

Ancient Skepticism: Overview

Diego E. Machuca*

Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas

Abstract

Scholarship on ancient skepticism has witnessed a remarkable renaissance in the last three decades. Specialists in ancient philosophy have explored the complex history of the Greco-Roman skeptical traditions and discussed difficult philological and exegetical issues. But they have also assessed the philosophical significance of the various ancient skeptical outlooks. In this first paper, I provide a general presentation of this area of study, while in the two subsequent articles I will focus on some of the topics that have been the object of much attention in the recent literature on ancient skepticism.

1. General Presentation

Nowadays, hardly anyone familiar with the extant fragments and works of the ancient skeptics and with other sources of information about their thought, such as reports and summaries, would question the philosophical import of the different strands of ancient skepticism. However, this was not always the case, since until quite recently most scholars of ancient philosophy undervalued the Greco-Roman skeptical traditions.¹ This tendency began to recede in the late 1970s and early 1980s, in line with a general reevaluation of the philosophy of the Hellenistic and Imperial periods. Not only has there been, as in the Renaissance, a strong revival of interest in ancient skepticism, but also the historical accuracy and the interpretive and analytic insight of scholarly studies have been, in general terms, superior to those of previous work. In this development a crucial part has, of course, been played by the competence of scholars, but also important has been the academic exchange made possible by the holding of several conferences and the publication of dozens of books and papers. We are now witnessing the consolidation of a tradition of highly specialized scholarship on ancient skepticism.

Ancient philosophy knew two main skeptical traditions, the Pyrrhonian and the Academic, which originated in the Hellenistic era and continued into the Imperial age. In pre-Hellenistic philosophers it is possible to detect skeptical inclinations, themes, and arguments.² In fact, members of the two traditions recognized their debt to earlier thinkers or considered themselves their faithful successors. This is particularly so in the case of the Academic skeptics, who believed that their skepticism was the culmination of a gradual development initiated with the Presocratics,³ and that it was perfectly in keeping with the tradition of Socrates and Plato.⁴ However, it is only at the beginning of the Hellenistic age that skeptical movements in the proper sense of the term made their appearance and the possibility of knowledge and justified belief was called into question in a systematic way by means of elaborate argumentative strategies.

It must be noted that, although what is commonly called the ‘epistemological’ stance of the Cyrenaic school (late fifth to mid-third centuries BC) is not generally discussed in presentations of Greek skepticism, it should be taken into consideration by those seriously

interested in ancient skeptical thought. The Cyrenaics claimed that we have knowledge of our own affections (*pathē*),⁵ but not of the properties of the external objects that cause them, and that we cannot know the content of other people's affections. It is true both that they were not interested in epistemological issues *per se* but only insofar as these were relevant to their ethical theory, and that they did not draw all the skeptical implications of their epistemology which they could have drawn. But their epistemological views seem to be more elaborate and subtle than those of the pre-Hellenistic philosophers in whom it is possible to discover skeptical elements, and their philosophical relations with Academic and Pyrrhonian skepticism are closer. For instance, when explaining in his *Pyrrhonian Outlines* the reasons why Cyrenaicism is not the same as Pyrrhonism, it is suggestive that Sextus Empiricus does not say anything against the claim made by some that the two philosophies say that we apprehend only the affections (*Pyrrōneioi Hypotyposēis* [PH] I 215). A detailed examination of the skeptical aspects of Cyrenaic epistemology and its philosophical relations with Academic skepticism, Pyrrhonism, and modern skepticism can be found in a relatively recent book by Voula Tsouna (1998), who also provides a translation of all the relevant testimonies.⁶

Jonathan Barnes once observed that 'it is plain that Pyrrhonism had a history in the full sense of the word: It grew and changed and developed. It is plain, too, that the ancient world knew of several different varieties of Pyrrhonism' (Barnes 1992: 4247, no. 30). This accurate judgment applies equally well to Academic skepticism. When dealing with ancient skepticism, therefore, it must be borne in mind that it was not uniform, not only because there were two main skeptical traditions, but also because there were important transformations within each of them. This cautionary reminder, which may be obvious but is sometimes forgotten, may help one appreciate the richness of ancient skepticism as well as explain some of the discrepancies between our sources or within a single source, even though it is often difficult to give a precise account of the distinct brands of ancient skepticism and of how they influenced each other or diverged from each other. Indeed, some skeptics (namely, Pyrrho, Arcesilaus, and Carneades) wrote nothing and the works of most of those who did are lost to us. In these cases, we must content ourselves with fragments, reports, and summaries which, as one would expect, are usually meager, sometimes of doubtful reliability, and on occasion hard to reconcile.

In the case of Pyrrhonism, the position of Pyrrho of Elis (360–270 BC) – more precisely, the position ascribed to him primarily by his leading disciple Timon of Phlius (320–230 BC) – differs in important respects from that of the later Pyrrhonian movement.⁷ This was initiated in the first century BC by Aenesidemus of Cnossos and culminated, as far as antiquity is concerned, with Sextus Empiricus (probably late second century AD) and his immediate successors.⁸ Although one could offer an account of Pyrrho's thought that makes it possible to regard the later Pyrrhonian tradition 'as the development of skeptical themes that emerge from Pyrrho's life' (Thorsrud 2009: 35), one should be very cautious about the extent of such a continuity. For it seems plain that Aenesidemus' interpretation of Pyrrho's outlook (DL IX 62, 106) was influenced by his own later form of skepticism, which is epistemological and includes sophisticated argumentative strategies. Moreover, it cannot be ruled out that the picture of Pyrrho painted by Timon in his poems and prose works (parts of which survive in fragments and second-hand reports) was shaped by the latter's own skeptical stance.⁹ Timon is very close to the later Pyrrhonists in refraining from affirming that things are as they appear and in taking that which appears (*to phainomenon*) as a guide in practical matters (DL IX 105). This is why Jacques Brunschwig has claimed that the epistemological views ascribed to Pyrrho by Timon are actually the latter's, who should therefore be considered the first

Pyrrhonist.¹⁰ Be that as it may, one should refrain from assuming that the skepticism expounded at great length in Sextus' extant works is nothing but a more developed version of Pyrrho's original position.¹¹ Sextus himself cautiously explains the connection between Pyrrho and the Skeptical philosophy in relative terms: He tells us that the reason the Skeptical way of thought is called 'Pyrrhonian' is that 'Pyrrho appears to us to have attached himself to Skepticism more tangibly and more conspicuously than his predecessors' (*PH I 7*).¹²

Also within the 'neo-Pyrrhonian' movement there appear to be significant differences between what we can reconstruct of Aenesidemus' outlook and the Pyrrhonian stance found in at least most of Sextus' surviving writings.¹³ For the former seems to have made both negative and relativized claims which the latter would have regarded as Dogmatic – i.e., as making assertions about non-evident matters or about what is objectively the case – and, hence, as violating rigorous suspension of judgment (*epochē*).¹⁴ As we will see in the second article on ancient skepticism, even in the Sextan corpus different forms of skepticism seem to coexist.

