

[Accueil](#)[Revenir à l'accueil](#)[CollectionBoite_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_f0768

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

virtue among the Epicureans and especially concerned the relations between teacher and pupils or between school-fellows, still did not cease to mean the right to speak freely to everybody, even to monarchs (cf. E. Peterson, 'Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte von Parrhesia,' *R. Seeberg Festschrift* i, 1929, 283 and De Witt, *Class. Phil.* xxxi, 1936, 205). The book of Philodemus *περί παρρησίας* is fairly definite on this point (coll. 22-3, ed. Olivieri, p. 62). Neither could the Epicureans easily swallow the deification of Caesar. Contrary to R. Philippson (*Rh. Mus.* lxxxiii, 1934, 173) I have little doubt that Diels (*Abh. Preuss. Ak.* 1916, 6, p. 34) is right in finding an unfavourable allusion to it in Philodemus, *περί θεῶν* iii, 10:—

διὰ δὴ τὰ προειρημένα καὶ καλῶς ἔχει τιμᾶν καὶ σέβασθαι καὶ ταῦτα, καὶ μᾶλλον ἢ τὰ κατασκευαζόμενα πρὸς ἡμῶν εἶδη καὶ τοὺς νέους θεούς, ἐπεὶ τὰ μὲν αἰεὶ συνάπτεται τοῖς γε σεβασμοῦ τοῦ παντὸς ἀξίοις, τὰ δ' οὐκ ὁμοίως.

And finally, we saw that the Epicureans were sympathetic to a State founded upon consent, as the Roman aristocratic Republic was.

Admittedly, all this is not sufficient. Nothing is sufficient explanation for the change from orthodox Epicureanism to the heroic Epicureanism of Cassius. But there is still something else which brings us even nearer to the revolutionary atmosphere of 44. It is the poem of Lucretius. Book V of *De Rerum Natura* has faith not only in the *deus ille*, but in mankind. We must agree with T. Frank (*Life and Literature in the Roman Republic*, 240 f.) that the idea of human progress is not to be found there logically, but is there as an aspiration. A Republic is an advanced stage of this progress. Whether the theory of the five stages of political development which we find in vv. 925 ff. was new to the Epicureans we do not know. But it is at least remarkable that the only other Epicurean theory of political development known to me does not distinguish a period with kings from a period of Republican magistracies. Hermarchus (*ap. Porphyrius, De abstinentia*, i, 7-12; 26), although emphasising the consent of the subject, recognised three phases only: anarchical stage, first social contacts, legislators (cf. J. Bernays, *Theophrastos' Schrift über Frömmigkeit*, 1866, 8; K. Krohn, *Der Epikureer Hermarchos*, 1921, 6). To Lucretius magistracies and laws, not kings, are able to ensure durable peace. It is a pity that the point has been missed in R. Philippson's important study, 'Die Rechtsphilosophie der Epikureer,' *Arch. f. Philosophie*, N.F. xvi, 1910, 289 ff. Furthermore, the whole of Lucretius is a vigorous invitation to work and fight for high ideals. An atmosphere of magnanimous enthusiasm—so different from the *ἀδύνατος* βιώσας—is the legacy of Lucretius to the men of 44 B.C. We should like to believe that the *Vita Borgiana* of Lucretius is reliable in saying: 'cum T. Pomponio Attico, Cicerone, M. Bruto et C. Cassio coniunctissime vixit.' But the last attempt to salvage it—by A. Rostagni in *Riv. Fil. Class.* lxvii, 1939, 113—has failed to persuade me. The arguments for a humanistic falsification are still unanswered. All those people certainly read their Lucretius, but the *Vita Borgiana* is no evidence of it.

As active politics were not really consistent with Epicurean philosophy, which was an *hortus* and not a battlefield, enthusiasm for liberty did not last very long. The Epicureans rapidly turned their hopes towards Octavian; and Varius Rufus—to quote only the less illustrious—ended in a *Panegyricus Augusti*. The philosophy of the Opposition during the Empire was to be Stoicism, not Epicureanism. The heroes *par excellence* were to be Cato and Brutus—an Academician who had much of the Stoic in him—rather than Cassius. It is especially significant that the part of Epicureanism in the struggle for liberty in 44 B.C. was no longer realised by the historians of the Imperial age. They had more difficulty in understanding Cassius than Brutus. In fact, Epicureanism—the first inspiration of Horace and Vergil—gave spirituality to the Roman peace, and Stoicism kept alive the claim of internal freedom. Here again we cannot choose.

ARNALDO MOMIGLIANO.

BnF
V55

