AUFSTIEG UND NIEDERGANG DER RÖMISCHEN WELT

BAND II. 36.4

RISE AND DECLINE OF THE ROMAN WORLD

VOLUME II. 36.4

Epicureanism under the Roman Empire

by JOHN FERGUSON †, Birmingham

revised and supplemented by JACKSON P. HERSHBELL, Minneapolis, Minnesota*

Contents

I. Introduction 2260

II. Epicureanism under the Republic 2261

1. Epicureanism in the Third and Second Centuries B. C. 2261

2. Epicureanism at the end of the Republic 2262

III. The Augustan Age 2263

1. Augustus and Epicureanism 2263

2. Epicurean 'friends' of Augustus 2263

3. The Epicureanism of Maecenas 2263

4. The Epicureanism of Vergil 2265

5. The Epicureanism of Vergil's friends 2267

6. Horace's Epicureanism 2268

7. Propertius and Tibullus 2270

* The late JOHN FERGUSON submitted the following study some years ago, but given the tremendous task of coordinating the many contributions to 'ANRW', and arranging these in coherent and consistent volumes, publication of FERGUSON's article had to be delayed until the present collection of studies on Epicureanism, Scepticism, Cynicism, and individual thinkers and themes of later philosophy, was ready for the press. Sadly, the author died before seeing his work appear, though shortly before his death, Mrs. FERGUSON and WOLFGANG HAASE encouraged me to bring the bibliographical references up to date. I have tried do to this. I have also completed the table of contents, and made minor changes in the original text for the sake of clarity.

I herewith honor JOHN FERGUSON's memory by helping to edit his work for ANRW. He was several times at the University of Minnesota as a visiting professor, and I came to know him in the last decade. He was a very knowledgeable scholar, much respected by colleagues and graduate students at Minnesota, but I leave it to others to compose the full and proper eulogy which his full and productive life deserves.

JACKSON P. HERSHBELL, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

8. Epicureanism in Vitruvius 2270
9. Medicine and Epicureanism 2271
10. Livy and Epicureanism 2271
11. Ovid and Epicureanism 2272
12. Summary of Epicureanism in the Augustan Age 2273
IV. The First Century A. D. 2273
1. Epicureanism and Judaism, and especially Philo of Alexandria 2273
2. Epicureanism, Christianity and the Writings of Paul 2275
3. Petronius 2277
4. Other Epicureans of the First Century 2279
5. Seneca 2280
6. Herculaneum and the *villa suburbana dei papiri* 2283
7. Pap. Oxy. 215 2283
8. Other Latin Writers and Epicureanism 2283
A. Persius 2283
B. Quintilian 2284
C. Statius 2284
D. Valerius Flaccus 2284
E. Silius 2284
F. Pliny the Elder 2284
G. Codex Vossianus Q. 86 2285
9. Concluding observations 2285
V. The Second Century A. D. 2285
1. Plotina 2285
2. Tacitus 2286
3. Plutarch 2286
4. Juvenal 2286
5. Hadrian 2287
6. Some known Epicureans of the Second Century 2288
7. Diogenianus 2289
8. Diogenes of Oenoanda 2290
9. Lucian 2293
10. Writers more or less hostile to Epicureanism 2294
A. Epictetus 2294
B. Marcus Aurelius 2294
C. Apuleius 2294
D. Aulus Gellius 2295
E. Cleonides 2295
F. Dio of Prusa 2295
G. Numenius 2295
H. Aristocles 2296
I. Sextus Empiricus 2296
J. Atticus 2296
K. Athenaeus 2296
L. Aetius 2296
11. Second Century A. D. references to Epicurus 2297
12. Epitaphs and Epicurean sentiments 2297

13. Epicureanism and Early Christian Writers 2298
A. Justin 2299
B. Athenagoras 2299
C. Irenaeus 2300
D. Theophilus of Antioch 2300
E. Minucius Felix 2300
F. Isidore (?) 2301
14. The Talmud and Epicureanism 2301
15. Summary 2302
VI. The Third Century A. D. 2302
1. Christian Writers continued 2302
A. Tertullian 2302
B. Hippolytus of Rome 2303
C. Clement of Alexandria 2303
D. Origen 2304
E. Pseudo-Clement 2305
F. Dionysius of Alexandria 2305
G. Arnobius 2306
2. References to the Epicureans which occur in other writers 2307
A. Aelian 2307
B. Philostratus 2308
C. Galen 2308
D. Diogenes Laertius 2308
E. Longinus 2308
F. Alexander of Aphrodisias 2309
G. Plotinus 2309
H. Porphyry 2309
3. Epitaphs of the Third Century 2310
4. Summary 2311
VII. The Fourth Century A. D. 2311
1. Diocletian 2311
2. Christian Writers and Epicureanism 2312
A. Lactantius 2312
B. Eusebius 2313
C. Athanasius 2313
D. Hilary of Poitiers 2314
E. Basil 2314
F. Gregory of Nazianzus 2314
G. Gregory of Nyssa 2315
H. Eunomius 2315
I. Ambrose 2315
J. Pelagius 2316
K. Augustine 2316
L. Jerome 2317
M. Paulinus of Nola 2318
N. Prudentius 2318
3. Non-Christian Writers 2318
A. Julian the Apostate 2318
B. Themistius 2318

C. Sallustius 2318
D. Macrobius 2319
E. Claudian 2319
F. Sulpicius 2319
4. Inscriptional evidence 2320
5. Busts of Epicurus 2321
6. Summary 2321
VIII. The Fifth Century Onwards 2321
1. Synesius 2321
2. Theodoretus 2322
3. Epicureanism in the West 2323
A. Martianus Capella 2323
B. Salvian 2323
C. Orientius 2323
D. Claudius Marius Victor 2323
E. Caelius Aurelianus 2324
F. Claudianus Mamertus 2324
G. Apollinaris Sidonius 2324
H. Boethius 2324
I. Fulgentius 2325
4. Epicureanism in the East 2325
A. Socrates 2325
B. Synesius 2325
C. John Stobaeus 2325
D. Proclus 2326
E. Marinus 2326
F. Justinian and philosophy at Athens 2326
IX. Conclusions 2326

I. Introduction

Summary accounts of Epicureanism often end with Lucretius. Even the encyclopaedic USENER dismissed the imperial period in less than three pages of his introduction, and DE WITT's expansive advocacy amounts to not much more than about eight pages. My study is an attempt to present the evidence as I have collected it over a number of years. It is no more than a preliminary survey, and I have relied more heavily than I would wish on indices. One problem about understanding Epicureanism in the imperial period, is the tendency of ancient authors to allude to its doctrines without the name. There is also the problem of knowing whether authors who mention Epicurean doctrines are alluding to their own experiences, or are merely familiar with Lucretius (in the West), or some handbook of philosophical history (in the East). I have tried to weigh the evidence reasonably, and significant modern literature is listed at the end of the appropriate sections. The fragments are

from H. USENER, 'Epicurea' (Leipzig, 1887). I have not mentioned all imperial writers who preserve references to Epicurus; USENER's index will help in supplying these references.

