PAPIRI LETTERARI GRECI E LATINI

a cura di MARIO CAPASSO

CONGEDO EDITORE

Pubblicazioni del Dipartimento di Filologia
Classica e Medioevale

Comitato Scientifico

Mario Capasso (Direttore), Pietro Giannini, Maria Cervellera

Questo volume è stato pubblicato con il contributo erogato dall'Università degli Studi di Lecce al Dipartimento di Filologia Classica e Medioevale

ISBN 887786494X

Tutti i diritti riservati

CONGEDO EDITORE - 1992

KNUT KLEVE - FRANCESCA LONGO AURICCHIO

HONEY FROM THE GARDEN OF EPICURUS

Epicurus has found the truth

After Epicurus we need not search for the truth. Epicurus has found it for us, everything is in his books. As Lucretius says in the prooemium to his third book: "As bees in the florwey glades sip all the sweets, so we likewise feed on all your golden words ... worthy of life eternal" (3, 10ff., Rouse's trans.).

What is left to do?

One may ask what there is left for the adherents of Epicurus to do except to take the master's doctrine to heart and enjoy life like the intermundane gods, free from fear of death and superstition. The right doctrine had, of course, to be preserved and spread, also to the barbariáns, like Lucretius did to the Romans. And the doctrine had to be defended against old enemies, like Plato, who always could threaten the disciples' peace of mind, and against new enemies who might appear, like the Stoics. Preservation and defence are the two chief elements to be found in Lucretius and the texts from Herculaneum. Colotes wrote anti-commentaries to the dialogues of Plato [1]. In Philodemus' "On Piety" popular religion is criticized and so are all philosophers from Thales to the Stoics for their theological theories [2]. "On Economy" is aimed at the Xenophontic Socrates and his views on management [3], "On Signs" at Stoic logic [4]. The opponents of Epicureanism are arrested for their lack of consequence and because their views are contrary to experience [5].

Epicurus and Philodemus on rhetoric

From the scarce sources Usener gives in addition to the Herculaneum ones, it appears that Epicurus has written a work "On Rhetoric" where he

[1] W. Crönert, *Kolotes und Menedemos*, repr. Amsterdam 1965, p. 162 ff.

[2] H. Diels, *Doxographi Graeci*, 1879, pp. 530-550.

[3] K. Kleve, *Scurra Atticus, The Epicurean View of Socrates, Syzetesis*, Studi sull'epicureismo greco e romano, offerti a M. Gigante, vol. I, Napoli 1983, pp. 238-242.

[4] De Lacy et al., *Philodemus on Methods of Inference, La Scuola di Epicuro* I, Napoli 1978, pp. 214-222.

[5] Cf. K. Kleve, 'The philosophical polemics in Lucretius', *Entrentiens sur l'antiquité classique*, vol. XXIV, 1974, pp. 63-70.

rejects rhetoric. He writes about rhetoric, Plutarch says, "to avoid rhetoric" [6]. Epicurus did not give rhetoric status as a special art or *technē* – it had eventually to be a *kakotechnia* which spoils natural speech (fr. 51). It is everyday language which gives the clearness (*safēneia*) which alone counts in speech [7].

Philodemus also wrote "On Rhetoric", in seven books, and he gives more. S. Sudhaus made the papyrus texts available in the 1890s [8]. "Eine grosse Leistung", R. Philippson calls it [9], quite correctly when one thinks of the bad condition of the scrolls. H.M. Hubbell's translation and commentary appeared in 1920 [10]. A considerable editorial work has been done in recent times by M. Gigante's pupils [11]. Thanks to reading in microscope the texts have become more certain. Today we even have the possibility of getting new texts from Philodemus' "On Rhetoric" because of B. Fosse's method of taking off the so called "sovrapposti" (papyrus layers which cover underlaying text) [12].

On R. Philippson's estimate Philodemus' "On Rhetoric" comprises one third of the collected texts which were opened with the method of A. Piaggio from the 1750s [13]. This indicates an exceptional interest in rhetoric in the Papyrus Villa in Herculaneum, stronger than in any philosophical problem. This may be deceptive. Of the papyri which have been unrolled with Fosse's method since 1983 no one seems to be about rhetoric (cf. note 39), so the rhetorical share of the text volume is decreasing. But it is, of course, still evident that rhetoric has been a matter of great importance for

[6] Plut. *Adv. Col.* 33, 1127a (USENER fr. 109).

