

5694
LYNCH, J.P.
1972

II

The Origins of Higher Education at Athens: The Lyceum and Athenian Education before Aristotle

The Old Education at Athens¹

Yes, but this was the stuff from which my kind of education made
the Men who fought at Marathon.

(Just Logos in Aristophanes' *Clouds*, vv. 985–986)

The connection between the Lyceum gymnasium and education was not simply fortuitous; for at Athens the Old Education, *hē archaia paideia* to use Aristophanes' phrase (*Clouds* 961), consisted of two major parts, physical and intellectual, "gymnastikē for the body, mousikē for the soul" (Plato, *Republic* 376e). As one of the three public gymnasia in classical Athens, the Lyceum was therefore not just a place for healthful relaxation and amusement but an important educational center as well.

1. A good discussion of Old Athenian Education is to be found in H. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity* (trans. by G. Lamb, New York, 1956) ch. IV, pp. 36–45. Many of the specific problems involved in the subject are clearly set out in F. A. G. Beck's *Greek Education: 450 to 350 B.C.* (New York, 1964). Useful summaries of nineteenth-century research are given in the following books (which are also still useful for periods beyond that of Old Athenian Education): P. Girard, *L'Éducation athénienne* (Paris, 1891), K. J. Freeman, *Schools of Hellas* (London, 2nd ed., 1912), and C. A. Forbes, *Greek Physical Education* (New York, 1929). T. Woody, *Life and Education in Early Societies* (London, 1949) is informative but dated. The new book by M. L. Clarke, *Higher Education in the Ancient World* (London, 1971), though sketchy, provides a good broad survey of ancient education.

The education of girls at Athens, which was normally confined to the domestic, presents special problems not considered in this discussion. See the comments and sources quoted in P. Monroe, *Source Book of the History of Education for the Greek and Roman Period* (New York, 1902) pp. 34–50. There are indications, however, that sometimes Athenian girls did receive elementary education in schools (cf. Beck, *Greek Education*, pp. 85–88).

Old Athenian Education was not an elaborately developed and rigidly defined system; the formal classroom instruction it provided for did not in fact go beyond the elementary stage. As its name implies, *paideia*, like a game (*paidia*), was originally something for children (*paides*, ca. ages 7 to 14). The *locus classicus* on education at Athens before the sophistic movement is the speech of Protagoras in Plato's dialogue (*Protagoras* 325c–326d). In Protagoras' account of the Old Education formal schooling consisted simply of the rudiments of *gymnastikē* (physical education) and *mousikē* (in the sense of all activities presided over by the Muses). Although the details of the Athenian practice are in many respects uncertain, the Old Education appears to have been completely a matter of individual initiative and also to have been only a generally defined custom which, depending on the individuals, was sometimes loosely, sometimes strictly observed.² The willingness and ability of a family to pay for a child's schooling must have been major factors in how much education a child received (cf. *Protagoras* 326c). No fixed number of years of school seems to have been prescribed by Athenian law, but the ideal was probably that all of childhood should be occupied with pursuit of *gymnastikē* and *mousikē*. Once a child reached adolescence, he was released from formal supervised training in school and was expected to gain his further education on his own through life in the city (*Protagoras* 326c–d).

The *Clouds* of Aristophanes is another important source in reconstructing the nature of Old Athenian Education. The debate between Just Logos and Unjust Logos (esp. vv. 961–1104) makes it clear that the ultimate goal of the early educational system was not simply excellence in *mousikē* and *gymnastikē* as such but, beyond that, a kind of moral excellence as well. The physical and

2. This point is convincingly argued by K. J. Freeman, *Schools of Hellas*, pp. 57–58. See also W. Jaeger, *Paideia I* (2nd ed., trans. by G. Highet, New York, 1945) p. 309.

mental discipline involved in these pursuits, it was felt, would make a child into a "good" (*eukosmos*) person and a useful citizen, like the men who fought at Marathon.

For each branch of study there were ordinarily separate teachers: the *kitharistēs* for *mousikē* and the *paidotribēs* for *gumnastikē*. Sometimes, and perhaps regularly in the later fifth century B.C., a separate teacher called the *grammatistēs* was employed to train the child in one aspect of *mousikē* which became increasingly important, the reading and writing of letters. All of these teachers taught for a fee and had to be hired privately by a child's family.³

An Athenian child seems to have had his lessons in at least two different buildings, one for *gumnastikē* and one for *mousikē*. Any suitable structure or open place might be used for the study of music and letters, although some teachers owned or had access to *didaskaleia*, structures specially built to serve as classrooms. For the study of *gumnastikē* some specialized facilities were required. Normally a child's formal training in physical education took place in a palaestra rather than in one of the three major Athenian gymnasia. The distinction between a palaestra and a gymnasium is not as clear-cut as it is sometimes made out to be, but most palaestrae were privately owned "wrestling schools," simple structures that were fairly numerous at Athens. Gymnasia on the other hand were elaborate, monumental buildings and numbered only three at Athens through the classical period.⁴ It should be added, however, that the distinction as made is too sharp to account for ancient usages of the two terms, since public gymnasia contained palaestrae of their own, some palaestrae might have been public,

3. The various aspects of *mousikē paideia* are discussed in detail (with illustrations) by Girard, *L'Education athénienne*, pp. 126-184. The *grammatistēs* and his teaching are discussed by Beck, *Greek Education*, pp. 111-126. The private character of instruction in this period is clearly demonstrated by K. J. Freeman, *Schools of Hellas*, pp. 58-59.

4. C. A. Forbes (*Greek Physical Education*, p. 82) tries to make a complete distinction between a palaestra and a gymnasium as terms, but without success. Recently H. Thompson has suggested that the Agora might have contained a gymnasium in the fifth-century B.C. ["Activity in the Athenian Agora: 1966-1967," *Hesperia* 37 (1968) 39-41]. If so, it would still be the case that the Lyceum, Academy, and Cynosarges were singled out in ancient sources as the major Athenian gymnasia.

and the word gymnasium was sometimes used (in its basic sense of a place for exercising in the nude) to refer to a palaestra. But as far as Old Education is concerned, the general rule seems to have been that a *paidotribēs* gave lessons in a privately owned palaestra.⁵

What a child learned about physical training from his *paidotribēs* he would continue to practice in a public gymnasium, once he had reached adolescence and was released from formal schooling. Under the simple system that came to be known as Old Education, the leisure time (*scholē*) a young man spent (*diatribein*) at a public gymnasium was an essential complement to the previous formal schooling in *gumnastikē* that he had received in a palaestra. In the company of peers and adults and under the general supervision of a public official called a gymnasiarch, a young man (*meirakion*) acquired at the gymnasium an important part of the indirect *paideia* which was provided by life in the city.⁶

The Lyceum, the Cynosarges, and the Academy were not, however, simply large public buildings which were available to the people of Athens for private tuition in *gumnastikē*. The Athenian gymnasia served other functions which — though they were strictly connected with physical education — should not be confused with it. The facilities of a gymnasium were regularly used by athletes who were training to take part in the games. The coach (*gumnastēs*) of the athletes and his various assistants

5. "Palaestra" used to refer to one part of a public gymnasium: [Plutarch], *Lives of the Ten Orators* 841c-d (in the Lyceum). "Palaestra" used to refer to a public building: Plato, *Lysis* 204a, [Plutarch], *Lives of the Ten Orators* 843 f, pseudo-Xenophon, *Constitution of Athens* II, 10. "Gymnasium" used to refer to a palaestra (i.e., a small, privately owned place of exercise): pseudo-Xenophon, *Constitution of Athens* II, 10.

Forbes (*Greek Physical Education*, pp. 76-82) takes great pains in attempting to harmonize all the references to palaestra and gymnasium to suit his interpretation, but it seems more reasonable to admit that actual linguistic usage was loose and did not always reflect a technical distinction between the two kinds of buildings.

6. C. A. Forbes, *Greek Physical Education*, pp. 82-83. The kind of life in a gymnasium which the Old Athenian Education opened up for a young man is glowingly described by Just Logos in Aristophanes' *Clouds* (vv. 1002-1023); the passage contrasts these advantages with the unhealthy and effeminate life which the New Education of the Sophists would bring.

(*aleiptēs*, etc.) should be distinguished from both the *paidotribēs* and the *gymnasiarch*.⁷ Another function of the public gymnasium, as noted in the first chapter, was only a temporary one — a place for drilling troops in time of war.

The gymnasia also served military purposes of the city in the Athenian ephebeia, the compulsory system of training all young men aged 18–20 (*epheboi*) for military service. Exactly when this system originated has been the subject of considerable debate. If, as a recent authority on the Athenian ephebeia has argued, the system was in operation during the fifth century B.C., the classical gymnasia doubtless served regularly as places where the epheboi trained.⁸ The instructors of the epheboi were not private teachers but state officials called the *kosmetēs* and the *sophronistēs* (cf. Aristotle, *Constitution of Athens* 42). Although virtually nothing is known about the workings of the Athenian ephebeia before the late fourth century B.C., it is doubtful that the ephebic system was originally conceived of as a part of *paideia*,⁹ but in the course of

7. The distinction between physical education and athletics in Greece, usually blurred in studies of Greek Education, is emphasized by C. A. Forbes (*Greek Physical Education*, pp. 5–6): "Physical education must be sharply distinguished from athletics. These are akin, in that both have the exercises of the body as a groundwork, but they employ the exercises in wholly different ways, and for different purposes. The athletes who took part in the games at Olympia and elsewhere did not acquire their proficiency at school, nor were paid teachers essential to their training; they had nothing to do with any school system, and their activities were distinct from those of organized physical education."

