

AENESIDEMUS AND THE ACADEMY

In cod. 212 of his *Bibliotheca*, Photius provides some information of great importance for our scanty knowledge of Pyrrhonian scepticism between Timon and Sextus:¹

- (1) ἀνεγνώσθη Αἰνησιδήμου Πυρρωνίων λόγοι η' (169b18).
- (2) ἡ μὲν ὅλη τοῦ βιβλίου διάληψις ὁ βούλεται, εἴρηται. γράφει δὲ τοὺς λόγους Αἰνησιδήμος προσφωνῶν αὐτοὺς τῶν ἐξ Ἀκαδημίας τινὶ συναιρεσιώτῃ Λευκίῳ Τοβέρωνι, γένος μὲν Ῥωμαίῳ, δόξῃ δὲ λαμπρῷ ἐκ προγόνων καὶ πολιτικὰς ἀρχὰς οὐ τυχοῦσας μετιόντι (169b30–5).
- (3) ταῦτα μὲν ἀρχόμενος τῶν λόγων καὶ τοιαῦθ' ἕτερα τὴν διαφορὰν τῶν Πυρρωνίων καὶ Ἀκαδημαϊκῶν ὑποδεικνύς, ἀναγράφει ὁ Αἰνησιδήμος ὁ ἐξ Αἰγῶν (170a39–41).

The first of these entries tells us that what Photius immediately goes on to report is drawn from a direct reading of Aenesidemus' work in eight books entitled *Πυρρώνια*.² The second gives us information on the proem of the work, which was dedicated to the Roman Lucius Tubero. The third adds Aenesidemus' place of origin, which Photius in all probability had derived from the same book.

There are two possible ways in which he could have done so: either the information formed part of the title, at the beginning or the end of the work; or it was to be found in the proem itself, assuming that this dealt with the circumstances of the meeting between the author and the person to whom the book was dedicated. What seems quite certain is that we have here unique biographical testimonies on Aenesidemus, which we can say derive directly from what he had written himself. They deserve, beginning with the geographical information, to be appraised with more attention than they have received up to now.³

As regards the places where Aenesidemus lived we possess two other pieces of evidence in addition to that of Photius. Aenesidemus' name appears in Diogenes Laertius 9.115–16, at the end of the *Life of Timon*, in a passage dealing with the

¹ So far as I know, the only scholar who has raised the question of evaluating Photius' testimony in the light of his own method is K. Janáček; but his attention is mainly focused on Photius' use of philosophical terminology: 'Zur Interpretation des Photios-Abschnitte über Ainesidem', *Eirene* 14 (1976), 93–100; see also *Philologus* 121 (1977), 93.

² Here *λόγοι* has the sense 'books', and so *Πυρρωνίων* will be understood as genitive plural noun. But Photius himself, a little later, again cites Aenesidemus' work in a way that gives *λόγοι* the meaning of 'Discourses': γράφει δὲ τοὺς λόγους κτλ. Photius' title recurs in the Byzantine tradition, cf. M. Gigante, *Poeti bizantini di terra d'Otranto nel sec. XIII*² (Naples, 1979), p. 46, who refers to Giovanni Grasso, diplomat and poet, author of *Πυρρώνια*. On the sceptical tradition in the Byzantine era, still incompletely explored, some references can be found in C. B. Schmitt, 'The Rediscovery of Ancient Skepticism in Modern Times', in M. Burnyeat (ed.), *The Skeptical Tradition* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1983), 225–51, pp. 234ff.

³ According to N. G. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium* (London, 1983), pp. 93ff., Photius will not be free of obvious mistakes; but see now the penetrating study by J. Schamp, *Photios historien des lettres. La Bibliothèque et ses notices biographiques* (Paris, 1987) ('Ce qui est surprenant, c'est la rareté des cas où, manifestement, Photios a commis une grossière erreur'); I hope to show that there is no reason, even in this case (not considered by Schamp), to suppose he is offering wrong information.

problematic succession of Pyrrhonian philosophers ending with the name of Saturninus, the pupil of Sextus:

- (4) *τούτου (sc. Timon's) διάδοχος, ὡς μὲν Μηνόδοτος φησι, γέγονεν οὐδείς, ἀλλὰ διέλιπεν ἡ ἀγωγή ἕως αὐτὴν Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Κυρηναῖος ἀνεκτήσατο. ὡς δ' Ἰππόβοτος φησι καὶ Σωτῶν, διήκουσαν αὐτοῦ Διοσκοουρίδης Κύπριος καὶ Νικόλοχος Ῥόδιος καὶ Εὐφράνωρ Σελευκεὺς Πραύλους τ' ἀπὸ Τρώαδος, ὃς οὕτω καρτερικὸς ἐγένετο, καθὰ φησι Φύλαρχος ἱστορῶν, ὥστ' ἀδίκως ὑπομῖναι ὡς ἐπὶ προδοσίᾳ κολασθῆναι, μὴδὲ λόγου τοὺς πολίτας καταξιώσας. Εὐφράνωρος δὲ διήκουσεν Εὐβουλος Ἀλεξανδρεὺς, οὐ Πτολεμαῖος, οὐ Σαρπηδὼν καὶ Ἡρακλείδης, Ἡρακλείδου δ' Αἰνεσίδημος Κνώσιος, ὃς καὶ Πυρρωνίωνων λόγων ὀκτὼ συνέγραψε βιβλία· οὐ Ζεῦξιππος ὁ πολίτης, οὐ Ζεῦξις ὁ Γωνίσιος, οὐ Ἀντίοχος Λαοδικεὺς ἀπὸ Λύκου· τούτου δὲ Μηνόδοτος ὁ Νικομηθεὺς, ἰατρός ἐμπειρικός, καὶ Θειωδᾶς Λαοδικεὺς· Μηνόδοτου δὲ Ἡρόδοτος Ἀριεὺς Ταρσεύς· Ἡρόδοτου δὲ διήκουσε Σέξτος ὁ ἐμπειρικός, οὐ καὶ τὰ δέκα τῶν Σκεπτικῶν καὶ ἄλλα κάλλιστα· Σέξτου δὲ διήκουσε Σατορνίνος ὁ Κυθηνὰς, ἐμπειρικός καὶ αὐτός.*

Setting aside for now the other evidence in this passage and the numerous problems that it presents, it is clear that in spite of the variant spelling of the name (*Αἰνεσ-/Αἰνησ-*), the same Aenesidemus is meant. The number of books coincides with that of the work read by Photius, and the difference in the title is not sufficient to lead one to suppose that a different piece of writing is meant.⁴ The genuine point of divergence seems to be the fact that, according to the data compiled by Diogenes Laertius, Aenesidemus was from Cnossos.

Aristocles (*ap. Eus. PE* 14.18) adds a further piece of information:

- (5) *μηδενὸς δὲ ἐπιστραφέντος αὐτῶν, ὡς εἰ μὴδὲ ἐγένοντο τὸ παράπαν, ἐχθὲς καὶ πρώην ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ τῇ κατ' Αἴγυπτον Αἰνησίδημός τις ἀναζωπυρεῖν ἤρξατο τὸν ὕθλον τοῦτον.*

Although the three testimonies contained in (3), (4) and (5) seem to diverge, they can actually be reconciled without major difficulty.