[7] USENER fr. 54. Cf. *Ep. ad Hdt.* 37-38 and J. FERGUSON, 'Epicurean Language-Theory and Lucretian Practice', *LCM* 12,1987, pp. 100-105. Cf. also G. MILANESE, *Lucida Carmina, Biblioteca di Aevum Antiquum* 3, Milano 1989.

[8] S. SUDHAUS, *Volumina rhetorica* I-II, Leipzig 1892-1896, ID., *Supplementum* 1895 (the two first books).

[9] R. PHILIPPSON, 'Philodemos', *RE* XIX, 1937, 2453, 24.

[10] H.M. HUBBELL, 'The Rhetorica of Philodemus', translation and commentary, *Trans. of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* 23/1920, pp. 243-382.

[11] F. LONGO AURICCHIO, *Philodemus peri rhetorikes* I-II, *Ricerche sui Papiri Ercolanesi* III, Napoli 1977, EAD., 'Frammenti inediti di un libro della Retorica di Filodemo (*PHerc.* 463)', *CErc* 12,1982, pp. 67-83; M. FERRARIO, 'Frammenti del V libro della Retorica di Filodemo (*PHerc.* 1669)', *CErc* 10,1980, pp. 55-124; M.G. CAPPELLUZZO, 'Per una nuova edizione di un libro della Retorica filodemea (*PHerc.* 1004)', *CErc* 6, 1976, pp. 69-76.

[12] Esp. in *PHerc.* 697 (in collaboration with S. Laursen), *PHerc.* 1015 (F. Longo Auricchio) and *PHerc.* 1426 (J. Hammerstaedt).

[13] *RE* XIX, 1937, 2453, 28.

Epicureans. Not only philosophical opponents had to be rebutted, the power of rhetoric was as great a danger for the disciples' peace of mind.

The last five books of Philodemus' "On Rhetoric" contain a criticism of school rhetoric and the philosophers who include it in their curriculum. It is no problem to conciliate these books with the fragments from Epicurus mentioned above or with the teaching of Epicurus in general. The first two books, however, raise difficulties. This will be a main problem in this paper. More below.

An introduction?

The third book is generally regarded as lost. Sudhaus suspected that some of the fragments of the so called "Hypomnematicum", which was thought to be a separate, earlier work on rhetoric by Philodemus, belong to the third book [14]. We shall not discuss this, just mention that, if this is correct, the third book might be a sort of introduction to the following ones: a short version of what the coming discussion is going to reveal. This way of presenting a theme is also in Lucretius [15]. Is this case we are invited to read the following books and be convinced that rhetoric and philosophy are essentially different subjects. Rhetoric is quasi-scientific, its values are more than dubious and its prospects of political success false. We can be certain to be immunized against the rhetorical plague. It is not easy to give a running summary of the contents of the books. The texts are fragmentary, and Philodemus' presentation is often confused. But we want to try because we think it may be helpful. Philodemus does not belong to every day reading even for classicists, but he is an important source to ancient rhetoric. The existing editions and commentaries are

[14] HUBBELL, p. 293. Cf. SUDHAUS vol. II, p. XIff. For the contents of the "Hypomnematicum" see HUBBELL, pp. 346-364 and SUDHAUS II, pp. 196-303. Palaeographical evidence is offered by G. CAVALLO, 'Libri scritture scribi a Ercolano', I Suppl. *CErc* 13, 1983, p. 63 f. Starting from CAVALLO's book, T. DORANDI, 'Per una ricomposizione dello scritto di Filodemo sulla Retorica', *ZPE* 82, 1990, pp. 59-87, makes a new and interesting hypothesis about the structure of Philodemus' "Rhetoric": the "Hypomnematicum" is the third book, *PHerc.* 832/1015 and 1004, which give criticism of the philosophical schools, are book five and six, and *PHerc.* 1669, which compares philosophy and rhetoric, is the last book, that is book seven. These last three books, whose number is uncertain, in the traditional order established by Sudhaus, were book six (*PHerc.* 832/1015), seven (*PHerc.* 1004) and five (*PHerc.* 1669). We follow here the traditional order, because Dorandi's article appeared when this paper was already in press, but we share his conclusions.

