

[H. North. Sôphrosune. Chapter VII - suite]

Auteur : Foucault, Michel

Présentation de la fiche

Coteb028_f0749

SourceBoite_028-11-chem | Sophrosunè.

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 22/03/2021 Dernière modification le 23/04/2021

and ethical persuasion, he did not confine his list to four; and it is uncertain what rhetor was the first to do so. Both Cicero in the *De Inventione* and the anonymous *Auctor ad Herennium*, reproducing what is clearly the commonplace Hellenistic rhetorical doctrine, use the canon of four virtues both in epideictic and in the topic of the honorable (*honestum* or *rectum*), which belongs to deliberative oratory. The definitions offered in both treatises seem to be Stoic in origin,⁹ but beyond this meager clue there is no evidence to determine who, after Aristotle and before Cicero's model in *De Inventione*, took this important step. If we turn back to the oratory of the fourth century B.C., we find that groups of virtues are often mentioned, but the Platonic four—just these and no others—are not common. The sophistic eulogy of *Erôs* which Plato ascribes to Agathon in the *Symposium*, and the panegyrics of Evagoras and Nicocles by Isocrates stand almost alone in making specific use of the tetrad.¹⁰ The loss of so much of Hellenistic rhetoric and the gap in Greek oratory between the fourth century and the beginning of the Second Sophistic conceal from our gaze the growth of this *topos*.

When sources once more become available, we find that treatises concerned specifically with epideictic oratory—such as those of Menander—and the handbooks that include encomium among the preliminary exercises (*progymnasmata*)—such as those of Hermogenes, Aphthonius, Theon, Nicolaus the Sophist, and Aristides—follow a uniform pattern.¹¹ The four cardinal virtues are dealt with under the heading of Achievements (*praxeis*), sometimes divided according to war and peace, in which case *andreia* is naturally considered a warlike virtue, and the other three are considered the virtues obtaining in time of peace (Menander 3. 372–73 Spengel). Theon alone goes beyond the Stoic tetrad and adds piety and Aristotle's two favorites, liberality and magnanimity. The place of sophrosyne in rhetoric and oratory is a special topic which cannot be briefly summarized, but it is relevant to the present discussion of sophrosyne in Hellenistic and Graeco-Roman literature to point out that the rhetorical treatment of the virtues had wide influence, especially on the writing of history from the fourth century on. The special affinity of history to epideictic is shown in the use of the topics of praise and blame by the historians of Philip and

⁹ See Wilhelm Kroll, *Philol.* 90 (1935), 206–215.

¹⁰ Xenophon, however, knows and uses the tetrad in both eulogy and historiography. He begins his praise of Agesilaus with piety (*eusebeia*) and then proceeds to the four cardinal virtues.

¹¹ See Georg Reichel, *Quaestiones Progymnasmaticae* (Leipzig, 1909). On epideictic in general, consult Theodore C. Burgess, *University of Chicago Studies in Classical Philology* 3 (1902), 123 ff.



