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ABSTRACT

This thesis is concerned with the educational history of the Athenian schools of philosophy in the Hellenistic period; with the pedagogy of the Academy, Lyceum, Garden and Stoa, and with the teaching of some of their representatives in the centuries a.d..

By the end of the fourth century b.c. the schools of philosophy were well on their way towards establishing themselves as separate educational institutions sui generis. Representatives of the Minor Socratic schools did not carry past the third century b.c., and it was with the Athenian schools that Hellenistic philosophic culture, its study, exposition, teaching and transmission, took place.

As pedagogical institutions, and with the exception of the Garden, the Athenian schools maintained an institutional trajectory for some three hundred years after Plato founded the Academy in 387 b.c., and not, as we have been usually led to believe, till a.d. 529. So, in line with the rejection of the view of the millennial institutional history of the schools, this thesis re-examines and re-interprets their intellectual and pedagogical history; their theory and practice of education in the teaching of philosophic culture. This activity took place mainly in the philosopher's schoolroom with its established classroom settings and makeup, teaching methods and curriculum, and where, as teachers, philosophers mediated the educational exchange of paideia in Antiquity.

The educative process was informed, organised and
structured by a network of social and interpersonal relations in both theory and practice based on professional competition between rivals on the one hand, and personal ties of friendship and intimacy between teachers and pupils on the other. Thus in its chiefly male teacher-pupil interaction, organisation and teaching practices, and in its exclusion of women from higher education, the Greek school of philosophy was a school established for men and male culture. Furthermore, the philosophic school was not only a school for men, but it was a school for a minority well-to-do men of the propertied ruling classes, for in Antiquity, these were by far the only few people that could afford to engage in intellectual labour for its own sake.

The teaching of the schools, with their systems of physics, logic and ethics, was the teaching of the highly elaborated spoken and written word dedicated to the pursuit of mental culture based on leisure (schole) and the contemplative life, intellectual as opposed to manual work. In the schools of philosophy, paideia was representative of male ruling class culture at its highest theoretical and practical expression: a feature illustrative of their general teaching and philosophy as it was expounded in the ideal of the philosopher-teacher as wise man.
INTRODUCTION.

In the course of their educational history, the Greek school of philosophy managed to frame, theorise and debate most questions that could be asked, given historical conditions, about the nature of existence (ontology), knowledge (epistemology), and practice (ethics), yet, in the history of Greek education, there is not a single extended critical account devoted wholly to the educational history of the Athenian schools of philosophy and their teaching in the Hellenistic period. Standard histories pay the schools little attention. Yet it was in the Hellenistic period that higher education, and schools of philosophy in particular, flourished as educational institutions, and it was during this time that the philosophic systems of Cynicism, Epicureanism, Stoicism, Academic Scepticism, and others, were developed, theorised and then taught for centuries.

However, the classical scholar's judgement that with the death of Aristotle the golden age of philosophic thinking also came to an end has had a most unproductive effect as far as the study of the intellectual and pedagogical tradition of the schools of philosophy is concerned. Classical scholars and philosophers have recently done a good deal of work in redressing this imbalance in their respective disciplines. Historians of education have not done the same in theirs, however, and since philosophers have so far shown little interest in matters of pedagogy, the problem of redressing the accounts
in the history of education still remains. A thorough re-theorisation of the Athenian schools and their educational history has now long been overdue.

We are, for example, well informed about most aspects of the schools' philosophies, but know little about the teaching of those philosophies: of the where, what and how of pedagogy. Yet, philosophers, like most other pedagogues, spent a good deal of their time teaching. There was a close interplay among philosophising, teaching, debating, publishing, and other activities. The school philosophies and their teaching developed out of these interactions and in order to understand them, one needs also to understand their educative practices.

Our knowledge of the state of philosophy and its teaching following the later first century B.C. crisis and that of the early empire still constitutes one of the major problems in the history of philosophy. There is a large gap between Antiochus of Ascalon and Plutarch, and between the Middle Platonists and Plotinus with his intellectual successors; a gap which still needs filling, though many of the details are now probably irretrievably lost in the sands of Egypt.

This thesis, then, attempts to redress some of the imbalances. It attempts to provide a critical account of education in the schools of philosophy. It is an attempt to understand an aspect of the Greek educational experience, namely, philosophical education, and explain a complex set of educational and social practices. It is thus also a statement of theory.
Its concerned primarily with the pedagogical history of the Athenian schools in the Hellenistic period, with the teaching of the Academy, Lyceum, Garden and Stoa. Although I focus on specific details to draw out a common trend or pattern, in doing this, I restrict myself to the central themes; to the themes of the institutional and intellectual-pedagogical history of the schools, with the principal theme being the theory and practice of education. The account is extended, albeit in brief, for in itself it would require a separate study of its own, into the centuries a.d. in order to show lines of continuity in the intellectual and pedagogic tradition.

The thesis is in two, though interrelated, parts. Part one (chapters 1 and 2) deals with the institutional and intellectual history of the schools and their representatives. Chapter 1 reconstructs their history. It is a critique of the dominant view in scholarship which has constructed a model of the history of the schools of philosophy spanning a millennia: the golden chain from Plato to Justinian, – 387 b.c. to a.d. 529 – and its companion myths regarding the organisation of the schools as institutions, likening them to modern day 19th century English, or German universities, and the representation of Athens as the educational centre throughout Antiquity. As a consequence, this model of interpretation has generated a body of scholarship which has based itself on attendant myths regarding things like succession of scholarchs and property, teaching practices and forms of organisation, and, following this line of thinking, it has necessitated
the construction of a corresponding school infrastructure; that is, schools require teachers and students where in the specific settings of a *scholē* with its garden, walks, exedrae, libraries, etc., philosophers carried out the schools' business of pedagogy, its production and transmission for over a thousand years. This in turn required comparable and determinate forms of organisation (symposia, lectures, debates, etc.) and appropriate modes of intercourse between teachers and pupils, the community and rivals. That is to say, it produced a model of interpretation of the pedagogical history of the schools comparable to the model of the uninterrupted millennial institutional history.

This ruling paradigm in educational history is one that has not been challenged by historians of education, and it is a model which has dominated the interpretation of the schools' pedagogy in the past. Chapter 1 refutes this model, and at the same time offers an alternative.

Chapter 2 looks at the intellectual history of the school with a view to establishing the schools' cultural tradition which was a central part of their pedagogical tradition. That is, the schools in their theorising of philosophy and of the philosophical enterprise were in effect theorising their educational enterprise: their theory and practice of education. They were in the process of constituting themselves as articulate institutions in a continuous process of interaction between themselves and other institutions.
It was a long and complex process in the division of intellectual labour towards the construction of educational theory and practice. The process was mediated by teaching, and by the dynamic of the schools as competing philosophical alternatives.

Thus, one of the main reasons why Part one is devoted to a re-theorisation of the institutional and intellectual history of the schools is to provide a basis for an alternative interpretation of their pedagogy, for this was their main activity.

Part two of the thesis is devoted to this aspect of the history of the schools: to the teaching of philosophy and to aspects of the educative process which were at its centre. These include, in particular, the relations of teacher-pupil interaction; the problem of women and philosophical education, and the teaching of the schools as it was theorised in the philosopher-teacher as wise man.

In the pedagogic arena, theory and practice was shaped in the agon for physical and doctrinal legitimacy in the production and reproduction (the practice of teaching) of knowledge and its transmission. This became the dominant competing activity of the schools. Teaching was its instrument. Chapter 3 reconstructs the teaching of the schools: the where, when, what and how, as well as the why of philosophic pedagogy.

Chapter 4 examines the network of social relations of interaction operating between teachers, students, teachers and students in the educative process of the teaching of philosophy. Interaction with other schools took the form of XV.
professional and personal rivalry, and this characterised the educational exchange between them; an exchange made possible by logos as philosophic discourse, the common ground of interaction.

Interaction between members of the same school was, by contrast, characterised by relations of friendship and intimacy. The educative eros was a central part of the teaching process and principal mechanism mediating the educational exchange. It was the active element of school pedagogy: of the walk, informal discussion, and symposium, as well as of the lecture, debate; the competition for students and other teaching practices. It informed, structured and organised the pedagogical and social activities of its practitioners.

Greek higher education was primarily (and almost exclusively) concerned with the education of men. Based on male knowledge and culture, the school was invented and maintained by, and for men. Women played a less than negligible part in higher education. Thus it becomes obvious, especially in the light of chapter 4, that the schools of philosophy and their teaching were of a particular kind; namely, schools designed for male intellectual culture and one that was predicated on the exclusion of women. Chapter 5, by focusing on the few women philosophers and their education in the Greek schools, aims to provide a clearer picture of the nature of the schools as educative institutions within Ancient society; a society where women got little or no higher education.

This is nowhere more evident than in the philosophy
and teaching of the schools as it was expressed in their ideal of the philosopher-teacher as wise man. The philosopher as sophos was the ideal pedagogue and the school philosophers theorised this ideal in their philosophy of the good life, of socio-political life and of themselves as professional teachers. This was the ultimate legitimation of their pedagogy. Chapter 6 takes up this theme, for this is where the schools' pedagogy was represented at its most elaborated and systematic form.

The aim of this thesis is to provide an alternative critical account of the pedagogical history of the schools and at the same time integrate this account with aspects of the social, political, institutional, intellectual and interpersonal history of the schools of philosophy and their practitioners in the Hellenistic period, and of some of their representatives in the teaching of philosophy in the centuries a.d..
PART I.

THE INSTITUTIONAL AND INTELLECTUAL HISTORY OF THE SCHOOLS OF PHILOSOPHY.
Ch. 1. The Schools of Philosophy and Their History.

Introduction.

1.1. The First Schools.

The Athenian Schools and Their Representatives.

1.1. (a). The Academy.
(b). The Neoplatonist Schools.

1.3. The Lyceum and Its Representatives.

1.4. (a). The Garden and Its History.
(b). Its Representatives.

1.5. The Stoa.

Conclusion to Chapter 1.
Chapter 1. The Schools of Philosophy and Their History.

Introduction.

Moreover, we know that neither in the Stoa, nor in the Academy or Peripatos was the succession ever interrupted. (1)

As an integral part of a larger cluster of statements dealing with the history of the schools of philosophy, the idea of the schools' institutional continuity spanning a near millennial history—the Golden Chain from Plato to Justinian, 387 B.C. to A.D. 529—has been the dominant theoretical position regarding the Athenian schools of philosophy, and one that has had a stranglehold on the interpretation of the schools' educational history. The schools have thus been viewed as religious associations (thiasoi) recognised by the state in law, and later made official and transformed into 'universities' by Marcus Aurelius. With the bringing into line of the Middle Platonist and, later, the Neoplatonist schools and their teachers, the classic Athenian schools are thus represented as continuing the mainstream intellectual tradition and mediating the educational exchange in Antiquity until Justinian closed them down in A.D. 529.

Thus from Mahaffy (1881) - Capes (1887) - Walden (1912) - Marrou (1956, 64) - to Clarke (1971), (2) this tradition of scholarship has been the dominant mode of representing the Hellenistic schools of philosophy in the English speaking world. This is the received account.

Chapter 1 is a detailed critical reconstruction of the
institutional history of the schools of philosophy and their representatives towards an alternative position which is at the same time a critique of the dominant view. It is a refutation of the golden chain thesis; of the mainstream Athenian millennial school tradition thesis and its attendant claims of the continuity of: scholarchs, school property, uninterrupted teaching, research and organisational practices, etc. Thus it reconstructs the institutional history of the Academy, Lyceum, Garden, Stoa and their representatives outside Athens. The main thesis is this: The schools did not continue into late Antiquity. Some time in the first century B.C. (70s) succession in the Academy and Lyceum (probably the Stoa too) came to an end. By the time of Marcus Aurelius' chairs only the Garden may have been able to benefit, if it survived that long. Schools of philosophy, however, did not as such become extinct, though they were not the same old schools of Athens. The educational tradition itself continued. Schools of philosophy sprang up everywhere in the Roman empire independently of Athens, and long before the institutional collapse of the Athenian schools. In the centuries A.D. individual teachers, Middle Platonist and, later, Neo-Platonist schools continued to transmit the educational tradition, and this took place mostly in the cities of Asia Minor - outside the intellectual orbit of Athens. Thus the notion of Athens as the educational Mecca of Antiquity with its four schools is false, especially in regard to the schools of philosophy in the centuries A.D..
1.1. The First Schools.

