

Selected Bibliography on the *Master Argument*, Diodorus Chronus, Philo the Dialectician

BIBLIOGRAPHY (in progress)

1. Barreau, Hervé. 1975. "Le Maître Argument de Diodore: son interprétation traditionnelle, sa signification historique, sa reconstitution contemporaine." *Cahiers Fundamenta Scientiae* no. 46:1-51.
2. ———. 2006. "Cléanthe et Chrysippe face au maître-argument de Diodore." In *Les Stoiciens et leur logique*, edited by Brunschwig, Jacques, 283-301. Paris: Vrin. Deuxième édition revue, augmentée et mise à jour (Première édition 1978, pp. 21-40).
3. Barreau, Hervé, and Picolet, Françoise. 1978. "Suite et fin sur le Maître Argument de Diodore." *Cahiers Fundamenta Scientiae* no. 88:1-53.
Françoise Picolet: *Nouvelles remarques à propos de Diodore*, pp. 7-11; Hervé Barreau: *Conception diodoréenne et conception stoïcienne du Maître Argument*, pp. 15-53.
4. Becker, Oskar. 1956. "Über den "Kurieuon Logos" des Diodoros Kronos." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* no. 99:289-304.
5. Blanché, Robert. 1965. "Sur l'interprétation du *Kurieon logos*." *Revue Philosophique* no. 155:133-149.
6. Boudot, Maurice. 1983. "L'argument dominateur et le temps cyclique." *Études Philosophiques*:271-298.
7. Celluprica, Vincenza. 1977. "L'argomento dominatore di Diodoro Crono e il concetto di possibile in Crisippo." In *Scuole socratiche minori e filosofia ellenistica*, edited by Giannantoni, Gabriele, 55-73. Bologna: Il Mulino.
8. ———. 1984. "Necessità megarica e fatalità stoica." *Elenchos* no. 3:361-385.
9. Denyer, Nicholas. 1996. "Gaskin on the Master Argument." *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* no. 78:166-180.
"Richard Gaskin's *The Sea Battle and the Master Argument* (1995) falls into two roughly equal sections each corresponding to one half of its title. The first explores Aristotle's treatment in *De Interpretatione* 9 of his puzzle about tomorrow's sea-battle; the second puts some of these results to work in developing a novel account of the Master Argument of Diodorus Cronus. Moreover, throughout the book, Gaskin pays detailed attention to rival interpretations from the mass of commentary that has accumulated around these topics since ancient times, and that continues to accumulate ever faster in our own. On this aspect of Gaskin's book, I will have little more to say than that he discusses all the rival interpretations with a general good sense, and with a patience that I for one could not so long sustain. Moreover, I propose merely to summarise the salient points in Gaskin's own understanding of Aristotle. In the bulk of this critical notice, I will examine at much greater length what I myself take to be Gaskin's most interesting achievement: a reconstruction of the Master Argument that, whatever its faults, is both more plausible historically and

