

12-30-1986

Philosophical Lives: The Academics

Jorgen Mejer
University of Copenhagen

Follow this and additional works at: <https://orb.binghamton.edu/sagp>

 Part of the [Ancient History, Greek and Roman through Late Antiquity Commons](#), [Ancient Philosophy Commons](#), and the [History of Philosophy Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mejer, Jorgen, "Philosophical Lives: The Academics" (1986). *The Society for Ancient Greek Philosophy Newsletter*. 141.
<https://orb.binghamton.edu/sagp/141>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by The Open Repository @ Binghamton (The ORB). It has been accepted for inclusion in The Society for Ancient Greek Philosophy Newsletter by an authorized administrator of The Open Repository @ Binghamton (The ORB). For more information, please contact ORB@binghamton.edu.

Philosophical Lives: The Academics.

Jørgen Mejer
University of Copenhagen.

(San Antonio,
December 30, 1986)

No philosophical school has had a longer life than the ancient Academy, founded by Plato in the early 380's BC and continuing well beyond that epoch-making year 529 AD. ^{NOTE 1} No ancient philosophical school has a history which is better documented than the Academy, despite major gaps in our knowledge of the school (its activities and its members) in particular in the centuries around the birth of Christ. Although, or perhaps because, the ancient sources are so numerous, no modern account of the history of the school as a whole exists. This is not least regrettable for the period after 200 AD when the Greek commentators on Aristotle, and to some extent on Plato, as well as other sources supply a vast amount of material illustrating the activities of the school. ^{NOTE 2}

For the early history of the Academy, the last 3 1/2 centuries BC, we are in an unusual situation, as compared with the other schools of philosophy, that two historical accounts have been preserved: Papyrus Herculanensis No. 1021 (+ 164), the Index Academicorum (henceforth Ind. Acad.), presumably a part of the Epicurean philosopher Philodemus' Σύνταξις τῶν φιλοσόφων, ^{NOTE 3} and book 4 of Diogenes Laërtius' Lives and Opinions of the Philosophers. ^{NOTE 4} Comparison of these two sources gives us a better possibility of determining what belongs to the main tradition and what is peculiar to each source. I shall begin with Diogenes Laërtius.

Diogenes pursues the history of Greek philosophy through two main lines of successions: after covering the Seven Wise in book 1, the Ionian line runs from Anaximander through Socrates, the Socratics, the Academy, the Lyceum, the Cynics and the Stoics more or less down to the I. century BC (books 2 to 7), while the Italic line runs from Pythagoras through the Eleatics, the Atomists and a few "random" persons down to the Sceptics and Epicurus (books 8-10). The timeframe is the same, though Sceptics down to the II. century AD are mentioned. Diogenes' main purpose is clearly to write about the lives of the philosophers, cf. 3. 47 and 10. 29; ^{NOTE 5} hence it should come as no surprise that he often gives no, or only very scant, information about philosophical views, and when it is given, it is often only because Diogenes wants to attribute an 'invention' (the πρῶτος εὐρητής -topos) to a philosopher,

or to illustrate a biographical point by telling an anecdote which includes a 'saying' by the philosopher in question.

Diogenes' account of the Academy is very disappointing from a philosophical point of view. Book 4 deals almost exclusively with the Academy from a biographical point of view. The reason is that Diogenes in general only gives a survey of the philosophical system of a school and not of the individual members of the school. Diogenes' account of Platonic philosophy is, needless to say, given at the end of his Life of Plato, just as we find in the case of the Peripatetics or the Stoics, where the doxographical summaries also appear in the Lives of the founders. It is worth noticing that while many of the biographical sections in Diogenes resemble one another and refer to the same set of sources, no two doxographical sections on the philosophical systems of the major schools look alike. NOTE 6

Diogenes is not, obviously, looking for developments in the history of philosophy. However, even if he seems to have found one survey of the doctrines of each school sufficient, he does exercise some effort to find either up-to-date accounts, or remarkable, old documents. In the case of Plato we find both: 3. 48-66 is an introduction

to the reading of Plato's dialogues, reminiscent of Albinus' Prolegomena and at least one other II. century AD source. NOTE 7

3. 67-88 contains a Platonic doxography, mainly on the basis of the Timaeus; though somewhat confused and jejune, it seems to fit in with main stream Middle Platonism of the II. century AD. NOTE 8