One thing needs to be noticed at the outset: the Epicurean school more than any other remained true to the tenets of its founder. There were no major doctrinal changes in the history of the school, though later Epicureans did not always emulate their master's purity of life: Epicurus rejected luxury, political power, literary ability, military ambition. But Maecenas and Petronius, for example, combined wealth with Epicureanism; Hirtius and Pansa were consuls; Lucretius, Vergil, and Horace were writers of style, and Cassius was a very brilliant soldier.

Two forces are here at work. First, the individual's capacity for ignoring any aspect of religious or philosophical belief inconvenient to a daily way of life. Second, the capacity of national cultures (and the Romans were especially adept at this) to conquer by absorption. One need only reflect on Christianity's history to see millionaires acknowledging a Master who said "Woe to you rich!" or soldiers professing loyalty to a Lord who told them to turn the other cheek. It is not a surprise to find equally compromising Epicureans.

See in general N. W. DE WITT, Epicurus and his Philosophy (Minneapolis 1954); W. SCHMID, Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum, V, ed. T. KLAUSER (Stuttgart 1962), s. v. Epikur, cols. 761 ff.; P. BOYANCÉ, L'épicurisme dans la société et la littérature romaine, Bull. Ass. G. Budé (1960), 499–516; also ID., Actes VIIIe Congrès G. Budé (Paris 1969); C. W. CHILTON, Diogenes of Oenoanda: The Fragments (London 1971) has a brief, but very good summary of the Epicurean school in Imperial times, xxii–xxvii; see also J.-M. ANDRÉ's excellent study on the philosophical schools in the time of the Principate, 'Les écoles philosophiques aux deux premiers siècles de l'Empire', ANRW II, 36,1, ed. W. HAASE (Berlin–New York 1987), 5–77, esp. 41 ff. ANDRÉ's 'L'otium dans la vie morale et intellectuelle romaine', Publications de la Faculté des lettres et sciences humaines de Paris, Série «Recherches», 30 (Paris 1966) also has relevance.
Studies relevant to individual authors, e. g. Vergil, Horace, Plutarch, who had contact with or knowledge of Epicureanism are listed when their works are considered.

II. Epicureanism under the Republic

1. Epicureanism in the Third and Second Centuries B. C.

The Romans became aware of Epicureanism during Epicurus's lifetime: tradition told of the shock caused by Pyrrhus's representative's account of a system which denied divine activity, refused political life, and aimed at pleasure (Plut., Pyrrh. 20,6; Val. Max. 4,3,6). Rome's expansion to the south and the Second Punic War brought fresh contacts, and Ennius discoursed on some of these beliefs. Senators were suspicious: in 161 B. C. they expelled two Epicurean missionaries, Alcius and Philiscus, "for teaching pleasures" (Aul. Gell. 15,11; Ath. 547 A). It is significant that there was no Epicurean on the Embassy of

Philosophers. But the Epicureans could not be kept out. One of the Claudii Nerones was in touch with Demetrius the Spartan (R. PHILIPPSON, Papyrus Herculanensis 831, AJP 64 [1943] 161–2), and by the end of the century T. Albucius, Cicero's 'perfect Epicurean', was prominent, and indeed a target for Lucilius's shafts (Cic., Fin. 1,3,9; Brut. 35,131). Hostility remained strong, and in 92 B. C. the school was closed (Aul. Gell. 5,11; Suet., Gramm. 6).

2. Epicureanism at the end of the Republic

The last period of the Republic was a great period for Epicureanism. There was Phaedrus, teacher in Rome and Athens; C. Velleius, Epicurean spokesman in 'De Natura Deorum', tribune in 90 B. C., and a senator; T. Pomponius Atticus, Cicero's friend and publisher; C. Memmius, patron to Lucretius; L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus, Caesar's father-in-law and Philodemus's patron; L. Cornelius Sisenna, historian and governor of Sicily; M. Fadius Gallus, the anti-Caesarian; C. Cassius Longinus, who was converted in 46; C. Trebatius Testa, converted in Caesar's camp in Gaul in 53; Hirtius and Pansa, consuls in 43; C. Matius, Caesar's ideal friend; C. Sergius Orata, a businessman; L. Papirius Paetus; L. Thorius Balbus, legate to Q. Metellus Pius; L. Saufeius, Atticus's friend; Statilius Taurus, who died at Philippi; probably Antony's friend P. Volumnius Eutrapelus; C. Catius Insuber, one of the more attractive of Epicurean writers; T. Manlius Torquatus, spokesman in 'De Finibus'; perhaps his relative L. Torquatus; perhaps also L. Lucceius; M. Marius, a friend of Cicero; Siro, of course, who taught in Campania and attracted some of the outstanding poets of the next generation; and his friend Trebianus; and Philodemus; Lucretius himself; and the doctor Asclepiades. Caesar was influenced but not committed (Cic., Pis. 25,59). Note too the inscription from Naples (DESSAU 7781):

Stallius Gaius has sedes Hauranus tuetur
ex Epicureio gaudivigente choro.

Influence from elsewhere may be suspected: Catullus, for example, was familiar with Memmius, saw death as everlasting night, and came from Gallia Cisalpina, and like many others (note M. Fadius Gallus and Catius Insuber, as well as Vergil and Horace) probably encountered Epicureanism in his younger days.

It is an impressive list. FARRINGTON's suggestion that there was a plebeian mass-movement alongside the aristocrats and intellectuals has not proved convincing. Even without that, they are a formidable array. But the Romans had made Epicureanism their own; the list includes politicians, soldiers, authors with some concern for style, and *bons viveurs*.

See B. FARRINGTON, Science and Politics in the Ancient World (London 1939), and the review by A. MOMIGLIANO, JRS 31 (1941), 149 ff. (= ID., Secondo contributo alla storia degli Studi classici, Storia e letteratura 77 [Rome 1960], 375 ff.). See also E. PARATORE, La

problematica sull'epicureismo a Roma, ANRW I, 4, ed. H. TEMPORINI (Berlin – New York 1973), 116 – 204. M. FUSSL, Epikureismus im Umkreis Caesars, Symmicta philologica Saliburgensia Georgio Pfligersdorffer sexagenario oblata (Rome 1980), 61 – 80.

III. The Augustan Age

1. Augustus and Epicureanism

It is likely that Augustus was not favourably disposed to Epicureanism. The political affiliations of the public-minded Epicureans had been various, but Cassius was too prominent among Caesar's assassins (Brutus's affiliations were later to make Stoics suspect). More seriously, the Epicureans worked against Augustus's policies for a stable society. Superstitious rather than religious, Augustus had a fine sense of religion as giving divine sanction to the *status quo*, and fostered it accordingly; the Epicureans were accused of undermining society by undermining religion. Augustus wanted to inculcate in the upper classes a sense of public responsibility; Epicurus advocated withdrawal. Augustus continued to fly the military pennants; the creed of Epicurus was pacifistic. Augustus, whatever his private life, became publicly a stern moralist; Epicurus 'taught pleasures' in a way contrary to the *mos maiorum*. We cannot trace overt disapprobation. Augustus maintained a public tolerance. But Epicurean watchwords are gradually ousted by Stoic watchwords: the process is very clear in Vergil and Horace. And there certainly seems to be a conspiracy of silence: Lucretius for example was read but not named. DE WITT's conclusion is reasonable (Epicurus and his Philosophy [op. cit. p. 2261 above], 345): "Thus Epicureanism, too strongly entrenched to be uprooted, was forced to become anonymous."

