

Selected Bibliography on the "Master Argument", Diodorus Cronus, Philo the Dialectician

BIBLIOGRAPHY (in progress)

1. *Ammonius and the Seabattle. Texts, Commentary, and Essays*. Edited by Seel Gerhard, Schneider Jean-Pierre, and Schulthess Daniel. Berlin: de Gruyter 2000.
Ammonius on Aristotle: *De Interpretatione* 9 (and 7,1-17).
Greek text established by A. Busse, reprinted from CAG IV/v. English translation by David Blamk, revised by J.-P. Schneider and G. Seel.
Philosophical commentary by Gerhard Seel. Essays by Mario Mignucci and Gerhard Seel.
Contents: Part I. Preliminaries 1; Part II. Gerahrd Seel: Introduction. Future contingencies: the problem and its possible solutions 13; Part III. Ammonius on Aristotle: *De Interpretatione* 9 (and 7, 1-17). Greek text with an English translation 39; Part IV: Gerhard Seel: Philosophical commentary 131; Part V: Essays. Gerhard Seel: Ammonius' semantics of the assertoric sentence 213; Gerhard Seel: 'In a definite way true'; truth values and their modalisation in Ammonius 234; Mario Mignucci: Ammonius on future contingent propositions 247; Part VI: Bibliography 285; Part VII: Index of names 307; Index of passages cited 310-312.
2. Anscombe Gertrude Elizabeth Margaret, "Aristotle and the Sea Battle. *De Interpretatione* Chapter IX," *Mind* 65: 1-15 (1956).
Appendix: A note on Diodorus Cronus.
Revised reprint in: J. M. E. Moravcsik (ed.) - *Aristotle: A Collection of Critical Essays* - London, Macmillan, 1968, pp. 15-33 and in: *The Collected philosophical papers of G.E.M. Anscombe* - Vol. I, Oxford, Blackwell, 1981, pp. 44-56
3. Barreau Hervé, "Le Maître Argument de Diodore: son interprétation traditionnelle, sa signification historique, sa reconstitution contemporaine," *Cahiers Fundamenta Scientiae* 46: 1-51 (1975).
4. Barreau Hervé and Picolet Françoise, "Suite et fin sur le Maître Argument de Diodore," *Cahiers Fundamenta Scientiae* 88: 1-53 (1978).
1) Françoise Picolet: *Nouvelles remarques à propos de Diodore*, pp. 7-11; Hervé Barreau: *Conception diodoréenne et conception stoïcienne du Maître Argument*, pp. 15-53.
5. Barreau Hervé. Cléanthe et Chrysippe face au maître-argument de Diodore. In *Les Stoïciens et leur logique*. Edited by Brunschwig Jacques. Paris: Vrin 2006. pp. 283-301
Deuxième édition revue, augmentée et mise à jour (Première édition 1978, pp. 21-40).
6. Bäck Allan, "Sailing through the Sea Battle," *Ancient Philosophy* 12: 133-151 (1992).
7. Becker Oskar, "Über den "Kurieon Logos" des Diodoros Kronos," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 99: 289-304 (1956).
8. Blanché Robert, "Sur l'interprétation du *kurieon logos*," *Revue Philosophique* 155: 133-149 (1965).
9. Bosley Richard, "In Support of an Interpretation of *On Int.* 9," *Ajatus* 37: 29-40 (1978).
10. Boudot Maurice, "L'argument dominateur et le temps cyclique," *Études Philosophiques*: 271-298 (1983).
11. Celluprica Vincenza. *Il capitolo 9 del De interpretatione di Aristotele. Rassegna di studi 1930-1973*. Bologna: Il Mulino 1977.
12. Celluprica Vincenza. L'argomento dominatore di Diodoro Crono e il concetto di possibile in Crisippo. In *Scuole socratiche minori e filosofia ellenistica*. Edited by Giannantoni Gabriele. Bologna: Il Mulino 1977. pp. 55-73
13. Celluprica Vincenza, "Necessità megarica e fatalità stoica," *Elenchos* 3: 361-385 (1984).
14. Eck Job van, "Another interpretation of Aristotle's *De interpretatione* IX. A support for the so-called second oldest or "mediaeval" interpretation," *Vivarium. An International Journal for the*

Philosophy and Intellectual Life of the Middle Ages and Renaissance 26: 19-38 (1988).