Although subsequent tradition theorised the Pre-Socratic philosophers within the framework of the Hellenistic schools, it can not be said that they belong to that tradition or that any of them established a schola of philosophy as an educational institution before Pythagoras. It was Pythagoras of Samos who towards the last decades of the sixth century b.c. came to Croton in Italy where he established the first school of philosophy (1). Within its confines, the study of philosophy and its teaching formed the primary activity that characterised the social relations of its members (2) and although as an educational institution it lasted just short of two generations, the impetus it generated as a precedent of a kind was powerful enough for the momentum to carry through far beyond its spatio-temporal confines. It was only half a century later that in the tragic wake of the death of Socrates, a group of philosophers, including Plato, (D.L.III.6) took refuge with Euclides of Megara, (D.L.II.106) himself a former pupil of Socrates who established a philosophical community in Megara. The dispersion of the Socratic Circle outside Athens was not, however, to prove its downfall. Philosophy, in the guise of the specter of Socrates was to come back to Athens and then spread out into the oikoumene with a philosophic vengeance in the formation of schools that was to follow, (3) and one that was not repeated in Athens after 300 b.c.. Following suit it was the literary studies and sciences that became institutionalised at Alexandria and
Asia Minor at centers such as Pergamum, Cos, Rhodes, etc., with their medical, empirical, mathematical and other schools.

As far as schools of philosophy are concerned, the fourth century B.C. was truly a watershed. Only a few years after the death of Socrates, Antisthenes, his most devoted student set himself up as teacher on a semi-permanent basis (4) and in c.393/2 B.C. Isocrates started his school of rhetoric in Athens which generated a school tradition that rivalled philosophy with great success over the next millennium (5). Phaedo, (6) the darling of Socrates, went back to his native city of Elis and started a school there, keeping part of the Socratic tradition (the elenchus) alive. A generation later, Menedemus, (7) a successor to the school and a former graduate of the Academy, transplanted Phaedo's school to his native Eretria where in the guise of philosopher-statesman he and his school engaged in the politics of the day and in the process constructed for themselves legitimation within the dominant culture. Aristippus of Cyrene (8) on the other hand secured justification for himself and his school with his own philosophical doctrine of hedone; carving a niche at the courts of the Hellenistic rulers whose interests he represented. His philosophy claimed many adherents and on the way influenced the doctrine of Epicurus. Plato followed suit and set up shop near the state gymnasium called the Academy in 387 B.C.. (9) Some thirty to forty years later Diogenes of Sinope (10), pre-empted in many ways by Antisthenes, appropriated the most extreme end of the
philosophic spectrum of the *physis* vs *nomos* controversy and coming down squarely on the side of *physis* gave a most consistent expression to the movement of Cynicism through a life based on *anaedeia*, *askesis* and *ponos*. This philosophy of life pervaded Ancient society at all levels from the Imperial court to the market place. Aristotle, failing to succeed to the headship of the Academy, nevertheless timed himself to perfection when close on the heels of the conquering Macedonian phalanx he started to teach on a regular basis in the Lyceum gymnasium in c.335/4 b.c.. (11) Some thirty years later in 306 b.c., Epicurus also migrated to Athens as the city was being 'liberated' (yet again!!) by Demetrius Poliorcetes. Meanwhile, after ten years of study and learning Zeno of Citium in c.300 b.c. offered himself as a teacher by the painted Stoa and started a school.

The process of the formation of schools of higher learning was well and truly on its way and the extent to which philosophers perceived institutionalisation as a form of legitimacy determined to a considerable degree their pedagogy in their subsequent history. The nature of the death of Socrates acted as a catalyst; to survive there was real need for a *terra firma* from where they could operate in physical safety and intellectual autonomy. In time some would grow deep roots in the fabric of Ancient society, becoming part and parcel of its makeup as its most effective instruments of the reproduction and transmission of the dominant culture of the Ancient world.

As the succession of the minor Socratic schools came
to an end towards the end of the third century b.c. as a result of their failure to establish for themselves a firm grounding and institutional continuity in their rivalry with other schools, their labour was made redundant by those who offered similar but superior cultural goods. Megarian logic, appropriated by the Stoa (Zeno learnt his logic from Stilpo, scholarch of the Megarian school) and Elian-Eretrian eristic found it very difficult in their attempts to translate the sophisticated logomachies of the classroom; whereas the salvationist doctrine of an Epicurus mediated through ordinary language struck the right chord with its listeners at all levels of social life. The doctrine of physical hedone advocated by an Aristippus, always philosophically suspect, could hardly match the arsenal and rigour of a Plato or Aristotle, while the religious devotion of a Stoic like Cleanthes, as shown in his celebrated Hymn to Zeus, for example, (12) brought the Gods within the personal reach of the individual.

The history of the schools of philosophy in the Ancient world after the third century b.c. is therefore the history of those schools that successfully addressed the problems of the day by constituting themselves as institutions of higher education with a power base, becoming in the process an integral part of the social dynamic of interaction in Ancient society. These schools were: the Academy, the Lyceum, the Garden and Stoa at Athens with their representatives in the Graeco Roman world at large. This chapter is a critical reconstruction of their history.
The Athenian Schools and Their Representatives.

1.2. (a). The Academy.

Having returned to Athens, he [Plato] spent his time (diatriben) in the Academy, which is a gymnasium located in a grove outside the city and is named after a certain hero Hecademus. (D.L.III.7).

He was buried in the Academy, where he spent the greatest part of his life in philosophical study. And hence the school which he found was called the Academic school. (D.L.III.41).

Plato, born c.429/7 b.c. in Athens and of illustrious family became the pupil of Socrates at the age of twenty. (1) When Socrates died there was a general exodus of philosophers from Athens and Plato was amongst them. (2) In the following years he travelled abroad and became acquainted with Pythagoreanism in Italy and Sicily as well as other philosophers/ies and religions of the Mediterranean lands. Some time in 387 b.c. he returned to Athens and began to frequent the Academy - one of the three gymnasia in Athens and centre of the general pedagogical activities of the polis: its citizens, and daily haunt of the poets, sophists and philosophers. According to established practice, he offered himself as a teacher and began to practice on a regular basis. In addition, he purchased a small garden near the gymnasium and took up his residence there. (3) Thus he made use of both the facilities of the gymnasium frequented by the youth of the
city and the privacy of his own estate with its modest house and garden. In time he attached to himself not only a following of students but a good number of first class philosophers as well. Some, like Xenocrates and Speusippus were graduates of the Academy, as was Aristotle; others like Eudoxus of Cnidus and Philippus of Opus had good reputations behind them when they joined the school. The former was temporary scholarch in 366/5 b.c. when Plato went to Sicily on his visit to the young Dionysius II. Later in c.361 b.c. Heracleides of Pontus was left in charge as Plato made his last attempt to convert Dionysius into a philosopher-king and failed. By this time the school had truly come into its own as an educational institution and a force in the politics of the day. (4) With the exception of the Pythagoreans and the Megarian school, the association of a number of philosophers engaged in the systematic study and teaching of philosophy in the Academy was the primary characteristic that set it apart from the rest of their predecessors and contemporaries before the foundation of the Lyceum in 335 b.c.. The itinerant sophists of the fifth and fourth centuries b.c. came and went as they pleased, their stay ranging from the time it took to deliver a single lecture to a course lasting several weeks, months or as was the case with Isocrates, years. Antisthenes taught in the Cynosarges but with no associates or a regular course of study. Nor did he seek students or successors. Isocrates, likewise, made no provision for a successor and had none. Yet, although the school died with him, the tradition he established
continued. Plato, on the other hand endowed his school not only with physical and organisational solidarity but continuity as an educational institution. This was to remain unbroken for some three centuries (387 b.c. - c.80s b.c.) when Philo of Larissa, probably the last scholarch of the Academy - along with other philosophers fled to Rome during Sulla's siege of Athens in 87 b.c., leaving behind him no successor that we can be certain of. Antiochus of Ascalon, the heir apparent, defected and set up his own school in the Ptolemaion upon his return to Athens. If the Academy continued in Athens it could not have been for very long for Cicero, Seneca and Diogenes Laertius would have us believe otherwise and there is no convincing evidence to suggest that it did. The Gymnasium, however, continued to figure in the history of Athenian institutions. Proclus is mentioned honoring Plato's tomb, but nothing is said of any school (Academy) there. The Academy had long been extinct. The chairs of Marcus Aurelius, an extension of the Antonines' general indulgence of Hellenismos and the Atticism of the day, enabled rhetoric and the four classic philosophies to be represented in Athens but in this the four schools of philosophy (with the possible exception of the Garden) had no part to play. Most, if not all, did not survive long enough to benefit. In the meantime alternative formations of schooling were asserting their dominance in the oikoumene, namely the Second Sophistic which held the stage for most of the centuries a.d.. The schools of Middle Platonism and Neoplatonism, most of them operating outside the orbit of Athens before Plutarchus founded a school
there, competed with their rivals in the cities of the empire by reformulating the philosophies of the classical schools while attempting to maintain the mainstream of the historical tradition of paideia; that is, the dominant mode of Greek education of the enkyklios paideia and subsequent higher educational studies in the schools of philosophy, rhetoric, etc. This was also part of the myth of the golden chain of the schools of philosophy: - Plato to Justinian! 387 b.c. to a.d. 529; the beginning and end of an institution. This myth has been hardest of all to dislodge for it has been kept in good repair over the centuries of scholarship. (5)

"We can follow the succession (diadoche) in the four greatest schools almost without a break right through the Hellenistic period and to the end of Antiquity". (6)

Despite this ideological representation, our knowledge of succession in the Academy (7) and the existence of the school as an educational institution is probably superior to that of the other three schools, although it cannot be claimed with much confidence after Philo of Larissa as to whether the school continued. When Cicero was in Athens in 79 b.c. he and Marcus Piso attended the lectures of Antiochus of Ascalon in the Ptolemaion. (8) It seems that there was no-one teaching in the Academy and the place was deserted as Cicero and company strolled along. (9)

I am reminded of Plato, the first philosopher, so we are told, that made a practice of holding discussions in this place, and indeed the garden close yonder not
only recalls his memory but seems to bring the actual man before my eyes. This was the haunt of Speusippus, of Xenocrates and of Xenocrates' pupil Polemo, who used to sit on the very seat we see over there. (10) Succession continued after Polemo, but with the advent of Scepticism brought about by Arcesilaus of Pitane, sixth head of the school, and its elaboration by his successors, the school was perceived by its rivals in terms of the establishment of new schools within the Academy; a view which in the centuries a.d. attributed five different Academies to the school. It seems to have made its appearance with the Stoic Panaetius of Rhodes (11) whose preference for and intimate familiarity with the doctrines of the original founders of the Academy, Lyceum and Stoa led him to declare himself their true successor in opposition to the sceptical Academy/ies which he considered an abandonment of Plato's original Academy and its teachings. He may therefore have been one of the first to distinguish between the 'Old Academy' of Plato and his immediate successors on the one hand and the 'New Academy' of Arcesilaus to Clitomachus. Furthermore, Antiochus of Ascalon, wishing to dissociate himself from the position advocated by Philo, designated his school: 'The Old Academy' and may have been the actual inventor of the distinction. Cicero knew of and rejected it. (Cic.Acad.I.3.13,46). Plutarch (Cic.4.) attributes the 'New Academy' to Carneades. Clement of Alexandria (Strom.I.62-64) mentions three Academies: Plato to Crantor, Arcesius to Hegesinus and Carneades with his successors and
associates. Diogenes Laertius presents the same with a slight variation on Clement's list. (12). In addition, later post-Ciceronian tradition added two more Academies. (13) Sextus Empiricus puts it in a nutshell:

According to most people there have been three Academies the first and the most ancient that of Plato and his school, the second and middle Academy that of Arcesilaus, the pupil of Polemo and his school, the third and new Academy that of the school of Carneades and Clitomachus. Some, however, add as a fourth that of the school of Philo and Charmadas; and some even count the school of Antiochus as a fifth. (S.E. P.H.I.220).

This conception of the school belongs to a hostile tradition and certainly does not represent the way in which members of the Academy saw themselves — Academics pure and simple. They did not call themselves by any other name, not even Platonists and in no way founders of new schools since they always maintained that they were the bona fide successors to the original Academy and its doctrine. Philo claimed this. (14)

The succession itself was definitely unbroken until we come to the early first century B.C.. The main problem at this juncture is: what happened to the Academy during the later days of Philo's headship when he fled to Rome in 87 B.C. (15) when Sulla besieged Athens, destroyed the groves of the Academy and caused considerable damage to the gymnasium. (16) Glucker is of the opinion that Philo died in Rome without returning to Athens, though we are nowhere
told this (17). Antiochus spent a few years in the train of Lucullus before returning to Athens and teaching in the Ptolemaion. (Cic.Fin.V.1.) But if the Academy was finished as Glucker argues (18) and if there was no one left to carry on from where Philo had left off, then why did not Antiochus simply move into the empty Academy and secure his claim to its representation by appropriating the physical settings of the school rather than moving to the Ptolemaion? The fact that he did not occupy the Academy is in itself no proof for the existence of a school or successors, although it is fair to say that there is really no firm evidence to the contrary. The Academy may not as yet have been completely devoid of members; not for a decade or so at any rate. Most of the senior members of the school were by now dead (19) and some of the younger ones defected with/to Antiochus. (20) Aenesidemus, for example, defected to Pyrrhonism, (21) and Cratippus went over to the philosophy of the Peripatos. Philo seems to have had no successor for even if Charmadas was left as caretaker scholarch in 87 B.C. and was still alive to prevent Antiochus from moving into the Academy in 79 B.C. he could not have continued for very much longer, being in extreme old age. As far as the evidence will allow he may or may not have been dead c.83 B.C.. In any case no successor is mentioned leading the school past the early 70s B.C. and the reason why Antiochus chose to teach in the Ptolemaion can be explained in terms of his attempt to clearly dissociate himself from the Philonian brand of Academic scepticism in formulating his own competing alternative
which he labelled the 'Old Academy'. He did not wish to be seen as a successor to Philo but as a rediscoverer of Plato. Antiochus himself was succeeded by his brother Aristus in 69 b.c. (22) Brutus attended his lectures (23) and in 51 b.c. Cicero paid him a visit while on his way to Asia Minor. (24) How long and in what capacity he continued to teach we do not know. The only philosopher of note, for lack of anyone better, was Cratippus of Pergamum, a private tutor who had to be seconded from Mytiline. Cicero's statements regarding the fate of the Academy are not far from the mark when he declares it "a lost cause and a ... position now abandoned... and in Greece itself it is now almost bereft of adherents". (25)

Clarke, (26) taking the golden chain for granted, but aware of the missing links in the chain, is not so sure as to where it continued. For example, he is forced to reject Horace's account of his student days in Athens as sentimental rather than accurate, when Horace says:

Athens added a little to my education. It gave me the desire to distinguish right from wrong and to seek the truth in the groves of the Academy. (27).