Diogenes Laertius' general purpose in citing the ethnics of philosophers is entirely clear: the information that he gives us has to do with their place of birth. So we can state quite confidently that according to the tradition that he follows, Aenesidemus was born at Cnossos on the island of Crete.

The point of Aristocles' statement is no less clear. However we interpret the controversial expression *ἐχθὲς καὶ πρώην*,⁵ and leaving aside the evidently pejorative tone of the sentence, he speaks of Aenesidemus as a figure of the past. He also indicates that Alexandria was the place where Aenesidemus developed his philosophical activity and where, in ending the long silence of Pyrrhonists after the death of Timon, he initiated the circulation of the Sceptic doctrine. Because Philo of Alexandria seems to be acquainted with the Pyrrhonian tradition, he forms a *terminus ante quem* for Aenesidemus.

We have, then, a place of birth, Cnossos, and a second place, Alexandria, recognized as the principal scene of his philosophical activity. It seems obvious, therefore, to take Aegae as a further place at which Aenesidemus found himself at some point in his life. Before seeking to learn more, we should spend a little time on the list of Pyrrhonian philosophers reported by Diogenes Laertius.

The report is rich in names and interesting also because it deals with a unitary succession that stretched down to times close to those of Diogenes himself. However,

⁴ For the title *Πυρρωνίωνι λόγοι*, see SE, *M* 8.215.

⁵ On Aristocles, a Peripatetic of the imperial period but of uncertain date, cf. P. Moraux, *Der Aristotelismus bei den Griechen* (Berlin and New York, 1984), ii.83–207. Because *ἐχθὲς καὶ πρώην* can mark either a short or a long span of time, we do not have definite means of dating Aristocles, not even if, as I hope to show, it is possible to date Aenesidemus fairly securely.

it says both too much and too little. None of the sources explicitly cited there can have compiled the list in its entirety. Menodotus is responsible for the evidence that Timon had no successors until Ptolemy of Cyrene restored the Pyrrhonian sect (D.L. 9.115). Someone else, not easily identifiable but probably a Sceptic, fixed an uninterrupted succession between Euphranor of Seleucia, a pupil of Timon (on the authority of Sotion and Hippobotus, who also mentioned three other pupils of Timon)⁶ and Saturninus, the pupil of Sextus. Of the names included in the list, only three are explicitly described as Empirical doctors – Menodotus, Sextus and Saturninus. The others are not characterized in any way, and the only individual for whom the title of a work is mentioned, apart from Sextus, is Aenesidemus. This fact confirms the importance that he had had for the constitution of the tradition.

If the Heraclides who is cited in the list as the teacher of Aenesidemus was Heraclides of Tarentum,⁷ it follows that Menodotus, an Empirical doctor himself, attributed the revival of the Pyrrhonian sect to a doctor, and associated Aenesidemus with the doctor Heraclides. I leave on one side the question of the compatibility of this operation with the chronological data at our disposal, and limit myself to noting that the list reveals a very close connection between Pyrrhonism and medical empiricism, making it difficult to draw any intrinsic distinction between doctors and philosophers. It seems reasonable to think that the list comprises a group formed by doctors with philosophical interests and philosophers with medical interests. On this point one may recall that Galen, who knew Menodotus well and engaged in lengthy controversy with him, seems to regard Timon as a member of the Empirical sect (*Subfig. emp.* p. 35 Bonnet).

In the case of Aenesidemus, as with the other names of the list, it is important to emphasize that we do not know what relation he had with the medical tradition. It is particularly necessary to evaluate with care the presence of medical material and terminology within the content of his ten Modes (SE, *PH* 1.36–163). We should remain open to the possibility that this material and terminology provide evidence of Aenesidemus' original interest in medicine rather than seeing them simply as additions to the primary Aenesideman material that Sextus drew upon for his work. Although the connection between Pyrrhonism and medicine cannot be ascertained purely on the basis of the names listed by Diogenes, it is clear from what he writes that Menodotus did not find lines of succession between Timon and Aenesidemus. This fits the picture given by Aristocles, who knows nothing about Pyrrhonists between the dates of these two philosophers.

⁶ But one should note the absence of the name that is to be expected, Xanthus the son of Timon, whom Timon had caused to study medicine (D.L. 9.110): *ιατρικὴν ἐδίδαξε καὶ διάδοχον τοῦ βίου κατέλιπεν*. From what follows next, we may deduce that the source of the information on Xanthus was Sotion himself in book 11 of his *Successions*. If so, was Sotion making a distinction between a 'Pyrrhonian way of life' and a stricter philosophical engagement? D.L.'s sentence is not easy to evaluate.

⁷ K. Deichgräber, *Die griechische Empirikerschule* (1930, repr. Berlin–Zürich, 1965), p. 172, dates him to about 75 B.C., but from a passage of Celsus, *de medic. prooem.* V 3, he should precede Asclepiades (dated by E. Rawson, 'The Life and Death of Asclepiades of Bithynia', *CQ* 32 (1982), 358–70, to the later second century B.C.). Cf. V. Brochard, *Les Sceptiques grecs*² (Paris, 1923), pp. 232f., and J. Glucker, *Antiochus and the Late Academy* (Göttingen, 1978), p. 109 n. 38. See also Ph. Mudry, *La préface du De Medicina de Celse. Texte, Traduction et commentaire* (Rome, 1982), p. 72. However, it should also be mentioned that Heraclides referred to Ptolemy, and this would rather favour identifying him with the Heraclides cited in the succession of Pyrrhonian philosophers, notwithstanding the chronological implausibility of his presence there.

For my purpose it is enough to have established that Diogenes' list does not furnish any proof of the existence of a proper and genuine Pyrrhonian sect in the time between Timon and Aenesidemus; what it does reveal unequivocally is the presence of a later tradition which perceived a tight connection between Pyrrhonism and medical empiricism.

Let us now turn to the evidence of Photius. If we accept the truth of Diogenes' report that Aenesidemus, author of *Πυρρώνειοι λόγοι*, was born at Cnossos, it is probable that the mention of Aegae was information that Photius derived from the proem of the work that he had before him, rather than something coupled with Aenesidemus' name as his birthplace in the work's title; Diogenes Laertius too, as we have seen, cites the same work but knows nothing about Aegae. We may take it, then, that it appeared in connection with the dedication to Tubero.⁸

In that case, it is most plausible to suppose that Aegae was a place where Aenesidemus and Tubero found themselves or, more probably, met and had discussions about the questions that formed the purpose of Aenesidemus' book or had inspired it and induced him to dedicate it to Tubero. Starting from this assumption, the next step is to investigate what city could be mentioned, on the reasonable assumption that this meeting took place in the first century B.C. and that Aenesidemus' move to Alexandria occurred in a period consistent with Philo's acquaintance with his work.

