virtue consists of wisdom (Zeller, 310-1). Diogenes Laertius says that according to Antisthenes, virtue can be taught and only the virtuous are noble. He considers virtue sufficient for happiness. All it takes for it is the strength of a Socrates: thus he portrays his teacher as a role model to be imitated, a teacher-centered perception. This form of teacher-centered pedagogy is a core aspect of Cynic pedagogy. It relies on teaching by example

and aims to preserve the original teaching as the student is expected to be more or less just like the teacher in virtue as well as doctrine. Politically, such an approach is supposed to keep a conservative doctrine conservative, and a radical doctrine radical, and arguably does better at it compared to other ancient educational approaches.

Antisthenes contrasts the law of virtue with established law in favor of the former. Moreover, Antisthenes claims nothing is foreign to the wise (Laertius, 264) in line with Cynic cosmopolitanism. Like his teacher Socrates, Antisthenes is an opponent of democracy as can be seen in how he mocks it in Diogenes Laertius for awarding uneducated people with high posts because they are elected (Laertius, 263), hinting a meritocratic position like that of his teacher. Moreover, in *the Cynic Epistles*, Antisthenes says that it is not right for a philosopher to be associated with tyrants. Like the masses, tyrants are uneducated, and cannot be befriended (Anonymous, 245). This portrayal in the epistles is completely in line with what could be expected from a dedicated student of Socrates. Antisthenes is not only opposed to all laws and the concept of nobility based on birth, but democracies, tyrannies and undoubtedly every political regime in between. His general political outlook is no less radical than that of his teacher.

In Xenophon's *Symposium*, Antisthenes explains his take on sexual desire as a bodily need which he prefers to satisfy with "what comes first to hand," as those who are unsought provide the same experience as those who are sought as partners (Xenophon, 39). Here Antisthenes puts forward a critical attitude to the mainstream standard of beauty. This hostility is also expressed in a saying attributed to Antisthenes, which is of uncertain authenticity according to Navia. Antisthenes says he would kill Aphrodite if he had the chance (Navia, 70). If genuine, this can only be taken

to be a desire to kill what Aphrodite represents. According to Zeller Antisthenes is in favor of marriage in order to keep up humanity (Zeller, 320). Diogenes Laertius says that Antisthenes believes the wise man should marry with the women of the best nature to beget children. Moreover, according to Antisthenes this should be a marriage of passion because the wise man alone knows who deserves to be loved (Laertius, 264). This would presumably apply for a wise woman as well, as Dudley notes that Antisthenes agrees with the Socratic position that virtue is the same for men and women (Dudley, 49-50). Yet, according to Henry, while considering virtue the same for men and women, Antisthenes is against Aspasia (470 – 400 BC), probably the greatest woman philosopher of the time and Socrates' teacher, in his dialogue carrying her name. Moreover, in the same dialogue, he condemns homosexuality (Henry, 31-2). The fact that Antisthenes sees marriage to be between a man and a woman, and with the purpose of producing children, demonstrates him to have a gender essentialist perspective, accordingly his homophobia is hardly surprising. Antisthenes' views on gender can be interpreted as radical to an extent, but they are also conventional. Hence, it is impossible to describe him as a feminist.

Zeller notes that Antisthenes wrote a number of highly praised treatises (Zeller, 286), which shows that he did not imitate his teacher's principle of not writing. According to Diogenes Laertius, as a writer Antisthenes employed the rhetorical style of his first teacher Gorgias in his dialogues (Laertius, 260). Of his numerous now lost works listed by Diogenes Laertius, the most relevant are *On Freedom and Slavery*, *On Education or On Names* (five books) and *On Questioning and Answering* (Laertius, 266-7). Yet, despite being an accomplished writer himself, Zeller says that Antisthenes thought one could do without reading and writing. This being

said, while rejecting speculative knowledge, Antisthenes was also interested in the study of logic and physics. Hence according to Zeller, Antisthenes and the Cynics who followed him did not declare war against all culture. Zeller goes on to add that for the Cynics, the value of culture was recognized to the extent that it produced Cynic virtue (Zeller, 293-4). It's possible to agree with Zeller only to the extent that the concept of culture can be separated from the concept of civilization, which was rejected more thoroughly. This being said, the implication from philosophically rejecting all speculative knowledge, and insisting on the study of logic and physics alone, is the rejection of metaphysics and embracing of some kind of materialism, or to be more exact, naturalism. This ontological position was to continue to dominate the Cynic movement.

Antisthenes has never been portrayed as someone too enthusiastic about being a teacher. According to Diogenes Laertius, when Socrates was alive, Antisthenes would encourage those who wanted to be his students to rather be fellow disciples of Socrates (Laertius, 260). He did start to converse and teach in the gymnasium of Cynosarges (Laertius, 264) after the passing of Socrates, likely synthesizing the student-centered method of his teacher with elements of his teacher-centered perception mentioned earlier. The Cynosarges was a gymnasium particularly for those who were not Athenian citizens like Antisthenes, who probably spent time there since his youth. The Cynics would continue to be associated with the Cynosarges after Antisthenes (Morison). The choice of the Cynosarges as an educational center has to be considered completely in line with Antisthenes' and his successors' political radicalism which embraced social strata excluded by mainstream society. According to Zeller, Antisthenes actually opened a school after the death of Socrates (Zeller, 285). If it is true that Antisthenes opened

a formal school, this would separate him from most of the Cynic tradition. In any case, despite his rejection of even the necessity of reading, as Georg Luck quotes Stobaeus (fl. 5th Century), Antisthenes considers the greatest achievement one could have to be in the field of education (Luck, 84). This shows the importance Antisthenes attached to education. Without a doubt, Antisthenes taught his whole doctrine, including his political views, thus using education as a political tool like his teacher Socrates.

Diogenes Laertius demonstrates Antisthenes to have been a harsh teacher. He would chase away prospective students with his staff, so he only had a few students. He would show no mercy while chastising his students as doctors chastise patients (Laertius, 262). Zeller notes that he saw not pursuing pleasure to be a means of education in itself (Zeller, 262). Skeptical of writing in Socratic fashion, according to Diogenes Laertius, taking notes was insufficient according to Antisthenes: one had to inscribe on the mind (Laertius, 262). Hard work had a large role in Antisthenes' educational approach according to Zeller. Inspired by Heracles, who had a temple near the Cynosarges and who would become the patron saint of the Cynics, he considered labor and toil to be good things (Zeller, 306). While it is necessary to underline that none of the Cynics are known to have used physical violence on prospective students, it nevertheless needs to be said that a number of Cynic educational theories and practices have their origins with the philosophy of Antisthenes. Especially the view that sees labor and toil to be educational, and education to be necessarily hard dominated the Cynic movement. It is very easy to interpret this view as a political appeal towards the laboring classes of antiquity, and against the classes who lived in pleasure without the need to perform physical labor.

Although the predecessors of the Cynics contributed to the movement by being a source of inspiration, a narrow rather

than wide definition of Cynicism is necessary as we see the origins of Cynicism take shape with a particular philosopher, Antisthenes. The predecessors before Antisthenes cannot really be considered proto-Cynics but are merely influences on the Cynic movement. As for Antisthenes himself, he was not a Cynic because he did not mean to create a new movement or doctrine, and instead tried to be an orthodox Socratic although based on the various accounts of Socrates written by Antisthenes' rivals in the Socratic movement, it is hard to claim that he was. Yet as he was not identical to his teacher, he can certainly be defined as a proto-Cynic, and there were original aspects in his philosophy which we do not see in accounts of Socrates that directly anticipate Cynicism. Accordingly, it is difficult to claim that all Antisthenes did was to imitate Socrates as he preached.

Diogenes: Founder of Cynicism

According to Zeller, Antisthenes' most important student was Diogenes (Zeller, 286-7). Dudley, however, rejects this account and claims that it is extremely unlikely that there was any personal contact between Antisthenes and Diogenes (Dudley, 8). One of Dudley's reasons is that Antisthenes' occupation was teaching while Diogenes' occupation was begging (Dudley, 2), even if, as we saw earlier, Antisthenes too professed to being a beggar in Xenophon, one of the earliest sources available on him. Besides, students of philosophers rarely follow their teachers in everything, so differences between Antisthenes and Diogenes does not prove the improbability of an educational relation between them. A stronger point Dudley makes is that only later authors talk about a connection between Antisthenes and Diogenes (Dudley, 3). While this is important to note, it does not necessarily follow that the ancient authors in question

completely made up the relationship between Antisthenes and Diogenes. Lastly, Dudley's claim that there is nothing to tie Diogenes to the Cynosarges (Dudley, 6) is contradicted by William Morison, who cites several ancient authors who say Diogenes lived and taught in the area of the Cynosarges (Morison). In short, there is little reason to doubt the ancient tradition that holds that Diogenes, the founder of Cynicism was Antisthenes' student.

At the origin of Diogenes' philosophical journey is his expulsion from his native city of Sinope. According to Diogenes Laertius, Diogenes, along with his father who was in charge of the public treasury, were accused of falsifying or restamping the currency, and they were exiled for this. The story of the restamping of the currency is tied to the temple of Apollo in Delphi according to two contradicting accounts transmitted by Diogenes Laertius (Laertius, 269-70). In either case, that is before or after his exile, Navia notes that Diogenes is told to falsify the currency by the oracle of Apollo "in no uncertain terms" (Navia, 88). As Navia explains, there is a deeper linguistic meaning to falsifying the currency: it means to destroy customs, values and conventions. Navia calls this the rejection of all established bourgeois norms. This experience is at the roots of Diogenes' uncompromising stance of rebelliousness against the world at large (Navia, 90-1). Thus, at the start of Diogenes' philosophical journey as a Cynic is not education, but experience. In other words, Diogenes was a radical before he became a philosopher.

Malherbe notes that the epistles of Diogenes, written by different authors, carry a strong Socratic influence, and portray Diogenes in a similar fashion to the portrayals of Socrates (Malherbe, 14-7). It would be hard to imagine Diogenes not being influenced by Socrates, given Socrates' devoted follower Antisthenes was his teacher. Yet according to the epistles, Diogenes' first teacher was not Antisthenes

but the poets (Anonymous, 143). Nevertheless, Antisthenes must have been unimpressed with Diogenes in their first encounter, for he rejected to take Diogenes as a student at first according to Diogenes Laertius. Diogenes did not give up, and when Antisthenes eventually threatened him with his staff, Diogenes offered his head, asking Antisthenes to hit him for there was no wood hard enough to keep Diogenes away from Antisthenes (Laertius, 270). *The Cynic Epistles* depict Diogenes distinguishing himself among Antisthenes' students by understanding his lessons and choosing the harder path in life as a result. So Antisthenes takes Diogenes' clothes and gives him the double cloak, equipped for summer and winter, the wallet so he can live everywhere, and the cup and bowl (Anonymous, 131-3), collectively the Cynic uniform. In his discourse titled *Diogenes or on Virtue*, Dio Chrysostom notes that Diogenes was at times critical of Antisthenes; yet Antisthenes tolerated him because he liked his character (Dio Chrysostom). Given Diogenes too wrote numerous philosophical works, including *the Athenian Democracy* and *the Republic* (Laertius, 296), it is logical to think he learned of philosophical writing from Antisthenes, and by studying the writings of other philosophers.

According to Diogenes Laertius, Plato (427 – 347 BC) described Diogenes as a “Socrates gone mad” (Diogenes Laertius 2, 55). Of course, what Plato says can only be taken as a flattering insult thrown by the head of a rival school. Diogenes was certainly an unusual character; however, his behavior was based on his philosophy. Diogenes lived, ate and slept everywhere: this was, after all, what his uniform was for. Eventually he started living in a tub (Laertius, 270). *The Cynic Epistles* have him say that satisfied with little, free from popular opinion to which he considers Greeks and barbarians subservient, he lived according to nature. He describes himself as a dog of heaven, as the word Cynic

comes from dog. He is free under Zeus, as dogs are under the protection of the Gods (Anonymous, 99). Zeller notes that Diogenes lived a life in harmony with nature, aiming to suppress everything artificial. Thus, according to Zeller, he tried to do without fire and ate raw meat (Zeller, 317-8). Though strange, this anecdote is certainly in line with Diogenes' absolute naturalism. As Dio Chrysostom says in his discourse titled *Diogenes, or On Tyranny*, Diogenes had more ordinary traits that were also completely in line with his naturalism as well: he cared about his health, he enjoyed his food more than others did, and he enjoyed the seasons (Dio Chrysostom). The naturalism of Diogenes, following that of his teacher, needed no rejection of the Greek polytheistic pantheon, made up of representations of nature. At the same time Diogenes' naturalism is clearly political, and his extreme lifestyle was deeply subversive towards the establishment of his day because he was not only against civilization, but could live without and opposed to it.

According to Diogenes Laertius, Diogenes describes laws as necessary to have a conventional city (Laertius, 292). It should be remembered, however, that as Dawson quotes Philodemus (110 – 35 BC), no Cynic recognized any city or law (Dawson, 139). This being said, we can see the Socratic roots of Cynicism at work when Diogenes speaks of ruling positively, and distinguishing it from making war in the epistles. To rule, according to Diogenes, is to know how to deal with people (Anonymous, 169). Other sources show that Diogenes had no time for the rulers of his day, no matter how great they were considered to be. Hence, when told by Emperor Alexander (356 – 323 BC) to make a request, Diogenes simply asks the Emperor to step out of his light (Laertius, 278). In the epistles, Diogenes is depicted writing to Alexander that if he wishes to become good and upright, he should throw aside the rag he has over his head and come to Diogenes. Yet Diogenes does

not think Alexander can do such a thing (Anonymous, 117). Diogenes' treatment of Alexander has to be considered to be a strong political disapproval rather than having anything to do with Alexander's character. Accordingly, we can infer Diogenes' attitude towards conventional rulers in general from his exchange with Alexander.

In an exchange recounted by Diogenes Laertius, Plato mocks Diogenes for washing lettuce, saying he would not have to do this if he courted Dionysius II (397 – 343 BC), to which the Cynic replies that Plato would not have to court Dionysius if he had washed lettuce (Laertius, 286). In the epistles too, Diogenes criticizes Plato for taking without moderation from the tables of a tyrant, and for scorning the Cynic lifestyle as difficult (Anonymous, 177). Aristippus is also condemned for slandering Diogenes and his poverty before a tyrant, as well as for not following Socrates properly, who he depicts as living like a Cynic (Anonymous, 137). Diogenes Laertius recounts that Diogenes opposed other philosophical schools, such as the Megarians too. Yet he considered philosophers, along with pilots and physicians to be the wisest of all animals (Laertius, 270-1). It can be concluded that all these philosophers and philosophical currents Diogenes opposed, he did not consider to be real philosophy, which is opposed to civilization and its luxuries. It's not surprising that Diogenes rejects the philosophers of civilization.

In the epistles, Diogenes says that the masses eagerly chase the happiness of the true philosophers until they discover the hardships of such a life, and they thus prefer the comfort of their pleasures, becoming slaves to every circumstance⁴⁹ (Anonymous, 107). In other words, for the Cynics, an overwhelming majority of people, that is everyone who is not a Cynic, are actually slaves. Zeller summarizes

⁴⁹ Despite Diogenes' criticism of the behavior of the masses, according to Diogenes Laertius, Athenians liked Diogenes a lot, so much so that they flogged the boy who broke his tub and gave him a new tub (Laertius, 280).

the Cynic position well: someone who is really free can never be a slave, even if enslaved. Zeller further comments that the Cynics were probably among the first to declare slavery an institution opposed to nature. They considered every difference among people other than virtue and vice to be unimportant. This being said, Zeller adds that they never pushed for the abolition of slavery (Zeller, 322-3). Hence they can only be described as proto-abolitionists. Zeller notes that when Diogenes was enslaved, he refused the offer of his friends to buy him back (Zeller, 322). Basing himself on Menippus (fl. 3rd Centuries BC), Diogenes Laertius says that when Diogenes was asked what he was good at when he was being sold as a slave, his response was that he was good at ruling over men (Laertius, 273). He chose who he would be sold to, and his master put him in charge of his sons' education. His master was so happy with Diogenes that he referred to him as a "kindly deity" (Laertius, 293). Diogenes seems to have been sympathetic towards slaves in general: according to an anecdote in Laertius, the only thing he had to say to a runaway slave who was sitting on the edge of a well was for him to be careful not to fall (Laertius, 283). According to Dio Chrysostom, in his discourse titled *On Servants*, Diogenes argues that it is better not to go after a runaway slave, as it is best to have no property in general (Dio Chrysostom). To conclude, it is more than likely that Dawson is right when he says the Cynics rejected ownership of slaves as well as all excess property (Dawson, 136). This position on slavery is an extremely radical continuation of the Socratic non-discrimination towards slaves. Only because they did not actively campaign for or attempt abolition are the Cynics only proto-abolitionists. Yet, there is no doubt that in their ideal world, there is no room for slavery.

Diogenes was an exile, and according Laertius, he was not ashamed of it at all, for he had become a philosopher thanks

to being an exile (Laertius, 282). He considered no city or country to be his motherland: he defined himself as a citizen of the world, or a cosmopolitan (Laertius, 288). In *the Cynic Epistles*, we see Diogenes harshly criticizing the “so-called Greeks,” above all for killing with greed during wars, as well as in peacetime with legal charges (Anonymous, 121). In fact, Diogenes considers the Greeks to be the “real barbarians,” whereas the actual barbarians he calls much more refined in their way of life. After all, nothing is enough for the Greeks as they constantly make war on barbarians, whereas barbarians make war only to protect their own land, and are content with what they have. Of course, Diogenes is not against being Greek in general, but Greek society as it is in his time. In fact, he considers it necessary for them to become true Greeks by learning the Greek way (Anonymous, 125). It can be inferred that what Diogenes means by the Greek way is the tradition of Greek philosophy, the worthiest representative of which is Cynicism itself. According to John Moles, though the idea that Cynic cosmopolitanism is entirely negative has been shared by current scholarly opinion for many years, this is an idea that needs to be rejected (Moles, 106-7). As Moles notes, the truly negative cosmopolitanism is that of Aristippus, as he declares he’s a foreigner everywhere, rather than Diogenes (Moles, 109-10). Diogenes not only has political positions against wars and repression based on his cosmopolitan perspective, but by declaring himself a citizen of the world, he puts forward the aim of a global commonwealth. Accordingly, Diogenes Laertius says that Diogenes considered the only true commonwealth to commensurate with the universe (Laertius, 292). Diogenes’ cosmopolitan politics have to be considered as extremely radical for his time to the extent that their realization has been difficult to conceive.

In the epistles, Diogenes sets an ambitious goal for the Cynic movement: the restoration of nature which has

disappeared under civilization. Only this can bring about the salvation of humanity (Anonymous, 97). As Zeller says, the way to achieve this is by bringing the wise to power (Zeller, 324). Luck notes that this is something the Cynic and Platonist movements have in common (Luck, 34), which can be explained by the Socratic roots they share. Thus, the Cynic position on rule can be described as a form of meritocracy, the sole merits in question being wisdom and virtue. Accordingly, it would be more accurate to call it a sophocracy. This is a necessity according to the Cynics. In the epistles, Diogenes says that although he wishes everyone could be wise (Anonymous, 179), he does not believe everyone is capable of virtue (Anonymous, 173), and consequently wisdom. Hence, only under the rule of Cynic philosophers, virtuous and wise, can humanity be liberated by returning to living in a state of nature. The political aim of the Cynics is to take power globally.

Zeller defines the ideal state of the Cynics as the destruction of all civil life, which would bring forth the freedom of the individual (Zeller, 324-5). Zeller thus sees the Cynic utopia as a mostly negative utopia. It's certainly true that the Cynics considered individual freedom to be very important. According to Diogenes Laertius, Diogenes considered freedom of speech to be the most beautiful thing in the world (Laertius, 291). According to Luck, individual freedom is not only an ideal for the Cynics, it is a concrete principle of being independent from obligations (Luck, 33-4). Diogenes Laertius says that according to Diogenes, eating the flesh of any animal is allowed, and it is not a sin to eat human flesh either (Laertius, 292). Zeller adds that Diogenes did not accept the incest taboo either (Zeller, 322). This being said, according to Luck, the Cynics also call for social justice, embodied in the principles of equal rights, including of slaves and women, and common property (Luck, 34). According to

Diogenes Laertius, the formulation put forward by Diogenes is that all things belong to the Gods, who are friends with the wise, and friends have all things in common, so all things belong to the wise. Accordingly, Diogenes considers it to be acceptable to steal from temples (Laertius, 292). In the epistles, Diogenes bases the Cynic practice of begging and his position against private property on Socrates, who is quoted saying sages do not beg but demand back, for all things belong to them as they do to the Gods (Anonymous, 105). The Cynic position on private property not only shaped the global Cynic utopia, but also the mentality behind the daily practice of a Cynic philosopher as a beggar. In Cynic philosophy, begging can be seen as a political activity in itself.

According to Dawson, Diogenes' *Republic* where his utopian views were laid out sets the following goals: the abolition of private property, the replacement of currency with dice, the end of all wars, the abolition of the family, and children being raised in common (Dawson, 112-3). Sexually, Diogenes' *Republic* features unrestricted homosexuality⁵⁰, all kinds of incest, in short the boldest promiscuity on the part of both genders. Dawson describes this as sexual communism with a free choice of partners (Dawson, 146). In Diogenes Laertius, we see Diogenes credited with the idea of consent as the key to having a relationship in a "community of women and children" (Laertius, 292). This is a position of historic significance, and although it is debatable whether Diogenes can be described as a feminist, this position certainly earns him an important place in the history of feminism. In any case, Dawson notes that there is no difference between how women and men are dressed and behave in Diogenes' utopia. Everyone exercises nude, yet have no use for weapons of war

⁵⁰ The difference between Antisthenes' and Diogenes' positions on homosexuality might have had something to do with Diogenes' sexual orientation. In the Cynic Epistles, Diogenes recounts having an erection while wrestling with a handsome young man (Anonymous, 147), demonstrating an attraction towards a male.

(Dawson, 147). It can thus be concluded that Diogenes' utopia aims to abolish not just the family and money, but gender and value too, along with wars and borders. Such radicalism can only be described as revolutionary. In general, it would be in order to define Diogenes' utopia as sophocratic communism.

According to the epistles, Diogenes was against marriage and having children, things he considered burdened human weakness with troubles (Anonymous, 179). Dawson says the Cynics condemned conventional marriages as well as relations with hetaera or concubines (Dawson, 137). In *the Cynic Epistles*, Diogenes argues that there is no reason that one should thank their parents, for birth happens by nature, and the quality of one's character is due to the blending of the elements. Particularly on birth, he says this happens because of sexual intercourse, which people do for the sake of pleasure rather than procreation (Anonymous, 115). Diogenes Laertius explains that Diogenes had a simpler solution to sexual desire: he would masturbate in the marketplace, and he would wish he could cure hunger by rubbing his belly (Laertius, 281-2) This practice of Diogenes is related to the Cynic suppression of shame which, according to Zeller, is "revolting" (Zeller, 326). Of course it is not surprising that a conservative author like Zeller is disturbed by Cynic suppression of shame. Yet especially on sexual matters this practice could be considered to have had an educational quality, teaching observers that sexual impulses were natural, that there was nothing wrong with having them, and there was no need to feel ashamed about them.

The Cynic opposition to prostitution did not necessarily mean the Cynics looked down on sex workers. Diogenes Laertius says Diogenes thought courtesans of kings should be called queens as they acted as queens (Laertius, 288). It can be inferred that Diogenes thought no less of courtesans than queens, which would be in line with Cynic philosophy.

Yet, the Cynics were not for effeminacy. Diogenes Laertius recounts two examples of Diogenes mistreating effeminately dressed youth. The first youth has a question for Diogenes, and he refuses to respond until he dresses to show whether he is a man or a woman (Laertius, 282). The second youth he rebuffs for making himself play the woman, whereas nature has made him a man (Laertius, 288). All these can be interpreted as examples of misogyny. Moreover, in Laertius, Diogenes describes Athens as women's quarters as opposed to Sparta as men's quarters (Laertius, 287). Dawson notes that the Cynics considered themselves the most "manly" of philosophers (Dawson, 137), and despite the fact that Diogenes' anti-militarist concept of manhood is deeply at odds with warlike Spartan manhood, as well as conventional Greek masculinity, this too can only be considered a statement attacking Athenians for femininity. It is because of these statements that it is difficult to describe the Cynics as feminists despite the fact that they not only defended the characteristics of Socratic feminism but even carried them further in certain respects.

According to Diogenes Laertius, nowhere in Greece did Diogenes see good men, yet he saw good lads in Sparta (Laertius, 272). This being said, in *the Cynic Epistles*, Diogenes says that the Spartans voted to ban him from their city, and criticizes them for surrendering to the passions (Anonymous, 119). Dudley notes that though he could not have liked or supported Sparta as even Athens was too narrow for autarchy, he sympathized with the Spartan educational system (Dudley, 34). It would thus be in order to take a closer look at this educational system favored by Diogenes. Xenophon, in *the Polity of the Lacedaemonians*, explains that in Sparta boys did not have slave teachers, but a public guardian, selected by the highest magistrates. This guardian had complete authority over them, and could severely punish

them if they misbehaved. Instead of allowing them to wear a variety of clothes, which would make them effeminate according to Xenophon, they were allowed to wear a single garment and had to go barefoot. Only extremely moderate food was permitted, although the students were allowed to steal so that they did not starve (Xenophon, 31-2) Given the harsh education he himself has received under Antisthenes, it is unsurprising that Diogenes thought well of Spartan education as it has a striking number of similarities with the Cynic doctrine.