But Clarke also notes that Philo's so-called successors did not teach in the Academy (Plato's private property). (28) So how could Horace have been taught in the Academy? Very simply! Horace, as he says, sought "the truth in the groves of the Academy" which belonged to the gymnasium owned by the state and not the Academy - Plato's garden school located near the gymnasium. As to the Gymnasium, Clarke notes that "the groves of the Academy had been
finally abandoned ... (p.60.), ... nor is there any
evidence in later writers that Plato's successors taught in
the Academy" (p.61.). Yet Clarke takes it for granted that
the school continued (pp.79-81.passim.). But did it? For as
Lynch has pointed out "After Philo of Larissa one looks in
vain for testimony to an Academic scholarch". (29) This is
no exaggeration, and as Glucker has demonstrated (30) no
Academic can be accounted scholarch after Philo of Larissa,
and after Theomnestus whom Brutus heard in 44 b.c.
(Cic.Brut.24.1.) no Academic is attested in the sources as
a teacher of philosophy in Athens until Ammonius of
Alexandria and Plutarch of Chaeronea. In his article "The
Teacher of Plutarch", Jones (31) has shown that Ammonius
could not have been scholarch of the Academy and the same
applies to Plutarch who kept school in his native town of
Chaeronea. Nor can any of the philosophers based in Rome
and Alexandria such as Eudorus, Nestor, Dercyllides,
Thrasylus, (32) etc, be accounted members of 'an Academy',
let alone scholarchs. Favorinus, the so-called Academic,
was also a representative of the second sophistic and may
have delivered a sophist's lecture/s in the Academy (the
Gymnasium), addressed to the ephebes of Athens before
moving on to bigger and better prospects on the lecture
circuit. And it is these Academics: Plutarch and his circle
that Epictetus had in mind when addressing his polemics,
(33) for he could find no other in Athens or anywhere else.
Earlier, Seneca named the Academy as one of the schools
whose succession had come to an end, and his list is by no
means meant to be exhaustive.
And so many schools of philosophy are dying without a successor. The Academy, both the Old and the New, has no successor left. (Sen. Nat. Quest. VII.32.2).

Diogenes Laertius (X.9) makes a statement to the effect that except for the Garden, succession in all the other schools had come to an end (34). Even though it specifies no school/s it is no mystery as to who the candidates are. It becomes a mystery only if one operates on the assumption that the four classic schools continued past Diogenes to Justinian. Thus Clarke is at a loss as to who these schools could have been and the Megarian and Cyrenaic are put forward as candidates, seeing that the Academy, Lyceum and Stoa (as far as Clarke is concerned) were still in the running as educational institutions. (35) But were they? Eunapius (V.P&S.453-455) testifies to a break in the history of philosophy which leaves the period between Antiochus and Ammonius a blank, where only names are given. This was a time when philosophers were just not written about in the biographical, doxographical or even hagiographical tradition established centuries before. Glucker is no doubt right here when he claims that the art of "philosophical biography died with the age of Augustus because the classic schools became extinct... and when schools and successions ceased to exist so did philosophical biography." (36)

But the crop of philosophers and sophists who came between Sotion and Porphyry was not described... Clear and accurate accounts of the lives of these men was impossible to discover, since as far as I know, no one
has written them. (Eunap.V.P&S.454).

The life of Apollonius of Tyana by Philostratus is an exception as are the biographies of Lucian of Samosata. (37) None of the Middle Platonists (38) - Gaius, Theon, Albinus, Apuleius, etc., were immortalised in a biography, not even Calvenus/Calvisius Taurus, the second century's best candidate for the headship of the Academy who was in reality a private teacher of Platonism and in no way connected with the Academy. (39) It was a simple case of being unable to compete with the sophists even in this field as Philostratus' Lives of the Sophists illustrate. The likes of Taurus had no chance against a Herodes Atticus. The other feature regarding the Middle Platonists was their sphere of activity, and most of this took place outside Athens: in Rome, Alexandria and North Africa; the cities of Asia Minor in particular. (40) Philosophers and students were no longer prepared to trek to Athens as both could be catered for at home. This was the case at Tarsus (Strabo.IV.15) and in the "schools" of Gaius and Theon in Pergamum and Smyrna respectively. Many taught as private teachers; others joined the lecture circuit of the second sophistic while a few enjoyed private patronage and/or imperial privilege in the form of salaries and immunities that were promoted by the Antonines. Marcus Aurelius confirmed and extended these and in addition endowed two chairs of rhetoric in Athens. (41) He also bestowed to representatives of the four classic schools chairs of philosophy. (42) It is a mistake to think that they had anything to do with either restoring those philosophies as
the schools of old or conferring benefits on existing institutions. (43)

Under Marcus Aurelius the four schools, the Academic, the Peripatetic, the Epicurean and the Stoic, were each allotted a chair at Athens with a salary of ten thousand drachmae. They had evidently maintained their separate identities and they probably kept up their succession of heads. (44)

This view is no longer tenable. Even Walden (1912) (45) raised doubts as to whether the succession could have ended by this time, though he is certain that if indeed it did then Marcus Aurelius restored it and established the so-called University of Athens, — another myth constructed by scholarship, starting with Capes' book: University Life in Ancient Athens. (46)

The way in which the establishment of the chairs is described in our sources and our present knowledge of the failure of the schools to keep up a succession leads us to conclude that what we in fact have here are individuals competing for one of the chairs in Athens and they have nothing to do with any classic schools as such, excepting possibly, the Epicurean. (47) Lucian (Eun.3.passim) gives us an account:

Lycinus:

Well, Pamphilus, the Emperor has established as you know, an allowance, not inconsiderable, for the philosophers according to sect (kata gene) the Stoics, I mean, the Platonists, and the Epicureans; also those of the Walk, the same amount for each of these... ten
thousand drachmas a year, for instructing boys. As we learn from Lucian, anyone from anywhere could contest the Peripatetic chair. (Luc.Eun.4) In this case it was narrowed down to two where suitability was a question of knowledge of school doctrine and not membership of any Athenian Peripatos of which, by the way, there is not the slightest mention.

That the title diadochos could be bestowed on or appropriated by a holder of a chair of philosophy need not mean that that person was a genuine successor. The title was also appropriated by the holders of the chairs of rhetoric (48) and they never had a succession. Nor is this phenomenon confined to Athens. Eusebius (Eccl.Hist.VII.32.1-6) speaks of the Antiochian episcopate as a succession. Marcellinus was a diadochos. Cyril received it from Timaeus; Tyrannus from Cyril. Anatolius was appointed Dionysius' diadochos and later in Alexandria he was deemed "worthy to establish the school of the Aristotelian succession" (kai tes epi Alexandreias Aristotelous diadoches ten diatriben, VII.32.6.) This succession could only be temporal and not spatial. (49) Galen further illustrates its ubiquity:

But now, from this age of ours, there are also diadochoi of these sects, and not a few of them take their title for this reason, after the sect from which they are endowed. (50)

Thus, in the next century Longinus speaks of Theodotus and Eubolus as hoi te Athenesi diadochoi, holders of chairs of philosophy or just public professors of Platonism who
preferred to teach in the privacy of their own homes (52) while the sophists monopolised the public buildings - the temples, baths, gymnasia, theatres, etc. None of these diadochoi can be linked with the physical settings of the old schools. The Athenian chairs of philosophy seem to have lapsed some time in the third century without having being revived; while in the fourth century philosophers were at a premium in Athens. Iamblichus and his circle of followers and successors were supreme in Asia Minor. The Emperor Julian totally bypasses Athens in his account of Neoplatonism (Or.VII.222) starting with Plotinus, then: Porphyry - Iamblichus - Aedesius - Maximus - form the line of succession. Julian is not deliberately omitting Athens, it is just that there was no one worth mentioning. The educational scene in Athens and the empire at large was the second sophistic, but the so-called University of Athens, as Lynch has argued, is a myth existing only in the mind of modern scholarship (54) and a misrepresentation of education in the later Roman empire.

As to the history of the actual property of Plato and its association with its Academics we are even less informed and lose trace of it soon after Polemo, third scholarch. Plato seems not to have made any specific provisions for the school's continuation. He was succeeded by his nephew Speusippus but his property went to Aidemantus, his nearest agnate relative. Whether this included the garden too, as it appears, or was handed over for the use of the school, we cannot say with certainty. (55) Yet Xenocrates, (56) the next head, was in possession
of it as was his successor Polemo who with his associates and students "made themselves little huts and lived not far from the shrine of the Muses and the lecture hall (exedra)". (57) This would have been difficult unless the property was in the hands of the school. After Polemo we are not informed as to the fate of the garden. It may have passed to other hands but there is no evidence that it did. Diogenes Laertius (IV.22) tells us that the next two successors did not live in the garden and his statement that Arcesilaus "spent his time wholly in the Academy" (D.L.IV.39) need mean no more than that he continued to teach in the gymnasium as his predecessors had done. (Cic.Fin.V.2) There is no mention of school property in his will (D.L.IV.43) and when Lacydes became scholarch (D.L.IV.59) he lectured in the Academy (the gymnasium) and in a new garden donated by king Attalus II, and named after Lacydes: the Lacydeion. (D.L.IV.60) Whether it was the personal property of Lycades or part of the state's gymnasium we cannot say nor how long it lasted and continued to be used by the school. Lacydes voluntarily stepped down from the headship of the school and his successors Telecles and Evander (58) may have taken over from where he left off along with Hegesinus, their successor. (59) Carneades is known to have lectured in the exedra of the Academy (60) and his successor and namesake did the same. (61) By far it was the facilities of the gymnasium like the exedra that figure in the subsequent history of the school (Cic.Fin.V.2.) and there is no further mention of the school property. Clitomachus, before
succeeding to the school, lectured in the Palladium. (62) Charmadas, another senior member, was in the Ptolemaion (63). As scholarch, Philo used the exedra and other facilities of the gymnasium. After this nothing is said as to what happened to the school after Philo went to Rome (64) and nothing more is known of the relation between the gymnasium and the school. Although both gymnasia (the Academy and Lyceum) recovered quickly from the events of the Mithridatic wars, the schools did not. Strabo (IX.I.7.) in a passing reference to the Academy mentions only the gymnasium as one of the many historical places to visit in Athens. (65) In the next century Pausanias (I.30) describes the gymnasium and notes Plato's tomb as not far from the Academy; relating a story of how Socrates acquired him as a pupil. Altars to Eros, Prometheus; the tower of Timon the misanthrope and other historical features are related but no garden school of Plato and no Academics still occupying it. If there was such a school surely it would not have gone unmentioned as part of the everyday life of the locality. Towards the end of the fourth century a.d. Athens was sacked by the Visigoths in 396 and the Agora and gymnasia were damaged considerably. (66) In the same year Synesius of Cyrene was in Athens and his account is not encouraging, despite the obvious preference for his Alexandrian school of Hypatia over Athens. Plutarchus of Athens may not have begun to teach yet and Proclus was another generation in the coming. So one need not be surprised to find no Neoplatonic school of philosophy in Athens at this time, let alone one that could yet rival
Alexandria.

All that remains for us is to travel around and wonder at the Academy, the Lyceum and the Painted Stoa... Athens... now has only beekeepers to make her famous. (67)

Yet Synesius was right. The Academy, Lyceum, Stoan and Garden (the latter he does not bother to mention; probably because no physical remains of any kind existed nor did he think it worth mentioning) had long come to an end. Who was to take much notice of Plutarchus or any other private teacher? As to the location of Plutarchus' school, Marinus (68) tells us that it was a private house in the city. Proclus inherited it and held school there. He made periodic visits to the Academy to pay his respects to "his ancestors and kindred, and shortly after, in another part of the same Academy, he supplicated in common the souls of all philosophers." (69) He was buried in the tomb of Syreanus, near Mt. Lycaebittus on the opposite side of the city from Plato's tomb in the Academy.