If we open Pauly-Wissowa (vol. I, 1894) at the entry 'Aigai', we read: '...der Name eine Anzahl griechischer Städte, welche fast sämtlich am Strande des Meeres... gelegen waren.' Six cities of this name are listed. The choice between them is fortunately made easier by the fact that at the period which interests us we know that some of them were no longer inhabited or had changed their name. Two candidates deserve serious consideration.⁹

First of all, no. 5 – an Aeolic city of Mysia 36 km to the south of Pergamum, on the west coast of modern Turkey facing Lesbos. Authors who refer to it include Herodotus (1.77, 149: *Αἰγαίαι*), Xenophon (*Hell.* 4.8.5: *Αἰγεῖς*¹⁰), Strabo (13.621: *τὰς Αἰγὰς*), and Pliny (*NH* 5.121: *Aegeae*). In Polybius 5.77.4 and 33.11.8 the inhabitants are called *Αἰγαεῖς*, and in Tacitus (*Ann.* 2.47) *Aegeaetae* (in this passage there is also reference to an earthquake which shook the city in A.D. 17).¹¹

Aegae no. 6 also deserves careful consideration: an important city of Cilicia, described in the sources as *Aegae* (Pliny 5.91, Lucan 3.277), *Αἰγαί* (Ptolemy 5.8.4;

⁸ As far as I am aware, only A. Goedeckemeyer, *Die Geschichte des Griechischen Skeptizismus* (Leipzig, 1905), p. 210 n. 7, has realized that the expression *ἐξ Αἰγῶν* does not necessarily signify the place of birth, and so does not have to be taken as alternative to Cnossos, as is customarily done (cf. E. Saisset, *Enésidème* (Paris, 1865), pp. 45ff.: 'Nous ne dirons qu'un mot du passage de Photius qui a induit à supposer qu'Égé fut la patrie d'Enésidème. *Αἰνησιδημος ὁ ἐξ Αἰγῶν*, dit Photius. Ménage propose de lire *ἐξ Αἰγύπτου* au lieu de *ἐξ Αἰγῶν*. Mais cette altération d'un texte bien établi est arbitraire, et il nous paraît plus sage de penser que Photius s'est trompé sur ce point comme sur tant d'autres', Brochard, op. cit., p. 242; L. Robin, *Pyrrhon et le scepticisme grec* (Paris, 1944), p. 139; M. Dal Pra, *Lo scetticismo greco*³ (Bari, 1989), p. 351 n. 4). Pappenheim, 'Der Sitz der Schule der pyrrhonischen Skeptiker', *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 1 (1888), 37–52, is completely silent on Photius' information.

⁹ The Macedonian city (no. 4) is less probable for reasons we shall see shortly (below, n. 16).

¹⁰ BVC have *Αἰγεῖς* (*Αἰγαιεῖς* M, Hude), corrected to *Αἰγαί* by Valckenaer.

¹¹ The ruins of the city are still visible. Further details in *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites* (Princeton, 1976), s.v. Aigai, p. 19. Seized by Attalus I in 218 B.C. (Polyb. 5.77) it was sacked by Prusias II in his war against Attalus II (156–154 B.C.): cf. Polyb. 33.13. The coinage began around 300 B.C., and continued up to the middle of the third century A.D. At no great distance was a temple of Apollo Chresterius, dedicated by the people of Pergamum under P. Servilius Isauricus, proconsul of Asia in 46 B.C. (cf. L. Robert, *EtudAnat* (1937), 74–87).

Philostr. *Vita Apoll.* 1.3) or *Aegaeae* (Αἰγαῖαι: Strabo 14.676, Dio Cass. 47.30, Paus. 5.21.117 or *Aegeae* (Tacitus, *Ann.* 13.8). Philostratus tells us of a stay by Apollonius in this city, where a sanctuary of Asclepius was situated (*Vita Apoll.* 1.7–13). At Aegae in Cilicia at this date there was some philosophical activity of a Platonizing kind.¹²

At this point we need to identify the second character in the story, the dedicatee of Aenesidemus' work. As Photius himself says, summarizing what he found in his author,¹³ the person in question was a Roman of illustrious rank, πολιτικὰς ἀρχὰς οὐ τυχοῦσας μετιόντι. Once again, Pauly–Wissowa comes to our aid. Of the 184 individuals listed (s.v. 'Aelius'), the Tuberones are relatively few, namely nos. 148–57. E. Klebs, the scholar who wrote the majority of the articles on these names, assists our task by proposing an identification of one of them with our Tubero. So we should first check whether what we know of Klebs's candidate is compatible with the picture sketched so far.

In the *Pro Ligario* (46 B.C.) Cicero says of Lucius Aelius Tubero (§21): 'domi una eruditi, militiae contubernales, post adfines, in omni vita familiares; magnum etiam vinculum quod isdem studiis semper usu sumus.'

On this intimate relationship between the two men Klebs comments: 'Von L. Tubero sagt Cic. Lig. 21 *magnum etiam vinculum quod isdem studiis semper usu sumus*, der Skeptiker Ainesidemus widmet ihm (τῶν ἐξ Ἀκαδημίας συναραιοσύνης) seine *Πυρρώνειοι λόγοι* Phot. bibl. 212; er schloss sich also wie Cicero der neueren Akademie an.'

From one of Cicero's letters to his brother Quintus we learn in addition that in the years 61–58 Tubero was the legate of Quintus Cicero, when the latter was proconsul in Asia (Cic. *Ad Q. fr.* 1.1.10; *Pro Planc.* 100). The other events of his life can be reconstructed by means of the *Pro Ligario*. On the outbreak of the civil war he joined the Pompeians; the Senate sent him to Africa as governor (*Pro Lig.* 23ff., Caes. *Bell. Civ.* 1.30.2).¹⁴ Tubero went there with his son but was prevented from landing by P. Attius Varus and Q. Ligarius. The two Tuberones then went to Greece on behalf of Pompey, and Cicero (*Pro Lig.* 9) tells us that the son took part in the battle of Pharsalus; they were later pardoned by Caesar. An identification with other members of the family (as proposed by Zeller¹⁵ to avoid the difficulty that Cicero seems completely ignorant of the existence of Aenesidemus) does not appear acceptable; none of the other Tuberones seems to have had the official positions to justify the words of Aenesidemus concerning his Tubero's high rank.

So on the evidence at our disposal, the following conclusion seems clear: Lucius Tubero met Aenesidemus in one of the two Aegae mentioned above, during the exercise of his duties as legate of Quintus Cicero, proconsul of Asia. And now the choice between the two cities becomes virtually unavoidable: the Aegae in question is that of Aeolia, which belonged to the territory of the province of Asia.¹⁶

¹² Cf. Glucker, op. cit., p. 137.

¹³ For Photius' liking for reporting details of this kind, cf. a similar, though much more detailed, instance in the case of the Neoplatonist Hierocles, before the summary of his *Περὶ προνοίας καὶ εἰμαρμένης*, cod. 214, p. 171 b 19–32; A. Elter, 'Zu Hierokles dem Neuplatoniker', *Rh. Mus.* 65 (1910), 175–99, p. 176.

¹⁴ Cf. Quint., 9.1.80: 'illum a senatu missum non ad bellum, sed ad frumentum coemendum.'

¹⁵ *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtliche Darstellung*, III.2, p. 15.

¹⁶ Cf. Victor Chapot, *La province romaine proconsulaire d'Asie* (Paris, 1904); David Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century after Christ*, i–ii (Princeton, 1950). The other Aegae in Cilicia was certainly visited by Cicero when he was proconsul of that province in 51/50. If Aenesidemus had stayed and been active in this city, Cicero's silence (which

As further support for the Aeolic Aegae it is appropriate to mention a piece of evidence (which has hitherto seemed unique) concerning the diffusion of Pyrrhonism in Asia Minor – an epitaph found near Nea Phocaea and tentatively dated by Peek to the first century A.D. It attests the duration in the region of an explicitly Pyrrhonian tradition.¹⁷

ὁ τὰς αἰοιδ[ά]ς ἀγεμὼν ἀν' Ἑλλάδα
ὁ παντάπασιν¹⁸ ἐξισώσας τὰν λόγῳ
καὶ τὰν ἀτάραχον ἐν βροτοῖς θεύσας ὁδὸν
Πυρρωνιαστὰ[ς] Μενεκλέης ὁδ' εἰμὶ ἐγώ.

