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Introduction

A question that continually confronts us in education is the question of how we can educate our children to become independent and critical beings, while at the same time making sure that they do not become so critical that they will have nothing to do with us when they grow up. By rooting this question in a generational tension Hannah Arendt in her seminal essay *The Crisis in Education* presents us with a practical and theoretical challenge. It is the challenge of reconciling ourselves with the world and with the challenge of having brought a new generation into the world. She does however leave us very few clues as to how it might be lived out in practice, the psychological and practical elements of the educational process if you will.

A place where the generational tension and the complex position in which it places the educator is described in a fascinating manner is in Søren Kierkegaard’s story *The Seducer’s Diary*. In this story Johannes on the surface of it seduces and has his way with the young girl Cordelia, subsequently leaving her the minute he loses interest. Underneath however is also the story of how Cordelia comes of age and discovers the existential condition of human life, through her relationship with, in our interpretation, Johannes the Educator.

What will be our focus in the present paper is not a philosophical investigation of the affinities between Arendt and Kierkegaard, but rather the manner in which they engage the educational relation and how they propose we consider the foundations and conditions of education. At first glance it would seem that Arendt’s writings on education attempt to outline the philosophical foundation of education, while Kierkegaard in *The Seducer’s Diary* presents us with a psychological exposition of how the adult can move and indeed in this case exploit the young. However when read as an educational text *The Seducer’s Diary* can also be seen as a psychological exemplification of the coming of age of a young woman with the aid of Johannes. One could then construct a Herbartian interpretation of Arendt as the philosopher providing the foundations and aims of education and Kierkegaard as the psychologists showing us how it can be done.

Such an interpretation does of course not fully do justice to the scope of their respective works. Kierkegaard’s exposition of the educational relation is not only psychological nor is Arendt’s essay simply a philosophical one, even if she does claim not to want to tell educators how to do their job (Arendt, 2006). Kierkegaard’s text is not only a literary masterpiece. It is at the same time a text that moves effortlessly between psychological, philosophical, theological and aesthetic reflections. Arendt’s essays on education moves from philosophical ponderings to strong political and educational statements, and she appears to be somewhat caught between her definition of freedom and her insistence upon the value of it on the one hand, and her commitment to classical almost conservative thoughts on the subject matter of a school on the other. This tension in her educational thinking is what gives it its potency, but at the same time it also makes it quite hard to
make out how an education based on her propositions might be practiced, since it is caught between strong conservatism on the one hand and a insistence on the value of freedom on the other (Korsgaard, 2014).

We will however in this paper attempt to delimit ourselves and focus on the affinities between the foundational thoughts in Arendt’s educational thinking and the psychological, existential and educational elements of The Seducer’s Diary. This naturally places us on thin ice, since the story of Johannes and Cordelia is also the tragic love-story of a young woman and an immoral older man, who takes advantage not only of his superior knowledge of the world, but also of Cordelia’s innocence and inexperience.

We do believe however that a strict educational reading of the text can reveal an underlying narrative that is highly enlightening if one wants to understand the educational thinking of Kierkegaard. Johannes does appear to want to educate Cordelia, and ultimately he wants to set her free and make her into a strong and self-reliant woman. A project in which he ultimately fails, since he is unable to separate his own lust from the endeavour.

In the first part of the paper we will present the educational thinking of Arendt with an emphasis on the generational tension and what it demands of us as educators. In the second part we will perform the aforementioned reading of The Seducer’s Diary using two key elements from Kierkegaard’s wider philosophy, namely the concept of the interesting and the concept of anxiety. In conclusion we will outline what makes Johannes’ relationship with Cordelia not only an erotic but also an educational one. One which is acutely attentive to the generational tension, but without Johannes recognizing the moral dimensions thereof and how this means that he is ultimately doomed to fail in his educational endeavour.

An educational and generational tension

Despite attempting to delimit herself from educational practice by posing as a layman, Arendt, in her essays on education, certainly has some strong opinions about what education is. By rooting it firmly in a generational tension she casts aside the progressive notion that children carry within them all that is needed for them to thrive, while at the same time distancing herself from the more instrumental perspectives (Arendt 2006). This placed her firmly outside of the established positions in the educational debate of her time, and she, especially with Reflections on Little Rock in mind, was probably quite out of tune with most educational thinkers at the time (Gordon 2001).