Dudley notes that although to claim there was an actual Cynic “school” would be an exaggeration, Diogenes was a familiar figure to Athenians and many listened to his speeches. Moreover, Dudley adds that Diogenes gathered a small circle of students or disciples around him (Dudley, 37). Accordingly, Diogenes was both a public educator and a teacher. In fact, Dudley notes that Cleomenes (fl. 3rd Century BC), a Cynic⁵¹, portrayed Diogenes as the ideal pedagogue in his work titled *Pedagogues* (Dudley, 18). Dio Chrysostom quotes Diogenes in his discourse titled *Diogenes, or On Virtue* saying that just as a physician should go where there are sick, a sage should go where there are fools (Dio Chrysostom). This shows Diogenes being portrayed as especially committed to his role as a public educator, considering it the equivalent of a physician’s duty. It should be added that beyond giving speeches, almost every aspect of Diogenes public activity was educational by setting an example, and provoking people to think. In all these, Diogenes has a naturally teacher-centered approach. The teacher is not just a role model for his students but a public superstar, and his art is a constant performance. Yet, teaching itself was something Diogenes theorized on too. According to Diogenes Laertius, he believed that training had to encompass both the mind and the body, and would

⁵¹ Cleomenes was a student of Metrocles, brother of Hipparchia (Laertius, 304)

be incomplete without either. Diogenes held that health and strength were equally necessary for the mind and the body (Laertius, 291). Hence, Diogenes' educational theory saw the mind and the body as parts of a whole that complemented each other. Accordingly, the mind and the body had to be developed together. As a public educator, however, Diogenes seems to have focused on the mind.⁵²

Regarding the education Diogenes gave to his individual students, how he trained his master's sons is depicted by Diogenes Laertius in some detail. Diogenes taught them how to ride, shoot with the bow, sling stones and throw the javelin. Yet he prevented their physical training beyond what sufficed to maintain good health. His master's sons memorized many passages from the works of poets and writers, including works written by Diogenes himself. Diogenes trained these students in every shortcut to improve their memorization skill. Besides, he taught them to live on plain food and water, and to go barefoot and without a tunic (Laertius, 274). Dudley explains the Cynic opposition to specialization in athletics as being due to wanting to better direct the student's energy. As a teacher of individual students too, Diogenes holds a strongly central role in the educational process, directing every step. This seemingly contradicts the end goal of promoting autarchy, however the point is to promote it by making students capable of it.

Based on Teles (fl. 3rd Century BC), Dudley goes on to add that the educational curriculum put together by Diogenes is a Cynic synthesis of a number of existing systems, such as the Greek elementary education, Spartan education and Persian⁵³ education. According to Dudley, although this

⁵² Moreover, an anecdote from Diogenes Laertius demonstrates that Diogenes may have put the mind above the body. Diogenes admires philosophical education for its effects on youth, turning them from being lovers of the beauty of the body to being lovers of the beauty of the mind (Laertius, 286).

⁵³ Based on Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*.

curriculum hopes to promote autarchy, its aim is not to produce little Cynics. Cynic education works not on behalf of the movement but of humanity (Dudley, 88). Based on a cosmopolitan synthesis of the various educational practices available at the time, the Cynic curriculum used by Diogenes in this instance may well have aimed to improve humanity rather than gain new followers for the Cynic movement. David Hansen emphasizes the relevance of cosmopolitanism for education as it substantiates “features of the relation between teachers, students, and curriculum that often remain in the shadows (Hansen, 1). According to Hansen, educational cosmopolitanism is not about simply acquiring information from different sources, instead requiring a transformation in value, practice or belief (Hansen, 9). The example above demonstrates such a transformation of at least practice. While unfortunately we have little information on how Diogenes educated his Cynic disciples, we can expect that he used a somewhat different curriculum than he used with his master’s sons, as he was educating not only for humanity, but the Cynic movement as well. This being said, certainly this curriculum was cosmopolitan too as this was merely the educational application of a vital aspect of Cynic politics. A citizen of the world had to be at the same distance to the educational practices of different peoples, and able to make use of them as needed. Moreover, this education certainly aimed to transform value as well as belief along with practice.

What Socrates professed to, Diogenes was accused of. He was told that as he knew nothing, he should not philosophize. Diogenes, in response, admitted that he was indeed pretending wisdom, but added that this was in itself practicing philosophy (Laertius, 288). Thus, like Socrates, Diogenes knew that he did not know. Yet because he pretended wisdom, it would be in order to consider him a more eager teacher who had less to learn from his students. As Luck quotes Stobaeus,

Diogenes too emphasized the importance of becoming one's own teacher, but to him this was possible by criticizing what one criticized in others in oneself (Luck, 173). In other terms, for Diogenes, being critical is the precondition of being self-critical; being a teacher the precondition of being one's own teacher. Diogenes Laertius quotes Diogenes saying no success can be achieved in life without training (Laertius, 292). This quote applies to Diogenes himself as well as his students. Obviously, Diogenes considered what he had become to be a success. What he was, he was because of his own training. His promise was to train his students to achieve the same success. The reward was great, but the training itself had to be harsh, and even painful. Dudley quotes Stobaeus to show that Diogenes considered Medea to be a sage instead of a sorceress, and underlined her educational role as well as that of pain in the stories where she takes over men whose physique has been ruined by luxury, and physically training them she makes them strong and healthy again (Dudley, 33). Thus it would not be an exaggeration to say that according to Diogenes, education is impossible without pain. Additionally, it is not insignificant that Diogenes can recognize in Medea, a woman, a great educator and a sage.

Diogenes is depicted criticizing the "so-called liberal arts" in *the Cynic Epistles*, which he says serve the function of making unlettered and unrefined men available when needed. What is actually needed, however, is to educate unjust men and use them whenever there is a need for just men. Diogenes calls on the Greeks to obey Socrates and himself and come together in common council in order to learn self-control, or alternatively to hang themselves (Anonymous, 123). According to Diogenes Laertius, Diogenes knew that education had a different meaning for different parts of the society: for the young, it was a bringer of temperance, for the elderly, it was a consolation, for the poor it was a richness,

and for the rich, it was an ornament (Laertius, 291). Thus education is useful for all parts of society, although given of all the things listed above an ornament is the least useful, according to Diogenes education is probably the least useful for the rich. Moreover, as Luck quotes Stobaeus, according to Diogenes, education can shape people much easier if they are young (Luck, 173). Accordingly, its effects listed for the youth and the elderly in Diogenes Laertius are not equal. Regardless, according to Diogenes Laertius, as an educator, Diogenes imitated the chorus trainers who would set their pitch a little sharp so that everyone else would hit the right note (Laertius, 276). In other words, Diogenes admitted that his expectations were higher than what the students should achieve regardless of their social background, yet this itself was an educational tool so that they would become what they were supposed to be.

According to Dawson, Diogenes believed that a shoemaker was a likelier candidate for philosophy than a king (Dawson, 140). An example in the epistles shows Diogenes strongly reacting to Dionysius teaching Athenian children about his deeds as the tyrant of Syracuse (Anonymous, 101). This example thus depicts Diogenes to be opposed to political leaders' attempts to influence education. Additionally, the epistles depict Diogenes writing about engaging in Socratic dialogue with Alexander about how little Alexander matters to him, and the virtues of Socratic style poverty. Alexander concludes saying if he had not been Alexander, he would have been Diogenes. Yet it is unclear whether Alexander has fully understood Diogenes as he urges Diogenes to join his campaign and only reluctantly lets him go in the end (Anonymous, 141-3). Although he engages in a dialogue with Diogenes, and admires him greatly, it is not possible for an Alexander to become a Diogenes, or even a student of Diogenes while remaining Emperor. This being said, Diogenes does

not have a problem with students coming from privileged backgrounds. In *the Cynic Epistles*, he recruits a young lad from a very rich family by spitting on him, and explaining that there was nowhere else to spit in his fancy home. The youth takes this to be a criticism of his lack of education, distributes all his property to his relatives, and takes on the cloak and the wallet (Anonymous, 163). Becoming a Cynic is the beginning of a long educational journey: hence Diogenes writes to his student Crates (365 – 285 BC) after the latter gives away all his property that he still needs training (Anonymous, 103). Letting go of property is the first step one who will become a Cynic has to take. As for a king, he not only has property but a kingdom to lose by becoming a Cynic, making it effectively impossible for a king to become a one.

In Diogenes Laertius, we see Diogenes distinguishing between real training and reading about it (Laertius, 282). It would be wrong to think Diogenes completely rejects reading or books. Luck quotes him saying he'd rather fail with educated people than succeed with ignorant people. He cautions that one should only take what is useful from books, like using the marrow and throwing away the bone (Luck, 172). According to the epistles, aside from training to acquire a balanced resistance to pleasure and hardship, Diogenes believes that there was a need to learn of old discoveries (Anonymous, 107). Yet, he is against the use of captious arguments and riddles (Anonymous, 181). In contrast, Zeller notes that the Cynics had a tendency to teach serious matters using jokes and poetry (Zeller, 334). With Diogenes, as we have seen, these included practical jokes as well. Lastly, it is important to note that as Diogenes Laertius says, Diogenes completely neglected mainstream academic fields of study of the time such as music, geometry and astrology because he considered them useless (Laertius, 293). Even though books in general were related to civilization, some of them,

for example the writings of Antisthenes, must have been considered valuable works of philosophy for the Cynics. Yet the disciplines mentioned above did not carry such value to the Cynics, and were arguably tied even closer to civilization. The reason Diogenes considered them useless may be because he considered them unnatural.

Bracht Branham and Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé note that the Cynics were reproached by numerous ancient authors for their educational philosophy which rejected conventional education and intellectual culture, including traditional disciplines such as music, geometry and astronomy (Branham and Goulet-Cazé, 23). Yet, all these had nothing to do with wisdom according to the Cynics. As Zeller notes, the Cynics taught what they saw as the only way to wisdom, which was the attainment of Cynic virtue. To the Cynics, everyone else was lacking in wisdom (Zeller, 313), so all other teachings and disciplines were irrelevant or even harmful. Zeller describes the Cynic as a physician to heal the masses of their slavery to pleasure, their self-conceit and pride. In this educational endeavor, the Cynics saw telling what they considered the truth as an important part of their role, no matter the consequences (Zeller, 332-3). As such, Cynic intellectual education to a large degree consisted of propagating the Cynic doctrine. Both the public variety and the one on one variety of Cynic education were political. In fact, education can well be described as the Cynics' sole political activity. Dawson is correct to define the Cynics as a movement rather than a school as the Cynics never established a formal school and can at most be considered a school of thought. Dawson says this is because they were unconcerned with doctrine and dialectic (Dawson, 127). Had Dawson been completely correct, it would be in order to describe the Cynics as an ethical and political movement only. Without a doubt, the Cynics were not interested in dialectic, however they were

actually very concerned with their own doctrine and teaching it. For this reason, though they did not have a formal school, they were not only a school of thought but an educational movement too.

The Cynic movement begins with Diogenes instead of Antisthenes because it was Diogenes who created it by synthesizing his own experiences, the doctrine of Socrates, and above all the teachings of Antisthenes. Under the latter's influence, Diogenes and his followers portrayed themselves as orthodox Socratics, however their movement was considerably more extremist than what we know of Socrates from accounts of his views. Like the other philosophical movements of the time, the Cynics were a political movement that aimed to put philosophers of their own school to power. Notably, their sole political activity was education, for the sake of humanity as well as in order to add new members to their movement, and they did not engage in politics in another way. Thus their efforts to realize their utopia through education were immensely insufficient. Although the political aims of the Cynics were not realistic and against the spirit of time, through education they made it so that society at least tolerated their existence, and even respected them to a degree.

Crates and Hipparchia: The Ideal Successors

The most famous student of Diogenes was Crates. According to Diogenes Laertius, Crates was nicknamed Door-Opener because he would enter every house and admonish its occupants (Laertius, 299). According to Navia, Crates was considered ugly and had a hunchback (Navia, 125). Crates was originally a wealthy man, and as mentioned earlier, he gave all his belongings away to become a Cynic. Luck notes that he exclaimed "Crates gives Crates his freedom" as he rid himself of his property (Luck, 207). Diogenes Laertius

notes that he turned his fields into a grazing ground for sheep following Diogenes' suggestion. Moreover, he chased relatives who visited him to divert him from his purpose with his staff, and this way preserved his integrity (Laertius, 300). Such details regarding his life are enough to show Crates to be a devoted student of Diogenes and a true believer of the small Cynic movement of his day. According to Dudley, Crates was perhaps more important than the learned professors of the Academy and the Lyceum of his day for the life of the average Athenian (Dudley, 53), which is in no small part due to him continuing the Cynic tradition of public education.

Dudley notes that the section of *the Cynic Epistles* featuring the letters of Crates have probably been written in the second century (Dudley, 144). According to Malherbe, there are striking similarities as well as noticeable differences between the epistles of Diogenes and the epistles of Crates (Malherbe, 10). These differences in portrayal must be a result of the differences in the perception of Diogenes' and Crates' characters in the Cynic tradition. To be sure, according to the epistles, Crates believes everyone should try to emulate Socrates and Diogenes (Anonymous, 89). Nevertheless, Navia compares Diogenes and Crates as dogs, saying that while in the content of his doctrines, Crates' Cynicism remained strict and rigorous, Diogenes bit his enemies and friends alike unlike normal dogs, whereas Crates had no enemies and had a much gentler yet just as effective bite (Navia, 127). Crates can thus be considered to be gentler as an educator, while no less strict in his ethics and politics as a philosopher. This may have been due to Diogenes himself being a gentler educator than Antisthenes.

Crates followed Cynic cosmopolitanism completely. According to Diogenes Laertius, when Alexander offered to rebuild Thebes, his home city, Crates rejected the offer, saying another Alexander would raze it again. Crates' indifference

to the fate of his hometown is understandable given his worldview. Diogenes Laertius says he considered his native land to be obscurity and poverty: he was a fellow citizen of Diogenes (Laertius, 303). As Dawson notes, Crates, like other Cynics, criticized not only kings but democrats too, such as Menedemus of Eritrea (345 – 261 BC) who he mocked for taking part in mainstream democratic politics, indifferent to the fact that Menedemus was defending democracy against the Macedonians (Dawson, 141). His criticism of Athenian democracy in the epistles is very similar to Antisthenes', involving electing uneducated people to perform duties they are not suitable for (Anonymous, 75). Diogenes Laertius quotes him saying that one should study philosophy to the point where one discerns that generals are mere donkey drivers (Laertius, 302), showing that Crates continued the Cynic opposition to war and militarism. Regarding the masses too, Crates is portrayed as continuing Diogenes' doctrine, as in the epistles he argues that the masses desire the same end as the Cynics but flee from the doctrine when they see how difficult it is (Anonymous, 71). In short, Crates' practical politics is certainly no less radical than Diogenes' for the most part. Yet on some issues, such as law, he is depicted as having a softer position in the epistles. Crates considers philosophy to be better than law, because it teaches not to do wrong, whereas law compels not to do wrong. Nevertheless, law is a good thing according to Crates (Anonymous, 57). It's unclear whether Crates makes a distinction between natural law and man-made law, however it is more likely that by law he means man-made law above in which case he's revising the radical Cynic position which has its roots in Antisthenes.

Crates' rejection of private property and consequent defense of begging in the epistles is based on and identical with Diogenes' rejection of private property and consequent defense of begging as asking for what is owed to the sage

(Anonymous, 77). There is no shame in begging according to Crates, but there is shame in not being worthy of what is given (Anonymous, 67). Crates says that one should only beg from the worthy (Anonymous, 73). By those who are worthy, Crates means those who have been initiated into philosophy, because otherwise virtue would be supported by vice (Anonymous, 55). In Crates, begging becomes a tool to bring about common property among philosophers, making it a political act, which surely enabled educational exchanges. As for the wealthy, Crates wants nothing from them. Fleeing from fame as well as wealth for the sake of freedom, Crates calls on the rich to hang themselves (Anonymous, 59). Perhaps because he too comes from a rich background, Crates seems to hate the rich more than Diogenes.

In the epistles, Crates remarks that humanity is midway between Gods and irrational beasts, but can and should become a superior race by needing only a few things (Anonymous, 63). Thus he believes that a new humanity will emerge as the species changes its ways. As Navia notes, Crates too has a utopia. His utopia is without laws and restrictions though he makes no mention of cannibalism, incest and free love (Navia, 137). If we take Crates' position on laws in the epistles into account, the absence of laws is most likely due to there being no need for them, as philosophy has taught everyone not to do any wrong. According to Dudley, there are no fools or parasites in his utopia, nor fighting against each other, or for petty gain or glory. The inhabitants delight in freedom as they're free from lust, and they're no longer slaves to gold or the desires of love or wantonness (Dudley, 44). While Crates' utopia carries a number of characteristics of Diogenes' utopia, it is less radical, above all for not including the question of gender in the Cynic new world.

Though Crates is undoubtedly the most important Cynic after Diogenes, perhaps the most remarkable aspect of his

life is his relationship with his partner Hipparchia (fl. 4th – 3rd Centuries BC), the only known Cynic woman. Captivated by Cynic doctrines, says Diogenes Laertius, Hipparchia fell in love with Crates, dismissing all her other suitors, and with them wealth, noble birth and beauty. Hipparchia had to threaten her parents with suicide so that they would allow her to marry Crates. Hipparchia's parents then asked Crates to dissuade their daughter. Crates took off his clothes in front of Hipparchia and implored her to think it over, adding that she would have to adopt his way of life to be his companion. Hipparchia would have it no other way. So she adopted the same dress as Crates and started accompanying him wherever he went. (Laertius, 305) The only woman philosopher featured by Diogenes Laertius, Hipparchia went on to become a very important figure in Cynic history. Dawson convincingly argues that Hipparchia's name was remembered because of her relationship with Crates, and because she was the only woman of a "good family" to live as a Cynic. Yet, he notes that she could not have been the only Cynic as a female slave or a foreigner who lived with the Cynics would not really be noticed, nor would they be "married". Dawson further adds that late Cynics were sometimes accompanied by women, and they not only participated in Cynic life, but introduced women and boys to the Cynic life (Dawson, 135). It may be added that being recorded by history as a devoted Cynic made Hipparchia a role model for the Cynic women who followed in her footsteps.

In a letter to Hipparchia in the epistles, Diogenes expresses admiration because despite being a woman, she yearned for philosophy and became one of the Cynics, whose path has struck many men with its austerity. Diogenes describes himself as Hipparchia's benefactor in philosophy, and implores Hipparchia to write to him frequently as her letters are worth a great deal, and this way she can finish what

she has started (Anonymous, 95). Diogenes is exalted in his message to Hipparchia's compatriots who have decided to rename the town after her. It's better for the town to be named after Hipparchia, "a woman, it is true, but a philosopher" than after a man who sells wine (Anonymous, 173). In another epistle, Crates calls Hipparchia to Diogenes' deathbed so that she could see him for the last time, and continue to learn the uses of philosophy even in the direst circumstances from him (Anonymous, 55). All these letters show that not only was Hipparchia accepted and embraced as a philosopher and a Cynic, but that the Cynics, the most "manly" of philosophers, were proud of having a woman such as Hipparchia in their history.

Dawson, who says that Hipparchia attending dinner parties with Crates surprised ancient Greek authors, is of the opinion that what was actually surprising was that they were invited in the first place. According to Dawson, this shows that the Cynic couple found a degree of acceptance in parts of Athenian society (Dawson, 135-6). Given Crates and Hipparchia's gender radical practices, this acceptance is certainly remarkable. Crates and Hipparchia's relationship allowed the Cynic couple to carry the principle of the suppression of shame to a new level. Both Luck and Navia refers to the stories of Crates and Hipparchia having sexual intercourse in public (Luck, 209), Navia adding that according to one account, Zeno (334 – 262 BC), Crates' student and founder of Stoicism hid them with his cloak (Navia, 124). Even more radical than how they suppressed shame together, however, is the nature of their marriage which, Dawson notes, was called kynogamia or dog marriage by Crates according to the Suda (Dawson, 135). Navia notes that their relationship has been described as a "companionate marriage," where the couple lives as equal partners in a relationship of freely chosen companionship (Navia, 136). There is an apparent

contradiction between kynogamous marriage and the community of women and men, and as Navia notes there is no other known marriage in the history of the Cynic current, which rejected marriage (Navia, 135). Stoic Epictetus (55 – 135) considers Crates and Hipparchia's marriage to be a special case, made possible only because Hipparchia "was herself another Crates" (Epictetus, 157). This being said, none of the known Cynics are depicted as objecting to Crates and Hipparchia's marriage, from which we can conclude that even in the utopia of Diogenes, such a relationship would be considered normal.

Diogenes Laertius recounts an exchange between Hipparchia and the Cyrenaic philosopher Theodorus the Atheist (340 – 250 BC) during a dinner party which demonstrates her self-confidence as a philosopher. Accordingly, Hipparchia gets the better of Theodorus by stating that anything he does that is not wrong is not wrong if she does it either. Theodorus, unable to respond, tries to pull up Hipparchia's dress, so as to shame her for being a woman. Hipparchia, neither alarmed nor distressed, retains her calm. Theodorus then tries to mock Hipparchia for forsaking her shuttle and loom. Hipparchia triumphantly admits that she's done just that: devoted the time she might have spent on the loom to her education (Laertius, 305-6). Hipparchia's approach demonstrates the Cynic rejection of conventional womanhood and femininity in favor of a womanhood that is not different from manhood. Moreover Hipparchia defends education as a worthier pursuit than weaving, for woman as well as for men. Moreover, like Diogenes and others' in their polemics with Aristippus and Plato, Hipparchia is defending the Socratic position in her dialogue with Theodorus, a follower of Aristippus, on women's education. Even if Theodorus is unwilling to learn from her, she is speaking in front of, and thus educating an audience. An epigram on

Hipparchia written by Antipater of Sidon (fl. 2nd Century BC) has her say she has chosen to follow the Cynic way “with a manly heart” instead of following “the customs of women,” while claiming “hunting is not as good as seeking wisdom” (Navia, 132). Considering Diogenes himself taught hunting, it certainly ranked above being a warrior, thus it could be inferred that Hipparchia rejected certain characteristic aspects of conventional manhood, and saw herself above the best of unwise men as well.

“Women are not by nature worse than men” writes Crates to Hipparchia in the epistles, citing the example of the greatness of the Amazons. Nor are women inferior to men, as “female dogs are not by nature inferior to male dogs”. Like men, women too need to follow the Cynic life in order to be freed, “since all are slaves either by law or through wickedness” (Anonymous, 79). Thus, the Cynics are not sexist, and the target of Cynic misogyny is not sex but gender. For this reason, Crates returns to Hipparchia a tunic she wove for him, not only because he is forbidden to wear it, but because this gives the impression that Hipparchia loves her husband in the conventional sense. This is incompatible with the philosophy they both yearn for (Anonymous, 81). Crates argues that Hipparchia should leave the wool-spinning, which is of little benefit, to other women, who have not aspired to any of the things she has (Anonymous, 83). It can be inferred that the Cynics considered practices associated with womanhood to be more subservient than manhood. Yet the Cynic manhood, as we have seen, is an alternative form of manhood which rejects the warlike qualities of conventional manhood and replaces it with philosophy, and perhaps more importantly, which is not based on the gender binary and which does not exclude biological women. Accordingly, it is possible to argue that the Cynics put forward a third, Cynic gender, distinct from conventional womanhood and

manhood, which nevertheless was more masculine than feminine.

In another letter by Crates addressed to Hipparchia, we get a glimpse of Cynic measures regarding childbirth and child-rearing. In regards to childbirth, Crates congratulates Hipparchia for toiling like an athlete during her pregnancy contrary to other women, which enabled her to easily give birth. Crates says that the bath water of their “little puppy” should be cold, his clothes should be a cloak, and his food should be milk. When the child is able to speak and walk, he is to be given not a sword but a staff, cloak and wallet, “which can guard men better than swords” (Anonymous, 83). First of all, in this letter we see a guide for the Cynic community in raising their own children, and naturally the goal is to raise little Cynics. Secondly, it is clear that the Cynics consider their uniform to be an alternative to the sword which represents conventional manhood. Lastly, and perhaps most strikingly, they consider the child a Cynic from the moment it can speak and walk, as giving the child its own Cynic uniform can mean nothing but to accept them as a fellow Cynic. This is an extremely radical pedagogical idea which acknowledges the child as a free and equal being worthy of as much respect as any adult. Moreover, this approach prevents the Cynic teacher from relying on a formal authority, constituting a notably egalitarian, though still teacher-centered, model.

Nevertheless, the Cynics did not force their children to be philosophers. Diogenes Laertius says that Crates deposited a sum of money with a banker on the understanding that if his children turned out to be philosophers, it would be distributed among the people, and if they turned ordinary, the banker would pay it to them (Laertius, 301). Regardless of how they turned out, Crates tried to educate his children into the age marriage. He gave his daughter for thirty day trial marriages (Laertius, 304), and it would be inconsistent

with Cynic philosophy if this arrangement was against her will. He also took a son to the house of a prostitute and told him marriages of adulterers are like tragedies, whereas those who ally themselves with courtesans live like comedies, recommending the latter (Laertius, 301). It's striking that though Crates himself was married, in both examples he's operating against conventional marriage norms. These anecdotes show Crates to have remained active in the lives of his children, and to have tried to influence their lives on the basis of his philosophy.