Major changes took place also within the skeptical Academic movement, which arose out of both the epistemological debate between Academics and Stoics and the return to Socrates' dialectical style of philosophizing.¹⁵ This style was deeply rooted in a commitment to the standards of rationality, the most important of which is that one should withhold assent or suspend judgment when one does not know.¹⁶ But we cannot discount the possibility that the figure of Pyrrho also played a part in the origin of Academic skepticism.¹⁷ The skeptical phase of the Academy ranges from Arcesilaus (316/5–241/0 BC), through Carneades (214–129/8 BC) and his student Clitomachus (187–10 BC), to Philo of Larissa (159/8–84/3 BC),¹⁸ to name only the most important figures.¹⁹ The interpretation of the thought of these philosophers is controversial. In the case of Arcesilaus, we can safely say that he adopted a radical form of epistemological skepticism characterized by universal suspension of judgment. In Carneades, skepticism was extended to other domains such as ethics and theology, but it may also have been mitigated by his espousal of a kind of fallibilism – as we will see in the third article on ancient skepticism, it is a matter of dispute whether his outlook is to be construed this way or even whether he adopted any epistemological stance *in propria persona*. After Clitomachus, who defended a strong skeptical outlook which he ascribed to his teacher, Academic skepticism began to soften. Philo first defended a radical skepticism but later held that it is possible to have knowledge, albeit not of the type proposed by the Stoics (*Acad. II 18, PH I 235*). This softening was followed by a total departure from skepticism on the part of Antiochus of Ascalon (130–69/8 BC), who after espousing Philo's skeptical outlook returned to what he took to be the views of the Old Academy, embracing a Stoicizing form of Platonism (*Acad. II 69–70, 132, PH I 235*).²⁰ Yet, Academic skepticism is still present in Cicero (106–43 BC), who was a student of both Philo and Antiochus. He considered himself to belong to the tradition of the skeptical Academy and espoused a moderate form of skepticism.²¹

Some scholars have thought that the epistemological challenge of the skeptical Academy died out, or played an entirely negligible part, in middle Platonism,²² which ranges roughly from the early first century BC to the early third century AD. The idea seems to be that, after Antiochus' total rejection of skepticism, Platonists simply ignored the skeptical challenge and the skeptical interpretations of Plato, and took for granted the truth of the Platonic doctrines. However, we know that Favorinus of Arles (80–160 AD) claimed to be an Academic skeptic and was influenced by Pyrrhonism.²³ In *On the Best Method of Teaching*, which is our most important source for Favorinus' thought, Galen (129–210

AD) attacks the ‘younger’ (*neōteroi*) Academics, among whom was Favorinus.²⁴ This shows that, even though the Academy as an institution ceased to exist in the first century BC,²⁵ in the second century AD there was a group of Academics who were skeptical and prominent enough to merit Galen’s onslaught.²⁶ In addition, recently some scholars have examined both the strong presence of skeptical Academic elements and the responses to Academic skepticism in the anonymous commentator on Plato’s *Theaetetus* (possibly second century AD),²⁷ in Plutarch (*ca.* 50–120 AD), and in Numenius (mid-second century AD).²⁸ Moreover, it has even been claimed that a full-fledged Platonist like Alcinoüs (second century AD) was concerned with Academic skepticism, implicitly responding to its epistemological challenge in his *Didaskalikos*.²⁹ It is finally worth noting that Plotinus (204/5–270 AD), the founder of Neoplatonism, seems to have made use of Pyrrhonian arguments,³⁰ although this use was merely methodological.

Scholars usually observe that, unlike the Pyrrhonists, the Academics did not call themselves ‘skeptics’. Although Aenesidemus probably did not use ‘skeptical’ but only ‘Pyrrhonist’, Sextus usually employs the former term when referring to the Pyrrhonists. It is commonly agreed that only in the early second century AD did this word come to be generally employed as a designation of the Pyrrhonist,³¹ although it was also applied to the Academics. Indeed, even though the second-century AD antiquarian Aulus Gellius tells us in his *Attic Nights* (XI v 1) that Pyrrhonists are referred to as ‘skeptics’, he later remarks that both Pyrrhonists and Academics are so designated (XI v 6). Moreover, if the source of Gellius’ text were indeed Favorinus, as seems likely, then this would bolster the conclusion that at least he and other Academics of the second century AD did actually call themselves ‘skeptics’ – which may be explained by their having been influenced by neo-Pyrrhonism. In any case, the use of ‘skeptical’ to refer to the views of certain Academics from Arcesilaüs to Favorinus is explained by the philosophical similarities between those views and the Pyrrhonian stance: e.g., the advocacy of (universal) suspension of judgment, the practice of arguing on both sides of a question, and the use of *ad hominem* arguments. In this connection, it must be noted that Aenesidemus probably was a former member of the Academy whose desertion seems to have been motivated by Philo’s abandonment of the rigorous skepticism of the earlier Academics.³² It could be argued that Aenesidemus’ revival of Pyrrho’s outlook was actually a return to radical Academic skepticism³³ – although, as noted earlier, it is possible that Arcesilaüs, the founder of Academic skepticism, was influenced to some extent by Pyrrho (see *PH* I 234, *DL* IV 33). What is clear is that the source of Aenesidemus’ argumentative practice is to be found in the dialectical method of the skeptical Academy. In addition, our sources state that both Arcesilaüs (*PH* I 232, cf. *Acad.* I 45) and Aenesidemus (*DL* IX 107, cf. *PH* I 30) conceived of suspension of judgment as the end (*telos*). But it is also clear that Aenesidemus viewed Pyrrho as a proponent of suspension of judgment (*DL* IX 62). Let us finally note that the similarities between the two skeptical traditions explain, at least in part, why in the second century AD authors like Seneca, Epictetus, Galen, Lucian, and even Favorinus tended to assimilate Academic skepticism to Pyrrhonism.³⁴

