

THE EMPIRICISM OF ACRON OF AGRIGENTUM

According to Cicero, the eminent Pythagorean philosopher Arion of Locroi was still alive in 388 B.C.¹, and therefore Plato was greatly desirous of making his acquaintance². Keeping in mind that the Pythagoreans of Locroi were on friendly terms with the Pythagoreans of Tarentum³, we have reason to believe that, having reached his fortieth year, Plato did not only proceed to Taras on a visit to Archytas but he also came to Locroi, where he attended the lectures of Arion⁴. In view of the scant information about Arion's life⁵, K. Freeman⁶ suggested that Arion had made a name for himself as one of Echecrates' collaborators, whereas M. Timpanaro Cardini⁷ maintained that in all probability Arion had been the founder of a new Pythagorean sect. Taking into account that Philippus of Opus had been not only a younger contemporary of Arion but also a native of a Locrian colony⁸, we may fairly assume that Arion received elaborate treatment in Philippus' work *On Plato*⁹. In other words, we put forward the opinion that Cicero's statement on Arion's Pythagoreanism was drawn from Philippus by way of M. Pupius Piso, who had the reputation of being a man of profound learning¹⁰.

1. Cf. H. DIELS-W. KRANZ, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, Vol. 1, Berlin, Weidmann, 1974¹⁷, p. 443; E. ZELLER-R. MONDOLFO, *La filosofia dei Greci nel suo sviluppo storico*, Part 1, Vol. 2, Firenze, La Nuova Italia, 1950², p. 288; D.R. SHACKLETON-BAILEY, *Onomasticon to Cicero's Treatises*, Stuttgart, Teubner, 1996, p. 85; P.M. FRASER-E. MATTHEWS, *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, Vol. 3, Part 1, London, Oxford Univ. Press, 1997, p. 70.

2. Cf. E. WELLMANN, Arion aus Lokroi, *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Vol. 2, Stuttgart, Metzler, 1896, p. 841; K.E. GEORGES, *Ausführliches lateinisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch*, Vol. 1, Leipzig, Bär und Hermann, 1913⁸, p. 573; F. NIUTTA, Le fonti letterarie ed epigrafiche, in *Locri Epizefiri*, Vol. 1, Firenze, Sansoni, 1977, p. 338; B. CENTRONE, Arion de Locres, in R. GOULET, *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, Vol. 1, Paris, Éditions du C.N.R.S., 1989, p. 352.

3. Cf. P.E. ARIAS, *Civiltà locrese in Grecia e nella Magna Grecia*, Catania, Crisafulli, 1944, p. 82.

4. Cf. A. CAPIZZI, *Platone nel suo tempo*, Roma, Edizioni dell' Ateneo, 1984, p. 142.

5. Cf. W.M.L. HUTCHINSON, *M. Tullii Ciceronis De finibus bonorum et malorum*, London, Arnold, 1909, p. 228.

6. Cf. K. FREEMAN, *The Pre-Socratic Philosophers*, London, Blackwell, 1946, p. 242.

7. Cf. M. TIMPANARO CARDINI, *Pitagorici*, Vol. 2, Firenze, La Nuova Italia, 1962, p. 427.

8. Cf. E. CIACERI, *Storia della Magna Grecia*, Vol. 2, Milano, Società Editrice Dante Alighieri, 1927, p. 461.

9. Cf. F. LASSERRE, *De Léodamas de Thasos à Philippe d' Oponte*, Napoli, Bibliopolis, 1987, p. 601.

10. Cf. G. SAURON, Un interlocuteur du *De finibus* à Oplontis (Torre Annunziata): M. Pupius Piso, *Revue des Études Latines*, 73, 1995, p. 104.

