

From the Socratics to the Socratic Schools

Classical Ethics, Metaphysics
and Epistemology

Edited by
Ugo Zilioli

From the Socratics to the Socratic Schools

“Ugo Zilioli has put together an inspiring, dialogical collection of papers, which explore routes traced by the evidence for the ‘other’ (let’s stop saying ‘minor’) Socratics and their heirs through many of the blank spaces left on our historical map between Plato and the Hellenistic age. At the same time as advancing our understanding of Classical metaphysics, epistemology, and ethics, the papers grapple with important questions about how we do ancient philosophy, and bring much needed critical light to categories, such as that of the ‘school’ itself, which shape our thinking.”

—George Boys-Stones, *Durham University, UK*

In the two golden centuries that followed the death of Socrates, ancient philosophy underwent a tremendous transformation that culminated in the philosophical systematizations of Plato, Aristotle and the Hellenistic schools. Fundamental figures other than Plato were active after the death of Socrates; his immediate pupils, the Socratics, took over his legacy and developed it in a variety of ways. This rich philosophical territory has however been left largely underexplored in the scholarship.

This collection of eleven previously unpublished essays by leading scholars fills a gap in the literature, providing new insight into the ethics, metaphysics, and epistemology as developed by key figures of the Socratic schools. Analysing the important contributions that the Socratics and their heirs have offered ancient philosophical thought, as well as the impact these contributions had on philosophy as a discipline, this book will appeal to researchers and scholars of Classical Studies, as well as Philosophy and Ancient History.

Ugo Zilioli has been an Irish Research Council fellow at Trinity College Dublin, Ireland, and, more recently, a Marie Curie Intra-European Fellow at the University of Pisa, Italy. His main publications include: *Protagoras and the Challenge of Relativism* (2007; Chinese translation 2012); *The Cyrenaics* (2012; reprinted for Routledge 2014); *The Circle of Megara* (London/ New York, forthcoming for Routledge).

This page intentionally left blank

From the Socratics to the Socratic Schools

Classical Ethics, Metaphysics and
Epistemology

Edited by Ugo Zilioli

First published 2015
by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

and by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group,
an informa business*

© 2015 Taylor & Francis

The right of the editor to be identified as the author of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

From the Socratics to the Socratic schools : classical ethics, metaphysics, and epistemology / edited by Ugo Zilioli. — First [edition].

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Socrates. 2. Philosophy, Ancient. I. Zilioli, Ugo, 1971— editor.

B317.F77 2015 183'.2—dc23

2014040827

ISBN: (hbk) 978-1-84465-843-5

ISBN: (ebk) 978-1-315-71946-7

Typeset in Sabon
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

Epigraph

Always keep Ithaca in your mind.
To arrive there is your final destination.
But do not rush the voyage in the least.
Better it last for many years;
and once you're old, cast anchor on the isle,
rich with all you've gained along the way,
expecting not that Ithaca will give you wealth.

Ithaca gave you the wondrous voyage:
Without her you'd never have set out.
But she has nothing to give you any more.

If then you find her poor, Ithaca has nor deceived you.
As wise as you've become, with such experience, by now
You will have come to know what Ithaca really means.

C.P. Cavafy (1911)

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

<i>Abbreviations and Conventions</i>	ix
<i>Preface</i>	xi
<i>Introduction</i>	xiii
UGO ZILIOLI	
1 Plato's Representations of the 'Socratics'	1
VOULA TSOUNA	
2 The First-Generation Socratics and the Socratic Schools: The Case of the Cyrenaics	26
CHRISTOPHER ROWE	
3 The Socratic Profile of Antisthenes' Ethics	43
ALDO BRANCACCI	
4 Rethinking Aeschines of Sphettus	61
KURT LAMPE	
5 Phaedo's <i>Zopyrus</i> (and Socrates' Confidences)	82
LIVIO ROSSETTI	
6 The Sources and Scope of Cyrenaic Scepticism	99
TIM O'KEEFE	
7 The Cyrenaics as Metaphysical Indeterminists	114
UGO ZILIOLI	
8 Diodorus Cronus on Perceptible Minima	134
FRANCESCO VERDE	
9 Pyrrho and the Socratic Schools	149
RICHARD BETT	