15. Frede Dorothea. *Aristoteles und die Seeschlacht. Das Problem der contingentia futura in De interpretatione* 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1970.
16. Frede Dorothea, "Omne quod est quando est necesse est esse," *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 54: 153-167 (1972).
17. Frede Dorothea, "The sea-battle reconsidered. A defence of the traditional interpretation," *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 3: 31-87 (1985).
"In De Interpretatione 9, Aristotle treats the relationship between the truth and necessity of future contingents differently from those of the past or present, as exemplified by his consideration of the statement "A sea battle will take place tomorrow". While Aristotle clearly believes in the application of the "principle of bivalence" to the present and past, he does limit its application to the future, despite recent claims to the contrary."
18. Frede Dorothea, "Fatalism and future truth," *Proceedings of the Boston Area Colloquium in Ancient Philosophy* 6: 195-227 (1990).
19. Gaskin Richard, "Alexander's Sea Battle: a discussion of Alexander of Aphrodisias *De Fato* 10," *Phronesis. A Journal for Ancient Philosophy* 38: 75-94 (1993).
20. Gaskin Richard. *The Sea-Battle and the Master Argument. Aristotle and Diodorus Cronus on the Metaphysics of the Future*. Berlin: de Gruyter 1995.
21. Gaskin Richard, "Sea battles, worn-out cloaks, and other matters of interpretation: Weidemann on Aristotle's *peri Hermeneias*," *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 78: 48-59 (1996).
22. Giannantoni Gabriele, "Il kyrieuon logos di Diodoro Crono," *Elenchos* 2: 239-272 (1981).
23. Goodman Lenn E. The Diodorean Modalities and the Master Argument. In *From Puzzles to Principles? Essays on Aristotle's Dialectic*. Edited by Sim May. Lanham: Lexington Books 1999. pp. 15-37
24. Hintikka Jaakko, "The once and future sea fight: Aristotle's discussion of future contingents in *De interpretatione* IX," *Philosophical Review* 74: 461-492 (1964).
Revised and reprinted as Chapter VIII in: J. Hintikka - *Time and necessity. Studies in Aristotle's theory of modality* - New York, Oxford University Press, 1973, pp. 147-178
25. Hintikka Jaakko, Knuuttila Simo, and Remes Unto, "Aristotle on Modality and Determinism," *Acta Philosophica Fennica* 29 (1977).
26. Judson Lindsay, "La bataille navale d'aujourd'hui. *De interpretatione* IX," *Revue de Philosophie Ancienne* 6: 5-37 (1988).
"Réexamen, mené dans la perspective de la philosophie analytique, des arguments discutés par Aristote à propos des futurs contingents et illustrés par l'exemple de la bataille navale. Aristote ne nie pas la "vérité-par-avance", mais il explique plutôt ce qui est erroné dans l'argument nécessitariste. En outre, il ne répond pas dans le *De int.* IX à l'argument de la vérité future, mais à un argument subtilement apparenté à celui-ci. Enfin il propose une solution qui vaut non seulement pour le problème qu'il discute, mais aussi pour d'autres problèmes posés par l'idée de "vérité-par-avance".
27. Kneale William and Kneale Martha, "Implication in the 4th Century," *Mind* 44: 484-495 (1935).
28. Michael Frederick Seymour, "What is the Master Argument of Diodorus Cronos?," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 13: 229-235 (1976).
29. Mignucci Mario, "L'argomento dominante e la teoria dell'implicazione in Diodoro Crono," *Vichiana* 3: 3-28 (1966).
30. Mignucci Mario. Ammonius on future contingent propositions. In *Rationality in Greek thought*. Edited by Frede Michael and Striker Gisela. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1996. pp. 279-310
31. Muller Robert, "Signification historique et philosophique de l'argument Souverain de Diodore," *Revue de Philosophie Ancienne* 2: 3-37 (1984).
32. Picolet Françoise, "A propos d'une recostitution recente du Maître Argument de Diodore Cronus," *Cahiers Fundamenta Scientiae* 72: 1-12 (1977).
Sur Barreau (1975).
33. Purtil Richard L., "The Master Argument," *Apeiron* 7: 31-36 (1973).
34. Rescher Nicholas, "A Version of the 'Master Argument' of Diodorus," *Journal of Philosophy* 63: 438-445 (1966).
Revised version as a Section of : *Truth and Necessity in Temporal Perspective*, in: N. Rescher,

Essays in Philosophical Analysis, Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburg Press, 1969, pp. 271-302 (see note 36, p. 296).