Thus the notion that the Neoplatonic school in Athens was in possession of the original property of Plato in unbroken succession is as mistaken as a succession of heads. Damascius' statement regarding the diadochika the two schools cannot be taken to mean as a succession of property; a claim which he did not make.

The property of the Neoplatonist diadochoi was not, as most people think, in origin the property of Plato. (70) As with the school itself it cannot be shown to have survived past our last known successor, Philo, and may have
changed hands any time after Polemo. Epicurus' house was itself in considerable danger of being lost in 51 b.c. (71) and the estate of the Lyceum most certainly terminated with the school in the 80s b.c. if not earlier. The Stoa taught entirely on public property thus the issue of private property is irrelevant. Given this it would have been very difficult for Proclus' school to claim physical descent from a school whose history was lost even to them, although they could no doubt claim doctrinal succession; forging for themselves a golden chain (72) of justifications and a claim to represent the true Platonic philosophy which formed part of Proclus' epithet:

   Great Syreanus formed my youth
   And left me his successor in the truth. (73)

1.2. (b). The Neoplatonist Schools.

As we have noted above Philo of Larissa is the last known scholarch of the Academy and the school, in all likelihood, did not survive the 70s b.c.. We have also noted that the so-called Middle Platonists, most operating outside the orbit of Athens, do not fill the gap. The same holds good for the chairs of Marcus Aurelius, and these probably terminated in the third century a.d.. The state of affairs does not improve in the slightest for the next two centuries until we come to the school of Plutarchus of Athens and his diadochoi with their conscious expression of their school in the classical tradition of the four schools of philosophy. (74) In the meantime, and much like the case of the Middle Platonists, the Neoplatonic schools (75)
flourished outside Athens; starting with Ammonius Saccas and his disciples Plotinus and Longinus; the former established his school in Rome, the latter in Athens. Porphyry carried Plotinus' school into the fourth century but left no successor. The school ceased but its philosophy found an advocate in Iamblichus of Chalcis (76) who set up a school in Asia Minor (Apamea) and with a considerable following behind him established important centres of Neoplatonism in the cities of the East, such as Smyrna, Pergamum, Ephesus, etc. From here on, it was close to a century before Alexandria and Athens reasserted themselves as the dominant philosophical centres. c. a.d.400. (77) The former made Aristotle its special object of study while the latter continued where Plotinus, Porphyry and Iamblichus had left off. As far as the non-Athenian schools are concerned a doctrinal succession is all that they could claim and the Alexandrian school certainly did this in respect to the philosophy of Aristotle. The school of Plutarchus attempted to do more than that. It was located in Athens and in addition to professing faithful adherence to the master doctrine, it could also lay claims to a continuity of this doctrine as well as to a continuity of scholarchs and property. What claims did it make? Its claims could be articulated under the single claim contained in that famous metaphor - the chruse seira (golden chain) of succession. (78) The idea of a golden chain of spatio-temporal succession has long fascinated the minds of scholars, and the notion of the millennial history of the Greek schools of philosophy has particularly been
applied to the Academy. Writes Clarke: (79)

The Academy has at least a good claim to have had a continuous history; the Athenian Platonists of the fifth century evidently believed that there had been an unbroken succession, that of a 'Golden Chord' of which Proclus spoke, from Plato downwards.

Lynch and Glucker have refuted this whole construct as unhistorical, one that was theorised in the school of Proclus. At best, however, all that they could claim was doctrinal succession - a claim "to the emanation of logismos"; (81) a claim to "the truth of Plato". (Marin.V.Proc.37) How else could Plotinus, Porphyry, Iamblichus and his followers belong to the hiera genea (sacred race) (82) and be the major bearers of the torch of Platonism when they had no spatial relation to any Athenian school? Hegias is represented "as one of that golden chain of philosophers". (Marin.V.Proc.27) Eunapius makes reference to a Hermetic chain embodied in the person of Porphyry (Eun.V.P&S.456-7) and Marinus does the same for Proclus. (V.Proc.11, 29) Julian the Apostate claimed descent from Helios. (83) The Neoplatonic theory of the Great Chain of Being and the process of interaction in Being by procession from the One to the Many and reversion to the One again gave currency to the offshoots - golden, sacred, hermetic etc., and legitimated them. Thus the claim that there is a direct spiritual emanation from Plato to Proclus and as far as Julian was concerned the inspiration went back to Homer. (84) Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, Plotinus, Sosipatra are inspired and their philosophy
logismos revealed. This type of theorising of the golden chain provided for a far more sophisticated and powerful legitimation of their own school and pedagogical practices, especially when precise knowledge of the spatial history of the Academy was long lost to them. Eunapius (V.P&S.455) laments this fact and is forced to begin his account with Plotinus where not a single Platonist figures as a representative of the Academy. Thus as Glucker has also argued (85) the idea of a golden chain can only be understood in terms of a torch theory - the transmission of supposedly pure doctrine by a few inspired representatives transcending the spatial confines of the Athenian Academy. It was also the primary justification of their educational practices and of themselves as teachers in reproducing an ideological school tradition that was no longer in touch with the material base of society - its socio-political-economic life.

The golden chain is a myth, but myths have a tendency to outlast both the truth behind them and spawn other myths in the process of reproduction. One such other myth - the fact that Justinian closed the schools of philosophy in Athens in a.d. 529 - has also been one of the most deeply ingrained of all. (86) Alan Cameron put it in a nutshell: Even those who know nothing else of Justinian know that he closed the Academy in Athens in a.d. 529 - the very year St. Benedict had founded the monastery of Monte Cassino. (87)

But as Cameron went on to show, (88) nothing of the sort ever took place, particularly the notion that all schools
were closed. What schools? Other than individual private teachers, there was only one — the school of Damascius. If any school was the object of Justinian's edict (89) it was presumably this one, although it is nowhere named. Yet it was after all Damascius and his six associates that left Athens for Persia (90) shortly after the edict came out but only to return more disillusioned than ever before. They continued their activities, however, for another generation or so under comparative safety. Simplicius did his best work in Athens after the Persian exodus (91) and Damascius was still active in the late 530s, dying c. a.d.539. However, even Cameron is mistaken in referring to the Athenian Neoplatonic school as The Academy (92) which it clearly was not. This term cannot be applied in the institutional sense to any school after Philo of Larissa.

What do the edicts of Justinian actually say in respect to this or any other school in the empire?

No person diseased with such heresies shall serve in the military or enjoy the dignity of public office... We permit to be teachers and to obtain public support only those who are of the orthodox faith. (Cod.Just.I.5.18.4.).

We prohibit all lessons taught by persons diseased with the madness of unholy pagans... let him not live off public support... For if anyone here or in the provinces be found guilty... he shall succumb to the aforesaid penalties... his property will be confiscated, and he himself will be sent into exile...
(Cod. Just. I. 11. 10. 2.)

What is more, Justinian caused physicians and teachers to be deprived of life's necessities. For he cancelled all the support which former emperors had decreed to be allotted to these professors.

(Procopius. Anecdota. 26. 5)

The main thrust of the legislation was to forbid pagans from benefiting in any way from the state by either holding office whether military or civil, or to be in receipt of salaries, immunities or privileges while professing paganism as teachers, lawyers, physicians, etc. What about private teachers who made no claims on the state, for this was the position of the school of Damascius? From the time of its founder, Plutarchus of Athens, it was a completely self-sufficient institution, private and considerably wealthy. It was not in receipt of the usual privileges and immunities granted to teachers nor were its teachers salaried. Against such a school Justinian's edicts could have little effect unless they were thoroughly and systematically enforced, which they were not; for as Cameron (93) says, if such extensive confiscations of the school's property were enforced they were still taking place thirty years after the legislation came out. Gluckner (94) even argues that no confiscations took place on the basis that the school, being independent and charging no fees, did not fulfill the edicts' conditions for it to be included. But being a known and professed pagan school was the primary condition and the Athenian school was the
representative of Paganism, consciously so and famous. The special decree dispatched to Athens was no doubt directed with a view to this school as much as to teachers of law and philosophy in general. It was the pagan thorn in the Christian side, yet the school was not closed and continued for at least another generation and was allowed to die a natural death. Its intellectual labour had long before turned inwards upon itself, and thus, locked in a vicious circle, it was unable to transcend the inflated fantasticals of late Neoplatonism, and was in due time replaced by alternative social and pedagogical institutions in the Christian state.

1.3. The Lyceum and Its Representatives.

Born in 384/3 b.c. in Stagira, the early life of Aristotle is difficult to reconstruct with much certainty. (1) His father, by profession a doctor, was court physician to Amyntas III of Macedon. If Aristotle accompanied his father then he might have became acquainted with Amyntas' son and equal in age, Phillip II. Whatever the association, in later life Aristotle found a good patron in Phillip and the Macedonian rulers, and his school benefited much from Alexander's epigoni. (2) Orphaned at ten he was raised by an uncle and at the age of seventeen he went to Athens and entered the Academy in 367/6 b.c.. (3) Eudoxus of Cnidus was temporary scholarch, Plato being in Syracuse. In the meantime Aristotle probably studied under Eudoxus and/or other senior members of the Academy. When Plato returned
from his unsuccessful voyage and resumed his position in the Academy, Aristotle became his pupil also. His stay in the school lasted some twenty years as student, teacher, researcher and writer. (4) In the year 347 B.c. when Plato died he was eligible as senior member of the school to stand for the headship of the Academy, but Speusippus, Plato's nephew, became scholarch. (D.IV.1.) Aristotle then left the Academy and spent the next three years at Assos with the tyrant Hermiaias and his circle of Academics. (5) He was for a short time accompanied by Xenocrates, the other candidate for Plato's position and who like Aristotle may not have found the atmosphere in the Academy congenial after Speusippus became scholarch. (6)

Grayeff (7) thinks that the trip was undertaken on Macedonian instructions and that Aristotle was acting as an agent for Phillip in furthering his interests in Persia. This is a possibility and may have been the case but Grayeff's position is conjectural at best and impossible of proof. During his sojourn in Assos he and his associates engaged in some form of study and research dealing with biological and zoological investigations (8) as a loosely organised body rather than a school engaged in teaching. When Aristotle moved to Lesbos c.343/2 b.c. he continued to research and was joined by Theophrastus, his future successor. He was shortly recalled to Macedon by Phillip as court-philosopher and tutor to Alexander. (9) Very little is known of this seven year period concerning his work and movements in general. (10) Hermippus (in D.IV.2) informs us that he was in Macedon in 339 B.c. as Athenian
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envoy when Speusippus died and Xenocrates was elected head of the Academy. He must have been very disappointed for Diogenes Laeritus (V.2) also says that five years later "on his return, when he saw the school under a new head, he made choice of a public walk in the Lyceum where he would walk up and down discussing philosophy with his pupils", and "where he was head of his school for thirteen years". (11)

Thus from his early days as a student to that of teacher, author, researcher and diplomat, Aristotle's more than twenty-year association with the Academy and subsequent travels abroad proved invaluable when it came to teaching independently on his own. This he finally did in 335 B.C. and on a regular basis. The the school at times suffered from both anti-Macedonian flare-ups in Athens and also during the sieges of the city by the Diadochoi. Each time Athens was besieged the gymnasium suffered damage and the school itself was in real physical danger. This happened several times. For instance, following the death of Alexander, Athens revolted. Aristotle was charged with asebeia (impiety) and forced to leave the city. (12) Antipater, effective ruler of Macedon and Greece, friend and chief executor of Aristotle's will, besieged Athens and forced it to capitulate. Yet in 319 B.C. Athens revolted again and this time Theophrastus was indicted with impiety although not actually prosecuted. By 317 B.C., after a successful siege by Cassander, former pupil of Theophrastus, Demetrius of Phalerum (a Peripatetic and another student of Theophrastus) was made governor of
Athens. The peace lasted ten years. It was a time of a great leap forward for the Lyceum and the consolidation of its position that enabled it to survive the crisis of 307 B.C. when after yet another siege of Athens, Demetrius of Phalerum was expelled by Demetrius Poliorcetes. On this occasion the anti-Macedonian faction led by Demochares, Demosthenes' nephew, managed to pass a general law proposed by one Sophocles of Sounion to the effect that "no philosopher should preside over a school except by permission of the Senate (boule) and the people, under penalty of death." (13) The schools closed and Theophrastus left the city. The law was specifically aimed at the Lyceum and Diogenes Laertius, relating the event in the life of Theophrastus, says that a year later Philo the Peripatetic "had prosecuted Sophocles for making an illegal proposal (graphe paranomon). Whereupon the Athenians repealed the law, fined Sophocles five talents, and voted the recall of the philosophers, in order that Theophrastus also might return and live there as before". (D.L.V.38) The school continued to be plagued by the incessant wars of the diadochoi and the will of Theophrastus (D.L.V.51.ff), in contains instructions and provisions to repair damage; thus testifying to the events of 296/4 and 289/7 B.C. (14) when Demetrius Poliorcetes twice besieged Athens. Similar events occurred in 200 B.C. as Phillip captured Athens, (15) 146 B.C. when Rome destroyed Corinth and subjugated Athens with the rest of Greece; while the worst of all took place during the Mithridatic wars of 88-6 B.C. in which Sulla wreaked wholesale destruction in Athens after months of
protracted siege. (16) Considerable damage was sustained by the city and its suburbs; both the Academy and Lyceum gymnasium and the schools of philosophy located nearby. Teaching stopped as philosophers like Philo of Larissa fled to Rome, Alexandria and the East. Neither school recovered and both shortly came to an end.