In the epistles, Crates argues that it is not the country or the city that makes one a good and bad man, but time spent with good or bad men. His conclusion is that children should be sent to a philosopher's school. This way the child can learn the fine things in life, above all virtue (Anonymous, 63). It would be surprising if what's meant by a philosopher's school is the school of any philosopher, or an actual, formal school. As the Cynics considered the teaching of virtue to be something only they could deliver, this could only be a Cynic philosopher's school, and because the Cynic philosophers overwhelmingly tended not to have formal schools, what is probably meant above is sending children to learn from Cynic philosophers. Crates' own address to the youths in the epistles shows the kind of virtues the Cynics wanted to spread: washing with cold water, drinking only water, earning food with toil, wearing a cloak, sleeping on the ground and so forth (Anonymous, 69). These practical Cynic virtues could not have been taught by anyone but a Cynic. Consequently, it should be added that Crates shares the same teacher-centered approach put forward by Diogenes.

Dudley notes that according to Crates a happy life cannot be judged by pleasures for education and life itself is full of pain (Dudley, 45), confirming older Cynic doctrines. Crates' educational philosophy, like Cynic educational philosophy

in general, gives the impression of being excessively strict, however according to Teles quoted by Dudley, Metrocles (fl. 4th – 3rd Centuries BC), who had studied under the Aristotelian Theophrastus (371 – 287 BC) and the Platonist Xenocrates (396 – 314 BC) previously found it liberating to be a student of Crates. Under Theophrastus and Xenocrates, Metrocles had to spend so much to have a liberal mode of life promoted in Aristotelian and Platonist circles that he was actually afraid of starvation though he had a generous allowance from home, while under Crates he could have maintained a second person without any allowance (Dudley, 47-8). Crates' educational practice continued the Cynic tradition: it was austere as well as painful, however this made it particularly preferable for those who could not afford the luxuries required by other philosophical schools. Another good example of Crates' way of teaching is how he tried to challenge the shame felt by his student Zeno. Crates gave his student a pot of lentil soup to carry through the streets. Zeno, however, was ashamed, and tried to hide the pot. Seeing this, Crates struck the pot with his staff and as Zeno was trying to run away, told him "Why run away, my little Phoenician? Nothing terrible has happened to you" (Laertius, 312-3). Crates thus challenged his students so that they could adopt the Cynic mentality in a strict, yet affirming way.

The fact that Crates and Hipparchia neither revised the Cynic doctrine, nor parroted it, but substantially developed it above all by applying it in new areas, or further deepened the original while remaining loyal to the core must be above all attributed to Diogenes' pedagogy rather than Crates and Hipparchia's character, reinforcing Diogenes' reputation as the ultimate pedagogue. Crates and Hipparchia are ideal successors to the founder of Cynicism only because Cynic education produced them. It is this education that enabled them to develop Cynicism further without revising its

doctrines. The education of Crates and Hipparchia, including their eventual contribution to Cynicism is arguably the most important moment in its history of swimming against the current. Moreover, unsurprisingly, the period when Cynicism was educationally strongest coincides with the period when, led by its controversial founder and his equally controversial successors, the movement was politically the most influential, even if the said influence was still small, and far from being able to realistically alter the course of history.

Late Cynicism

According to Dudley, Cynicism was most potent during the lifetime of Diogenes and Crates, and declined afterward (Dudley, 95-6). Zeller too thinks that after Diogenes, Crates and their students, Cynicism cultivated and was toned down by Stoicism. Henceforth, Zeller considers Cynicism useless (Zeller, 288-9). Admittedly, there is less information that can be found on late Cynics, however while Dudley may be right that Cynicism may have declined, at least intellectually, it by no means disappeared, nor was it useless as Zeller claims, and it is worth examining in order to understand its evolution. According to Diogenes Laertius, Cynicism was continued by Metrocles, brother of Hipparchia and student of Crates, who was so committed a Cynic that he burned down either his own previous writings, or the notes he took of his previous teacher Theophrastus' lectures. According to Diogenes Laertius, Metrocles argued that some things are bought with money, like a house, and others are acquired by time and effort, like education (Laertius, 304). This position is important because it shows Metrocles continue the Socratic and Cynic political position of seeing education as something that cannot be bought with money. Rather, it takes dedication and toil, in line with Cynic educational philosophy.

Another early follower of Diogenes and Crates was Monimus (fl. 4th – 3rd Centuries BC), a slave of a banker who, upon encountering Cynic philosophy, feigned madness by throwing all the coins on the banker's table until he was dismissed. Thus Monimus devoted himself to following the Cynic doctrine (Laertius, 298). The example of Monimus is important because it demonstrates the appeal of Cynicism among slaves. Not all Cynics followed the doctrine as closely as Metrocles and Monimus, however. Menippus, a Cynic of Phoenician origin, made a lot of money as a money lender, only to lose it all, and commit suicide in despair (Laertius, 306-7). Zeller defines him as a base representative of late Cynicism (Zeller, 290). Zeller is certainly correct that Menippus was not very good at following Cynic teachings. Menippus may thus be described as an imperfect Cynic, or as a philosopher who followed Cynic teachings partially and imperfectly. This shows that eventually Cynic education begun to prove insufficient in ensuring all who claimed to be Cynics to follow the original social and political doctrine.

Teles is another significant figure in the history of Cynicism. Dudley thinks it a curious turn of literary fortune for there to be more fragments by Teles, preserved by Stobaeus, than of others such as Crates and Menippus. Among the topics dealt with by Teles are exile, self-sufficiency, poverty and wealth, polemics against the hedonist doctrine, and that outward appearance is the true criterion of justice (Dudley, 84-85). Thus, it seems certain that the themes of Teles' work are in line with the Cynic doctrine. Dudley notes that Teles' heroes are Socrates, Diogenes and Crates, and he quotes figures like Metrocles too (Dudley, 86). Dudley further says that Teles has the distinction of being the only known Cynic schoolmaster in history, despite the fact that the Cynics had always laid great stress on education. Teles' own educational philosophy was completely based on the practices of

Diogenes, and in fact much of what we know of Diogenes' educational philosophy is based on Teles' account (Dudley, 87-8). Teles was a relatively faithful Cynic, even if his was a soft kind of Cynicism, according to which there could even be indulgence in luxury, so long as circumstances were favorable (Dudley, 122). Nevertheless, Teles proves that there was a formal Cynic school at one point in history, even if it was led by an imperfect Cynic.

After the third century BC, Cynicism entered what Dudley calls a period of obscurity and anonymity which would last two hundred years. Dudley stresses that the Cynics did not disappear in this period, but their names did not survive because they lived outside Rome and lacked Roman admirers. Demetrius (fl. 1st Century), however, whose name is remembered, carried on his propaganda in Rome. Demetrius, whose poverty and asceticism are said to have been remarkable even by Cynic standards, has been described as an anti-monarchical radical (Dudley, 125). According to Luck, Demetrius opposed two Roman emperors, Nero (37 – 68), who threatened him, and Vespasian (9 – 79), who exiled him along with other philosophers, because he had rejected monarchy as a regime (Luck, 323). Seneca notes that yet another Roman emperor, Caligula (12 – 41), tried to tempt Demetrius with an excessive amount of money, to which the Cynic responded that Caligula should have offered his entire kingdom instead (Seneca, 175-6). Despite his political radicalism, Demetrius is patriarchal and conservative when it comes to gender according to Seneca, arguing that women should not wear revealing clothes and save themselves for their lovers (Seneca, 174). Despite having misogynistic aspects, the Cynic position on gender is not concerned with sexual chastity or whether women's clothing is revealing, so Demetrius' views are not in line with the Cynic doctrine, and demonstrate that patriarchy has a far deeper influence in his thought.

Demetrius' philosophy of education, according to Seneca, considers it better to know few philosophical precepts well than to learn many but not have them at hand. Accordingly, topics which are neither possible nor useful to know can be skipped, for the truth is in the depths. Demetrius does not seem to agree that education has to be painful for he believes things difficult to discover yield no profit except the discovery. This clearly contradicts the Cynic emphasis on the importance of labor and hardship in education. This being said, like the earlier Cynics, he too thinks that things that will make us happy are right in front of us. Demetrius argues that humans, by nature social animals, must dedicate their mind to virtue and common good and if they do, they will see the world as a common home for all: this is the summit of all useful and necessary knowledge. Everything else is an amusement for leisure which can be studied afterward (Seneca, 166-7). Thus, the educational philosophy of Demetrius, whose cosmopolitan utopianism is in line with earlier Cynics, has political priorities. Demetrius wants to teach the cosmopolitan political doctrine that will unite the world in virtue first. The extreme conclusion is that nothing else should be studied until then. Although Demetrius is an imperfect Cynic due to his views on gender, the radicalism of his educational views is quite similar to the original Cynics.

Dudley notes that Cynics became much more numerous in the second century even though there are few famous names, Dio Chrysostom being one of them (Dudley, 143-4). Originally a Sophist hostile to philosophy, Dio Chrysostom was converted by late Stoic Musonius Rufus (fl. 1st Century) (Dillon, 51). According to Luck, he was exiled by Domitian (51 – 96), but formed good relations with Trajan (53 – 117). Dio Chrysostom's Cynicism started with his exile. In his discourse titled *In Athens*, Dio Chrysostom explains that after his exile by Domitian, he consulted the oracle of Delphi, and

was told that he had to walk the earth a begging philosopher (Dio Chrysostom). Dio Chrysostom's days as a begging Cynic lasted for as long as his exile. Like the Cynics, he held that the work of the true philosopher was to rule over men. He contradicted Cynic practice, however, by becoming involved with mainstream politics (Dudley, 160). According to Dudley, Dio Chrysostom put forward a social reform package which aimed to provide the poor with jobs rather than try to obviate poverty, as he considered some will always be poor (Dudley, 158). Moreover, he criticized the Cynics of his day in a lost work (Luck, 331). Dudley adds that Dio Chrysostom was influenced by Plato and even Aristotle aside from the Cynics and the Stoics (Dudley, 148), nevertheless commenting that his writings were marked by radical Cynicism (Dudley, 151). It's difficult to agree with Dudley's last characterization, given the early Cynics were much more radical than Dio Chrysostom. Rather, Dio Chrysostom was an imperfect Cynic like much of the late Cynics, if he's to be considered a Cynic at all rather than a Stoic or an eclectic philosopher.

In his first discourse titled *On Kingship*, Dio Chrysostom describes himself as a wanderer and self-taught philosopher who finds his happiness in labor. Dio Chrysostom's self-description portrays him as a Cynic philosopher. In the same work, Dio Chrysostom paints the picture of a Cynic-like king whose soldiers are fellow-soldiers, and whose associates are his friends. This is a king who is fonder of toil than many others are of pleasure or of wealth. He plans and studies for the welfare of his subjects (Dio Chrysostom). Yet this is not the Socratic and Cynic philosopher ruler, for he is not a philosopher; he's an actual ruler, like Trajan who he praises as the true king in his third discourse *On Kingship* (Dio Chrysostom). In Dio Chrysostom's discourse titled *On Slavery and Freedom*, we see an attitude similar to the Cynic doctrine. According to Dio Chrysostom, people do not understand

what freedom and slavery actually are. In Cynic fashion, he considers almost everyone to be slaves and complains that they do nothing to escape slavery. He stresses that the free man, even the king, may be a prisoner. He describes freedom, however, as the knowledge of what is allowed and what is forbidden, and slavery as the opposite (Dio Chrysostom). Dio Chrysostom does not clarify how what is allowed and what is forbidden is determined. If he means or includes knowledge of man-made laws, Dio Chrysostom's views fall far outside Cynicism. If he solely means what is allowed and forbidden by nature, he does not contradict Cynic doctrine.

The only instance when Dio Chrysostom touches the subject of gender is regarding sex work. In his discourse titled *the Euboean Discourse, or the Hunter*, Dio Chrysostom puts forward the idea that brothels should be forbidden in no uncertain terms. Sex works brings individuals together without love or affection. Moreover, hapless women or children, captured in war or purchased with money, are used for shameful ends. Neither barbarian women nor Greeks should be treated this way according to Dio Chrysostom. Under no condition can this mistreatment of outcast and enslaved creatures be taken with calmness and indifference. Condition of girls being as described above, Dio Chrysostom argues that not much can be expected of the boys, and the education and training they receive (Dio Chrysostom). Dio Chrysostom's critique of prostitution is certainly sympathetic to plight of the sex workers. This being said, Dio Chrysostom's approach does not coincide with the Cynic gender doctrine. Although early Cynics were not in favor of sex work either, Crates, as we have seen, considered an alliance with a sex worker to be preferable to a conventional marriage. Proponents of the suppression of shame, early Cynics certainly saw nothing shameful with sex work. This being said, they too would probably find the conditions of sex workers described by Dio Chrysostom to be objectionable.

Dio Chrysostom was interested in education, and he has a discourse titled *On Training for Public Speaking*, where we get a glimpse of his philosophy of education. The focus on education in rhetoric is surprising in someone associated with Cynicism, though it is not surprising that someone as involved in Roman mainstream politics as Dio Chrysostom to be interested in this field. Dio Chrysostom considers education in rhetoric, like education in general, to require hardship and toil. This education, though perhaps best given in youth, can be given in old age as well, as a part of Socratic life-long learning. Dio Chrysostom considers oratorical education is necessary for a statesman, though it is easier for a lad to withdraw from politics for the sake of pursuing studies. Other than the works of rhetoricians, Dio Chrysostom recommends studying the works of Socratic philosophers, above all Xenophon (Dio Chrysostom). Aside from stressing the importance of toil and hardship, though not going as far as pain, in education, Dio Chrysostom's educational philosophy is not particularly Cynic. That the Socratic philosopher he suggests is Xenophon rather than Antisthenes or Diogenes can be seen as an indication of the level of Cynic influence in Dio Chrysostom's educational philosophy. Moreover, Dio Chrysostom's political focus in education is neither benefiting a movement nor humanity, but transmitting technical knowledge to the student. All this being said, at least as a teacher of rhetoric, Dio Chrysostom seems to be teacher-centered.

If fate made a Cynic out of Dio Chrysostom, and he himself did not really willingly become one, it made an imperfect Cynic who did not share many aspects of the original doctrine, especially regarding politics and education. An eclectic philosopher, Dio Chrysostom did not so much modify Cynicism but mixed it with other doctrines, such as conservative Stoicism, Platonism, and even Aristotelianism.

Some of his practical activity, such as involvement in mainstream politics, or teaching rhetoric for would be politicians are incompatible with Cynicism and would certainly be condemned by the likes of Diogenes and Crates. It is questionable whether Dio Chrysostom ever shared the political and even educational aims of the Cynic movement, such as the Cynic philosophers taking power and the establishment of the cosmopolitan Cynic utopia.

Navia describes the Cynics as men and women in a state of total rebellion (Navia, 31). Taking into account what we've seen of the figures whose names and views survived to our day, the majority of late Cynics, who according to Dudley continued to exist until the sixth century (Dudley, 209), do not really meet this description. It seems Cynicism got considerably less radical and more conciliatory in time. These revisions can be attributed to a weakness seen in all teacher-centered pedagogies: considering how important the role of the teacher is in these models, a mediocre teacher instead of an exceptional one is unlikely to produce the same loyalty to the doctrine. This being said, it should not be forgotten that no ancient school could resist the revision of above all its political principles. As we have seen, the Cynics were no exception.

Nevertheless, we know that there were radical late Cynics as well, even if we know the name of only one. The anonymous authors of *the Cynic Epistles*, one of the most radical texts of the antiquity, deserve mention as representatives of a more orthodox current within Cynicism, as the epistles overwhelmingly complement rather than contradict the other sources about the early Cynics. It must be Cynics of this sort Lucian mentions in *the Runaways* as practicing free love among themselves, based on the community of women (Lucian). Dio Chrysostom mentions the Cynics of Alexandria who addressed people like slaves and sailors (Dawson, 244).

The only known representative of late orthodox Cynicism, Oenomaus (fl. 2nd Century), was attacked two hundred years after his death by Julian for defending incest and cannibalism as well as subverting customs that require respect for private property. Oenomaus, whose version of Cynicism still existed in Julian's time, is also known to have authored a work titled *the Republic*. According to Dawson, this work most probably was modeled on *the Republic* of Diogenes and taught communism (Dawson, 249-50). Rather than the imperfect Cynics who were influenced by Cynicism in various degrees, it is the orthodox Cynic current that needs to be considered as the true heirs of Diogenes, Crates and Hipparchia.⁵⁴ The exceptional success of Cynic education, then, is the continued existence of the orthodox Cynics rather than the imperfect Cynics.

Conclusion

This chapter has followed the trajectory of the Cynic current from its prehistory to its foundation by Diogenes, and its continuation. I have separated the origins of the Cynic movement from its later incarnations. This separation does not mean there is a large difference between Diogenes, the originator of Cynicism, and his disciples such as Crates and Hipparchia, and the anonymous Cynics who philosophized in line with them, quite the contrary. Nevertheless, as we have seen, many later Cynics were imperfect followers of the original doctrine in that they significantly deviated from it. I have described the political doctrine of the original Cynics as sophocratic communism, as opposed to the meritocratic socialism of Socrates. I consider the Cynics sophocratic rather

⁵⁴ It is not for no reason that Cynicism was described as the "philosophy of the proletariat" (Dudley, xi). The Cynics' did not identify with the masses, but this was due to a distrust of their current state of consciousness and education rather than a prejudice towards the lower classes. The austere life of labor promoted by the Cynics, their attitude towards slaves and women, and their requirement that members of the upper classes give up their property in order to join them situate the Cynic base on a widely defined ancient proletariat.

than meritocratic because they elevate philosophical wisdom alone, rather than envisaging an education in other sciences. I consider them communists rather than socialists because their global utopia is more extremist than that of Socrates as transmitted by Plato. Original Cynicism continued Socratic feminism by accepting the equality of men and women, offering equal education for them and challenging patriarchy with a systematic doctrine against the conventional family. Nevertheless, the Cynics were social misogynists as well as gender abolitionists, critically preferring manhood over womanhood, making it difficult to categorize them as feminists.

Rejecting all aspects of mainstream politics completely, education, public and private, was the sole political activity of the Cynics. They put forward a harsh and extremely radical philosophy of education. This radicalism is in part due to the Cynic rejection of conventional education, including the sciences of their day. For them, only Cynic wisdom is worth transmitting via education. Methodologically, toil and hardship was an important part of the Cynic education. Cynic education was teacher-centered, portraying the teacher as a role model and even a superstar. Nevertheless, the Cynics respected the individuality of children, treating them as fellow Cynics from a very early age, while at the same time respecting their decision to not be Cynics. In Cynic thought, politics and education are deeply connected, not only in education being the sole form of political activity, but also in it coherently complimenting politics in the Cynic doctrine. Although education alone proved immensely insufficient in bringing the Cynics closer to their utopia, it earned them tolerance and even some respect. Political cosmopolitanism was reflected in Cynic education, for example, as Diogenes synthesized Greek and non-Greek educational practices to create his own curriculum. The naturalist metaphysical and

ethical views of the movement were in line with their political and educational philosophy too: the Cynics had one of the most coherent doctrines of the antiquity.

In terms of getting near its goals, the Cynics were the greatest failure of all the philosophical movements of antiquity. The spirit of time never favored them, as they were against civilization and progress. Despite their blatant extremism, they were never influential enough to be considered a threat, and they were never seriously repressed. Their victory lied in their long existence, which in any case did not exceed the antiquity, and their ability to maintain a coherent orthodoxy whose views could be transmitted to the modern era. The manliness and social misogyny of the Cynics seems to have prevented them from attracting more women, at least from the upper classes. Moreover, the gender radicalism of the movement must have made it difficult for men with moderate and conservative leanings to swallow the Cynic doctrine. In short, the contradictory nature of the Cynic position on gender probably did not serve the movement. Their educational efforts, however, were successful to the extent that it may be argued that they were what carried the movement until the end of the antiquity.

Chapter 6

Stoicism

Initially, Stoicism was an extremist, and at one time even a revolutionary philosophical school. It was a political movement which aimed for power, and its main tool for this purpose was education. Stoicism went through a drastic revision starting from 2nd Century BC, and turned into a conservative school of thought. This revision changed the Stoic position on gender too as well. Initially similar to the Cynics and in any case true to its Socratic roots, Stoic views on gender became more patriarchal. Although we lack direct evidence, there are sufficient hints to indicate that the extremist early Stoics to be teacher-centered like the Cynics. In turn, their pedagogical experience with the upper classes seems to have lead the conservative late Stoics into adopting a student-centered approach.

Early Stoics are among the more successful ancient philosophical movements in terms of getting near their goals, despite having split from and retaining many positions of the Cynics, the least successful movement in this regard. This difference is above all due to their position in favor of directly engaging with politics. Despite their eventual failure, in the person of Gaius Blossius (2nd Century BC), the early Stoics are the only truly radical Socratic movement that managed to make a real bid for power. Middle and late Stoics are even more successful, with plenty of failed attempts to influence

the course of history, culminating in their ultimate victory in the reign of Emperor Marcus Aurelius. In turn, the failure of conservative Stoics in Marcus Aurelius ruling like a moderate reformist, and confining Stoicism to mainstream higher education. There are no known early Stoic women, but this should be attributed the tendency not to record women of lower classes, especially slaves, a demographic with good reason to find early Stoic views on gender attractive. There are not many middle and late Stoic women either, however the fact that there are exceptions whose names have been recorded demonstrate that the late Stoics version of patriarchy had benevolent aspects like the Pythagoreans, which, especially when it came to educating women, could only have benefited Stoicism. The fact that we do not see great revisions within the quite heterogeneous early Stoicism shows that it for a while successfully functioned like the Cynic teacher-centered pedagogy. Following the revision of Stoicism at the hands of Panaetius (185 – 110 BC), the availability of Stoic education increasingly became restricted to an elite, whose needs were not fulfilled by following the philosophy of a superstar teacher. Accordingly, Stoic education drastically evolved to meet its new educational goals.

The sources on early Stoicism are extremely scarce, although at least we have the detailed account of Diogenes Laertius (fl. 3rd Century), along with Quintilian (35 – 100) as a supporting source. Similarly, there is Plutarch's (46 – 120) account of Gaius Blossius, the figure whose name is associated with Stoicism's brief insurgent turn. Plutarch is also the main source on middle Stoicism, along with Cicero (106 – 43 BC), Seneca (4 BC – 65) and Diogenes Laertius. These sources are all major sources for anyone who would study the history of philosophy, and they shed light to the earlier stages of the Stoic movement as well. As for the late Stoics, sources on them are plentiful. Major works of Seneca, Musonius Rufus

(fl. 1st Century BC), Epictetus (55 – 135), and Emperor Marcus Aurelius (121 – 180) have survived to our day. Overall, there is little that might be seen as controversial about the sources on Stoicism. All these sources were examined and taken seriously in order to get a holistic picture of the historic evolution of the Stoic movement.

Early Stoicism

Stoicism has always considered itself a Socratic movement, however it was rather an offshoot of the politically extremist and teacher-centered Cynic school of thought which we have seen in the previous chapter. Stoicism was founded by a Phoenician called Zeno (334 – 262 BC). Diogenes Laertius, basing himself on the authority of Demetrius of Magnesia (fl. 1st Century BC), says that Zeno met philosophy in his hometown of Citium at an early age. Zeno's father was a trader and brought back books about Socrates (470 – 399 BC) for his son. (Laertius, 326). Zeno, who grew up to become a young trader, was shipwrecked near Athens and found his way into a bookstore where Xenophon's (431 – 354 BC) *Memorabilia* was being read out loud. Zeno asked the bookseller where to find such people, and the bookseller pointed to Crates (365 – 285 BC). From then on, Zeno started studying with the Cynic philosopher, and was an excellent student except not being shameless, something Crates tried to challenge (Laertius, 312-3). Luis Navia recounts that Zeno hid Crates and Hipparchia (fl. 4th – 3rd Centuries BC) when they were having sexual intercourse in public under his cloak, demonstrating that he could not overcome his sense of shame (Navia, 124). All this being said, Zeller's claim that Zeno was disgusted with the extravagances of the Cynic mode of life (Zeller 1892, 37) is unconvincing. Diogenes Laertius portrays Zeno as a dedicated student of Crates who took care of his teacher, even carrying

money for his needs (Laertius, 318). Zeno is quoted saying “I had a good voyage when I was shipwrecked” (Laertius, 314), which demonstrates that he regarded his education under Crates fondly. Thus, it has to be concluded that Stoicism is above all a current with Cynic roots.