10 Epicureanism and Socratism: The Evidence on the Minor Socratics from the Herculaneum Papyri	168
TIZIANO DORANDI	
11 Socrates, Alcibiades and Antisthenes in PFlor 113	192
MENAHEM LUZ	
 <i>Contributors</i>	 211
<i>Index</i>	215

Abbreviations and Conventions

Abbreviations for ancient authors and works are those of LSJ and OLD. All Greek and Latin is translated into English. In some cases (especially in the ‘philological’ chapters by Dorandi and Luz), the original Greek is given with translation but with no transliteration. Bibliographical details of works cited are given at the end of each chapter.

The following abbreviations are used:

- LSJ* H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, and H. S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th edition, Oxford 1940.
SSR G. Giannantoni, *Socratis et Socraticorum Reliquiae*, Naples 1990.

This page intentionally left blank

Preface

This collection mainly arises from an international conference on the Socratics and the Socratic schools that was held at the Hotel Post-Victoria, Soprabolzano, in September 2013. The conference and the present collection represent one of the two main outcomes of a Marie Curie Intra-European Fellowship which I was privileged to hold during 2011–2013. I warmly thank the European Union and its FP7 scheme for the wonderful opportunity provided by the Fellowship to explore new avenues in my research.

The speakers at the Soprabolzano conference were Christopher Rowe, Kurt Lampe, Livio Rossetti, Aldo Brancacci, Tiziano Dorandi, Voula Tsouna and Richard Bett; George Boys-Stones acted as chairman. I thank all the participants at the conference, who travelled from far and wide to reach Soprabolzano: not an easy destination, but beautiful enough, I hope, to compensate them for the trouble they took to reach it. Sigmund Freud once went to Soprabolzano and immediately fell in love with it—coming back each subsequent summer to enjoy the special nature of the place and its breath-taking setting; its charms will not have been lost on any of us who were there.

In addition to the contributions by the participants to the Soprabolzano conference, the collection has been enriched and broadened by the inclusion of papers by Tim O’Keefe, Francesco Verde and Menahem Luz. I am here happy to thank them for accepting my invitation to contribute. All the contributors have been extremely supportive and collaborative in the long process of assembling the final version of the collection, always gracefully meeting the deadlines set. My particular thanks go to Christopher Rowe, who undertook the demanding task of translating the contributions by Brancacci, Dorandi and Rossetti from Italian into English, and for revising Verde’s own translation. He has also substantially helped me in the revision of the Introduction. My thanks also to the two anonymous reviewers for Routledge, who have provided useful comments both on the collection as a whole and its various components.

On a more personal note, I wholeheartedly thank my wife, Cristiana, for having helped me substantially (and our children, Zoe and Delio, for their lively contributions to the occasion).

16 September 2014

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

In recent decades there has been renewed interest among scholars on the Socratics and the Socratic schools. Recent studies have focused either on the Socratics or on the Socratic schools: two subjects that are closely related but also distinct. The label ‘Socratics’ is usually employed to refer to the immediate followers of Socrates other than Plato, such as Euclides of Megara, Aristippus of Cyrene, Phaedo of Elis, Antisthenes, Aeschines of Sphettus and Xenophon. The term ‘Socratic schools’, by contrast, is typically used to refer to those schools of thought that appear to have originated, more or less directly, from some of the Socratics just listed: the Megarians or Megarics (from Euclides of Megara), the Cyrenaics (from Aristippus of Cyrene), the Elians-Eretrians (from Phaedo of Elis and Menedemus of Eretria), and the Cynics (from Antisthenes – though many believe that the real founder of ancient Cynicism was Diogenes of Sinope).

1. THE SOCRATICS AND THE SOCRATIC SCHOOLS

There are then two distinct areas for investigation: the philosophical environment that grew up and flourished around and immediately after Socrates, and the enduring contribution of the immediate followers of Socrates in what Denis O’Brien has called “the two golden centuries that followed the death of Socrates.” Yet, distinct as they are, these topics also constitute two sides of the same coin. As we reconstruct the different directions taken by the first-generation Socratics, we begin to see the richness and breadth that allowed the development of the ‘schools’ into which we are used to dividing the later ‘Socratic’ tradition.