At the moment there is a growing interest in her educational thinking, but not many engage her generational tension. Most educational readers of Arendt seem rather to attempt to align her thinking with existing forms of educational theory, and focus on her concepts of
natality and authority as ways towards establishing democratic practices in schools (Biesta 2010a & 2010b, Gordon 2001, Hayden 2012, Schutz 2001). We believe that by doing so they do not fully grasp the scope of her thoughts on the matter. By overlooking or deconstructing, as most do, her separation of politics and education, they diminish the force of her critique not only of the instrumentalisation of education that is no less important today than in the 50’s, but especially her critique of progressive education. This is of course not to say that the interpretations and uses of her work do not contribute and add value to philosophy of education, but we do believe there is a tendency to overemphasize her political thoughts and to overlook the potency of her educational thinking.

Education is for Arendt essentially a generational relation where the old meet(s) the new. It is the place for the transmittance of the knowledge and skills that have been acquired through generations. This transmittance must, however, be carefully administered in order that the values and structures inherent in our knowledge and skills are not imposed upon the coming generation in a manner that the young become unable to create and choose something other (Arendt 2006). If we as adults impose upon our children our norms and values in a way in which they are beyond discussion we strike from our children’s hands their possibility of creating something new. We must accompany them and stand beside them on their journey towards adulthood, and while introducing the world to them, we must not implant in them the notion that this world is as it should be and that as such they should not change it.

At the same time education entails a responsibility for the world in the sense that the educational relation must be of such a kind that the (be)coming generation will not eject the older generation from the world by recreating it beyond recognition. It must be protected from “the onslaught of the new” (Arendt, 2006: 182). The tension between the existing world and that of the coming generation thus entails a double responsibility. A responsibility on the one hand for the world in order that it remains a common world, and on the other hand a responsibility for the inherent potential and freedom of the child. The common world is what lies between us. It is the inter-est and thus what we must take care of and engage with in order to traverse the distance between us. We must in the interposed world of the school, between the private and the public, meet each other through the medium of the inter-est, the common world.

The tension between the world and the child is based on Arendt’s political concept natality and her interpretation of the concept of authority, which she understands as a form of conservation. Arendt’s concept of natality describes the idea that human freedom is rooted in the fact that we are born with a unique ability to bring something unforeseen and unexpected into the world. Indeed our very birth into the world with such properties is such an event (Arendt, 1998). It is the existential condition of human life that we are born into the world with the ability to create our own destiny, and to be a part of shaping that of the world.
Her use of the word conservation is double in the sense that it contains on the one hand the conservation or protection of exactly the aforementioned feature, natality, and on the other hand reaffirms her insistence on the importance of a respectful renewal of the values and norms of the old world. When explicating this form of conservation she draws upon the Roman understanding of authority; of what it means to (re)present a world to a new generation (Gordon, 2001). Authority in the Roman tradition rested with the elders [maiores] and for Arendt in education it rests with the teacher. So what the teacher must conserve is both the inherent natality of the child and the foundation, which in her understanding of it is our common world (Arendt, 2006, Gordon 2001).

These two aspects of her educational thinking have so far dominated the educational literature about Arendt (Gordon 2001, Korsgaard 2014). And they are indeed central to it. However the conclusion Arendt draws from them being the essence of education is often overlooked or disregarded. The clash between natality and conservatism in The Crisis in Education and in Reflections on Little Rock draws attention to the danger of considering education to be a political endeavour. By placing political ideas and political aims as the foundation of education we run the risk of robbing our children of their destiny. If we consider our children to be the means of rescuing the world from the chaos we ourselves and those before us have created, we rob them of their chance at creating something new and something that we could perhaps not have foreseen.

This perhaps sounds absurd when we recollect that “our hope always hangs on the new which every generation brings” (Arendt 2006, 189). Our children are of course, as the song goes, our future. The crux of the matter however is that “we destroy everything if we so try to control the new that we, the old, can dictate how it will look” (Arendt 2006, 189). This is the generational tension at its barest and precisely the reason we must “decisively divorce the realm of education from the others, most of all from the realm of public, political life” (Arendt 2006, 192).

