

Prolepsis Citations from Long & Sedley

Post by "Don" of July 6, 2024 at 8:45 AM



Construction of Col.66 of On Piety. Is like this (Engraved 1844-1852 by

των καὶ πο[.....]
λη[- ca.12 -]
ον· πᾶν γὰρ[ρ.....]
οἴεται καθάπ[ερ ὀρί-]
ζεται χρό[νος, εἶναι]
πρόληψιν· [καὶ κα-]
θάπερ κάγ [τῷ δευ-]
τέρω καὶ [τριακοσ-]
τῷ, καὶ τῶν [θεῶν ἐ-]
10ναργεῖαι φησ[ὶν κατα-]
λαμβάνεσθα[ι τὸ ὄν],
καίπερ ἐν τῶν [ἐν ὑπο-]
κειμένοις ὄν, [τὴν δὲ]

φύσιν διανο[ητήν]
15[ῆ]ττον ἔχον [τῶν]
ἄλλων ὄντων [καὶ κα-]
[θόλ]ου πρὸς τῆ[ν...]
[7 lines missing]

That's A LOT of bracketed reconstructions. And its placement in the order of the text is a best guess, too, from my understanding.

Just because something fits in the number of letters doesn't necessarily convince me that that is the *correct* reconstruction. That said, the word πρόληψιν is tantalizingly right there. And I believe that the πᾶν doesn't have the usual definite article for it to refer to TO PAN "The All" "the universe." The author (again could be Philodemus or Phaedrus) could be referring to "all (somethings)" and not The All.

This exactly demonstrates my reluctance to rely too heavily on any of the Herculaneum papyri that are too heavily damaged to reliably read blocks of text and not interpolate and reconstruct what *might* have been there. There are good reliable sections of the *On Piety* papyri [like Col. 75 for example](#). Unfortunately, Col. 66 isn't necessarily one of them from my perspective... even if we would REAAALLLY like to have more context for that πρόληψιν.