On the difference between the *paidotribēs* and the *gumnastēs*, see E. N. Gardiner, *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals* (London, 1910) pp. 503–504, where the point of distinction between physical education and athletics is also made: "Athletic exercises formed part of the national education long before the demand for specialized athletic training arose."

8. C. Pélékides, *Histoire de l'éphébie attique* (Paris, 1962) pp. 71–79; cf. also the interesting speculations of P. Vidal-Naquet, "The Black Hunter and the Origin of the Athenian Ephebeia," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, New Series 14 (1968) pp. 49–64, also supporting an early date.

9. This view goes against the conclusions of Pélékides, who believes that the ephebic system was regarded as an *educational* institution (*Histoire de l'éphébie attique*, p. 79). The *Clouds* of Aristophanes, which Pélékides cites as evidence, does not seem to me to prove the point, since the gymnastic training which is referred to there is not that given to young men aged 18–20 (*epheboi*) but the kind described in the text above: it is

time ephebic training became closely related to Athenian educational institutions — a development which will be described in more detail later on. At first, even though the Lyceum and other Athenian gymnasia did serve a number of functions, the only *paideia* that went on there was the kind described above: indirect, informal, and unstructured. Before the sophistic movement there was no system at Athens which provided any organized education beyond the elementary stage (cf. Plato, *Laches* 178a–180a).

the *gumnastikē paideia* provided in palaestrae for children and (without formal instruction) available in public gymnasia for adolescents on up (cf. *Clouds*, 916–919; 973–982; 1002–1023). As noted in the text above, Aristophanes, Plato, and other sources which reveal the character of *paideia* in the Old Athenian Educational system divide it into two major parts—*gumnastikē* and *mousikē* — although *grammatikē* is sometimes spoken of as a third separate element; no hint is given that military instruction was thought of as a component of *paideia*. In view of this, a more probable theory is that, according to the scheme of education followed in the fifth century B.C., young men who reached the age of eighteen were thought to be already basically "educated," and their ephebic years were spent on training that was beyond and distinct from *paideia*. In the fourth century B.C., when the Athenian educational system had broadened and the ephebeia itself had changed in character, the ephebic years were devoted to advanced instruction which was part of a person's *paideia*. Thus, although Pélékides is probably correct in arguing that the ephebeia was an old institution at Athens, it is likely that originally it was a civic institution concerned with the city's defense and only later developed into an educational institution.

In his study *Aristoteles und Athen* (Berlin, 1893), U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf tried to show that the ephebeia did not exist at Athens before 335/4 B.C. (cf. vol. I, pp. 191–193), and his arguments convinced most historians before the study of Pélékides reexamined the problem. Wilamowitz' principal proof rested on a learned and elaborate argument *ex silentio* which asked again and again, how could such and such a writer of such and such a date make the following statement if the ephebeia existed in his day? For example, how could Plato in the *Laws* (613c) suggest that teachers be paid by the state if in fact there already existed in Athens ephebic instructors who were state-supported? Pélékides' careful discussion of the evidence has demonstrated the invalidity of the proof used by Wilamowitz. But the reason why Wilamowitz' argument *ex silentio* appeared so convincing may well have been this: the writers whose statements he cites probably did not think of the ephebeia as a state *educational* system. Not until the end of the fourth century B.C. could the ephebic system be said to be serving the end of *paideia* rather than just of civic defense. It is no wonder then that before this change in the ephebeia took place there are many passages in Greek writers which suggest that there was no state-run system of education (e.g., in Plato, *Laws* VI and VII; Aristotle, *Politics* V).

The Sophistic Movement at Athens

A gymnasium is a general place for exercises. Yet at Athens it was the place where philosophy was learned and the pursuit of wisdom was "exercised."

(Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae* XV, 2.30)

The sophistic movement, which brought to Athens a large number of foreign teachers, had quite an upsetting effect on the system of Old Athenian Education. By destroying the traditional balance between *mousikē* and *gumnastikē*, the sophists' teaching went against what the Old Education conceived of as the substance of *paideia*. Matters of intellect were emphasized in the sophists' teaching, while the physical aspect of *paideia* was slighted.¹⁰ Complaints are heard in writers of the late fifth century B.C. that the traditional places of exercise have been "emptied" or "spoiled"; much of the criticism spoken by Just Logos in Aristophanes' *Clouds* is directed against the breakdown of physical education caused by the sophists.¹¹

But since no formal instruction beyond the elementary was previously available in Athens, the sophists supplied a real need and had a definite positive effect on Athenian education. The sophists did not revolutionize Athenian practice so much as they built their new kind of instruction into the existing system. For the elementary stage of education all the sophists seem to have accepted the Athenian practice as it was; it was only on the secondary level that they sought to go beyond the provisions already in existence. Rather than expect young men to acquire advanced education on their own, the sophists offered a variety of more formal programs, which gave some kind of structure and supervision to the learning process after elementary school. These programs, which varied in length and content according to the educational

beliefs of individual sophists, could be taken, like the elementary courses, by anyone who could afford them (Isocrates, *Antidosis* 304).¹²

The sophists introduced their programs aggressively, in large part through the medium of *epideixeis* or advertisement pieces. The rise of this phenomenon is well delineated by Marrou:

Protagoras was the first to teach for money in this way: there had been no similar system before. The result was the sophists did not find any customers waiting for them but had to go out and persuade the public to take advantage of their services: hence arose a whole publicity system.¹³

The more public a place was the better suited it was for *epideixeis*. The Agora was a natural spot (cf. Hippias in Plato's *Hippias Minor* 368b); another obvious location where the sophists might find a large and receptive audience was a public gymnasium such as the Lyceum, where young and old were at their leisure taking part in bodily exercises. Since the character of the education the various sophists had to offer was different from the *gumnastikē paideia*, which was being pursued in the gymnasium, the sophistic movement in effect confronted Old Athenian Education in its stronghold and, in winning adherents, changed the sub-

12. In a paper entitled "The Professional Technique of the Sophists," an abstract of which is published in *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 71 (1940) p. xli, E. A. Havelock pointed out, more clearly than has been done since, the relation between the education of the sophists and the Old Education at Athens. Instead of the aristocratic notion of education through *sunousia*, Havelock says, "the sophists sought to offer both a curriculum and some educational disciplines, i.e., lectures by professionals. But initially they also strove to preserve continuity with the past."

Among ancient sources the relation between the Old Education and the new is revealed most clearly by Isocrates, who wrote after the sophistic movement had introduced more formal curricula into Athenian secondary education: e.g., "Now, then, so far am I from scorning the education handed down by our ancestors that I even praise what has been established in our own day—I mean such things as geometry, astronomy, and those eristic debates which our young delight in more than they should" (*Panathenaikos*, 26; cf. the interesting passages on the new higher studies in *Antidosis*, 265–267).

13. Marrou, *History of Education in Antiquity*, p. 49. Gilbert Ryle in a suggestive essay entitled "Dialectic in the Academy" [in *New Essays on Plato and Aristotle*, ed. by R. Bambrough (London, 1965) pp. 39–68] speculates on how the aggressive approach of the sophists' teachings contributed to the eristic character of Greek philosophy.

10. Marrou, *History of Education in Antiquity*, p. 59; Jaeger, *Paideia* I, pp. 292–293.

11. Aristophanes, *Frogs*, vv. 1069–1071; [Xenophon], *Constitution of Athens* I, 13. The effect of the sophists on the Old Athenian Education and contemporary complaints that occur in Greek literature are discussed by C. A. Forbes, *Greek Physical Education*, pp. 85–89. An excellent discussion of the historical context of sophistic education and its importance in the history of culture is given by W. Jaeger, *Paideia* I, pp. 286–331.

stance of the secondary stage of *paideia*. To use E. A. Havelock's formulation of the nature of this development, the sophists "professionalized" the activities, which in the Old Educational system fell under the general headings of *scholē* and *diatribē*; and, in doing so, they "professionalized" the terms *scholē* and *diatribē* themselves to refer to schools of higher learning.¹⁴

It is usually said that since they did not coordinate their teaching but instead taught as private tutors in competition with one another, the sophists cannot be credited with founding an institution of secondary education at Athens.¹⁵ In an important sense, however, the sophists did establish institutions of higher learning that operated very much like the elementary schools. Like the various teachers of *mousikē* and *gymnasikē*, the sophists might do their teaching in private homes, palaestrae, gymnasia, or stoas.¹⁶ The word *phrontisterion* ("thinkery") given by Aristophanes to a sophistic school of this kind is a recognition of an institution or proto-institution in this sense. A sophist and his pupils formed a group which had collective, if not corporate, identity and

14. For this formulation see Havelock as cited above, n. 12. Professor Havelock has kindly allowed me to profit from the (unpublished) full text of this paper.

15. For example: Mairou, *History of Education in Antiquity*, p. 80; Boeck, *Greek Education*, p. 147.

16. Teaching in private homes: cf. the sophists at the house of Kallias in Plato's *Protagoras*. After 306 B.C. Epicurus, an Athenian citizen, founded a permanent school in his house at Athens (cf. Diogenes Laertius X, 2, 15, 17).

