

Best Source For Analysis of Surviving Portions of Philodemus On / Against __ ??__ - PHerc 1005

Post by "Cassius" of December 12, 2020 at 12:51 PM

Thanks to Charles for finding this commentary on Sbordone's work by Cyril Bailey. We still need Sbordone's full work, or work by someone else more recent:

PHILODEMUS
F. Sbordone: *Philodemus adversus Sophistas*. Pp. iv + 215. Stuttgart: L. Lachmann, 1937. Paper, 4.50.
F. Sbordone, who has undertaken an edition of Philodemus' works, has done so in a way which will be of great value to all who are interested in the fragments of this philosopher. His edition is not only a critical edition, but also a commentary. It is a commentary in the sense that it contains a running commentary on the fragments, which has been in part published in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, and in part in the *Journal of Philology*, which is particularly valuable in the case of the fragments of the *De Mysteriis* (PHerc 1005). The present volume is the first of a series of volumes which will contain the text of the fragments, with a commentary on each fragment, and a general introduction to the fragments of Philodemus. The present volume contains the text of the fragments of the *De Mysteriis*, and a commentary on each fragment. The commentary is written in a clear and concise style, and is of great value to all who are interested in the fragments of this philosopher. The present volume is a valuable addition to the literature of ancient philosophy.

something about the 'Sophists', that they were given to the pursuit of 'pleasure' in the superficial sense, but exhibited 'indolence' (ἀσέβεια Col. XI. 17) in learning the true doctrines. There are references to sayings and doctrines of Epicurus (frs. I, P, etc.) including an allusion to the *De Repetenda* (Col. IV) and one of the few extant mentions of the *De Mysteriis* (Col. VII. 3). We gather something of the relations of Philodemus to Zeno (fr. P, Col. VII, Col. IX), and can infer that Philodemus was as pleased with

his own 'originality' as Epicurus was before him (fr. P). There are references to Nausiphanes (fr. x) and to the behaviour of Epicureans during the siege of Athens—in Sulla's day, as Sbordone rightly maintains (Col. X). And the end of the Book seems to have interesting suggestions as to the education of budding philosophers. But there is little of real importance and one is left with the feeling that the Herculean labours of the editor have in the end produced a rather ridiculous mouse.

CYRIL BAILEY.

Review: Philodemus

Reviewed Work(s): *Philodemus adversus Sophistas* by F. Sbordone

Review by: Cyril Bailey

Source: *The Classical Review*, Dec., 1940, Vol. 62, No. 3/4 (Dec., 1940), pp. 133-134

Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association