In our opinion, it deserves to be noted that the name *Arion* appears only in a Valerian passage drawn from Cicero¹¹. As a matter of fact, the reading *Arion* is an emendable one, and the variant *Acrion*, which has been noted by J. Jonsius from a Ciceronian manuscript, may, as J.A. Fabricius¹² thinks, represent the text of Cicero. To our way of thinking, it seems probable that Cicero's alleged reference to *Acrion* is nothing but a reference to *Acron* of Agrigentum, who withdrew to Locroi because of the events of 406 B.C.¹³. Granting this to be true, we may concur with W. Crönert¹⁴ in observing that Acron was a Pythagorean physician mentioned not only by Aristoxenus in his work *On Pythagoras and his School* but also by Philodemus in his work *Systematic Treatise upon the Opinions of Philosophers*¹⁵. Now W. Crönert's views, which met with F. Wehrli's¹⁶ approval but were out of line with B. Centrone's¹⁷ partial scepticism, are regarded with disfavour by T. Dorandi¹⁸. Taking into consideration that in his account of the Pythagorean Succession Aristoxenus mentions Acron in connection with Euryphon of Cnidus¹⁹, we may conclude that Acron was considered a follower of Democedes of Cnidus²⁰.

According to M. Wellmann, it was rumoured before the times of Diogenes Laertius that Empedocles had made a punning couplet on Acron in order to satirize Acron's self-confidence²¹, and the matter in dispute was the authorship of this couplet²². With a view to facilitate research, Sir D.L. Page²³, who had emphasized the reliability of Diogenes Laertius, and M.R. Wright²⁴, who had emphasized the reliability of Eustathius of Thessalonice,

11. Cf. J.N. MADVIG, *M. Tullii Ciceronis De finibus bonorum et malorum*, Hildesheim, Olms, 1963⁴, p. 760.

12. Cf. J.A. FABRICIUS, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, Vol. 1, Hildesheim, Olms, 1966⁴, p. 828.

13. Cf. G. MANGANARO, *Akragas, Der neue Pauly*, Vol. 1, Stuttgart, Metzler, 1996, p. 407.

14. Cf. W. CRÖNERT, *Kolotes und Menedemos*, Leipzig, Avenarius, 1906, p. 132.

15. Cf. R. PHILIPPSON, *Philodemos, Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Vol. 19, Part 2, Stuttgart, Metzler, 1938, p. 2464; M. GIGANTE, *La biblioteca di Filodemo, Cronache Ercolanesi*, 15, 1985, pp. 14-15.

16. Cf. F. WEHRLI, *Aristoxenos*, Basel, Schwabe, 1967², p. 54.

17. Cf. B. CENTRONE, *Acron d' Agrigente*, in R. GOULET, *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, Vol. 1, Paris, Éditions du C.N.R.S., 1989, pp. 50-51.

18. Cf. T. DORANDI, *Filodemo storico del pensiero antico*, in W. HAASE, *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Vol. 37, Part 1, Berlin, de Gruyter, 1990, p. 2418.

19. Cf. W. CRÖNERT, *op. cit.*, p. 131. In point of fact, it deserves to be noted that Euryphon and Acron were older contemporaries of Hippocrates (cf. EURYPHON, T3 Grensemann, and ACRON, F1 Wellmann).

20. Cf. W. BURKERT, *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism*, Cambridge Massachusetts, Harvard Univ. Press, 1972, p. 272.

21. Cf. M. WELLMANN, *Akron aus Agrigent*, *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Vol. 1, Stuttgart, Metzler, 1894, p. 1199.

22. Cf. IDEM, *Die Fragmente der sikelischen Ärzte Akron, Philistion und des Diokles von Karystos*, Berlin, Weidmann, 1901, p. 108.

23. Cf. Sir D.L. PAGE, *Further Greek Epigrams*, London, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1981, p. 153. In our opinion, it seems probable that the above-mentioned epigram on Acron was included in the *Sylloga Simonidea* because it was embedded in an anecdote linked to the name of Phoenix of Agrigentum, who had pulled down the tomb of Simonides (cf. J.M. EDMONDS, *Lyra Graeca*, Vol. 2, Cambridge Massachusetts, Harvard Univ. Press, 1924, p. 269).