Another current in ancient skepticism was that of the Empirical school of medicine, which extended from the third century BC to the second century AD and was one of the three main medical ‘sects’ of the Hellenistic and Imperial ages.³⁵ However, medical Empiricism did not constitute an entirely independent skeptical tradition, since it was in close connection with Pyrrhonism. Indeed, we know that several Pyrrhonists were Empirical doctors.³⁶ According to the external evidence and as his sobriquet indicates, Sextus himself was an Empiricist.³⁷ In addition, it has been argued that medical Empiricism was heavily influenced by the skeptical Academy.³⁸ This is not strange since, as

already observed, there exist close similarities between Pyrrhonism and Academic skepticism and the latter exerted a strong influence on the former.³⁹

2. Recent Translations and General Studies

Progress in the study of ancient skepticism has to a large extent been possible thanks to the publication, in the past fifteen years, of an important number of translations of our primary sources for both Academic and Pyrrhonian skepticism. Most of these are translations of Sextus' voluminous extant corpus, some with excellent exegetical and philological commentaries and facing Greek text.⁴⁰ The traditional and still useful English translation of all of Sextus by R. G. Bury (1933–1949) has become dated. We now have two complete translations of the three books of *PH* by Julia Annas and Jonathan Barnes (2000) and Benson Mates (1996). As for the six books of the *Adversus Mathematicos* (*AM*), David Blank (1998) has offered a translation of its voluminous first book. Of the five surviving books of the *Adversus Dogmaticos* (*AD*),⁴¹ Richard Bett has translated the fifth book (Bett 1997) as well as the first two (Bett 2005), and he is at present working on a translation of the two remaining books. In Italian, Emidio Spinelli has translated the fifth book of *AD* and the fifth book of *AM* (Spinelli 1995, 2000, respectively). In French, we have complete translations of *PH* (Pellegrin 1997) and of *AM* (Sextus Empiricus 2002). Hansuli Flückiger (1998) has translated into German the five books of *AD*. In Spanish, there are translations of *PH* (Sartorio Maulini 1996; Bergua Cavero 1997) and of *AM* (Gallego Cao and Muñoz Diego 1993), but these are not always reliable. We also have the first Croatian translation of *PH* by Filip Grgić (2008).⁴²

Cicero's works are crucial for the study of Academic skepticism, not only because they are our earliest and most extensive source but also because, as already noted, he is sympathetic to this form of skepticism. Thus, he is for Academic skepticism what Sextus is for Pyrrhonism. But Sextus is also a key source for Academic skepticism,⁴³ whereas in Cicero's extant corpus there is no mention of Aenesidemus' revival of Pyrrhonism⁴⁴ and no reference to the skeptical side of Pyrrho's philosophy.⁴⁵ Cicero's most important work for Academic skepticism is his *Academica*, of which only parts of its two editions survive. There, he presents both the controversy between Stoics and Academics about the attainability of knowledge and the possibility of action without assent, and the controversy that took place within the skeptical Academy about what form of skepticism (radical or mitigated) should be adopted. Until recently, the only available complete English translation was that by H. Rackham (1933), but we now have Charles Brittain's fine translation of the work (Brittain 2006). There is also a relatively recent German translation, with facing Latin text, by Christoph Schäublin (1995). In addition, a French translation, with facing Latin text, by José Kany-Turpin (2010) has just come out. Finally, a new critical edition and English commentary by Tobias Reinhardt is in progress, and an edition, French translation, and commentary by Terence Hunt, Carlos Lévy, and Ermanno Malaspina will be published in the near future.

In the past few years, several general presentations of ancient skepticism have appeared in print. Among them, one must first mention Robert J. Hankinson's voluminous and comprehensive work (Hankinson 1998). A more introductory presentation by Harald Thorsrud has been published very recently (Thorsrud 2009). The approach of these two books is of course historical, but they also attempt to understand the sense of the various skeptical stances and to evaluate their soundness and philosophical implications. It should be noted that Alan Bailey's book, whose main purpose is to provide an examination of Sextus' Pyrrhonism from a systematic perspective, discusses at length the outlooks of

other Pyrrhonists and the most important Academic skeptics (Bailey 2002). As regards specifically Pyrrhonian skepticism, Richard Bett's work on Pyrrho should also be mentioned because it explores Pyrrho's possible antecedents and the later Pyrrhonism of Aenesidemus and Sextus (Bett 2000). In addition, Bett has just edited an authoritative companion to ancient skepticism which contains contributions by some of the leading specialists in the field (Bett 2010). In the literature in French, there has lately appeared a short and useful introductory book focusing primarily on ancient skepticism by Carlos Lévy (2008), whose perspective is wholly historical.⁴⁶ In Italian, one must first mention a recent history of Greek skepticism by Maria L. Chiesara (2003). There is also a volume of essays by Emidio Spinelli (2005) which together constitute a good introduction to ancient Pyrrhonism.

In the two subsequent articles on ancient skepticism, I will present and discuss some of the issues that have attracted the most attention from specialists in recent years. The first article will deal with the thought of some of the members of the Pyrrhonian movement (Pyrrho, Aenesidemus, and Sextus), and the second with the outlooks of certain representatives of the Academic tradition (Arcesilaus, Carneades, and Philo).

Acknowledgement

I am grateful to Luca Castagnoli, Stéphane Marchand, Harald Thorsrud, and an anonymous referee for their constructive comments on earlier versions of this paper. I would also like to thank Dale Chock for correcting some infelicities of my English.

Short Biography

Diego E. Machuca is Assistant Researcher in philosophy at the Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (Argentina) and Editor-in-Chief (with Duncan Pritchard) of the *International Journal for the Study of Skepticism*. He received his PhD from the University of Buenos Aires in 2006. His areas of research are ancient skepticism, epistemology, and metaethics. His publications related to skepticism include: 'The Local Nature of Modern Moral Skepticism,' *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 87 (2006); 'The Pyrrhonist's *Ataraxia* and *Philanthrōpia*,' *Ancient Philosophy* 26 (2006); 'Sextus Empiricus: His Outlook, Works, and Legacy,' *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 55 (2008); 'Argumentative Persuasiveness in Ancient Pyrrhonism,' *Méthexis* 22 (2009); 'The Pyrrhonian Argument from Possible Disagreement,' *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 93 (2011); and 'Pyrrhonism and the Law of Non-Contradiction,' in D. E. Machuca (ed.), *Pyrrhonism in Ancient, Modern, and Contemporary Philosophy* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2011).

