

# "On Methods of Inference": Notes For Review And Discussion (Including David Sedley Article: "On Signs")

Post by "Cassius" of August 26, 2021 at 8:26 AM

## [Quote from Godfrey](#)

Accordingly, every sign is also a thing; for what is not a thing is nothing at all. Every thing, however, is not also a sign.

This would appear to be a very critically important assertion if it is in fact an accurate representation of the position that Philodemus is taking, but I have no clue how reliable this statement should be considered to be. Is this in fact an accurate summary of the way (1) philosophers in general, and (2) Philodemus, think? I immediately worry that this conclusion may be "begging the question" and assuming a position with which Philodemus may not agree.

Do we know for sure that Philodemus would agree with this?