2. Epicurean 'friends' of Augustus

Lucius Varus was an *amicus* of Augustus and an Epicurean. Quintilian tells an amusing story. Cassius Severus was criticized for letting his supporters insult Varus; he replied "I don't know who they were who were so insulting to him; Stoics, I suppose" (6,3,78). The story, though slight, is very illuminating. First, because it reveals an active hostility between Stoics and Epicureans in Augustus's time. Second, because it shows that an Epicurean might still be *amicus principis*.

3. The Epicureanism of Maecenas

Maecenas is also an interesting study. Some verses of his are cited by Seneca (Ep. 101,11):

Debilem facito manu,
debilem pede coxo,
tuber adstrue gibberum,
libricos quate dentes:
vita dum superest, benest;
hanc mihi, vel acuta
si sedeam cruce, sustine.

Seneca is critical. Yet the passage does not seem, as he implies, redolent of an inglorious love of life, but rather a personal elaboration of the Epicurean κἂν στρεβλωθῇ δ' ὁ σοφός, εἶναι αὐτὸν εὐδαίμονα. Much of our knowledge of Maecenas comes from Seneca, and much of it seems Epicurean. For example (Ep. 92,35) the words

Nec tumulum curo: sepelit natura relictos.

are reminiscent of the Lucretian insistence on how little it matters how you are buried, since death is the end. Again the saying *ipsa enim altitudo attonat summa* (Ep. 19,9) fits well Epicurus's injunction to avoid the positions of power. Indeed this was one of the most remarkable – and Epicurean – things about Maecenas: he was content to remain an *eques*, to live out of the public eye, and to exercise influence without the possession of power.

Another Epicurean trait recorded by Seneca (Ep. 114,7) in a highly critical passage, was his abstention from bloodshed. This is confirmed by a story recorded by Dio Cassius (55,7), and the Byzantine monk Georgius Cedrenus. Augustus was busy condemning men to death. Maecenas could not get near him for the crowd and tossed a message into his lap which read *Surge tandem carnifex*. Augustus refrained from further condemnations. In general, Dio believed that Maecenas influenced Augustus toward calmness and moderation.

Seneca indicts Maecenas for laxness and effeminacy. He was possibly indifferent to his personal appearance, but this could come from indifference to material values. Similarly, the carelessness of style with which Seneca reproached him was wholly compatible with Epicurean indifference to such matters. There is little doubt that in his own way Maecenas pursued pleasure, that he was very rich, and that he was also very liberal. He spent most of his time in his own house and garden; this too seems very Epicurean.

Finally, there was Maecenas' genius for friendship. The great trait of his character was loyalty (Prop. 3,9). His relations with a beautiful but difficult wife show the same trait. He had only one, said Seneca (Ep. 114,6), and he remarried her a thousand times. Certainly his friendship with Horace shines through the poet's verses. To Horace Maecenas was "half of my soul" (Od. 2,17,5). Maecenas's dying injunction to Augustus was: "Remember Horatius Flaccus as you would remember me." When this exaltation of friendship is combined with the fact that so many of his literary circle had associations with Epicureanism I cannot doubt that Maecenas too had such associations.

See C. PASCAL, Epicurei e Mistici (Catania ²1914); R. AVALLONE, Profilo umano di Mecenate, Antiquitas 8 (1953), 3 – 16; ID., Mecenate (Naples 1962); J.-M. ANDRÉ, Mécène: Essai de biographie spirituelle (Paris 1967); ID., Mécène écrivain (avec, en appendice, les fragments de Mécène), ANRW II, 30,3, ed. W. HAASE (Berlin – New York 1983), 1765 – 1787.

4. The Epicureanism of Vergil

Vergil's relation to Epicureanism has been much discussed, and can therefore, be given summary treatment.

From a variety of sources it is known that about 48 B. C. Vergil went to Campania, and spent six years or more in an Epicurean community whose leading professor was Siro. Tacitus (Dial. 13) speaks of Vergil's *securum et quietum ... secessum* and his *felix contubernium*: the latter is a technical Epicurean term. The period is reflected in the little collection 'Catalepton', which seems to be mainly authentic. Two of the poems refer to Siro (5; 8); there are amiable little poems to Tucca and Varius (1; 7); a well-known fragment from Herculaneum (A. KÖRTE, Augusteer bei Philodem, Rh. Mus. 45 [1890], 172) testifies to the presence of Varius and Quintilius and plausibly to Plotius and Vergil as well. Particularly Epicurean are the expression of friendship for Musa (4), and the invocation of the *dulces Camenae*, using the Epicurean *dulces* (5). 'Ciris', whether or not it was Vergil's, was written by an Epicurean, who was seeking wisdom in the Garden (Ciris 3). Servius (in Aen. 6,264) testified to the continued impact of Siro on Vergil's thought. There is no doubt that at this stage Vergil was a committed Epicurean.

By the time he wrote the 'Eclogues' Vergil was full of an assimilated Epicureanism. This comes out for example in Silenus's song (6,31) when he tells of the formation of the universe out of the seeds of the elements streaming through the void. But while there is assimilated Epicureanism, there is also a rejection of specific Epicurean doctrines, as in Damon's scorn *nec curare deum credis mortalia quemquam* (8,35). The key line, however, is near the beginning of the first poem, where Tityrus says *deus nobis haec otia fecit* (1,6). The exact sense here is important. *Otium* was an Epicurean concept; it is the pleasure in retirement promised by Epicurus. And because Epicurus had shown human beings the way to peace, Lucretius says of him *dicendum est, deus ille fuit, deus, inclyte Memmi* (L. 5,8). But Tityrus, by common consent, is referring not to Epicurus, but to Octavian. In other words, Octavian has for Vergil taken Epicurus's place. The *pax Augusta* has made irrelevant Epicurean quietistic philosophy. Political and public action has done the philosopher's work for him.

The movement is still clearer in the 'Georgics', especially in the second book (2,490):

> *Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas,*
> *atque metus omnis et inexorabile fatum*
> *subiecit pedibus strepitumque Acherontis avari.*
> *fortunatus et ille, deos qui novit agrestis ...*

The indicative verbs show that Vergil has definite people in mind. The first three lines clearly refer to Lucretius; they allude to the title of his poem and echo his verses. It is hard not to think that in the fourth line Vergil refers to himself. The exact meaning is important: "Blessed by Fortune also is the man who has come to know the gods of the countryside." Vergil has come to know: he has passed from disbelief to belief, for though Epicurus believed in gods, he did not believe in gods of the countryside. And in so doing, Vergil is blessed by that Fortune with whom Epicurean wisdom had no dealings (Epic. fr. 77).