- more interesting philosophically than all but a handful of the umpteen reconstructions that are now on offer."
10. ———. 1999. "The Master Argument of Diodorus Cronus: a near miss." *Philosophiegeschichte und logische Analyse* no. 2:239-252.
"Diodorus' Master Argument was intended to show that whatever is possible either is or will be true. The intended conclusion does not follow from the extant premisses of the Master Argument. The Near Miss argues however, from those premisses alone, that nothing can be more than momentarily an exception to the Master Argument's intended conclusion. Strong arguments support even the most contentious of those premisses ("every past truth is necessary"). We therefore cannot easily ignore the Near Miss. Moreover, there are various supplementary premisses that would turn the Near Miss into an argument with the full force of the Master Argument itself. Each of Diodorus' ancient rivals, since they accepted such doctrines as eternal recurrence, temporal atomism, and the "extended" present, would grant him at least one of these supplementary premisses. So too would any modern who holds that time is not circular, has no beginning, and does not branch."
 11. Gaskin, Richard. 1995. *The Sea Battle and the Master Argument. Aristotle and Diodorus Cronus on the Metaphysics of the Future*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
 12. ———. 1999. "Tense logic and the Master Argument." *Philosophiegeschichte und logische Analyse* no. 2:203-224.
"Diodorus' Master Argument was intended to show that whatever is possible either is or will be true. The intended conclusion does not follow from the extant premisses of the Master Argument. The Near Miss argues however, from those premisses alone, that nothing can be more than momentarily an exception to the Master Argument's intended conclusion. Strong arguments support even the most contentious of those premisses ("every past truth is necessary"). We therefore cannot easily ignore the Near Miss. Moreover, there are various supplementary premisses that would turn the Near Miss into an argument with the full force of the Master Argument itself. Each of Diodorus' ancient rivals, since they accepted such doctrines as eternal recurrence, temporal atomism, and the "extended" present, would grant him at least one of these supplementary premisses. So too would any modern who holds that time is not circular, has no beginning, and does not branch."
 13. Giannantoni, Gabriele. 1981. "Il *kyrieuon logos* di Diodoro Crono." *Elenchos* no. 2:239-272.
 14. Goodman, Lenn E. 1999. "The Diodorean Modalities and the Master Argument." In *From Puzzles to Principles? Essays on Aristotle's Dialectic*, edited by Sim, May, 15-37. Lanham: Lexington Books.
 15. Hintikka, Jaakko. 1964. "Aristotle and the 'Master Argument' of Diodorus." *American Philosophical Quarterly* no. 1:101-114.
Revised and reprinted as Chapter IX in: J. Hintikka, *Time and Necessity. Studies in Aristotle's Theory of Modality*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1973, pp. 179-213.
 16. Hintikka, Jaakko, Knuutila, Simo, and Remes, Unto. 1977. "Aristotle on Modality and Determinism." *Acta Philosophica Fennica* no. 29.
 17. Meixner, Uwe, and Newen, Albert, eds. 1999. *Antike Philosophie mit einem Schwerpunkt zum Meisterargument = Ancient philosophy with a focus on the Master Argument*. Paderborn: Mentis.
Philosophiegeschichte und logische Analyse, Vol. 2.

- Inhalt / Contents: Einleitung 1; Uwe Meixner: Die Zentralität der analytischen Methode für die Philosophie, insbesondere die der Antike 25; Fernando Ferreira: On the Parmenidean misconception 37; Erwin Tegtmeier: Parmenides' problem of becoming and its solution 51; Theodor Ebert: Der fragende Sokrates : Überlegungen zur Interpretation platonischer Dialoge am Beispiel des Menon 67; Katarzyna Paprzycka: Socrates meets Carnap : explication in the Theaetetus 87; Burkhard Hafemann: Indefinite Aussagen und das kontingent Zukünftige 109; Fernando Inciarte: Aristotle and Aquinas 139; Nicholas White: Intrinsically valued parts of happiness: Aristotle, Butler, and Mill 149; Verity Harte, Meilssa Lane: Pyrrhonism and Protagoreanism : catching Sextus out? 157; Christian Schäfer: Proklos' Argument aus De malorum subsistentia 31, 5-21 in der modernen Interpretation 173; Hermann Weidemann: «Aus etwas Möglichem folgt nichts Unmögliches»: zum Verständnis der zweiten Prämisse von Diodors Meisterargument 189; Richard Gaskin, Richard: Tense logic and the Master Argument 203; Michael J. White: The lessons of Prior's Master Argument 225; Nicholas Denyer: The Master Argument of Diodorus Cronus 239-252.
18. Michael, Frederick S. 1976. "What is the Master Argument of Diodorus Cronos?" *American Philosophical Quarterly* no. 13:229-235.
 19. Mignucci, Mario. 1966. "L'argomento dominante e la teoria dell'implicazione in Diodoro Crono." *Vichiana* no. 3:3-28.
 20. Muller, Robert. 1984. "Signification historique et philosophique de l'argument Souverain de Diodore." *Revue de Philosophie Ancienne* no. 2:3-37.
 21. Picolet, Françoise. 1977. "A propos d'une reconstitution recente du Maître Argument de Diodore Cronus." *Cahiers Fundamenta Scientiae* no. 72:1-12. Sur Barreau (1975).
 22. Purtill, Richard L. 1973. "The Master Argument." *Apeiron* no. 7:31-36.
 23. Rescher, Nicholas. 1966. "A Version of the 'Master Argument' of Diodorus." *Journal of Philosophy* no. 63:438-445.
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).
 24. Schuhl, Pierre-Maxime. 1960. *Le dominateur et les possibles*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
 25. Seel, Gerhard. 1982. "Diodore domine-t-il Aristote?" *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale* no. 87:293-313.
 26. Sutula, John. 1976. "Diodorus and the "Master Argument"." *Southern Journal of Philosophy* no. 14:323-344.
"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."
 27. von Wright, Georg Henrik. 1979. "The 'Master Argument' of Diodorus." In *Essays in Honour of Jaakko Hintikka. On the Occasion of His Fiftieth Birthday on January 12, 1979*, edited by Saarinen, Esa, Hilpinen, Risto, Niiniluoto, Ilkka and Hintikka, Merill Provence, 297-307. Dordrecht: Reidel.