By contrast, the hypothesis of a meeting in Alexandria, the other city where we know that Aenesidemus happened to live, can be rejected for two reasons. First, there is no evidence that the Tuberones stayed there. Second, and more important, the difficult circumstances in which they found themselves during their African mission do not fit the content of Aenesidemus' dedication. If this is so, we have a date for the meeting between the Roman statesman and Aenesidemus, the years 61–58, and a place, the Aeolic region of the province of Asia.

Photius' manner of expression (πολιτικὰς ἀρχὰς οὐ τυχοῦσας μετιόντι) makes one think not only of an office important in execution but also of a career that could be described, probably not without a smattering of conventional flattery, as destined for further achievements.¹⁹ This is appropriate to Tubero's office as legate; as we have seen, his future was actually to turn out a lot more uncertain.

I turn now to one of the most delicate of the problems regarding Aenesidemus' role in the history of first-century B.C. scepticism – the fact that Cicero, a friend of Tubero, seems to be completely in the dark concerning his existence. The majority of scholars have found this silence very hard to explain, and the data I have proposed for the

I will discuss later) would be quite inexplicable. As to identification with the Macedonian Aegae (no. 4), that would require a meeting between Aenesidemus and Tubero at the time of Pharsalus; but the words of the poem do not seem at all consonant with such circumstances.

¹⁷ Cfr. *Μουσεῖον καὶ Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς σχολῆς* II.1 (1875–6), not available to me; Kaibel, *Ep. Gr.* no. 241b, p. 522; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Antigonos von Karystos* (*Philologische Untersuchungen* IV, Berlin, 1881), p. 291; D. Baltazzi, *Bull. de Corr. Hell.* 12 (1888), no. 17, p. 368; F. Picavet, *Revue de philologie* 12 (1888), 185–6; *IGR* iv.1740; W. Peek, *Griechische Vers-Inschriften*, i (Berlin, 1955), no. 603, p. 147; *Inschriften Griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien*, Bd 5. *Die Inschriften von Kyme*, ed. H. Engelmann (Bonn, 1976), no. 48, pp. 114–15. This inscription and the obscure Meneclēs were the subject of a lecture by Jonathan Barnes, 'Pourquoi lire les anciens?' at the Collège International de Philosophie (Paris, 30 June 1990), the text of which, thanks to the author's courtesy, I was able to read after having completed this study. It is worth noting that without even exploiting Photius' evidence (and so underestimating the importance of its information), Barnes points out *en passant* the geographical connection between the place where the inscription was found and Aegae in Mysia.

¹⁸ Barnes (see previous note) suggests, instead of παντάπασιν, πάντα πᾶσιν.

¹⁹ Cic. *Ad Q. fr.* I 1.10: 'quamquam legatos habes eos qui ipsi per se habituri sint rationem dignitatis tuae. de quibus honore et dignitate et aetate praestat Tubero, quem ego arbitror, praesertim cum scribat historiam, multos ex suis annalibus posse deligere quos velit et possit imitari.' The mention of Tubero's age can be best explained by the fact that the office of legate was the normal beginning of the *cursus honorum*. We do not know Tubero's birth date, but if we take him to be contemporary with or not much younger than Cicero, he would have taken up the position in his maturity. J. Glucker op. cit., p. 117 and n. 87 gives a future sense to μετιόντι because he wants to date Aenesidemus' writing to a period in which Philo was active in the Academy. So too J. Barnes, 'Antiochus of Ascalon', Appendix C, in M. Griffin and J. Barnes (eds), *Philosophia Togata* (Oxford, 1989), 51–96, pp. 93–4, who, though not committing himself to the 'physical' presence of Philo when Aenesidemus and Tubero had frequented the Academy, takes Philo to have been Aenesidemus' specific target.

composition of his work seem to make it still more difficult. As the basis for discussing the problem it has been generally assumed that Aenesidemus was originally an Academic and that he addressed another Academic, with the object of showing him that he should abandon the Academy and join the Pyrrhonian sect. Could Cicero, who was so well informed about the circumstances of the Academy, have been ignorant of all this, especially when it involved his own *familiaris*?

As is well known, Cicero mentions Pyrrho only in the context of the *divisio Carneadea*, where he refers to him, along with Ariston and Herillus, as a moralist. He seems to be completely unaware of the existence of a sceptical tradition different from that of the Academy and attached to the name of Pyrrho.²⁰ Because it has appeared impossible that he should have ignored Aenesidemus' secession and the ensuing revival of Pyrrhonism, scholars have sought to lower the dating of this event and that of Aenesidemus himself as far as possible (or, like Zeller, have sought to identify the figure of Lucius Tubero with someone else). But, as we have seen, placing the meeting between the two of them after the events of the civil war seems ill adapted to Photius' words. The answer to this problem, or at least an important factor that makes it less inexplicable, can be found by carefully examining the testimony of Photius.

Elimar Krebs, the author of the article on Lucius Tubero in Pauly-Wissowa, probably read Photius as an historian without being aware of what historians of philosophy had already begun to write on this passage. It will perhaps have been noticed that Krebs drew from it only the information that Tubero was a member of the Academy – which corresponds perfectly with the fact that Cicero speaks of their affinity of studies and interests – and that the sceptic Aenesidemus had dedicated a book to him.

Photius' crucial sentence, γράφει δὲ τοὺς λόγους Αἰνησίδημος προσφωνῶν αὐτοὺς τῶν ἐξ Ἀκαδημίας τινὶ συναρρεσιώτῃ Λευκίῳ Τοβέρωνι has normally been interpreted as if it said: 'Aenesidemus wrote *Discourses* dedicating them to one of his fellow Academics, Lucius Tubero.' But does this interpretation truly reflect what Photius says?²¹

As far as I know, no expert on ancient scepticism has realized that the term *συναρρεσιώτης* is extremely rare. In the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* and the lexica it is attested in only two very restricted contexts. The first of these pertains to astrological literature, and more precisely, to the *Excerpta Sarapionis Alexandrini*.²² There the word is clearly a variant for *συναρρετίστης*,²³ *αἵρεσις* being a common technical term in astrology. The second context is Christianity. *συναρρεσιώτης* is used with some frequency in the Photian epitome of Philostorgius' *Ecclesiastical History* or in reference to it and its content.²⁴

²⁰ On this, cf. F. Decleva Caizzi, *Pirrone. Testimonianze* (Naples, 1981), commentary on T 69.

²¹ For Photius' method of citation, cf. Thomas Hägg, *Photios als Vermittler antiker Literatur. Untersuchungen zu Technik des Referierens und Exzerprierens in der Bibliothek* (Uppsala, 1975), and especially the remarks of J. Schamp, *op. cit.*

²² *Catalogus Codicum Astrologorum Graecorum. Codicum Parisinorum*, VIII (4), descripsit P. Boudreaux, edidit appendice suppleta Franciscus Cumont (Brussels, 1921), p. 230, line 26: ὅτι χαίρουσιν οἱ ἀστέρες ἐν ἀγαθοποιῶν καὶ συναρρεσιωτῶν τόποις, ὥσπερ καὶ ἰδιοτοπούντες· τότε γὰρ καὶ οἱ φθόροισι ἀγαθύνονται. On Sarapion, cf. *ibid.* p. 225.

