

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

Post by "Cassius" of August 26, 2021 at 6:32 PM

Good grief. So according to Sedley there is a second edition of DeLacey's translation of Philodemus on Signs. I don't see that listed anywhere though --

## 1. *Philodemus, de Signis*

With the appearance in 1978 of Philip and Estelle De Lacy's second edition of *Philodemus, de Signis*, one which unlike its predecessors is based on adequate papyrological information,<sup>1</sup> the time is ripe for renewed discussion of this work and its place in Hellenistic philosophy. Its real title is *Philodemus, De [...] et Signis* *inferentis*. The missing word may be *phantasiai*, 'impressions', or *phantasmata*, 'appearances', but this need not concern us now

1. P. and E. De Lacy, *Philodemus, the Method of Inference* (Naples, 1978). Marcello Gigante, director of the *Consorzio Internazionale per lo Studio dei Papiri Egiziologici*, generously supplied the editors with the readings of the papyrus, and to this end was able to call upon the expert papyrological assistance of Francesco Longo Martellino and Adèle Trepollin Guerin. Previous editions and discussions had relied mainly on the 19th-century editions of J. Goussier, *Methodische Studien z. Philodemus über Induktionslehre* (Leipzig, 1862); F. Böhmer, *Die Epigramme Philodemos Schrift De Signis inferentis und Logik* (Leipzig, 1876); F. Philippson, *De Philodemi Libri qui de Signis Inferentibus et Logicae tractatus* (Bonn, 1881); and 'Zur Wiederherstellung von Philodemus sog. Schrift De Signis inferentibus', *Bibliotheca Classica et Orientalis*, 1909, 1-26 and the De Lacy's first edition (*Philodemus*, 1978). A full bibliography on the *de Signis* can be found in M. Gigante (ed.), *Catálogo de papiros griegos* (Naples, 1979), 211-2. My debt to the De Lacy's hard and scholarly book is enormous, and if I shall have some occasion to signal disagreement than agreement in this paper, that is mostly because much of their contribution to our understanding of the work has become by now part of the common stock of knowledge. On the other hand, their text (and any papyrological text) should not be regarded as definitive. I propose several alterations to it in this paper, and to modify the *variae lectiones*, providing repair, and the reading notes at the *Clavis de Papiri Egiziologici* in Naples that has so far prevented me from checking all passages discussed against the papyrus. In the meantime I have been greatly helped by Francesco Longo Martellino and Adèle Trepollin Guerin, who have very kindly provided information from the notes which they took during their recent stay at the papyrus. But, more where indicated, the text follows in this paper is that of the De Lacy's second edition. I also take this opportunity to express my gratitude to Jonathan Barnes, Jonathan Lear and Malcolm Schofield for their enormously helpful written comments on the first draft of this paper, and to many participants at the Paris conference for the valuable criticism which it received there.

Presumably that won't change his commentary much but I sure would like to see the updated text.