Finally, 3. 80-109 contains a number of definitions, or divisions, of concepts - mostly ethical but otherwise showing no sign of systematical order, though most of them have a decidedly Platonic flavor. Diogenes claims that these divisions come from Aristotle, and indeed the concern for such lists seem to go back to Plato and his immediate successors. NOTE 9

While this survey of Platonic philosophy is most unsatisfying as an account of Plato's philosophy, it may be taken as a genuine expression of Platonism in the II. century AD. The stress is on providing a systematic account of the world, not on dialectics or on the theory of ideas. The emphasis on the Timaeus is well known in this period. As for the first part, the introduction to the dialogues, the edition prepared by Tiberius' court astrologer, Thrasyllus, seems to have spurred a new interest in the Platonic corpus, with attempts to establish a canon and classify the individual dialogues, and with advice as to how to interpret the texts (e.g. Plutarch and Favorinus).

Nevertheless, Diogenes' survey of Platonic philosophy is disappointing and in stark contrast to the richness of the biographical material on Plato (and his school). To a very large extent, however, the information found in ancient Greek and Roman biographies is untrustworthy, if not outright fictitious.^{NOTE 10} Often the particular details reveal more about the author of a biography than about the personality under discussion. There is no reason to look far for an explanation: information about individuals of the past was not easy to come by in the ancient world where no records as such were kept and few personal data survived for very long. While a biography of a poet or of a historian might be created on the basis of their preserved works (but of course not therefore more trustworthy), biographical information about other writers or people without a literary output was often only preserved within a group of people who had a common interest in preserving the memory of, say, a founder of a school of thought. Sometimes students would write a Life of their teacher, but even so much of the information was not readily available, and even a simple date could not be verified from objective sources. Consequently, most biographical information cannot be checked today and deserves a minor role in the history of philosophy. Nevertheless, it is possible from Diogenes' Life of Plato to extract a number of items which can illuminate some points in the annals of philosophy.

In general, Diogenes' Life of Plato is standard fare in its biographical parts (3. 1-46), both when compared to other ancient biographies of Plato (Apuleius, Anon. Proleg., Olypiodorus - and the Ind. Acad.)^{NOTE 11} and to the other Lives in Diogenes: family, birth and death, various dates, travels, education, relations to other philosophers, students etc. I will mention only one detail here: the statements in 3. 25 that Plato was the first to contradict nearly all his predecessors, and that the question was raised why Plato nowhere mentions the Atomist Democritus. This question goes back to the early Hellenistic period when Democritus' works were (still) available and of interest to scholars, as is evident e.g. from Aristoxenus' anecdote about Plato wanting to burn all of Democritus' books (DL 9. 40 = Aristox. fr. 131 Wehrli)^{NOTE 12} or Callimachus' book on Democritus, whether this was a bibliographical work or a discussions of his 'sayings' (DK 68 A 32 = Call. fr. 456 Pfeiffer).^{NOTE 13} Aristoxenus must have been convinced that Plato had access to Democritus' writings, and since they obviously were well known by Aristotle (as evidenced by both early and late

Aristotelian texts), likelihood is that Plato did in fact also read Democritus. An anecdote about Aristotle acting as Plato's 'reader' (ἀναγναστής, that is 'one who reads out a book to someone else') in the Vita Aristotelis Marciana § 6 indicates that Plato did in fact read many books - whether or not books played a major role in the activities of the Academy. Thus, there is no reason to reject attempts to find Democritean influence in the Platonic dialogues.

The most interesting sections in Diogenes' Life of Plato are exactly those which have no parallels in the other ancient biographies of Plato: 3. 9-17, excerpts from a work by Alcimus on Plato and Epicharmus, and 3. 26-28, quotations from IV. century comedy ridiculing Plato. - The historian Alkimus, a student of the Megarian philosopher Stilpo, wrote a work against Amyntas, one of Plato's students, in the latter half of the IV. century BC. ^{NOTE 14} Diogenes quotes from book 1 of this work, giving (a) summaries of Platonic philosophy followed by (b) passages from the 'comedies' of the Sicilian Epicharmus, written in the early V. century. Whatever the nature of these plays, there is no reason to believe that there were anything but coincidental verbal similarities between Epicharmus and Plato, though it is interesting that such logico-sophistical arguments are to be found at the same time as Parmenides was writing his poem on Being. ^{NOTE 15} But Alcimus' claim that Plato had copied Epicharmus demonstrates that Plato's position in the history of philosophy as a successor of Socrates and Pythagoras was not yet an indisputable thing in this period. More important, however, is the fact that Alcimus seems to have had considerable knowledge of Plato's dialogues of the middle and late period, and that he also mentions Platonic doctrines which are not found in the Platonic corpus, but known from other texts written in the early Academy. ^{NOTE 16} Alcimus seems to have looked upon Platonic philosophy as one coherent philosophical system. The excerpts from Alcimus' work concentrate on the theory of ideas. The world is divided into objects of sense and objects of thought, and the latter are identified with the ideas. To study the cosmic principles we must distinguish between the following classes of ideas: 1) ideas by themselves such as likeness, unity and plurality, size etc., 2) the beautiful, the Good, and the Just (i.e. universals), and 3) ideas which are relative to other ideas such as knowledge, size and ownership. Entities in this world exist because of both participation in and likeness to the ideas, the existence of