In order to avoid instrumentalising measures we must heed the tension and keep our political noses out of education. Not only to safeguard the future of our children but also in order not to inflict upon them a climate they cannot live and breathe within. The public and political stage is of such a nature that one must be ready to stand in its light. To expose oneself to it, and to stand up and say here I am and this is how I propose we create our common world takes more than we would consider to ask of our children. And this is not, as Biesta (2010b) proposes, only a developmental matter. It is in fact also and perhaps most especially an existential question.

To exist politically as Biesta rightly asserts is a matter of being present in a specific manner. It is however perhaps not as romantic as he would have it. At least not in the way Arendt describes it in her educational writings. Placing children in the political light essentially ejects them from the common world that their primary attachment to the private sphere, their home and family, secures, and places upon them the responsibility of
creating a world anew, even before they have come to grips with the old one. Arendt’s describes this in The Crisis in Education as a ‘being handed over’ to “the tyranny of their own group” (Arendt 2006, 178). Whether we agree with this or not there is however perhaps a reason that we generally assent to the idea that adult supervision of children is a good idea. Not that they should always be in sight, but we do like to be close by.

Arendt puts this in different perhaps more illuminating words in Reflections on Little rock, where she takes the controversial stand that integrating schools at a time when interracial marriage was prohibited by law is simply nonsensical. It places upon our children the responsibility of resolving grave problems that we as adults have been unable to solve. She pointedly asks “Do we intend to have our political battles fought out in the school yards?” (Arendt 1959, 50). Of what this can entail for the individual children the personal stories of the Little Rock Nine, perhaps most illuminating is the one told by Elizabeth Eckford⁴, tell us plenty.

Arendt saw the famous photograph of Elizabeth Eckford leaving the High School grounds hounded by abuse from the crowd, as a perfect caricature of progressive education (Arendt 1959). The wave of progressive thinking and practice in the American school system in the first half of the 20th century, had completely turned the educational relation on its head and what was meant as an emancipation of childhood had in fact lead to a situation where “children have been so to speak banished from the world of grown-ups” (Arendt 2006, 178).

This upheaval of the educational system was caused by three underlying assumptions all of which can be attributed to progressive education. The first assumption has already been mentioned and states that there is such a thing as a world of childhood, and that it should as far as possible be left to itself. The second assumption regards teaching and its development into a science of teaching that is emancipated from the subject matter, from the “actual material to be taught” (Arendt 2006, 179). Teaching has become a competency and anyone who has acquired it can effectively teach anything. The third assumption “is that you can know and understand only what you have done yourself” (Arendt 2006, 179). This is of course an obvious critique of Dewey and his notion that we must learn by doing.² Important as this third assumption is, we would like to draw attention first and foremost to the second.

The separation of teaching from the subject matter was for Arendt the definitive banishment of authority from education, since what for her provided the teacher/educator

---

² Arendt appeared to have a somewhat dubious relation to the works of Dewey, and rarely mentioned him. In a review of Problems of Men she states that “What makes it so difficult to review this philosophy is that it is equally hard to agree or to disagree with it” (Arendt 1994, 194). There can be no doubt however that Arendt considered progressive education to be a form of ‘vocationalisation’ of education that was suited better to vocational training, something belonging to the sphere of labor, or at best fabrication, and not something that is able to contribute to the creation of a shared (political) world in the paradoxical manner suggested by her and in this paper.
with authority was precisely a superior knowledge of the subject, and the natural splendour that came from standing as a representative of the world in front of the coming generation. As we shall see it is precisely this form of authority that Johannes holds over Cordelia; a superior knowledge of the world and the demands her future existence holds in store for her. The challenge for him and for any educator is to introduce Cordelia, the child, to this world and this existence without determining beforehand her relation to and perception thereof, and perhaps the even greater challenge of setting them free without knowing or determining their future for them.

The Educator's Diary

The elusive text *The Seducer's Diary*, which is a part of *Either/Or*, consist of a number of journal entries found by A. In these journal entries Johannes, a hyper reflective man of the world, describes how he through elaborate schemes and careful planning seduces the young girl Cordelia and leaves her again as soon as the ‘deed’ is done.

Often the text is read as a description of the aesthetic character, a Kierkegaardian version of Don Juan if you will. So in the reception of the text much focus has been placed on Johannes’ character and in many cases on his moral traits, or rather the lack thereof. This emphasis on the moral ineptitude of Johannes has in our view had three consequences of a regretful nature. First is the fact that the development or rather evolution of Cordelia from child to adult has largely been overlooked. As a natural consequence of this follows secondly that the role that the act of seduction plays in this development is also overlooked along with, and this is the third consequence, its connection with the Kierkegaardian concept of anxiety, and not least Cordelia’s anxiety. Running underneath the description of the aesthetic character is thus the overlooked story of the coming of age of Cordelia.