[15] E. ASMIS, 'Rhetoric and reason in Lucretius', *AJPh* 104, 1983, pp. 36-66, DORANDI, p. 69 f.

written for specialists and difficult to use for students who need a quick synopsis of what Philodemus actually meant.

General criticism of rhetoric

Book four[16] gives a general criticism of rhetoric. Philodemus thinks rhetorical education is superfluous. The natural language is qualification good enough for speaking correctly and beautifully. We need not imitate models like Isocrates, Thucydides or Demosthenes.

It is what we mean, and not the embellishment of speech which is important. We will not be able to avoid ambiguities by studying rhetoric. The claim of the rhetors that they are able to express themselves about any subject, is ridiculous. To avoid ambiguity one has to study the subject in question. Only professionals can present technical problems and argue about them, a physician about medicine, an architect about housebuilding, a musician about music, and a mathematician about geometry.

To give a speech presupposes only natural talent. With all his rhetorical ballast Isocrates never managed that.

The rhetor's way of arguing is much inferior to the philosophers'. Their enthymemes are amputated syllogisms.

Rhetorical education is presumably a preparation to political practice. The rhetors regard the philosophers as remote from life. But, Philodemus says, only philosophers can explain what virtue, vice and happiness are. By combining rhetoric and politics the pupils of the rhetorical schools are lead on to a world of false values. It becomes important to consider the favour of the multitude and the voters and tune one's speech thereafter.

As we see, not all of Philodemus' views are equally original, but then he does not try to hide that they have been picked up elsewhere. He refers to Plato's "Gorgias" and "Protagoras", among others. If it seemed convenient, the Epicureans could be eclectic, not only in regard to rhetoric. Epicurus himself and Lucretius are eclectic in their physical views[17].

Philodemus criticizes several hellenistic rhetoricians and philosophers. This shall not be dealt with in any detail here[18].

[16] Text, translation and commentary SUDHAUS, vol. I, pp. 147-225, HUBBELL, pp. 293-305.

[17] Cf. D. SEDLEY, 'Epicurus and his Professional Rivals', *Cahiers de Philologie* 1/1976, 148; Lucr. I 743ff.: KENNEY's ed. of Lucr. III, p. 31f.

[18] On the Peripatetic Critolaus and the Stoic Diogenes of Babylon: K. SCHOEPSDAU, *Antike Vorstellungen von der Geschichte der griechischen Rhetorik*, Saarbrücken 1969. On the Megarian Alexinus: F. LONGO, 'I filosofi megarici nella "Retorica" di Filodemo', *CErc* 5, 1975, pp. 77-80.

Criticism of a manual?

Book five[19] seems to be a criticism, point by point, of a rhetorical manual. Apparently it has been a rather popular Greek manual from the time of Philodemus, or his teacher Zeno of Sidon. The author is unknown.

The schools of rhetoric, Philodemus contends, give no good preparation for political and legal practice. In these fields only experience counts. Rhetoric may at the most be used in festival speeches or written compositions[20] (here Philodemus refers to the epideictic or panegyrical rhetoric, of which we already ought to make a mental note).

The great work the pupils invest in the schools of rhetoric, is a waste. The rhetorical education is also expensive, while philosophy is free.

Rhetoric does not open up for the great possibilities in politics. Just a few reach the top of the ladder, most people have to be content in the shadow of the rich and mighty and be ready to say and do what is expected of them.

The result of rhetoric may be disastrous. One's smart formulations may lead to loss of friends, molestations, exile, torture and execution.

No question can be finally decided by means of rhetoric. The conclusions of the rhetors shift with the wind, with the favour of the voters or with the interest of one's client. Only philosophy can give definitive answers to the important problems in life. Everybody, both rhetors and philosophers, can meet misfortunes. But only the philosopher is mentally prepared, say, for death, with the conviction that death is nothing to us.

Criticism of philosophical rhetoric

Book six and seven give a criticism of the philosophical schools which have admitted rhetoric into their curricula and hold out expectations to their pupils that they will be able to function both as philosophers and statesmen. In book six[21] Nausiphanes and Aristotle are criticized. Philodemus has probably taken the criticism directly from Epicurus. Epicurus had been Nausiphanes' pupil and had a good knowledge of the Peripatetic school[22].