²³ Cf. LSJ, s.v.: 'Members of the same faction of planets', and *Cat. Cod. Astr.* VII.215.10–11; 216.26; 218.13; 220.26.

²⁴ Cf. Philostorgius, *Kirchengeschichte, mit dem Leben des Lucian von Antiochien und den Fragmenten eines Arianischen Historiographen*², ed. J. Bidez, revised by F. Winkelmann (Berlin, 1972), pp. 19.11; 60.16; 65.34; 69.13; 131.4. Photius also uses the term in *Amphil.* 154.19 (Westerink), in reference to Theodosius of Ephesus, the friend of Marcion, and in reference to

19.11: ὅτι περὶ Ἀγαπητοῦ τοῦ συναιρεσιώτου, ὃς καὶ ἐκ καταλόγου στρατιωτικοῦ πρεσβύτερος τε κατέστη παρὰ τῶν ὁμοφρόνων καὶ Συνάδων ἐπίσκοπος ὕστερον.

60.16: οἱ δὲ συναιρεσιῶται τοῦτον ἀναφέροντες πρὸς τὸ ἐτερούσιον ἀνήγον.

65.34: οὗτος δὲ ὁ Ἀέτιος παρ' αὐτῶν μὲν τῶν συναιρεσιωτῶν... τῆς διακονίας καθηρέθη.

69.13: μεταπέμπεται δὲ ἐξ Ἀλεξανδρείας τὸν συναιρεσιώτην Ἀρείου Εὐζώϊον.

131.4: λέγει γὰρ περὶ τίνος Εὐδοξίου, συναιρεσιώτου μὲν, πρεσβυτέρου τὴν τάξιν.

A primary datum emerges clearly: the term is always used to indicate the members of the Arian sect of Eunomius. What is less clear is whether Philostorgius used it himself or whether it was introduced by Photius. But Photius' general accuracy in reporting the terminology of his sources favours the former alternative. When Photius makes use of the term in other passages of his works, it retains the sense that it had in Philostorgius, i.e. it refers to Arians. It is noteworthy that Photius' use of it in his account of Aenesidemus' work forms an exception to the rule. So we need to understand why Photius, whom we have noted to be most scrupulous in his terminology, chose to use the word even out of the usual context.

The most convincing explanation of this fact can be found by examining Photius' attitude to the Arians and to the Arian historian Philostorgius in particular.²⁵ Cod. 40 8a31ff. reads:

ἀνεγνώσθη Φιλοστοργίου Ἀρειανοῦ τὴν θρησκείαν, ὡς δὴθεν ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία. ἱστορεῖ δὲ τὰνάντια σχεδὸν ἅπασιν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς ἱστορικοῖς. ἐξαίρει τοὺς Ἀρειανίζοντας ἅπαντας, λοιδορίας πλύνει τοὺς ὀρθοδόξους, ὡς εἶναι τὴν ἱστορίαν αὐτοῦ μὴ ἱστοεῖαν μάλλον ἀλλ' ἐγκώμιον μὲν τῶν αἰρετικῶν, ψόγον δὲ γυνὸν καὶ κατηγορίαν τῶν ὀρθοδόξων.

And a little further on (8b3ff.):

ἱστορεῖ δὲ τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀρείου περὶ τὴν αἵρεσιν σπουδῆς τε καὶ κατάρξεως μέχρι τῆς Ἀετίου τοῦ δυσσεβεστάτου ἀνακλήσεως. οὗτος δὲ ὁ Ἀέτιος παρ' αὐτῶν μὲν τῶν συναιρεσιωτῶν, διὰ τὸ κακέινους ὑπερβαλέσθαι τῇ δυσσεβείᾳ, ὡς αὐτὸς οὗτος καὶ μὴ βουλόμενος ἱστορεῖ, τῆς διακονίας καθηρέθη κτλ.

As for Eunomius, whom Philostorgius admired (8b14), the tone in which Photius writes of him (cod. 137, 96a31) is unequivocal:

ἀνεγνώσθη βιβλιδάριον Εὐνομίου, τῆς οἰκείας δυσσεβείας ἔκθεσις, οὗ ἡ ἐπιγραφή... τοῦτο τὸ βιβλιδάριον ἐπεὶ τοῖς συναιρεσιώταις Εὐνομίου διὰ θαύματος μὲν ἤγετο...

From these passages it appears very clearly that Photius nurtures a strong hostility towards the Arian *συναιρεσιῶται*. So if, as it appears, the term was strictly associated with them, an isolated reference to others could hardly have a quite neutral connotation. It is permissible to draw two important conclusions: first, that the word was not used by Aenesidemus in the proem of his work, but by Photius; second, that the latter used it with a negative tone.

But there is more. From some of the examples (pp. 19.11; 60.16; 131.4), another important datum emerges: although the word is normally accompanied by a genitive,

the Arian Asterius. Independently of these instances, the term appears to refer to 'heretics' in Hippol. *Haer.* 9.23. Apart from Photius, none of the Christian writers included in the *TLG* uses the word (as not all such authors are included there as yet, the datum must be regarded as only provisional).

²⁵ Cf. J. Bidez, op. cit. (n. 24), introd.; id., 'L'Historien Philostorge', in *Mélanges d'histoire offerts à H. Pirenne* (Brussels, 1926), i.23–30; G. Zecchini, 'Filostorgio', in A. Garzya (ed.), *Metodologie della ricerca sulla tarda antichità* (Naples, 1989), 579–98.

it can also be used absolutely, i.e. not in the direct sense of 'companion of...' but more generally, meaning 'member of the sect'. In any case, the use of the genitive of the person in the parallel passages of Photius shows that the compound noun with *συν-* refers quite naturally to τῶν ἐξ Ἀκαδημίας and does not need an external reference such as Aenesidemus.²⁶

In the light of all this, the whole expression can be interpreted most correctly as the patriarch's chosen and characteristic way (all things considered, an elegant way and one quite in keeping with his reputation) of revealing his own opinion: by using the emphatic expression (a certain²⁷ 'member of the Academic sect' or 'associate of the Academics')²⁸ instead of the very simple Ἀκαδημαϊκός, Photius gives a slight but clearly negative charge to his report.²⁹

As for the attitude with which Photius read Aenesidemus' book, it emerges clearly in his closing judgement, where he interprets its spirit by describing it as 'a fighting manual'³⁰ full of foolish chatter which could none the less have a certain value provided its content was used solely for the aim of dialectical training:³¹

οἱ μὲν οὖν τοῦ Αἰναισιδήμου λόγοι πρὸς τοιοῦτον ἀγῶνα κονίζονται· ὅτι δὲ ματαιότης αὐτῶν καὶ πολλὴ λésχη ἢ σπουδὴ, Πλάτωνί τε καὶ πολλοῖς ἄλλοις τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν τὸν ἔλεγχον ἔδοσαν· καὶ ὅτι μηδὲν εἰς δόγμα συντελεῖ, καὶ τοῦτο κατάδηλον, ὅπου γε καὶ τὰς ἐνούσας δογματικὰς θεωρίας ἐλαύνειν ἡμῶν τῆς διανοίας ἐπεχείρησαν. τοῖς μέντοι κατὰ διαλεκτικὴν μελέτην πονουμένοις, ἂν μὴ τὸ ἀστήρικτον αὐτῶν τοῖς λογισμοῖς ἐνεδρεύῃ καὶ ἡ κρίσις πρὸς ἀγχνόιαν οὐ νενοθευμένη τὸ βιβλίον οὐκ ἄχρηστον (170b36–171a2).³²

It is particularly interesting to find that Photius' judgement on the possible value of Aenesidemus' book is mirrored in the immediately preceding cod. 211:

χρήσιμον δὲ βιβλίον τοῖς τὴν διαλεκτικὴν τριβὴν ἀσκουμένοις (168b32).