Despite his fondness of Cynicism, however, Zeno did not suffice with the education provided by Crates. He was always interested in learning, and Diogenes Laertius recounts how he was willing to pay great sums of money to receive it (Laertius, 323). Diogenes Laertius says that after Crates, Zeno attended the lectures of Stilpo⁵⁵ (360 – 280 BC) of the Megarian school, and Xenocrates (396 – 314 BC), head of the Platonic Academy, each for ten years (Laertius, 312). Doyne Dawson considers the statement that Zeno studied with Megarians and Academics for twenty years was intended to show how slight Cynic influence on Zeno was (Dawson, 161). While it is possible that the number of years Zeno studied with these philosophers may have been exaggerated, it is difficult to claim that this account is fabricated given Zeno’s philosophy was not simply a continuation of Cynicism, but included elements inspired by other Socratic currents. Zeno was not as open to all other philosophical currents as he was to the Megarian and Platonist currents. For instance, according to

⁵⁵ According to Diogenes Laertius, Stilpo studied with Euclides (435 – 365 BC), a pupil of Socrates who founded the Megarian school, or his students (Laertius, 115). Diogenes Laertius recounts a number of humorous exchanges between Stilpo and Crates (Laertius, 116-8) from which it can be concluded that they were friends. Stilpo did not consider his property and possessions to be truly his. When Stilpo was offered a gift of money and asked to journey to Egypt by Ptolemy Soter (367 – 282 BC), he took a distant but respectful attitude, accepting a moderate sum while refusing to journey with the ruler (Laertius, 116). Stilpo had a wife but lived with a hetaera called Nicarette (Laertius, 115). Athenaeus (fl. 2nd and 3rd Centuries) says Nicarette, a woman born of free parents, was not only Stilpo’s partner but also his pupil. Moreover, she had a student of her own (Athenaeus). Stilpo also had a daughter who did not live according to custom according to Diogenes Laertius, something he did not mind (Laertius, 115). In his philosophy, Zeller says that Stilpo synthesized the views of the Megarian school with Cynic theories, above all relating to morality (Zeller 1877, 275-8), which must have made him an attractive teacher for Zeno.

Zeller, Zeno was repelled by the Peripatetic school more than by any other (Zeller 1892, 133). It's not inconceivable that his background in Cynic and Socratic radicalism caused Zeno to dislike the reactionary politics of Aristotelianism.

According to Diogenes Laertius, in *On Human Nature*, Zeno says that the goal is to live in harmony with nature, which means to live according to virtue, for nature leads us to virtue (Laertius, 344). Zeno's code of ethics lead him to live an austere life, although he would relax at dinner parties (Laertius, 323). Outside goodness, virtue and wisdom, Zeno sees a conflict among everyone. All people who were not wise and good are enemies, slaves, and alien to one another, including parents and children, siblings, kinsmen and so on (Laertius, 326). Without a doubt influenced by the discussions about different types of regimes in the broad Socratic movement, Zeno puts forward an original idea as part of his solution. He considers the best form of government to be a combination of democracy, monarchy and aristocracy (Laertius, 358). Of course, any interpretation of this position is bound to be speculative because nothing further is known about it. Nevertheless, it can be considered that Zeno uses aristocracy like Socrates does in Plato's (427 – 347 BC) *Republic* (Plato 3, 384-5), meaning meritocracy. By monarchy, he most likely means there should be a single ruler rather than advocating hereditary rule. As for democracy, it is probable that this means he wants mass participation in the system.

Diogenes Laertius says that Zeno never denied that he was a citizen of Citium, and insisted on his name being recorded with his hometown added to it (Laertius, 318). Nevertheless, Zeller emphasizes the cosmopolitanism of the Stoic school (Zeller 1892, 35). Zeno may have been a cosmopolitan and a patriot at the same time although it is debatable whether his affirmation of his native city counts as proof of his patriotism. In any case, Zeno was not comfortable with the distinction

between citizens and non-citizens. In *Of Consolation: To Helvia*, Seneca writes that Zeno did not own a slave (Seneca). While Diogenes Laertius says he flogged a slave for stealing, this is an act which is not really in character with his views as he is also portrayed criticizing a friend for flogging a slave (Laertius, 322). Moreover, according to Zeno, only the wise man who lives like a Cynic is a free man, whereas everyone else are slaves. This is the first and most common form of slavery. The second is subordination, and the third is actual slavery, subordination and being possessed. The third form of slavery in particular is a form of despotism, and it is evil (Laertius, 354). Zeno's theory of slavery borders abolitionism, and like the Cynic critique, requires a rejection of all civilized societies of his time. It is hard to think one could hold these views about slavery without being a cosmopolitan.

Zeno's most famous political work was *the Republic*, written when he was still "on the tail of the dog" (Laertius, 313), that is when he was a part of the Cynic movement. Plutarch notes that Zeno's *Republic* had many admirers in *On the Fortune or Virtue of Alexander*. According to Plutarch, the main principle behind Zeno's Republic was that the inhabitants of the world should not live separated by their respective rules of justice into separate cities and communities, but should be considered one community and one polity. Zeno thus emphasized a common life and a common order, such as a herd that feeds together, sharing the pasturage of the field which was held in common. Thus Zeno expressed a dream and painted a "shadowy picture of a well-ordered and philosophic commonwealth" (Plutarch). As Zeller says, all differences of nationality would merge in a common brotherhood in the Stoic utopia (Zeller 1892, 322), making it difficult to claim Zeno was a patriot. Zeno cared about his hometown, however there is no indication that he preferred it over other cities.

Zeno's *Republic* put forward a utopian cosmopolitanism that wanted to abolish private property. Naturally, warfare and cities or at least city states could not exist in this utopia (Dawson, 175). The building of temples, law courts and gymnasia would be prohibited (Laertius, 326-7), possibly because they embodied the civilized regimes Zeno was against. In *the Contradiction of Stoics*, Plutarch offers an alternative explanation about Zeno's opposition to building temples: nothing made by men can be holy⁵⁶ (Plutarch 4, 328). Lastly, according to Diogenes Laertius he wanted to completely abolish money, for exchange as well as traveling. The similarities between the Cynic and Stoic utopias are striking, however even more striking is that replacing the currency with dice (Dawson, 112-3) was not enough for Zeno; hence he openly and directly calls for its abolition (Laertius, 327). This difference makes Zeno's *Republic* slightly more extremist than that of Diogenes (412 – 323 BC). Regardless, like the Cynic utopia, Dawson concludes that Zeno's utopia can be defined as complete communism (Dawson, 181). If his thoughts on society and the hybrid political system he defends are taken into account, Zeno's communism cannot be defined as sophocratic: as we have seen, Zeno believes the society is already divided between the wise on the one side, and the vile on the other, and the ideal society can only come as a result of the victory of the wise. The hybrid political system of Zeno can only be understood as a system of government for an already wise community, not a community divided between the wise and the unwise. Hence, rather than sophocratic communism, it can be interpreted as a communist meritocracy with mass participation and a possibly rotating single leader.

No ancient communist utopia would be complete without the community of women, and as Diogenes Laertius says, this

⁵⁶ Plutarch also criticizes his contemporary Stoics who sacrificed in altars of temples despite being against their construction. (Plutarch 4, 328)

idea was a feature of Zeno's Stoic utopia as well. Zeno says in *the Republic* that partners should be held in common among the wise so that anyone might have intercourse with anyone. This way, fatherly love is shown to all children equally, and jealousy and adultery are eliminated (Laertius, 358). This being said, Zeno definitely promotes unions between sexes and consequent childbirths (Laertius, 354). This is not to say he opposes homosexuality: quite the contrary, he believes the wise man will fall in love with young men who reveal the natural aptitude for virtue by their appearance (Laertius, 357). Zeno was a bisexual who rarely procured young boys, as well as young girls (Laertius, 318). In his utopia, men and women would wear the same clothes which leave no part of the body completely hidden (Laertius, 326-7). The abolition of different clothes assigned to binary genders essentially implies the abolition of gender, while the semi-transparency of the clothes can be interpreted as Zeno's attempted solution for the problem of shame. Zeno was like the Cynics not only in his extremely radical views on gender, but also in his attitude towards femininity, as he is depicted criticizing a man wearing perfume with giving off the scent of a woman (Laertius, 322). The Stoic Zenodotus (fl. 2nd Century BC) praises Zeno for teaching a manly doctrine (Laertius, 325). Accordingly, despite his gender radicalism, it is difficult to consider Zeno to be a feminist.

Zeller considers Zeno's appearance as a teacher to have followed his decades-long intellectual preparation (Zeller 1892, 38). If Zeller is right, Zeno was undoubtedly an already accomplished author by then. Other than *the Republic*, Zeno's works include *On Life According to Nature*, *On Greek Education*, and *Reminiscences of Crates* (Laertius, 313-4). Dawson says Zeno's school was basically informal. Zeno's followers would assemble in the busy Painted Stoa of Athens where he kept a certain spot free of idlers by walking up and down (Dawson,

161). According to Diogenes Laertius too, Zeno used to lecture walking up and down in the Painted Stoa (Laertius, 314). The fact that his essential method of teaching is described as lecturing hints at a teacher-centered approach similar to the Cynics. Differently from them, however, Zeno considered the sciences important, saying nothing is more needed than time for scientific studies (Laertius, 322). Given he divided philosophy into logic, ethics and natural science (Zeller 1892, 62), Zeno likely had a good grasp of the scientific method of his day, and included scientific questions as a part of his educational curriculum. Indeed, probably the reason Zeno parted ways with the Cynics was to study the disciplines rejected by them. Thus Zeno moved away from Cynicism in education like he did in politics, engaging with the heritage of civilized society without compromising his extremism.

Despite the importance Zeno attaches to scientific education, at the beginning of his *Republic*, Zeno declares general education useless (Laertius, 326). Dawson offers several interpretations of Zeno's rejection of general education. The first is that Zeno's position is influenced by the Cynic view that all the ordinary subjects at all levels are worthless, and the only worthy education is Cynic education. The second is that he meant secondary education rather than elementary education, and perhaps developed an alternative curriculum in his works on education. The third, favored by Dawson as well as other authors, is that he was rejecting the educational plan of Plato's (427 – 347 BC) *Republic* (Dawson, 176). In my view the third interpretation is the weakest. Zeno may have rejected some or even all of Plato's views on education, yet given his later association with Xenocrates, there is no reason to think he was prejudiced against Plato and his account of Socrates. The second interpretation is likelier, yet fails to explain why Zeno would say he rejects general education, but mean he only rejects secondary education. The

first and simplest explanation, that Zeno said what he meant, is most likely to be true. Nevertheless, given Zeno's position on sciences, it is more likely that he prepared not only an alternative curriculum for secondary education, but also for elementary education rather than focusing exclusively on Cynic education.

Zeno seems to have had rather high expectations of his young students. According to Diogenes Laertius, Zeno believed that the young should behave with perfect propriety in walk, demeanor, and attire (Laertius, 322). Zeno's views on what the youth should be like seem to be in line with the norms of Greek society. Yet, Zeno was not a perfect teacher himself. He was not comfortable around people, sometimes he would even beg to push people away (Laertius, 318). He would do everything in his power to push the students he did not want away, especially those who were "handsome and rich, but nothing else," a preference which reflected his politics (Laertius, 321-2). Nevertheless, all evidence point to him being an exceptional teacher to those he wanted to teach. Dawson describes Zeno's lectures with an audience seated on benches where he would talk to two or three pupils a time while teaching. Dawson's description of Zeno fits the image of a Cynic-like superstar teacher. Moreover, while he pushed some students away, even beggars were admitted to attend his lectures (Dawson, 162). Zeno's admission of beggars shows that even when he had become a teacher in his own right, and the head of a new movement, Zeno continued to carry Cynic influence.

Like the Athenians and the natives of Citium, King Antigonus II of Macedonia favored Zeno and attended his lectures whenever he was in Athens (Laertius, 314-5). According to the letters preserved by Stoic Apollonius of Tyre (fl. 1st Century BC) and quoted by Diogenes Laertius, Antigonus wrote to Zeno declaring him to be his inferior in

fortune and fame, yet his superior in reason and education, and offering him the role of being not only his own teacher but that of all Macedonians. In response, Zeno praised Antigonus because he strove for real education instead of common education, yet declined his offer due to old age. In his stead, he sent two of his fellow scholars to the king's court (Laertius, 316). We understand from Diogenes Laertius that unlike the Stoics, Antigonus did not consider wealth to be an indifferent as he challenged the Stoic scholars Zeno sent on this issue (Laertius, 327). While there is no reason to doubt Zeno's reasons for refusing Antigonus' offer, Zeno probably considered the possibility that his associates or even himself would not really become the instructors of the Macedonian nation, but mere court philosophers.

Zeno's most important student was Cleanthes (330 – 230 BC), who, according to Diogenes Laertius, studied with him for nineteen years (Laertius, 377). Upon Zeno's death, Cleanthes succeeded him as the head of the Stoic movement. Zeller says Cleanthes was a faithful follower of Zeno's doctrine who promoted it by the moral weight of his own character. Nevertheless, in Zeller's view, he could not expand it or establish it on a wider basis (Zeller 1892, 40-1). According to Diogenes Laertius, during his education, Zeno trained Cleanthes in a way that he would take on every sort of physical work for the sake of philosophy. He believed, like Zeno and his Cynic predecessors, that labor was a good thing. Zeno would proudly say "Cleanthes could support a second Cleanthes if he liked," comparing him to those who shun philosophy and look to others to meet their needs despite having the time for philosophy and the means to support themselves. This being said, later on Cleanthes would be generously supported by Antigonus who gave him three thousand drachmas (Laertius, 372-4). Like Zeno, he held that only universal nature needs to be followed, and nothing else

(Laertius, 344). Regarding the struggle between wisdom and evil, Cleanthes had an optimistic position. According to Zeller, he believed that in the long run, evil will be turned into good (Zeller 1892, 190). Dawson says only Cleanthes made politics a separate branch of philosophy while other Stoics considered it an important part of ethics (Dawson, 195). Cleanthes also seems to have held certain eclectic beliefs such as the idea of grasping character from looks. He also considered it effeminate to sneeze (Laertius, 376), demonstrating an example of Cynic-Stoic misogyny. His books included *On Marriage*, *On Freedom*, *The Statesman*, *On Laws*, *On Education*, and *On Kingship* (Laertius, 376-7). Overall, it is certain that for the most part, Cleanthes faithfully carried the Stoic school to the next generation. This being said, it is difficult to assess whether Zeller is right in saying that he could not improve it, given his works are not available.

After Cleanthes comes Chrysippus (279 – 206 BC), a philosopher so important in the history of Stoicism that Diogenes Laertius reports a saying about him according to which: “Had there been no Chrysippus, there would have been no Stoa” (Laertius, 381). According to Zeller, Chrysippus was considered the second founder of Stoicism by the ancients (Zeller 1892, 45). Chrysippus disagreed with Cleanthes and even Zeno on certain issues, although whenever he disagreed with Cleanthes, he apparently regretted it (Laertius, 379). Zeller too says that Chrysippus deviated from the teachings of Zeno and Cleanthes in many respects (Zeller 1892, 47). This being said, while there are certain differences regarding their political and educational doctrines, as we will see, these do not constitute a deviation from the core of Stoic philosophy. Thus the early Stoic movement was unified around a core doctrine while allowing room for a significant degree of heterogeneity.

In *the Contradictions of Stoics*, Plutarch, basing himself on Antipater of Tarsus (fl. 2nd Century BC), a head of the Stoic

school, says that the difference between Chrysippus, and Zeno and Cleanthes was that the latter two would not accept Athenian citizenship in order not to injure their own countries (Plutarch 4, 238). They were all cosmopolitans, of course, but Zeno and Cleanthes related to the reality of their belonging to their native cities differently than Cynic cosmopolitans such as Crates who was indifferent to the fate of his hometown (Laertius, 303). As for Chrysippus, there is no indication his disregard for his native city was on the same level as Crates. He may instead have accepted Athenian citizenship for its benefits. Perhaps, being an Athenian citizen suited his political ambitions. Zeller says that according to Chrysippus, the wise man will aim for power if doing so is in his interests, and if he cannot rule, he will reside at the court of a worthy ruler (Zeller 1892, 322). Dawson quotes Arius Didymus (fl. 1st Century BC) who says early Stoics thought the wise person would go into politics in order to progress towards the perfect constitution (Dawson, 196). While this sentiment must have been shared by Zeno and Cleanthes, it seems like it was Chrysippus who established it as criteria. Diogenes Laertius quotes him saying the wise man will take part in politics if nothing prevents him. Chrysippus believes that the wise are not only free; they are kings. He defines kingship as unaccountable authority. Only the wise are qualified to wield this authority as only they know what is good and bad. Similarly, only the wise are fit to be orators, judges and magistrates (Laertius, 354). Chrysippus' political philosophy can be described as a return to Cynic-like sophocracy, as he is clearly envisaging the rule of the wise over the unwise, adding that a number of positions in society specifically demand wisdom. In the meanwhile, Chrysippus, seems to be rejecting the legitimacy of all rulers who are not philosophers.

According to Zeller, an intelligent person taking advice from Chrysippus would avoid business and withdraw

into a peaceful retirement although he can politically take part in states which present a progress towards perfection (Zeller 1892, 323). It's extremely unlikely, however, that Chrysippus considered the states of his day to be as such. Diogenes Laertius quotes him declaring that "If I had cared about the multitude, I would not have studied philosophy" (Laertius, 380), and Zeller quotes him via Stobaeus (fl. 5th Century), saying that a statesman must either displease the Gods or displease the people (Zeller 1892, 323). He must have considered that most leaders to have chosen the former rather than the latter. Diogenes Laertius says that though he wrote so much, he dedicated none of his books to any of the kings. Moreover, he declined Ptolemy Philopator's (244 – 205 BC) invitation to join him in Egypt when he was still a student of Cleanthes (Laertius, 382). Due to their radical rejection of mainstream politics, Plutarch criticizes the doctrine of Zeno, Cleanthes and Chrysippus in *the Contradictions of Stoics* for being interested in government but not in the practical aspects of governing (Plutarch 4, 237). The early Stoics, then, despite accepting the possibility of supporting rulers whose views were aligned with their own, were not concerned with the affairs of actual rulers. Their politics remained utopian, and their involvement in politics was limited at most, and conducted with the aim of progressing towards their final goal.

In his *On the Republic*, Chrysippus shows himself to be a follower of Zeno's sexual communism. He completely accepts the community of women where anyone can have sex with anyone, so that father's love is shown to all children equally, and jealousy and adultery are eliminated (Laertius, 358). In other words, like Zeno, Chrysippus is against the system of patriarchal monogamy. It should be noted that this is despite the fact that Chrysippus contended himself with a single old woman for a partner (Laertius, 382). Moreover, Chrysippus,

like numerous ancient radicals, defends all sorts of incest in *On the Republic*, and condones eating corpses in *On Justice* (Laertius, 383). According to Zeller, the “revolting traits” of Stoicism have their roots in Cynicism. Zeller criticizes Stoics for raising no objection to the prevalent profligacy and unchastity. Zeller says that Chrysippus, and perhaps Zeno too supported the “atrocious shamelessness of Diogenes” (Zeller 1892, 307-8). It is understandable for a current such as the early Stoics to shock and disappoint the conservative reader. Without a doubt, Zeller is right that generations of early Stoics remained on the tail of the dog.

Dawson emphasizes that Chrysippus did not consider himself, his teachers or his disciples wise (Dawson, 214). In seeing wisdom as something extremely difficult to attain, something to always strive towards, Chrysippus faithfully followed the Socratic tradition. This approach of Chrysippus might have been why he joined Platonic Sceptic Arcesilaus (316 – 240 BC) to study philosophy in the Academy. Due to his time at the Academy, Diogenes Laertius says, he would argue both for and against custom and habit (Laertius, 381). Methodologically arguing for both cases was not Chrysippus’ only innovation to Stoic doctrine. He was also first to deliver his lectures in the open air (Laertius, 382). Chrysippus was not only a lecturer but an exceptional scholar. He would set down everything that came to mind, make many corrections, and cite many authorities to the extent that he was criticized in antiquity for making too many citations. Regardless, he was an extremely productive writer, producing 500 lines a day, and the number of his works exceeding 705 (Laertius, 379-80). Despite all this, according to Plutarch in *the Contradictions of Stoics*, Chrysippus rejects the idea that scholarly life is the most suitable for the philosopher. Plutarch criticizes this as an inconsistency, noting that Stoics including Chrysippus lived the scholarly life (Plutarch 4, 237). In fact, it is more likely that

Chrysippus was rejecting the idea that a philosopher should live an exclusively scholarly life rather than rejecting scholarly work entirely. For instance, as we have seen, Chrysippus taught that the philosopher had to take part in political life in order to bring forth the Stoic utopia, something a purely scholarly life would not allow.

Diogenes Laertius says that like Cleanthes, Chrysiuppus responded to the Socratic question about whether virtue can be taught positively. After all, an evil person could become good. (Laertius, 345). Yet, according to Zeller, while Cleanthes had held, like the Cynics, that virtue can never be lost, Chrysippus thought this was not the case (Zeller 1892, 295). Despite this important disagreement, Chrysippus agreed with the previous Stoics in holding ethics to be the most important and highest part of their philosophy. The Stoics taught logic, rhetoric and natural science along with ethics before Chrysippus too. Chrysippus, however, established the criteria that all ethical inquiries must start with the universal order. Good and evil could only be comprehended in a satisfactory way based on the study of nature (Zeller 1892, 64). In *the Contradictions of Stoics*, Plutarch says Chrysippus is in favor of teaching natural science both before and after ethics. Accordingly, Chrysippus' curriculum for young students starts with logic, continues with physics, followed by ethics, then physics again, and finally theology (Plutarch 4, 239). Thus, it can be said that Chrysippus gave the Stoic educational practice a more systematic framework.

According to Diogenes Laertius, when a parent asked Chrysippus: "To whom should I entrust my son?," the Stoic teacher confidently replied: "To me" (Laertius, 380). According to Zeller, Chrysippus considered what is a training of his powers to a good man to be a real misfortune and punishment for the bad (Zeller 1892, 193). Thus, Chrysippus believed that the effects of education differed according to the

student's character, and that the education he offered was not necessarily a remedy for everyone. Nevertheless, Chrysippus had a utopian educational plan which would solve this problem. According to Quintilian, Chrysippus starts early in the education of the children by selecting a universal tune to be used by all nurses to put the babies to sleep (Quintilian). This is an educational policy which aims for a standardization of the children's earliest experiences. According to Ralph Doty, Chrysippus disagreed with the common view that those under the age seven should not be taught how to read (Doty, 70). The children's nurse, who takes care of them for the first three years, has an enormous role in Chrysippus' philosophy of education. The formation of the child's mind on the best principles is one of her most important duties. Since children are capable of moral training, asks Chrysippus, why should they not be capable of literary education? The nurse's job is so important that she not only needs to speak correctly, but ideally she should be a philosopher, or if that is not possible she should be as qualified as possible (Quintilian). This being said, Unlike Zeno, Quintilian believes ordinary education to be serviceable (Doty, 70). As long as the child is educated well from the start, by a philosopher, Chrysippus must have felt that ordinary education would not cause any harm. Lastly, according to Quintilian, Chrysippus was not opposed to the use of flogging in education (Quintilian), presumably because it created hard people who were disciplined. This view positions Chrysippus closest to Antisthenes.

Overall, it is safe to conclude that while there certainly are important disagreements among the early Stoics, neither Cleanthes nor Chrysippus have significantly altered or revised Zeno's core doctrine itself. Despite certain disagreements, Stoicism so far remained extremist. In fact, we need to observe an effort to clarify the details of the doctrine, and apply it on areas where it was not applied before in the works of Zeno's

successors. As such, Zeno's relationship with Cleanthes and Chrysippus can be compared Diogenes' relationship with Crates and Hipparchia. Moreover, it might be added that, Cleanthes and Chrysippus were almost as ideal successors and Crates and Hipparchia. Given the Stoics split from the Cynics, it is not a coincidence that the teacher-centered pedagogy of the two schools produced similarly loyal successors who contributed the clarification and application of the doctrine. The most important difference between the Cynics and the early Stoics, aside from their curriculum, was that the latter advocated a more active involvement in politics. While for the Cynics education was to be used as a political tool indiscriminately, the early Stoics were particularly interested educating rulers who they thought could bring the world closer to their utopia, along with teaching their doctrine to anyone interested.

Realizing the Stoic Utopia

Diogenes of Babylon (230 – 140 BC) succeeded Chrysippus as the head of the Stoic school; in turn, his pupil Antipater of Tarsus succeeded him (Zeller 1892, 49-50). In *On Duties*, Cicero demonstrates that, in line with the Stoic school, the two philosophers had their disagreements. Diogenes of Babylon thought that a wise man could offer counterfeit money in a transaction or sell wine that is spoiling, while Antipater of Tarsus held that an honest man would do no such thing (Cicero, 367). Cicero further quotes Antipater of Tarsus saying that it is our duty to consider the interests of our fellow men and to serve society: Our interest is the interest of the community, the interest of the community is our interest (Cicero, 321). With the help of this passage, we can interpret the difference between Antipater of Tarsus and his teacher to be the difference between communal interests and individual interests.

Gaius Blossius, a student of Antipater of Tarsus, seems to have put into practice his teacher's communistic worldview. In *the Life of Tiberius Gracchus*, Plutarch notes that Gaius Blossius became the main adviser of Tiberius Gracchus (165 – 133 BC), along with Diophanes (fl. 2nd Century BC), a rhetorician. Antipater of Tarsus must have approved of his student and his political activities, for he honored him by dedicating some of his philosophical treatises to him (Plutarch). Donald Dudley says Gaius Blossius had family ties to the democratic party in his native Cumae (Dudley 1941, 96). This can certainly be seen as a factor in Gaius Blossius' affiliation with Tiberius Gracchus, however it would be a mistake to consider it the only or even the main factor. John Riddle notes that Gaius Blossius, as well as Diophanes, had ideas of social justice alien to Roman civilization which were similar to utopian communism (Riddle, vii). Riddle is almost certainly right about Gaius Blossius, given Stoicism itself had always been a utopian communist philosophy so far, it would be surprising if a figure such as Gaius Blossius did not share this belief.