The outcome is fascinating. One could say that Aratus and Lucretius are jousting for mastery within Vergil, and Lucretius does not always lose. For example, the spontaneous generation of bees from a carcass (4,295 ff.) comes from a very odd passage in Lucretius (L. 3,713 ff.). In all, MERRILL has calculated that one line in twelve is derived consciously or unconsciously from Lucretius. The passage about *dulces ... Musae* (2,475) is referred to by Tacitus in the context of Vergil's Epicurean quietism (Dial. 13) and echoes the *dulces Camenae* of Catalepton 5. Even more interesting is the anthropology of the first book (1,125 ff.). At first blush Vergil has abandoned the Epicurean view altogether; a close view shows that he has incorporated the Epicurean picture (note the keyword *usus* at 1,133) within a framework of myth (1,125; 1,147). The same Epicurean insistence on *usus* is even clearer in the next book (2,22). Again, the horror of war which ends the first book (1,461 – 514) is strongly Epicurean. Vergil regrets the beating of sickles into swords, and welcomes the conversion of a Corycian pirate into a gardener (1,508; 4,125 ff.). He rejects *negotium* and all the busyness of public life, and welcomes the *latis otia campis* (2,461 ff. cf. L. 2,29 – 33). Even more striking is the rejection of love. The third book of the 'Georgics' (3,209 ff.) is nearly as bitter as the fourth of Lucretius. Sexual intercourse is enervating (3.209); the idealized bees do not indulge in it (4,197). Love in the 'Georgics' is disastrous, whether to Leander, Aristaeus, or Orpheus; in the Thracian women it is a power of destruction. Even in the famous passage which attributes to bees a share of the divine mind and which asserts a kind of pantheism (4.219 ff.) he retains a certain ambivalence, being content to attribute the view to others (*quidam ... dixere*). Still, the movement which was observed in the 'Eclogues' has gone further, and in the last lines he contrasts the *ignobile otium* which he enjoyed at *dulcis Parthenope* in the past, with Augustus's military glory and divine destiny (4.559 ff.).

In the 'Aeneid' the change is completed. The theme of the glory of Rome is impossible in Epicurean terms. The world-picture is dominated by destiny. The famous philosophical picture of the sixth book is eclectic, linking traditional mythology with Stoic pantheism, Pythagoreanism, and Platonism, but it is not Epicurean at all (6.724 ff.). Aeneas is depicted as a Stoic hero who goes through various tests till he can say in technical Stoic language *omnia praecepi* (6,105). The only expression of Epicureanism is put into the mouth of misguided Dido, and patently repudiated: she scorns the idea that the gods intervene, and she is wrong (4.379: *scilicet is superis labor est*). The aim is

still peace, but it is governed by destiny (1,205 – 6: *sedes ubi fata quietas / ostendunt*) and approached through world dominion (6,851 – 3). In Lucretius the eternal wound of love subdues the god of war (L. 1,34); in Vergil the eternal wound of love (however disastrous to Dido and Lavinia) makes Vulcan consent to forge Aeneas's arms (8,394), and Vergil points the change by quotation. For Lucretius, Venus is the personification of Epicurean pleasure; for Vergil she is the mother of Aeneas and arbiter of Rome's destiny. Of course, the influence of Lucretius remains strong, but it is verbal echo now rather than ingrained thought, and FRANK made too much of vaguely Epicurean phrases (e.g. 6,6; 7,527; 8,23; 8,315), or the passing compliment to Memmius (5,117).

Yet Vergil could not completely throw off an attitude of mind so deeply implanted. The Epicureans were alone among Hellenistic philosophical schools in extolling pity as a virtue. Seneca actually called it "the vice of a feeble mind which succumbs at the sight of suffering in others" (Clem. 2,5,1). But Aeneas is a man of pity. The spectacle of the Trojan War in pictures moves him to cry *sunt lacrimae rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt* (1,462). The sight of the unburied dead leads him to pity them (6,332). Yes, and he pities Lausus whom his own hand has killed (10,823). The pity does not and cannot lead to action: it is there for its own sake. It is Vergil's residual Epicureanism.

See further C. PASCAL, La dottrina epicurea nell'egloga vi di Vergilio, Atti della R. Academia delle Scienze di Torino 37 (1901 – 2), 168 ff. (but note the contrary view of M. G. HACKMANN, Vergils sechste Ekloge, Hermes 58 [1923], 290 ff.); W. A. MERRILL, Parallelisms and Coincidences in Lucretius and Virgil (Chicago 1918); T. FRANK, Vergil (New York 1922) (to be used with caution) and ID., Epicurean Determinism in the Aeneid, AJP 41 (1920), 115 ff.; N. W. DE WITT, Vergil and Epicureanism, CW 25 (1932), 89 ff.; ID., Vergil, Augustus and Epicureanism, CW 35 (1941 – 2), 281 – 2; B. FARRINGTON, Vergil and Lucretius, Acta Classica 1 (1959), 45 ff.; L. ALFONSI, L'Epicureismo nella storia spirituale di Vergilio, in: Epicurea: In memoriam Hectoris Bignone (Genoa 1959); M. J. OROZ-RETA, Virgile et l'épicurisme, Actes VIIIe Congrès G. Budé (Paris 1969), 436 – 47. I have not seen P. BOYANCÉ, Virgile et l'épicurisme, Bull. de la Franco-ancienne (1958). W. SPOERRI, Zur Kosmogonie in Vergils 6. Ekloge, Museum Helveticum 27 (1970), 144 – 63 in which SPOERRI argues that Ecl. 6 is not eclectic, but Epicurean, in its orientation; P. FEDELI, Sulla prima bucolica di Virgilio, Giornale Italiano di Filologia 24 (1972), 273 – 300; E. PARATORE, La problematica sull'epicureismo a Roma, ANRW I, 4, ed. H. TEMPORINI (Berlin – New York 1973), 194 – 200 ('Motivi epicurei nell'opera di Virgilio'); H. NAUMANN, War Vergil Epikureer?, Sileno 1 (1975), 245 – 247; J. BOLLACK, Die Tartaros-Szene in der Aeneis, Annales Universitatis Budapestinensis de Rolando Eötvös nominatae 4 (1976), 47 – 61; C. NAUMANN, Ist Vergil der Verfasser von Catalepton V und VIII?, Rheinisches Museum 121 (1978), 78 – 93 (cf. also J. RICHMOND, Recent Work on the 'Appendix Vergiliana' [1950 – 1975], ANRW II, 31,2, ed. W. HAASE [Berlin – New York 1981], 1112 – 1154, esp. 1147 f. and 1148); W. R. JOHNSON, The Broken World. Virgil and his Augustus, Arethusa 13 (1981), 49 – 56.

5. The Epicureanism of Vergil's friends

We note briefly Vergil's other associates in Siro's school. Not much is known about Plotius Tucca except that he survived Vergil and was one of his executors; he too was a friend of Horace and belonged to the circle of Maecenas

(H., S. 1,5,40; 1,10,81). Much the same is true of Varius, Vergil's other executor. More is known about his writing, including a poem 'On Death', perhaps a lamentation for Caesar, but conceivably an Epicurean work (fragments in Macrobius 6,1 – 2 indecisive, but 6,1,40 *incubet et Tyriis atque ex solido bibat auro* has an Epicurean ring), a panegyric on Octavian, and a popular tragedy 'Thyestes'. We cannot be certain, but it looks as if he may have moved away from Epicureanism as did Vergil.