In cod. 185 the same book as in cod. 211 is assessed:³³

ταῦτα μὲν τὸ βιβλιδάριον τῶν Διονυσίου Δικτυακῶν διέλεγετο. οὐκ ἄχρηστον δὲ πρὸς τε γυμνασίαν διαλεκτικὴν καὶ δοξῶν εἶδησιν ἐνίαν ἱατρικὴ θεωρίᾳ οἰκείων (130b19).

²⁶ The convergence of all these factors is a strong ground for interpreting the compound differently from the more common *συμπολίτης* in cod. 158, 100b24 (τὸν δὲ τέταρτον Ἰουλιανῶ τινι συμπολίτῃ καὶ φίλῳ προσφωνεῖ), where the only possible reference is the author of the work.

²⁷ The use of the indefinite accompanying the name of one to whom a work was dedicated is frequent in Photius, cf. 83b25; 87b6; 100a6; 100b24; 100b31; 101a2; 146b9.

²⁸ For this reason, Tarrant, *Scepticism or Platonism?* (Cambridge, 1985), p. 60 appears doubly mistaken: not only does he call Tubero a fellow Academic of Aenesidemus, he also discusses what *Aenesidemus* meant by αἵρεσις.

²⁹ This conforms to a pattern which Janáček has noted (see note 1). In particular, the way in which Photius sets out the book's *πρόθεσις* is an ironical indication of its self-contradictoriness: βεβαιῶσαι ὅτι οὐδὲν βέβαιον.

³⁰ Cfr. also 170b17–18: προβάλλεται...τὰς...λαβὰς. The same term is applied to Aenesidemus in SE, M 9.218.

³¹ Ziegler, *RE* xx s.v. 'Photius', col. 672ff., esp. 674, on dialectic (cf. e.g. *Amphil.* 77.3ff.: ἐζήτῃται μὲν ἡμῖν πολλάκις ἡ περὶ τῶν γενῶν τε καὶ εἰδῶν ὑπόθεσις, καὶ διάκρισις τῶν πάλαι ἀμφισβητημάτων κτλ.; see SE, PH 2.219ff.). One should not be surprised at the fact that Photius, though negative in his attitude to Plato and to the theory of Forms in particular, should invoke him here against scepticism. Cf. next note, and Paul Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantin* (Paris, 1971), p. 201.

³² The topicality of this type of judgement in late antiquity can also be seen in a passage by Philoponus, *In Arist. Cat. prooem.*, p. 2.7ff. Busse (cf. also Elias, *In Arist. Cat. prooem.*, p. 109.24ff.), where Plato is similarly invoked against the 'Sceptics'.

³³ Instances in the *Bibliotheca* of a report of the same work repeated at a distance are not lacking; this is not a mark of carelessness, as Schamp (op. cit., chh. VII and VIII) has shown. In the light of my general argument, it deserves close attention from those who seek to

The text that Photius judges useful for dialectical exercises has to do with medical argument. Its author, Dionysius, deals with fifty medical theories, setting out the arguments for and against each.

Two facts are at least worth mentioning. First, this Dionysius is called *Αἰγεύς*; second, Deichgräber reports the content of the work in his collection *Die griechische Empirikerschule*,³⁴ because Eustathius (*In Iliad* 1192) mentions it in a very significant context:

ζηλοῦσι τοῦτο (sc. τὸ διγλωσσον) μάλιστα μὲν οἱ διαλεκτικοί, ὧν καὶ Ζήνων ὁ περιαδόμενος καὶ οἱ ἐφεκτικοὶ καὶ ὁ τὰ Δικτυακὰ δὲ μελετήσας, ὧν σκοπὸς τὰ ἀντικείμενα κατασκευάζειν, οἷον λουστέον τὸν πυρέττοντα διὰ τὰ καὶ διὰ τὰ, καὶ αὐτὸν πάλιν, μὴ λουστέον τὸν πυρέττοντα διὰ τὰ καὶ διὰ τὰ.

Goedeckemeyer³⁵ identified him with the Methodist doctor Dionysius (first century A.D.) mentioned along with Mnaseas in Galen (XIV, p. 684 Kühn); H. von Arnim³⁶ identified him as 'empirische Arzt und Skeptiker';³⁷ Deichgräber took no position on the question when including the text in his collection; with comparable caution I simply point out for now that an identity between the Aegae referred to in Dionysius' ethnicon³⁸ and the Aegae where Aenesidemus spent part of his life cannot be completely excluded, that the two works appear next to one another in Photius' *Bibliotheca*, and that they are accompanied by the same type of judgement and, for that reason, can be thought of as belonging to the same genre.

Rather than proceeding on a path that risks being highly speculative, let me recapitulate the most secure results deriving from analysis of Photius' text.

Aenesidemus dedicated his own book to an Academic whom he met at Aegae in Asia during the years 61–58. At this point, we have a sufficiently secure date for the meeting that he mentioned in the proem of his book although nothing compels us to think that the work was composed in the same period; it could have been written some years after and have recalled in its proem the circumstances of the meeting between the two men. However, the subsequent events of Tubero's life make a date too much later less probable, as I have emphasized.

In addition, the so-called Academic phase of Aenesidemus disappears from the philosophical scene, at least to the extent that the words of Photius offer it no support,³⁹ and so no reconstruction should take it for granted.

reconstruct Photius' method of work. Apart from the fact that the diverging chapter headings (100/50) seem to indicate that we are dealing with two different editions (cf. Schamp, p. 98), it is noteworthy that the comment at the end of cod. 211 alludes only to the book's dialectical value (like that of Aenesidemus' work which directly follows), while the one in cod. 185 also considers the medical aspect of the book.

³⁵ Op. cit., p. 237 n. 7. ³⁶ RE s.v. (no. 124), col. 975; cf. Zeller, op. cit., V/3, 7.

³⁷ It is noteworthy that D.L. 9.106 mentions Zeuxis, the author of a work *περὶ διττῶν λόγων*, as a 'friend' of Aenesidemus.

³⁸ Although Henry, the editor of Photius, translates *Αἰγεύς* in reference to Dionysius by 'd'Egée' and ἐξ *Αἰγῶν* in reference to Aenesidemus by 'd'Aegé', the same city would be meant. The inhabitants of *Αἰγαί* in Mysia are called *Αἰγεῖς* in Xenoph. *Hell.* 4.8.5 (codd.); the orthography of the names of these cities and their inhabitants oscillates (as we have seen).