Notes

* Correspondence: Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas, Av. Alvear 1711, C1014AAE Buenos Aires, Argentina. Email: diegomachuca@fibertel.com.ar.

¹ There were some exceptions, such as Victor Brochard (2002), Mary Mills Patrick (1899, 1929), Pierre Couissin (1929, 1983), Léon Robin (1944), Mario Dal Pra (1975), Phillip De Lacy (1953, 1958), Charlotte Stough (1969), Jean-Paul Dumont (1985), and Marcel Conche (1994). The philological studies of Karel Janáček should also be included in this list: See Janáček (1948, 1972, 2008b). Janáček (2008b) collects his many papers on Sextus Empiricus and Pyrrhonism.

² On the skeptical and anti-skeptical arguments found in early and classical Greek philosophy, see Lee (2010).

³ See Brittain and Palmer (2001).

⁴ On both Socrates' influence on Academic skepticism and the skeptical interpretations of Plato, see Calogero (1981), Woodruff (1986), Long (1988), Annas (1994), Shields (1994), Ioppolo (1995, 2004, 2008), Glucker (1997), Warren (2002), Bonazzi (2003a,b,c), Cooper (2004), Trabattoni (2005), and Bett (2006b). For an overview of these topics, see Hankinson (1998: 83–5), and Thorsrud (2009: 40–5, 56–8). The Pyrrhonists were in general more reluctant than the Academic skeptics to recognize philosophical forebears (see Lévy 2001).

⁵ The Greek *pathos* refers here to a state a person is in as a result of being affected by something. Although in ordinary English the term 'affection' does not have this meaning, it has become in the specialist literature a technical term to translate *pathos*.

⁶ On Cyrenaic epistemology, see also Brunschwig (1999: 251–9).

⁷ For a detailed account of the differences between Pyrrho's outlook and the later Pyrrhonian tradition, see especially Bett (2000). Of value are also the relevant chapters in Brochard (2002). For a complete collection of texts referring to Pyrrho, see Decleva Caizzi (1981).

⁸ Diogenes Laertius (third century AD) reports that Sextus was the teacher of an Empirical doctor named 'Saturninus' (*Lives of Eminent Philosophers* [DL] IX 116).

⁹ See Frede (1973: 806); Brunschwig (1994a; 1999: 246–51).

¹⁰ Brunschwig (1994a, 1999). Brunschwig's view has been criticized by Bett (1996) and Long (2006b).

¹¹ This explains why, particularly in the French and Italian scholarship, interpreters prefer to employ 'Pyrrhonism' to refer to the stance of Pyrrho and Timon, and 'neo-Pyrrhonism' to refer to the outlooks of Aenesidemus and Sextus. In the English scholarship, by contrast, the term 'neo-Pyrrhonism' is generally used to designate contemporary versions of Pyrrhonism, such as that defended by Robert Fogelin (1994).

¹² For reasons that will become clear later, I use 'Skeptic' and 'Skepticism' with capital letters to refer specifically to the Pyrrhonist and his outlook.

¹³ As we will see in the article on Pyrrhonism, it has been claimed that, in some of Sextus' writings, it is possible to detect traces of the Aenesideman variety of skepticism.

¹⁴ See Woodruff (1988, 2010) and Bett (2000, ch. 4); *contra* Thorsrud (2009, ch. 6).

¹⁵ The claim that Academic skepticism derived (in part) from the opposition to the Stoics has been rejected by Ioppolo (1986: 36).

¹⁶ See Cooper (2004: 96, 98, 100–3).

¹⁷ For the view that Arcesilaus was influenced by Pyrrho, see Sedley (1983: 15–6), Barnes (1988: 236), Bett (2006a, sect. 8), and Thorsrud (2009: 44–5); *contra* Ioppolo (1986: 34–40).

¹⁸ Ancient sources present distinct divisions of the Academy: See Cicero, *On the Orator* III 67, *Academic Books* (*Acad.*) I 46, *On Moral Ends* V 7; *PHI* 220; *DL* I 14, 19; Eusebius, *Preparation for the Gospel* XIV iv 12–6.

¹⁹ For the outlooks of minor Academics such as Lacydes, Charmidas, and Metrodorus, see Tarrant (1985, ch. 2) and Lévy (2005).

²⁰ On Antiochus, see Glucker (1978), Tarrant (1985, ch. 5), Barnes (1989), Striker (1997), and Allen (2005). Lévy (2010) rejects the widespread view that Antiochus adhered to Stoicism.

²¹ On Cicero's skepticism, see Ioppolo (2007) and Thorsrud (2009, ch. 5).

²² See Dillon (1993: 62; 1996: 43) and Tarrant (2002).

²³ On Favorinus, see Ioppolo (1993, 1994, 2002), Holford-Strevens (1997), Opsomer (1997), Bonazzi (2003a: 158–70), and Lévy (2009). An edition and French translation of Favorinus' extant works and fragments has been undertaken by the Collection des Universités de France. So far two of the three projected volumes have appeared in print: see Amato and Julien (2005) and Amato (2010).

²⁴ See Ioppolo (1994, 2002).

²⁵ Glucker (1978: 280–93) argues that, after Philo, the Academy as an institution disappeared.

²⁶ On Galen's reply to skepticism, see De Lacy (1991), who nonetheless does not discuss Galen's attack on Favorinus.

²⁷ Most interpreters think that the anonymous commentary dates from the second century AD. Harold Tarrant, by contrast, has argued for an earlier date, namely, the late first century BC (Tarrant 1983: 161–79, 1985: 67–9).

²⁸ See Opsomer (1996, 1998, 2005); Bonazzi (2003a, ch. 5–6, 2003c, 2004); Brittain (2007).

²⁹ See Boys-Stones (2005).

³⁰ See O'Meara (2000).

³¹ See Janáček (2008a), Striker (1996b: 92, no. 1), Sedley (1983: 20, 27–8, no. 61), Tarrant (1985: 22–9), Decleva Caizzi (1992b: 296–7), and Polito (2007: 337).

³² Aenesidemus' former affiliation to the Academy is almost unanimously accepted by scholars, the only exception being, as far as I know, Decleva Caizzi (1992a). See also Decleva Caizzi (1996: 38).