If Gaius Blossius authored any works, they did not survive to our day. However, we can get a good idea of the movement he was involved with by examining the views and actions of its leader, and his student, Tiberius Gracchus. In *On Friendship*, Cicero says Tiberius Gracchus attempted to exercise supreme power, or rather, he really reigned for a few months (Cicero, 20). As Plutarch says in *the Life of Tiberius Gracchus*, his power was based on his position as plebeian tribune. Gaius Blossius, Diophanes, and his mother Cornelia (fl. 2nd Century BC) guided Tiberius after his election in his attempt to pass a mild land reform law. Faced with immense conservative opposition, Tiberius appealed to the poor, and especially poor soldiers who risked their lives only to end up homeless. According to Tiberius, soldiers fought and were slain in order to maintain the luxury and wealth of other men

(Plutarch). Although there is no indication that the movement led by Tiberius was a movement of the whole ancient proletariat including the slaves, it was certainly a plebeian movement. Gaius Blossius' role in this movement as a Stoic demonstrates that he must have disagreed with Chrysippus about the multitude.

When Tiberius' fellow tribune and friend Marcus Octavius (fl. 2nd Century BC) turned against him, Tiberius had to put aside his mild legislation, while preferring another which was even more beneficial to the common people. Eventually Tiberius' freed slaves removed Marcus Octavius, and the law was ratified and confirmed. According to Tiberius, a tribune who had betrayed the people could be removed by force as he was no longer a tribune at all. During his reign, Tiberius decreased the years of military service, granted liberty of appeal from the judges to the people, and joined to the senators, who were judges at that time, an equal number of citizens of the horseman's degree. In short, he did as much as he could to lessen the power of the senate. Tiberius appealed to the plebeians about a threat to his life and they set up tents around his house to defend him, but eventually the conservative Roman Senators had him murdered (Plutarch). As E. Badian says, with the death of Tiberius, law and order triumphed, and even his timid noble allies approved of his murder (Badian, 68). Tiberius Gracchus probably was not so radical as to aim the revolutionary overthrow of the Roman senate by the Plebeian assembly. Nevertheless, things may well have come to that had Tiberius somehow survived the attempt on his life. As for Gaius Blossius, he must have seen Tiberius' reign as a step in the right direction towards the Stoic utopia.

According to Plutarch, after the murder of Tiberius Gracchus, Gaius Blossius was carried before the consuls, and interrogated. The Stoic philosopher freely confessed that he

had done, without hesitation, whatever Tiberius told him. Asked if he would have burned the capitol if Tiberius told him to, Gaius Blossius responded that Tiberius would have never ordered any such thing. Being pressed with the same question, he declared, "If Tiberius had commanded it, it would have been right for me to do it; for he never would have commanded it if it had not been for the people's good." Strangely, Gaius Blossius was pardoned, and he left Rome to join Aristonicus' (fl. 2nd Century BC) rebellion in Asia (Plutarch). Dudley says that after the slave risings of Sicily were put down, Asia was the focus of resistance to Rome (Dudley 1941, 99). During Tiberius' reign, Plutarch continues, King Attalus III (170 – 133 BC) of Pergamon had died, and left his kingdom to Rome (Plutarch). Tiberius, to please the people, immediately proposed making a law, that all the money which Attalus left should be distributed amongst citizens poor enough to be sharers of the public lands, and as for the cities that were in the territories of Pergamon, he had declared that the disposal of them did not at all belong to the senate, but to the people (Plutarch). Tiberius' approach on this question shows that while he may have been influenced by Gaius Blossius' Stoic cosmopolitanism philosophically, in practice and as a politician, he was above all concerned with the interests of the Roman poor. In any case, Justin (fl. 2nd Century) says, Eumenes II (197 – 159 BC), father of Attalus III, had an illegitimate son, Aristonicus, who rejected his half-brother's will and laid claim to the throne of Asia (Justin). Perhaps, if he was not killed, Tiberius might have come to an agreement with Aristonicus, although it is also possible that a conflict of interests would bring the two leaders to war.

Diodorus Siculus (fl. 1st Century BC) says that when Aristonicus sought to gain the kingdom of Asia without any proper rights, all the slaves, because of the cruelty of their masters, joined him, and filled many towns and cities

with bloodshed and slaughter (Diodorus Siculus). Austin documents a legislation from Aristonicus' reign according to which all foreigners and mercenaries were given citizenship by the people of Pergamon, and all slaves, public and private, except royal slaves, became foreign residents. The legislation also declared that the city will take over the property of all who abandoned the city during and after Attalus' death (Austin, 343-4). In short, Aristonicus' revolution can be considered abolitionist, given it was not only supported by slaves but took actual measures to abolish slavery for the most part. While the slaves who followed Aristonicus along with the impoverished commoners were not given citizenship of Pergamon, according to Strabo (64 BC – 24), they were referred to as the Citizens of the Sun, or Heliopolitai (Strabo, 647). The use of the term Heliopolis likely refers to the People of the Sun, from Iambulus' (fl. 3rd Century BC) utopian novel, *Islands of the Sun*. Dawson considers it possible for the constitution of the Sun People in this work to be influenced by the Stoic utopia. In Iambulus' *Islands of the Sun*, the people are divided into associations of four hundred, led by the eldest member who acts as a magistrate with king-like powers. In the *Islands of the Sun* and the Stoic utopia, government is minimal, non-compulsory, and concerned with certain administrative functions (Dawson, 181). This utopian ideal was combined with open class warfare proclaimed by Aristonicus. After all, as Africa says, even restrained scholars have described Aristonicus' City of the Sun as a proletarian state (Africa, 110). The presence of Gaius Blossius as the main intellectual influence on Aristonicus and the Asian revolution certainly strengthens the possibility that it was inspired by Stoic utopianism.

Hasan Malay writes that Aristonicus' slave rebellion spread through the region but met the resistance of large cities like Smyrna (Malay, 38). According to Justin, although

the Romans were initially defeated by Aristonicus when they came to claim Attalus' will and plunder Pergamon, eventually they defeated the revolt (Justin). In *the Life of Tiberius Gracchus*, Plutarch says that when Aristonicus was overthrown and ruined, Gaius Blossius killed himself (Plutarch). Arnold Toynbee calls Gaius Blossius the Stoic prophet of revolution. Toynbee describes him as the master of Tiberius Gracchus as well as Aristonicus (Toynbee, 179-80). Toynbee's indication that the most important figure of both movements was the teacher rather than the leader powerfully underlines the importance of education in politics. There is no evidence for the presence of other Stoics on the side of Tiberius Gracchus or Aristonicus, yet given the extraordinary support Gaius Blossius received from his teacher Antipater of Tarsus, it is unlikely that he was alone as a Stoic. Moreover, it is difficult to imagine him not having students of his own other than Tiberius Gracchus and Aristonicus. In any case his legacy can be considered to have lived on, considering Dawson notes that Stoic extremists continued to exist after Gaius Blossius. These Stoics, Dawson says, must have been indistinguishable from the Cynics (Dawson, 244). It's conceivable that they were considerably closer to the Cynics than to middle and late Stoicism, however probably they rather continued the heterogeneous tradition of early Stoicism than becoming Cynics in every respect.

It is no coincidence that it was a philosopher of the Stoic school who educated both the leader of Italian plebeians and that of Western Anatolian slaves. Not only should Gaius Blossius be considered a representative of early Stoicism in many respects; as a philosopher-politician, he is also notable for attempting to put into practice what the early Stoics preached by educating Tiberius Gracchus and Aristonicus. Unfortunately, we do not know about Gaius Blossius' views on the City of the Sun's practices on gender and education,

however it would be logical to consider them to be generally in line with early Stoicism. Accordingly, It's likely that women fought for the City of the Sun along with men, and it is possible that women, slaves and commoners were given a public education of some sort, if not the full Stoic curriculum.

In this period of slave revolts and plebeian uprisings, Stoicism, more or less in its original form, briefly enjoyed the blessing of the spirit of time. For a few moments, Stoic extremism was posed to significantly alter the course of civilization. The fact that the status quo prevailed was not due to a weakness in early Stoicism, but to the unavoidable military defeat of the lower classes mobilized around leaders influenced by early Stoicism. In any case, the defeats suffered by the Roman plebeians and the Western Anatolian slaves was to take a heavy toll on the original variant of Stoicism. Gaius Blossius' involvement with Tiberius Gracchus was one thing, however taking up arms against Rome along with slaves meant that abolitionist Stoicism would never have a significant political influence within the borders of Rome again, evidenced by the lack of any philosophical influence in the plebeian movement lead by Tiberius Gracchus' brother Gaius Gracchus (154 – 121 BC). Accordingly, Stoicism had to go through drastic changes that would leave no doubt of its lack of association with figures like Gaius Blossius, Tiberius Gracchus or Aristonicus if it was to survive as a political current.

Generalizations About Early Stoic Theory

Both ancient and modern authors have made certain generalizations about the views of Stoics, above all early Stoics, which deserve to be examined. According to Zeller, they held that everything in the world was created for the benefit of some other thing (Zeller 1892, 185). From this

observation on nature, they concluded that man must not live for himself, but for society. This was tied to reason, by which, human beings would feel they are a part of a whole. According to them, everyone needed to contribute to the general welfare, obeying the natural law. The wise man was never a private man (Zeller 1892, 185). Even if we did not know that the early Stoics defended a communist utopia like the Cynics, we could infer from this position of theirs, which we've seen in Antipater of Tarsus earlier, some sort of socialism. Plutarch, in *On Common Conceptions, Against the Stoics* notes their indifference to all natural things: health, vigor of body, beauty, strength are not desired or any way contribute to natural perfection; maims, pains, disgraces and diseases are not hurtful and should not be shunned (Plutarch 4, 207). Zeller adds that they were indifferent to riches, honor and even life itself, as well as poverty, disgrace, and death, considering them neither good nor evil in themselves, but depending on how they are used. They vigorously attacked the Academics and the Peripatetics for including among goods external things which are dependent on chance (Zeller 1892, 232-3). This approach of Stoic philosophy can be considered to be a systematic rejection of all sorts of discrimination. Additionally, according to Zeller, the Stoics believed that the highest good, the final end, or happiness can only be found in what is comfortable to nature, what is in harmony with the law of the universe, or the universal reason of the world (Zeller 1892, 227). Here lies the Stoic rejection of established civilization which is in harmony with the laws of men, or the local reason of states. All this establishes the philosophical background to early Stoicism's extremist politics, which eventually became openly revolutionary with Gaius Blossius.

Zeller notes that according to the Stoics, virtue means harmony with the laws of the universe. This is only possible if we know these laws. Thus, regarding the Socratic question

of whether virtue may be learned, they argued that it may, and that knowledge is indispensable for this education (Zeller 1892, 58-9). Zeller adds that in Socratic fashion, they defined virtue as knowledge and vice as ignorance. They rejected “natural virtue”: insisting on the necessity of learning virtue (Zeller 1892, 255). This is a strikingly egalitarian view of moral education: no one is considered morally better due to any reason related to their birth. In *Did Stoicism Condemn Slavery?*, Donald Robertson quotes Lactantius (250 – 325), a Christian author, according to whom the Stoics said that both women and slaves should be taught philosophy, because they saw no difference between their capacity for wisdom and that of free men (Robertson). There is little reason to doubt this account as it is a consistent educational application of Stoic views on slavery and gender. Women and slaves, then, must have participated along with free men in Stoic teachings.

Zeller says the Stoic curriculum began with logic, continued with natural science and ended with ethics according to the oldest and most distinguished adherents of the school (Zeller 1892, 68-9). Diogenes Laertius adds that these subjects were taught together, and that logic was divided into rhetoric and dialectic. Rhetoric was regarded as a knowledge of how to speak well in an expository way, and dialectic of how to discourse correctly in speeches conducted by question and answer (Laertius, 328-9). This emphasis on dialectics can be taken as an indication that the early Stoics were not as teacher-centered as the Cynics. Nevertheless, in their curriculum, discoursing in questions and answers is not the determining aspect of their educational method, but a part of the doctrine handed to the students in a framework centered on the teacher. Zeller generally defines the Stoic teachings on logic as the formal conditions of thought and expression. Zeller adds to Diogenes Laertius that there was a third part of logic along with dialectic and rhetoric,

which is the theory of knowledge, sometimes included in dialectic, and a fourth part, inquiries into the formation of conceptions. (Zeller, 1892, 70-1). Moreover, Zeller adds that the Stoics did not mean anything other than a collection of artificial rules of no philosophical value by rhetoric (Zeller, 1892, 71-2), essentially a Socratic position. Again, in line with Socratic philosophy, dialectic was considered more important as according to Zeller, they believed that correctness of expression was believed to be inseparable from the correctness of thought (Zeller 1892, 73). In short, Stoic education in logic can be considered to be a systematic approach in line with the Socratic tradition. All these teachings were seen as necessary to equip their students with the consciousness necessary to appreciate the early Stoic political doctrine.

According to Zeller, the Stoic theory of knowledge and learning can be summarized in the following manner: Sensation is regarded as the only source of perception. The soul is a blank leaf that is filled with sensation. Memory is based on perceptions, experience is based on repeated acts of memory, and conclusions based on experience result in conceptions which go beyond the sphere of sensation (Zeller 1892, 79). Due to the nature of thought, what is called primary conceptions, including the highest ideas like good and evil, can be deduced by all human beings from experience. In line with primary conceptions, and in agreement with nature in every sense are the artificial conceptions which are reached with a logical process. These give rise to knowledge (Zeller 1892, 81-2), which is indispensable for the study of ethics. Due to their natural determinism, the Stoics rejected the concept of the freedom of will, however this absence of freedom did not mean the human will was not a deciding power. This was what gave meaning to virtue and vice (Zeller 1892, 179), and by extension, what made education necessary for happiness. Hence, there was a direct link between the education of individuals and social change in the early Stoic doctrine.

To conclude, like the Cynics, the early Stoics were naturalists who rejected metaphysics. They opposed the laws of the universe against the laws of men, rejecting the latter in favor of the former. Stoic morality meant living according to the laws of the universe. It was the rejection of the laws of men that enabled the Stoics to reject mainstream regimes based on patriarchy and slavery and envisage communist utopias. Thus, ethics and politics were deeply connected for the Stoics. By rejecting natural virtue, Stoics deemed education a necessity for ethics, and consequently for politics. Stoic education was a systematic elaboration of their philosophy, aimed at helping their students obtain knowledge. Without obtaining knowledge through education, the laws of the universe could not be understood, and the final goal of happiness, a social rather than an individual goal, could not be realized.

Middle Stoicism

The major changes Stoicism underwent started with Panaetius, a student of Antipater of Tarsus. Zeller, disregarding Gaius Blossius' influence on Tiberius Gracchus, claims Stoicism entered the Roman world with this philosopher (Zeller 1892, 51). According to Dawson, Panaetius started a sharp controversy within Stoicism by making significant revisions, decisively changing Stoic social and political doctrines, and probably burying the utopian ideal (Dawson, 223). Dawson notes that while Diogenes Laertius saw the origin of Stoics lied with Cynicism, basing himself on Apollodorus (2nd Century BC), a student of Diogenes of Babylon, members of Panaetius' circle such as Hecaton and Apollonius denied this origin. They claimed that Zeno became a Stoic by studying the ancients and gave Stilpo rather than Crates credit as his teacher (Dawson, 160-1). Dudley emphasizes that Panaetius' brand of Stoicism enjoyed the support of the

cautious conservative Scipio Aemelianus (185 – 129 BC) and his friends (Dudley 1941, 96-7). Plutarch, in *the Life of Tiberius Gracchus*, recounts that when the news of Tiberius Gracchus' death was first brought to his relative Scipio Aemilianus, he wished all who do as Tiberius Gracchus to suffer the same fate. He later continued to speak against Tiberius Gracchus in front of plebeians and was rebuffed by them (Plutarch). It would not be far-fetched to consider Panaetius and his circle shared their patron's attitude, and it goes without saying that they did not approve of the radical Stoicism of Gaius Blossius. As Dawson says, the failure of the revolutions in Rome and Pergamon gave the future of Stoicism to its newly emerged conservative wing. Accordingly, Panaetius became the head of the Stoic school of Athens in 129 BC, and within half a century Stoicism was dominated by his followers (Dawson, 239). Panaetius' revisionism had turned Stoicism from a subversive philosophy critical of multiple aspects of society into one in harmony with the existing order.

Dawson notes that Panaetius, Poseidonius (135 – 51 BC) and their followers pushed communism into the distant past and turned it into a historical theory about the origins of civilization. All property, according to Panaetius, was originally common, and it was still common by nature; however, the earth was now divided into states. Panaetius and his followers had no nostalgia for primitive society and they considered the rise of civilization a positive and natural phenomenon. The establishment of codes of law and the consequent security of property rights was one of the primary achievements of human progress. In fact, the establishment of cities and states mainly served to safeguard property rights. Acquisition of property was no less natural than original communism. However, all laws for the redistribution of income and cancellation of debt were against nature, as the distribution of property established by the early kings and

lawgivers was sacred (Dawson, 228-9). According to late Stoic Seneca in one of his Letters, Poseidonius argued that the original monarchies belonged to wise men, but they eventually turned into tyrannies, and laws were proposed by wise men like Solon who founded Athens as a democracy. Pythagoreans too were looked up to as they made laws (Seneca, 178). Overall, with these philosophers, Stoicism became a perfect example of ancient conservatism, wanting to preserve the existing laws and institutions. In fact, politically they had more in common with the Pythagoreans than with Zeno and his followers.

Dawson notes that probably due to connections with the upper segments of Roman society, a new Stoic sexual morality was developed by Panaetius and his followers, where intercourse according to nature was identified with procreative sex, in line with Roman patriarchal values (Dawson, 239). According to Dawson, this new sexual morality carried the influence of Plato's *Laws*. Panaetius condemned the Cynics, and with them the Stoics who were "almost Cynic" because they were opposed to modesty (Dawson, 233). Hill notes that while early Stoics held that the fetus only became a human being at birth, and thus considered abortion to be acceptable, later Stoics were generally censorious of their remarks on the subject (Hill, 29). In general, the contradiction between old and new Stoicism caused a problem for the latter. According to Diogenes Laertius, the Stoic Athenodorus Cordylion (fl. 1st Century BC), in charge of the library of Pergamon, censured Zeno's works (Laertius, 327). Dawson notes that though he was discovered, conservative Stoics continued to respect him (Dawson, 240). Moreover, according to Clement of Alexandria, later Stoics prevented their disciples from reading the works of Zeno, the official reason being that they had not proven themselves to be genuine philosophers yet (Clement of Alexandria). The revision Stoicism underwent regarding

politics, including gender politics, was so serious that these incidents of censorship have to be taken as the tip of the iceberg. Stoicism could never be accepted as a conservative movement if it did not succeed in blurring its extremist past to a large degree.

In *On Duties*, Cicero quotes Antipater of Tyre (fl. 1st Century BC), a follower of Panaetius who claims that two points were overlooked by Panaetius: the care of health and property. Cicero presumes Panaetius overlooked these issues because they were easy to deal with (Cicero, 263). Middle Stoics after Panaetius filled in this and other gaps in new Stoic political philosophy. In *On Duties*, Cicero quotes Hecaton, a student of Panaetius, who says a wise man takes care of his private interests while doing nothing contrary to civil customs, laws, and institutions. According to Hecaton, we do not aim to be rich for ourselves alone but for our children, relatives, friends, and above all for our country. Private fortunes of individuals are the wealth of the state (Cicero, 333). It goes without saying that slaves are a part of the private fortunes mentioned above. In *Did Stoicism Condemn Slavery?*, Robertson says that Poseidonius embraced elements of Aristotelianism, including the notion of natural slavery (Robertson). It is unlikely that Hecaton or any other middle Stoic, including Panaetius, did not share Poseidonius' position to a degree. It is not surprising that early Stoic abolitionism did not survive middle Stoicism.

Dawson notes that Diogenes Laertius originally included Stoics from as late as the 1st century in his *Lives and Opinions of Eminent Philosophers*, but his work breaks off in the middle of the section dealing with Chrysippus (Dawson, 167). It is nevertheless possible to observe what must have been the views of later Stoics in parts where Diogenes Laertius refers to the views of Stoics collectively due to contradictions with early Stoic views transmitted by earlier sources such as Plutarch. One example of this is the preference of qualities

awarded by chance such as natural ability, skill, life health, strength, physical attractiveness, wealth, fame and noble birth, contrasted with the rejection of lack of ability and skill, death, disease, weakness, maiming, ugliness, poverty, ignominy and low birth (Laertius, 349-50). This perspective can be understood as the complete revision of Stoic morality from a radical rejection of conventional ethics to an attitude completely in line with it. Moreover, in family relations too, Diogenes Laertius mentions the apparently Stoic belief that parents and brothers should be honored in the second place after the Gods (Laertius, 353). Given that early Stoics held that unwise parents and their children are enemies, and that there would not be conventional parenthood in the community of the wise, this view too must be considered to belong with later Stoics, showing that they shifted the Stoic current's focus from criticizing family life to advising on how to behave within it.

One thing that did not change from early Stoicism to middle Stoicism, however, was their involvement in politics, their quest for power and their use of education along with conventional political means to further their goals. After Scipio Aemelianus, the most prominent political figure known for his affiliation with middle Stoicism was Cato the Younger (95 – 46 BC). In *the Life of Cato the Younger*, Plutarch says that early on, Cato became a close companion of Antipater of Tyre, and devoted himself especially to the study of ethical and political doctrines. Moreover, Cato visited the elderly Athenodorus Cordylion, who had censured the works of Zeno, and despite the fact that Athenodorus had always refused the friendship of princes and great men, Cato convinced Athenodorus to go to Rome together, where they spent time in philosophical conversation (Plutarch). Michael Parenti describes Cato as a highly principled conservative, a leader of the oligarchy, and a defender of high birth (Parenti, 141). The most major act of Cato's political life was his opposition to the ambitious but

moderate populist Julius Caesar (100 – 44 BC). According to Parenti, Cato accused Caesar of trying to subvert the state and seeking to frighten the senate (Parenti, 105) and urged the senate to put the entire state command in Pompey's (106 – 48 BC) hands in order to suppress Caesar (Parenti, 143). After the defeat and death of Pompey, Cato continued to fight against Julius Caesar but lost, and took his own life (Plutarch). It was not power for its own sake that Cato desired, however had he been victorious against Julius Caesar, he certainly would have taken it for the sake of his conservative Stoic political ideals.

Dawson notes that Cato acknowledged the existence of two camps within Stoicism on the question of Cynicism (Dawson, 240). There can be no question that he belonged to the anti-Cynic camp. Nevertheless, Plutarch says in *the Life of Cato* that Cato held the classic Cynic and Stoic position that the good man alone is free, and that the bad are all slaves (Plutarch). Rather than being an original position of Cato, this shows that middle Stoics in general did not revise this old formulation. Lucan (39 – 65) summarizes austere Cato's outlook as follows: his inflexible rule was to observe moderation, follow nature and to give his life for his country. However, at the same time he believed that he was born to serve the whole world rather than himself. Thus Cato was a patriot as well as a cosmopolitan. All we know of his views on the question of gender is that he considered the sole purpose of love to be birth (Lucan, 85), which indicates his rejection of homosexual relationships.

Cato had a daughter, named Porcia (70 – 43 BC), who became the wife of Brutus (85 – 42 BC), one of the conspirators who assassinated Julius Caesar. Plutarch says in *the Life of Brutus* that Porcia was addicted to philosophy, which without a doubt means she received a good education. Plutarch quotes Porcia imploring her husband to share all his hidden griefs

with her, and to admit her to his counsels that require secrecy and truth, since she is not a concubine but the daughter of Cato. Porcia admits that women seem to be of too weak a nature to be trusted with secrets, however she says that with a virtuous birth and education, and the company of good and honorable men, such as Cato and Brutus himself, the manners of women can be formed (Plutarch). Porcia, who certainly deserves to be counted among the middle Stoics, demonstrates that while the revision this school of thought went through made Stoic morality align with the patriarchal ethics of the time, it did not consider women to be invisible semi-humans.

Overall, early and middle Stoicism are so different when it comes to their political philosophies that they can well be considered two separate schools of thought. Panaetius and his followers must have thought the Stoic quest for power would be far easier after the revision of almost all major extremist political views of Stoicism so that it was now in line with traditional values of civilization and patriarchy, the social forces that drowned the rebellions of Gaius Blossius. Throughout his life, and with good reason, Cato must have felt the spirit of time behind his cause. In the end, however, the middle Stoics and the conservative movement they were a part of failed too, despite the desperate plot to take the life of their mortal enemy, Julius Caesar, led by Cato's son in law. Little is known about the middle Stoics' philosophy of education, however what we do know indicates that the turn from early Stoics' teacher-centered education begun with middle Stoicism. This change was due to prominent Roman politicians embracing middle Stoicism, who would converse with Stoic sages rather than be lectured. Consequently, if the early Stoics were a loose movement, the middle Stoics were even looser.