What exactly it is to constitute a Socratic ‘school’ is a controversial issue. Are we justified in speaking of ‘schools’ when we refer to the Megarians, the Cyrenaics or the Cynics? If they were ‘schools’ at all, they were quite different from the more institutionalized schools of Plato, Aristotle, and Epicurus, each of which was located in Athens, and developed its own well-defined philosophical agenda. The Socratic ‘schools’ were located in cities outside

Athens, sometimes even outside the Greek mainland: in Megara, in Elis, in Eretria or in Cyrene, and on the basis of the evidence currently available, it is hard to reconstruct their particular philosophical profiles.

The school of Megara is by far the most active and diversified of all the Socratic schools. Its first members were Euclides of Megara and Eubulides of Miletus, who developed important views in ethics, metaphysics and logic. Some scholars (most notably, David Sedley)¹ have claimed that subsequent members of the Megarian school such as Diodorus Cronus and Philo are better understood as philosophers belonging to a separate school, the Dialecticians, whose philosophical activity contrasted with that of the Megarians.² But if it is difficult to see the Megarians as a unified group of philosophers sharing a common approach and similar philosophical views, the Cyrenaics, by contrast, can appear a rather monolithic group of philosophers who defended more or less the same views until Theodorus the Godless broke Cyrenaic orthodoxy with his new ethics of joy and grief.³

The Cynics are even more difficult to come to terms with. Antisthenes was undoubtedly an important and prolific philosopher who developed original views, many of them contrasting with Plato, in ethics, epistemology, logic, metaphysics and philosophy of language. Some ancient authors, and some contemporary scholars, take him to be the originator of ancient Cynicism; others believe Diogenes of Sinope to have been the actual founder of the Cynic movement. The place and authority of Antisthenes in the history of ancient Cynicism is thus problematic, and it is hard to assess the Cynic movement as a whole before understanding its proper genealogy. As for the Elean-Eretrian school, often understood as a branch of the Megarians, it is perhaps the most elusive of all the Socratic schools, and we really know very little about it.

By comparison with the Athens-based schools of Plato, Aristotle and Epicurus, the Socratic schools are thus difficult to reconstruct historically and philosophically. Tiziano Dorandi calls them ‘pseudo-schools’,⁴ but this is probably too negative a view. The members of each of the Socratic schools will quite probably have shared common ways of life that resulted in their sharing similar philosophical approaches and basic doctrinal positions.

The contributors to the present volume take different views of the Socratic schools, and about the historical linkage between the schools themselves and the first generation Socratics. What all the contributors share, to a greater or lesser extent, is an awareness of the scope that exists for exploring the debates that flourished around Socrates, from which the Socratic schools appear to have originated. A fresh look at those debates should help us gain a wider understanding of the intellectual context in which Plato, Aristotle and the Hellenistic schools (Epicureans, Stoics and Sceptics) operated and, at the same time, while also bringing us face to face with an array of philosophers and views that often go unnoticed, but that are thoroughly worthy of exploration not only in relation to the major figures of ancient philosophy but in themselves.⁵

In short, this collection of essays does not pretend to be a comprehensive survey of the Socratics and the Socratic schools, which would require a book considerably longer than this one. The aim of the volume is more modest: to fill in some of the gaps in the existing map of the routes leading from Plato to the Hellenistic schools, by exploring the philosophical commitments of some first-generation Socratics and of some of the Socratic schools – with special emphasis, as it has turned out, on the Cyrenaics.

2. RECENT SCHOLARSHIP

Debate about the Socratics and the Socratic schools has been flourishing in the last two or three decades, thanks particularly to the appearance of Gabriele Giannantoni's monumental work on Socrates, the Socratics and the Socratic schools, *Socratis et Socraticorum Reliquiae* (henceforth 'SSR': published in Naples in 1990, in four volumes), the impact of which on the field of Socratic studies has been considerable. For the first time scholars had available a collection of the vast majority of the sources on Socrates, the Socratics and the Socratic schools, complemented by a critical scrutiny of the main scholarship on those thinkers and schools by Giannantoni himself.⁶

One cannot do justice, in a brief introduction, to all the important studies on the Socratics that have appeared since the publication of Giannantoni's work. I shall therefore be somewhat selective, briefly touching—roughly in chronological order, from 1990, when SSR appeared—on the contributions I believe to be the most relevant, both for the Anglophone reader and in the context of the present collection.