³³ Cf. Frede (1973: 806; 1997: 146) and Long (2006a: 96).

³⁴ See Ioppolo (1994, 2002).

³⁵ On medical Empiricism, see Edelstein (1967), Marelli (1981), Mudry (1982, 1990), Frede (1987, 1988, 1990), Hankinson (1987), Matthen (1988), Stok (1993), Perilli (2001, 2004), and Giovacchini (2008). See also Allen (2001, 2010).

- ³⁶ For a list of all the possible Pyrrhonian doctors of whom we have some information, see Barnes (1990: 2613, no. 20). For the possible historical and sociological reasons for the association of Pyrrhonism with medical Empiricism, see Polito (2007).
- ³⁷ Nevertheless, the internal evidence mostly runs counter to the external evidence, since Sextus explicitly distinguishes Pyrrhonism from medical Empiricism (*PH* I 236). For a discussion of his relationship with the Empirical medical school which takes into account previous literature, see Machuca (2008), Section II. See also Allen (2010).
- ³⁸ See Edelstein (1967: 198, no. 11; 201, no. 19), and especially Mudry (1982: 78, 116, 118, 132, 142, 163) and Mudry (1990: 92–6).
- ³⁹ See Declava Caizzi (1986: 148, 177–8; 1992b, 292), Striker (1996a; 2001: 124, 127–8; 2010), Machuca (2006, *in fine*), Thorsrud (2009: 2–7).
- ⁴⁰ Other important sources for Pyrrhonian skepticism are Diogenes' *Lives* (Hicks 1925; Diogène Laërce 1999), Eusebius' *Preparation for the Gospel* (Gifford 1903), and Photius' *Library* (Henry 1962). For a fine discussion of Diogenes' account of Pyrrhonism, see Barnes (1992).
- ⁴¹ It should be noted that scholars commonly refer to the five extant books of the *AD* as *AM* VII–XI. This designation has its origin in the fact that, in our manuscripts, *AD* is attached to the end of the six books of *AM*, even though it is clear that they are two different works. I prefer not to follow this conventional designation not only because it is incorrect, but also because it still creates confusion among non-specialists.
- ⁴² For a complete list of vernacular translations of Sextus' writings up to the year 2000, see Floridi (2002: 56–61).
- ⁴³ On Sextus as a source for Academic skepticism, see Ioppolo (1992) and especially Ioppolo (2009).
- ⁴⁴ Some interpreters suggest that Cicero is referring to Aenesidemus when, at *Acad.* II 32, he talks about those who affirm that all things are uncertain: see, e.g., Brochard (2002: 257) and Striker (1996b: 100). It is much more plausible, however, that Cicero is referring to Arcesilaus: see Ioppolo (1986: 65–70) and Ioppolo (2009: 193–208).
- ⁴⁵ Other important sources of information on the skeptical Academy are Diogenes' *Lives*, Eusebius' *Preparation for the Gospel*, Plutarch's *Against Colotes* (Einarson and De Lacy 1967), Galen's *On the Best Method of Teaching* (Barigazzi 1991), and Augustine's *Against the Academics* (King 1995).
- ⁴⁶ Brochard's full-length volume on ancient skepticism, originally published in 1887, is still a useful work.

Works Cited

- Allen, J. 'Antiochus.' *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. E. Zalta. 1 Mar. 2005 <<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/antiochus-ascalon>>.
- . 'Pyrrhonism and Medicine.' *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Scepticism*. Ed. R. Bett. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 232–48.
- . 'Rationalism, Empiricism, and Scepticism: Sextus Empiricus' Treatment of Sign-inference.' *Inference from Signs: Ancient Debates About the Nature of Evidence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. 87–146.
- Amato, E. *Favorinos d'Arles. Oeuvres, Tome III: Fragments*. Greek text, French translation, and commentary. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2010.
- and Y. Julien. *Favorinos d'Arles. Oeuvres, Tome I: Introduction générale – Témoignages – Discours aux Corinthiens – Sur la Fortune*. Greek text, French translation, and commentary. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2005.
- Annas, J. 'Plato the Skeptic.' *The Socratic Movement*. Ed. P. Vander Waerdt. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994. 309–40.
- and J. Barnes. *Sextus Empiricus: Outlines of Scepticism*. English translation with an introduction. 2nd ed.. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. (First edition 1994.)
- Bailey, A. *Sextus Empiricus and Pyrrhonian Scepticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Barigazzi, A. *Galeno: Sull'ottima maniera di insegnare. Esortazione alla medicina*. Greek text, Italian translation, and commentary. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1991.
- Barnes, J. 'Antiochus of Ascalon.' *Philosophia Togata I: Essays on Philosophy and Roman Society*. Eds. J. Barnes and M. Griffin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989. 51–96.
- . 'Diogenes Laertius IX 61–116: The Philosophy of Pyrrhonism.' *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II* 36.6. Ed. W. Haase. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1992. 4241–301.
- . [J. H. Maconij]. 'Nova Non Philosophandi Philosophia.' *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 6 (1988): 231–53. (Critical notice of Ioppolo 1986.)
- . 'Pyrrhonism, Belief and Causation: Observations on the Scepticism of Sextus Empiricus.' *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II* 36.4. Ed. W. Haase. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1990. 2608–95.
- Bergua Cavero, J. *Sexto Empírico: Contra los profesores libros I–VI*. Spanish translation with an introduction. Madrid: Gredos, 1997.
- Bett, R., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Scepticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- . 'Hellenistic Essays Translated.' *Apeiron* 29 (1996): 75–97. (Critical notice of Brunschwig 1994b.)
- . 'Pyrrho.' *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. E. Zalta. 15 June 2006a <<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/pyrrho/>>.
- . *Pyrrho, His Antecedents, and His Legacy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