which is proved by means of a mainly epistemological argument: knowledge and memory can only be of stable and permanent objects. Even animals are capable of seeing similarities. - Alcimus' discussion only makes sense if we assume that this summary would be perceived as a fair presentation of Platonic philosophy. Hence, we must conclude that the debate of the theory of ideas within the Academy was known to a wider group, and that Plato's 'unwritten doctrine' in no way was a secret doctrine - which is also implied by the famous anecdote about Plato's unsuccessful lecture(s) on the Good, which goes back to Aristotle and Aristoxenus. ^{NOTE 17}

Diogenes was fond of poetry (indeed, he wrote poems himself with some skill) ^{NOTE 18} and he often quotes bits and pieces of Greek poets, Hellenistic and even Classical, to support his statements about philosophers. The ridicule of Plato in contemporary comedy, as quoted by Diogenes, is anything but great humor, and certainly not as funny as the long fragment from Epicrates quoted by Athenaeus (2. 59 c = Epicrates fr. 11 Edmonds). But these fragments nevertheless have some significance. The Theopompus - fragment (fr. 15 Edmonds) seems to be the oldest: ^{NOTE 19} "One is not one, two are hardly one, as Plato says", alludes to a passage in the Phaedo (96 e) and implies that this dialogue must have been known by a larger audience soon after it was published. The passages from Alexis ^{NOTE 20} come from four different plays (fr. 1, 147, 158, 180 Edmonds) and show that Plato was a conspicuous figure in contemporary Athens, a person to whom anyone could have access. Plato seems to have walked around while philosophizing, and in the public gymnasium of the Academy (here used as a topographical term), as clearly stated in the Epicrates-fragment. People must have been particularly struck by the aporetic result of such peripatetic exercises. Of special interest is the quotation from Amphis' Amphicrates (fr. 6 Edm.): it alludes to the Platonic Good, another indication that Plato's teachings on this subject was no secret. The quotations in Diogenes all give the same impression as we get from the passage from Epicrates; though the latter undoubtedly is influenced by Aristophanes' Clouds it does support the idea that the activities in Plato's Academy could be quite different from the picture Plato paints in his dialogues, and that Aristotle's school in some respects is a continuation of life in Plato's Academy. Interestingly enough, the impression we get from the comic fragments is confirmed by a passage in the Ind.

When we turn to Diogenes' survey of Plato's successors, one of the more interesting features is his division of the Academy into three stages: the Old Academy from Plato to Crates, the Middle Academy initiated by Arcesilaus, and the New Academy initiated by Arcesilaus' student, Lacydes.^{NOTE 22} Diogenes explains Arcesilaus' position by stating that he was the first to change Plato's philosophy, by arguing in *utramque partem* and withholding his own view. No reason is given for Lacydes' position. Diogenes' divisions differs e.g. from those in Sextus Empiricus (*Hyp.* 1. 220): 1) Plato, 2) Arcesilaus, 3) Carneades/Clitomachus, 5) Antiochus, and in Numenius' discussion of the Academy : he takes Plato's successors to task for deserting Plato and mentions specifically Arcesialus, Carneades and Antiochus as initiating the second, the third and "another" Academy (*frr.* 25-28 des Places = 2-8 Leemans).. Cicero, of course, only knows of an old and a new Academy (*Acad.* 1. 7, 13, 43, 46 etc.), but since he has a philosophical axa to to grind, viz. his opposition to Antiochus' renewal of the supposedly Old Academy, Cicero's testimony may not be as valuable as it first appears to be.^{NOTE 23} The mention of the otherwise little known Lacydes as the founder of the New Academy may not be as meaningless as many have supposed, though a mistake on Diogenes' part cannot be totally excluded. In the *Ind. Acad.* XXI 36-42 Lacydes is said to have changed the Middle Academy by mixing its views with those of another school (the Cynics?) and thus caused it to be called "the newer". Furthermore, Numenius seems to indicate that Carneades turned his back to his immediate predecessors and related directly to Arcesilaus, thus hinting that something had happened in between (*fr.* 27 des Places). Diogenes should not always be blamed for what seems to be ignorance and carelessness.