In a palaestra: cf. the sophist Miklos at the palaestra near the Lyceum (Plato, *Lysis* 203a-204b) and Socrates' visit to the palaestra of Taureas (Plato, *Charmides* 153a).

In gymnasia: cf. the sophist Prodikos at the Lyceum in the pseudo-Platonic dialogue, the *Eryxias* 397c-d, and Socrates on his way to the Cynosarges at the opening of the *Axiochos* (364a).

In stoas: cf. the stoa of Zeus Eleutherios in Xenophon, *Oikonomikos* 7. The most famous philosopher to teach in a stoa was Zeno, who founded a school in the Stoa Poikile in the Agora toward the end of the fourth century B.C. (Diogenes Laertius VII, 1.5). For philosophical activity in the stoas of Athens, see R. Wycherley, "The Painted Stoa," *Phoenix* 7 (1953) pp. 20-35.

Any other suitable public building might be used, the Odeion of Pericles being a particularly favored structure: "What's this foolishness you're talking?—babbling the sophists' nonsense every whichway in the Lyceum, the Academy, and the gates of the Odeion" (Alexis, poet of Middle Comedy quoted in Athenaeus VIII, 336e-f; cf. Strabo IX, 1.17, p. 396; Plutarch, *De Exilio* 605a; Diogenes Laertius VII, 184).

which embodied an ideal that gave regularity to an aspect of society (education). In the *Clouds* Aristophanes transferred this formalized arrangement of the sophists to Socrates and comically coined a term which emphasized the commercial rather than the educational aspect of the institution.

With the coming of the sophists the beginnings of a new institutionalized phase of higher education are detectable. But since most of the early sophists were non-Athenian and itinerant, they did not establish any buildings as permanent schools, and the groups which gathered about them for lessons were dissolved after a course was completed. Hence the only element lacking in sophistic schools was permanence; a sophist did not ordinarily commit himself to teaching in any one place or for an indefinite length of time. As Isocrates says of his teacher Gorgias, "he taught (*diatipus*) in the area of Thessaly where the most prosperous Greeks were concentrated and devoted most of his life to his business enterprise; and in no city did he establish a permanent home and therefore did not spend money for community interests nor was he obliged to pay taxes" (*Antidosis* 155-156).

The career of Socrates as a teacher is best considered in the context of the sophistic movement. To distinguish Socrates sharply from the sophists is only to accept the validity of one rather special point of view—that of Plato. To many Athenians Socrates probably appeared to be only one of the many varieties of sophistic teacher. There is ample evidence that contemporaries considered Socrates (and, for that matter, Plato and Aristotle) to be sophists and that many of the sophists, like Plato's Socrates, termed themselves *philosophoi*, rather than *sophistai*. In the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. there does not in fact appear to have been any commonly accepted dividing line between a sophist and a philosopher.¹⁷

17. As Isocrates' use of both terms to refer to himself makes clear, *sophistes* and *philosophos* were words used for an intellectual, and their connotations varied according to context. The history of *sophistes* and *philosophos* in the late fifth century B.C. is discussed by E. A. Havelock, *Preface to Plato* (Cambridge, Mass., 1963) pp. 280-283. On *philosophos* see also the note in W. H. Thompson's edition of *The Phaedrus of Plato* (London, 1868) pp. 145-146 and W. Burkert, "Platon oder Pythagoras?" *Hermes* 88 (1960) pp. 159-177. W. K. C. Guthrie [*A History of Greek Philosophy III* (Cambridge, 1969) pp. 27-54] has a detailed discussion of *sophistes*.

There undoubtedly were, as Plato is at pains to emphasize, a number of important differences between the teaching practice of Socrates and that of the other sophists of his time. For one thing, Socrates did not travel from city to city but remained in Athens. As he is represented by both Plato and Xenophon, moreover, Socrates seems never to have developed as formal a secondary curriculum as contemporary teachers of wisdom did. The sophists formed temporary schools apart from life in the city and introduced into the Old Educational system a second level of formal education, the content of which was not necessarily advanced instruction in the subjects of elementary school but rather a variety of subjects differing according to the educational views of each sophist. In the writings of Plato and Xenophon, the teaching of Socrates is represented as a *reaction against* the sophists in favor of the traditional method of higher education, through association (*sunousia*).¹⁸ The Platonic dialogues and the works of Xenophon picture Socrates going about Athens questioning and making people in everyday life think about their basic assumptions. In contrast to the sophists, Socrates seems to have kept closely to the notion of the Old Education that after the elementary stage of classroom instruction a young man was educated, not in any kind of school apart from the city, but informally through life in the city itself. As his career is interpreted by Plato and Xenophon, what Socrates was striving to do for secondary education was this: he wanted to make young men's associations in city life more valuable for their moral development and tried to inject more intellectual concern into the existence a person leads from day to day. Xenophon relates:

Socrates was constantly out in the open. Early in the morning he went to the *peripatoi* and the gymnasia; when the Agora filled up, he could be seen there; and for the rest of the day he would always be wherever he might associate with (*suneseisthai*) the most people.

(*Memorabilia* I, 1.10; cf. IV, 1.1)

18. This interpretation of Socrates in relation to the sophistic movement is suggested by Marrou, *History of Education in Antiquity*, pp. 57-59. Many passages in Xenophon's *Memorabilia* and in the Platonic dialogues stress *sunousia* as the basis of Socrates' practice as a teacher. An account of the Socratic method of teaching derived from the Platonic dialogues is given by Beck, *Greek Education*, pp. 190-198. Xenophon, *Memorabilia* IV, 2 characterizes Socrates' teaching.

In this way Socrates won many adherents, some of whom developed as individuals because of contact with him and some of whom, in addition, attempted to observe his methods as a "teacher." Thus it may be said that Socrates, unlike most of the sophists, founded a school in the abstract sense, having influenced a number of spiritual followers who sought in their own lives to emulate his example. But both Plato and Xenophon reveal that Socrates did not establish any kind of secondary school that diverged from the custom in the Old Educational system; Socrates' refusal to accept a fee for services, according to Xenophon, emphasized this fact (*Memorabilia* I, 2.5-8; I, 6.11-13).

There is of course a basic problem with this account of Socrates' *paideia*: it is based only on Plato and Xenophon. Did the historical Socrates hold these views about the nature of higher education? It would be digressive and perhaps fruitless, even if desirable, at this point to define a position on the complicated "Socratic question."¹⁹ But, without going into the problem fully, at least this much seems reasonable to believe about the historical Socrates and his relation to the development of Athenian educational institutions: the essential agreement between Plato and Xenophon, as opposed to Aristophanes, suggests that Socrates deliberately refused to found any kind of secondary school that was set up apart from life in the city; instead he held to the belief that *sunousia* in the context of city life was the basis of higher education. Plato and Xenophon are supported on this point by other early evidence about the teaching practice of Socrates. The dialogue *Theages*, if it is not by Plato, provides an additional indication that Socrates did not give instruction in a private context apart from city life (cf. *Theages* 127d-128b), as he said very plainly in Plato's *Apology* (33a-b). That Socrates was not a teacher in the sophistic sense, especially not the teacher of Alcibiades, is stated by Isocrates (*Busiris* 5), as well as by Xenophon (*Memorabilia* I, 2.24). Socrates' belief in education by association, not institution, is attested by another Socratic, Aeschines, in his *Alcibiades* (fr. 4, p. 37, Krauss). In this passage Aeschines' Alcibiades asserts that he learned only by association with Soc-

19. W. K. C. Guthrie has a sensible discussion of the Socratic question which is refreshing in that it does not despair of the evidence; cf. *A History of Greek Philosophy* III, pp. 325-377 (methodological considera-

rates (*sunōn* . . . *ekainōi*), not by lessons (*ouden mathēna epistamēnos*).²⁰ One of the distinguishing features of the Cynic Diogenes, "a Socrates gone mad" in Plato's opinion, was a hostility toward institutionalized education:

Diogenes used to call Eukleides' school (*scholēn*) "bile" (*cholēn*) and Plato's instruction (*diatribēn*) "a waste of time" (*katatribēn*).
(Diogenes Laertius VI, 24)

Like Socrates, Diogenes refused to commit his teaching to any place or time, and any followers that he had did not have collective identity as a group of pupils. In this connection it is worth quoting the characterization of Socrates given by Aristotle's pupil Dikaiarchos:

Socrates at any rate was a philosopher, although he did not set up benches or establish himself on a throne or observe a fixed hour for conversing (*diatribē*) or walking (*peripatos*) with his acquaintances (*gnōrimoi*): instead he played with them whenever he had a chance and served in the army or went to the Agora with some of them . . .
(Plutarch, *An seni res publica gerenda sit* XXVI. 796d = Dikaiarchos, fr. 29, Wehrli)

All of this evidence points to the same conclusion. The early tradition about the Socratic practice of education confirms one important aspect of the interpretations Plato and Xenophon gave of Socrates' career as a teacher: Socrates was against the sophistic tendency to institutionalize higher education.