- . *Sextus Empiricus: Against the Ethicists*. English translation with an introduction and commentary. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- . *Sextus Empiricus: Against the Logicians*. English translation with an introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- . 'Socrates and Skepticism.' *A Companion to Socrates*. Eds. S. Ahbel-Rappe and R. Kamtekar. Oxford: Blackwell, 2006b. 298–311.
- Blank, D. *Sextus Empiricus: Against the Grammarians*. English translation with an introduction and commentary. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Bonazzi, M. *Accademici e Platonici Il dibattito antico sullo scetticismo di Platone*. Milano: Led, 2003a.
- . 'Contro la rappresentazione sensibile: Plutarco tra l'Accademia e il platonismo.' *Elenchos* 25 (2004): 41–71.
- . 'I pirroniani, l'Accademia e l'interpretazione scettica di Platone.' *Platone e la tradizione platonica. Studi di filosofia antica*. Eds. M. Bonazzi and F. Trabattoni. Milano: Cisalpino La Goliardica, 2003b. 181–217.
- . 'Un dibattito tra accademici e platonici sull'eredità di Platone. La testimonianza del commentario anonimo al Teeteto.' *Papiri filosofici. Miscellanea di studi IV*. Firenze: Olschki, 2003c. 41–74.
- Boys-Stones, G. 'Alcinous, *Didaskalikos* 4: in Defence of Platonism.' *L'eredità platonica. Studi sul platonismo da Arcesilao a Proclo*. Eds. M. Bonazzi and V. Celluprica. Napoli: Bibliopolis, 2005. 201–34.
- Brittain, C. *Cicero: On Academic Scepticism*. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2006.
- . 'Middle Platonists on Academic Scepticism.' *Greek & Roman Philosophy 100 BC–200 AD*. Vol. II. Eds. R. Sharples and R. Sorabji. London: Institute of Classical Studies, 2007. 297–315.
- and J. Palmer. 'The New Academy's Appeals to the Presocratics.' *Phronesis* 46 (2001): 38–72.
- Brochard, V. *Les Sceptiques grecs*. 4th ed. Paris: Le livre de poche, 2002. (First edition 1887.)
- Brunschwig, J. 'The Beginnings of Hellenistic Epistemology.' *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*. Eds. K. Algra, J. Barnes, J. Mansfeld, and M. Schofield. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. 229–59.
- . 'Once again on Eusebius on Aristocles on Timon on Pyrrho.' *Papers in Hellenistic Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994a. 190–211.
- . *Papers in Hellenistic Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994b.
- Bury, R. G. *Sextus Empiricus*. 4 vols. Greek text and English translation. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1933–1949. 1933–49.
- Calogero, G. 'Socratismo e scetticismo nel pensiero antico.' *Lo scetticismo antico*. Vol. I. Ed. G. Giannantoni. Napoli: Bibliopolis, 1981. 35–46.
- Chiesara, M. L. *Storia dello scetticismo greco*. Torino: Einaudi, 2003.
- Conche, M. *Pyrrhon ou l'apparence*. 2nd ed. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1994. (First edition 1973.)
- Cooper, J. 'Arcesilaus: Socratic and Sceptic.' *Knowledge, Nature, and the Good: Essays on Ancient Philosophy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004. 81–103.
- Couissin, P. 'L'origine et l'évolution de l'*epochē*.' *Revue des études grecques* 42 (1929): 373–97.
- . 'The Stoicism of the New Academy.' *The Skeptical Tradition*. Ed. M. Burnyeat. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press, 1983. 31–63. (Originally published as 'Le Stoïcisme de la Nouvelle Académie.' *Revue d'histoire de la philosophie* 3 [1929].)
- Dal Pra, M. *Lo scetticismo greco*. 2nd ed. Roma and Bari: Laterza, 1975. (First edition 1950.)
- De Lacy, P. 'Galen's Response to Skepticism.' *Illinois Classical Studies* 16 (1991): 283–306.
- . 'Ou mallon and the Antecedents of Ancient Scepticism.' *Phronesis* 3 (1958): 59–71.
- . 'Plutarch and the Academic Sceptics.' *The Classical Journal* 49 (1953): 79–85.
- Decleva Caizzi, F. 'Aenesidemus and the Academy.' *The Classical Quarterly* 42 (1992a): 176–89.
- . 'Enesidemus e Pirrone. Il fuoco scalda 'per natura' (Sext. *Adv. Math.* VIII 215 e XI 69).' *Elenchos* 17 (1996): 37–54.
- . 'Pirroniani ed Accademici nel III secolo a.C.' *Aspects de la philosophie hellénistique*. Eds. H. Flashar and O. Gigon. Vandœuvre and Genève: Fondation Hardt, 1986. 147–83.
- . *Pirrone: Testimonianze*. Collection of texts referring to Pyrrho, with Italian translation and commentary. Napoli: Bibliopolis, 1981.
- . 'Sesto e gli scettici.' *Elenchos* 13 (1992b): 279–327.
- Dillon, J. *Alcinous. The Handbook of Platonism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- . *The Middle Platonists*. 2nd ed. London: Duckworth, 1996. (First edition 1977.)
- Dumont, J.-P. *Le scepticisme et le phénomène*. 2nd ed. Paris: Vrin, 1985. (First edition 1972.)
- Edelstein, L. 'Empiricism and Scepticism in the Teaching of the Greek Empiricist School.' *Ancient Medicine*. Eds. O. Temkin and C. Temkin. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1967. 195–203.
- Einarson, B. and P. De Lacy. *Against Colotes, in Plutarch: Moralia*. Vol. 14. Greek text and English translation. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1967.
- Floridi, L. *Sextus Empiricus: The Transmission and Recovery of Pyrrhonism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Flückiger, H. *Sextus Empiricus: Gegen die Dogmatiker (M VII–XI)*. German translation. Sankt Augustin: Academia, 1998.
- Fogelin, R. *Pyrrhonian Reflections on Knowledge and Justification*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