³⁹ This is important because even recently it has been used as a significant factor for reconstructing the first-century B.C. Academy (cf. Tarrant, op. cit., pp. 34–5, 60) and has played a role in the debate on Aenesidemus' so-called Heracliteanism. It is enough to mention J. Rist, 'The Heraclitism of Aenesidemus', *Phoenix* 24 (1970), 309–19 and, recently, P. Woodruff, 'Aporetic Pyrrhonism', *OSAP* 6 (1988), 139–68, esp. pp. 164ff. The reconstruction by Barnes, art. cit., pp. 93–4, presumes a joint stay by Tubero and Aenesidemus in the Academy after the liberation of Athens in 86. This line seems to require far more assumptions than are implied by the path I propose to explore.

This has immediate relevance for the solution of an issue concerning a passage of Sextus' *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* (1.222), on which I need to dwell briefly.

In the course of discussing the differences between Pyrrhonism and some philosophies which have been likened to it, Sextus focuses upon the Academy. In the section on Plato (221–5) he notes that Plato's philosophy has been considered dogmatic by some, while others have taken it to be aporetic, or partly aporetic and partly dogmatic. Temporarily sidestepping the second option (an aporetic, i.e. sceptical Plato), Sextus reports the arguments used by those who attribute to Plato a mixed character, and sets them on one side together with those who make a dogmatist of Plato, because his difference from the Sceptics is also admitted by those who interpret him in this way.⁴⁰ On the other hand, in the eyes of Sextus the hypothesis that Plato was 'purely'⁴¹ a Sceptic deserves greater attention; so he mentions a work of his own where the topic has been thoroughly treated (ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν διαλαμβάνομεν).⁴² The matter, then, was a crucial one for the distinction between Academy and Scepticism. Sextus will refute this thesis indirectly by showing that some parts of Plato's dialogues cannot on any reading conform to the Sceptic's posture, thus invoking the characterization of his philosophy as mixed in order to establish the difference between scepticism and Platonic philosophy.

After reference to the more ample treatment in the *Commentaries*, there follows an expression which is clearly corrupt: καταπερμηδοτον καὶ Αἰνησιδημον.

From what follows – οὗτοι γὰρ μάλιστα ταύτης προέστησαν τῆς στάσεως⁴³ – one realizes that what precedes the name of Aenesidemus should be that of another person to whom could be attributed a viewpoint on the same matter. The editors and interpreters fall into three distinct groups. One set (Mutschmann–Mau,⁴⁴ Heintz, Bury, Janáček) emend to κατὰ <τῶν> περὶ Μηνόδοτον κτλ. and interpret: 'in opposition to the adherents of Menodotus and Aenesidemus, who were supporters of the thesis that Plato was a pure sceptic'. Others (Natorp, Mutschmann, Burkhard, Burnyeat) emend to κατὰ <τοῦς> περὶ Μηνόδοτον and interpret: 'following the adherents of Menodotus and Aenesidemus, who adopt the position that I too adopt and that I set forth here as follows'. Pappenheim, followed by Deichgräber,⁴⁵ emended to κατὰ Ἡρόδοτον, while Zeller⁴⁶ proposed the reading κατὰ Ἡρόδοτον, καὶ <Μηνόδοτον> καὶ Αἰνησιδημον.

⁴⁰ Sextus' third option – that Plato devoted part of his own work to the exposition of doctrines (e.g. by making Socrates or Timaeus his spokesmen) and part to exposing aporiai for the sake of research (a category which would include the dialogues which are playful or ironical) – fits the division of the dialogues elucidated by D.L. 3.49. Diogenes, however, does not connect such a division with the topic of Plato's scepticism or non-scepticism, a topic which is introduced instead in the next paragraph as a new subject. This probably explains Sextus' observation that those who see in Plato two types of philosopher, dogmatic and aporetic, do not mean by this to assimilate him to scepticism (αὐτοὶ γὰρ ὁμολογοῦσι τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς διαφορὰν).

⁴¹ εἰλικρινῶς. The term is not as strong an indication of Platonic influence as Woodruff seems to suppose (art. cit., p. 168). The adjective and adverb, which occur particularly in the ten Modes, are very frequent in medical literature.

⁴² The use of the present makes one think of a work the plan of which was contemporary with, or at least close to, PH, and in any case not later. Cf. similarly M 2.106.

⁴³ There is no doubt that στάσις here does not mean 'disagreement' but 'opinion'. Cf. PH 2.48; 3.33, 37 and below.

⁴⁴ κατὰ <τῶν> περὶ Μηνόδοτον καὶ Αἰνησιδημον Mutschmann–Mau (1958); in app.: κατὰ <τοῦς> περὶ Μηνόδοτον Natorp: κατὰ περμηδοτον GT (secundum permindotum): κατὰ Μηνόδοτον Fabr.: κατὰ Ἡρόδοτον Pappenheim. In the first edition (1912) Mutschmann accepted Natorp's proposal.

⁴⁵ Op. cit., p. 266 n. 2, who observes that Pappenheim's correction is 'paläographisch gleichberechtigt' and the only acceptable one.

⁴⁶ Op. cit. iii.6 n. 2.

At first sight it is not easy to choose between these solutions.⁴⁷ Heintz⁴⁸ declared himself in favour of the first version (Aenesidemus as author of the thesis that Sextus refutes) by showing that it is wrong to take *ταύτης τῆς στάσεως* to mean 'of this stance', i.e. Scepticism. Because *στάσις* signifies 'philosophical thesis', the expression can only refer to the thesis of those who think that Plato was a pure sceptic. But if the premise of the reasoning is certainly sound, the conclusion is not necessary. It is true that the demonstrative *οὗτος* generally refers to what precedes, but this rule is often violated;⁴⁹ from a grammatical point of view it is not essential to take *ταύτης τῆς στάσεως* with what precedes. While Sextus' extract contains nothing that speaks logically for or against *κατὰ τοὺς ... / κατὰ τῶν ...*, there are some external reasons, insufficiently considered up to now, which tip the scale in favour of Paul Natorp's correction.⁵⁰

The first of these is that Photius does not mention Plato when he says that Aenesidemus discussed the difference between Academics and Pyrrhonists in book 1 of his *Pyrrhonian Discourses*. This is a significant argument from silence in support of the thesis that Aenesidemus had adopted the same position on the point as Sextus. If Aenesidemus in this book had argued in favour of a sceptical Plato and against the Academics, ancient or modern, it would seem very strange that Photius should have omitted to mention this in his summary; at the end of the codex, as we have seen, Plato is cited in his own right in a context hostile to the Sceptics.

The second reason has to do with the assumption that Aenesidemus could have considered Plato a true Sceptic and from this perspective attacked the later Academy especially in its most recent phase. This assumption is based essentially on the presupposition that Aenesidemus got his sceptical education from within the Academy and that he detached himself from that school because of its increasingly dogmatic tendency. But if this interpretation of Photius' text reveals itself to have been built on sand, it becomes highly improbable that Aenesidemus could have defended the thesis that Plato was a 'pure Sceptic'. It is also difficult to explain why someone who had such a view of Plato and therefore considered him to be a genuinely sceptical philosopher should have subsequently moved over to Pyrrho, a figure who had nothing genuinely in common with Plato, and to Timon, whose attitude to Plato was certainly not an affectionate one.⁵¹

⁴⁷ Deichgräber's starting point for introducing the name of Herodotus was the difficulty of understanding how a medical Empiricist such as Menodotus could ever have supported a viewpoint whose final result is the connection between Scepticism and Methodist medicine, while Herodotus and Aenesidemus, both philosophers only, could have adopted the position described by Sextus (following in the footsteps of Mnaseas, a Sceptic and Methodist). But this assumes (1) a distinction between doctors and philosophers which is not easy to draw and (2) that Sextus had to follow his sources to the letter. The falsity of the latter assumption is shown by the fact that when he discusses Methodist medicine Sextus uses the first person. To this should be added that Sextus may address different opponents in this chapter: empirical doctors like Theodosius or Menodotus could hold different opinions on relevant points.