In the beginning of the text we are introduced to Johannes’ character and his affection for young women. In the note from the 9th of April however there is a slight change in the tone. Something has happened to Johannes. He has seen something. What this something is, is somehow unclear to Johannes. “Have I become blind? Has the inner eye of the soul lost its power? I have seen her, but it is as if I had seen a heavenly revelation - so completely has her image vanished again for me. In vain do I summon all the powers of my soul in order to conjure up this image” (Kierkegaard 1987, 323).

He curses his misfortune and wishes only to tear out his eye and punish it for its mischievous behaviour. All he can remember is her green cloak. In the note from the 14th of April he writes: “I am almost unable to find a foothold … Turkey cocks ruffle their

---

3 There is to our knowledge one exception. In *Kierkegaards Psykologi* Johannes Nordentoft points out that Kierkegaard with the story of Cordelia portrays the metamorphosis from child to adult. (Nordentoft 1972, s. 66)  
4 The fact that we choose not to focus too much on the unethical nature of Johannes’ seduction, does of course not imply that we condone it nor any form of erotic seduction in educational relations, but merely that there is also a different story present in the text.
feathers when they see red. So it goes with me when I see green, every time I see a green cloak, and since my eyes often deceive me, all my expectations sometimes run aground on a porter from Frederik’s Hospital” (Kierkegaard 1987, 325).

Finally on the 15th of May Johannes sees her again. He thanks his good fortune, and follows her for a while, enjoying the sight of this delightful manifestation. Cordelia is her name and on the 16th of May he notes: “How beautiful it is to be in love; how interesting it is to know that one is in love. This, you see, is the difference” (Kierkegaard 1987, 334).

Later he learns of her address and her family. He also enlists the unfortunate Edvard Baxter, the son of a local grocer, who has long been in love with Cordelia, in his scheme. Pretending to want to help Edvard win the hand of Cordelia, Johannes slowly begins his seduction of her. At first he accompanies Edvard to Cordelia’s house, and while conversing with the aunt about the prices at the market and other such “bourgeois matters”, Johannes sends Cordelia ironic looks, letting her know just how distasteful such conversation and such conventions are.

By being present without being present he places himself invisibly between Cordelia and Edvard, who are in the next room conversing, and draws Cordelia’s attention as well as her repulsion. She is repelled by the manner in which he converses with her aunt, and as a consequence she begins to question her aunt and her conventional attitude and behaviour. She begins to question her life and her future, while she is increasingly drawn to and at the same time repelled by Johannes.

Johannes then begins the real conquest and sure enough he – with the assent of the aunt, who has been raising Cordelia from a young age – becomes engaged with Cordelia. This however is not his aim, so he slowly begins to introduce a doubt in Cordelia. In letters he swears her everlasting affection, while during the same period he brings her to his uncle’s house and lets her witness different games and situations that force her to question whether marriage and bourgeois life is necessary for their love to flourish. Through this she develops distaste for the conventional engagement ritual and in the end Cordelia herself puts an end to it.

Johannes wants her to freely give herself, and thus allow him to set her free the moment he loses interest. So it happens and on the night of the 24th of September Cordelia – with the permission of her aunt – leaves for the country, not to rest and recover as the aunt assumes, but instead to spend the night with Johannes.

This brief summary in no way does justice to the story we are engaged with here, and we whole-heartedly urge those of our readers who have not yet had the pleasure to instantly grab hold of the book and read it, preferably in the late hours and in a comfortable armchair.
What we have to notice first of all is the ambiguity of the text. It is unclear who is actually being seduced, or rather when who is seducing who. No doubt at the first instance it is Johannes who is seduced. So much so that he is temporarily blinded and cannot even recall the sight of Cordelia.

Later on of course it is seemingly Johannes who is in charge, but he appears still to be in a certain state of mind in which he cannot escape the clutches of Cordelia’s being. As he states in a note from 3rd June that the law of every moment of his campaign is that “the potency of the interesting must be exhausted” (Kierkegaard 1987, 346). He must draw every little atom of the interesting out of Cordelia.

