Summary. In this section we compare chs. 3–6 of Achilles’ On the All, a cousin writing of Aëtius, with Books I–II of the Placita. The topics that are explicitly announced in Achilles are the same, while themes parallel to the theoretical chs. 1.11–29 are lacking. What we find in this later representative of the doxographical tradition moreover supports our argument that chs. 1.3–4, on principles/elements and cosmogony, belong together in their Aëtian order and were originally not so far distant from the cosmology of Book II. Yet there are substantial differences of detail. Although he elsewhere makes considerable use of the diaphonia there are for example no contrasting tenets in Achilles ch. 3, while his list of principles begins with Hellenistic authorities and ends by going all the way back to the Presocratics and their purported ancestors. Achilles’ lengthy ch. 4, ‘On the construction of the whole’, incorporates a number of issues, among which cosmogony, the sequence of cosmic layers, and the immobility of the earth. An important piece of evidence, argued away by Diels, is that both Achilles and Aëtius mention ‘Metrodorus the teacher of Epicurus’ as rejecting the thesis that there is only one cosmos. Cosmogony follows on the principles not only in Achilles but also in some of the abstracts of Theophrastus’ account of the Presocratics preserved by Simplicius. This may help explain what we have in both Achilles and the Placita.

A further argument in favour of the hypothesis that a large part of A Book I consists of chapters going back to ingredients that have been combined with a cosmological account can be derived from a comparison of the macrostructure of Books I and II of the Placita with a sequence of chapters of the On the All of Achilles. This tract, dealing with physics and astronomy, recycled as an introduction to Aratus and dating to the third century CE, does not depend on P, or even on A, but (insofar as physical doxography is concerned) on the tradition, or traditions, on which A also depends. Accordingly much of Ach, a cousin writing of A, is comparable to what we have in the Placita, but the differences between such parallel accounts are often quite substantial.269 Diels in the DG believed this work

269 For Ach see Vol. 1:299–306. For the text we now have the useful critical edition of Di Maria (1996) (‘stampato Novembre’), published almost simultaneously with Vol. 1 (its date 1997 is due to the publisher’s wish to avoid 1996 in a book published at the end of
to be dependent on P, but as Pasquali tells us, this view was later retracted.  

We shall look at some aspects of the macrostructure of this curious work, limiting the inquiry to chs. 3–6. The chapters that follow in Ach are about astronomical, cosmical, and a few meteorological phenomena (as well as about teaching astronomy). There are no parallels for the Aëtian chapters on the gods, or on more theoretical concepts such as form, matter, cause, and necessity, found in Book I of the *Placita*.

Ach ch. 3, entitled ‘On the principle of the whole’ (περὶ τῆς τῶν ὅλων ἀρκηῆς) can be put alongside A 1.3, ‘On the principles, what they are’. Seven of its nine lemmata are close to what is in A: same name-labels, similar tenets, but with some differences in phrasing. A few lemmata or parts of lemmata, as well as a few name-labels in other lemmata, are not paralleled in A. Like the Aëtian chapter, and like Arist. *Cael.* 2.13.295a7–24, also the chapter in Ach contains a few brief references to cosmogony, viz. in the lemma on Apollonius of Rhodes about Orpheus tucked on to the Empedocles lemma, while the final lemma (no name-label) is also about cosmogony, viz. (as we have seen) about earth as the first to be formed, followed by fire, water, and air—this takes care of a smooth transition to Ach’s next chapter.

But a major difference is in the ordering of the lemmata. The sequence of name-labels and tenets looks like a selective back-to-front reproduction of a sequence that, compared with the various and rather disorderly sources for this Aëtian chapter or Diels’ disputable reconstruction, is much different. If we take P’s arrangement as our guide, we may remember from Section 7 above that this begins with the Ionian Succession starting with Thales, and then lists the Italian Succession starting with Pythagoras. We have seen that this arrangement was followed up in Book II by the presence of archegetes of Successions, or their early followers, in the first lemmata of nineteen out of thirty-one chapters. The overall tendency of A is clear. But Ach provides a relative

---

270 Pasquali (1910) 221 n. 1. This paper was one of the seven offprints Diels preserved together with his own copy of the *DG*, see list at Oniga Farra (1985) vi–vii n. 8. (On this *Supplementum* see Vol. 1:104–105 n. 119. We are most grateful to Dr. Oniga Farra for permission to use and quote this valuable study.)

271 On the subject matter of these chapters see preliminary remarks Vol. 1:303.