

[AccueilRevenir à l'accueilCollectionBoite_023 | Notes de la fin de sa vie pour ses derniers livres.CollectionBoite_023-17-chem | Epicuriens. Item\[Arnaldo Momigliano - suite\]](#)

[Arnaldo Momigliano - suite]

Auteur : Foucault, Michel

Présentation de la fiche

Coteb023_f0765

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

also those Epicureans whose devotion to Caesar's memory was stronger. On 1st August Piso made the famous attack against Antony, which gave heart to Cicero (*Phil.* i, 10-14). The emphasis was evidently not so much on peace—before and later Piso's favourite subject (Appian, iii, 50; 54-61)—as on constitutional normality: 'excessurum se ex Italia dixit, deos penatis et sedes patrias relicturum, si, quod di omen averterint, rem publicam oppressisset Antonius' (*Phil.* xii, 6, 14). Hirtius, although obviously not favourable to the Liberators (*cf. ad Att.* xv, 6, 2), was adverse to Antony (*Fam.* xi, 1; *ad Att.* xv, 8, 1) and capable *melior fieri* (*ad Att.* xiv, 20, 4). Pansa was more suspect, but still not a hopeless case (*ad Att.* xv, 22). After all, they both died for the Republic. Little is known about Trebatius Testa, but he was then on very friendly terms with Cicero (who wrote for him the *Topica*; *cf. Fam.* vii, 19) and justified to him what was thought to be his excessive loyalty of C. Matius to the memory of Caesar (*Fam.* xi, 27-8). Matius himself, of course, is no exception to our argument.

Piso's domestic philosopher, Philodemus, is a more complex case. He was a Hellenized Oriental and a professional teacher of Λάθε βιώσας. Taking into account these qualities, we shall recognize that he went very far. H. Diels was able to understand the following words in the Herculaniensian papyri of *περί θεῶν*, Book i, col. xxv, 22 ff. (*Abh. Preuss. Ak.* 1915, 7, p. 44):

ἀλλὰ γὰρ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκ θεῶν παραχῆς ἰκανῶς οἰμαί μοι λελέχθαι καὶ προτετράφθαι τὸν εὐφρέστατον, ὥστ' ἔξω μένειν αἰωνίων παραχῶν ὡς ἀπαλλαγησόμενον κακῶν τῶν χαλεπῶν καὶ περιποιησόμενον τάγαθὰ τὰ συνέχοντα καὶ μόνον ἑαυτὸν ἔνδρα νομιούντα, τῶν ἄλλων δὲ καταφρονήσοντα πάντων ὡς σέρφων, καὶ οὐ μόνον τῶν ταπεινοτέρων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν μέγιστα χρήματα κεκτημένων ἰδιωτῶν καὶ τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων ἐν δυνάμει πολιτικαῖς καὶ τῶν τὴν ὑποουλότητ' ἐκκαίοντων ὅταν ὄρᾳ παρωσαμένους ὑφ' ἐνὸς Ἀντωνίου χεῖρας τὰ κατ' ἄστου τοὺς ἐναντίους.

To Diels the passage meant Republican sentiments, which Philodemus would have expressed after the constitution of the Second Triumvirate (*Abh. Preuss. Ak.*, 1916, n. 6, p. 34, 1). R. Philippson (*Hermes* liii, 1918, 381) understood a profession of impartiality to be dated in the summer of 44: 'An seine glühende Freiheitsliebe glaube ich nicht. Auch Epikur ist Opportunist gewesen.' This is an opinion which we can follow only with some modification. The words were written before the Triumvirate was constituted: τοὺς ἐναντίους are the Liberators. Philodemus concludes from the failure of opposing Antony that his philosophy is right in suggesting aloofness from the crowd. The most convenient date seems to be immediately before or after the speech of Piso, which left its author isolated: 'Pisoni qui in eum (Antonium) primus invectus est nullo adsentiente' (*Fam.* xii, 2, 1). So far we can agree with Philippson. But if the logical argument of Philodemus is a defence of Λάθε βιώσας, the *animus* is not indifferent to the events. The words reflect the indignation of a man who saw the defenders of the Republic playing into the hands of the tyrant. He is against Antony, but has no faith in the Liberators. In a book *περί θανάτου* the same Philodemus invited men to face death from political persecutors with courage: ἐγὼ δὲ θαυμάζω τῶν ἀβίωτων ἡγουμένων τὸ καταγνωσθῆναι καὶ ταῦτ' οὐχ ὑπὸ σπουδαίων, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ χειρίστων ἀνθρώπων, μᾶλλον δὲ θηρίων κτλ. (xxxv, col. 6, 11 ff.). The last editor, T. Kuiper, *Philodemus over den Dood*, 1925, 96, proposed for the book the date 43 B.C., which must be approximately right, although Kuiper's argument is founded upon an obvious slip. The subject and the tendency of the book seem closely related to the *De morte* by Varius Rufus. Without emphasising details, it is clear that in Philodemus the tradition of the school and the call against the tyrant were in conflict.

On the whole, the events of 44 B.C. prove that Cassius was not an exceptional case among the contemporary Epicureans. The majority stood for the Republic against Caesarism.

BrF
MSS