Kierkegaard draws upon Friedrich von Schlegel’s concept of the interesting, when he describes how it is in fact the existential struggle between freedom and nature (Koch 1992 and Rehm 1949). However as Walter Rehm has shown us, Kierkegaard seemed to at least partly misinterpret von Schlegel, since he failed to see how engaging the interesting also implies a responsibility for the other. That one is taking a part in it and therefore should care for the other (Rehm 1949). In the diary the interesting is the developing conflict between nature and freedom that occurs in Cordelia, and this is what Johannes essentially is chasing. She becomes more and more aware of the conflict between her latent inner energies. I other words; she begins to reflect on her existential condition. For Johannes this is the interesting, for Cordelia it is dizziness and anxiety (Henriksen 1954, 37). This moment, when instinct clashes with the will and we stand on the precipice between our nature and our possible temporary freedom from it, is the existential condition of adult life.

Kierkegaard uses different analogies to explain this condition, and one which for us encapsulates it wonderfully is the one he finds in Phaidros. It is the image of man as a coachman attempting to hold the reins and steer a carriage with two horses, one of which is Pegasus, the other a close to death nag (SKS 7, 284). These interchanging forces constantly pull at us, and the task of every human is to walk the narrow ledge between each abyss.

This introduces a duality and a struggle into our being in the world, and forces us to constantly relate ourselves to ourselves. Existence is continually in the process of becoming. It indicates something unfinished, something the individual must constantly relate himself to, and Kierkegaard throughout his work emphasizes how man is constantly moving and not a substance that holds form through the passing of time. There is no end for man. Kierkegaard does not operate with a starting point and a finish line, a beginning and an end. Man is thus qua existence always confronted by the unrelenting demand of having to engage eternity in a world that is structured in time. Man is the synthesis of timeliness and eternity, and forever caught between these two forces, and this is what makes him anxious (Grøn 1997, 60).

5 It is also unclear who the author and in fact who the protagonist is. See Henriksen 1954, Garff 2008 and Koch 1992.
It does however in our story of Johannes and Cordelia appear to be the case that this condition, this existence, only begins once and if this reflection, this duality is introduced into the young mind. In the beginning of the text Johannes describes Cordelia as being oneness. She is described as being at one with her nature, uncomplicated and uninflicted by the forces that lie dormant within her. “Erect was she and proud, mysterious and abounding in thought like a spruce tree, one shoot, one thought, which deep from the interior of the earth shoots up toward heaven, unexplained, unexplainable to itself, a unity that has no parts” (Kierkegaard 1987, 330). Cordelia is at one with herself as a child. She is nature and at one with this nature. She has not yet become reflective in the existential and Kierkegaardian sense. She is a child that has not yet seen enough of the world to know of its conditions and the duality of life. She rests within her existence and accepts it without discussion.

In the same note however Johannes writes: “She herself was hidden in herself; she herself rose up out of herself; there was a recumbent pride in her like the spruce’s bold escape - although it is riveted to the earth … She was an enigma that enigmatically possessed its own solution” (Kierkegaard 1987, 330). Cordelia carries within her the urge to freedom that will eventually place her in the existential condition. In The Concept of Anxiety Kierkegaard states that in the child anxiety, is not a burden, rather it is an adventurous and mysterious force, which unconsciously guides and follows the child in its process of becoming reflective (SKS 4). This is what is awakened in Cordelia’s encounter with Johannes, and he is careful not to move along too quickly. For what is this awakening for Johannes but the interesting.6 What drives him is the experience of the interesting, the experience of Cordelia’s beginning realization of the possibility of freedom, and her beginning reflectiveness.

So what Johannes in our reading, in the underlying story of her coming of age, is after is not her virginity, but the development from child to adult. That the journal entries stop before the night of the “deed”, and we only hear briefly from Johannes the day after when he has left Cordelia hints at this. The actual act is not present in the story, and what is at the centre is not the erotic act, but what Johannes has been seeking all along is the inner uproar in Cordelia, her violent eruption into a free and self-reliant woman.

Johannes is the facilitator of the change and he wants to witness and play his part in the development. But in order to bear witness to the interesting he must proceed slowly and he must proceed unseen. He must move her without her noticing, lest it becomes a matter of force and not a willingly falling into his hands of Cordelia. She must in other words give herself freely, she must by all means become a free person before he can be set free from the grasp of the interesting, and she from her natural state of oneness.