At the same time the educational practices of Socrates and the sophists were similar in a number of ways — enough so that Aristophanes with comic point could confound the two. Both Socrates and the sophists were concerned about the state of secondary education provided for in the Old Educational system (cf. *Kleitophon* 407a–c). And both Socrates and the sophists had the effect of making secondary education a conscious pursuit and more intellectual in content than it had been previously. Even the way that Socrates went about his teaching had much in common with the sophistic practice. Like the sophists, Socrates accepted invita-

20. On the importance of the Socratic Aeschines as a contemporary witness independent of Plato and Xenophon, see the essay by A. E. Taylor, "Aeschines of Sphettus," in his *Philosophical Studies* (London, 1934) pp. 1–27.

tions to visit private houses and also regularly frequented public buildings for the purpose of reaching people, especially younger men.

The Lyceum played an important role in these developments in Athenian education. The gymnasium in which Aristotle later founded his school was in the late fifth century B.C. already a favorite spot for the philosophical teaching of both Socrates and the sophists. Euthyphro in Plato's dialogue refers to the "haunts" (*diatribas*) of Socrates in the Lyceum (*Euthyphro* 2a). In Plato's *Euthydemus* the Lyceum is the scene of Socrates' confrontation with the sophists Euthydemus and Dionysodoros. The two sophists, together with some pupils, come into the undressing-room of the gymnasium and meet Socrates, who proceeds to take over their class. The *Lysis* (203a–b) pictures Socrates on his way to the Lyceum. At the end of the *Symposium* (223d) it is said that the Lyceum was where Socrates began the new day after the banquet ran through the night (cf. Athenaeus V, 192b). According to one tradition (Diogenes Laertius IX, 54), Protagoras' pupil Archagoros read his master's famous treatise *On the Gods* in the Lyceum. In the pseudo-Platonic dialogue, the *Eryxias* (397c–d), the sophist Prodikos is said to have taught in the Lyceum. In the first half of the fourth century B.C. the Lyceum appears to have become a regular place for classes such as the one the sophists Euthydemus and Dionysodoros were holding in Plato's dialogue. In his *Panathenaikos* (18 and 33), Isocrates notes that some friends of his witnessed "three or four sophists of the common herd" discussing poetry amid their following and openly criticizing him in the Lyceum. This passage incidentally demonstrates the proliferation of teachers of higher learning at Athens and the growing rivalries that resulted between them; Isocrates continues (*Panathenaikos* 18–19) with a quotation of the "most impudent" of the sophists in the Lyceum:

One of the sophists tried to slander me, claiming that I scorn all talk of poetry and that I would do away with the education offered by every other teacher on the pretext that all men talk foolishness except for those who participate in *my* school.

The Socratic Aeschines, who never established a school at Athens but did take pupils for hire (Diogenes Laertius II, 62), mentions

the Lyceum (in what sounds like an educational context) in a fragment quoted in Chapter I: "We sat on the benches in the Lyceum, where the managers of the games do their regulating" (fr. 15, ed. Krauss). The writers of Middle Comedy also testify to the extensive use of the Lyceum for sophistic teaching. Although the dates of the fragments are very uncertain, there is no need to assume, as is usually done, that the references to the sophists at the Lyceum found in Middle Comedy must be to Aristotle and his followers. The date of the speech quoted above from Isocrates is approximately 340 B.C., or at least three years before Aristotle returned to Athens and became associated with the Lyceum. A poet of Middle Comedy, Antiphanes, quoted by Athenaeus (III, 98 f; cf. XIII, 565 f), makes reference to "respectable young men following skinny, pale, and anemic sophists around the Lyceum." Alexis, another comic poet of the fourth century B.C., also mentions the Lyceum as a place where the sophists were teaching: "What's this foolishness you're talking? — babbling the sophists' nonsense every whichway in the Lyceum, the Academy, and the gates of the Odeion" (Athenaeus VIII, 336e-f).

In the late fifth and early fourth centuries B.C., therefore, the Lyceum became an increasingly important center of secondary education at Athens. In an attempt to introduce into the Old Educational system formal paid instruction on the secondary level, the sophists went to the gymnasium to attract a following and often used the building for their classes; in opposition to the sophists, as is illustrated most graphically in Plato's *Euthydemus*, Socrates frequented the Lyceum to improve the quality of associations by which young men informally acquired their higher education in the Old Athenian system. As was noted in the first chapter, the Lyceum was a kind of civic center at Athens serving a variety of important needs for the people of the city. All of the developments brought on by the sophists increased and diversified the activity that went on there. Well before Aristotle became associated with the place, the Lyceum was being used for a large number of concurrent functions, not the least of which was its role as an educational center where traditional and innovative practices found a proving ground.

The Earliest Permanent Schools of Higher Learning at Athens

During this period there were men worthy of memorial for their contributions to education (*kata paideian*): Isocrates the orator, his various pupils, and Aristotle the philosopher; Anaximenes of Lampsakos, Plato of Athens, and the last of the Pythagorean philosophers; plus Xenophon, who composed histories late in life (for he mentions the death of Epameinondas which occurred some time after this period); also Aristippos, Antisthenes, and indeed Aeschines the Socratic.

(Diodorus of Sicily XV, 76.4: On Athens in 366/365 B.C.)

About 388/387 B.C., when he returned to Athens from his travels in Sicily and elsewhere, Plato founded a school in the Academy — an Athenian institution devoted to higher learning which was permanent in the fullest sense. For not only did Plato commit himself to teaching in a particular place on some kind of regular basis at Athens, but he also made provisions that his school in both the physical and the spiritual sense be continued after him.

In the context of the developments described above in discussing the Lyceum and the sophistic movement, it is clear that Plato's founding of the Academy was not as radical an innovation as it is sometimes made out to be. As a result of the sophistic movement, the Lyceum, the Academy, the Cynosarges, as well as other public and private buildings at Athens, were serving as places where some form of education beyond the elementary might be obtained for a price. The *Clouds* of Aristophanes suggests that by the last quarter of the fifth century B.C. the sophists had developed something very close to institutions for secondary education at Athens; the only element lacking in sophistic schools which would allow them to be identified concretely as institutions was permanence.

Athenian law may not have recognized the various sophistic schools as institutions, but very frequently, if not normally, institutions come into being without the express recognition or consent of the law. In the fourth chapter it will be argued that legal sanction cannot be considered a distinguishing feature between the schools of the sophists and philosophical schools such as the Academy and the Peripatos, since very probably the major Athenian

schools of philosophy did not have any official legal status either. The Athenians do not seem to have been concerned about the precise legal sanction or description of philosophical schools. Since the law allowed, or at least did not restrict, the right of free association, the question of the legal status of the schools may have not even occurred to a fifth- or fourth-century Athenian.²¹

Part of the reason is perhaps that law was far less intricately developed than it came to be in Roman times, and hence forms of social organization in Greece were subject more to custom and convention than to legal dictates. But another part of the reason is surely that the development of schools to provide formal instruction on the secondary level was very much a logical extension of the Old Educational system. The schools of the sophists were not unlike those that provided an Athenian child with elementary education. Both provided group instruction for a fee to those who could afford it and were completely voluntary as far as the law of the state was concerned. Like the institutions of the *paidotribēs* or the *kitharistēs*, the sophists' schools were a matter of individual initiative and do not appear to have involved any kind of legal action or certification. The major differences, aside from permanence, were that the sophistic schools provided advanced instruction which presupposed some elementary education, and they offered courses which did not consist of fixed elements such as *nomiskē* and *gumnastikē* but varied according to the educational beliefs of each sophist.

THE SOCRATICS AND ANTISTHENES

The historical context in which Plato's founding of the Academy must be understood is even more broad than a discussion of the elder sophists would suggest. Many other men before Plato contributed to the establishment of permanent secondary schools at Athens. Socrates himself was undoubtedly a major force in the development, although he himself seems to have resisted the sophistic trend toward setting up temporary schools which offered some sort of formal curriculum apart from life in the city. The closest students of Socrates were no more than followers with spiritual and emotional ties to their teacher; they did not con-

stitute a collective body which gave regularity and structure to the educational process. But since Socrates in both Plato and Xenophon often criticized the lack of concern about education beyond the elementary at Athens (e.g., *Laches* 178a-180c; *Kleitophon* 407a-c), his thinking probably influenced some of his followers to try to remedy the situation. For most of the Socratics who concerned themselves with education, this meant taking up the lead of the sophists and establishing some kind of school.

Many of the Socratics had themselves studied with sophists — Antisthenes with Gorgias, for example (Diogenes Laertius VI, 1) — and hence were exposed to more than the Socratic view of higher education. To some followers perhaps Socrates' death on a charge of impiety exposed a weakness in his way of effecting education and pointed out the desirability, for purposes of higher studies, of forming groups that were set apart from everyday city life and from immediate public view.

There is only meager evidence about what the various lesser Socratics taught or in what physical setting they gave their instruction.²² But from what little is known about them, many appear to have moved in the direction of establishing either temporary or permanent schools of a kind that represented a departure from the thinking of Socrates. After Socrates' death, it is said — on the excellent authority of Hermodorus, a member of the early Academy — that most of his closest friends abandoned the Athenian educational scene and went to the house of the Socratic Eukleides in Megara (Diogenes Laertius II, 106). The circle which formed in Megara, according to Hermodorus, consisted of both non-Athenian and Athenian associates, including Plato himself. How this group was organized and in what manner it functioned is unknown, but it is reported that Eukleides was succeeded in the leadership of the school by Euboulides (Diogenes Laertius II, 108). The passing on of leadership to a successor may be an innovation of the Megarians, a hypothesis which would account for the unusual term for their school, *diadochiē* (Diogenes Laertius II, 108-109). It may also have been Eukleides' house which was still being used by the Megarian philosophers in the next century

22. The minor Socratics and their relation to the history of Greek education are excellently discussed by II. von Arnim, *Leben und Werke des Dio von Prusa* (Berlin, 1898) pp. 21-43.