[19] Text, trans. and comm. SUDHAUS vol. I, pp. 131-167, HUBBELL, pp. 305-318, FERRARIO (see note 11).

[20] SUDHAUS vol. II, p. 135, 28ff. (fr. V).

[21] Text, trans. and comm. SUDHAUS vol. I, pp. 270-325, vol. II, pp. 1-64; HUBBELL, pp. 318-332.

[22] Cf. ARRIGHETTI's ed. of Epicurus, fr. [127] 12, where Aristotles' *Analytics* is cited.

Criticism of Democritean rhetoric

Nausiphanes was an adherent of Democritus' atomism [23]. According to Philodemus he had the bizarre idea that the pupils who studied philosophy of nature in his school got an all round education with answers to all questions, included human relations [24]. His pupils would become the best politicians, knowing how to treat their fellow beings.

Philodemus points out that politics and philosophy are two totally different subjects. The voters will not be persuaded by philosophical arguments, even when given in short-form, the so called enthymemes. People are too impatient and stupid to listen to philosophical lectures. Their sympathies and preferences change rapidly, so it will be a problem for the slow philosopher to keep up with the political galopp. The philosopher will realize that no matter how truly and rightly he speaks, people will not listen to him. He will be overrun by the experienced politician trained in manipulation.

Philodemus ends his criticism of Nausiphanes with a praise of the Epicurean school, where the disciples are duly warned against taking part in political life.

Criticism of Aristotle

Philodemus regrets that Aristotle [25] took up rhetorical exercises in his school in the afternoon and made politics a branch of philosophy [26]. Aristotle believed that the state needed the philosophers and that the philosophers could create a better state, at all events a state which was more friendly towards philosophy. In this way Aristotle abandoned his ideal of a *bios theoretikos*. Instead of pointing to the quiet happiness of contemplation he forced his pupils to meddle in other people's affairs. He deprived them of the horn of Amalthea and handed them the bottomless cup of the sophists [27].

[23] S. SUDHAUS, 'Nausiphanes', *RhMus* 48, 1893, pp. 321-341; R. MÜLLER, *Rhetorik und Politik in Philodems Rhetorica, Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia*, II, Napoli 1984, p. 475f.; F. LONGO-A. TEPEDINO, *Per un riesame della polemica epicurea contro Nausifane*, in *Democrito e l'atomismo antico*, Catania 1980, pp. 467-476.

[24] Certain sophists seem also to have had such an idea, cf. the parody in Aristoph. *Nub.* 1284f.

[25] S. SUDHAUS, 'Aristoteles in der Beurteilung des Epikur und Philodem', *RhMus* 48, 1893, pp. 552-564.

[26] SUDHAUS vol. II, p. 50, HUBBELL, p. 329f.

[27] SUDHAUS vol. II, p. 53, col. L 12ff.

But Aristotle's motive was not only his discontent with political affairs. He also envied Isocrates, and would, like him, be both rhetorician and philosopher. In his way Aristotle became a more dangerous enemy for Epicurus than rhetoricians themselves. But Aristotle's dream of making philosophical rhetoric a political force will never be fulfilled. The Golden Age has passed and swift solutions are not possible[28].

Criticism of Stoics

In book seven[29] Philodemus continues the criticism of the philosophers who have allied themselves with rhetoric, and the Stoics, the main enemies of Epicureanism at his time, are the next.

Philodemus takes his point of departure in the Stoic thesis that the wise man cannot make mistakes. But mistakes have demonstrably been made by Stoics in power. Perhaps nothing is wrong with the Stoic doctrine, but the doctrine has been abused! In this case the abuser is no wise man. To be a politician the philosopher must change. He cannot speak the truth any more, but has to adapt his arguments to the expectations of the multitude. To get a break-through he must advocate false values: wealth, strength, beauty, material benefits. He must also compromise with his argumentation, so that the multitude can understand him, and sinks down to the low level of mass communication. In brief, if the philosopher becomes a statesman, he stops being a philosopher. The philosophers cannot help the state. With all their virtue (*kalokagathia*) they have never been able to pass a law[30].