Late Stoicism

Although not all middle Stoics aligned with Cato and the conservative republican struggle against Julius Caesar⁵⁷, their defeat nevertheless seems to have been a setback for the movement. The first major figure of what has been called late Stoicism was Seneca, who was born in Cordoba and educated in philosophy and rhetoric in Rome. Katja Vogt describes Seneca's political career as highly successful and quite dramatic (Vogt). Nevertheless, according to Zeller, Seneca advised philosophers not to meddle in politics (Zeller 1892, 323), perhaps because he was not too happy with his own experiences in doing so. Contradicting Zeller, Miriam Griffin quotes Seneca declaring no state to be so bad to prevent a man in public life from continuing to serving (Griffin, 176). This was a motto he seems to have followed his whole life. Vogt says that Seneca was the teacher of future Emperor Nero (37 – 68) in adolescence, and continued to act as his adviser in adulthood. Nevertheless, he was eventually accused of being involved in a conspiracy to kill the emperor, and was ordered to take his own life, which he obeyed (Vogt). Despite being a part of the ruling elite of the greatest power in the whole Mediterranean, or perhaps because of it, Seneca seems to have been more interested in service than personal power. In fact, his failed attempt for getting his ideas in power, if it may be termed as such, was through the education of Nero than politics.

In one of his letters, Seneca makes it clear that he thinks the moral purpose of Socrates and Cato were on the same level

⁵⁷ In fact, as Robertson writes in *An Ancient Stoic Meditation Technique*, Athenodorus Canaanites (fl. 1st Century BC), a student of Poseidonius, was the personal tutor of Augustus Caesar (63 – 14 BC) (Robertson). In *Sayings of Romans*, Plutarch recounts that eventually, Athenodorus asked the Emperor to be dismissed of his service due to old age. Before leaving, however, he could not resist teaching a technique against anger to the emperor, consisting of doing or saying nothing before repeating the letters of the alphabet. Augustus was so impressed that he detained Athenodorus for one more year as his teacher and adviser (Plutarch 4, 207).

(Seneca, 12). In another letter, again, he compares Cato with Socrates, praising his consistency. He further adds that only Cato formed a party of the free state, while others who followed Caesar or even Pompey did nothing of the sort (Seneca, 223). Seneca's approach to recent history favoring only Cato was not fully shared by those in his circle. Seneca's nephew Lucan (Duff, ix), for example, considers the senators divine, Pompey a pure lover of his country, Cato the embodiment of virtue while he depicts Caesar as a bloodthirsty ogre (Duff, xiv-v). In any case, given Seneca and people around him made a symbol out of a figure such as Cato in what was essentially the continuation of the regime formed by his enemies, it is surprising that he managed to rise so high both politically and as an educator. The only logical conclusion is that he must have had a favorable audience among men of influence, and he must have known how to choose his words carefully.

In *On Leisure*, Seneca says there are two commonwealths: The first is a vast and truly common state, of which Gods and humans are both a part of, in which earth is not divided and the bounds of citizenship are measured by the path of the sun; the second is the lesser commonwealth which we have been assigned by the accident of birth. Seneca notes that some yield service to both commonwealths at the same time, while others chose one over the other (Seneca). Seneca, like Cato, must have embraced both commonwealths. Compared to the Cynics and the early Stoics whose cosmopolitanism required the abolition of all lesser commonwealths in the name of the greater one, Seneca's approach bases cosmopolitanism on the already existing cosmos, and emphasizes that there does not need to be a contradiction between cosmopolitanism and patriotism. Seneca, like Cato may thus be considered to be a moderate cosmopolitan, though compared to the mainstream approach of adopting only the lesser commonwealth, their position is nevertheless more radical.

Seneca's letters show him to give little importance to class differentiation. In one of his letters, he argues that the nobility have no privileged position as "philosophy does not reject or chose anyone; it shines for everyone" (Seneca, 66). In another letter, Seneca writes that the spirit of a Roman knight is no different than that of a freedman or a slave. Knight, freedman and slave are simply names won by ambition and injustice (Seneca, 52). Thus Seneca continued the classical moral rejection of slavery of the early Stoics rather than consider slaves to be so by their nature like Poseidonius and probably other middle Stoics. This being said, another letter demonstrates that Seneca called on people to live on friendly terms with their slaves rather than the abolition of slavery. Slaves were human beings, companions, humble friends and fellow slaves in the hands of fortune (Seneca, 68). Seneca condemned the arrogant, cruel, and abusive treatment slaves received from their masters in another letter. Live mercifully with your slaves, says Seneca, and admit them to conversation and discussion and even shared living (Seneca, 70). In *On Anger*, Seneca defends slaves', freedmen's and women's right to talk, be silent, and laugh (Seneca, 109). Overall, Seneca's views on slavery, though perhaps not as radical as early Stoics, were shaped by a compassionate and sincere humanism. This being said, when it came to gender, Seneca's position was not quite as radical. In *On Benefits*, he transmits Demetrius the Cynic's (fl. 1st Century BC) patriarchal views restricting women's clothing favorably (Seneca, 174), complains about divorce and adultery becoming normal, and laments the evaporation of shame (Seneca, 68-9). These views of Seneca are in line with the patriarchal philosophy he inherited from the middle Stoics.

In *On Benefits*, Seneca says he has devoted himself to receiving a liberal education (Seneca, 79). It's more than likely that by liberal education Seneca meant an education,

worthy of a free person, in conventional disciplines of higher education, acquired in order to take an active part in civic life. In any case, Seneca's educational philosophy starts with what he had learned from his teacher, Attalus (fl. 1st Century BC), who he says was a Stoic in one of his letters (Seneca, 106). According to Attalus, the teacher and student should have the same purpose: The teacher should want to do the student good, and the student should want to do well. Seneca and his friends were students of this kind, as they would besiege the school of Attalus, entering first and leaving last (Seneca, 230), demonstrating their common educational purpose with their teacher. Seneca seems to have been critical of what he saw as the educational practices of certain philosophical schools. In *On Benefits*, he says one cannot learn from a teacher who regards his student as one of his crowd of pupils, without giving special and personal care (Seneca, 147). Seneca's criticism, which was probably a jab at certain teacher-centered pedagogical approaches, expresses an approach that can instead be categorized as student-centered.

In *On Benefits*, Seneca approves of the common parental practice of shaping their children both physically and through forcing on them a liberal education, as well as introducing them to thrift and shame by force if there is resistance, which he expects. All these he considers to be great benefits we receive from our parents (Seneca, 152). This clearly demonstrates his approval of conventional practices of educating children by forcibly shaping them. This is not to say Seneca is in favor of treating children in an extremely strict manner. For instance, in the same work he approvingly notes that mistakes in children due to lapses of memory are patiently tolerated by their teachers (Seneca, 136). In *On Anger*, he says the student should be guided between the two extremes of arrogance and lack of confidence. Accordingly, the student should only be rewarded for merit. In general, Seneca believes it is

necessary to keep the child away from luxury, although he acknowledges that some free time should be given. Seneca thinks children should be told the truth rather than flattered. Thus, he says their mistakes should be brought up against them. A soft and comfortable education makes people bad tempered according to Seneca. Moreover, the more a child is given their freedom, the more corrupt they become. Instead, it is right for them to feel fear sometimes, and respect all the time, especially for their elders. Lastly, Seneca emphasizes the importance of the character of nurses and tutors, who are reflected by their pupils (Seneca, 59-60). Seneca's approach to children's education seems to have the purpose of raising youths who would act according to the gerontocratic customs of Roman society. Nevertheless, it would be unfair to consider it completely repressive as the children are given a number of rights, such as the right to make mistakes, the right to free time and the right to hear the truth from the adults.

With the right guidance, Seneca says in *On Benefits*, it possible for students to surpass their teachers, yet no one can achieve anything without teachers (Seneca, 81). In his *Epistles*, Seneca says the ideal educator teaches with his life. His deeds are more important than his words (Seneca, 349). Here, Seneca's approach can be compared more to Plutarch's approach of seeing the teacher above all as a moral example (Plutarch 1, 19) rather than the Cynics approach of seeing the teacher as a superstar whose example to be imitated in everything. Nevertheless, in line with the Socratic tradition, and similarly to the Cynics, teachers of liberal arts especially are so important to Seneca that he compares them to doctors who sell life and good health in *On Benefits*. Similarly, teachers of liberal arts sell the education of a gentleman and the cultivation of the mind (Seneca, 146). Other than learning to conform to upper class norms, Seneca underlines the importance of independent thinking. Seneca's advice for

students in *On Anger* is for them to differentiate themselves from books and make an original contribution instead of repeating philosophers like Zeno and Cleanthes (Seneca, 54). Although Seneca lived by this approach not only regarding Zeno and Cleanthes but the middle Stoics too, it is nevertheless no coincidence that he names early Stoics instead of a figure like Panaetius or Cato. Overall, Seneca's approach to higher education is well within the framework of conventional education of the time. The purpose of education is to improve students so that they can excel in their roles in society. All this, of course, is not unexpected from a philosopher who served as the adviser of an emperor.

The next major figure in the history of late Stoicism is Musonius Rufus. An Etruscan who belonged to the knightly class, Musonius Rufus identified with Nero's political victims, and he was eventually banished by the Emperor. He later returned, only to be exiled again by Emperor Vespasian (9 – 79). Eventually, however, he was recalled by Emperor Titus (39 – 81), who was a friend to him (Lutz, 14). According to J. T. Dillon, Musonius Rufus mostly taught applied Stoic ethics, and specifically he taught prudence, justice, temperance and courage. His aim in teaching philosophy was to make sure his pupils learned the good life and could act accordingly in their daily lives. Musonius Rufus was active in public affairs as a normal part of his life, however he did not set out to reform the Roman Empire (Dillon, 41-2). Tacitus says that during a conflict among Romans, Musonius Rufus was sent as a part of a peace delegation, and discoursed on the blessings of peace and the dangers of war to Vespasian's soldiers. Many ridiculed his words, and some were ready to assault him, although he stopped his discourse before they did (Tacitus). This example shows Musonius Rufus could take a great deal of personal risk for the sake of trying to realize his ideals. If he did not seek to reform the Roman Empire, that could only

mean he approved of it the way it was, even if he might have had criticisms of the acts of individual emperors.

Like Seneca, Musonius Rufus admired Cato, as he approvingly quotes one of his speeches (Musonius Rufus, 145). When kings from Syria who were subject to the Romans visited him, he said kings too should study philosophy so that they can learn to distinguish between what is good and helpful, and what is bad and harmful. According to Musonius Rufus, philosophy also enables a ruler to decide on things for their subjects and understand justice so that they can be just. Moreover, a king has to be self-controlled, and able to control his subjects (Musonius Rufus, 40-1). In short, Musonius Rufus, like all Stoics, agreed that politicians and rulers should be educated in philosophy so that they can acquire the qualities they need to rule. Musonius Rufus' political philosophy emphasizes the concept of duty over the concept of power: Kings who justify their actions to their subjects referring to their power rather than their duty soon perish (Musonius Rufus, 86). Nevertheless, the duty of a philosophical educator requires him to be close to the power of emperors and politicians, so that the latter can learn of their duties.

According to Musonius Rufus, one should not be concerned with their own city or their personal interests alone (Musonius Rufus, 61). This is not necessarily a rejection of patriotism or self-interest as he is not saying one should not be concerned with them at all. Rather, Musonius Rufus is rejecting the approach that dismisses what Seneca calls the greater commonwealth for the sake of the lesser. Although Musonius Rufus is not a utopian, cosmopolitanism is evidently very important to him. He refers to Socrates and Euripides as the original cosmopolitans who defined the world to be the common fatherland of all human beings. Moreover, he emphasizes that there is nothing evil about

being exiled – it takes nothing away from a person. In fact, Musonius Rufus notes that exile transformed Diogenes into a philosopher (Musonius Rufus, 44-5). Even if Musonius Rufus is a patriot, being forced to live elsewhere is no punishment for him due to his cosmopolitanism. Nor does exile rob one of free speech. Musonius Rufus puts forward two examples to prove the point: Diogenes, and himself (Musonius Rufus, 48). Free speech must have been dear to Musonius Rufus indeed, as it must be remembered that he risked more than exile by opposing the emperors of his time.

Musonius Rufus holds the classical Socratic position that virtue is the same for men and women, and argues that daughters should get the same education as sons, as those who train horses and dogs treat males and females the same way (Musonius Rufus, 31). While it is entirely appropriate for both men and women to have the same upbringing and education, and while all human affairs have a common basis and nothing is exclusively reserved for men or women, some things are more suited to either sex. Accordingly, Musonius Rufus says, men should not learn spinning and women should not pursue gymnastics. Males are stronger than females, so spinning and being indoors is more suitable for women while gymnastics and being outdoors is more suitable for men (Musonius Rufus, 32-3). Musonius Rufus may be inspired by what Socrates says in Plato's *Republic* about women being assigned lighter labors because they're considered physically weaker (Plato 3, 293). Unlike Plato's Socrates, who does not restrict women to domestic duties, Musonius Rufus' elaboration, however, is certainly patriarchal, as the conventional assignment of women to indoor spaces and domestic duties is one of the pillars of male dominance. Musonius Rufus continues to say that women should also study philosophy, as they have the same reasoning power as men, so that they can manage their estate and take charge of the household staff (Musonius

Rufus, 28). Compared to Socrates in Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*, where wife and her husband must manage the affairs of the household together (Xenophon, 27), Musonius Rufus is once again patriarchal for excluding men from domestic duties, with the implication that they rule over society at large while women manage their household.

Musonius Rufus puts forward his expectations from women as follows: she must be self-controlled, free from sexual inappropriateness, she must not be a slave to desires, quarrelsome, extravagant or vain. She should do the tasks some consider appropriate for slaves with her own hands. She should not bow down to anyone, even if well-born, powerful, wealthy or a tyrant. Thus, she should be brave according to Musonius Rufus, and an educated woman, trained in philosophy, is braver than the uneducated. Moreover, a female philosopher would love her children more than anyone else. Musonius Rufus holds that a woman who pursues philosophy must not cast aside her appropriate tasks, like spinning wool. A woman like this, he says, would be a great advantage for her husband and bring honor to her family (Musonius Rufus, 28-9). Once again, many of Musonius Rufus' expectations are certainly in line with those of patriarchal society. It is radical of him to say a woman should not bow down to anyone; it is hard to be sure whether this includes the husband and the father. In any case, Musonius Rufus espouses a mostly moderate form of patriarchy. His views are in line with the most important patriarchal practices and expectations of his day, but he also acknowledges a degree of equality between man and women in their intellectual capacities.

Unsurprisingly, Musonius Rufus is a defender of marriage. He believes husband and wife should come together to live with each other, to have children, and to consider all things as common possessions (Musonius Rufus, 57). He adds that marriage did not hinder Pythagoras, Socrates or

Crates from their philosophy. The philosopher is a teacher and guide regarding what human beings must do to be in accordance to nature, and the gender binary and marriage are natural. Depriving people of marriage destroys family, city and the human race (Musonius Rufus, 59-60). Musonius Rufus' views on the question of marriage is conservative, and in line with Stoic teachings starting from the middle period of this school. As the patriarch of his family and in line with customs, it was Musonius Rufus who chose a husband, a Stoic philosopher, for his daughter to marry (Dillon, 50). Moreover, he considers it right for the lawgivers to promote childbirth and honor couples who had a lot of children while forbidding women from inducing miscarriages, agreeing to be childless and preventing conception, punishing all these offenses as well as being childless (Musonius Rufus, 62). To the extent that he defends repressive measures against women who do not want to or cannot have children, Musonius Rufus can be described as a reactionary. Moreover, Musonius Rufus considers homosexuality to be a crime against humanity. Good men, he says, must only engage in sexual acts which occur in marriage and which are carried out for procreation. He considers only this to be lawful. Even if it is within marriage, he considers seeking pleasure to be wrong. As for homosexuality and adultery, especially with slave women, he considers them to be against nature (Musonius Rufus, 55). Thus, Musonius Rufus holds homophobic and conservative views on sexuality, in line with his generally patriarchal outlook.

Being an educator himself, Musonius Rufus was interested in educational philosophy. According to his approach, education should start with teaching infants the difference between what is good and helpful, what is bad and harmful, and what should and should not be done. Musonius Rufus argues that the results of this elementary ethical education

will be the same for boys and girls. Yet, while he believes the education of boys and girls should be the same, he differentiates the concept of training from education. Accordingly, they would later be trained in different crafts (Musonius Rufus, 33), which would no doubt assign them to their traditional gender roles. Though he does not dismiss the importance of training, Musonius Rufus, being a teacher of philosophy, is more interested in education. According to him, the teacher of philosophy should not use too many words and arguments but instead speak appropriately about each subject. He should use arguments that are persuasive and not easily overturned. It's very important that he practices what he preaches. In turn, the student should maintain critical thinking so that he does not inadvertently accept a falsehood. The student should seek plain proofs rather than numerous proofs, and must follow the lessons that are persuasive enough. Philosophical education is helpful only on this methodological basis. Musonius Rufus applies the same principle to youths' relationships with their parents. Accordingly, an obedient youth should listen to and follow the good advice of their parents; yet when the advice is not good, the youth should do what he should rather than what he's told. Doing this does not even make the youth disobedient (Musonius Rufus, 66). Musonius Rufus' approach to educational relations emphasizes the importance of youths' capability of questioning their elders: the students choose their own path in their education and life. Accordingly, Musonius Rufus' educational approach is student-centered.

Musonius Rufus' philosophy of education acknowledges differences between different types of students in a linear way. He believes young people who are smarter and better educated accept correct reasoning more easily and with fewer arguments. He compares a soft young man raised in luxury, with a womanish body and a dull nature with another brought up in a Spartan manner who is unaccustomed to luxury. The

first youth may perhaps agree after a thousand words that life, pleasure and wealth are not good, and death, pain and poverty are not bad, the second will readily accept the conclusions (Musonius Rufus, 24). In other words, Musonius Rufus' categorization of students is according to their inclination to accept Stoic teachings. He further argues that working the land and manual labor does not prevent one from practicing philosophy. Quite the contrary, young people would benefit less by listening to a teacher in the city than watching him work in the country (Musonius Rufus, 53). By arguing for the importance of work in teaching, Musonius Rufus continues the educational tradition upholding labor and toil started by Antisthenes (445 – 365 BC) (Zeller 1877, 306). This shows that although Musonius Rufus' politics diverge greatly from the early Stoic tradition, his educational philosophy maintained certain aspects of the classical doctrine.

Dillon says Musonius Rufus taught aspiring young men of good background, including professional students, as well more mature men of high political standing (Dillon, 36). Among the latter group were Thrasea Paetus (fl. 1st Century) and other politicians who would collectively come to be known as the Stoic martyrs. They were friends, associates, and students of Musonius Rufus, receiving from him philosophical conversation, instruction, and advice (Dillon, 52). According to Griffin, Thrasea Paetus conducted a bold political opposition to Emperor Nero which involved boycott of the Senate, non-participation in the senatorial oath taken to uphold the acts of past and present Emperors, absence from the priestly collage when vows for the Emperor's safety were taken, and absence from Empress Poppaea's (30 – 65) funeral and consecration (Griffin, 170). Thrasea Paetus and Helvidius Priscus (fl. 1st Century), his son in law who was plebeian tribune at one point (Griffin, 284), would celebrate the birthdays of Brutus and Cassius (85 – 42 BC) while

Seneca disapproved of Caesar's assassination (Griffin, 284). Tacitus quotes senator Cossutianus Capito's (fl. 1st Century) influential speech calling for the "seekers after a new world" who want to overthrow the empire to "lose their chief" (Tacitus). Without a doubt, Cossutianus Capito greatly exaggerates the political ambitions of the Stoic opposition led by Thrasea Paetus which were not nearly so radical as to seek a new world in the fashion of the early Stoics. Besides, not even Tiberius Gracchus wanted to overthrow Rome but to reform it.

In any case, Tacitus continues, the Senate condemned Thrasea Paetus to death, and although Arulenus Rusticus (35 – 93), the young and ardent Stoic plebeian tribune, offered to veto the Senate's decision, Thrasea Paetus rejected him because it would be fatal for Arulenus Rusticus but would not help him in the end (Tacitus). Demetrius the Cynic comforted Thrasea Paetus in his final hours. Numerous other Stoics were killed or banished around the same time as Thrasea's death (Griffin, 171). Helvedius Priscus was put to death later by Emperor Vespasian (Griffin, 284), while Arulenus Rusticus, by then a consul, was put to death under Emperor Domitian (51 – 96), because he was a philosopher and because he gave Thrasea Paetus the sobriquet 'holy'. A large number of others perished or were exiled on the charge of philosophizing around the same period (Penwill, 360). Overall, the Stoics of this era seem to have been a loose, heterogeneous but highly influential political movement. This movement, which expanded through education in Stoic philosophy, though not blatantly anti-monarchist, nevertheless sympathized with historical enemies of the imperial system. Fundamentally a conservative movement, evidence strongly suggests that it was considered a serious threat by the Roman ruling elites.

The most famous student of Musonius Rufus, however, was not any of the Stoic martyrs, but a slave. Probably a slave at

birth, Gill says, Epictetus was fortunate that his master, a high-ranking freedman, allowed him to study philosophy under Musonius Rufus. Later, he was freed and set himself up as a teacher in Rome, only to be banished from Italy by Domitian along with other philosophers. He settled in Nicopolis and set up a school of philosophy which became quite famous, and was even visited by Emperor Hadrian (76 – 138). His discourses were recorded by Arrian (89 – 146), one of his students (Gill, 9). In these discourses, Epictetus notably gives a very sympathetic account of the Cynics which nevertheless leaves out the most extreme aspects of this school (Epictetus, 152-9). In line with the late Stoic tradition, he holds that slaves and slave-owners are brothers. Even if some men rule over slaves, they should not forget this brotherhood and act like tyrants (Epictetus, 50). The person who lives as he wishes, who can neither be constrained, nor hindered, nor compelled, whose motives are unimpeded, who achieves his desires and does not make mistakes, is free. No one of bad character is free, however, they're slaves (Epictetus, 176). Neither wealth, nor a consul's post, nor a kingdom makes a man his own master but the knowledge of the art of living (Epictetus, 180). Thus even a slave can be free, in line with the doctrines of both the Cynic and Stoic schools. Additionally, while slaves always want to be free, when they are freed they either have to face miserable conditions or end up miserable because of their mistakes, and in the end find themselves wishing to be slaves again (Epictetus, 178). In short, Epictetus, like the rest of the late Stoics, is no abolitionist; however, his sensitivity to the conditions of the slaves, including the circumstances they face after they are freed is noteworthy. Lastly, he believes that human beings are born for fidelity. Women are common property by nature only like a pig is the common property of those invited to the meal, but then the portions are handed out. (Epictetus, 81). In short, Epictetus defends the patriarchal

monogamy of conventional society where men chose their portion, and women are handed out by their fathers.

According to Dillon, Epictetus' classroom shared major characteristics with that of his teacher Musonius Rufus. The teacher would lecture and discourse; students would do exercises, readings and recitation; they would also write compositions. Socratic discussion formed an important part of this educational approach where emphasis was made on training on virtue. In the end, students would be evaluated by the teacher. Epictetus, like his teacher, was outspokenly critical of his students when necessary (Dillon, 59-60). We can see that the teacher occupies a critically important guiding role in this educational process in what appears to be a scholarly interpretation of Cynics' teacher-centered approach. Epictetus' motto that one should never call oneself a philosopher, or for the most part talk about philosophical principles in front of laymen, since what matters is that one acts according to these principles (Epictetus, 231) is a good example. Epictetus explicitly shows his admiration of the Cynic approach of teaching by example of lifestyle which is to be imitated by the student (Epictetus, 154). Nevertheless, Epictetus' pedagogy, and especially his model of classroom, encompassing multiple ways of learning, does not contradict the student-centered approach of late Stoicism, requiring the active participation of students rather than positioning them as passive learners and imitators. It is important to note the difference between the apparently similar early Stoic inclusion of dialectics in the curriculum, and Epictetus' methodological practice of Socratic discussion. For the first, it is the core doctrine that is to be passed over, while the latter is mainly interested in developing virtue. Hence, apparently similar educational practices tilt towards teacher-centered and student-centered approaches respectively, though of course neither are extreme examples.

Epictetus cautions against unnatural and extraordinary educational practices. Not everything that is difficult or dangerous is suitable, only practices that contribute to achieving the goal of getting what we desire, and avoiding what we want to avoid should be adopted (Epictetus, 141). This is not to say Epictetus thinks we should give in to our inclinations. Quite the contrary, because we're inclined to pleasure, he thinks we should train against it, and because we're inclined to avoid hard work, we should train to be comfortable with it. These educational principles Epictetus inherits from his teacher and a series of Cynic and Stoic philosophers going back to Antisthenes. Moreover, he sees another field of education as being able to act in a reasonable way, and being concerned with what is plausible and attractive. The former can be considered a general position of Stoicism, while the latter is rather an educational goal in line with later Stoicism. Lastly, Epictetus concludes from the Socratic motto stating we should not live an unexamined life that we should not accept any impression without subjecting it to examination (Epictetus, 142). Thus, Epictetus too continues the Stoic emphasis on the importance of critical thinking in education.