To these we may perhaps add Octavius Mussa, poet and historian, to whom one of the 'Catalepton' is addressed. He was probably in the Naples circle, and is mentioned by Horace in the context of other members (H., S. 1,10,82). Among these perhaps C. Valgius Rufus (to whom various literary works are attributed by a variety of sources), the Visci, of whom we know nothing (cf. S. 1,9,22), and Aristius Fuscus, recipient of a somewhat Epicurean letter (Ep. 1,10 *laetus sorte tua vives sapienter Aristi*) and the delightful *Integer vitae* (O. 1,22).

Certainty is not possible. We know that several of these belonged to the Naples *contubernium*. We also know that they remained close friends with one another, and were together in Maecenas's circle. Maecenas retained Epicurean attitudes; it is known that Vergil and Horace moved away from them without losing them altogether. Probably the circle was held together by their personal relations with Maecenas and one another, rather than by a continued Epicureanism. But it is just possible that Epicurean ties remained, and that those who abandoned the philosophy remained for the friendship; certainly it is possible that some of these retained their Epicureanism.

On the Naples *contubernium*, Tucca, Varius etc., see W. WIMMEL, Der Augusteer Lucius Varius Rufus, ANRW II, 30,3, ed. W. HAASE (Berlin – New York 1983), 1567 f.

6. Horace's Epicureanism

Horace is another interesting study. Horace has been well treated by DE WITT. It looks as if his father, to whose upbringing he owed much, was an Epicurean (S. 1,6,65 – 88); certainly he himself learned of the blessed unconcern of the gods (S. 1,5,101), and he calls himself whimsically but sincerely enough *Epicuri de grege porcum* (Ep. 1,4,16). Epicurean values shine from his poems at all periods: in his utilitarianism (S. 1,3,98; Ep. 2,2,141 – 5; AP 343); in his exaltation of the simple life (S. 2,2,1; O. 2,16,13 *vivitur parvo bene*; Ep. 1,10,39; 1,15,41 – 6); in his attacks on Stoic paradoxes (Epod. 8,15 – 6; S. 1,3,96); in his exaltation of friendship (S. 1,4,135); in his acceptance of death as the end (Ep. 1,16,79; O. 2,20,21 – 4); in his refusal to take thought for the morrow (O. 1,9,13 *cras fuge quaerere* cf. 1,11 with its attack on astrology); in his independence of Fortune (Ep. 1,1,68 – 9); in his exaltation of Maecenas as *praesidium*, that is the guarantor of *securitas* (O. 1,1,2); in his concept of the end of life as *mens sana in corpore sano* (O. 1,31,17 – 9; Ep. 1,18,111 – 2); in his search for *otium* (O. 2,16); in his calculus of pleasures and his doctrine of choice and avoidance (S. 1,2; cf. Ep. 1,2,55 *sperne voluptates*; *nocet empta dolore voluptas*); in his λάθε

βιώσας which he himself practised (Ep. 1,11,7 – 10. 29 – 30; 1,16,15; 1,17,10; 1,18,103 *fallentis semita vitae*). At times he is almost paraphrasing Epicurus. "If you wish to make Pythocles really happy, don't give him more money but try to lessen his desires" (Epic., fr. 28 B)

contracto melius parva cupidine
vectigalia porrigam ... (O. 3,16,39).

Again *grata superveniet quae non sperabitur hora* (Ep. 1,4,13) is straight from Epicurus. He is full of Epicurean technical terms: *falsis vocibus* are κεναὶ δόξαι (O. 2,2,19 – 21); in one single stanza *tutus, sordibus, invidenda* and *sobrius* are technical terms (O. 2,10,5 – 8). *Dulcis* is worth watching for: it means in Epicurean circles 'giving pleasure'. Thus it is applied to friends (S. 1,4,135; O. 1,1,2 etc.); to the pleasure which mingles with the profitable to produce the best poetry (AP 343); to relaxation (O. 2,7,28; 4,12,28); to music (O. 2,13,38). But note too the familiar *dulce et decorum est pro patria mori* (O. 3,2,13); one is tempted to translate: "To die for your country is both Epicurean and Stoic." And where is there a better exposition of Epicureanism than in Odes 3,29,41?

ille potens sui
laetusque deget, cui licet in diem
dixisse „vixi ...“

Horace moved away from Epicureanism. In Odes 1,34 he tells how as *parcus deorum cultor* he heard thunder from a clear sky, to believers an omen, to unbelievers an impossibility whose non-occurrence was a standard argument (Lucr. 6,400). Horace heard it and thought "Lucretius is wrong". So we have the exaltation of Jupiter (O. 1,12,17; 3,5,1) and the plea for the rebuilding of the temples (O. 3,6) and the acceptance of the commission to write the 'Carmen Saeculare'; we have also the adaptation of the Stoic sage exemplified in their picture of Socrates: *iustum et tenacem propositi virum* (O. 3,3,1). Not that he became a convert to Stoicism. A. Y. CAMPBELL (Horace [London 1924]) overstated this. In fact allegiance to any school sat lightly upon Horace (Ep. 1,1,13 – 9). He retained many Epicurean attitudes, and his personal friendships with Epicureans in Maecenas's circle. But it doubtful whether he retained any other contacts with the school.

See N. W. DE WITT, Epicurean Doctrine in Horace, CP 34 (1939), 127 ff.; P. MERLAN, Epicureanism and Horace, JHI 10 (1949), 445 ff.; L. ALFONSI, Un poetico protrettico epicureo di Orazio, Riv. di St. della Filos. 4 (1949), 207 – 9; C. DIANO, Orazio e l'epicureismo, Atti dell'Istituto Veneto, Classe di Scienze Morali e Lettere 120 (1961 – 2), 43 ff.; K. BÜCHNER, Horace et Epicure, Actes VIIIe Congrès G. Budé (Paris 1969), 457 – 68; K. GANTAR, Horaz zwischen Akademie und Epikur, Živa antika 22 (1972), 5 – 24 who argues that Horace was really opposed to Epicureanism, and only after the conspirators' defeat at Philippi did he turn to it. A. TRAGLIA, L'epicureismo in Orazio, Atti del convegno di studio: Horatianum (Rome 1971), 41 – 54; E. PARATORE, La problematica sull'epicureismo a Roma, ANRW I, 4, ed. H. TEMPORINI (Berlin – New York 1973), 201 – 202 ('L'epicureismo in Orazio e il suo culmine in età augustea'); W. D. LEBEK, Horaz und die Philosophie: Die 'Oden', ANRW II, 31,3, ed. W. HAASE (Berlin – New York 1981), 2031 – 2092.

7. Propertius and Tibullus

We can pass briefly over Propertius and Tibullus. Propertius was not an Epicurean though. He thinks of travelling to Athens to escape the pangs of love and will clear his soul by studying in Plato's Academy or Epicurus's Garden (3,21,25 – 26). Not much here – except that Epicureanism is decidedly a live option in Athens (and perhaps not easily in Rome), and perhaps Propertius knows enough to know that in their different ways both schools offered a cure for passion.

