

# Tetrapharmakos: Alternate Translations and Content of PHerc. 1005 from Reviews

Post by "Cassius" of March 19, 2020 at 8:40 PM

Thank you for all this detailed information Eugenios!!!

## [Quote from Eugenios](#)

She rejects outright some of Sbordone's restorations, including those that appear as fragments 262 and 263 in the second edition of Arrighetti's Epicuro. Others are greatly altered.

The details in the commentaries you quote are fascinating, and worth all sorts of discussion, but I cannot (nor do I think I should) shake the concern that SO MUCH is speculation, and for us to have any idea which position is correct we would have to have access to the original texts from which these scholars are generating their restorations. We don't have access to those, nor would most of us have much capability of reaching an independent determination if we had it.

What I would like to have, however, would be at least pictures of the reconstructed pages from which they are working. When I see the material laid out in the various works that I have seen, it seems helpful to me to see "graphically" how much is lost, and how fragmentary the lines are, and that seems to me to be a good caution against reading too much into something.

Both of the JSTOR excerpts you quoted have fascinating details, but do we really have any way of knowing which of those details, if any, are really well founded!?

It reinforces my concern about the "tetrapharmakon" that it seems to appear in a book work which is significantly directed at disputes within the Epicurean community, especially including issues of oversimplification. It is not out of the question that this formulation was one which Philodemus was criticizing as oversimplistic (which is my concern with it), rather than praising it as useful.

But I don't want to end on a negative note. This stuff is fascinating!! Thank you!