21. I. Vinogradoff, *Outlines of Historical Jurisprudence*, vol. II (Oxford, 1922) pp. 119-127.

(Diogenes Laertius II, 115), when the school, headed by Stilpon, was thriving well enough to offer serious competition to the schools of Athens (cf. Diogenes Laertius II, 113–114).

Like Eukleides, other Socratics went back to their native cities after 399 B.C. and established schools of sorts; Phaidon of Elis, for example, founded the Elian school, which continued for more than one generation (Diogenes Laertius II, 105).

Although all the lesser Socratics are very shadowy figures, it seems that the half-Athenian Antisthenes (ca. 444–ca. 365 B.C.) was among the first to set up some sort of permanent school at Athens. As is the case with Antisthenes himself, very little is known about the nature and operation of his school. In the manner of the sophists, Antisthenes established himself in a public building — the Cynosarges gymnasium — and attracted a group of students (Diogenes Laertius VI, 13). But having settled there, he does not appear to have followed the sophistic practice of moving from one city to another. When Antisthenes died, his school in the Cynosarges probably did not continue to operate. Although even in ancient times Antisthenes was hailed as the founder of Cynicism, his connection with the school (or anti-school) of Diogenes seems remote. As Dudley and others have argued, the tradition linking Antisthenes with the Cynicism of Diogenes is probably the result of later harmonizers who tried to find neat and continuous schemes of successionship in all the philosophical schools. Exactly when Antisthenes established his school in the Cynosarges is uncertain, but it may have been fairly soon after Socrates' death.²³

Despite the haziness of Antisthenes as a figure in the history of Athenian institutions of higher learning, his departure from Socrates on education is quite clear. The break went beyond the taking of fees for teaching, which Antisthenes seems to have done (cf. Diogenes Laertius VI, 4 and 9). Instead of the Socratic belief

23. On the lack of historical connection between Antisthenes and Diogenes, see D. R. Dudley, *A History of Cynicism* (London, 1937) pp. 1–16 and F. Sayre, "Antisthenes the Socratic," *Classical Journal* 43 (1948) pp. 237–244. Sayre reviews the evidence for Antisthenes' dating and conjectures ca. 344–ca. 366 B.C. In 366, according to Diodorus of Sicily (XV, 76.4), Antisthenes was an educational leader at Athens. Unlike Plato and most of the other associates of Socrates, Antisthenes does not appear to have gone to Megara or elsewhere outside of Athens in 399 B.C.

that advanced education should be continued but improved in the context of life in the city, Antisthenes opted for the sophistic view that some kind of formal course on the secondary level was needed. Unlike Socrates, Antisthenes did not go out into the city to try to make everyone interested in improving himself but rather set up a convenient place — a *diatribē* according to Theopompos (as quoted in Athenaeus XI, 508c–d) — where those interested could search *him* out. Significantly Antisthenes, again following the sophists and diverging from Socrates, argued that *aretē* was teachable (Diogenes Laertius VI, 10; see also *Antisthenis Fragmenta* 68–71, ed. Caizzi).

The Socratic Aristippos of Cyrene (ca. 435–ca. 350 B.C.) is said to have taught as a sophist both before and during his association with Socrates; according to the Peripatetic Phantias of Eresos, quoted by Diogenes Laertius (II, 65), Aristippos was "the first of the Socratics to charge fees." His life in Diogenes Laertius (II, 65–83) reveals that he traveled extensively in his teaching; he was absent from Athens at the time of Socrates' death (*Phaedo* 59b) and at one point in his career taught in the gymnasium at Rhodes (Vitruvius *De Architectura* VI, intro. 1). Nevertheless he appears to have established quite a successful school of sorts at Athens, even if he did not commit himself permanently to the city. Aeschines the Socratic also taught in Athens but did not found any kind of institution. When he returned to the city, according to a report in Diogenes Laertius (II, 62), he did not venture to set up a school because of the great reputation of Plato and Aristippos; but Aeschines did take in pupils for hire.

ISOCRATES AND LATER SOPHISTS AT ATHENS

Another important figure in the development of permanent secondary schools at Athens was Isocrates, an Athenian who had himself traveled to Thessaly to study with Gorgias, and who had begun his career as a teacher in the manner of an itinerant sophist by setting up a school in Chios (cf. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Isocrates* 1; pseudo-Plutarch, *Lives of the Ten Orators* 837b). Isocrates is the first well-known teacher of higher learning who founded a permanent institution of higher learning at Athens. For, unlike most of his immediate predecessors who taught at Athens, Isocrates discussed his educational practice extensively

in writings, which are still extant.²⁴ The date of his school at Athens is 390 B.C. or even earlier.²⁵

But other less renowned sophists may have given up their itinerant practice and established themselves permanently at Athens even before him. A glimpse of the developments in Athenian secondary education in the aftermath of the early sophists may be seen in the story of Eudoxus' first trip to the city:

Having disembarked at the Piraeus, [Eudoxus] traveled every day to Athens and heard the sophists' lectures and then returned to ship. After studying for two months, he went back home. (Diogenes Laertius VIII, 86)

By the early fourth century B.C. Athens not only was drawing in itinerant teachers; it had also gained a reputation for higher education which now was attracting students from abroad as well. To use the words of Hippias in Plato's *Protagoras*, Athens had become "the very headquarters of Greek wisdom" (337d). By the time Isocrates, at the beginning of his teaching career in Athens, wrote his educational manifesto *Against the Sophists* (ca. 390 B.C.), it is clear that there were large numbers of teachers offering secondary courses at Athens (cf. *Against the Sophists* 4 and 10). Isocrates never claims to have been the first to set up a permanent institution of higher learning at Athens; it would have been a logical step for someone to take, especially for a teacher who — like Isocrates himself — was an Athenian citizen. As was suggested above, the half-Athenian Antisthenes, a Socratic who had also studied with Gorgias, may have been one teacher who founded a secondary school at Athens before Isocrates.

In several places in his writings — most notably in *Against the Sophists* and the later *Antidosis* (354/353 B.C.) — Isocrates gives explicit account of the educational philosophy which he practiced in his school. As in earlier sophistic schools, he was the

24. For Isocrates as a teacher see Maaron, *History of Education in Antiquity*, pp. 79–91; Beek, *Greek Education*, pp. 253–289; and especially Jaeger, *Paidéia* II, pp. 46–155.

25. R. C. Jebb, *Athic Orators*, vol. II (London, 1893) p. 8 argues for 392 B.C.; Jaeger (*Paidéia* II, pp. 303–304) argues for the beginning of the 380's. Isocrates himself reveals that his *Antidosis* was the work of 354/353 B.C. and refers to the earlier work *Against the Sophists* as the speech which launched his career as a teacher (cf. *Antidosis* 193).

only teacher and he gave instruction in groups (*Panathenaios* 200). Like the sophists, he took fees for his instruction. According to his own testimony, his school was financially very successful — much more so than those of the older sophists who, he claims, did not earn much money despite their reputation (*Antidosis* 155–156); Isocrates made enough profit that his school was easily self-supporting (*Antidosis* 152). But the contrast between his school and the schools of the other sophists went beyond success. A basic difference was that Isocrates scorned the "jiffy" courses of the sophists and insisted that his pupils devote extensive time to study with him, sometimes as long as three or four years (*Antidosis* 86–88). Nor does Isocrates appear to have developed any fixed course of instruction which he would give to everyone in his school, but instead he tailored his teaching to the needs and the abilities of individual students.²⁶ For, unlike the sophists whom he criticizes, he believed that formal training played only a small part in human development and that native ability and practice or experience were more important factors (*Against the Sophists* 14–15; *Antidosis* 186–188). Isocrates also argued that higher education required more advanced techniques in teaching than did elementary training and on this account criticizes, and distinguishes himself from, other sophists, who — he says — give instruction in exactly the same way as a *grammatistēs* (*Against the Sophists* 10–13).

Isocrates set up his school in Athens, not in a public gymnasium as Antisthenes had done, but in a private building — perhaps his own house — which was near the Lyceum (*diatribēn . . . eiche pros tōi Lukeiōi gymnasiōi*, Anonymous *Life of Isocrates* 108–109, p. 257, Westermann). In doing this, Isocrates was diverging from the sophistic tradition in another important respect. Since he relied entirely on publications to advertise his school (cf. *Antidosis* 1–13), Isocrates was among the first to abandon the aggressive approach to gaining adherents; his school therefore had less of a public aspect than the schools of sophists, who normally gained their followings through the medium of

26. Cicero, *De Oratore* II, 9.35–36: In Isocrates' school, *ad cuiusque naturam institutio doctoris accommodaretur*. See R. Johnson, "Isocrates' Methods of Teaching," *American Journal of Philology* 80 (1959) pp. 25–36.

epideixis put forth for all to hear in public buildings such as gymnasia.