- Frede, M. 'The Ancient Empiricists.' *Essays in Ancient Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987. 234–60.
- . 'The Empiricist Attitude Towards Reason and Theory.' *Method, Metaphysics and Medicine: Studies in the Philosophy of Ancient Medicine*. Special volume of *Apeiron* 21. Ed. R. J. Hankinson. Edmonton: Academic Printing and Publishing, 1988. 79–97.
- . 'An Empiricist View of Knowledge: Memorism.' *Companions to Ancient Thought I: Epistemology*. Ed. S. Everson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. 225–50.
- . 'Review of Stough (1969).' *The Journal of Philosophy* 70 (1973): 805–10.
- . 'The Sceptic's Two Kinds of Assent and the Question of the Possibility of Knowledge.' *The Original Sceptics: A Controversy*. Eds. M. Burnyeat and M. Frede. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1997. 127–51. (Originally published in 1984.)
- Gallego Cao, A. and T. Muñoz Diego. *Sexto Empírico: Esbozos pirrónicos*. Spanish translation with an introduction. Madrid: Gredos, 1993.
- Gifford, E. H. *Eusebius: Preparation for the Gospel*. 4 vols. English translation. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903.
- Giovacchini, J. 'Le 'dogmatisme négatif' des médecins empiriques: Sextus et Galien à la recherche d'une médecine sceptique.' *Cahiers Philosophiques* 115 (2008): 63–80.
- Glucker, J. *Antiochus and the Late Academy*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.
- . 'Socrates in the Academic Books and Other Ciceronian Works.' *Assent and Argument: Studies in Cicero's Academic Books*. Eds. B. Inwood and J. Mansfeld. Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill, 1997. 58–88.
- Grgić, F. *Sekst Empirik: Obrisi pironizma*. Greek text and Croatian translation. Zagreb: Kruzak, 2008.
- Hankinson, R. J. 'Causes and Empiricism: A Problem in the Interpretation of Later Greek Medical Method.' *Phronesis* 32 (1987): 329–48.
- . *The Sceptics*. 2nd ed. London and New York: Routledge, 1998. (First edition 1995.)
- Henry, R. *Photius: Bibliothèque*. Vol. III. Greek text and French translation. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1962.
- Hicks, R. *Diogenes Laertius: Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. 2 vols. Greek text and English translation. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925.
- Holford-Strevens, L. 'Favorinus: The Man of Paradoxes.' *Philosophia Togata II: Plato and Aristotle at Rome*. Eds. J. Barnes and M. Griffin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997. 188–217.
- Ioppolo, A. M. 'The Academic Position of Favorinus of Arelate.' *Phronesis* 38 (1993): 183–213.
- . 'Accademici e pirroniani nel II secolo D.C.' *Realtà e ragione: Studi di filosofia antica*. Ed. A. Alberti. Firenze: Olschki, 1994. 85–103.
- . 'Cicerone e lo scetticismo.' *La personalità filosofica di Marco Tullio Cicerone*. Ed. P. Ciaravolo. Roma: Aracne, 2007. 75–84.
- . 'Gli accademici "neōteroi" nel secondo secolo d.C.' *Méthexis* 15 (2002): 45–70.
- . 'Il dibattito antico sullo scetticismo di Platone.' *Elenchos* 25 (2004): 413–46. (Critical notice of Bonazzi 2003a.)
- . 'La critica di Sesto Empirico all'interpretazione di Platone 'aporetico'.' *Anthropine sophia. Studi di filologia e storiografia filosofica in memoria di Gabriele Giannantoni*. Eds. F. Alesse, F. Aronadio, M. C. Dalfino, L. Simeoni, and E. Spinelli. Napoli: Bibliopolis, 2008. 457–80.
- . *La testimonianza di Sesto Empirico sull'Accademia scettica*. Napoli: Bibliopolis, 2009.
- . *Opinione e scienza. Il dibattito tra Stoici e Accademici nel terzo e secondo secolo a. C.* Napoli: Bibliopolis, 1986.
- . 'Sesto Empirico e l'Accademia scettica.' *Elenchos* 13 (1992): 169–99.
- . 'Socrate nelle tradizioni accademico-scettica e pirroniana.' *La tradizione socratica*. Ed. G. Giannantoni. Napoli: Bibliopolis, 1995. 89–123.
- Janáček, K. 'Das Wort *skeptikos* in Philons Schriften.' *Studien zu Sextus Empiricus, Diogenes Laertius und zur pyrrhonischen Skepsis*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2008a. 239–43. (Originally published in 1979.)
- . *Prolegomena to Sextus Empiricus*. Olomouc: Nákladem Palackého University, 1948.
- . *Sextus Empiricus' Sceptical Methods*. Praha: Universita Karlova, 1972.
- . *Studien zu Sextus Empiricus, Diogenes Laertius und zur pyrrhonischen Skepsis*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2008b.
- Kany-Turpin, J. *Cicéron: Les Académiques*. French translation with an introduction by P. Pellegrin. Paris: Flammarion, 2010.
- King, P. *Augustine: Against the Academicians. The Teacher*. English translation. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1995.
- Laërce, Diogène. *Vies et doctrines des philosophes illustres*. French translation by J.-F. Balaudé, L. Brisson, J. Brunschwig, T. Dorandi, M.-O. Goulet-Gazé, R. Goulet, and M. Narcy. Paris: Le livre de poche, 1999.
- Lee, M. 'Antecedents in Early Greek Philosophy.' *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Scepticism*. Ed. R. Bett. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 13–35.
- Lévy, C. 'Favorinus et les *Academica*.' *Revue des études anciennes* 111 (2009): 45–54.
- . 'Les petits académiciens: Lacyde, Charmadas, Métrodore de Stratonice.' *L'érédité platonica. Studi sul platonismo da Arcesilao a Proclo*. Ed. M. Bonazzi and V. Celluprica. Napoli: Bibliopolis, 2005. 53–77.
- . *Les scepticismes. Collection "Que sais-je?" 2829*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2008.