The two major Stoics following Epictetus were his student Arrian, and Junius Rusticus (100 – 170), who was probably the grandson of Arulenus Rusticus. According to Themistius (317 – 390) these philosophers obtained positions of power not because they sought power, but because Emperor Hadrian pulled them away from their books, refusing to let them be mere pen-and-ink philosophers, and escorted them to the general's tent as well as to the speaker's platform. Emperors Antoninus Pius (86-161) and Marcus Aurelius continued to make use of them after Hadrian. The two philosophers achieved great successes in war and became consuls, governed Rome and presided over the Senate (Themistius,

215). According to Julius Capitolinus (fl. 4th Century), Marcus Aurelius received most of his education from Junius Rusticus, and in fact became his disciple. Marcus Aurelius shared all his public and private counsels with his teacher, and following his death he asked the senate to honor him with statues (Julius Capitolinus). Marcus Aurelius himself says that the first thing he learned from Junius Rusticus was that his life needed some redress and cure. Under his teacher's influence, Marcus Aurelius avoided the ambition of sophists, as well as writing common theorems, exhorting men unto virtue and the study of philosophy by giving speeches. Thus, he says he gave up the study of rhetoric and poetry. He learned to read with diligence, never satisfied with a light and superficial knowledge, never quickly assenting to things commonly spoken of. Marcus Aurelius is also thankful of his teacher for giving him a copy of the discourses of Epictetus. Moreover, Marcus Aurelius had another Stoic teacher, Apollonius, who he says taught him true liberty, invariable steadfastness, and not to have regrets, along with common theories of Stoic philosophy (Aurelius, 13). In short, Marcus Aurelius received an education that truly shaped him in the tradition of late Stoic philosophy. Thus, with him, the Stoic movement finally conquered ultimate political power, the Roman Empire itself, above all thanks to education.

According to Paul Watson, Marcus Aurelius had feelings of benevolence towards the slaves, but also wanted to avoid slave uprisings, and balance the interests of the small free population and the distress of the slaves and freedmen (Watson, 89). Hadrian and Antoninus Pius had passed laws banning the killing of slaves for no reason, and punishing such act as if the slave of someone else was killed (Watson, 90). Marcus Aurelius introduced a law where every injury a master suffered because of a slave was encouraged to be brought before the law, so that they would not take the

punishment of their slaves into their own hands. This way, the custom of torturing the slaves to obtain evidence became a last resort (Watson, 90-1). Watson concludes that Marcus Aurelius' position about the slaves was as follows: As long as the masters were just and kind towards their slaves, he felt that the slaves were bound to obey their masters (Watson, 92). Marcus Aurelius was clearly not an abolitionist. At most, he was a benevolent representative of the free population and a mild reformer. This being said, the fact that he tried makes it likely that he agreed with the late Stoic philosophers about the humanity of the slaves.

The historical figures Marcus Aurelius looks up to are Cato, Brutus and Thræsea. He desires an equal commonwealth, administered by justice and equality; a kingdom which puts the good and welfare of the subjects above all (Aurelius, 14). His city and country, as Marcus Aurelius, is Rome; but as a man, it is the whole world (Aurelius, 40). Thus he can be considered a patriot and a cosmopolitan at the same time, and in fact this sort of a cosmopolitanism is in line with an expansionist civilization like the Roman Empire. Following the tradition of Stoicism since its middle period, Marcus Aurelius is no utopian. "I must not expect a Plato's commonwealth," he says, "but be content of even a little progress" (Aurelius, 59). Indeed, compared to the empire Marcus Aurelius was ruling, even the realistic Platonic utopia of *the Laws* is radical. Lastly, it should also be mentioned that, as Anthony Birley says, the Stoic emperor was a great patron of education. He granted an annual salary to teachers of every intellectual discipline in Athens for the benefit of humanity. Among these teachers were four chairs of philosophy, a Platonist, an Aristotelian, a Stoic and an Epicurean, along with a chair of rhetoric (Birley, 195). Thus, Marcus Aurelius was not partisan in his Stoicism, and did not impose his own philosophy on the educational field, instead allowing different schools of philosophy, including ones he disagreed with, flourish with state support.

The Stoics seems to have received no preferential treatment under Marcus Aurelius' rule, though likely he gave them no cause for complaint. It would be hard to claim any of the middle or late Stoics would be dissatisfied with the rule of Marcus Aurelius. All evidence regarding the views and rule of Marcus Aurelius demonstrate that he ruled like a true late Stoic, bringing philosophy to power. Perhaps had Marcus Aurelius used his power to promote the philosophical tradition he belonged to, however, he would not end up as the last of the major Stoics. There is no indication that the Stoic Emperor made any attempts to make his philosophy the doctrine of the state. Thus, his influence did not outlive his reign, and it did not prevent the eventual downfall of philosophy in the Western world. In this sense, his reign was a missed opportunity not just for Stoicism but for philosophy itself.

The middle Stoics had tried to defend the republican traditions of Rome. The late Stoics defended the same traditions, as well as those of the middle Stoics. Although it was the enemies of the middle Stoics who had turned Rome into an empire, the late Stoics found an important place for themselves in imperial politics both as educators and as political actors. Late Stoic politicians were as bold conservatives as their predecessors, and the setbacks they suffered only strengthened their movement. On the question of gender, late Stoics retained patriarchal values while insisting on women's education. Both aspects of their views on gender served the needs of the movement well: they were not bereft of the contribution of women, and they were in line with the values of the elites of the Roman civilization. The late Stoics eventually succeeded in what the early and middle Stoics failed at: the conquest of the Roman Empire. Yet, Marcus Aurelius apparently did not act on behalf of the Stoic movement, and the failure of late Stoicism came

in being treated as an equal to other schools of philosophy by the Stoic emperor. Stoicism's fall into obscurity so soon after its apparent triumph shows that, despite its relative success compared to the earlier versions of the movement, late Stoicism too ended up a failure.

Late Stoicism was a natural continuation of middle Stoicism to such an extent that the division itself may well seem arbitrary. Above all, what separates middle and late Stoicism is a process of maturation, related to the latter's attempt to systematize its political and above all educational philosophy. Late Stoicism proved that political conservatism and a student-centered educational philosophy based on critical thinking were not incompatible. Such an approach was more suitable to the needs of their elite student profile. This shift to student-centered pedagogy has to be understood within the context of the political reality middle and above all late Stoics operated in. The early Stoic educational approach had envisaged educating leaders towards realizing the extremist utopian goals of the movement. Accordingly, it was not appealing for the education of the members of elite families for the overwhelming part. Late Stoicism had no such goals, and its conservatism made it appealing to the same circles that would have shunned the extremist utopian politics of original Stoicism. The student profile of the Stoic movement had already dramatically changed with middle Stoicism and although the middle Stoics had lost against the populists, the Empire established by the latter furthered this situation. Seneca could believe Nero was no different than a common slave, yet the political reality he was faced with necessitated that he treat Nero differently than he would treat a slave. The students of the late Stoics were overwhelmingly members of the elites trying to further their political careers. They required an education that revolved around this goal. A teacher-centered pedagogy which had as its purpose the

transmission of a doctrine was thus replaced by a student-centered pedagogy which had as its purpose making the doctrine serve the needs of the student. Needless to say, this was a mild form of student-centered pedagogy comparable to the Platonist approach rather than an extreme form like that of Socrates.

Conclusion

This chapter followed the trajectory of the three periods of Stoicism called early, middle and late, as a philosophical, political and educational movement aiming for power. I have observed deep differences between the early period of the Stoic school, and its middle and late periods. While early Stoicism is an extremely radical current regarding politics, gender and education, aiming for a meritocratic or sophocratic communist utopia, middle and late Stoicism are not radical at all, but in fact conservative. It is this radical extremism that makes early Stoicism the only known current of ancient philosophy to have produced an abolitionist revolutionary, Gaius Blossius. The defeat of Gaius Blossius and his comrades in Rome and Pergamon, and the triumph of conservatives certainly contributed to the revision of much of old Stoicism by Panaetius and his followers, who became important players in the game for political power and eventually conquered the post of the Emperor after many setbacks. Among the revisions of the Stoic doctrine was the changes made to make it compatible with traditional gender roles and patriarchal customs. For early, and middle and late Stoicism alike, education was the main tool of political activity. Stoics became educators of politicians, who in some cases became Stoics themselves. In the case of Gaius Blossius, who represented the culmination of early Stoicism, as well as Cato, who represented the rejection of early Stoicism, the armed philosopher at the opposite ends of the political

spectrum, education was not the only major tool of political activity, though they were both defeated as ultimately it was not the social movements he participated in but the power of their moderate enemies who had the spirit of time behind it.

Nevertheless, Early Stoics were among the more successful ancient philosophical movements in terms of getting near their goals. Despite their eventual failure, in the person of Gaius Blossius, the early Stoics were the only radical Socratic movement that managed to make a real bid for power. Middle and late Stoics were even more successful, with plenty of failed attempts to influence the course of history, culminating in their ultimate victory in the reign of Emperor Marcus Aurelius. In turn, the failure of conservative Stoics was in Marcus Aurelius ruling like a moderate reformist, and confining Stoicism to mainstream higher education. There are no known early Stoic women, but this should be attributed the tendency not to record women of lower classes, especially slaves, a demographic with good reason to find early Stoic views on gender attractive. There are not many middle and late Stoic women either, however the fact that there are some whose names have been recorded demonstrate that the late Stoics version of patriarchy had benevolent aspects like the Pythagoreans, benefited Stoicism especially when it came to educating women. That we do not see great revisions within the quite heterogeneous early Stoicism shows that it for a while successfully functioned like the Cynic teacher-centered pedagogy. Following the revision of Stoicism at the hands of Panaetius, the availability of Stoic education increasingly became restricted to an elite, whose needs were not fulfilled by following the philosophy of a superstar teacher. Accordingly, Stoic education drastically evolved to meet its new educational goals. Given the relative success of Stoicism in its different periods, it can be concluded that both educational models served the Stoics sufficiently when practiced.

Chapter 7

Conclusion

It should be apparent by now that the modern and popular understanding of ancient Western philosophical movements quoted earlier from *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* are completely superficial at best, and grossly inaccurate at worst. For example, as David Hansen notes, original Cynicism deeply differs from the modern conception, having a strong sense of value, rather than being nihilistic about the worthiness of life (Hansen, 5). It is not an insignificant distant historic memory that is blurred by the generally superficial and often inaccurate understanding of ancient Western philosophy in the eyes of the public, but the roots of modern intellectual discourse, not only political and educational, but also scientific and metaphysical. In turn, this lack of understanding strongly contributes to a lack of understanding about our modern world, which can never be properly comprehended without trying to make some sense of its past.

In the ancient Western world, all education, mainstream and philosophical, were political. Mainstream education, encompassing family, craft, elementary, and liberal arts, above all rhetorical education, was indirectly political, naturally preparing new generations to life in an ever-changing civilization. Philosophical education, on the other hand, was directly political in most cases. All the philosophical

movements of the antiquity I studied, Pythagoreans, Socratics, Platonics, Cynics, and Stoics, used education as their main activity to realize their political goals of taking power and determining the direction of the progress of society. These movements tended to use two different kinds of education: education for the masses, which had the characteristic of propaganda, and education for the students of philosophy, which had the characteristic of indoctrination. This way, philosophical movements tried to create a solid core and public support.

Karl Marx' (1818 – 1883) famous dictum stating that “Philosophers have hitherto only interpreted the world in various ways; the point is to change it” (Marx) cannot be considered to be accurate for ancient philosophy. These philosophical movements of the ancient West did not only try to interpret the world but actively tried to change it, even though they largely failed to realize their political goals. The most important reason was that the spirit of time was not behind them, or that they weren't in line with the general character of their era that determined its dominant tendency. Because their views were not in line with the reality of their societies, it was difficult for them to gain popularity. This was especially true for the radicals, who envisaged egalitarian and communal utopias in a society of patriarchy, slavery and class discrimination, but it was true for conservatives too as they yearned for a society that was left behind by history. It is because of their political failure that they are rather remembered for their interpretations of the world as political as well as educational theory in the Western world originated with these movements. We should not forget that the theories of these movements were created in order to help them change the world rather than purely being tools of interpretation.

The philosophical movements of the antiquity all had different if sometimes similar goals. The heart of the conflict among these various movements was regarding their relation

to civilization. Radical and extremist critics of civilization, and its conservative and reactionary defenders remained on the sidelines of mainstream politics, dominated by moderates who were open to change but also wanted to preserve this or that aspect of civilization according to need. Radicals, such as Socrates (470 – 399 BC) and certain Platonists at least wanted to drastically change the course of civilization, while extremists such as the Cynics and the early Stoics wanted to subvert or even destroy it. However, while the ultimate goal of conservatives and reactionaries was to preserve civilization, this vision also required significant social change due to the constantly changing and evolving nature of civilization. Hence, Pythagoreanism was overthrown by democrats, and middle Stoicism defeated by the populists. Overwhelmingly, it was the moderates, regardless of whether they leaned towards democracy or oligarchy, who remained at the helm of civilization with the spirit of time behind them.

Although the philosophical movements all failed to realize their most important political goal, that is dominating the direction of social progress, they claimed certain smaller but nevertheless far from insignificant victories. For one, despite failing to dominate politics on a long term, some of these movements, especially Pythagoreanism, and Stoicism posed significant challenges to the mainstream establishment at times. The success of Platonism was its extraordinary longevity and survival into the late medieval period, while for the Cynics it was the existence of an orthodoxy faithful to the original doctrine throughout centuries. It was above all with the martyrdom of Socrates that philosophy became somewhat respected, though not accepted by a society alien, and potentially hostile to its many doctrines.

One clear lesson of ancient Western philosophy is that trying to cause significant social change feeds theoretical attempts, in other words politics breeds philosophy. Moderates, regardless of whether they were democrats,

oligarchs or tyrants were overwhelmingly neither philosophers nor theorists but politicians, involved in the day to day running of mainstream political affairs. Perhaps surprisingly, the moderates did not produce major political theorists. Other than Isocrates (436 – 338 BC), the rhetorician father of liberal arts whose expensive school prepared would be politicians (Kimball, 25), the moderates did not produce a major educational theorist either. This lack of moderate theorists was to an extent mended by the contributions of conservative or radical philosophers who moderated their views, such as Archytas (428 – 347 BC), mature Plato (427 – 347 BC) and Marcus Aurelius (121 – 180). In other words, for the most part it was thanks to philosophers who were revisionists within their own conservative or radical traditions that the moderate political tendency acquired theorists to base itself on.

Factors such as patriarchy and slavery prevented significant segments of the ancient Western population from participating in mainstream politics or receiving a mainstream education. The philosophical movements provided an important though limited outlet for individuals from these segments to receive an education and in certain cases, become a teacher as well, thus engaging in political activity, famous examples being Sosipatra (fl. 4th Century) and Hypatia (370 – 415). It was not just the radicals and extremists who made a strong emphasis on women's education. Differing from the mainstream as well as the reactionaries, most conservatives stressed the necessity of giving some sort of education to women within a patriarchal framework. In turn, radicals and especially extremists sometimes suffered from having views on gender and slavery that were too much outside the norms of ancient Western society, and accordingly their views had to be moderated. Plato's revisions of Socrates, Demetrius' (fl. 1st Century) revisions of the Cynics, and Panaetius (185 – 110 BC) and his students' revisions of the early Stoics all point to

the discomfort caused by the radical and extremist attitudes on gender and slavery.

It was Aristotle (384 – 322), known for his views against women and slaves, who was chosen by the medieval world to represent ancient philosophy, though as we have seen, his approach represented a small minority in the ancient West. The ancient views on gender, and philosopher women of the ancient Western world that we have discussed has been an inspiration for women in the intellectual sphere for millennia. For example, Laura Cereta (1469 – 1499) cited the ancient Babylonian, Chaldean, Egyptian, Ethiopian, Greek and Roman scholars, authors, prophetesses, and leaders (Cereta, 76-8). Marie de Gournay (1545 – 1645) based her arguments for the equality of men and women on the existence of Pythagorean philosopher women as well as Hypatia (de Gournay, 77), Diotima (fl. 5th century BC) and Aspasia (470 – 400 BC) (de Gournay, 79), along with Socrates' approach in Plato's Republic, as well as that of Antisthenes (445 – 365 BC) (de Gournay, 82). All this is enough to demonstrate that the ancient criticisms of the patriarchal order were not in vain, and that all these philosophical schools had an indirect political impact. The same can be said about criticisms of discrimination against slaves, and the existence of slave philosophers such as Diogenes (412 – 323 BC) and Epictetus (50 – 135). As David Hansen says, Diogenes and his extreme cosmopolitanism was an important influence on the intellectual awakening in the Western world of the 17th and 18th centuries, to the extent that encyclopedist Jean le Rond d'Alembart (1717 – 1783) remarked that: "Every age, above all ours, needs its Diogenes" (Hansen, 4-5). These influences provide an important clue about how the ancient tradition of philosophy could have an effect which could be felt a thousand years after most philosophical movements perished. By providing new visions of who was to be educated, ancient philosophy reshaped notions of who should have a cultural

and political voice. The fact that slavery has been wiped out almost completely, and women have near universal access to education today is not disconnected from the philosophical views developed on gender and slavery in antiquity.

While the educational philosophies of the movements in question were naturally in line with their political outlook, they were not determined by it but evolved according to the characteristics of the movement. Of the ancient movements studied, Pythagoreanism, middle and late Stoicism and some currents within Platonism were found to be conservative, Aristotelianism was found to be reactionary, the early Socratic movement and some currents within Platonism were found to be radical, and Cynicism and early Stoicism were found to be extremists. Educationally, Pythagoreanism, Cynicism and early Stoicism were found to be teacher-centered, the early Socratic movement, late Stoicism, and to a lesser extent Platonism were found to be student-centered. In other words, political conservatism or radicalism did not dictate teacher or student-centered pedagogy. What dictated the educational approach of a movement was the political function of education in the eyes of the movement. For example, the Pythagoreans wanted an educational system that made sure the students followed what the master said, hence their approach was teacher-centered, whereas the late Stoics wanted to influence the children of the elites through education, hence they preferred a student-centered approach. Socrates wanted his students to realize their ignorance and lack of wisdom and consequently develop critical thinking, hence his approach was student-centered, whereas the Cynics and early Stoics wanted to transmit a well-defined doctrine and way of life to their students as the path to wisdom, hence preferring a teacher-centered approach.

Similarly, the metaphysical theory a movement subscribed did not determine its political or educational philosophy. Pythagoreanism, the early Socratic movement and Platonism

were idealistic, while Aristotelianism, Cynicism and Stoicism were materialistic. Nevertheless, the political, educational and metaphysical views of ancient philosophers formed more or less coherent wholes, leading to systematic doctrines. The most important factor that contributed to the incoherence of their views was the conflict between their ideals and the impact of the reality of the societies they lived in. Hence extremist schools like the Cynics and the Stoics could be opposed to the patriarchy and social misogynists at the same time. Even if arguably these apparently contradictory positions were both in line with their general world-views, they nevertheless had the implication of establishing a hierarchy of genders, a phenomenon both these currents actually wanted to abolish.

It could be argued that education was the primary activity of the philosophical movements of the ancient West because it was the only way through which they could pursue their political aims. Such an argument would not be fully accurate, considering as early as the 4th Century, an abolitionist Christian movement called Circumcelliones emerged in North Africa, forming military bands to free slaves and overthrow existing social order (Jones and Ereira, 327). The Circumcelliones were a religious rather than a philosophical movement, but they showed what the most extreme of the philosophical movements, with the possible exception of Gaius Blossius (fl. 2nd Century BC) could have done, but did not do. The reality was that education was the only peaceful path for the ancient philosophical movements to take for the most part, and though maybe they realized it was not going to be enough to reach their goals, they did not stray from it. Even Gaius Blossius who joined a rebellion against Rome in order to realize the Stoic utopia did so as an educator. Nevertheless, the ancient relationship between politics and education shows that education is a form of activity that is effective and necessary but not sufficient for the realization of political goals.

Philosophy survived the antiquity largely in the form of Neoplatonism. Roman Emperor Justinian's (484 – 565) measures against Pagan philosophers limited Western thought to a Christian version of Neoplatonism (Monfasani, 182), the founder of which, St. Augustine (354 – 430), did not consider himself a philosopher (Spade). Thus, philosophy had to flee the land of its birth. The Arab conquests of Eastern cities of the Roman Empire where philosophers, above all Neoplatonists had managed to survive despite Justinian's measures against them provided them protection as well as an opportunity to spread philosophy to the Arab world. Syriac Christians and Muslims collaborated in a remarkable campaign to translate Greek texts into Arabic, either directly or via Syriac or Persian. Soon, the works of philosophers like Plato, Aristotle, Plotinus (205 – 270), Proclus (412 – 485), and others were translated, and the curriculum used by the schools in places like Alexandria were put into practice (O'Meera, 186). Philosophy survived and flourished in the East, but with the exception of the Brethren of Purity, which emerged in the second half of the 10th century in Basra as a secret society (Koç, 91), it did not manage to form movements like it did in the antiquity. It was not until the twelfth century, thanks to translations efforts launched due to Western exposure to the Greek and Islamic worlds during the First Crusade, that philosophy was to return to the West (Spade). Again, philosophy flourished, but it did so without establishing political and educational movements arguably until modern times. Philosophy survived and continued to develop, but it had lost so monumentally in the Western world at the end of the antiquity that it has not managed to recover even the small amount of might it mustered back then.

Could philosophy have a more powerful influence? Perhaps a more favorable outcome for philosophy was possible. However, because the ancient philosophical movements were marginal elements, the question of whether

civilization could be subverted, destroyed or preserved as it was, especially using education as the main form of political activity, has to be answered negatively. Because the philosophers lacked the elements of power due to their marginalization, it was impossible then, and it is questionable whether it is possible today. The ancient philosophers were overwhelmingly restricted to the margins of the society, with very little influence on mainstream society. The lead cause of this marginalization was the fact that they dared to think and be different. Accordingly, they were up against the social forces that maintained mainstream society, and these forces exceeded the might of their teachings. Even philosopher emperors like Julian and Marcus Aurelius, who were certainly not marginalized in their time but who stand out as marginal elements among the long list of Roman emperors who were not philosophers, demonstrate the extreme difficulty of making immediate change through education alone. This does not mean there is not tremendous value in the efforts of ancient philosophers. The endeavor of the ancients deserves to be remembered and studied for being the first political and educational debate to try to consciously shape the direction of civilization, something which has never been achieved in the sense the ancients understood it. Hence, ancient Western philosophy remains one of the most important subjects to study for those who want to bring social and political change through education, a very difficult task.

The lessons of ancient philosophy shed light on how to move forward. First of all, while education is vital for social and political change, it is not enough by itself and needs to be accompanied by other social and political activity. The experience of ancient philosophy shows that even having education as the main rather than only political activity was a factor which made the realization of political goals extremely difficult. Secondly, bringing major social and political change alone is impossible, and individual educators are most useful

when part of philosophical movements, where education is shaped according to its political function. Thirdly, education can enable marginalized groups an opportunity to have a political voice, which creates a powerful impact on human memory that can endure for centuries and even millennia. The question of who is doing philosophy can be as important a factor as the content of the said philosophy, and it is certainly not cut off from the content either. Lastly, educational efforts towards social and political change take a lot of time to yield results and often involve significant setbacks; hence, the educator needs to be patient, and accept that the changes they want to bring may well be realized in hundreds if not thousands of years.

The intrinsic link between politics and education naturally continued to exist throughout the ages. Accordingly, those studying education can bring the philosophical movements of the antiquity into dialogue with the rare philosophical movements of the medieval era along with its many philosophers, as well as the political movements and philosophical tendencies of modern times through systematic comparison. Such a study would demonstrate that the essential issues have remained constant through thousands of years: even today, the conflict between conservative and radical approaches, and the debate over teacher-centered and student-centered education continues. It is impossible to fully understand politics and education today without studying the similarities and differences between ancient, medieval and modern philosophies. In this sense, I hope this study will contribute to a better understanding of the ancient roots of our current political and educational existence.

References

- Africa, Thomas W. "Aristonicus, Blossius, and the City of the Sun". *International Review of Social History*, Vol. 6, No. 1 (1961).
- Allen, Michael J. B. *The Platonism of Marsilio Ficino*. (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1984)
- Anonymous. *The Cynic Epistles: A Study Edition*. (Atlanta, GA: The Society of Biblical Literature, 2006).
- Anonymous. *The Golden Verses*. <https://sacred-texts.com/cla/gvp/gvp03.htm> (11.24.2020).
- Anonymous. *The Suda*. <https://www.cs.uky.edu/~raphael/sol/sol-html/> (11/29/2019).
- Archytas, "On Disciplines". *Life of Pythagoras or Pythagoric Life*. (Rochester: Inner Traditions International, 1986).
- Archytas. "Political Fragments". *The Pythagorean Writings*. (Kew Gardens: Selene Books, 1986).
- Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).
- Aristotle. *On the Generation of Animals*. (E-book: University of Adelaide, 2015).
- Aristotle. *Politics*. <http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/politics.html> (11/29/2019).
- Asmis, Elizabeth, "Basic Education in Epicureanism". *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*. (Leiden: Brill, 2001).
- Athenaeus. *Deipnosophists*. <http://www.attalus.org/old/athenaeus.html> (4/23/2020).
- Aurelius, Marcus. *Meditations*. (E-book: The Project Gutenberg, 2001).