About Tibullus I am not so sure. Certainly there is a delight in the country's gods and their activities in developing civilization which is not Epicurean (2,1,37 ff.); but if you strip the gods away the account might (and doubtless ultimately did) come from Lucretius. The first poem of all is a strongly Epicurean account of the simple life, *contentus vivere parvo* (1,1,25), and an attack on the pursuit of riches and military glory; it ends in a variant on the Lucretian *suave mari magno* (1,1,45 cf. L. 2,1). Again the tenth poem is a strongly pacifist assault on war; it is hard not to see Epicurus behind it (1.10). One suspects that Tibullus has at some time been exposed to Epicureanism and assimilated a good deal without becoming an adherent of the school.

See J. P. BOUCHER, Properce et ses amis, Colloquium Propertianum, eds. M. BIGARONI, and F. SANTUCCI (Assisi 1976), 53 – 71, who appreciates the role of Epicureanism in Propertius' concept of friendship.

8. Epicureanism in Vitruvius

Vitruvius seems more unlikely; one does not expect to find Epicureanism in a military architect, and his suggestions (e.g. 9,1,1) that the world is designed by a divine intelligence are incompatible with Epicurean theology. But his anthropology is wholly Epicurean, both in general outline and in detail: the wild, animal-like life of primitive man, the origin of fire in the friction between the branches of storm-tossed trees, the account of the origin of language from a combination of natural cries and agreed articulation, the emergence of society, the creation of shelters from caves or the imitation of animals, the way necessity becomes the mother of invention, the gradual emergence of scientific craftsmanship (2,1,1 – 7). This is a splendid account, which could hardly have been given by anyone belonging to another school of thought, or indeed by anyone who did not know Epicureanism from the inside. Vitruvius does mention the name of Epicurus three times. Two of these are in summary histories of philosophy (2,2,1; 7 pref. 2); the third is a quotation to the effect that wise men owe little to fortune, everything to thought (6 pref. 3), and as it does not recur in this form (cf. Ep. fr. 77) it suggests again internal knowledge.

See A. STÜCKELBERGER, Die Atomistik in römischer Zeit: Rezeption und Verdrängung, below in this same volume (ANRW II, 36,4), 2574 ff.

9. Medicine and Epicureanism

Asclepiades of Prusa, a dominant figure in medicine in the first century B. C., brought together Epicurean philosophy and the Greek medical tradition. Why not, given that according to Epicurus the greatest pleasure consisted in freedom from pain? His associate Themison is usually credited with the foundation of the Methodist school of medicine. Themison believed in atoms, but in practice concentrated more upon the pores. He systematized Asclepiades's somewhat pragmatic approach; pain was caused by overcrowding of atoms in a given area, but the thinning out of the atoms was in the long run more radically dangerous. The Methodists, who were generally opposed to dogmatism, came to something like a dogma of three states of 'universals', the clogging of the pores, the relaxation of the pores, and a mixture of the two. In general, the Methodists, starting from an Epicurean scheme, were influenced by the sceptical Empiricists. They showed a commendable awareness of the individual and the particular. It would be quite false to suggest that the adherents of the schools were Epicureans, but it is clear that the school helped to keep Epicureanism alive.

We may here mention Antonius Musa. Whether any doctor ever served such an eminent group as Augustus, Agrippa, Maecenas, Vergil and Horace is questionable. He was a disciple of Asclepiades, as we know from his use of physical treatment such as cold baths. This leads us to think that he may have had Epicurean connections. We have noticed Octavius Musa as a probable Epicurean; we do not know of any relationship between them but it seems likely. And it is, after all, the circle of Maecenas.

10. Livy and Epicureanism

Livy twice shows an awareness of Epicurean beliefs. The first is in the third book. Appius Claudius records people as growling that gods exist and are indifferent of human affairs (3,56,7). The wording of the second clause is a direct negation of Epicureanism; the dramatic date is 449 B. C. and must be anachronistic if it is a reference to Epicureanism. Livy is reflecting a controversy of his own day. But the assertion of the people is not upheld by events: the implication might be taken to be that the Epicurean view is true. Livy, however, does not intend this conclusion, and in the tenth book approves Sp. Papirius as *iuvenis ante doctrinam deos spernentem natus* (10,40,11); the chapter ends in an omen and the affirmation by the consul that the gods were active in human affairs (10,40,14). The passage is clear evidence of the prevalence of Epicureanism in Livy's own time.

See W. WEISSENBORN, Livius I (Berlin 1885), Einleitung, 17; G. STÜBLER, Die Religiosität des Livius (Stuttgart – Berlin 1941), 80; P. G. WALSH, Livy and Stoicism, AJP 79 (1958), 355 ff. and ID., Livy (Cambridge 1961), 51.

11. Ovid and Epicureanism

Finally we mention Ovid. Here the evidence is ambiguous. The account of the creation of the world which begins the 'Metamorphoses' (M. 1,5 – 88) is eclectic, largely Stoic and not at all Epicurean; the last book contains several hundred lines of Pythagoreanism. Again the 'Fasti' is an unlikely subject for an Epicurean, and in it Ovid speaks of the god within much as does Seneca, and plainly identifies him with the primal fire (F. 6,5).

But there are passages which point in a very different direction. Echoes of Lucretius need not count for much, though Ovid's knowledge seems very thorough (Am. 1,15,24, L. 5,95,1000; M. 7,517 – 613, L. 6,1136 – 1285; M. 15,143 – 53, L. 2,7 ff.; Tr. 2,261 – 2, L. 1,1). But what can be said of Ovid's rejection of augury (M. 15,127 ff.) or of ritual purification (F. 2,45 – 6)? And when Ovid says that the gods were invented for the good of society

> *nec secura quies illos similisque sopori*
> *detinet: innocue vivite, numen adest.* (AA. 1,637)

does it not follow that he really believed that the gods do not intervene in human affairs, and enjoy *secura quies*, which is pure Epicureanism?

It is in the last poems that Epicureanism seems strongest. But some of the passages refer to his earlier life.

> *quique fugax rerum securaque in otia natus* (Tr. 3,2,9)

> *aspera militiae iuvenis certamina fugi,*
> *nec nisi lusura movimus arma manu.* (Tr. 4,1,71)

> *... quaeque meae semper placuerunt otia menti*
> *carpere et in studiis molliter esse meis,*
> *et parvam celebrare domum veteresque Penates,*
> *et quae nunc domino rura paterna carent,*
> *inque sinu dominae carisque sodalibus inque*
> *securus patria consenuisse mea.* (Tr. 4,8,7)

> *optabam placide vivere posse senex.* (Tr. 4,8,30)

> *nec patiens corpus, nec mens fuit apta labori,*
> *sollicitaeque fugax ambitionis eram,*
> *et petere Aoniae suadebant tuta sorores*
> *otia, iudicio semper amata meo.* (Tr. 4,10,37)

So too he claims that his life was chaste even if his poetry was gay, and the object of his writing was *honesta voluptas* (Tr. 2,353 – 8). He still writes not for *gloria* but for *utilitas* (P. 3,9,55 – 6). His own fate has shut the path to *utilitas* (Tr. 3,5,16), though he still pursues it (Tr. 4,1,38; P. 1,5,554). He advises a friend to avoid great names and glory (Tr. 3,4,3 – 6 cf. 43). All these references strongly suggest Epicureanism's influence on Ovid.

