

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

Post by "Cassius" of August 26, 2021 at 10:14 PM

I'm just a fountain of random points of interest tonight!

THIS is interesting in asserting that the enemy was not the Stoics but the Academics. I don't know that I have a dog in that fight (Stoics vs Academics) because I think it's important to see that they were all generally allied against Epicurus (not just the Stoics).

Academic philosophers (a hypothesis she had already suggested in 1984: 198), given that they aligned themselves against non-evident signs in general and especially against Epicurean inference by signs. As evidence in support of this hypothesis, Asmis mentions the criticisms against Epicurean inference launched by the Academic Cotta in Cicero's *De natura deorum*, which match the criticisms refuted in Philodemus's *On Signs*. According to Asmis, the Academic philosophers were in any case responsible for mobilizing a unified opposition against the Epicureans, drawing allies from various philosophical schools: 'I conclude, therefore, that the arguments against Epicurean induction in *On Signs* were shaped in the Academic school. It is plausible that Carneades first gave systematic form to these arguments. The Academic objections are indebted to the Stoics and others, just as the Epicurean answers are indebted to Stoics and others. It would not be at all surprising if Stoics such as Chrysippus also attacked Epicurean induction. But if they did, their arguments were reshaped by the Academics. The Academics may be seen as the master tacticians who led an army of opponents against the Epicureans. The troops under their command include Stoics, Empiricists, and others' (1996: 179).