Other factors contributed. The Lyceum was in constant competition with other schools, notably its traditional rivals in Athens and later the rival schools at Alexandria and Asia Minor. It did however manage to maintain a trajectory for close on to three centuries as a distinct and influential educational institution. Antiochus of Ascalon (17) and later philosophers in their attempts to reconcile Plato and Aristotle, tended to represent the Peripatos as a branch of the Academy and subsume its identity within the latter's. (18) This was initially not without justification; after all Aristotole did spend twenty years in the school and many more in the company of Academics at Asia, Mytilene, etc., and was therefore profoundly influenced by the model, although not to the extent that he was unable to break away and initiate the establishment of a school in his own right. From the very start he was concerned to provide his teaching with a systematic legitimacy as an educational alternative and one that could offer better paideia than its rivals, including the Academy's. His successors reproduced the Peripatos' pedagogy and secured for the school a justification in the eyes of its contemporaries and rivals in no uncertain terms, and Grayeff goes so far as to claim
that not only did the Peripatos provide the dominant identity of the educated person, but displaced that of its rivals.

the success of the school was such that for a time the designation of 'Peripateticos' (for an educated and highly qualified man) replaced the older names of 'Sophist' and 'Philosopher'. (19)

Although somewhat of an exaggeration, it is not altogether far from the mark. It does explain the so-called Peripatetics of Alexandrian scholarship in the Hellenistic period who in reality specialised in the disciplines which the Lyceum first articulated: historiography, doxography, literary criticism, biography etc. The Lyceum however had a clear and conscious identity of itself and was no appendage of the Academy. It took its name from the Peripatos in the Lyceum and its members designated themselves: Peripatetics, (20) a title which was only replaced in the late Roman empire by that of: Aristotelians.

As to succession in the Lyceum and its existence as an educational institution we are on no surer ground than that of its rivals. (21) By far and until very recently modern scholarship has been operating on the premise that, with its counterparts, it had an uninterrupted history as a school of philosophy throughout Antiquity, when in actual fact it did not survive the 80s b.c.. (22) Yet the old myth persists:

Alexander of Aphrodisias (head of the Peripatetic school in Athens at the beginning of the third century) was the greatest of the ancient commentators
on Aristotle. (23)

and

Although St. Augustine mentions Peripatetics as still to be met with towards the end of the fourth century, there is some doubt whether the school at that time still maintained its separate identity. (24) This view is no longer acceptable. It is certainly indefensible. All that we can gather from the evidence on the succession is: Aristotle - Theophrastus - Strato - Lyco - Aristo of Caos -? - Aristo of Cos -?- Critolaus -?- Diodorus -?- Erymnius -? - ---?? (25) Grayeff goes even further and asserts that "the fourth scholarch and perhaps the last was Lyco of the Troad (266/5-225 B.C.), after which time the school in Athens was either dormant or had ceased to exist". (26) We do know however of several scholarchs after Lyco, the most notable being Critolaus of Phaselis who represented the Lyceum on the famous embassy of philosophers to Rome in 156 B.C. Erymnius may or may not have succeeded Diodorus for he is nowhere called scholarch. (27)

The school continued into the first century (though we really cannot be certain even about this) but the only possible candidates - Ariston of Alexandria, Boethus of Sidon, Andronicus of Rhodes or Cratippus of Pergamum were not scholarchs of the Peripatos. (28) The only philosopher of note in Athens was Antiochus of Ascalon, and he taught in the Ptolemaion. Taking a walk to the Academy in 79 B.C., Cicero finds it deserted, as he had expected. (29) Thirty five years later there seems to have been no one left for
Cicero could find no better philosopher to teach his son than the private and itinerant teacher Cratippus of Pergamum - a defector from the school of Antiochus to the philosophy of the Lyceum and one who had to be enticed to Athens by the council (boule) and given Roman citizenship by Caesar on Cicero's request. (Plut.Cic.24.2.)

It follows then that none of the Aristotelian commentators of the centuries a.d. such as: Alexander of Agae, Aristocles of Messana, Alexander of Aphrodisias or any other Peripatetic, were diadochoi of a school that had long been dead. The process of decline started early and was a steady one, as Cicero informs us in his short summary:

Their successors are in my opinion superior to the philosophers of any other school, but are so unworthy of their ancestry that one might imagine them to have been their own teachers. To begin with, Theophrastus' pupil Strato set up to be a natural philosopher... and on ethics he has hardly anything. His successor Lyco has a copious style, but in matter he is somewhat barren. Lyco's pupil Aristo is somewhat polished and graceful, but has not the authority that we expect to find in a great thinker. Critolaus... even he is not true to the principles of his great ancestors. Diodorus, his pupil,... cannot correctly be called a Peripatetic. (Cic.Fin.V.5.13-14)

Cicero's verdict is not altogether unjust, for both Strato and Lyco while increased the material prosperity of the school considerably (30) they had not at the same time maintained its intellectual leadership.(31) The doxography
fizzles out after the first three heads and even that is impoverished. Diogenes' account stops with Lyco, whose forty-four year reign was not very memorable philosophically and only noticeable for the extravagant symposia he gave and that of his physical prowess. (32) His successors fade into obscurity and we lose trace of them towards the end of the first century B.C.

Even less is known of succession of diadochika (the school property). Aristotle taught exclusively on state property, making use of the facilities of the Lyceum gymnasium with its colonnades, walks and exedrae (D.L.V.51-2). (33) It was only with Theophrastus that the school acquired private property of its own, a garden "through the intervention of his friend Demetrius of Phalerum". (D.L.V.39) When Theophrastus was succeeded by Strato the estate included the garden with its own Peripatos and a number of buildings for living, teaching and storage purposes that had been erected in the meantime. (D.L.V.52-3) Theophrastus stipulated in his will that the diadochika was to be the inalienable property of the school, (D.L.V.53) passing from successor to successor. Strato willed the school (ten diatriben, D.L.V.62.) to Lyco who in turn left the Peripatos to his associates (ten gnorimoi) to elect from amongst themselves a scholarch. Aristo of Ceos became the diadochos and although this is the extent of our knowledge of the school's diadochika it is fairly safe to say that it probably lasted as long as there was a succession of scholarchs.

As for the school library itself, it had a checkered
history and one that is shrouded in considerable mystery. A first of its kind, (34) Aristotle's personal collection of books and teaching materials, which he brought with him to Athens, played an important part in the operation of the school. Housed in the Mouseion of the gymnasium, the library was continually expanded by the addition of new rolls. (35) Upon the death of Theophrastus its history took a new turn. In his will Theophrastus gave "all his books to Neleus" (D.L.V.52) of Scepsis, a senior member of the school who, failing to succeed him and embittered, returned to his native town with them in his possession. Later (c.260s ff.) to prevent their confiscation by the state of Pergamum for its library, its then owner/s buried them where they remained hidden for close on to two centuries before a certain bibliophile, Apellicon of Teos (c.150/40-86 b.c.) acquired them from the descendants of Neleus and kept them in Athens while producing second rate copies for sale. In 86 b.c. Sulla confiscated them as part of his booty and they were transported to Rome where they were deposited in the public library. A few years later they received scholarly attention from the grammarian-scholar Tyrannion who provided the groundwork for Andronicus' edition of what is now the Corpus Aristotelicum. (36)

This is the received account from Strabo and Plutarch, but it has not gone unchallenged. (37) Strabo (XII.1.54.c 609) gives the impression of the Lyceum as a school without a library which it clearly had and an educational institution ignorant of its written tradition, which it was
not. We cannot be really certain that Neleus received the whole of the school's library or just Theophrastus' personal collection, although this personal collection may very well have included the school's library also since Diogenes Laertius does state "all the books to Neleus" (ta de biblia panta Nelei, V.52). A total loss of the library would undoubtedly have caused a crisis short of putting an end to the school, affecting severely its research and teaching capacities. But this did not happen. Though less vigorous, teaching went on uninterrupted. The library may on occasions have been depleted when senior members like Eudemus and Dichaearchus, upon leaving the school, took with them their own private books and perhaps other rolls. The school library as such, however, remained in the hands of the school itself and was no doubt being constantly added to and enlarged upon. That is, the school most likely had duplicates made of such works as fell into other hands, for this would be both logical and politic to do, as well as individuals being private owners of copies of the school's works which were made available to them, and to rivals and the cultured public through publication. Theophrastus' successor Strato proves this. "I leave the school to Lyco... all my books, except those of which I am the author". (D.L.V.62.) The former clearly refers to the school library which Lyco inherited. Strato does not stipulate who was to get his published works, but Lyco did. Chares received them along with his freedom. (D.L.V.73) He further bequeathed his unpublished works to Callinus to edit with a view to publication while the school which
included the library received from Strato, went to the next successor, - Aristo of Ceos.

In short, the school continued to maintain a library which included works of the founder and his associates and successors, plus works of rival schools and other literature. Furthermore, the Hellenistic libraries of Alexandria (39) and Pergamum and perhaps Rhodes and Antioch were in possession of works of the Peripatos, (40) some with more comprehensive holdings than others. The Mouseion which Demetrius of Phalerum helped to establish had close relations with the Peripatos. Strato was tutor to Ptolemy II (D.L.V.58) and Lyco was on the best of terms with the rulers of Pergamum, "esteemed beyond all other philosophers by Eumenes and Attalus, who did him very great service. Antiochus too tried to get hold of him but, without success". (D.L.V.67-8) As scholarch, courted by the kings of Pergamum and Antioch, Lyco was in an ideal position to further the interests of his school by providing their libraries with copies of its works, including that of its esoteric works. The school's interests were also represented at courts by resident Peripatetics such as Lysimachus, former pupil of Theophrastus and teacher of king Antiochus. (Athen.252c). Athenaeus (3a-b) further relates a story where Ptolemy II is alleged to have bought a complete set of the works of Aristotle and Theophrastus. How much truth there is behind this story is hard to say. It may be improbable but not impossible.

Grayeff (41) argues that the story of the burial of Neleus' books was a fabrication on the part of Appelicon
who probably acquired them not from the descendants of Neleus but as pirated material from the library of Pergamum when the kingdom, willed to Rome, suffered wholesale plunder and exploitation; and that the books which had been seized by Sulla had been expertly cared for and maintained texts by being copied and re-copied over the centuries. It was these and no mouldy decomposing rolls as a result of being buried and neglected (Strabo.XII.54) that Andronicus consulted for his magisterial edition. Grayeff however nowhere considers the relation of Appelicon to the Lyceum, for Lynch (42) on the authority of Posidonius (in Athen.214d) argues that not only was he a Peripatetic, but a member of the school where access to his books on the part of other school members caused a revival before Sulla's confiscation put an end to it.

In any case, and whatever the real fate of Neleus' books, the school and others outside it had independent access to the works of the Peripatos. (43)

From the Peripatos' writings and teachings can be found all the liberal arts, history and style; indeed so great is the variety of subjects treated by them that no one ventures to approach any significant matter without prior knowledge of their works. (Cic.Fin.V.3.).

There are no compelling reasons for taking Strabo's account at face value; that the world, including the Peripatos, was ignorant of the works of the school when the catalogues of the works of the school in Diogenes Laertius and Hesychius (the latter includes the use of post-Augustan compilations)
are the productions of the Hellenistic libraries, notably at Alexandria under Hermippus of Smyrna c.200 b.c., (44) or the Peripatos itself under Aristo of Ceos, scholarc c.225 b.c. ff. (45) or both. (46)

As to the esoteric works of the school, Grayeff (47) works with the proposition that many were the product of the successors which were attributed to the sole authorship of Aristotle only from the time of Cicero and argues that they were therefore the ongoing productions of the school after Aristotle, available to all members, and constitutive of their practices as teachers, writers etc., and deposited in the school library. The issue is by no means settled and the position maintaining the genuineness of the authorship of Aristotle is extremely hard to dislodge, given the present state of the evidence. For it is plausible to suggest that the esoteric works may in fact be reformulations of Aristotle's original treatises and lectures as utilised by his successors. That is, a lecture or a series of lectures delivered by Aristotle (eg. the Nichomachean Ethics) and recorded for the school library underwent changes of style, content or method as they were redelivered in the classroom by his successors.

If an author reads his works, he must rewrite it. Always to shirk revision and ignore criticism is a course which the present generation of students will no longer tolerate. (D.L.V.37 Theophrastus).

In the school library they were available to both teachers, students and outsiders on request. They were not likely to have been in want of most of them and though we lose trace
of the library after Aristo of Ceos, it is reasonably safe to assume that like the diadochika, the schole was in possession of some kind of library (though we should not press our claim too far) (48) for the duration of the remainder of the diadoche as the property of the scholarchos.