35. Schuhl Pierre-Maxime. *Le dominateur et les possibles*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France 1960.
36. Seel Gerhard, "Diodore domine-t-il Aristote?," *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale* 87: 293-313 (1982).
37. Spellman Lynne, "DI 9. An exegetical stalemate," *Apeiron* 14: 115-124 (1980).
38. Sutula John, "Diodorus and the "Master Argument"," *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 14: 323-344 (1976).
"Diodorus Cronus was a Megaric logician who was reputed to have derived from uncontroversial premises the surprising conclusion that the possible is that which either is or will be the case. Versions of his lost argument have been reconstructed recently by Prior, Hintikka, and Rescher. I analyze and compare these versions and argue that none of them forms a sound argument."
39. Talanga Josip. *Zukunftsurteile und fatum. Eine Untersuchung über Aristoteles' De interpretatione 9 und Ciceros De fato, mit einem Überblick über die spätantiken Heimarmene-Lehren*. Bonn: Habelt 1986.
See in particular pp. 169-185.
40. Vuillemin Jules, "L'argument dominateur," *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale* 84: 225-257 (1979).
41. Vuillemin Jules, "Le chapitre IX du *De interpretatione* d'Aristote. Vers une réhabilitation de l'opinion comme connaissance probable des choses contingentes," *Philosophiques* 10: 15-52 (1983).
42. Vuillemin Jules. *Nécessité ou contingence: L'aporie de Diodore et les systèmes philosophiques*. Paris: Éditions du Minuit 1984.
43. Vuillemin Jules, "Un système de fatalisme logique: Diodore Kronos," *Revue de Philosophie Ancienne* 3: 39-72 (1984).
Repris comme Chapitre III dans: J. Vuillemin, *Nécessité ou contingence. L'aporie de Diodore et les systèmes philosophiques*, Paris, Éditions de Minuit, 1984.
44. Vuillemin Jules. Le chapitre IX du *De Interpretatione* et la connaissance probable. In *Aristote aujourd'hui*. Edited by Sinaceur Mohammed Allal. Paris: Éditions érès 1988. pp. 77-93
45. Vuillemin Jules. *Necessity or Contingency. The Master Argument*. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information 1996.
46. Vuillemin Jules, "Nouvelles réflexions sur l'Argument Dominateur: une double référence au temps dans la seconde prémisse," *Philosophie* 55: 14-30 (1997).
"Révision de l'interprétation modale de la seconde prémisse de l'argument dominateur d'Epictète, selon laquelle l'impossible ne suit pas logiquement du possible, développée par l'Auteur dans son ouvrage intitulé *Nécessité ou contingence: l'aporie de Diodore et les systèmes philosophiques* (1984). L'Auteur reconstruit son analyse de l'argument aristotélicien du *De Coelo* et aménage le système chrysippéen à la lumière des principes aristotéliciens de la nécessité conditionnelle et de la contraction synchronique de la possibilité."
47. Weidemann Hermann, "Das sogenannte Meisterargument des Diodoros Kronos und der Aristotelische Möglichkeitsbegriff," *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 69: 18-53 (1987).
48. Weidemann Hermann, "Aristotle, the Megarics, and Diodorus Cronus on the Notion of Possibility," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 45: 131-148 (2008).
49. Wheeler Samuel C.III, "Megarian Paradoxes as Eleatic Arguments," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 20: 287-295 (1983).
50. White Michael J., "Necessity and unactualized possibilities in Aristotle," *Philosophical Studies* 31: 298 (1980).
51. Zeller Eduard, "Über Den Kupieuwv des Megarikers Diodorus," *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*: 151-159 (1882).
Reprinted in E. Zeller, *Kleine Schriften*, Band I, ed. Otto Leuze, Berlin, Reimer, 1910, pp. 252-262.