That year, 1990, also saw the publication of Aldo Brancacci's study on Antisthenes, *Oikeios logos: La filosofia del linguaggio di Antistene* (Naples 1990), which has now also appeared in a revised edition in French (Paris 2005). Brancacci's monograph revolutionised our understanding of Antisthenes by showing how all the various aspects of his thought converged in a systematic theory of language and predication. Then, in 1994, Paul A. Vander Waerdt edited *The Socratic Movement* (Ithaca 1994), with papers contributed by, among others, Gisela Striker, Christopher Shields, Julia Annas, Donald Morrison, Harold Tarrant and Voula Tsouna; the volume is ample testimony of the lively debate then in progress about the Socratics and the Socratic schools in the Anglophone world.⁷ Another important addition to the literature was the collection of papers edited by R. Bracht Branham and Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé, *The Cynics* (Berkeley and London 1996), a revised and expanded English version of a volume in French edited by Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé and Richard Goulet (Paris 1993); while in 1998 Voula Tsouna published her invaluable book on the Cyrenaics: *The Epistemology of the Cyrenaic School* (Cambridge 1998). Tsouna's study is now a classic in the field, demonstrating the great originality of Cyrenaic epistemology as well as connecting it with ideas in modern epistemology.

Tsouna's example shows that it is possible to offer a general account of the philosophy of a Socratic school despite the extreme paucity of the available textual evidence.

In the last fifteen years, research on the Socratics and the Socratic schools has intensified further. Livio Rossetti and Alessandro Stavru have organized three international conferences on the Socratics and edited three collections of essays arising from those conferences.⁸ The third conference, co-organized with Fulvia De Luise in Trento in March 2012, was particularly well attended, attracting speakers from all over the world, from New Zealand to the United States, from England to Israel, from Brazil to Iran. The proceedings of the Trento conference are now published as *Socratica III* (Sankt Augustin 2014). A brief glance at the contents—and especially the *Introduction* by Stavru—will suffice to show the presently flourishing state of Socratic studies. George Boys-Stones and Christopher Rowe have together edited *The Circle of Socrates. Readings in the First-Generation Socratics* (Indianapolis 2013), which is the first translation ever in English (with introduction and notes) of the main sources on the immediate followers of Socrates. *The Circle of Socrates* has already become standard reading for scholars working on the Socratics, both in the Anglophone world and beyond. A welcome addition on the Cynics and the Cyrenaics is the new translation of the sources on them by Robin Hard for Oxford Classics: *Diogenes the Cynic, Sayings and Anecdotes* (Oxford 2012). On Cyrenaic ethics and its later reception there is Kurt Lampe's monograph *The Birth of Hedonism: The Cyrenaic Philosophers and Pleasure as a way of life* (Princeton 2014). The Acumen Ancient Philosophies Series (now published by Routledge) has recently hosted such books as *The Cynics* (by William Desmond, 2005) and *The Cyrenaics* (Ugo Zilioli 2012). Susan Prince's fundamental and long-awaited edition of Antisthenes (*Antisthenes of Athens: Texts, Translations, and Commentary*, 824pp) was at the time of writing of this Introduction about to appear with the University of Michigan Press.

3. THE CONTENTS OF THE PRESENT VOLUME

The papers appearing in the present volume have been written specifically for it. They may be divided roughly into five sections.

First come the chapters by Voula Tsouna and Christopher Rowe, both of which deal with the Socratics and the Socratic schools in the context of Plato's dialogues. Plato is by far the most important source—more important even than Xenophon (himself now undergoing a scholarly revival)—on the Socratics of the first generation, such as Aristippus or Euclides.