The most impressive aspect of these later poems is their exaltation of friendship. It would be tedious to quote all the passages, but some references

show how deep this runs: Tr. 1,8,15 *amicitiae sanctum et venerabile nomen*; 1,9,39–40; 3,4,1; 3,5,1 *usus amicitiae*; 3,6,1 *foedus amicitiae*; 4.8.11. Or look at the expression of conjugal affection in Tr. 1,3; 1,6; 3,3; 4,3. Such *amicitia*, between man and man or between man and woman, was a peculiar characteristic of the Epicureans.

What does this amount to? I suspect an exposure to Epicureanism in Ovid's youth, leading to a general commitment to an Epicurean way of life. I do not see any evidence of membership in an Epicurean confraternity. As Ovid grew away from his youth his Epicureanism sat more lightly on him; other interests developed, and for poetic or other purposes he turned to other philosophies. When he was broken by exile he reverted to the 'religion' of his younger days, which he had never wholly lost. It is not an uncommon experience.

12. Summary of Epicureanism in the Augustan Age

At Boscoreale two silver cups of the Augustan Age show a morbid and extravagant satire on death and culture. Skeletons are identified as well-known figures in literature and philosophy. The philosophers include Zeno, Epicurus, the Cynic Monimus, and perhaps Demetrius of Phalerum. Epicurus is accompanied by two pigs; he has his hand on a cake, and is associated with the motto τὸ τέλος ἡδονή. It is a comment on the transitoriness of material enjoyment which Epicurus might not have disowned.

A summary is in order: At the beginning of this period there were a good many Epicureans at Rome, and the philosophy permeated in their youth to adult Augustans. Lucretius is the main, but not sole channel through which Epicureanism continued to be known. There seems, however, to have been a movement away from Epicureanism, probably fosterd by official policy, which was not intolerant. The Epicureanism which survived tended to adjust itself to Roman social values, and except possibly in Maecenas's circle there are no signs of an Epicurean community at Rome. Meanwhile Epicureanism continued to flourish in Greece.

IV. The First Century A. D.

1. Epicureanism and Judaism, and especially Philo of Alexandria

To the Jews Epicureanism was anathema. Their natural repugnance to a creed to which God was irrelevant was intensified by the career of Antiochus Epiphanes, who became an Epicurean convert.

Philo's evidence is thus of particular interest. H. A. WOLFSON says well of him: "He openly disagreees with the Epicureans on the most essential points

in their doctrine. In physics he rejects their atomism; in ethics he rejects their hedonism; in theology he denounces the belief in the existence of gods in the form of human beings, as taught by Epicurus in his popular writings, and he denounces also the denial of providence and the doctrine that the world is governed by chance, as taught by Epicurus in his philosophical writings." (Philo 1 [Cambr., Mass. 1948], 110–1).

The fact is that Philo has an accurate and detailed knowledge of Epicurean doctrine. He knows, to take an obvious instance, that the Epicureans are not atheists, and contrasts those who say that God does not exist at all (Opif. Mundi 61,170) with those who say that deity exists but does not exercise providence, and that the world moves on unstably as chance directs (Confus. Ling 23,114). He knows that the Epicurean gods are corporeal, and claims that to portray God in human form is to plunge straight on the road to Epicurean impiety (Post. Caini 1,2). He knows the doctrine that the gods live in the interstices between worlds (Somn. 1,32,184). Again he knows the relationship and difference between the cosmologies of Democritus and Epicurus (Aet. Mundi 3,8); much of his own cosmology is an attempt to defend a Platonic view against an Epicurean view on allegedly scriptural but really philosophical grounds. In a homily on Genesis 15,10 (Quis Rerum 26,130–1) "he divided them in the midst" he says that the Logos "never stops dividing; when it has passed through all sensible objects down to the atoms, the so-called indivisibles, it goes on again to divide the objects of reason into parts which are beyond verbal account". This is an attack on the doctrine of indivisible atoms, but it is an accurate attack; Philo knows that the atoms are accessible to the mind, not to the senses. Another impressive assimilation of detail is his assertion that God made amphibious animals, and could if he chose have created an animal capable of living in all the elements (Quod Deterius 42,154). This runs counter to the Epicurean view that trees cannot exist in the sky, clouds in the sea, or fishes live in the fields; each has its determined place of existence (L. 3,787).

Philo, then, is opposed to Epicureanism. In a homily on Exodus 2,12 (Fug. et Inv. 26,148) he interprets the Egyptian whom Moses smote as "the doctrine that pleasure is the principal and supreme good, and the doctrine that atoms are the elementary principles of the universe". But he knows what he is opposing, and we can legitimately deduce a lively Epicurean school at Alexandria under the early empire.

There is a contrast here with Josephus, who is aware of the Epicureans (Ant. 10,227–9; 19,32; Ap. 2,180) and thinks they are worth attacking, but in an extended paragraph against them says nothing more than that they deny providence. This is partly a contrast between the philosopher and the historian, and partly between Palestine and Alexandria.

See W. C. VAN UNNIK, An Attack on the Epicureans by Flavius Josephus, in: Romanitas et Christianitas. Studia Jano Henrico Waszink ... oblata, edd. W. DEN BOER et al. (Amsterdam 1973), 341–355.

2. Epicureanism, Christianity and the Writings of Paul

N. W. De Witt in his 'Epicurus and His Philosophy' (Minneapolis 1954) made some original observations about the possible influence of Epicureanism on Christianity. He pointed out the following facts: a) although the Jews generally repudiated the Epicureans, there was possible Epicureanism in the Jewish tradition, certainly in 'Ecclesiastes' and possibly among the Sadducees, with their reluctance to hold public office, their denial of immortality, their denial of providence, and their assertion of free will; b) Epicureanism certainly existed in the Decapolis, as Philodemus came from Gadara, and c) Epicureanism was strong in Antioch, where the followers of Jesus were first called Christians; lastly, d) Epicureanism forms a bridge between Greek philosophy and Christian ethics. Plato's ethics are part of his total philosophy, and directed to an intellectual aristocracy. Epicurus's ethics are linked with physics but divorced from politics, and directed to the middle class. Jesus's ethics are individual, and directed to the poor. This is far too schematic an account, but the vocabulary of Epicureanism and of the New Testament are sometimes closely similar, and examples are necessary for such a generalization.

In 'St. Paul and Epicurus' (Minneapolis 1954) De Witt made a closer examination of passages in Paul which seemed to him to show traces of Epicureanism, either assimilated or opposed. The first letter to Thessalonians is a good example. De Witt starts from Paul's use of παρρησιάζεσθαι (2,2), and suggests rightly that it is used, as Epicurus uses it, to mean 'speak with complete frankness'. Now in the last chapter Paul speaks of those who believe in 'peace and security' (εἰρήνη καὶ ἀσφάλεια: 5,3), and De Witt rightly claims that these are Epicurean catchwords. The Christians to whom Paul is writing are not like that: they know that peace comes from God (5,23). Similarly he has earlier contrasted the Christian belief in resurrection with the state of those who have no hope (4,13); this probably fits the Epicureans better than any other group of the ancient world. In the second letter (2,1 – 12) Paul has an account of the coming of Antichrist; the description seems based on Antiochus Epiphanes, who was a convert to Epicureanism.