With Andronicus' edition Aristotelian philosophy entered a new phase and at the forefront of scholarship; providing its representatives with a new lease on life in Rome, Alexandria and the cities of Asia Minor.

Its Representatives.

from the Peripatetic school, as from a factory producing specialists, there went forth orators, generals and statesmen, also mathematicians and poets, musicians and physicians. (Cic.Fin.V.3)

The history of the Lyceum is accompanied by that of its representatives who continued to theorise and practice in various forms the school's philosophy and its teachings. Thus as early as the first generation of the Peripatos some of its members left the school and founded their own. Such were Eudemus of Rhodes, (49) and Praxiphanes, who settled in Rhodes, (50) while Dichaearchus returned to Messene where he taught. (51) Demetrius spent his last days of exile at the court of Ptolemy I and II. As already mentioned, Stato was tutor to the latter; Lysimachus to Antiochus. Although Lyco refused many invitations from the eastern princes and kings he did oblige them by recommending other school members and works
of the school for their library. According to Diogenes Laertius (52) he had other things to keep him in Athens, namely rivals, including a former renegade Peripatetic, one Hieronymus, who had set up a rival school (53) in Athens in competition with Lyco's. The relations were anything but cordial. (D.L.V.68) Other representatives from abroad and by far the most numerous were the immediate graduates of the school. (Cic.Fin.V.3) Of those that did not assume their position in the ruling class, or those that did not belong to it, they set themselves up either as private teachers or professional hangers on (parasites) at the Hellenistic courts. The designation Peripatetic itself became an umbrella term when appropriated by persons outside the school such as the Alexandrian scholars of the Hellenistic period who also inherited the Lyceum's work in the literary studies of art criticism, historiography, biography, doxography, poetics, etc. (54) But as K.O.Brink has argued, (55) the Alexandrian Peripatetics had little to do with the Athenian school as such. The ties were in the way of theoretical identity with and/or rejection of the Peripatos' philosophical position on the various disciplines which concerned the Alexandrians. Their activities were characterised both by real advances on the one hand (textual criticism, philology, grammar etc.) and a real decline on the other such as the degeneration of doxography and biography into a series of 'witty' and 'amusing' anecdotes that were designed to please the ear of the moment rather than satisfy any rigorous philosophical standard.
Thus the work of the Alexandrian "Peripatetics" - Hermippus of Smyrna, Sotion, Antigonus of Carystos or Heracleides Lembos, to name a few of the most important, tells us nothing about the contemporary Athenian Peripatos. The title Peripateticos became common property and many availed themselves of it; its use ranging from that of a genuine member of the Peripatos to that of a humble grammarian when "the name lost its connection even with Alexandria, and did not mean more than 'grammariian' or 'literary critic'. (56) 'Peripatetics' in general proliferated in the Ancient world and as such figure in the literary sources well into the fourth century a.d. when they were finally displaced by the term 'Aristotelian/s' as the Academics had long given way to 'Platonists'. The Aristotelian Commentator (ho exegetos), whether Aristotelian or not in philosophical persuasion like Alexander of Aphrodisias or Hypatia in Alexandria, was the dominant representative of the philosophy of the school and its pedagogy. Andronicus of Rhodes gave it definitive form with his edition of the works of Aristotle. He was followed by a succession of others: Boethus of Sidon, Nicolaus of Damascus, Ptolemy Chennes, Alexander of Aegae, Nero's tutor; Adrastus and Aspasius of Alexandria, Aristocles of Messana (57) who taught Alexander of Aphrodisias known as The Commentator. (58) He was no doubt followed by others in the Neoplatonic schools of Alexandria, Rome (Porph.V.Plot.13.5-15), Asia Minor, and later Athens in the school of Proclus insofar as Aristotle was included in the school curriculum as the introduction to Plato, Pythagoras
and the Chaldean Oracles. Simplicius of Silicia (fl. c. a. d. 530-560) is our best representative at Athens although it was at Alexandria that the exegesis of Aristotle formed the central activity of scholars and philosophers, even at the expense of both Plato and Pythagoras: (59) an activity that was finally and totally appropriated by the Christian state in the sixth century a.d. (60)

1.4. (a). The Garden and Its History.

The Life of Epicurus in Book X of Diogenes Laertius' history of Greek philosophy represents for Diogenes the apex of that philosophy; a philosophy that starts and ends with the Greeks themselves. (1) Epicurus' life also represents the telos of philosophy and is therefore placed at the end of the work, bringing it to a conclusion and thus "making the end of it coincide with the beginning of happiness". (D.L.X.138)

No other person in the history of Greek philosophy has been more misrepresented and misunderstood in both the ancient and the modern tradition than Epicurus, (2) although scholarship has certainly vindicated him and his school. (3) The picture of Epicurus as the consummate hedonist, atheist, egoist and enemy of all culture has remained firmly entrenched in the popular mind whereas in its own day, the philosophy communicated in the language of ordinary discourse was clearly and easily understood. (4) Diogenes Laertius, perhaps an Epicurean himself; most
certainly a sympathiser, went out of his way to vindicate him (X.9.ff) from a hostile tradition. (X.3-9)

Born Feb. 341 B.C. in Samos of Athenian parents and the son of a schoolmaster with three brothers who were his life-long devotees; he himself became a student of philosophy at the early age of fourteen. (D.L.X.2) According to Ariston (in D.L.X.14) it was at twelve, but this is too early. At the age of eighteen before he was sent off to Athens for ephebic service in 323 B.C. he had studied under Pamphilus the Academic and later with Nausiphanus of Teos. (5) Between 321 and 311 B.C. he no doubt came in contact with representatives of the dominant philosophies at Colophon, Samos, Mytilene etc., where his own philosophy and pedagogy took shape against the background of his interaction with them. He claimed to have been self-taught (D.L.X.13) and insofar as he may not have spent a number of years with any single person or school engaged in the systematic study of philosophy in a close teacher-pupil-relationship, he may be justified in his claim. By 311/310 B.C. at the age of thirty-one, he at last set himself up as a teacher in Mytilene but was quickly forced to leave due to hostile Academic and Peripatetic elements. (6) He retreated to Lampsacus where he taught and in the process established a school with a strong community of followers—patrons, associates and pupils. (7) Many of these followed him to Athens when in 306 B.C. he founded a school there. He bought a Garden (kepos) a little way from the Dipylon gate on the road to the Academy and a house in the city suburb of Melite. (8) There has been some
controversy regarding the actual location of the school itself. Wycherly in his article "The Garden of Epicurus", (9) has argued against the general tenor of the evidence (10) which represents the house and garden as separate properties with separate locations. Wycherly's argument is not convincing, as Clarke in his reply to him has shown, (11) adding that if the house had a garden attached to it as Pliny seems to imply (Pliny.N.H.19.51) (and which garden Wycherly wants to identify with the garden of the school itself), (12) then this could itself had been a separate little garden attached to the Melite house independently of the garden situated close by, and outside the city walls. This is not impossible, and there is more to support this line of reasoning. In his will, (D.L.X.17-18) Epicurus speaks of the garden and house as separate properties and of the former as the place where the community was meant to spend its time living, teaching and philosophising. (endiatriben kata philosophian) Now if this property was just a garden where Epicureans grew their vegetables and no more, then systematic pedagogy would have been rather difficult. So it is very likely that around the kēpos there were erected open classrooms (exedrae) and the odd little stoa, peripatos and annex facing the garden. The existence of rooms as living quarters (which could double as classrooms), lecture-classrooms for teaching, writing and publishing are necessitated by the consistent representation of such activities taking place in the Garden. A community lived and taught in the garden as well as in the house, growing its own vegetables; developing and
teaching its own philosophy. Thus we could have here a house with a small garden in the city and a garden with a house and/or surrounding little rooms outside the city. Neither property was large and the garden and house are often referred to in the diminutive. (13) Both house and garden figured in the subsequent educational history of the school as the physical settings where the teaching of the Epicurean philosophy took place and even if one argues that the term kepos was later used generically to refer to the school of Epicurus, rather than to the private property of their garden, it then has no bearing as such on the problem of its location.

Within a short time the school became firmly established as an educational institution and a serious rival to the Academy, Lyceum and later the Stoa. It acquired all the requisite characteristics of a school of philosophy; a permanent physical setting where teachers and pupils engaged in the systematic study of philosophy (teaching, learning, writing, publishing, holding symposia etc.) in an atmosphere of close co-operation and intimacy between all members comprising young and old, men and women, free and slave, rich and poor alike. In his will Epicurus placed the Garden and house at the disposal of Hermarchus, his successor and to all members of the school in perpetuity. (D.L.X.16-18) In addition he also gave all his books to Hermarchus (D.L.X.21) which along with the published works and private books of the other senior members served as a library at the disposal of its members. Succession in the school was secured and an entry in the
Suda on Epicurus reads:

His school lasted 227 years until the first Caesar, during which time there were 14 heads. (14)

It is generally accepted that this refers to the successors of the centuries b.c. from the death of Epicurus in 270 b.c. to that of Julius Caesar in 44 b.c. and that the statement was excerpted by Hesychius from a source probably going back to the Augustan age. (15) Glucker (16) suggests that it may be from a work by Philodemus of Gadara, the Epicurean of the day who is known to have written on school histories. Though there is no evidence to confirm this, it is by no means improbable and there are certainly no reasons to think that there were no other such works on the Garden in the diadochist literature. Yet, of these alleged fourteen heads, only about half are known to us, and even then as mere names. Diogenes Laertius (X.25.) ends his account with Basilides, fourth scholarch of the Garden. Cicero (17) adds Zeno, Phaedrus and Patro, though Phaedrus may not have been scholarch. (18) Given that Philodemus and Siro were based in Italy and were never heads of the Athenian school, Patro (19) was in fact the last known person to claim the title *scholarchos* or *diadochos* of the Garden before we come to the two inscriptions of a.d.121 and a.d.125 in the reign of Hadrian attesting *diadochoi* in possession of the Garden (the estate - the *diadochika*). In the meantime there is no evidence bearing directly on the existence of the school as an institution and the material that is usually offered as evidence really tells us very little. For example, in regard to the school in the first
century a.d. it has been customary to appeal to St. Paul (20) and the works of Plutarch. But all that we learn from the former is that St. Paul talked to/with some Epicurean and Stoic philosophers in Athens as he might have done with anyone else in any other city of the empire. It tells us nothing about schools and scholarchs as such. The works of Plutarch (21) are in like manner brought to bear as evidence but cannot sustain any such claim/s. Of the three surviving anti-Epicurean works in Plutarch, (22) none contains a single reference to the Garden school of the day in Athens. There is no mention of X or Y being diadochos or that Plutarch is addressing the contemporary Garden in his polemics. This is understandable and perfectly consistent with Plutarch's practice of refuting a philosophical doctrine at its core. In the case of the Garden this was to be found in the writings of Epicurus himself and his immediate associates. Later successors added nothing new and therefore there was no need for Plutarch to bother with them. The same is true of the Stoics as when in De Stoicorum Repugnatis (1033b.ff) Plutarch is concerned to refute the heart of the Stoic doctrine represented by Zeno and Chrysippus for if they could be shown to be self-refuting, then the rest of the edifice would crumble. There is no polemical value in Plutarch addressing himself to second rate first century a.d. representatives of Stoic or Epicurean doctrine, nor does he do so. Thus unless there are specific references (and there are not) in Plutarch to schools in Athens with their diadochoi and students engaged in educational activities; the writings of Plutarch
otherwise tell us nothing about the existence of the Garden or any other school in Athens. (23)

This is true of all subsequent literary evidence of the centuries a.d. and it is only two epigraphical pieces of the second century a.d., the Hadrianic inscriptions of a.d. 121 and 125 (24) that testify to the school's continued existence. Both inscriptions deal with the succession of a diadochos and the transfer of school property (the diadochika). One of the conditions to be met however before this could take place was that the person in question had to be a Roman citizen; a condition apparently that could not be met. (25) Plotina the dowager empress, in sympathy with the school and by all accounts a member, (26) interceded for them by having Hadrian reverse the former ruling to grant the right of succession to persons who were not Roman citizens. Four years later a certain Heliodorus seems to have availed himself of this privilege by succeeding to the headship of the Garden.

What does this tell us about the Garden in the second century a.d.? The traditional answer (27) is that what we have here is a clear case of diadochal succession to the schole of Epicurus. This is at first sight a reasonable enough conclusion although Glucker (28) argues that this is not necessarily so. Rather what we have here is a case of diadoche sectae Epicurae (29) and not diadoche to a schole. Arguing that "diadochos and diadoche had generally ceased by this time to denote any ordinary succession in one of the Athenian schools", Glucker (30) claims that it is inappropriate to talk of the Garden and its successors in
terms of the traditional framework of institutional schools.