What of it? Since we know nothing about Lacydes' philosophical ideas,^{NOTE 24} the history of Platonic philosophy gains only marginally. However, the fact that a writer like Diogenes, who is otherwise rather opposed to the idea of development within philosophical schools, feels obliged to adopt several stages within the Academy, indicates that the idea must have been widely accepted, certainly from the middle of the I. century BC. And, indeed, from the time of Arcesilaus there must have been a lively discussion within the Academy as to the nature of Plato's philosophy. This may have something to do with the fate of Plato's

works about which we know nothing for about 100 years after Plato's death. NOTE 25 No writings are mentioned in Plato's last will (DL 3. 41-43), there is no evidence that there was a library in Plato's school/the Academy: Diogenes tells us that Aristotle acquired Speusippus' books (4. 5), Strabo mentions that Aristotle was the first real book-collector (13. 1, 54 p. 608 = T 66 b Düring), and Plato's name does not appear in Athenaeus' list of libraries (1. 3 a). In 3. 66 Diogenes refers to Antigonus of Carystus for the information that anyone who wanted to read through the newly published works by Plato had to pay the owners a fee; whatever the exact meaning of this statement, it does not support the idea of a library in the Academy. Nor does Diogenes' remark in 4. 32, that Arcesilaus was in possession of Plato's works, a statement which is confirmed by the Ind. Acad. XIX 13-16. Arcesilaus was accused by his contemporaries for trying to justify his scepticism by appealing to "Socrates, Plato, Parmenides and Heraclitus", and it is tempting to speculate that his philosophy of non committal to any doctrines at least in part was due to his knowledge of Plato's earlier dialogues while Plato's immediate successors had concentrated on his later works (from the Republic on). This is also implied by Cicero De Or. 3. 67.

Underlying the previous paragraph is the suggestion that Plato's school was not set up as an institution like e.g. the Lyceum or Epicurus' Garden. Scattered remarks in Diogenes' Lives in book 4 support this: the lame Speusippus was transported on a wagon to the Academy (4. 3), Polemon had withdrawn from the world and lived "in the garden", next to which his students built huts and lived close to the sanctuary of the Muses and the exedra (4. 19). On the authority of Antigonus of Carystus we are told that Arcesilaus lived in Crantor's house, while Polemon and Crates lived in a house belonging to a citizen named Lysicles (4. 22). Later Arcesilaus lived with two courtesans (4. 40). Lacydes lived in the Academy in a special garden called Lacydeum, provided by King Attalus (4. 63). - All these statements indicate that the Academy must not be thought of as identical with Plato's house or another separate building. Information about Xenocrates (4. 6) and Arcesilaus (4. 39) spending most of their time in the Academy does not contradict this: the Academy denotes either an area or an intellectual tradition rather than an educational institution. While the philosophical activities of the Academics often, but not always, took

place in the area of the Academy, this was not the property of the school or of the scholarch. The same situation comes to life in Cicero's charming description of his experiences in Athens in 79 BC (De fin. 5. 1-6) where we find Antiochus lecturing, not in the Academy, but in a gymnasium closer to the center of Athens. ^{NOTE 26}

The open nature of Plato's school explains why his successors seem to have given up writing scholarly philosophical treatises and turned to the increasingly popular essay ^{NOTE 27} - if they wrote at all. Some students took notes of their master's lectures but it is impossible to say anything of the form and content of these σχολαί and ἐπομνήματα (cf. Ind. Acad. XX 43, Q 33.35, XXII 38, XXIII 5).