24. Cf. M.R. WRIGHT, *Empedocles: the Extant Fragments*, New Haven, Yale Univ. Press, 1981, p. 19.

reached the conclusion that the epigram on Acron has been wrongly attributed to Empedocles. Being in agreement on that point, we bear in mind that Diogenes' reference to the Empedoclean authorship of the epigram on Acron goes back to Timaeus of Tauromenium²⁵, and thus it does not come from a reliable source²⁶. In view of the above-mentioned epigram, M. Wellmann²⁷ argued that Acron had been a son of the Pythagorean Xenon of Locroi, whereas K. Wickert²⁸ did not express any personal opinion on this matter. Far from finding himself in opposition to M. Wellmann on this question, L. Zhmud²⁹ aligned himself with J.A. Fabricius³⁰, who was the first to assert that Acron had been regarded as a Pythagorean.

Being of the opinion that J.A. Fabricius' assertion may be omitted, W.A. Greenhill³¹ insisted that Acron and Empedocles had come to Athens with the purpose of founding a new philosophical school, whereas C. Georgacopoulos³² contended that Acron and Empedocles had come to Athens with the purpose of studying for the medical profession. To our mind, J. Rubin Pinault³³ rightly stressed the point that the legend that Acron had lectured in Athens together with Empedocles is ridiculed on chronological grounds, and M.R. Wright³⁴ clearly understood that the story that Acron and Empedocles had practised medicine at Athens during the great plague has no foundation in fact. Taking into account that the whole story was faked up in the age of Pliny³⁵, we concur with F.G. Welcker³⁶ in observing that Acron was reputed to be a medical practitioner. As a matter of fact, Acron is said to have practised medicine at Athens during the plague of 430 B.C.³⁷, but «Plutarch gives no indication that any remedy or doctor was effective in stopping or alleviating the outbreak»³⁸. This being so³⁹, we may assume that Acron was in Athens during the plague of 427 B.C.⁴⁰.

Now Epimenides' approach to the plague of 595 B.C.⁴¹ contrasts sharply with Acron's

25. Cf. J. BIDEZ, *La biographie d'Empédocle*, Gand, CLEMM, 1894, p. 47.

26. Cf. R. GOULET, Empédocle d' Agrigente, in IDEM, *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, Vol. 3, Paris, Éditions du C.N.R.S., 2000, p. 79.

27. Cf. M. WELLMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

28. Cf. K. WICKERT, Xenon aus Lokroi, *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Ser. 2, Vol. 9, Part 2, Stuttgart, Druckenmüller, 1967, p. 1540.

29. Cf. L. ZHMUD, *Wissenschaft, Philosophie und Religion im frühen Pythagoreismus*, Berlin, Akademie Verlag, 1997, p. 73.

30. Cf. J.A. FABRICIUS, *op. cit.*, p. 828.

31. Cf. W.A. GREENHILL, Acron, in W. SMITH, *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, Vol. 1, London, Murray, 1880, p. 15.

32. Cf. C. GEORGACOPOULOS, *Ancient Greek Physicians* (in Greek), Athens, Iaso, 1998, p. 32.

33. Cf. J. RUBIN PINAULT, *Hippocratic Lives and Legends*, Leiden, Brill, 1992, p. 48.

34. Cf. M.R. WRIGHT, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

35. Cf. J. RUBIN PINAULT, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

36. Cf. F.G. WELCKER, *Kleine Schriften*, Vol. 3, Bonn, Weber, 1850, p. 43.

37. Cf. A. ERNOUT, *Pline l' Ancien. Histoire Naturelle. Livre XXIX*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1962, p. 72; J.GWYN-GRIFFITHS, *Plutarch's De Iside et Osiride*, Cardiff, Univ. of Wales Press, 1970, p. 568; M. GARCÍA VALDÉS, *Plutarco. De Iside et Osiride*, Pisa, Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 1995, p. 207.