Criticism agrees with Epicurus

The contents of book three to seven can easily be reconciled with the views of Epicurus: The contemplative life is to be preferred to the unrest and dangers of publicity: *bene qui latuit, bene vixit* (Ov. *Trist.* III 4, 25). The lasting pleasure ought to be preferred to the shortsighted advantages of politics. Natural speech is superior to mannered rhetoric. Clear thought sees through the rhetorical tricks of persuasion.

So far, so good. The difficulties lie in the first and second book.

[28] SUDHAUS vol. II, p. 63, col. 46.

[29] Text, trans. and comm. SUDHAUS vol. I, pp. 326-385, HUBBELL, pp. 332-341.

[30] SUDHAUS vol. I, p. 383 col. CX 1ff. R. MÜLLER (*op. cit.* note 23) tries to give a positive picture of the Epicurean relation to politics, p. 478ff.

Is epideictic rhetoric an art?

In the first book [31] Philodemus discusses what an art (*technē*) is. An art presupposes principles and methods which ensure a certain result. It is not enough to build on innate capacities, practice or chance. Instances of arts are medicine, sculpture, grammar, architecture and, even more, dialectics and geometry where the principles mean everything, contrary to medicine, where chance has a free hand.

Is rhetoric an art? This question is answered in book two [32]. Surprisingly the Epicureans are divided in their answer. The schools in Rhodes and Cos maintain that rhetoric is no art, pointing out that Epicurus regarded rhetoric in its entirety as based on exercise without any theoretical foundation which could ensure certain results. This was the case both with the deliberative and forensic rhetoric (intended for political assemblies and courts), and also the epideictic rhetoric (intended for panegyric and literature).

To the contrary, Philodemus and the *contubernium* in Herculaneum mean that epideictic rhetoric build upon principles and methods which can be taught and secure good results. Epideictic rhetoric, then, can be used with some certainty to make assertions seem persuasive. But with regard to deliberative and forensic rhetoric Philodemus agrees with his colleagues in Rhodes and Cos: these forms of rhetoric lack principles and methods. Here only natural capability and exercise are counting, and the results are completely in the air.

Philodemus further contends that epideictic rhetoric is the original rhetoric, introduced by the sophists and Isocrates and therefore called sophistic (*sophistikē*). Philodemus does not refer to the new sophists [33], but the old ones. This may be supported by Cicero who uses the same terminology in *Orator* 42 [34], also referring to the old sophists (*ibid.* 39 f.). Deliberative and forensic rhetoric, Philodemus seems to mean, are degenerated forms of sophistic rhetoric which have lost their professional fundamentation.

What did Epicurus mean?

Philodemus claims that this was also the view of Epicurus, and in addition brings in the old Epicureans Metrodorus and Hermarchus, so that

[31] Text, trans. and comm. LONGO AURICCHIO, pp. 3-22, SUDHAUS vol. I, pp. 1-12, HUBBELL, pp. 265-267.

[32] Text, trans. and comm. LONGO AURICCHIO, pp. 24-288, SUDHAUS vol. I, pp. 14-146, HUBBELL, pp. 267-293.

[33] HUBBELL, p. 255ff., FERRARIO, p. 81ff.

[34] 'In illo epidictico genere, quod diximus proprium sophistarum'.

he has the whole Epicurean trinity on his side. He also contends that his own teacher, Zeno of Sidon (probably the scholarchus of the Garden in Athens), agreed with him. The colleagues in Rhodes and Cos are harshly rebutted: Since they in writing have attacked the founders of the school, they are almost like parricides (*patraloiai*).

Philodemus has some difficulties in proving his thesis. One unambiguous citation from Epicurus had been enough. We are left with citations and paraphrases of the school fathers, interpreted in such a way that they seem to have accepted epideictic rhetoric as an art.

It has clearly been important for Philodemus to get a breakthrough for the view that epideictic rhetoric is an art. We are faced with no petty school difference. The choice of words is strong ("parricides"), and the view is already presented in the two first books, before the general presentation of rhetoric. It is forced upon the reader[35].

Why is it so important? But first: Is it really so that Epicurus and his nearest followers made an exception for epideictic rhetoric? Epicurus could write elegantly, which he has demonstrated in the *Letter to Menoeceus*. In other works he is clumsy and almost unreadable in spite of his principle that daily language ought to be used even in scientific writings[36]. The *Letter to Menoeceus* is just written in an elegant daily language. It is not easy to understand why Epicurus should need any embroidered rhetoric à la Isocrates, whose "Panegyricus", "Panathenaicus", "Busiris", "Helena" and "On Peace" are mentioned as style models for epideictic rhetoric by Philodemus in book two[37].