Turning now to the other main source of the history of the Academy in the Hellenistic period, the Index Academicorum, we face a number of problems due to the fact that the text is preserved on a papyrus which has come down to us with many gaps, and in which the transitions from one fragment to another are far from certain. Furthermore, the text of the papyrus seems to be a draft rather than the final manuscript. ^{NOTE 28} Frequently, the preserved text consists of no more than a few letters per line, and part of the text has been reconstructed on the basis of two, sometimes conflicting, transcriptions. It is no coincidence that many of the extensive supplements were made by German scholars who were skilled in Greek composition, and who had much confidence in their own ability to make conjectures and reconstruct the lost original. ^{NOTE 29} Considering this state of affairs, we must always remember that many conclusions about the Ind. Acad. are hypothetical and beyond proof. In the following I shall concentrate on the Ind. Acad. but many points apply to the Index Stoicorum as well. ^{NOTE 30}

The Ind. Acad. is a history of the scholarchs of the Academy. Beginning with Plato, it offers short biographies of Plato's successors down to the middle of the I. century BC, including comprehensive lists of the scholarchs' students. A remarkably large amount of information has parallels in Diogenes' book 4 (cf. the table on the next page), even to the point that the order of presentation is the same. As in Diogenes, philosophical doctrines seem not to have played a major role in the account, in fact the only time the Ind. Acad. offers something like a doxography is in connection with Arcesilaus (XVIII-XIX)

TABLE COMPARING DIOG. LAERT. BK. 4 AND IND. ACAD.

DL	Ind.Acad.
Speusippus	
1 = 164, 6-7 statue of Muses	VI 30-38
4-5 leader 8 years	VII 14-17 ?
9 weak character	VI 39-40
2 = 164, 12-3 female students	VI 26-27
3 = 165, 1 paralysis	VI 38-39
Xenocrates	
8 = 168, 1-3 golden wreath	VIII 41 - IV 7
15 = 172, 20 relative	IV, 9
Polemo	
16 = 173, 6 dissolute life	IV 40 - XIII 10
17 = 173, 17-19 father	IV 36-40
19-20 accused by wife	XIII 3-5
20-22 imperturbable	11-19
23-25 mad dog	20-30
18 = 174, 1 in the theatre	38-40
5-7 like in painting	46- XIV 1
7-11 theory and praxis	XIV 3-7
19 = 174, 18-20 seclusive, students building huts	12-40
20-23 Polemo & Xenocrates	41-45
20 = 174, 25 liked Sophocles	45-46
Crates	
21 = 175, 14 loved by Polemo	XV 31-33 ?
22 = 176, 5-6 Arcelaus on Polemo and Crates	3-10
Crantor	
24 = 177, 5-6 education, writings	XVI 1-16
17-19 tomb	41 - S 10 ?
Arcesilaus	
28 = 179, 9-12 Scepticism	XVIII 7-18
13 ff his brothers	XVII 1 ff.
32 = 181, 4 Socratides	XVIII 2-4
4-7 writings	31-41
7-8 owned Plato's works	XIX 14-16

- where the author even seems to suggest that it is a bit of a nuisance to do so (XIX 10). In any case, this doxographical section is connected with Arcesialus being the founder of a new Academy, just as in Diogenes.

The Ind. Acad. is especially important for the information it gives on the organization of the Academy. Sometimes scholars were elected by members of the Academy, sometimes they were appointed by their predecessor. The members seem to have been divided into two groups, the younger and the elder, though the point of this distinction is unknown.^{NOTE 31} It is noteworthy that the members sometimes lectured outside the Academy, cf. VII 8-10 (Menedemus), N 1-6 (unnamed Academic), XXIV 32-37, XXV 7-11 & XXX 6-12 (Clitomachus), and XXXII 7-9 (Charmades?) & 13-15 (unnamed Academics). Once again, the activities of the Academy does not seem to have been confined to a single building or property.

However small the philosophical contributions of most of the Hellenistic Academics, the Ind. Acad. proves beyond doubt that the school was flourishing at least to the middle of the I. century BC. The preserved text lists by name more than 100 students from all over the Greek world. Whether this has anything to do with the less dogmatic attitude of the Academics, is another question, but there is certainly no sign of any decline in this period.^{NOTE 32}