From a semi private diadochos of the Epicurean haeresis to the 'Professors of Epicurean Philosophy' of Marcus Aurelius' foundation is a small step. Popilius Theotimus - and Heliodorus? - are already far nearer the new category of a professor of the doctrines of a world wide sect than to the older image of an Athenian scholarch - with one difference, that they still inherit and pass on property in direct succession to Epicurus. (31)

Glucker's hypothesis is challenging and no doubt correct insofar as it demonstrates the fact that the Garden had most probably acquired many of the characteristics of a haeresis where succession could really mean succession to a sect and not a school (schole), but if we are confronted here with an unbroken succession of both scholarch and property then this should lead us to believe that their theorisation of it likewise remained basically intact without radical alteration to signify exclusively a doctrinal succession only. There are no compelling reasons to think that Popilius Theotimus saw himself in these terms, especially when the problem at hand was not doctrinal succession but outgoing and ingoing transfer of scholarchs and school property. How long the school continued to exist in Athens in this capacity past the two inscriptions is very difficult to say. It may have survived into the third century. This is not impossible though it does not appear to have happened and Glucker is probably
right in his suggestion that "once the salaried chairs were instituted by Marcus Aurelius whatever had been left of the old Epicurean order (except, perhaps, the property) was allowed to go into abeyance". (32)

This however is not the opinion of the majority of scholars. (33) As far as Clarke (34) is concerned for example, not only the Garden, but all the four schools had kept up their succession intact well into the fourth century a.d. with only the Academy surviving into the fifth. (35) Chilton, (36) trading on the distinction between sect (haeresis) and school (schole) without making it clear how the terms apply in relation to the Garden, seems on the one hand to refer to the whole Epicurean movement as a sect (p.XXIV) while the Garden in Athens is the parent school (p.XXIV) which was endowed by Marcus Aurelius. Once he moves into the third and fourth centuries a.d., however, "sect" becomes the only referent of both a philosophical "-ism" and a school (pp.XXVI-VII). Talk of school in distinction to sect has disappeared. But the schools themselves had long disappeared and even Marcus' chairs, which had lapsed sometime in the third century a.d. were not revived. (37) As separate haeresis the teaching of the old schools had given way to these new forms of pedagogical expression.

This is not to say that there were no longer schools as such! There were still schools with teachers and students where, through specific social relations under determinate material conditions, the education of the Ancient world took place. But they were not the old four
schools of the early days. The material conditions had undergone a transformation and the theorisation of the new social relations regarding educational practices had been translated into reformulations of their intellectual labour carried out in both public and private life. The teaching of philosophy continued past the institutional history of our four schools. Intellectual labour went on uninterrupted.

Since the chairs of Marcus Aurelius cannot lend support to the view of the existence of the Garden as an educational institution in the later second century a.d., final recourse is made to Diogenes Laertius X.9.

The diadoche (succession) itself which, while nearly all the others have ceased to exist, continues forever without interruption through numberless archas (reigns), one after the other, out of its gnorimoi (disciples). (38).

There are two basic claims contained in this statement: (i) Succession in all the other schools has stopped. (ii) Succession in the Garden continues unbroken. Who the "others" are is not specified. Clarke, (39) operating on the assumption that the Academy, Lyceum and Stoa survived along with the Garden well into the fourth century, suggests that the only possible candidates are the Minor Socratic schools; the Megarian, Cyrenaic, and/or probably the Sceptical "Academies" of Arcesilaus, Carneades, Philo and Antiochus of Ascalon (the latter were viewed by their opponents as separate schools within the Academy) that came to an end circa mid first century b.c., quoting Seneca as a
witness. (40) Glucker, (41) on the other hand, working with the premise that the Academy, Lyceum and Stoa had terminated as schools in Athens by the above mentioned time, argues that Diogenes' source, probably of an Epicurean origin and postdating the end of the other schools, could name no other schools but these - its traditional rivals. There were, simply, no other schools in contention. Clarke is certainly mistaken.

The second claim is equally problematic and Glucker, concerned with it only insofar as it can explain the first, takes it as evidence for the continuity of the Garden's succession; and adds force to it by coupling it with the Hadrianic inscriptions:

We do know, from Diogenes Laertius' evidence, that the succession in this particular school went on longer than that of any (or most) of the other schools. This has now been confirmed by our two inscriptions. (42) This makes his job of attempting to refute the thesis of the Garden as a school in the second century a.d. a lot more difficult.

But how much does Diogenes Laertius X.9 really tell us? One can argue that Diogenes clearly had a proper succession in mind; for this is what he means when he claims that it had come to an end in the other schools, but the Garden had continued to maintain its own. The passage is however a lot more problematic than that. If Diogenes was simply quoting (perhaps not faithfully) his source, then all that this informs us of is that succession in the Garden was still intact when the author of his source
wrote. When was this? The statement is very general and cannot be dated with much certainty. On Glucker's reckoning it is either Augustan or early first century a.d.. (43) Except for Favorinus, most of Diogenes' sources do not postdate the Augustan age. (44) Thus, if this is the case, it tells us nothing about the Garden after this date. But what if Diogenes Laertius' assertion was meant to apply down to his own day, into the third century, especially when Diogenes himself would have been in a good position to know the actual fate of the Athenian school?

The diadoche... continues forever without interruption through numberless archas (reigns), one after the other. (D.L.X.9).

How are we to take this claim? As Glucker argues, (45) by the third century a.d. the meaning of diadoche as succession to a schole in the classical sense had given way to the new sense of succession in general; i.e. succession to a haeresis or chair of philosophy, rhetoric, medicine etc. anywhere in the empire. The title of diadochos had become a standard term for a public professor holding a chair and where the diadoche formed a succession of chairs. The problem is compounded in that the successors of the diadoche may simply consist of Epicurean public professors who were formerly the qnorimoi (46) (disciples, learners, students) of the school's philosophy. By the end of the first century a.d. there was no great need for persons to go all the way to Athens to study. Apollonius of Tyana was served well enough at Aegae in all the disciplines including that of the Garden, (47) and Aegae was no rival
to the cities of Asia Minor in the East or Alexandria; Rome and Massilla (Tac.Ag.4) in the West, etc. In the second century a.d. Galen studied with representatives of the various philosophies at Pergamum. (48) Other examples abound. (49) One could even study and gain expertise by recourse to books alone. The epitomes of Epicurus were easy to understand and in wide circulation. (50) The tradition of Epicurus' claim that he was self-taught (D.L.X.13) was further justification for students of the philosophy of the Garden. These hoi gnorimoi then went on to inherit the succession, that is, its philosophy, and taught it as public professors for pay. They were persons in possession of what they believed to be faithful Epicurean gnosis. Adding to this a political dimension where hoi gnorimoi was one of the standard titles for the ruling class; (51) hoi gnorimoi were, therefore, literally those who were in the know, and as a consequence of their dominant position, masters and authorities of a philosophical gnosis whose role was to instruct and pass their knowledge to their successors. The succession was thus one of gnosis. There is no reference in D.L.X.9 to the Garden as a schole with its succession of diadochoi and it is the second century a.d. inscriptions attesting diadochoi that seem to confirm the passage. On its own, far too much weight has been placed on it as solid evidence for the history of the school's existence and its succession.

It is thus somewhat of an irony that the Garden, longest to maintain its existence and succession as a school in comparison to that of its rivals, much less is
known of its successors and their teachings than that of the other schools. This is no accident and as Glucker has also pointed out, (52) the Garden's successors were extremely impoverished material for the biographer and doxographer of the day, including Diogenes himself. There was simply nothing to write about them. They led dull and uninteresting lives spent in the quiet pursuit of ataraxia (happiness) away from the limelight of socio-political life. Nevertheless it is interesting to note that Diogenes did not append a succession list for the Garden when he was kind enough to oblige us with one for the Pyrrhonian Sceptics, even though the latter was a fake and of later construction, courtesy, most likely, of the Alexandrian school of Sextus Empiricus. (53)

Similar references of later writers (pagan and christian, and most of them hostile) do not stand up as evidence for the Athenian school. Diogenes of Oeonanda, Origen, Lactantius, Eusebius, Julian and others, may and do refer to Epicureans and Epicurean doctrine, but not to any Epicurean school in Athens.

Old scholarship dies hard however and it has managed to continue to represent the Garden as still functioning well towards the end of the fourth century a.d..

Nevertheless, the sect itself was quite finished by the end of the fourth century. (54) This is certainly true of Epicureanism as a body of doctrine that was displaced by Christianity, a rival which offered superior cultural goods such as immortality, state support, etc.; but as far as the school itself was concerned it is very likely that it did
not even survive long enough to benefit from Marcus Aurelius' chairs that were taken up instead by some peregrine from Asia Minor.

Though the school came to an end much sooner than has been admitted, Epicureans and transmission of doctrine did not, for within the span of its history the Garden did truly go international, becoming independent of the fate of the Athenian school. Epicureans, whether as teachers with or without schools or just as private individuals, covered the social spectrum and were to be found everywhere in the oikoumene. The inscription of Diogenes of Oeonanda is illustrative of this universalising influence of Epicureanism.

(b). Its Representatives.

Lampsacus, the first place where Epicurus established himself as teacher before moving his Headquarters to Athens, continued as an Epicurean stronghold throughout Epicurus' life, (55) although it is difficult to ascertain how long it continued thus after the first generation of the school. Its supporters numbered some of the most prominent members of the ruling class, including Mithras, the treasurer of Lysimachus who was one of Alexander's epigoni. Mytilene was another city where Epicurus had friends and converts. (56) Earlier he had been badly received there when as a novice teacher he came up against a stronghold of Academic and Peripatetic elements. (57)

On the whole, however, Asia Minor was in the third and second centuries b.c. following a fruitful extension of the
Garden's influence and a logical consequence of the school's ties with the East. If Lampsacus and Mytilene are any indication, the friends and students are of the well-to-do classes rather than of the populace in general and it is a mistake to ascribe Epicurean inroads into the countryside and influence with the multitude of ordinary persons at this early date when the Garden's sphere of operation was restricted to the cities and aimed at the wealthy patrons and students of financial means; not that the Garden was at all exclusive, it was just that it simply did not operate on any principle of free education. Students had to be self-sufficient and Epicurus demanded and got not only fees from his students who had to support themselves in Athens but also annual subscriptions from his wealthy members. (58) Our knowledge is thus restricted, and it would have taken the Garden some time before its philosophy was able to filter down to the grassroots where it found a wider audience in the populace. In the meantime we have only about half a dozen items or so of information from which it is very difficult to get an accurate picture of the Garden's representatives outside Athens.

An empirical question which is impossible to answer, but is worth asking nevertheless, is: How many graduates of the Garden over the centuries went away and established themselves as teachers of Epicureanism, thus accounting for all those schools De Witt (59) thinks there were in the East? Higher education in the Ancient world was always the realm of the minority ruling class culture and for most it was part of the education of the citizen of means. The life
of schoolmaster was not an option for them. It was only lucrative for a fraction of teachers who attached themselves to wealthy patrons, while the remainder, those who actually carried and performed the real bulk of the education of the Ancient world, remain anonymous and unknown to us. And it was from amongst the latter that Epicurean individuals went out into the oikoumene as private teachers spreading its philosophy. The so-called Epicurean schools of De Witt are largely a myth. These include sister schools in Antioch, (60) and Tarsus, (61) Alexandria, (62) with flourishing communities and strongholds in Asia Minor such as Judea, (63) and other places like Thessalonica and Corinth. (64) This is not so! We are nowhere told that it was a schole which Philonodes had in Antioch. Whatever Epicurean influence he exerted, it was in his capacity as royal-tutor to Antiochus IV Epiphanes, whom he converted to the school philosophy. Later under his successor, and acting in the capacity of librarian, he furnished the royal library with a collection of the works of Epicurus. In addition, he took on the role of advisor, diplomat and all-round court philosopher (parasite) in the current tradition of the time. (65) As to Epicurean schools, the same can be said of Tarsus (66) and Alexandria. In the latter, for example, all we know is of two active individuals at the court of Ptolemy II. (67) Colotes had earlier made overtures to Ptolemy Soter but nothing eventuated. Whether or not the so-called schools of Asia Minor acted as a mainspring for the Epicurean colonisation of the East is difficult to say. (68) It is
more likely that this was in fact due more to the efforts of the less spectacular graduates of the Garden: the rank and file teachers that were able to influence people at the more popular level.