It seems that Epicurus could be interpreted in two ways: either as totally inimical to rhetoric, or as giving some concessions to epideictic rhetoric, the least dangerous branch, so to say, of oratory. These two ways of interpreting the Master had apparently lived peacefully together for a couple of centuries until they clashed vehemently in the time of Philodemus.

[35] Philod. *Rhet.* I col. VII 18ff. (LONGO AURICCHIO, p. 21, SUDHAUS vol. I, p. 12). Cf. also F. LONGO AURICCHIO-A. TEPEDINO GUERRA, 'Aspetti e problemi della dissidenza epicurea', *CErc* 12, 1982, pp. 30-32. On the problem of Philodemus' citations, see D. SEDLEY, *Philosophical Allegiance in the Greco-Roman World,* in *Philosophia Togata* ed. by J. BARNES and M. GRIFFIN, Oxford 1989, pp. 107-117; F. LONGO AURICCHIO, 'Retorica da Epicuro a Lucrezio', *CErc* 20, 1990, p. 177 n. 3.

[36] *Letter to Herodotus* 37-38.

[37] Philod. *Rhet.* II col. XXVII 20 ff. (LONGO AURICCHIO, p. 231ff., SUDHAUS vol. I, p. 127f., HUBBELL, p. 285). HUBBELL (256) means that already Epicurus regarded epideictic rhetoric as an art, likewise R. MÜLLER (*op. cit.* n. 23, p. 481ff.) and M. FERRARIO, 'La concezione della retorica da Epicuro a Filodemo', *American Studies in Papyrology* 23, Chico 1981, pp. 145-152.

Why epideictic rhetoric?

The clear acceptance of *epideictic rhetoric* is something new in the history of Epicureanism. But why has it been accepted? In some way or other it has been so badly needed that it had to be incorporated in the right doctrine and attached to the name of Epicurus, the authority.

But for what has it been needed? Was it Philodemus' teacher, Zeno of Sidon, who needed it? His writings are lost, but Cicero says that Zeno, differently from other Epicureans, spoke *distincte, graviter, ornate* (*Nat. deor.* I 59). Zeno also spoke Latin. He was the man who gave Socrates the nickname "clown of Attica", *scurra Atticus* (*ibid.* 93). In Diogenes Laërtius (VII 1.35) Zeno is *safēs*, "clear and distinct", but daily language ought to be sufficient to gain these qualities.

Or does Philodemus just speak for himself? In that case he can hardly mean his prose. It is clusmy and tortuous, anything but elegant (Philodemus' daily language as a professor?). His epigrams *are* elegant: *ita elegans, nihil ut fieri possit argutius*, Cicero says (*In Pis.* 70). But the epigrams have nothing to do with philosophy[38].

Lucretius in Herculaneum

Among the papyri unrolled since 1983 with the method of B. Fosse[39] there are several philosophical works in Greek, some of them probably by Philodemus (see below). Remains of some latin scrolls have also been found. One scroll (*PHerc.* 21) contains fragments from the sixth book of Ennius' *Annals*, and pieces from other scrolls (unnumbered) contain fragments from Lucretius' *De rerum natura* book one, three, four and five. This means that the whole Lucretius has once been present in the Herculaneum library[40].

The handwriting in the Lucretius papyri is greater than in any other work from Herculaneum, Greek or Latin, and the text is written on excep-

[38] Was Philodemus a philosopher in the morning and a pornographer in the afternoon, or do the epigrams belong to his renounced youth? Cf. M. GIGANTE, *Ricerche Filodemee*, Napoli 1983², pp. 175-178. On the problem of epideictic rhetoric in Philodemus, see F. LONGO AURICCHIO, 'Testimonianze dalla "Retorica" di Filodemo sulla concezione dell'oratoria nei primi maestri epicurei', *CErc* 15, 1985, p. 32 e *Scetticismo e Epicureismo sulla retorica*, in *Atti del XVII Congr. Int. Papirol.*, Napoli 1984, p. 461, 470; A. ANGELI, 'L'esattezza scientifica in Epicuro e Filodemo', *CErc* 15, 1985, p. 72 s.