The extensive overlapping between the Ind. Acad. and Diogenes book 4 points towards a common source.^{NOTE 33} While the sources mentioned in the Ind. Acad. (and in the Ind. Sto.) generally correspond to sources mentioned in Diogenes,^{NOTE 34} in fact only two names are found in both Diogenes and the Ind. Acad.: Apollodorus the Chronographer and Antigonus of Carystus.^{NOTE 35} Since quotations from Apollodorus only appear in the latter part of the preserved text, covering the period after Arcesilaus, while Antigonus is used for the previous period both in the Ind. Acad. and in Diogenes, there is little doubt that these accounts ultimately go back to two different sources, which do not exhibit one general tenor. It is no coincidence that the parallels between Diogenes and the Ind. Acad. stop after the Life of Arcesilaus, and that the Lives of Lacydes and Carneades show affinities with Numenius' On the Academics' Disagreement with Plato which, as we could expect, is violently anti-sceptical.^{NOTE 36} As a matter of fact,

Diogenes seems to switch from one source to another at the end of chapter 32 in his *Life of Arcesilaus*, right after the last parallel to the Ind. Acad. and just as a more critical and anecdotal tone sets in with the first correspondence to Numenius. If this observation is correct, Wilamowitz is wrong in attributing Diogenes 4. 33-44 to Antigonus;^{NOTE 37} he does so with no better argument than his impression that the sections on Arcesilaus' ties to his birthplace, Pitane in Mysia, must have been written by someone familiar with that place and not living in Athens. This fits Antigonus, provided that the biographer is identical with the art historian of the same name, and provided that Antigonus write his biographical sketches while in Pergamon. As so often in this youthful monograph on Antigonus, Wilamowitz piles hypothesis upon hypothesis with the result that he claims many more passages for Antigonus than the evidence warrants. While Rohde's virulent criticism of the book is no more acceptable than Wilamowitz' hysterical attack on Nietzsche,^{NOTE 38} the whole question of Antigonus' literary output and its influence on ancient biography deserves to be reconsidered.

Be that as it may, it is nevertheless interesting to notice that three main sources for the history of Plato's Academy in the Hellenistic period were a) the autobiographical recollections of a contemporary writer, b) the very brief biographical outlines in Apollodorus' chronological poem,^{NOTE 39} and c) Numenius' ideological attack on the sceptical tradition within the Academy.^{NOTE 40} The inadequacy of these sources is obvious, and it should warn us not to accept too readily the seemingly richer material which appears in later text. There seems to have been little interest in the history of their school among the Academics themselves - except in the first generation after Plato's death where we find a multitude of works on the founder of the school, mainly biographical. But it is important that the anecdotal character of the tradition sets in already here, and that the information about Plato is no more trustworthy than that of most other philosophers.^{NOTE 41} A more vigorous interest in the history of the school does not appear until Plutarch and the II. century Platonists renew the debate about the true nature of the Academy (cf. Plutarch's On the Unity of the Academy since the Time of Plato, no. 63 in the Lamprias-catalogue as against

Numenius' abovementioned On the Academics' Disagreement with Plato, a number of works on the relationship between the Academy and other schools as well as the commentaries on Platonic dialogues). The lack of evidence for the lives of Plato's successors can perhaps be explained by the fact that the Academics were too busy philosophizing and arguing about Plato, but perhaps the less organized nature of the school is also to blame. Furthermore, the literary output of the Academics seems to have been small compared to that of many other philosophers. The history of the Hellenistic Academy cannot be told from a historico-biographical point of view. But then, we know much about the debate of epistemology within the school, and as long as we have Plato's own philosophical works, and as long as they can provoke a lively philosophical discussion, there is little need to take refuge to philosophical historiography.