⁴⁸ W. Heintz, *Studien zu Sextus Empiricus* (Halle, 1922), pp. 30ff.

⁴⁹ Cf. Kühner-Gerth, *Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* II/1, p. 646.

⁵⁰ *Forschungen zur Geschichte der Erkenntnisprobleme im Altertum* (Berlin, 1884; repr. 1965), pp. 69ff. The foundation of Natorp's position was what we read of Aenesidemus in Photius, together with a reconstruction of the parallels between the material in Aenesidemus' first book and Sextus' chapter on the Academy. Recently Natorp's proposal has been defended by U. Burkhard, *Die angebliche Heraklit-Nachfolge des skeptikers Aenesidem* (Bonn, 1973), pp. 21ff.

⁵¹ This is a question which cannot be answered satisfactorily by those who ask themselves about Aenesidemus' Academic education and who investigate 'which Plato' he could reasonably have appealed to, not in order to recognize in him the presence of sceptical traces (something easy enough to do), but to make of him a 'pure Sceptic'. In fact, as Gisela Striker has rightly

I turn now to the question of Cicero's misleading information about Pyrrhonian philosophers. Gucker has recently discussed particular ways of accounting for Cicero's neglect of Aenesidemus – that he was not acquainted with his book, or that he deliberately wished to pass over him.⁵² But if the reading of Photius suggested above is correct, we can replace such chance reasons with something more general – a better explanation for Cicero's apparent ignorance of the existence of a sceptical Pyrrhonian movement and in particular of a figure such as Aenesidemus, who was to be very important for the succeeding tradition.

Whatever may have been his activity during his stay at Aegae, Aenesidemus had access to good sources of information concerning early Pyrrhonism (we know, *inter alia*, that after Timon had spent time with Pyrrho he stayed in the Hellespont, a region not far from Aeolia, and his prose writings could have remained in circulation, although perhaps just limited to this area).⁵³ Given his philosophical interests, at a certain point in his life he happened to meet and spend time with Lucius Tubero, an illustrious and cultivated person who was sympathetic to the Academy. From the knowledge he himself had of the early Pyrrhonian tradition and from discussion about the positions of the Academy, he developed his own viewpoint, perhaps really inspired by this meeting, on what a truly sceptical position might be. This would explain the composition of the *Pyrrhonian Discourses*, a work which, beginning with the comparison between Pyrrhonism and the Academic tradition, set out to present the Pyrrhonian tradition as the only truly coherent one in its means and its end.

Following this reconstruction, we may imagine that Aenesidemus' work did not reflect the actual existence of a genuine philosophical sect, but was rather the manifesto of a Pyrrhonist revival, the first step in a project of diffusion which was really achieved only later, at Alexandria. We may also imagine that it was in this book, for the first time since Timon, that the figure of Pyrrho was put forward as the paradigm of a sceptic, presented in such a way as to make his philosophical position invulnerable to the attacks mounted by dogmatists against sceptics – especially Academics – in the preceding centuries.⁵⁴ If this reconstruction of the events is plausible, Cicero's silence will be much less difficult to explain. For it would be quite natural for Aenesidemus' book not to have acquired the significance that, in the light of history, it has for us; it probably did not have this even in the eyes of Tubero himself when the book came into his hands (*if* it actually ever did so, a matter which should not be taken for granted).

In speaking of the Pyrrhonists, Aenesidemus did not refer to a genuine group of contemporary philosophers who called themselves members of a 'sect'.⁵⁵ Contrasting οἱ ἀπὸ Πύρρωνος with the Academics, Aenesidemus invoked Pyrrho and his immediate followers, whose philosophical achievements had been preserved via the works of Timon and, in all probability, only in medical circles.⁵⁶ It was to these ancient philosophers that Aenesidemus intended to appeal, showing that scepticism

pointed out to me, an ancestor like Plato, just because of his extraordinary cultural importance, would have been extremely inconvenient for anyone who appealed at the same time to another founder.

⁵² Op. cit., p. 116 n. 64.

⁵³ Cf. D.L. 9.110 and, among the followers of Timon, Praxylus of the Troad, mentioned in 9.115.

⁵⁴ D.L. 9.106: καὶ Αἰνεσίδημος ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν Πυρρωνείων λόγων οὐδὲν φησὶν ὀρίξειν τὸν Πύρρωνα δογματικῶς διὰ τὴν ἀντιλογίαν, τοῖς δὲ φαινόμενοις ἀκολουθεῖν. See my *Pirrone* (op. cit., n. 20), commentary on T 6–9.

⁵⁵ Cf. D.L. 1.20; Aristocles, *ap. Eus. PE* 14.18; SE, *PH* 1.16–17.

⁵⁶ Cf. D.L. 9.109, already quoted (n. 6), where it is said that Timon caused his son Xanthus to study medicine.

had to follow the path adopted by Pyrrho if it was to become a genuinely coherent philosophy, ethically effective and logically invulnerable. Aenesidemus was not known in Academic circles either as a member of them or as a renegade for the simple reason that he had never belonged to the Academy.

Photius' summary does not enable us to be precise about the level of Aenesidemus' knowledge of the Academic positions when he wrote his *Pyrrhonian Discourses*, nor about the extent to which, after having begun to emphasize the difference between Academics and Pyrrhonists, he made his own use of the sceptical Academy's dialectical legacy. It will at least be necessary, I think, to assess the judgements that he makes on the Academics as those of an external spectator, not those of a participant in disputes internal to the Academy. At Alexandria, to which he moved, he could certainly have found traces of the presence of Antiochus and of Heraclitus of Tyre,⁵⁷ the pupil of Clitomachus and Philo of Larissa. And it was certainly at Alexandria that the Pyrrhonian tradition established itself, drawing extensively on the Academic arsenal.

From here the Pyrrhonian sect gradually spread, though only later and not into all educated circles of the Empire, if Seneca could still write, perhaps rhetorically overstating his case (*N.Q.* 7.32.2): 'quis est qui tradat praecepta Pyrrhonis?' But some decades later, as Plutarch and Favorinus attest, the situation would be radically changed, and the relation between Pyrrhonian and Academic scepticism could be summed up in the words: 'vetus...quaestio et a multis scriptoribus Graecis pertractata.'⁵⁸

University of Milan

FERNANDA DECLEVA CAIZZI

⁵⁷ Cf. *Acad.* 2.4.11; in the light of the present reconstruction, it is clear why it is implausible to correct Heraclides, the teacher of Aenesidemus in D.L.'s succession of Pyrrhonists (see above), to Heraclitus of Tyre – as proposed by Pappenheim, *op. cit.* (n. 8).

⁵⁸ Aul. Gell. *NA* 11.5.6.

My thanks to Fabrizio Conca and the Editors for help and advice on this article, and to Tony Long for translating it into English.