[39] M. CAPASSO-A. ANGELI, 'Papiri aperti col metodo osloense (1983-1989): descrizione e classificazione', *CErc* 19, 1989, pp. 265-270.

[40] K. KLEVE, 'Ennius in Herculaneum', *CErc* 20, 1990, pp. 5-16; ID., 'Lucretius in Herculaneum', *CErc* 19, 1989, pp. 5-27.

tionally thin papyrus[41]. The great letters gave everybody, even the weak-sighted, a possibility of reading this fundamental text[42].

This is the first time Lucretius has been found in Herculaneum, 237 years after the papyri were discovered (in 1752). Several strange, but nevertheless quite popular theories have been furthered on the assumption that Lucretius was not among the papyri: that he was an unhappy and mad person who tried to find consolation and peace in the doctrine of Epicurus, without success, that he was a lonely wolf without contact with contemporary Epicureanism, that he had only read Epicurus and was unaware of the criticism of Stoicism which is so prominent in Philodemus[43].

Such theories have suffered a serious set-back after Lucretius *has* been found[44]. Lucretius has hardly been out of tune with his school. His work is meant to be an efficient and up to date help for the Romans to conquer fear of death and superstition[45].

Honey from the Garden of Epicurus

Lucretius was not out of date. On the contrary, his poem represents something new in the history of Epicureanism. He is himself very much aware of that. Twice he repeats that he traverses "distant tracks never yet trodden by any foot", loves "to pluck new flowers", and seeks "an illustrious chaplet from fields whence before this the muses have crowned the brows of none" (I 926ff., IV 1ff.):

> "Since this doctrine commonly seems somewhat harsh to those who have not used it, and the people shrink back from it, I have chosen to set forth my doctrine to you in sweetspeaking Pierian song, and as it were to touch it with the Muses' delicious honey, if by chance in such a way I might engage your mind in my verses ..." (I 943ff., IV 18ff., Rouse's trans.)

Lucretius presents Epicurus in panegyrical phrases. Panegyric was not only prominent in Greek rhetoric, but also in the Roman *laudationes funebres*[46], and so even more natural for Lucretius. Epideictic rhetoric applies

[41] Cf. the *charta regia* of Catullus 22,6.

[42] Cf. K. KLEVE, 'What Kind of Work did Lucretius Write?', *SO* 54, 1979, pp. 81-88.

[43] Bibliography and discussion: BAILEY's ed. of Lucr. vol. I 12, 5; KLEVE, *op. cit.* note 5; C.J. CLASSEN, 'Poetry and Rhetoric in Lucretius', *Probleme der Lukrezforschung* (ed. C.J. CLASSEN), Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 1986, p. 368ff.

[44] It can also be shown that Philodemus has read and used Lucretius, see M. GIGANTE, *op. cit.* note 38, index *s.v.* "Lucrezio".

[45] Cf. his promises to Memmius I 24ff., 410ff.

[46] J. MARTIN, *Antike Rhetorik*, München 1974, p. 197.

tropes and figures and is especially open for the use of poetry [47]. In Lucretius Epicurus' writings are like "flowery glades" where "bees sip all the sweets" (III 10ff.). Epicurus himself is celebrated like a Roman *triumphator* who has conquered the universe and brought back its secrets as spoil (I 62ff.), he is the subject of religious awe (III 28ff.), and regarded as a god:

deus ille fuit, deus, inclute Memmi (V 8ff.)

Memmius was the Roman nobleman to whom Lucretius dedicated his poem. Also Philodemus, as we shall see below, had such Roman noblemen to whom he dedicated his books.

Lucretius and Cicero

Which impression Lucretius made on his contemporaries, we can see from a letter Cicero, the great antagonist of Epicureanism, sent to his brother Quintus (*Q. Fr.* II 9,4):

"Lucretius' poem has, as you write, many lights of genius and, not least, of great art. But more when we meet." [48]

This is the only time Cicero mentions Lucretius, but he has read him, as we can see from his choice of philosophical terms [49]. The only Roman authors who write about the doctrine of Epicurus, and whom Cicero mentions, are Amafinius, Rabirius and Catius [50]. We know them only from Cicero. He is full of contempt for their lacking elegance and *sermo vulgaris*. It must have been a shock for Cicero to see what a fabulous champion the Epicureans had got in Lucretius.