38. Cf. J. RUBIN PINAULT, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

39. Cf. A.P. COUZIS, Acron (in Greek), *Great Greek Encyclopedia*, Vol. 3, Athens, Phoenix, p. 245.

40. Cf. THUC., *Hist.*, III 87, 1-2.

41. Cf. DIOG. LAERT., *Vit. Phil.*, I, 110.

approach to the plague of 427 B.C.⁴², which found acceptance by Galen in his work *Theriac to Piso*⁴³. In our opinion, Acron was keeping in mind that everything which decomposes «must be cooled before it decomposes, and fire (πῦρ) is permanently hot, and...nothing hot decomposes»⁴⁴. Furthermore, we consider that his medical knowledge disposed Acron to believe that in all probability «some diseases arise...from moisture..., and those arising from moisture are cured by heat (πυρ), for this dries up the moisture»⁴⁵. In conclusion, we think that Acron adhered to the opinion that «the moisture must not be great (for a large quantity is difficult to concoct), nor must the ground be waterless, for then there is no evaporation. This happens also with newly- burned wood and with the kind which has naturally a sweet scent»⁴⁶. In this regard, M. Wellmann's⁴⁷ assertion that Acron was an advocate of Empedocles' four element theory, which is supported by Aëtius' ⁴⁸ criticism of a reading of Oribasius⁴⁹, may be questioned⁵⁰.

With a view to lay emphasis on the correlation between Acron's medical reasoning and Empedocles' way of thinking, Pliny declared that a «school of medicine, which gave itself the name *Empiricist* ..., started in Sicily with Acron..., who was commended by the authority of...Empedocles»⁵¹. Having his doubts about this being true, E. Bignone⁵² contended that Acron was contemporary not only with Empedocles but also with the Empedoclean physician Pausanias, whereas M. Wellmann attempted to demonstrate that the Empedoclean sciences of anatomy⁵³ and diet⁵⁴ were influential in Acron's medical reasoning. Our contention is that, according to some authorities, Acron was considered the author of the first book of a work entitled *On Regimen*, which had been wrongly attributed to Hippocrates⁵⁵. Now L. Edelstein⁵⁶ implied that Acron had a high regard for Empedocles, who was relying on

42. Cf. G. SARTON, *A History of Science*, Vol. 1, London, Oxford Univ. Press, 1953, p. 334.

43. Cf. G.P. ALIVIZATOS, *The Early Smallpox Epidemics in Europe and the Athens Plague after Thucydides* (in Greek), Athens, 1950, pp. 46- 47. It should however be borne in mind that in all probability Thucydides' description of the plague has to do with the symptomatology of typhus (cf. A.W. GOMME, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides. Books II- III*, London, Oxford Univ. Press, 1956, p. 153).

44. Cf. ARIST., *Pr.*, KE20, 939 b 29- 31. The translation is by W.S. HETT, *Aristotle. Problems*, Vol. 2, Cambridge Massachusetts, Harvard Univ. Press, 1957², p. 67.

45. Cf. ARIST., *Pr.*, A57, 866 b 4- 6. The translation is by W.S. HETT, *Aristotle. Problems*, Vol. 1, Cambridge Massachusetts, Harvard Univ. Press, 1953², p. 45.

46. Cf. ARIST., *Pr.*, IB3, 906 b 20- 23. The translation is by W.S. HETT, *op. cit.*, p. 299.

47. Cf. M. WELLMANN, *op. cit.*, pp. 69- 70.

48. Cf. J. RUBIN PINAULT, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

49. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 55.

50. Cf. J. LONGRIGG, *Greek Rational Medicine*, London, Routledge, 1993, p. 105.

51. Cf. ACRON, F2 Wellmann. The translation is by H. VON STADEN, *Herophilus*, London, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1989, p. 359.

52. Cf. E. BIGNONE, *Empedocle*, Roma, Bretschneider, 1963², p. 57.

53. Cf. M. WELLMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 95.

54. Cf. IDEM, Akron aus Agrigent, *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Suppl. 1, Stuttgart, Metzler, 1903, p. 46.