But even though his school was permanently located at Athens during his lifetime and was a significant force in Athenian higher education for decades, Isocrates apparently did not choose to continue the institution by arranging for a successor. Part of the reason may have been this: Isocrates' school had the same practical emphasis as earlier sophistic schools; it equipped young men for life in the city, not for carrying on the work of a school-master.²⁷ But equally important is the fact that Isocrates *was* his school and hence the school died with him.

Plato and the Academy

Returning to Athens, [Plato] began to frequent (*diatriben*) the Academy, which was a gymnasium located in a grove outside the city and named after a certain hero Hekademos (as Eupolis says in his play *The Draft-dodgers*, "in the shady walks of the divine Hekademos").

(Diogenes Laertius III, 7)

At first [Plato] would philosophize in the Academy, then in the Garden at Kolonos . . .

(Diogenes Laertius III, 5)²⁸

²⁷ For lists of Isocrates' pupils see *Antidosis* 93-94 and pseudo-Plutarch's *Life of Isocrates* 837c-d. His success as a teacher is well attested independently of his own statements: cf. Cicero, *De Oratore* II, 94, *Ece tibi exortus est Isocrates, magister rhetoricum omnium, cuius e hudo, tanquam ex equo Troiano, meri principes exierunt*. On the number of students in the school, see R. Johnson, "A Note on the Number of Isocrates' Pupils," *American Journal of Philology* 78 (1957) pp. 297-300.

²⁸ I interpret this second passage (which comes first in Diogenes Laertius' account) as an accurate description of Plato's setting up a school in the Academy. In borrowing this information from his source, Diogenes must have misplaced it in his account, since it comes before Plato's encounter with Socrates and conversion to philosophy. Diogenes may not have meant to imply that Plato philosophized in the Academy before he met Socrates, although his connective (*epeta mentoi*, III, 5) suggests a chronological sequence. Interestingly enough, the error or inelegance which Diogenes commits in his *Life of Plato* is exactly paralleled in his *Life of Aristotle*: Diogenes tells something of Aristotle in the Academy, his leaving Athens, and his return when Xenocrates was scholarch (V, 2); at that point he describes Aristotle's setting up a school in the Lyceum and gathering a large following (V, 2-3). So far the chronological sequence is accurate. But then Diogenes goes on to record Aristotle's departure to the court of Her-

As unsatisfying as the evidence for most pre-Platonic schools of higher learning may be, it is clear that there were such — some permanently located at Athens — and that therefore there were ample precedents for Plato's founding of the Academy. Various kinds of schools had already been established by 387 B.C., not only by teachers in the sophistic tradition of education but also by other followers of Socrates. But to say this is not to minimize Plato's achievement; it is only to attempt to understand it more precisely in its historical context. In so far as previous Athenian schools of higher education are known, the school Plato founded in the Academy appears to have represented several new departures in the history of Athenian educational institutions.

In the first place Plato's school had a more complex structure than the Athenian secondary schools known to have existed previously. The Academy was organized, perhaps quite loosely, as a community of advanced members and of younger students; it was not simply a group in which one person was the expert and the rest a following in search of their leader's services or doctrines. Plato was the leader, as well as founder, of the school (*scholarchos*); but, in relation to the more advanced members of the school, he appears to have conceived of his role as "a first among equals." The metaphor used in the *Index Academicus* about Plato's role in the Academy is revealing: Plato's contribution, it is said, was to "act as architect and set the problems," while the other members of the school pursued them (col. Y, pp. 15-16, Mekler). The modern scholar who has developed this view of the Academy most clearly is H. Cherniss in his excellent study *The Riddle of the Early Academy* (Berkeley, 1945). After closely analyzing the available evidence on how the Academy operated, Cherniss concludes as follows:

Plato's role appears to have been not that of a "master" or even of a seminar director distributing subjects for research or prize

meias, which took place after Aristotle left the Academy and long before he founded his school in the Peripatos. Diogenes connects the two events in Aristotle's career in exactly the same way he did in talking of Plato's setting up a school in the Academy and encountering Socrates (*epeta mentoi*). The connective in both instances probably implies a change of sources, not a chronological sequence. On the *Lives* of Diogenes Laertius as compilations see the useful discussion of E. Schwartz, art. "Diogenes Laertius," *P-W* (band 5, 1903) cols. 738-763.

essays, but that of an individual thinker whose insight and skill in the formulation of a problem enables him to offer general advice and methodical criticism to other individual thinkers who respect his wisdom and who may be dominated by his personality but who consider themselves at least as competent as they consider him in dealing with the details of special subjects. (p. 65)

This is a carefully worded and fair statement of the implications of the ancient evidence. It is very different from the picture of the Academy usually given — the one based on the assumption that the educational curriculum outlined in the *Republic* and the *Laws* was the course of study in the Academy. Cherniss has adequately disposed of this mistaken notion (pp. 66–81). According to Cherniss' interpretation, the Academy was a place where works like the *Republic* were produced and discussed, not a place which attempted to implement the educational practice of an ideal state.

A further implication of Cherniss' study is that the Academy was not, as is often assumed, a sectarian community:

All the evidence points unmistakably to the same conclusion: the Academy was not a school in which an orthodox metaphysical doctrine was taught, or an association the members of which were expected to subscribe to the theory of ideas. (p. 81)²⁹

In other words, one could be — as Eudoxus, for example, was — a member of the Academy without being a Platonist; and one could even become the scholarch of the Academy while not accepting the theory of ideas, as the case of Speusippus demonstrates (cf. Aristotle, *Metaphysics* XIV, 2, p. 1090a. 2–16). The ancient *Life of Plato* attributed to Olympiodoros, although Cherniss does not mention it, has a passage which nicely characterizes the nonsectarian nature of the Academy:

Plato likewise freed himself from the Pythagoreans' sacred obligation (or oath) about keeping the doors closed and from the *ipse*

29. I would certainly amplify Cherniss' view to include affirmative answers to the questions posed by F. Solmsen in his review: "But, if there was no orthodox truth to which members were bound, was there also no joint search for the truth, no bending of efforts in the same direction, no interest in the same complex of philosophical problems, no intellectual excitement, when, for instance, Eudoxus had something new to say on the Ideas and their mode of existence or on the nature of the Good (*Eth. Nic.* 1172b 9)?" *Classical World* 40 (1946) p. 168.

dixit procedure; instead he gave everyone the impression of greater concern for civic matters (*politikōteron heauton parechōn pros hapantas*).

(*Life of Plato* 61, p. 387, Westermann)

The same passage in Olympiodoros identifies another feature of Plato's Academy about which modern accounts tend to present mistaken notions. It is often contended that the Academy, like a Pythagorean brotherhood, was an extremely exclusive society requiring a secret and elaborate procedure for membership. The *Life of Plato* quoted above contradicts this view of extreme exclusiveness, and from what is known about the operation of the Academy it seems that the source of this passage in the ancient life is correct. As was argued in the first chapter, topographical considerations and other information from sources such as the fragments of Middle Comedy indicate that the activities of the Academy and other gymnasia were very much in the public eye. The lesson in the Academy described in the Epikrates fragment was witnessed by outsiders; nothing prevented a Sicilian doctor from heckling while Plato taught (Athenaeus II, 59d–f). Places such as gymnasia and stoas were chosen by philosophers not to exclude but to attract the attention of as large a number of people as possible.

The Academy was, however, exclusive in one respect, on economic grounds, just as much as the most expensive sophistic schools. Even though Plato did not charge fees, only those who could afford to provide themselves with a livelihood for a number of years would be able to be members of Plato's school. But for those who had the means and were so inclined it appears that the society of the school was quite open. Some prospective members, such as Eudoxus on his first visit to the Academy (Diogenes Laertius VIII, 87), may have been given a cold reception; but there is no suggestion that anyone was barred by an array of formalities, secret or otherwise. The open character of the Academy is supported by stories of other persons who entered the school: Axiothea, for example, who came to the Academy from Phleious after having read a book of Plato's *Republic* and took part in the school for a long time disguised as a man; and the Corinthian farmer Nerinthos who came to study with Plato after being impressed by his reading of the *Gorgias* and about whom Aristotle as a fel-

low member of the Academy wrote a dialogue (Themistius, *Oratio* XXIII, 295c-d; cf. *Aristotelis fragmenta* 64, Rose). One of the *Anonymous Prolegomena to Platonic Philosophy*, which have been edited and translated by L. G. Westerink (Amsterdam, 1962), relates that "the magi came to Athens because of Plato, being eager to participate in the philosophy that he was expounding" (pp. 14-15, Westerink); and, according to the reliable authority of the *Index Academicus*, Plato in his old age "welcomed a Chaldean" into the Academy (col. III, p. 13, Meiler).

Even if Plato, like Isocrates, abandoned the aggressive approach to winning adherents, he did compose dialogues which were directed toward the public outside the Academy. Part of the purpose of the dialogues, as well as of the various protreptic works such as Aristotle's lost *Protrepticus*, was certainly to propagandize and convert.³⁰ This orientation toward the public contrasted with the monastic character of Pythagorean society. All of these considerations indicate that Plato's school was a relatively open institution and that it did *not* differ significantly in this respect from other Athenian schools of higher learning.