6 Hidden behind the synonymus writer Vigilius Haufniensis Kierkegaard declares: “Naar man vil iagttage Børn, vil man finde denne Angest bestemmere antydet som en Søgen efter det Eventyrlige, det Uhyre, det Gaadefulde” (SKS 4, 348).
“She herself must be developed within herself; she must feel the resilience of her soul; she must come to grips with the world and lift it. In her eyes and in what she says, it is easy for me to see the progress she is making; only once have I seen a devastating wrath there. She must owe me nothing, for she must be free. Only in freedom is there love; only in freedom are there diversion and everlasting amusement” (Kierkegaard 1987, 360).

**To stand alone – by another’s aid**

Kierkegaard was a great lover of (language) games, of playing with words and meanings. Often he did this to throw of his reader in order for them to reconsider what they had just read or to force them to go back on their immediate understandings and assumptions. In a quotation that we believe to be of central importance to how we can understand and develop an educational reading of the *Diary* he plays with the hyphen as a way of remaking a sentence to fit an alternative or more precise meaning, while at the same time underlining the paradoxical nature of the statement.

When I say, “This man stands only through my help,” and what I say is true: have I then done the highest possible for him? Let us see! What do I mean by that? I say, “He stands only and alone by my help” – but then he does not stand alone, then he has not become his own, then it is to my help that he owes all this – and he is conscious of that fact. To help a man in this manner is really to deceive him. […] Hence the greatest benefit cannot be bestowed in such a way that the recipient comes to realize that he owes it to me; for if he learns to know that, then it simply is not the greatest benefactions. If, on the other hand, someone says, “This man stands alone – through my assistance,” and what he says is true: aye, then he has done for this man the most one man can do for another, he has made him free, independent, a self, an ego and just through concealing his aid, has helped him to stand alone. Consequently, to stand alone – by another’s aid!

Kierkegaard 1946, 223

In the first formulation of standing alone by another’s aid the sentence is self-contradictory. If you are standing alone through another’s help, you are not alone. If I have helped another in a manner that he still requires me and is aware of this dependence then I have not helped him at all. I have in fact deceived him. This is also what is at stake in Johannes’ relation to Cordelia. He must by all means make sure that she is not beholden to him, that she owes him nothing. If not, he will have aided her in becoming dependent and not independent. He will have turned her into a slave to his will, and not into a free and self-reliant woman.

What Johannes intends is to allow Cordelia to stand alone – with the hyphen separating and at the same time emphasizing the connection with - the aid of another. However progressive we become, we cannot escape the fact that our children need us in order to
ensure that they can overcome their oneness and traverse the troubled waters from childhood to adulthood.

It is perhaps not a character such as Johannes that is needed, as he of course fails in his endeavour to set Cordelia free, but he does however illuminate some of the necessary steps and premises in the coming of age of the young.

On the surface of it Johannes accomplishes his task, and along the way he displays an uncanny ability to understand the psyche of Cordelia. He appears to be a master psychologist and an accomplished student of the human soul (Nordentoft 1972). He does however fail in his endeavours to set Cordelia free. She ultimately feels irrevocably connected to him and declares herself to be forever his.8

The reason for this failure is obvious. Johannes to his own and Cordelia’s detriment confuses his own desires with Cordelia’s coming of age and fails to see Cordelia’s existence and he plays with her just to experience the interesting. In doing so he displays the exact misrepresentation of the concept of the interesting that Walther Rehm pointed out to us. He fails to see that the interesting is what lies between us, and we must in order to engage with it care for the other, and, if it is an educational encounter, it should certainly not lead to a sexual encounter.

This aside, even if we must of course tread carefully when performing an educational reading of The Seducer’s Diary, we do believe that underneath the portrayal of the tragic love-story of Johannes and Cordelia, Kierkegaard is also trying to enlighten us about some of the features of the educational process. At the very least he shows eloquently how young people’s encounters with the adult world set in motion the existential conditions that we all share.

The paradoxical nature of Johannes relation to Cordelia not as her lover but as her educator, echoes the tension between the adult world and the world of the becoming generation, and how it is a shared – but separate world, and how we must carefully administer our relation with the coming generation, so that we allow them finally to stand alone – by our aid.
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