In "Plato's Representation of the Socratics," Voula Tsouna contends that Plato's representation of the Socratics is very different from the way they are represented either by the ancient doxographers or by modern scholars. Through a detailed analysis of key sections of some of Plato's dialogues, Tsouna sets out to show that Plato conceived of the Socratics as a group of

individuals that were influenced by Socrates but were not proper philosophers. Tsouna also examines two examples of figures often understood as Socratics, Alcibiades and Critias, showing that Plato himself did not think of them as belonging to Socrates' circle. Tsouna's chapter concludes by suggesting some reasons why Plato offers so peculiar a characterization of the Socratics within the context of his own work. The chief outcome of the chapter is that 'Socratic' is a rather more contested term than we are currently in the habit of supposing.

In "The First-Generation Socratics and the Socratic Schools: The Case of the Cyrenaics," Christopher Rowe focuses on the Cyrenaics and especially on Plato's *Theaetetus*. According to an interpretation widely accepted until some years ago, the 'subtler thinkers' of *Theaetetus* 156a3 are Aristippus and other early Cyrenaics; most scholars—Voula Tsouna among them—now reject this interpretation, and place the proper origins of the Cyrenaic 'school' two generations later. Rowe rejects both interpretations, arguing that the evidence—especially that of the *Theaetetus*, and even discounting 156a—may be good enough to justify Aristippus' reinstatement as 'founder', at least in some heavily qualified sense. Rowe's chapter bears a close relationship with those of O'Keefe and Zilioli, both of which focus on the Cyrenaics.

A second group of papers has to do with individual Socratics: Antisthenes, Aeschines and Phaedo. In "The Socratic Profile of Antisthenes' Ethics," Aldo Brancacci illustrates how ancient sources depicted Antisthenes as a fully Socratic figure who took over and further developed some key concepts of Socrates' philosophy. In particular, Brancacci insists on the fundamental idea of moral knowledge that is often, if not exclusively, understood as the kernel around which Socrates constructs his own philosophy. Brancacci argues that Antisthenes elaborated in different and original ways Socrates' idea that ethics is a form of moral knowledge.

In his chapter "Rethinking Aeschines of Sphettus," Kurt Lampe addresses the philosophical importance of a much neglected representative of the Socratics: Aeschines of Sphettus. Not much work has been done on this figure since the fundamental study by Dittmar in 1912 and some more recent papers by Livio Rossetti. It has sometimes been held that Aeschines has little to say that is of philosophical interest. Opposing this view, Lampe argues that Aeschines will have much to say if we understand him in light of the interpretative categories developed by Michel Foucault in some of his final seminars on Greek philosophy. The outcome of Lampe's argument is a thoroughly original chapter that shows the importance of both Aeschines of Sphettus as a Socratic philosopher and of Foucault as a sensitive interpreter of the Greek world.

In his chapter "Phaedo's *Zopyrus* (and Socrates' Confidences)," Livio Rossetti goes back once again to Phaedo of Elis, in particular to the *Zopyrus*, to illustrate the difference between the treatment of Socrates by other Socratics such as Phaedo (and, to a lesser extent, Aeschines of Sphettus) and his treatment by Plato. According to Rossetti, Phaedo understands Socrates

not as a man who defends particular philosophical views, but rather as someone who is the master of his own passions (and resists them when they should be resisted). Rossetti concludes that if we try to reconstruct Socrates' philosophical outlook from the available evidence, we will be doomed to a failure. The proper conclusion from the evidence about Socrates is that he was a man who made self-control and rational deliberation the fulcrum of his approach to life.

A third group of chapters concerns the Cyrenaics. The two chapters belonging to this third group offer two radically alternative interpretations of the major philosophical commitments of this Socratic school.

In his paper, "The Sources and Scope of Cyrenaic Scepticism," Tim O'Keefe defends with renewed vigour the interpretation of the Cyrenaics as traditional sceptics. According to his view, the Cyrenaics deny that we can gain any knowledge of external things because of the contrast between the indubitable grasp we have of our affections and the inaccessibility of external things. O'Keefe thus maintains that Cyrenaic subjectivism is not rooted, as I myself have proposed, in the view that the world is metaphysically indeterminate. In contrast with Tsouna's and James Warren's reading, O'Keefe also argues that the scope of Cyrenaic scepticism is quite wide, including not only properties of external things, but also their identity and nature.