The author of the anonymous *Life of Plato* also adds another point about the Academy which would make it closer in character to sophistic schools than to Pythagorean brotherhoods: Plato showed himself "more concerned with civic matters" (*politikōteron*) than Pythagoras. In the *Seventh Epistle* (esp. 325-326) it is revealed that the aim of Plato's school was not just to help individuals develop in philosophy but also to produce men who would be of use in running the state.³¹ The two principal literary

30. On protreptic discourses and their affinity to Platonic dialogues see the excellent introduction to I. Düring's edition of *Aristotle's Protrepticus* (Göteborg, 1961) esp. pp. 19-35. For the Platonic dialogues as conversion pieces and a discussion of what their literary form implies about the relation of philosophy to society, see A. D. Nock, *Conversion* (Oxford, 1933) ch. XI, esp. pp. 165-168, 179-186; one passage is worth quoting: "though the world could not participate [in the Academy], the Dialogues were written largely in order to give to wider circles some idea of the direction in which truth lay, to stimulate thought, and to enable the individual here and there who had a call to philosophy to realize his vocation" (p. 167).

31. There appears to me to be no major problem in treating the *Seventh Epistle* as Platonic after the excellent defense of its genuineness by K. von Fritz, *Platon in Sizilien und das Problem der Philosophenherrschaft* (Berlin, 1968) esp. ch. I.

productions of the Academy were long political dialogues. Plato's own entanglement in the politics of Sicily is well known, and the number of his students who became involved in government was enormous.

In Plutarch's defense of Plato against the attacks of the Epicureans, for example, there is a long list of Academicians who were active in affairs of state: Dion in Sicily; Pytho and Hierakleides, slayers of King Kotys in Thrace; the Athenian generals Chabrias and Phokion; Aristonymos, reformer of the Arcadian constitution; Phormion, reformer of the Eleian constitution; Menedemos, constitutional advisor for the Pyrrhians; Eudoxus, law-giver to his native Knidos; Aristotle, law-giver to his home city of Stageira; Xenocrates, governmental consultant of Alexander the Great; and Delios of Ephesus, advisor to Alexander the Great on war policy (Plutarch, *Adversus Colotem* 1126c-d). An equal number could be added from other sources.³² The list of men of affairs who studied in Plato's Academy is in fact as impressive as the number produced by the most successful sophistic school, that of Isocrates. It is clear from what Plato's school produced that the aims and emphasis of the Academy were very different from those of the society which Pythagoras founded; in its concern for

32. See C. B. Armstrong, "Plato's Academy," *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society* 7 (1953) pp. 103-104. The political activity of the Academy is also discussed by G. C. Field, *Plato and His Contemporaries* (3rd ed., London, 1967) pp. 43-45 and U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Antigonus von Karystos*, Excurs 1, "Die Philosophenschulen und die Politik," pp. 178-234. Other scholars have generalized the Academy's involvement in politics into a view of the nature of Plato's school: P.-M. Schuhl, "Platon et l'activité politique de l'Académie," *Revue des études grecques* 59 (1946) pp. 46-53 and "Une école des sciences politiques," *Revue philosophique* 149 (1959) pp. 101-103; cf. A.-H. Chrout, "Plato's Academy: The First Organized School of Political Science in Antiquity," *Review of Politics* 29 (1967) pp. 25-40. This latter view is, I think, an overstatement, since there was at least equal emphasis in the Academy on theory and on individual improvement through philosophy. In dealing with the evidence for political activity on the part of Academicians, one should not forget that the stereotype of the philosopher in comedy was nevertheless quite the antithesis. In the caricature of comic poets, philosophers, including those of the Academy, were not dangerous meddlers in affairs of state but rather impractical and abstracted types [cf. T. B. L. Webster, *Studies in Later Greek Comedy* (2nd ed., Manchester, 1970) pp. 50-56]. Plutarch's *Adversus Colotem* is a piece of special pleading which argues that the Academy did in fact have practical effects.

producing men skilled in political matters, the Academy was not unlike many of the earliest sophistic schools set up at Athens.

A feature of the Academy which did distinguish it from most, if not all, previous Athenian institutions of higher learning was that Plato made provisions for the administrative continuation of his school after him. The groups formed around itinerant sophists dissolved when a course was completed; the school of Isocrates and probably that of Antisthenes ended when they died or retired from teaching. After Plato's death in 347 B.C., however, a new scholarch, his nephew Speusippus, succeeded him, and other scholarchs were elected in turn.³³

Plato also provided for the physical permanence and continuation of the school which he founded. Unlike most of the teachers who offered advanced instruction before him, Plato was an Athenian citizen and had the right to own land in the city. But he could not own the Academy, which — like the Lyceum — was a public sanctuary and gymnasium. Even after Plato was established in the Academy as a teacher with an international reputation, the site could still be used by others for instruction, and the sanctuary and the gymnasium continued to serve as a center

33. The way in which scholarchs in the Academy were appointed is indicated by a passage of the *Academicorum Philosophorum Index Herculanensis* (cols. VI–VII, pp. 38–39, Mekler): “The young men, voting on who should be their leader, elected Xenocrates of Chalkedon; for Aristotle was abroad in Macedonia and Menedemos of Pyrrha and Herakleides of Heraklea were defeated by a few votes. As a result Herakleides went away to the Pontos and Menedemos founded another *peripatos* and *diatribē*.” How (and why) Speusippus was chosen is not explicitly stated; there is some suggestion in ancient accounts that kinship was an important factor and that Speusippus received the school *because he was Plato's nephew* (cf. Diogenes Laertius IV, 1; *Vita Marciana* 13, p. 99, Düring; and esp. T3, pp. 259–260, Düring). Election procedure may have varied, as it did in the Peripatetic School, since Straton named his successor in his will (V, 62). But the normal practice appears to have been election by the members, although the previous scholarch might express a preference. There is evidence that Speusippus (Diogenes Laertius IV, 3), Aristotle (Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* XIII, 5), and Theophrastus (Diogenes Laertius V, 52) all expressed some preference in their lifetimes as to who should succeed them. Of these Theophrastus' preference (Neleus) was not elected, and Speusippus', as the passage quoted above from the *Index* makes clear, won only by a narrow margin. See the articles by H. von Arnim, “Neleus von Skepsis,” *Hermes* 63 (1928) pp. 103–107 and by P. Merlan, *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 77 (1946) pp. 103–111, on “The Successor of Speusippus.”

for religious, gymnastic, and athletic activity, as well as for other public and civic functions.

The school of Plato did not appropriate the Academy grounds; instead, in the manner of sophists like Mikkos at an Athenian palaestra (*Lysis* 204a), Plato set up a school which took advantage of facilities contained in the Academy and of the opportunities offered by so public a place to gain adherents. In the famous comic fragment of Epikrates (Athenaeus II, 59d–f), which parodies one kind of educational activity in the Academy, it is a “lounge” (*leschē*) in the gymnasium that Plato and his students were using. More than two centuries later, when Karneades was scholarch, the members of the Academy were still using the facilities of the public gymnasium (in this instance, the *exedra*; cf. Cicero, *De Finibus* V, 2.4). But as a citizen, Plato was able to define his school and give it physical permanence in a way that many previous teachers could not: he bought a small estate *near* the Academy, which gave the property of his school both a public and a private dimension (Diogenes Laertius III, 5; Apuleius, *De Platone* I, 4). His successors were therefore able to use the private part of the school as well as the buildings and grounds of the nearby state sanctuary (Plutarch, *De Exilio* 10, 603b).

It is often stated that Plato's contact with the Pythagorean brotherhoods of Southern Italy, immediately before his founding of the Academy, suggested the lines along which his school was organized. There may be some truth in this but no explicit evidence to support it. Certainly as far as the evidence for the nature of a Pythagorean community goes, the differences between Plato's school and a Pythagorean brotherhood are more striking than the similarities.³⁴ Some of these differences have already been noted above, in the discussion of the passage in the anonymous *Life of Plato* which explicitly contrasts the Academy with a Pythagorean brotherhood. According to the passage quoted, the Academy was a more open and public community and the bond of its members was not an *ipse dixit* relationship with Plato. As Cherniss' study of the Academy has shown, the solidarity of the Academic community was not that of sacred dogma

34. Characteristics of Pythagorean communities and much of what is known about their activities are conveniently brought together by T. Africa, *Science and the State in Greece and Rome* (New York, 1968) pp. 29–32.

indoctrinated into initiates, nor were oaths or anything comparable to dietary rules prescribed for its members.³⁵ A passage in Diogenes Laertius' *Life of Epicurus* (X, 11) revealingly contrasts Epicurus' school with a Pythagorean brotherhood:

Epicurus did not think it right that possessions be held in common, as is required by the dictum of Pythagoras on the goods of friends.

Plato's will preserved by Diogenes Laertius (III, 41-43) indicates that he also, unlike a member of a Pythagorean community, regarded his possessions as his own, to be handed down to whom-ever he pleased. This point is confirmed by the way in which he is said to have handled gifts. Although Plato did not exact fees for his teaching, the Thirteenth "Platonic" Epistle indicates that he accepted gifts of money from Dionysios, Dion, and other friends (*Epistle* 13, 361b-362d). Whoever the author of the epistle was, he doubtless knew how the Academy was operated, and he reveals that Plato did not consider such funds to be the endowment of the school. For, according to this source, Plato used the funds as his own personal money, to pay taxes, to provide gifts for friends, and even to supply dowry for female relatives (*Epistle* 13, 361b-e). In quite a number of fundamental ways, therefore, the nature of Plato's school appears to contrast with that of a Pythagorean brotherhood.