Epicurean rhetoric

But the *contubernium* in Herculaneum could be happy. New views were opened for the distribution of the message of Epicurus. This was regarded as so important that it had to be built into the Epicurean system.

[47] MARTIN, p. 320ff.

[48] Lucreti poëmata ut scribis ita sunt, multis luminibus ingeni, multae tamen artis. Sed cum veneris.

[49] F. PETERS, *T. Lucretius et M. Cicero quo modo vocabula Graeca Epicuri disciplinae propria Latine verterint*, München 1924; K. KLEVE, 'Zur epikureischen Terminologie', *SO* 38, 1962, pp. 25-31.

[50] Cic. *Acad. Post.* I 5; *Tusc.* IV 6f., *Ad fam.* XV 16 and 19, 2. Cf. also GIGANTE, *op. cit.*, pp. 27-34.

That is the reason, we think, why Philodemus is so anxious to connect epideictic rhetoric with the name of Epicurus.

The character of Lucretius' rhetoric we have provisionally tried to hint at by referring to Greek rhetoric theory: it was literary, panegyric, applied tropes, figures and poetic effects. But Lucretian rhetoric may be determined more accurately by examining Lucretius himself. This has been done by E. Asmis (see note 15). According to Asmis there is a distinct difference in the presentation of matter in Lucretius and Epicurus: "Lucretius has abandoned Epicurus' strict logical sequence of argument in order to present his own sequence of even more astounding revelation ..." (p. 65), yet, Asmis points out, without letting this impair the thought content.

Lucretian rhetoric may be determined even more accurately, not only by comparing Lucretius with Epicurus' *Letter to Herodotus*, to which Asmis limits herself, but also with Epicurus' "On Nature". Considerable fragments have been found of the 37 books which this work originally comprised. It might further be worth while to compare the aesthetic theories which are put forward in Philodemus' "On Poetry" and "On Music", where poetry and music are evaluated from a hedonistic point of view. A preliminary work is R.N. Gaines' thesis "Philodemus on rhetorical expression" [51].

Lucretius and Ennius

When Lucretius has been found in Herculaneum, it is not surprising that Ennius also should be there (cf. above). Ennius was Lucretius' master of poetic embellishment (cf. Lucr. I 117, 121), and it is not impossible that it is Lucretius' own copy of Ennius we now see before our eyes.

The Epicureans and the people's party

Newly unrolled is "On Slander", probably by Philodemus [52]. In the concluding column the author writes that he has "said enough, dear Plotius, Varius, Vergilius and Quintilius ...". Plotius Tucca, Varius Rufus, Publius Vergilius Maro (the great Vergil) and Publius Quintilius Varus are well know names from the people's party and later from the circle around

[51] *Dissertation Abstracts* XLIII 2493A, Ann Arbor 1983. See also E. LEEN, 'Didactic use of Rhetoric in Lucretius', *Dissertation Abstracts* XLI 3095A, Ann Arbor 1981.

[52] Cf. M. GIGANTE, *Filodemo in Italia*, Firenze 1990, p. 59f.; M. GIGANTE-M. CAPASSO, 'Il ritorno di Virgilio a Ercolano', *SIFC* Terza serie, vol. VII, 1989, pp. 3-6.

Augustus. The connection between the Epicurean school and the people's party should create no wonder, and is well known. The Epicureans emphasized private life as an ideal: *bene vixit qui bene latuit*. One lost one's peace of mind if one meddled in the dispositions of the mighty. Epicurean rhetoric was meant for peaceful learning and panegyric. There was no need for the despot to expect flaming speeches for freedom from that part. The Stoics were different. To use an expression from Philodemus' "On Rhetoric", *PHerc.* 1004: The Stoics are rhetors "who prefer to live in a democracy, the worst form of governement" [53]. Translated into Latin: they prefer the republic. The Stoics were the coming dissidents.

Universitetet i Oslo
Università degli Studi di Napoli 'Federico II'

[53] HUBBELL (339) paraphrasing SUDHAUS vol. I, p. 375 col. XCVII 1ff.