NOTES

- 1 On the events of 529 AD and the continuation of the Academy, cf. A. Cameron: The Last Days of the Academy of Athens, Proc. of the Cam. Philol. Soc. 195 (1969), 7-29. - The history of the Academy - and many other matters - are dealt with in John Glucker: Antiochus and the Late Academy (Hypomnemata 56, Gött. k978). Glucker's presentation of the history of the Academy is based on a detailed discussion and combination of numerous passages in ancient literature and differs considerably from the one offered here. His negative conclusion as to the nature and continuation of the Academy in the centuries surrounding the birth of Christ, and in particular of Antigonos' role, may well be true. Many of his arguments and the way he first interprets, then combines, different sources seem to me doubtful, but it takes yet another book to discuss this learned and important book. In the present paper I try to show that the information preserved in our two main sources is not inconsistent nor unimportant.
- 2 Cf. K. Praechter's review of the complete Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca in Byz. Zeitschrift 18 (1909), 516-38.
- 3 Cf. Academicorum Philosophorum Index Herculaneus ed. S. Mekler (Berlin 1902) with an excellent app. testimoniorum. Ref. to this work will be by column and line in the papyrus. This edition should be read in conjunction with W. Crönert: Die Ueberlieferung des Index Academicorum, Hermes 38 (1903), 357-405. On this work, cf. also J. Mejer: Diogenes Laertius and his Hellenistic Background (Hermes Einzelschriften 40, 1978), 72-75. (henceforth MEJER)
- 4 Diogenis Laertii Vitae Philosophorum ed. H.S. Long 1-2 (Oxford 1964). Ref. to this work will be by book & chapter and/or page & line. - The most recent publication about Diogenes is the Atti del Convegno Diogene Laerzio, Elenchos - Rivista di studi sul pensiero antico VII 1-2 (1986). This came out too late for me to use it in this paper.
- 5 Cf. MEJER 2-7.
- 6 Cf. MEJER 4-7. I intend to discuss the doxographical sections in Diogenes in a forthcoming paper.
- 7 Compare DL 3. 48 = 141, 20-23 with Albinus Proleg. p. 147, 18-21 Hermann; DL 3. 49-51 = 141, 26 - 142, 21 & 3. 58 = 145, 9-12 with Albinus Proleg. p. 148, 24-38 Hermann. DL 3. 78 is similar to Albinus Proleg. p. 151, 4 Hermann (and Didasc. p. 153, 7 Hermann). - DL 3. 65-66 on the critical signs in editions of Plato has a parallel in a Florentine papyrus of the II. century AD, cf. V. Bartoletti in Melanges Tisserant I (The Vatican 1964), 25-30.
- 8 Cf. John Dillon: The Middle Platonists (London/Ithaca 1977), in part. 408-10.
- 9 Cf. the preface to Divisiones Aristoteleae ed. H. Mutschmann (Bibl. Teubn., Berlin 1906) and H.J. Krämer in Ueberweg Grundriss..., Die Philosophie der Antike, Band 3 Herausgegeben von H. Flashar (Basel/Stuttgart 1983), 124 and 141-42. (Henceforth UEBERWEG 3).
- 10 Cf. O. Gigon: Antike Erzählungen über die Berufung zur Philosophie, MusHely 3 (1946), 1-21; F. Wehrli: Gnome, Anekdote und Biographie, MusHely 30 (1973) 193-208; J.A. Fairweather: Fiction in the Biographies of Ancient Writers, AncSoc 5 (1974), 231-75; M.R. Lefkowitz: The Lives of the Greek Poets (London/Ithaca 1981); as a corrective to the latter, J.A. Fairweather: Traditional Narratives, Inference and Truth in the Lives of the Greek Poets, Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar 4 (1983), 315-69.
- 11 Cf. Leisegang in Pauly-Wissowa RE 20, 2342-47. and Diogenis Laertii vita Platonis rec. H. Breitenbach at alii (Basel 1907). See also A. Riginos: Platonica (Columbia Stud. in the Class. Trad. 4, 1976).