55. In our opinion, the author of Suda asserted that Acron had written a work entitled Περὶ τροφῆς ὑγιεινῶν, βιβλίον α' (cf. ACRON, F1 Wellmann) because he was keeping in mind that Acron had the reputation of being the author of a work entitled Περὶ διαίτης ὑγιεινόν, βιβλίον α' (cf. EURYPHON, T6b Grensemann).

56. Cf. L. EDELSTEIN, *Ancient Medicine*, Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1967, p. 196.

observation and experiment, but J. Longrigg⁵⁷ objected that the methodology adopted by Empedocles could not be called *empirical*. In view of some remarks made by L. Hahn⁵⁸ and G. Serbat⁵⁹, we think that Acron disapproved of Empedocles' conception of medicine⁶⁰.

In this regard, one may be under the impression that K. Deichgräber⁶¹, H. Diels- W. Kranz⁶² and F. Kudlien⁶³ are quite right in assuming that Acron was known as an Empedoclean physician who referred all questions of health to pneumatic agencies. Far from sharing this view, we stress the point that, in contrast to Acron, the physicians who adhered to the Pneumatic School had a propensity for focusing their attention on the distinction between ἀήρ and φῦσα⁶⁴. Moreover, H. Thesleff's assumption that Acron's tract *On Medicine* «was compiled by a later pneumatic interested in the Pythagorean literary convention»⁶⁵ and that it was attributed to Acron in the third century B.C.⁶⁶ has been proved wrong by W. Burkert⁶⁷. In view of some remarks made by B. Centrone⁶⁸ and M. Wellmann⁶⁹, one can throw much fresh light on the subject. Taking into account that Acron had practised medicine at Athens, we are inclined to think that he exerted influence upon the author of *Problems*, who maintained that «south winds from the sea are good for plants...This is the case in Attica on the Thriasian Plain...»⁷⁰.

This being so, it may be inferred that there were some similarities between Acron's views and those held by the exponents of an Empiric approach to medicine, which started with Serapion⁷¹. Taking into account that Serapion's conception of medicine was this which gained for him the admiration of Heracleides of Tarentum⁷², we hold that in his work *On Medical Sects*⁷³ Serapion recognized Acron to be the founder of Empiricism. As a matter of fact, W.A. Greenhill⁷⁴ and P. Kroh⁷⁵ claimed that the Empiricists recognized Acron to be the

57. Cf. J. LONGRIGG, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

58. Cf. L. HAHN, Acron, *La Grande Encyclopédie*, Vol. 1, Paris, Société Anonyme de la Grande Encyclopédie, p. 449.

59. Cf. G. SERBAT, *Celse. De la Médecine*, Vol. 1, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1995, p. XL.

60. Cf. EMP., A71 Diels.

61. Cf. K. DEICHGRÄBER, *Die griechische Empirikerschule*, Berlin, Weidmann, 1965², p. 270.

62. Cf. H. DIELS-W. KRANZ, *op. cit.*, p. 283.

63. Cf. F. KUDLIEN, Acron aus Agrigent, *Der kleine Pauly*, Vol. 1, Stuttgart, Druckenmüller, 1964, p. 222.

64. Cf. A. NELSON, *Die hippokratische Schrift Περὶ φύσεως*, Uppsala, Almqvist and Wiksells, 1909, p. 100.

65. Cf. H. THESLEFF, *The Pythagorean Texts of the Hellenistic Period*, Åbo, Åbo Akademi, 1965, p. 1.

66. Cf. IDEM, *An Introduction to the Pythagorean Writings of the Hellenistic Period*, Åbo, Åbo Akademi, 1961, p. 114.

67. Cf. W. BURKERT, *op. cit.*, p. 223.

68. Cf. B. CENTRONE, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

69. Cf. M. WELLMANN, *Die Fragmente der sikelischen Ärzte Acron, Philistion und des Diokles von Karystos*, Berlin, Weidmann, 1901, p. 70.