In my own chapter, "The Cyrenaics as Metaphysical Indeterminists," I continue to maintain my claim, *pace* O'Keefe, that the Cyrenaics may have well been metaphysical indeterminists. According to my view, the main ground for Cyrenaic subjectivism does not lie in the inevitable epistemological limitations of human beings but rather in the metaphysical structure of the external world. According to my interpretation, the Cyrenaics claim that what we are able to know is constituted solely by our affections; we cannot know the things that cause them because these lack any intrinsic ontological features of their own. I also suggest that this interpretation gives us a deeper insight into some other related aspects of Cyrenaic philosophy, in particular their invention of such neologisms as 'I am being whitened'.

The fourth group of essays deals with Diodorus Cronus and Pyrrho. In his paper "Diodorus Cronus on Perceptible Minima," Francesco Verde offers a careful investigation of the topic of perceptible minima in the atomism of Diodorus Cronus, one of the most talented members of all the Socratic schools. The question is tricky and involves a possible conceptual and historical link between Diodorus' theory of perceptible minima and Epicurus' doctrine of minimal parts. In conversation with the main interpretations available (Denyer, Sedley, Sorabji), Verde shows that a central aim of Diodorus' theory of perceptible minima could have well been to argue against the legitimacy of perceptual knowledge.

In "Pyrrho and the Socratic Schools," Richard Bett explores the reception of the Socratic schools in Pyrrho. Bett discusses the possible influence of the Megarians, the Cyrenaics and the Cynics on Pyrrho, concluding that Pyrrho was indeed influenced by the Cynics, and by some aspects of the thought of

the Megarian thinker Stilpo—that is, by those aspects of Stilpo’s philosophy that were themselves more Cynic-oriented. Contrary, then, to the views of some scholars, little of Socrates’ thought will have come down to Pyrrho, and the little that did came through the mediation of the Socratic schools. Bett’s chapter also complements those of O’Keefe and Zilioli, insofar all three pay attention to the possible mutual influence between the Cyrenaics and Pyrrho (Bett arguing for the view that there was none).

The fifth and last group of chapters is eminently philological. Recent studies of the papyrus evidence have brought to attention new material on the Socratics and the Socratic schools. Both Dorandi’s and Luz’s chapters explore that material, and do the hard philological work that philosophers require the philologists to do for them. Their chapters are particularly welcome in a collection on the Socratics and the Socratic schools; given the scantiness of our evidence, any additions are clearly very welcome.

Some thirty years after Giannantoni’s essay,⁹ “Epicureanism and Socratism: The Evidence on the Minor Socratics from the Herculaneum Papyri,” Tiziano Dorandi provides us with a general overview of the evidence on the Socratics and the Socratic schools from some newly edited Herculanean papyri. In particular, Dorandi focuses on the criticism that Epicurus and the Epicureans levelled against the Socratic schools, above all the Megarians. In so doing, Dorandi not only offers new details about the philosophical commitments of the Socratic schools, but also shows how prominent those schools were in the philosophical debates of the early Hellenistic period.

Finally, in “Socrates, Alcibiades and Antisthenes in Pflor 113,” Menahem Luz focuses on a second century AD papyrus roll from Egypt preserved at the Laurentian Library of Florence. The papyrus was originally edited at the beginning of last century by Domenico Comparetti, but a new appraisal is needed in light of its importance. The papyrus deals with Socrates and Antisthenes and their respective approaches to influencing the moral behaviour of a favourite pupil (most likely Alcibiades, in the case of Socrates). Luz analyses the two anecdotes and the differing views on education that lie behind them, while also trying to trace any resemblances. Luz’s account of the papyrus succeeds in demonstrating its usefulness for the reconstruction of the debate about education that flourished both during Socrates’ time and among his pupils.

NOTES

1. Sedley 1977.
2. I argue against this view in *The Circle of Megara*, forthcoming.
3. See Diogenes Laertius II 98. In his ground-breaking appraisal of Cyrenaic hedonism Kurt Lampe (Lampe 2014) illustrates the philosophical difference between the Cyrenaics of the first generation (Aristippus and his early followers, included his grandson) and the later sects of the Cyrenaic school, that is, the followers of Hegesias and Anniceris.