- Austin, M. M. *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).
- Babbitt, Frank Cole. "Introduction". *Moralia*, vol 1. (London: William Heinemann, 1927).
- Badian, E. "Guilty of Unconstitutional Behavior". *Tiberius Gracchus: Destroyer or Reformer of the Republic*. (Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath and Company, 1970).
- Baltzly, Dirk, "Proclus and Theodore of Asine on Female Philosopher-rulers: Patriarchy, Metempsychosis and Women in the Neoplatonic Commentary Tradition," https://www.academia.edu/7511616/Proclus_and_Theodore_of_Asine_on_female_philosopher-rulers_patriarchy_metempsychosis_and_women_in_the_Neoplontic_commentary_tradition_Ancient_Philosophy_33_2_2013_403-24 (11/29/2019)
- Bertram, Christopher. *Jean Jacques Rousseau*. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/rousseau/> (5/29/2021).
- Birley, Anthony R. *Marcus Aurelius: A Biography*. (New York, NY: Routledge, 2000).
- Boyer, Carl. *A History of Mathematics*. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1979).
- Branham, R. Bracht and Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé. "Introduction". *The Cynics: The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and Its Legacy*. (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1996).
- Brosius, Bernhard. *From Çayönü to Çatalhöyük: Emergence and Development of an Egalitarian Society*. http://www.urkommunismus.de/catalhueyuek_en.html (2/18/2021).
- Brunt, P. A. "The Aims of Alexander". *Alexander the Great: A Reader*. (London: Routledge, 2005).
- Burnet, John. *Greek Philosophy Part 1: Thales to Plato*. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1928).
- Capitolinus, Julius. *Historia Augusta*. http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Historia_Augusta/Marcus_Aurelius/1*.html (4/27/2020).
- Carrick, Paul. *Medical Ethics in the Ancient World*. (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2001).

- Cereta, Laura. *Collected Letters of a Renaissance Feminist*. (Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press, 1997).
- Chrysostom, Dio. *Diogenes, or on Virtue*. http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Dio_Chrysostom/Discourses/8*.html (2/10/2020).
- Chrysostom, Dio. *Diogenes, or on Servants*. http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Dio_Chrysostom/Discourses/10*.html (2/10/2020).
- Chrysostom, Dio. *In Athens, About his Banishment*. http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Dio_Chrysostom/Discourses/13*.html (2/10/2020).
- Chrysostom, Dio. *On Kingship 1*. http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Dio_Chrysostom/Discourses/1*.html
- Chrysostom, Dio. *On Kingship 3*. http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Dio_Chrysostom/Discourses/3*.html (2/10/2020).
- Chrysostom, Dio. *On Slavery and Freedom 1*. http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Dio_Chrysostom/Discourses/14*.html (2/10/2020).
- Chrysostom, Dio. *On Training for Public Speaking*. http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Dio_Chrysostom/Discourses/18*.html (2/10/2020).
- Chrysostom, Dio. *On Tyranny*. http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Dio_Chrysostom/Discourses/6*.html (2/10/2020).
- Chrysostom, Dio. *The Euboean Discourse, or The Hunter*. http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Dio_Chrysostom/Discourses/7*.html (2/10/2020).
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *De Officiis*. (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1928).
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *On Friendship*. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *On Invention*. https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/On_Invention (5/26/2021).
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *On the Republic*. <http://www.attalus.org/info/republic.html> (3/3/2021).

- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *The Academic Questions, Treatise de Finibus, and Tusculan Disputations*. (London: George Bell and Sons, 1880).
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *Tusculan Disputations*. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1886).
- Clastres, Pierre. *Society Against the State*. (New York: Zone Books, 1989).
- Clay, Diskin. "The Origins of the Socratic Dialogue". *The Socratic Movement*. (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994).
- Clement of Alexandria. *The Stromata*. <https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0210.htm> (4/23/2020).
- Csikszentmihalyi, Mark. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/confucius/> (3/12/21).
- Curren, Randall. "Aristotle's Educational Politics and the Aristotelian Renaissance in Philosophy of Education". *Oxford Review of Education*, Vol. 36. No 5. Political and Philosophical Perspectives on Education. Part 1 (October 2010).
- Dawson, Doayne. *Cities of the Gods: Communist Utopias in Greek Thought*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992).
- De Gournay, Marie le Jars. *Apology for the Woman Writing and Other Works*. (Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press, 2002).
- De Vogel, C. J. *Pythagoras and Early Pythagoreanism*. (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1966).
- Desmond, William. *Cynics*. (Stocksfield: Acumen, 2008).
- Dewey, John. "The Teacher and the Public". *Teachers, Leaders and Schools: Essays by John Dewey*. (Carbonale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2010).
- Dillon, J. T. *Musonius Rufus and Education in the Good Life: A Model of Teaching Virtue*. (Dallas, TX: University Press of America, 2004).
- Dillon, John. *The Heirs of Plato: A Study of the Old Academy*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005).
- Diogenes of Oinoanda, *The Inscription*, <http://newepicurean.com/suggested-reading/diogenes-of-oinoanda/> (3/12/2021).
- Dorion, Louis-Andre. "Xenophon's Socrates". *A Companion to Socrates*. (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006).

- Doty, Ralph. "Chrysippus' Theory of Education". *The Journal of Thought*, Vol. 20, No. 2 (Summer 1985).
- Dudley, Donald R. *A History of Cynicism: From Diogenes to the 6th Century A. D.* (London: Meuthen & Co. Ltd, 1937).
- Dudley, Donald R. "Blossius of Cumae". *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 31 (1941).
- Duff, J. D. "Introduction". *The Civil War, Books I-X.* (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1962).
- Dzielska, Maria, "Learned Women in the Alexandrian Scholarship". *What Happened to the Ancient Library of Alexandria?* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).
- Epictetus. *Discourses, Fragments, Handbook.* (E-book: Oxford University Press, 2014)
- Eunapius. *Lives of the Philosophers and Sophists.* http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/eunapius_02_text.htm (11/29/2019).
- Euripides. *Medea.* (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2008).
- Ficino, Marsilio. *Commentary on Plato's Symposium on Love.* (Dallas, TX: Spring Publications, 1985)
- Filonik, Jakub. *Athenian Impiety Trials: A Reappraisal.* https://www.academia.edu/5355670/Athenian_imp_iety_trials_a_reappraisal_2013 (8/16/2019).
- Fortunati, Leopoldina. *The Arcane of Reproduction: Housework, Prostitution, Labor and Capital.* (New York: Autonomedia, 1995).
- Fraser, Chris. *Mohism.* <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/mohism/> (3/12/2021).
- Gersh, Stephen. *Middle Platonism and Neoplatonism.* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1986).
- Gill, Mary-Louise. *Method and Metaphysics in Plato's Sophist and Statesman.* <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/plato-sophstate/> (3/19/2021).
- Gray, Peter. "Play as a Foundation for Hunter-gatherer Social Existence". *American Journal of Play*, 1. (Rochester: The Strong, 2009).

- Griffin, Miriam T. *Nero: The End of a Dynasty*. (New York, NY: Routledge, 2001).
- Griffith, Mark, "Public and Private in Early Greek Institutions of Education," *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*. (Leiden: Brill, 2001).
- Guthrie, W. K. C. *Plato and His Dialogues: Earlier Period*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975).
- Guthrie, W. K. C. *Socrates*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971).
- Guthrie, W. K. C. *The Later Plato and the Academy*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978).
- Guthrie, W. K. C. *The Sophists*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977).
- Hallett, Judith. "Women in the Ancient Roman World". *Women's Roles in Ancient Civilizations*. (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999).
- Hansen, David T. "Walking with Diogenes: Cosmopolitan Accents in Philosophy and Education". *Philosophy of Education*. (2009).
- Hegel, G. W. F. *Shorter Logic*. <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/hegel/works/sl/> (11.24.2020).
- Henry, Madeleine M. *Prisoner of History: Aspasia of Miletus and Her Biographical Tradition*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).
- Heraclitus. *Fragments: A Text and Translation with a Commentary* by T. M. Robinson. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2023).
- Herodotus. *History*. [https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/The_History_of_Herodotus_\(Rawlinson\)](https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/The_History_of_Herodotus_(Rawlinson)) (12.9.2018).
- Hesiod. *Works and Days*. <https://sacred-texts.com/cla/hesiod/works.htm> (3/12/2021).
- Higgins, C. Francis. *Gorgias*. <https://www.iep.utm.edu/gorgias/> (8/16/2019).
- Hill, Lisa. "The First Wave of Feminism: Were the Stoics Feminists?". *History of Political Thought*, Vol.22, No. 1 (Spring 2001).
- Huizenga, Anette Bourland. *Moral Education for Women in the Pastoral and Pythagorean Letters: Philosophers of the Household*. (Leiden: Brill, 2013).

- Iamblichus. *On the Pythagorean Life*. (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1989).
- Irvin, Terence. *Classical Thought*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).
- Isaac, Benjamin. *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004).
- Johnson, Patricia Cannon. "The Neoplatonists and the Mystery Schools of the Mediterranean". *The Library of Alexandria: Center of Learning in the Ancient World*. (London: I. B.Taurus, 2004).
- Jones, Terry and Alan Ereira. *Barbarians: An Alternative Roman History*. (E-book: Random House, 2007).
- Joshel, Sandra. *Roman Slavery and the Question of Race*. <https://www.blackpast.org/global-african-history/perspectives-global-african-history/roman-slavery-and-question-race/5/17/19>).
- Jowett, Benjamin. "Introduction to the Sophist". *The Dialogues of Plato*, vol 4. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Julian. *To the Uneducated Cynic*. https://en.m.wikisource.org/wiki/To_the_uneducated_Cynics (2/10/2020).
- Justin. *Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus*. <http://forumromanum.org/literature/justin/english/trans20.html>(12.9.2018).
- Kahn, Charles, H. "Aeschines on Socratic Eros". *The Socratic Movement*. (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994).
- Kimball, Bruce. *The Liberal Arts Tradition: A Documentary History*. (Lanham, MA: University Press of America, 2010).
- Koç, Ahmet. "İhvân-ı Safâ". *Klasik İslam Eğitmcileri*. (Istanbul: Rağbet, 2016).
- Kraemer, Sebastian. *The Origins of Fatherhood: An Ancient Family Process*. *FamProc* No: 30, 1991. <http://sebastiankraemer.com/docs/Kraemer%20origins%20of%20fatherhood.pdf> (9/1/2020)
- Kurke, Leslie. "Inventing the "Hetaira": Sex, Politics, and Discursive Conflict in Archaic Greece". *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 16, No. 1, 1997.

- Laertius, Diogenes. *Lives of the Eminent Philosophers*. (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2018).
- Laertius, Diogenes. *Lives of the Eminent Philosophers*, vol. 2. (London: William Heinemann, 1925).
- Lampe, Kurt. "Rethinking Aeschines of Sphettus". *From the Socratics to the Socratic Schools: Classical Ethics, Metaphysics and Epistemology*. (New York, NY: Routledge, 2015).
- Lawrence, Marilyn. *Hellenistic Astrology*. <http://www.iep.utm.edu/astr-hel/> (11/29/2019).
- Lerner, Gerda. *The Creation of Patriarchy*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986).
- Liebert, Hugh. *Plutarch's Politics: Between City and Empire*. (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2016).
- Lindberg, David C. *The Beginnings of Western Science: The European Scientific Tradition in Philosophical, Religious, and Institutional Context*. (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 2007).
- Lloyd, Genevieve. *The Man of Reason: "Male" and "Female" in Western Philosophy*. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993).
- Lucan. *The Civil War, Books I-X*. (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1962).
- Lucian. *The Runaways*.
http://lucianofsamosata.info/wiki/doku.php?id=home:texts_and_library:dialogues:the-runaways (2/18/2020).
- Luck, Georg. *Köpeklerin Bilgeliği: Antikçağ Kiniklerinden Metinler*. (İstanbul: Say, 2011).
- Lutz, Core E. "Musonius Rufus "The Roman Socrates"". *Yale Classical Studies*, Vol. 10. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1947).
- Malay, Hasan. "Batı Anadolu'da Aristonikos Ayaklanması (İ.Ö. 133-129)," *Ege Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, III (1987).
- Malherbe, Abraham J. "Introduction". *The Cynic Epistles: A Study Edition*. (Atlanta, GA: The Society of Biblical Literature, 2006).

- Malinowski, Bronislaw. *Marriage: Past and Present, A Debate Between Robert Briffault and Bronislaw Malinowski*. (Boston: Porter Sargent, 1956).
- Marrou, H. I. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. (Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1956).
- Marx, Karl. *Theses on Feuerbach*.
<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/theses/index.htm> (4/8/2021).
- McAvoy, Paula and Diane Hess. *The Political Classroom: Evidence and Ethics in Democratic Education*. (E-book: Routledge, 2015).
- McClure, Laura. "Subversive Laughter: The Sayings of Courtesans in Book 13 of Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae*". *The American Journal of Philology*. 124, 2. (2003).
- Minar, Edwin L. *Early Pythagorean Politics: In Practice and Theory*. (Baltimore: Waverly Press, 1942).
- Mintz, Avi I. "The Education of the Third Class in the Republic: Plato and the Locus Classicus of Formative Justice". *Teachers College Record*. Volume 118 (October 2016).
- Mitchell-Boyask, Robin. "Introduction". *Medea*. (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2008).
- Moles, John L. "Cynic Cosmopolitanism". *The Cynics: The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and Its Legacy*. (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1996).
- Monfasani, John. "Marsilio Ficino and the Plato-Aristotle Controversy". *Marsilio Ficino: His Theology, His Philosophy, His Legacy*. (Leiden: Brill, 2002).
- Morgan, Lewis Henry. *Ancient Society*. (Chicago, IL: Charles H. Kerr & Company, 1877)
- Morison, William. *Critias*. <https://iep.utm.edu/critias/> (2/18/2021).
- Morison, William. *Cynosarges*. <https://www.iep.utm.edu/cynosarg/> (5/27/2021).
- Morrison, Donald R. "Xenophon's Socrates as Teacher". *The Socratic Movement*. (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994).
- Navia, Luis E. *Classical Cynicism: A Critical Study*. (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1996).

- Nussbaum, Martha C. *The Fragility of Goodness: Luck and Ethics in Greek Tragedy and Philosophy*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- O'Connor, David K. "Socrates as Educator". *A Companion to Ancient Education*. (Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2015).
- O'Meera, Dominic, J. *Platonopolis: Platonic Political Philosophy in Late Antiquity*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005).
- Ober, Josiah. *Political Dissent in Democratic Athens*. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998).
- Parenti, Michael. *The Assassination of Julius Caesar: A People's History of Ancient Rome*. (New York, NY: The New Press, 2003).
- Penwill, John L. "Expelling the Mind: Politics and Philosophy in Flavian Rome". *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text*. (Leiden: Brill, 2003).
- Plato. "Alcebiades I". *The Dialogues of Plato, vol 2*. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Plato. "Apology". *The Dialogues of Plato, vol 2*. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Plato. "Charmides". *The Dialogues of Plato, vol 1*. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Plato. "Cratylus". *The Dialogues of Plato, vol 1*. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Plato. "Critias". *The Dialogues of Plato, vol 3*. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Plato. "Crito". *The Dialogues of Plato, vol 2*. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Plato. "Euthydemus". *Plato IV*. (London: William Heinemann Ltd, 1952).
- Plato. "Euthydemus". *The Dialogues of Plato, vol 1*. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Plato. "Euthyphro". *The Dialogues of Plato, vol 2*. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Plato. "Gorgias". *The Dialogues of Plato, vol 2*. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).

- Plato. "Ion". The Dialogues of Plato, vol 1. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Plato. "Laches". The Dialogues of Plato, vol 1. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Plato. "Laws". The Dialogues of Plato, vol 5. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Plato. "Lysis". The Dialogues of Plato, vol 1. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Plato. "Menexenus". The Dialogues of Plato, vol 2. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Plato. "Meno". The Dialogues of Plato, vol 2. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Plato. "Parmenides". The Dialogues of Plato, vol 4. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Plato. "Phaedo". The Dialogues of Plato, vol 2. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Plato. "Phaedrus". The Dialogues of Plato, vol 1. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Plato. "Protagoras". The Dialogues of Plato, vol 1. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Plato. "Republic". The Dialogues of Plato, vol 3. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Plato. "Sophist". The Dialogues of Plato, vol 4. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Plato. "Statesman". The Dialogues of Plato, vol 4. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Plato. "Symposium". The Dialogues of Plato, vol 1. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Plato. "Theaetetus". The Dialogues of Plato, vol 4. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Plato. "Timaeus". The Dialogues of Plato, vol 3. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Plato. "Translation of the Seventh Letter". Plato at Syracuse. (Sioux City, IA, Parnassos Press – Fonte Aretusa, 2019).

- Plotinus. *The Six Enneads*. (E-book: University of Adelaide, 2014).
- Plutarch, "Can Virtue Be Taught?". *Moralia*, vol 6. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962).
- Plutarch. "Lycurgus". <http://classics.mit.edu/Plutarch/lycurgus.html> (8/16/2019).
- Plutarch. "On Common Conceptions, Against the Stoics". *The Morals*, vol. 4. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Plutarch, "On Monarchy, Democracy, and Oligarchy". *Moralia*, vol 10. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960).
- Plutarch. "On Listening to Lectures". *Moralia*, vol 1. (London: William Heinemann, 1927).
- Plutarch. *On the Fortune or Virtue of Alexander*. http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Plutarch/Moralia/Fortuna_Alexandri/ (4/23/2020).
- Plutarch. "Pericles". <http://classics.mit.edu/Plutarch/pericles.html> (8/16/2019).
- Plutarch, "Precepts of Statecraft". *Moralia*, vol 10. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960).
- Plutarch. "Sayings of Romans". *The Morals*, vol. 4. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Plutarch. "The Contradictions of Stoics". *The Morals*, vol. 4. (E-book: The Online Library of Liberty, 2011).
- Plutarch. "The Education of Children". *Moralia*, vol 1. (London: William Heinemann, 1927).
- Plutarch. *The Life of Cato the Younger*. http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Plutarch/Lives/Cato_Minor*.html (4/23/2020).
- Plutarch. *The Life of Cicero*.
https://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Plutarch/Lives/Cicero*.html (3/3/2021).
- Plutarch. *The Life of Marcus Brutus*. http://classics.mit.edu/Plutarch/m_brutus.html (4/23/2020).
- Plutarch. *The Life of Tiberius Gracchus*. <http://classics.mit.edu/Plutarch/tiberius.html> (4/23/2020).

Plutarch. *The Life of Solon*.

https://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Plutarch/Lives/Solon*.html (3/11/2021).

Plutarch. *The Life of Sulla*.

http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Plutarch/Lives/Sulla*.html (11/29/2019).

Plutarch, "To an Uneducated Ruler". *Moralia*, vol 10. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960).

Pomeroy, Sarah B. *Pythagorean Women: Their History and Writings*. (Baltimore: John Hopkins University, 2013).

Porphyry. *Porphyry the Philosopher to His Wife Marcella*. (London: George Redway, 1896).

Porphyry. *The Life of Pythagoras*.

<https://www.philaletheians.co.uk/study-notes/buddhas-and-initiates/porphyry-on-pythagoras.pdf> (12.9.2018).

Prince, Susan. "Socrates, Antisthenes, and the Cynics". *A Companion to Socrates*. (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006).

Rawson, Elizabeth. *Cicero: A Portrait*. (London: Penguin Books, 1975).

Reeser, Todd W. *Setting Plato Straight: Translating Ancient Sexuality in the Renaissance* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2016).

Reyes, E. Christopher. *In His Name Vol IV*. (Bloomington, IN: Trafford Publishing, 2014).

Riddle, John M. "Introduction". *Tiberius Gracchus: Destroyer or Reformer of the Republic*. (Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath and Company, 1970).

Ritter, Heinrich. *The History of Ancient Philosophy*, vol 2. (Oxford: D. A. Talboys, 1838)

Rhodes, P. J. *Aristotle – A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985).

Robertson, Donald. *An Ancient Stoic Meditation Technique*. <https://donaldrobertson.name/2017/03/22/an-ancient-stoic-meditation-technique/> (4/23/2020).

- Robertson, Donald. Did Stoicism Condemn Slavery. <https://donaldrobertson.name/2017/11/05/did-stoicism-condemn-slavery/> (4/23/2020).
- Robinson, Eric W. "The Sophists and Democracy Beyond Athens". *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*, vol. 25, no. 1. (University of California Press, 2007).
- Roller, Lynn E. *In Search of God the Mother: The Cult of Anatolian Cybele*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999).
- Rufus, Musonius. *Lectures & Sayings*. (E-book: CreateSpace, 2011).
- Rullman, Marit. *Kadın Filozoflar: Antikçağ'dan Aydınlanmaya Kadın*. (Istanbul Kabalcı, 1996).
- Russell, Bertrand. *The History of Western Philosophy*. (New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, 1945).
- Quintilian. *Institutio Oratoria*.
http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Quintilian/Institutio_Oratoria/home.html (4/23/2020).
- Scholasticus, Socrates. *Ecclesiastical History*. <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/26017.htm> (11/29/2019).
- Seldeslachts, Erik. "Greece, the Final Frontier: The Westward Spread of Buddhism". *The Spread of Buddhism*. (Leiden: Brill, 2007).
- Seneca, Lucius Annaeus. *Epistles, Vol 1*. (London: William Heinemann, 1925).
- Seneca, Lucius Annaeus. *Of Consolation: To Helvia*. https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Of_Consolation:_To_Helvia (4/27/2020).
- Seneca, Lucius Annaeus. "On Anger". *Seneca: Moral and Political Essays*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- Seneca, Lucius Annaeus. *On Benefits*. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2011).
- Seneca, Lucius Annaeus. *Selected Letters*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).
- Siculus, Diodorus. *Historical Library*. <http://www.attalus.org/info/diodorus.html> (4/23/2020).
- Simonton, Matthew. *Classical Greek Oligarchy: A Political History*. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2017).

- Soukhanov, Anne (Ed). *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*. (E-book: American Heritage, 1994).
- Stoneman, Richard. *Palmyra and its Empire: Zenobia's Revolt Against Rome*. (Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press, 2008).
- Strabo. *Antik Anadolu Coğrafyası*. (Istanbul: Arkeoloji ve Sanat Yayınları, 2000).
- Tacitus. *The Annals*.
<https://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Tacitus/home.html> (4/27/2020).
- Taylor, A. E. *Socrates*. (Boston: The Beacon Press, 1951).
- Themistius. *The Private Orations of Themistius*. (Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 2000).
- Thomas, P. L. *Politics and Education Don't Mix*. <https://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2012/04/politics-and-education-dont-mix/256303/> (5/15/2020).
- Thucydides. *The Peloponnesian War*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).
- Toynbee, Arnold J. *A Study of History, Vol. V*. (London: Oxford University Press, 1955).
- Trotsky, Leon. *If America Should Go Communist*. <https://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1934/08/ame.htm> (8/16/2019).
- Vivante, Bella. *"Women in Ancient Greece". Women's Roles in Ancient Civilizations*. (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999).
- Vogt, Katja. *Seneca*. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/seneca/> (4/27/2020).
- Waithe, Mary Ellen. *A History of Women Philosophers, vol 1: Ancient Women Philosophers 600 BC – 500 AD*. (Dodrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1987).
- Warner, Betsy. *Education is Political*. <https://activisthistory.com/2017/08/23/education-is-political/> (5/15/2020).
- Watson, Paul Barron. *Marcus Aurelius Antoninus*. (New York, NY: Harper & Brothers, 1884).
- Weber, Max. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. (Glencoe, IL: The Free Press, 1947).

- Wenar, Leif. John Rawls. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/rawls/> (5/29/2021).
- Wildberg, Christian. "Socrates and Euripides". *A Companion to Socrates*. (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006).
- Woodruff, Paul. "Socrates Among the Sophists". *A Companion to Socrates*. (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006).
- Wolfsdorf, David. "Sophistic Method and Practice". *A Companion to Ancient Education*. (Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2015).
- Xenophon. *Apology*. (E-book: University of Adelaide, 2014).
- Xenophon. *Memorabilia*. (E-book: University of Adelaide, 2016).
- Xenophon. *Oeconomicus*. (E-book: University of Adelaide, 2016).
- Xenophon. *Symposium or the Banquet*. (E-book: University of Adelaide, 2016).
- Xenophon. "The Hellenics". *The Cyropaedia or Institution of Cyrus and the Hellenics or Grecian History*. (London: George Bell & Sons, 1876).
- Xenophon. "The Polity of the Athenians". *The Polity of the Athenians and Lacedaemonians*. (E-book: University of Adelaide, 2016).
- Xenophon. "The Polity of the Lacedaemonians". *The Polity of the Athenians and Lacedaemonians*. (E-book: University of Adelaide, 2016).
- Xuyet, Ngo Van. *Ancient Utopia and Peasant Revolts in China*. <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/ngo-van-xuyet-ancient-utopia-and-peasant-revolts-in-china> (3/12/2021).
- Zeller, Eduard. *Plato and the Older Academy*. (London: Longmans, Green and Co, 1876).
- Zeller, Eduard. *Socrates and the Socratic Schools*. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co, 1877).
- Zeller, Eduard. *The Stoics, Epicureans and Skeptics*. (London: Longmans, Green and Co, 1892).