- 12 Cf. J. Bollack: Un Silence de Platon (DL 9, 40 = Aristoxene fr. 131 Wehrli), RPh 41 (1967), 242-46.
- 13 Cf. M.L. West: The Sayings of Democritus, CR NS 19 (1969), 142.
- 14 Cf. Jacoby's introduction to FGrHist 560 (the passage in DL = F 6) and H.J. Krämer: Platonismus und Hellenistische Philosophie (Berlin/NY 1971), 73 note 282.
- 15 On Epicharmus, cf. Schmid/Stählin Gesch. der gr. Lit. I. 1, 638-54.
- 16 Cf. Krämer l.c. in note 14, idem UEBERWEG 3, 134-39 and K. Gaiser: Die Platon-Referate des Alkimos bei Diogenes Laertios (III 9-17), Festschrift de Strycker (Antwerpen/Utrecht 1973) 61-79.
- 17 Aristox. Elem. harm. II 1. Cf. H. Cherniss: The Riddle of the Early Academy (Berkeley/LA 1945), chapter 1, and the judicious remarks by I. Düring on T 53 b in Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition (Göteborg 1958).
- 18 Cf. MEJER 46-50.
- 19 Theopompus was active before 400 BC to well into the next century, cf. OCT s.v. or Schmid/Stählin o.c. in note 15 I. 4, 161-65.
- 20 The date of Alexis as well as the other Middle comedy writers mentioned here is approximately around the middle of the IV. century.
- 21 Cf. Ind. Acad. Y 1-17 and see Proclus in Eucl. comm. 66, 8 Friedl. On the similarities of the two schools, cf. J. P. Lynch: Aristotle's School (Berkeley/LA 1972), 75-96.
- 22 Cf. DL 4. 1 (emphasizes Speusippus' adherence to Plato); 28; 59.
- 23 On the question of the various Academies, cf. most recently J. Glucker l.c. in note 1, 330-79.
- 24 Cf. E. Zeller: Philos. der Gr. 3. 1, 514 note 3.
- 25 Most recently discussed by F. Solmsen: The Academic and the Alexandrian Editions of Plato's Works, Ill. Class. Stud. 6 (1981), 102-11.
- 26 The question of the Academy as a piece of property - and most of passages mentioned here - are discussed by Glucker l.c. in note 1, 226-55. On the physical setting of the Athenian schools of philosophy, cf. R.E. Wycherley: Peripatos: The Athenian Philosophical Scene, G & R 2. Ser. 8 (1961) 152-63 and 9 (1962) 2-21.
- 27 It is, admittedly, difficult to judge the nature of Academic writings before Carneades: all we have are a couple of lists of titles in Diogenes, a few additional titles, but virtually no fragments. The paraphrase of a text by Crantor in Sextus Empiricus Adv. Math. 11. 51-58, however, should not be overlooked.
- 28 Cf. Mekler's introd. l.c. in note 3 XXII-XXV. Both the confusion towards the end of the text, and the fact that Apollodorus' iambic poem sometimes is paraphrased, sometimes is left untouched, indicate that the text is unfinished. Cf. also Jacoby as FGrHist 244 F 47.
- 29 It is to be hoped that the two indices will be included in the recently announced Corpus dei Papiri Filosofici Greci e Latini. Testo e lessico nei papiri di cultura greco-latina del sec. IV a. C. al VII d. C., to be published under the auspices of the Accademia Toscana di Scienze e Lettere 'La Colombaria'. - The quotations of Apollodorus' poem in the Ind. Acad. are given in Jacoby FGrHist 244 F 47-60.
- 30 Cf. A. Traversa: Index Stoicorum, Genoa 1953. The Ind.Sto. is less well preserved.
- 31 Reff. in Lynch o.c. in note 21, 80-82 (add col. Q) and cf. Cherniss o.c. in note 17, chapter 1.
- 32 Cf. UEBERWEG 3, 464.
- 33 Cf. e.g. F. Leo: Die gr:röm. Biographie... (Leipzig 1901), 56-74.
- 34 Cf. MEJER 74.

35 Hermippus appears both in the Ind. Acad. (XI 4-7) and in Diogenes 4. 44, but the former passage comes from a work not used by Diogenes while the latter passage clearly was added by Diogenes himself, cf. MEJER 32-34.

36 Cf. DL 4. 33 = Numenius fr. 25 des Places
 59 = do 26 do
 63 = do 27 do.

The Life of Bion 4. 46-58 differs from all the other Lives in Diogenes book 4 and must go back to yet another source. Though Bion was no Academic, Diogenes had reasons for including him in book 4: Bion had been a student in the Academy (DL 4. 51 and Ind. Acad. S 32), and already Eratosthenes had implied that Bion had philosophical ambitions (DL 4. 52 = FGrHist 241 T 10). There is no trace, however, that Bion was included in Hellenistic books on philosophers. If Diogenes wanted to include Bion in his book - and that he did is evident from his strong disapproval of Bion's behavior, cf. Diogenes' poem 4. 55-57 - the Academy was as good an opportunity as any. A similar 'displacement' is Heraclides Ponticus in book 5. - On Bion, cf. the comprehensive monograph by J.F. Kindstrand: Bion of Borysthenes, A collection of Fragments with Introduction and Comm. (Studia Graeca Upsaliensia 11, 1976).

37 U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff: Antigonos von Karystos (Philol. Unters. 4, 1881) 57-59.

38 Cf. E. Rohde: Kleine Schriften I (Tübingen/Leipzig 1901), 356-61. Rohde, of course, was a friend of Nietzsche.

39 The quotations in the Ind. Acad. seem likely to represent what was to be expected from an entry in Apollodorus' poem.

40 Cf. E. des Places in his introd. to Numénius Fragments (Budé 1973), 14-15.

41 Cf. Riginos o.c. in note 11, 199-213.