- . 'Pyrrhon, Énésidème et Sextus Empiricus: la question de la légitimation historique dans le scepticisme.' *Antichi e moderni nella filosofia di età imperiale*. Ed. A. Brancacci. Napoli: Bibliopolis, 2001. 299–326.
- . 'The Sceptical Academy: Decline and Afterlife.' *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Scepticism*. Ed. R. Bett. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 81–104.
- Long, A. A. 'Arcesilaus in His Time and Place.' *From Epicurus to Epictetus: Studies in Hellenistic and Roman Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006a. 96–113. (Revised and updated version of a paper published in *Elenchos* 7 [1986]).
- . 'Socrates in Hellenistic Philosophy.' *Classical Quarterly* 38 (1988): 150–71.
- . 'Timon of Phlius: Pyrrhonist and Satirist.' *From Epicurus to Epictetus: Studies in Hellenistic and Roman Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006b. 70–95. (Revised and updated version of a paper published in *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* NS 24 [1978]).
- Machuca, D. E. 'Review of Brittain.' *Bryn Maur Classical Review* 2006.11.07.
- . 'Sextus Empiricus: His Outlook, Works, and Legacy.' *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 55 (2008): 28–63.
- Marelli, C. 'La medicina empirica ed il suo sistema epistemologico.' *Lo scetticismo antico*. Ed. G. Giannantoni. Napoli: Bibliopolis, 1981. 657–76, vol. II.
- Mates, B. *The Skeptic Way: Sextus Empiricus's Outlines of Pyrrhonism*. English translation with an introduction and commentary. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Matthen, M. 'Empiricism and Ontology in Ancient Medicine.' *Method, Metaphysics and Medicine: Studies in the Philosophy of Ancient Medicine*. Special volume of *Apeiron* 21. Ed. R. J. Hankinson. Edmonton: Academic Printing and Publishing, 1988. 98–121.
- Mudry, P. *La préface du De medicina de Celsus*. Latin text, French translation, and commentary. Lausanne: Imprimerie des Arts et Métiers, 1982.
- . 'Le scepticisme des médecins empiriques dans le traité *De la médecine* de Celse: modèles et modalités.' *Le scepticisme antique: perspectives historiques et systématiques*. Cahiers de la Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie 15. Ed. A.-J. Voelke. 1990. 85–96.
- O'Meara, D. J. 'Scepticism and Ineffability in Plotinus.' *Phronesis* 45 (2000): 240–51.
- Opsomer, J. 'Divination and Academic 'Scepticism' According to Plutarch.' *Plutarchea Lovaniensia (Studia Hellenistica* 32). Ed. L. Van der Stockt. Lovanii: Peeters, 1996. 164–94.
- . 'Favorinus Versus Epictetus on the Philosophical Heritage of Plutarch. A Debate on Epistemology.' *Plutarch and His Intellectual World*. Ed. J. Mossman. London and Swansea: Duckworth & Classical Press of Wales, 1997. 17–39.
- . *In Search of the Truth: Academic Tendencies in Middle Platonism*. Brussels: Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, 1998.
- . 'Plutarch's Platonism Revisited.' *L'eredità platonica. Studi sul platonismo da Arcesilao a Proclo*. Eds. M. Bonazzi and V. Celluprica. Napoli: Bibliopolis, 2005. 161–200.
- Patrick, M. M. *The Greek Sceptics*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1929.
- . *Sextus Empiricus and Greek Scepticism*. Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Co., 1899.
- Pellegrin, P. *Sextus Empiricus: Esquisses Pyrrhoniennes*. Greek text and French translation. Paris: Seuil, 1997.
- Perilli, L. *Menodoto di Nicomedia. Contributo a una storia galeniana della medicina empirica*. München and Leipzig: Saur, 2004.
- . 'Menodoto di Nicomedia e i principi della medicina empirica.' *Antichi e moderni nella filosofia di età imperiale*. Ed. A. Brancacci. Napoli: Bibliopolis, 2001. 267–97.
- Polito, R. 'Was Skepticism a Philosophy? Reception, Self-Definition, Internal Conflicts.' *Classical Philology* 102 (2007): 333–62.
- Rackham, H. *Cicero: De Natura Deorum, Academica*. Latin text and English translation. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1933.
- Robin, L. *Pyrrhon et le scepticisme grec*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1944.
- Sartorio Maulini, R. *Sexto Empírico: Hipótesis pirrónicas*. Spanish translation with an introduction. Madrid: Akal, 1996.
- Schäublin, C. *Marcus Tullius Cicero: Akademische Abhandlungen, Lucullus*. Latin text and German translation. München: Meiner, 1995.
- Sedley, D. 'The Motivation of Greek Skepticism.' *The Skeptical Tradition*. Ed. M. Burnyeat. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press, 1983. 9–29.
- Sextus Empiricus. *Contre les professeurs*. Introduction by P. Pellegrin, Greek text and French translation by C. Dalimier, D. Delattre, J. Delattre, and B. Pérez. Paris: Seuil, 2002.
- Shields, C. 'Socrates Among the Sceptics.' *The Socratic Movement*. Ed. P. Vander Waerdt. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994. 341–60.
- Spinelli, E. *Questioni scettiche: Lecture introduttive al pironismo antico*. Roma: Lithos, 2005.
- . *Sesto Empirico: Contro gli astrologi*. Greek text, Italian translation, and commentary. Napoli: Bibliopolis, 2000.
- . *Sesto Empirico: Contro gli etici*. Greek text, Italian translation, and commentary. Napoli: Bibliopolis, 1995.

- Stok, F. 'La scuola medica Empirica a Roma. Problemi storici e prospettive di ricerca.' *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II* 37.1. Ed. W. Haase. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1993. 600–45.
- Stough, C. *Greek Skepticism: A Study in Epistemology*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969.
- Striker, G. 'Academics Fighting Academics.' *Assent and Argument: Studies in Cicero's Academic Books*. Eds. B. Inwood and J. Mansfeld. Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill, 1997. 257–76.
- . 'Academics Versus Pyrrhonists, Reconsidered.' *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Scepticism*. Ed. R. Bett. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 195–207.
- . 'On the Differences Between the Pyrrhonists and the Academics.' *Essays on Hellenistic Epistemology and Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996a. 135–49. (Originally published in 1981.)
- . 'Sceptical Strategies.' *Essays on Hellenistic Epistemology and Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996b. 92–115. (Originally published in 1980.)
- . 'Scepticism as a Kind of Philosophy.' *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 83 (2001): 113–29.
- Tarrant, H. 'The Date of the Anon. In *Theaetetus*.' *Classical Quarterly* 33 (1983): 161–87.
- . 'Review of G. Boys-Stones.' *Post-Hellenistic Philosophy: A Study of Its Development from the Stoics to Origen*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2002.02.03.
- . *Scepticism or Platonism? The Philosophy of the Fourth Academy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Thorsrud, H. *Ancient Scepticism*. Stocksfield: Acumen. 2009.
- Trabattoni, F. 'Arcesilao platonico?' *L'eredità platonica. Studi sul platonismo da Arcesilao a Proclo*. Eds. M. Bonazzi and V. Celluprica. Napoli: Bibliopolis, 2005. 13–50.
- Tsouna, V. *The Epistemology of the Cyrenaic School*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Warren, J. 'Socratic Scepticism in Plutarch's *Adversus Colotem*.' *Elenchos* 23 (2002): 333–56.
- Woodruff, P. 'Aporotic Pyrrhonism.' *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 6 (1988): 139–68.
- . 'The Pyrrhonian Modes.' *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Scepticism*. Ed. R. Bett. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 208–31.
- . 'The Sceptical Side of Plato's Method.' *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 40 (1986): 22–37.