70. Cf. ARIST., *Pr.*, KΣT17, 942 a 17- 20. The translation is by W.S. HETT, *Aristotle. Problems*, Vol. 2, Cambridge Massachusetts, Harvard Univ. Press, 1957², p. 83.

71. Cf. L. EDELSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 195.

72. Cf. F. STOK, Celso e gli Empirici, in G. SABBAH-P. MUDRY, *La médecine du Celse*, Saint-Étienne, Publications de l' Univ. de Saint-Étienne, 1994, p. 67.

73. Cf. K. DEICHGRÄBER, *op. cit.*, pp. 255- 256.

74. Cf. W.A. GREENHILL, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

75. Cf. P. KROH, *Lexikon der antiken Autoren*, Stuttgart, Kröner, 1972, p. 20.



founder of their School in order to boast of a greater antiquity than the Dogmatists, whereas P.J. van der Eijk declared that the Empiricists traced the origin of their method to Acron in order to «establish a medico- doxographical tradition free from philosophical influences»⁷⁶. Our contention is that Acron probably came to Athens together with Euryodes⁷⁷, who had been distinguished as a nephrologist⁷⁸. In view of a disagreement between Euryodes and his professional rivals⁷⁹, we think that Acron was firmly convinced that Rationalist medicine is not a τέχνη⁸⁰.

In point of fact, it is greatly to Acron's credit that he was generally considered a chief (προστάτης) of the Empiric Sect⁸¹, which could be traced back to the times of Asclepius⁸². Keeping in mind that the Empiricists attached great importance to the distinction between αὐτοματικὴ πείρα and αὐτοσχέδιος πείρα⁸³, it seems possible to believe that the above-mentioned distinction was due to Acron, who had enough knowledge to build on the Pythagorean distinction between ἀπροβουλεύτως and προβεβουλευμένως⁸⁴. In respect of this point, it should be borne in mind that for the Empiricists the foundations of medical knowledge were indissolubly linked to a wide variety of case histories⁸⁵. In our opinion, Acron was probably the first to take the position that Polus' approach to Empiricism⁸⁶ harmonized well with the principles of Empiric medicine⁸⁷. In other words, we think that Acron was firmly convinced that «if a man has theory without experience, and knows the universal, but does not know the particular contained in it, he will often fail in his treatment...»⁸⁸.

Far from sharing Acron's view, Plato did not only criticize the exponents of the Acronian Empiricism for rejecting all grand theory⁸⁹ but he also attempted to minimize the

76. Cf. P.J. VAN DER EIJK, *Ancient Histories of Medicine*, Leiden, Brill, 1999, p. 11.

77. Keeping in mind that the author of Suda, who was utterly uncritical, confused the name Ἐμπεδοκλῆς with the name Εὐδόξος (cf. ARCHYT., A2 Diels), we are inclined to think that he also confused the name Ἐμπεδοκλῆς with the name Εὐρυώδης (cf. ACRON, F1 Wellmann). In other words, we maintain that the true reading of the text of the author of Suda is as follows: Ἀκρων...ἐσοφίστευσεν ἐν ταῖς Ἀθήναις ἅμα Εὐρυώδει.

78. Cf. M. WELLMANN, Euryodes aus Sizilien, *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Vol. 6, Stuttgart, Metzler, 1909, p. 1341.

79. Cf. H. GRENEMANN, *Knidische Medizin*, Part 1, Berlin, de Gruyter, 1975, pp. 174- 175.

80. Cf. D.L. BLANK, *Sextus Empiricus. Against the Grammarians*, London, Oxford Univ. Press, 1998, p. XXVII.

81. Cf. K. DEICHGRÄBER, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

82. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 41.

83. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 292.