28. Vuillemin, Jules. 1979. "L'argument dominateur." *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale* no. 84:225-257.
29. ———. 1984. *Nécessité ou contingence: L'aporie de Diodore et les systèmes philosophiques*. Paris: Éditions du Minuit.
30. ———. 1984. "Un système de fatalisme logique: Diodore Kronos." *Revue de Philosophie Ancienne* no. 3:39-72.
Repris comme Chapitre III dans: J. Vuillemin, *Nécessité ou contingence. L'aporie de Diodore et les systèmes philosophiques*, Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1984.
31. ———. 1996. *Necessity or Contingency. The Master Argument*. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
32. ———. 1997. "Nouvelles réflexions sur l'Argument Dominateur: une double référence au temps dans la seconde prémisse." *Philosophie* no. 55:14-30.
"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."
33. Weidemann, Hermann. 1987. "Das sogenannte Meisterargument des Diodoros Kronos und der Aristotelische Möglichkeitsbegriff." *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* no. 69:18-53.
34. ———. 2008. "Aristotle, the Megarics, and Diodorus Cronus on the Notion of Possibility." *American Philosophical Quarterly* no. 45:131-148.
35. White, Michael J. 1999. "The Lessons of Prior's Master Argument." *Philosophiegeschichte und logische Analyse* no. 2:225-238.
"Diodorus' Master Argument was intended to show that whatever is possible either is or will be true. The intended conclusion does not follow from the extant premisses of the Master Argument. The Near Miss argues however, from those premisses alone, that nothing can be more than momentarily an exception to the Master Argument's intended conclusion. Strong arguments support even the most contentious of those premisses ("every past truth is necessary"). We therefore cannot easily ignore the Near Miss. Moreover, there are various supplementary premisses that would turn the Near Miss into an argument with the full force of the Master Argument itself. Each of Diodorus' ancient rivals, since they accepted such doctrines as eternal recurrence, temporal atomism, and the "extended" present, would grant him at least one of these supplementary premisses. So too would any modern who holds that time is not circular, has no beginning, and does not branch."
36. Zeller, Eduard. 1882. "Über Den *Kurieuon* des Megarikers Diodorus." *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*:151-159.
Reprinted in E. Zeller, *Kleine Schriften*, Band I, edited by Otto Leuze, Berlin: Reimer, 1910, pp. 252-262.

RELATED PAGES

[Index of the Section: History of Logic from Aristotle to Gödel](#)

[The Dialectical \(Megarian\) School and the Origins of Propositional Logic \(under construction\)](#)

[Bibliography on The Dialectical \(Megarian\) School](#)

Stoic Logic:

[Critical Editions and Translations of the Fragments and *Testimonia*](#)

[Stoic Logic: The Dialectic from Zeno to Chrysippus](#)

[The Stoic Doctrine of *Lekta* \(Sayables\)](#)

[Second Part: The Rhetoric \(under construction\)](#)

[Stoic Philosophy of Language and Grammar \(under construction\)](#)

Annotated Bibliographies on Ancient Stoicism:

[Stoic Logic. First Part: A - E](#)

[Stoic Logic. Second Part: F - Z](#)

[Early Stoic Logicians: Zeno of Citium, Cleanthes, Chrysippus](#)

[Philosophy of Language, Grammar and Rhetoric](#)

[On the website "Theory and History of Ontology"](#)

[The Stoic Doctrine of *Supreme Genera* \(Categories\)](#)

[The Stoic Doctrine of "Something" as Supreme Genus \(under construction\)](#)

[Stoic Theory of Categories](#)

Stoic Ontology