

Arnaldo Momigliano

Auteur : Foucault, Michel

Présentation de la fiche

Coteb023_f0762

SourceBoite_023-17-chem | Epicuriens.

LangueFrançais

TypeFicheLecture

RelationNumérisation d'un manuscrit original consultable à la BnF, département des Manuscrits, cote NAF 28730

Références éditoriales

Éditeuréquipe FFL (projet ANR *Fiches de lecture de Michel Foucault*) ; projet EMAN (Thalim, CNRS-ENS-Sorbonne nouvelle).

Droits

- Image : Avec l'autorisation des ayants droit de Michel Foucault. Tous droits réservés pour la réutilisation des images.
- Notice : équipe FFL ; projet EMAN (Thalim, CNRS-ENS-Sorbonne nouvelle). Licence Creative Commons Attribution - Partage à l'Identique 3.0 (CC BY-SA 3.0 FR).

Notice créée par [équipe FFL](#) Notice créée le 19/03/2021 Dernière modification le 23/04/2021

(ib. ii, 22, 70), the consul L. Manlius Torquatus (ib. i, 11, 39), the senator Velleius (*De nat. deor.* i, 6, 15) do not appear either dangerous revolutionaries or willing to compromise themselves by awkward connections.

Two real problems of Epicureanism well within the scope of this book have been missed. The first concerns the value the Epicureans attached to the opinions of common people. Professor Farrington, who here and in a special article (*The Modern Quarterly* i, 1938, 214) attributes much importance to the fantastic reconstruction of a letter of Epicurus (?) by Chr. Jensen, 1933 (cf. R. Philippson, *Phil. Woch.* 1934, 154), has apparently overlooked the two fundamental (and reliable) texts. (a) *P. Oxy.* ii, 225 on the cult of the gods, admirably re-edited by H. Diels, *Sitz. Preuss. Ak.* 1916, 886 (beside whom G. Fraccaroli, *Atti Accad. Scienze Torino* xxxv, 1899, is of some use), is, as is well known, one of the best expositions of the Epicurean point of view by an authentic Epicurean, perhaps by Epicurus himself. (b) The *περί ἀλόγου καταφρονήσεως* by Polystratus (ed. C. Wilke 1905, cf. R. Philippson, *N. Jahrb. f. kl. Alt.* xxiii, 1909, 487) has importance as a whole, but a single sentence perhaps requires special mention—that in which the falsity of the opposed doctrines is brought home by recalling the repressions of their supporters (col. xiv, a). Evidently about 230 B.C. persecution had not yet reached the quietistic Epicureans.

The second problem is the sudden outburst of political interest among the Epicureans of the Ciceronian period. This has nothing to do with the 'mass movement of lower-class people discussing among themselves the undistinguished writings of their plebeian school of thought' (p. 192), but has the advantage of being real. It is an aristocratic movement, clearly connected with the main political currents of that age. If the papyri of Philodemus first called attention to it, less esoteric texts, such as the letters of Cicero, are the main evidence. Modern philologists have discussed the point: H. Diels ('Philodemus, Ueber die Götter', *Abh. Preuss. Akad.* 1915, n. 7; 1916, n. 6); R. Philippson (*Hermes* liii, 1918, 359); T. Frank (*Vergil*, 1922, 77); A. Rostagni (*Arte Poetica di Orazio*, 1930, xxix ff.; *Virgilio Minore* 1933, 169; *Riv. Fil. Class.* lxi, 1933, 445; *La letteratura di Roma repubblicana ed augustea*, 1939, 240, 344). An Italian scholar has furthermore collected the largest number of texts in a book too often naïve, but never useless: G. Della Valle, *Tito Lucrezio Caro e l'epicureismo campane*, i, 1933 (in *Atti Accademia Pontaniana*; the second edition, 1935, is not yet available to me). It results from all these studies that we need not conjecture with Professor Farrington a secret political activity of the Epicureans. We can follow their open intervention in the political struggle. By implication, the most searching criticism of F.'s views is offered by this different line of approach, which is far from being exhausted. Professor Tenney Frank simplified the positions of the Epicureans in the Ciceronian period by making them as a whole a group of devotees of Caesar and his memory. Rostagni has prepared the way for more subtle distinctions. The evidence may still be increased and better understood. The following pages are meant to be a small step in that direction. They should substitute for F.'s interpretation of political Epicureanism something better based on the sources.

II

Epicureans in Revolt

There is a conspicuous date in the history of Roman Epicureanism: the date (46 B.C.) at which Cassius turned Epicurean (*Cic. Fam.* xv, 16; 19), not to enjoy the *hortulus*, but to reach quickly the conclusion that the tyrant had to be eliminated. This obviously was a profound crisis, even for a man with the family tradition

BnF
1465