84. Cf. ARISTOX., F41 Wehrli.

85. Cf. K. DEICHGRÄBER, *op. cit.*, pp. 294- 295.

86. Cf. M. FREDE, *Essays in Ancient Philosophy*, London, Oxford Univ. Press, 1987, pp. 245- 246.

87. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 236. On the other hand, it remains a fact that the statement that Acron only tried to reduce the importance of medical reasoning (cf. ANONYMOUS, Acron, *Nouvelle Biographie Générale*, Vol. 1, Paris, Didot, 1857, p. 203) is not a clear indication of Acron's view.

88. Cf. ARIST., *Metaph.*, A1, 981 a 20- 23. The translation is by H. TREDENNICK, *Aristotle. Metaphysics. Books I- IX*, New York, Putnam's Sons, 1933, p. 5.

89. Cf. G. MÜLLER, *Studien zu den platonischen Nomoi*, München, Beck, 1951, p. 157.

epistemological framework of the Empiric medicine⁹⁰. To our mind, Acron's medical reasoning⁹¹ paved the way for denying that nonevident matters are knowable⁹². Being chiefly influenced by the specific structures of Acron's thought, the adherents of Medical Empiricism concerned themselves with epistemological views held by the Sophists⁹³, who combined Empiricism with Relativism⁹⁴. Taking into account that, in contrast to the Pyrrhonists, the Empiricists never denied the veracity of all sensations and beliefs⁹⁵, we concur with F. Stok⁹⁶ in observing that Acron's Empiricism was out of accord with Timon's «negative Dogmatism». In point of fact, Acron's epistemological views accorded with those held by Alcmaeon⁹⁷, who was favourable to Medical Empiricism⁹⁸. Keeping in mind that the father of Acron was a contemporary of the Pythagorean friends of Alcmaeon⁹⁹, we maintain that Acron's Empiricism was in line with Alcmaeon's premises, which had formed a boundary between *human* and *divine*¹⁰⁰.

Christopher N. POLYCARPOU
(Athens)

90. Cf. H. GÖRGEMANN, *Beiträge zur Interpretation von Platons Nomoi*, München, Beck, 1960, p. 45.

91. Cf. V. NUTTON, Akron aus Akragas, *Der neue Pauly*, Vol. 1, Stuttgart, Metzler, 1996, p. 411.

92. Cf. J. ALLEN, Pyrrhonism and Medical Empiricism, in W. HAASE, *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Vol. 37, Part 1, Berlin, de Gruyter, 1993, pp. 654- 655.

93. Cf. N. CHRONIS, The Empiric School of Physicians and the Controversy over the Limits of Knowledge (in Greek), *Scientific Yearbook of the Faculty of Philosophy, Univ. of Athens*, 29, 1979, p. 431.

94. Cf. E. MOUTSOPOULOS, *The Itinerary of Mind* (in Greek), Vol. 2, Athens, Hermes, 1975, pp. 254- 255.

95. Cf. N. CHRONIS, *op. cit.*, p. 432.

96. Cf. F. STOK, La scuola medica Empirica a Roma, in W. HAASE, *op. cit.*, p. 621.

97. Cf. K. DEICHGRÄBER, *op. cit.*, pp. 270- 271.

98. Cf. A. LEBEDEV, Alcmaeon on Plants, *La Parola del Passato*, 48, 1993, p. 460.

99. Cf. E. ZELLER-R. MONDOLFO, *op. cit.*, p. 613.

100. Cf. E. HUSSEY, The Beginnings of Epistemology: from Homer to Philolaus, in S. EVERSON, *Epistemology*, London, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1990, p. 37. In our opinion, it seems probable that Alcmaeon, who was skilled in anatomy (cf. ALCMAEON, A5 Diels), supplied much inspiration for Acron's Medical Empiricism. On the other hand, we do not disregard the fact that in a way Acron's emphasis on observation is not compatible with Alcmaeon's study of the causes of disease (cf. W. CAPELLE, *Die Vorsokratiker*, Leipzig, Kröner, 1935, p. 105).