If it is necessary to find precedents which might have suggested to Plato the kind of institution he was to found in the Academy, there are numerous other possibilities which are as likely as Pythagorean brotherhoods. As was said above, Athenian law allowed, or at least did not restrict, the right of free association.³⁶ Clubs whose members were joined by political interest were common in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.,³⁷ and the researches of Ziebarth and Poland have shown that the Greeks

35. Nor was geometry required. See: H. D. Saffrey, "Ageōmetrētos mēdeis eisitō, Une inscription légendaire," *Revue des études grecques* 81 (1968) pp. 67-87. Much of the evidence for a quasi-mystical dimension to Plato's Academy comes from Neo-Platonic sources who were imposing their own ways of looking at philosophy on Plato.

36. P. Vinogradoff (above, n. 21).

37. See G. M. Calhoun, *Athenian Clubs in Politics and Litigation*, *Bulletin of the University of Texas, Humanities Series*, 14 (Austin, 1913).

at a very early date began to form trade, professional, and religious organizations, which had rules of their own and constituted institutions apart from the state.³⁸ Groups such as these might have suggested points of organization which Plato incorporated into his school. The philosophic community which formed after Socrates' death at the house of Eukleides in Megara and to which Plato himself belonged for a time perhaps gave some suggestions as to what a Socratic might do if he were going to break his master's dictum and form an institution of higher education apart from the city; in particular the *diadochē* of Eukleides might have suggested to Plato that a school should make some provision for administrative continuance after the leader's death.

But the basic elements which went into the organization of the Academy were to be found right in Athens, in the educational thinking of Socrates and the sophists: (1) the Socratic view that education meant *sunousia* in an intimate sense and not a simple master-pupil arrangement; (2) the sophistic doctrine that higher education, to be effective, required the same setting as elementary education, viz. institutions in which professionals taught and one who wanted to learn availed himself of their services. It was perhaps because of the success of the educational institutions which the sophists (especially Isocrates) established that Plato decided to emulate their practice. Nevertheless in setting up the Academy Plato held to the Socratic belief in *sunousia* as the basis of higher education, as the *Seventh Epistle* makes clear (341c); in effect, Plato may be said to have institutionalized *sunousia* in his school.

Athenian Schools of Higher Learning: General Descriptions and Some Cautions

The main contention underlying the account given in this chapter is that it falsifies the historical development to distin-

38. E. Ziebarth, *Das griechische Vereinswesen* (Leipzig, 1896) and F. Poland, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens* (Leipzig, 1909). In my opinion, however, both of these books exaggerate the religious character of these organizations and the extent to which they were formally organized. Every group recorded in ancient sources need not have been recognized, defined, or sanctioned by the law of the state. This subject will be discussed further in Chapter IV.

guish sharply between philosophical schools, such as the Academy and the Peripatos, and the schools of the sophists and the minor Socratics. To call one "philosophical schools" and the other "mere rhetorical schools" as if there were no essential similarity between them is to foster a rather extreme form of the Platonic viewpoint.

All of these schools arose in response to the same social condition at Athens: the lack of institutions of any kind to provide education beyond the elementary stage. In the late fifth and early fourth centuries B.C. all schools of higher learning, whether temporary or permanent, were the products of individual initiative and grew up in a vacuum without the regulation of the state or of any other outside agency. As a result, there were great variations between the schools, and some of the most important have been discussed in this chapter. What has to be particularly stressed, however, is that the lack of uniformity was largely the result of a very fluid and newly established tradition of higher learning at Athens. The differences do not mean that the philosophical schools and the schools of the sophists were antithetical types of institutions; rather the ways in which the various schools differed reflected the divergent attitudes toward truth and education that characterized their founders and became embodied in the institutions. All the secondary schools were of the same general type. They were concerned with *paideia* of a more advanced kind and were competing for the same students. A good corrective to the Platonic viewpoint is that of Isocrates, who sometimes talks of philosophy and sophistry as if they were the same thing (*Antidosis* 169–179) and at other times, in his more polemical passages, distinguishes himself as the *philosophos*, as opposed to the *eristikoi* such as Plato and Aristotle (*Letter to Alexander* 5; *Helen* 1 and 6).³⁹

A corollary to the central argument of this chapter is that many schools of higher learning grew up at the end of the fifth

39. On relations between Isocrates and Plato, see W. Jaeger, *Paideia* III, pp. 55–70 and 132–155; Beck, *Greek Education*, pp. 290–300. On relations between Isocrates and Aristotle (during the latter's time in the Academy) see A.-H. Chroust, "Aristotle's Earliest Course of Lectures on Rhetoric," *L'Antiquité classique* 33 (1964) pp. 58–72; and the collection of passages and commentary by I. Düring, *Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition* (Göteborg, 1957) pp. 299–314.

century B.C. and during the first half of the fourth. It was noted that by the time Isocrates wrote his educational manifesto *Against the Sophists* (ca. 390 B.C.) there were already a number of secondary schools at Athens, some of which may have been permanently located in the city (cf. *Against the Sophists* 4). When Isocrates wrote his other major treatise on education — the *Antidosis* of 354/353 B.C. — there appear to have been still more established schools offering advanced education at Athens (*Antidosis* 84–85), one of which was Plato's Academy, founded about 387 B.C.

An issue which was raised in this chapter and will be further developed later is the legal status of these institutions. It was argued that there was no legal formality involved in founding a secondary school at Athens. The way in which one went about setting up a school can be seen at the beginning of Plato's *Lysis* (203a–204b), where the sophist Mikkos has established himself in a newly built palaestra and is attempting to win a following of students. Although a full discussion of the legal question is reserved for the fourth chapter, this appears to have been all that the founding of Plato's and Aristotle's schools initially entailed (cf. Diogenes Laertius III, 5 and 7; V, 2).

For the sake of brevity the term "secondary school" has been often used to distinguish all of the various advanced schools (i.e., rhetorical, sophistical, philosophical, etc.) from an elementary school which taught *mousikē* and *gymnastikē* to children. The term should not be interpreted to mean that these later institutions fitted into a neatly graduated scheme such as one would find in a society where education is regulated by the state (Plato's ideal state of the *Republic*, for example). Although the secondary schools seem to have been directed primarily toward young men (*neirakia*), the education which they provided did not necessarily correspond to any fixed age span such as fourteen to eighteen. Aristotle was seventeen when he entered the Academy and stayed there for twenty years; Eudoxus and the Corinthian farmer Nerinthus were much older. One could, if he chose, pursue philosophy for a short while in the Academy or for a lifetime. Isocrates limited stays in his school to three or four years, although most students — he says — wished to remain longer (*Antidosis* 86–88). In the schools of

some sophists advanced education may have entailed as little as a week or an hour. All of these schools, however long one might spend at them, were "secondary" in this sense: they all intended to supplement elementary education for anyone (of any age) who wanted additional formal instruction.

It is misleading to think or speak of Greek institutions of higher learning — even the major Athenian philosophical schools — as "universities" in the medieval or modern sense. As H. Rashdall, who made an elaborate study of the medieval university, has said, "the university is a distinctly medieval institution — as much so as constitutional kingship, or parliaments, or trial by jury."⁴⁰ Although some schools such as that of Isocrates may have *required* study for three or four years, there is no evidence that any Athenian institution of higher learning ever developed a defined graduated curriculum like the one outlined for the ideal state in Plato's *Republic* or like the ones followed in medieval universities. All of the Athenian secondary schools presupposed some elementary training and served the need for higher education, but they did *not* fit into a graduated scheme of education so that they correspond to a college or other grade level. The whole new system of advanced studies that was emerging was very flexible and fluid. The Athenian schools of higher learning were voluntary in the fullest sense. No one was obliged to found them; no one was obliged to attend them. Neither the teachers of the schools nor the schools themselves were licensed or certified, nor were formal examinations given or degrees awarded to those who completed their studies. Even though many of the schools used public property, they were entirely private organizations, self-regulated and self-supporting. The term university — of Roman origin with no Greek equivalent — should therefore be avoided in discussions of Athenian schools.

There is, however, a most interesting parallel between the origins of Athenian schools of higher learning and the origins of the medieval university; the parallel is by no means complete but a number of points of comparison can be noted. In his study *Paris and Oxford Universities in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth*

Centuries (New York, 1968), Gordon Leff has given the following account of the way in which medieval universities grew up:

[Medieval universities in the thirteenth century] had virtually no common property or wealth; their schools and lodgings were rented houses and rooms; their meeting places were churches or the premises of the religious orders. (p. 8)

A development very similar to this was sketched above in discussing the state sanctuary of the Lyceum and its use for educational purposes. As will be seen in the following chapters, what developed in the Lyceum, in the time of Aristotle and Theophrastus, was ostensibly the same as the outcome of the phenomenon Leff is describing: a concretely definable institution of higher learning. But, as will also be seen, the Lyceum became an educational institution of a very different character from the medieval university.

40. H. Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, ed. by F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden (Oxford, 1936) p. 3.