De Witt argues that there was considerable Epicurean influence on St. Paul at Tarsus, on the New Testament and on Christian communities in Judea. (69) Chilton has rightly dismissed this argument of De Witt's as unconvincing and impossible of proof. (70) It is not that Epicureanism was not represented at some of these places; rather it is the particular mode of representation that is at issue. We have no knowledge of replicas of the Garden dotting the oikoumene, and although we can assume of those that did exist that they were not likely to have been radically different from the original model, we know next to nothing of them. Yet, over two hundred years down the line, towards the middle of the first century B.C. Cicero grudgingly concedes that not only have they taken Italy by storm, especially at the popular level, but were to be found all over the East as well. Speaking of Epicurus and his influence Cicero says:

Here is a famous philosopher, whose influence has spread not only over Greece and Italy but throughout all barbarian lands as well... (71)

De Witt speculates on the possibility of Epicureanism reaching Italy within Epicurus' lifetime; as early as 278 B.C., (72) but there is no evidence for this. However in the second century B.C. (c.170s) two Epicurean teachers, Alcinus and Philiscus, were expelled from Rome (73) as had
been others from Lyctos/Lytos in Crete and also from Messene in the Peloponnesse. (74) The Garden as such was not represented on the official embassy of philosophers to Rome in 156/5 B.C. sent by Athens and consisting of Diogenes the Stoic, Critolaus the Peripatetic and Carneades the Academic. (75) Whether this was a deliberate snub on the part of the Athenian state or just a disinterested refusal by the Garden in accord with its doctrine of me politeuesthai and lathe biosas we do not know, but by the next century, using its own unorthodox methods of conversion, (76) it was firmly entrenched in Italy, claiming adherents in both the upper and lower classes. Cicero, no fan of Epicureanism, testifies to the later (77) and for the former includes prominent ruling class members such as Atticus, Piso, Lucretius and others. (78) Foreigners like Philodemus of Gadara preferred Italy to Athens. Siro had a flourishing school in Sicily as Epicureanism took hold of the popular mind; an equation which Cicero links with vulgarism, hoping to discredit it. (79)

With the school surviving into the first and second centurie a.d. its representatives continued to further its doctrines as teachers. Apollonius of Tyana heard one at Aegae. (80) Epicureans were no doubt to be found everywhere in the commonwealth along with representatives of the other schools who also offered their services for pay. Their activities were kept up in the second century a.d. where they occupied chairs of philosophy, especially the Epicurean chair/s at Athens as long as it/the...
endowed. Writers like Lucian (81) attest the popularity of the sect and the wide circulation of its works. The third century is however problematic and the evidence conflicting. At approximately the same time, Longinus, the foremost critic of the day, - "a living library and a walking museum" as Eunapius describes him (Eunap.V.P&S.456), in his complaint regarding the great dearth of philosophers names only a few Platonists, Stoics and Peripatetics, but mentions no Epicureans. (82) On the other hand, across the continent in a small town in Lycia, an Epicurean, Diogenes of Oeonanda set up an inscription offering the Epicurean message to the public. It shows that the sect was still alive but now having to contend with the increasing rivalry of the growing influence of religious cults and associations like Christianity, it is probably a mistake to think that it was still flourishing in the later third century a.d.. (83) This view is based on a misconception that references in third century authors are to current individuals and groups when they only refer to Epicurean doctrine in general.

The sect and its members lingered on into the fourth century by which time Epicureans, like Stoics with their works were quickly becoming an extinct species. (84) If any survived into the fifth century it was only in the form of ivory-tower intellectuals who need not have been adherents of Epicureanism any more than of Stoicism or the like. As in Plotinus, who cannot escape the framework of having to refute rival positions on any given problema as a matter of inherited classroom practice rather than because there
are persons and/or groups like the Gnostics in his very own
circle that needed refuting, Epicureanism was represented
only insofar as it figured in the work of someone else. If
any were still left, they remain unknown to us and in any
case they could neither exert nor exercise any educational
influence of any order, type or form.

1.5. The Stoa.

He used to discourse, pacing up and down in the
painted colonnade... Hither, then, people came forward
to hear Zeno, and this is why they were known as men
of the Stoa or Stoics; and the same name was given to
his followers who had formerly been known as
Zenonians. (D.L.VII.5)

Zeno had prepared long and hard for that momentous day
in 300 b.c. when he started to teach on a permanent basis.
For, for over ten years and although officially the pupil
of Crates the Cynic, (1) he made the rounds of the schools
of philosophy, (2) studying at the Academy with Xenocrates
and then Polemo. (3) At the same time he also devoted
himself to logic and dialectic in the Megarian school under
Stilpo, Diodorus Chronus and Philo the Dialectician. (4) He
is reputed to have paid two hundred drachmas to a
dialectician for teaching him seven different forms of The
Reaper fallacy (D.L.VII.25). There is no reason to think
that he did not at some time hear Theophrastus in the
Lyceum or any other philosopher of interest to him.

The Lyceum and the Academy having been taken over by
Aristotle and Plato and their successors, Zeno made choice of the Painted Stoa in the Agora, the centre of the city. It was a busy place, full of people and hardly a place with much privacy, but because of this, it had an abundant supply of possible converts. The school took its name from this structure.

Thus in respect to diadochika the school had none. Zeno taught entirely on public property, the Stoa Poikile. He could have also availed himself of the facilities of any of the state gymnasia or leased private property since he was by no means poor, (5) enjoying also the patronage of Antigonus Gonatas of Macedon and his many gifts (D.L.VII.6,15) in addition to the good will of the Athenian people who deposited the key of the city with him and honoured him with a golden crown, and when he died, with a public funeral. (D.L.VII.10-12) However, we have no evidence that he taught anywhere else but in the Stoa where he established a permanent school of philosophy, having a regular following of pupils and associates, (D.L.VII.36-40) and where he was succeeded by one of them, Cleanthes of Assos; (D.L.VII.174) and he by Chrysippus of Soli. By this time the succession was firmly established and as the school flourished it attracted the attention of both students and Hellenistic rulers alike. (6)

Lacking systematic internal organisation and a private physical setting, the school nevertheless made great progress, especially under its third successor styled, not unjustly, the second founder. (7) This was Chrysippus of Soli, a master dialectician who defended the Stoa from the
sharp attacks of the Sceptical Academy and set it on a new foundation; constructing at the same time its massive edifice: the Stoic System. Diogenes of Babylon, fifth head, represented the school in Rome on the 156/5 b.c. embassy and some three decades later another scholar, Panaetius of Rhodes, friend of Scipio Amellianus and member of the Scipionic Circle, Romanised Stoicism. The school’s philosophy entered a new phase (often called the Middle and later Roman period of the Stoa ending with Marcus Aurelius, its last representative) as the Roman ruling class transformed it into a sophisticated ideology of imperialism and class rule. Polybius, also a member of the Circle, studied it in his history of the rise of Rome to world power.

As for the Athenian school itself, the last known position of scholar was held jointly by Mnesarchus and Dardanus c.112/110 b.c.. (8) Cicero nowhere mentions a Stoic scholar for the first century b.c. Posidonius had his school in Rhodes and was succeeded by his grandson Jason. Neither were heads of the Stoa. There is no strong evidence to suggest however that the succession came to an end with our joint scholars just because the Index Stoicorum breaks off at this point, or because further names have failed to survive the millennia. At best argumentation from silence in this instance leaves the issue open and unresolved given that Stoics were still plentiful in Athens at this time. There is really no evidence at this time that can settle the issue beyond any doubt. The Stoa may or may not have have carried into the
first century a.d.. With Dardanus, the real problem is: how long did he continue as scholarch? We can not even be sure of how long the physical setting of the Stoa itself remained their Headquarters in the material and not just the spiritual sense. None of the later known first century B.C. Stoics can be accounted scholarchs. Some of these included: Diodotus the Stoic, Cicero's tutor and resident philosopher, Arius Didymus and Athenodorus of Tarsus, (9) tutors of Augustus; Apion and his school in Alexandria. The Roman Stoics (Seneca, Thrasea Paetus or Helvidius Priscus with their political factions) are not even in the running. The same can be said of individual teachers like Musonius Rufus, who was as much Cynic as he was Stoic, Epictetus with his school in Nicopolis, and last in the line, the Stoic on the throne: Marcus Aurelius. Although this informs us a great deal about the Roman aspect of the Stoic philosophy, it tells us nothing about the history or fate of the Athenian school and its pedagogy in the centuries a.d.. The evidence marshalled is epigraphic: (10) inscriptions designating a number of individuals as Diadochoi Stoichoi. There are four of them. (i) A certain Flavius Menander is titled simply diadochos. But diadochos of what? Thus in itself, it is insufficient to confirm him scholarch in the traditional sense. (ii) T. Coponius Maximus titled Diadochos Stoichos. (iii) Aurelius Heracleides Eupyrides, is styled diadochos ton apo Zenonos logon, as is (iv) Julius Zozimianus. Lynch admits the last three, with reservations about (i) on the grounds that these diadochoi predate the chairs of Marcus Aurelius and
since they are called scholarchs, then they must have been scholarchs of the Stoa. This confirms them, while Zozimianus, who postdates the chairs, may have been scholarch but it is equally and more likely that he was just a holder of a chair of philosophy. (11)

However, it is by no means certain that any of them was scholarch in the classic sense of the term, i.e. diadochos to a schole. Both Hadrian (12) and Antonius Pius (13) confirmed and increased existing privileges of salaried public professors in the Roman empire where in the cities as well as the provinces such holders were often designated diadochoi of X or Y philosophy. As Glucker argues, (14) not only does the title diadochos in the second century a.d. not mean exclusively diadochos of a schole, but it was also used as a formulaic designation of a public professor, especially a holder of a chair of philosophy at Athens and elsewhere, and these antedate the chairs of Marcus. (15) While the possibility that despite this the above names in the inscriptions may in fact represent genuine diadochoi, I am inclined to be persuaded by Glucker's reasoning that they represent public professors rather than an unbroken institutional diadoche. Even Lynch (16) has serious doubts about the possibility of an unbroken line or that the school continued to have a succession and exist as an institution after the second century a.d.. Glucker (17) further suggests that like the Academy and Lyceum, the Stoa came to an end at about the same time as they. The argument is primarily from silence; silence of the evidence to attest a succession and a school
but that does not mean that there was no such succession or school past the later first century B.C.. It would not prove very fruitful to speculate without further evidence. What we have from the first century B.C. onwards is Stoics who much like the Peripatetics and Academics-Platonists of the day can not be shown to have had much to do with any mother school in Athens, but as adherents of school doctrine and in their capacities as individual teachers (whether private, public and salaried or not) they performed the educational job in the cities and towns of the Roman empire well past the reign of Justinian. The idea of Athens as the educational Mecca of the Ancient world with its four institutional schools of philosophy is a basically mistaken account in the educational histories of Capes - Mahaffy - Walden - Clarke etc., and one that does the cities of the rest of the oikoumene such as Alexandria-Rhodes - Pergamum - Antioch - Smyrna - Ephesus, etc very little justice and much harm.

As for Stoics themselves, by the later third century a.d. even Longinus was at pains to name a few worthy of the title (Porph.V.Plot.20) and these, too, disappear from the educational stage towards the close of that century.
Conclusion to Chapter 1.

As educational institutions, the philosophical schools that survived the third century b.c. were the Academy, Lyceum, Garden and Stoa. Individual and itinerant representatives of the Pre-Socratic philosophies and of the Minor Socratic schools lingered on, but by the later second century b.c. they were mostly incorporated in the teaching and dialectical repertoire of the Athenian schools. The latter had already established, and now maintained, both an institutional and intellectual continuity of school tradition which they sustained for over three centuries, and in the case of the Garden, five or more, and not, as has been generally thought, for close on to a thousand years. The so-called golden chain spanning a millennial history is a myth.

Some time towards the middle of the first century b.c. the Athenian schools underwent an institutional crisis which only the Garden survived. Organised, continuous and systematic teaching in the Academy, Lyceum and probably the Stoa, too, came to an end.

This is not to say, however, that teaching in general or schools as such ceased. This was not so. Well before the institutional collapse of the Athenian schools, the infrastructure (teachers, students, schools and school literature, etc.) for the teaching of philosophy outside Athens had been set up and was operating independently of the fate of the Athenian schools. The latter had themselves ensured this through their representatives (alumni,
converts, patrons, teachers, etc) and in their succesful expansion in the cities of Antiquity. As with the Stoa, as early as the second generation, Stoic philosophers did not need to teach specifically in the Stoa Polikile in order to keep the school philosophy going. In the Academy, and Lyceum, philosophers not only taught in the private property of their school and in the Academy and Lyceum gymansia, but also in other public places, and did so readily. Then there were the schools' graduates who went off and taught on their own in the various cities of Greece, Asia Minor, Egypt and Italy, etc, spreading the school philosophies. Very often, and this was particularly so of such individual teachers, a school was where ever a philosopher happened to be teaching at any given time or place. Through such people, the Athenian schools did a good job of establishing their doctrine and its teaching outside Athens, and this transcended the physical fate of the mother schools.

The teaching in the centuries a.d. was done mainly by these rank and file individual teachers, representing and teaching the various school philosophies, whether they were operating in a private, public, salaried or other capacity. The salaried chairs of Marcus Aurelius, for instance, fall in this category of professional educators engaged in the teaching of philosophic culture. They represent schools of thought (hairesis) rather than an existing institutional school in the tradition of the classic schole. Thus, it is not true to say that Athens was still the Mecca of philosophic teaching with its four classic schools in the
centuries a.d., and it was not before the Neoplatonic school of Plutarchus in the later fourth century a.d., and that of his successors, that Athens could boast a strong school of philosophy. This school, too, came to a natural end. It was nothing dramatic, certainly nothing as spectacular as the generally accepted, but mistaken, view of Justinian putting an end to it by official decree.