Without pressing all the points made by De Witt it seems reasonable to assume that when Paul wrote about the middle of the first century A. D., there was a strong Epicurean community at Thessalonica, some of whose members had been converted to Christianity.

'Colossians' deserves treatment next. Colossae is not far from Oenoanda where Diogenes proclaimed salvation according to Epicurus a century or so later. De Witt points out that in the letter to Colossae, in three verses (2,18 – 20) Paul uses five concepts associated with Epicureanism: the emphasis on the evidence of sight, the allegation of arrogance, 'the mind of the flesh', 'the elements of the universe' (a phrase for the atoms), and the dogmatism. Angel-worship adduced in the same passage clearly takes it away from the Epicureans, and Paul speaks of the elements in a non-Epicurean sense. None the less the concatenation is striking, and when Paul afterwards calls on his readers to concentrate on the things above, not on earthly things (3,2), we may well

think that his words are directed against Epicurean tendencies: *quod super nos nihil est ad nos.*

'Philippians' is clearer. In the first place, the pattern of the letter: warm beginning, critical admonition, ethical exhortation, is characteristically Epicurean. In the central section Paul characterizes some non-Christians: "... their god is their belly and they glory in their shame" (3,19). This is a typically hostile view of Epicurus and his followers. Paul says that "their minds are set on earthly things" (which seems to refer to Epicureans in 'Colossians') and that they are headed for destruction, which similarly appears of the Epicureans in '1 Thessalonians'. But now in the final, positive, section, Paul takes up for his own purposes some constructive sides of Epicureanism. For example "Rejoice in the Lord always" (4,4) seems to echo Epicurus's invitation to continuous pleasures, but now in a Christian context ("The Lord is at hand"). τὸ ἐπιεικές (4,5), not in the gospels, a favourite Epicurean word; προσφιλής (4,8) echoes the Epicurean enthusiasm for friendship; αὐτάρκης (4,11), not exclusively Epicurean, is one of the great words of Hellenistic philosophy. But it is to the peace of God that Paul calls his readers (4,7).

There is enough here to make us think that, as at Thessalonica, there was a significant Epicurean group at Philippi, some of whom became Christian converts, and that Paul is concerned to warn them against their old associates, and to show them that Christianity offers a richer and truer fulfilment of the good things in Epicureanism.

Finally, let us look at '1 Corinthians'. Here the word atom occurs (15.52), though it is used of time rather than of matter. But it is legitimate to infer that Paul has Epicurean terminology in mind. This chapter is, in fact, an attack on the fear of death. Epicurus made this the central point of his own onslaught, as the third book of Lucretius bears ample witness. But the answers are different. Paul and Epicurus might agree that "what is sown on earth is perishable" (15,42). The whole concept of 'corruption' is strongly Epicurean. But Epicurus can only say that death is not felt; Paul offers a life beyond death. In the great thirteenth chapter, Paul pushes faith and hope in the background to love. We often speak of these as the three Christian virtues, but they weren't, until Paul wrote this passage. Hope was an Epicurean virtue; the proper attitude towards the past was gratitude, to the present enjoyment, to the future hope. So that when Paul says "If it is for this life only that Christ has given us hope, we of all men are most to be pitied" (15,19), he is claiming that Christ has more to offer than Epicurus. So indeed with love itself. Paul claims for 'love' (*agape*) the very things that Epicurus claims for 'friendship' (*philia*); the difference is that *agape* is rooted in God, and *philia* is not.

There are other points in this letter. Two will suffice. Paul's use of ψυχικός is undoubtedly complex. It is contrasted with πνευματικός, and seems to mean the opposite of all that we would normally understand by spiritual (15,44–6); the New English Bible renders it 'animal'. De Witt suggests that Paul, as elsewhere in this chapter, has the Epicureans in mind; they believed in a soul, but in a mortal, perishable soul. Again, earlier in the letter Paul has written "Everything is open to me, but everything is not expedient" (6,12;

10,23). This is a very Epicurean statement: on the one hand the assertion of free will, on the other the judgement of an action by its consequences, τὸ συμφέρον, *utilitas*.

DE WITT, like many scholars with fresh and original insights, overstates his case. He assumes that any word common to Epicurus and Paul is derived by Paul from Epicurus. He underestimates the extent to which words and concepts were part of the common currency of the Hellenistic World. Further, his suggestion that Paul was brought up an Epicurean is exceedingly unlikely (though Tarsus was an Epicurean centre).

What DE WITT has shown is that Paul expects his readers in Thessalonica, Colossae, Philippi and Corinth to be familiar with Epicureanism, and that it is highly probable that some of them were converts from Epicureanism. Christians and Epicureans had much in common: they shared in attacking superstition; they stood against war and political ambition; they were classless societies; they had an active concern for helping the needy; they were in a real sense communities. Those who were attracted by the way of life of the Epicureans, but hankered after faith, might well feel at home with the Christians. It is significant that Epicurean language is much less easy to extricate from Romans. This suggests that DE WITT was right to see these parallels as specifically Epicurean, and not just part of the everyday exchanges of the Graeco-Roman world; we have seen good reason to believe that Epicureanism was from the time of August discouraged at Rome; the evidence of the epistles is that it was prominent in the Near East.

Besides the study of DE WITT, see also H. D. BETZ, The Sermon on the Mount. Its Literary Genre and Function, Journal of Religion 69 (1979), 285–297 in which BETZ argues for similarities between the Sermon on the Mount and the 'Kyriai Doxai'.

3. Petronius

OSKAR RAITH has claimed Petronius as an Epicurean. The evidence is mainly derived from the fragments, some of which are of doubtful authenticity. We may cite a number of Epicurean commonplaces, e.g. the famous *primus in orbe deos fecit timor* (fr. 27), the view that dreams are a reflection of waking thoughts (fr. 30 cf. L. 4,961 ff.), the use of optical illusions – *fallunt nos oculi* – and the particular example of the square tower appearing round (fr. 29 cf. L. 4,353 and 385 *nec possunt oculi naturam noscere rerum*), the inexhaustible variety of nature (fr. 26). In all these the proximate source is Lucretius; this means that they may be literary commonplaces, though they seem to be cited with sympathy for their substance and for their expression. Also interesting are the treatments of Prometheus (fr. 25) and Tantalus (S. 82,5). Here in the use of allegorical interpretation there are close parallels with Lucretius (L. 3,980 ff.), but the details are different. Either Petronius has modified Lucretius, or else he has drawn on another, almost certainly Epicurean, source (cf. Diog. Oen., fr. 15). Also notable is the use of Lucretius's attack on love in a love-poem (fr. 54). Possibly this is just a witticism, but it

looks like a semi-serious attempt to give Epicurean justification for making love. NETHERCUT argues that one of the sexual passages in the 'Satyricon' (23,4 – 5), marked by a strong revulsion, is indebted to Lucretius (4,1099. 1121. 1284 – 7). Two other passages in the 'Satyricon' are derived from Lucretius's exposition of Epicureanism. In one of them Eumolpus calls Epicurus *hominem divinum* (S. 104,3 cf. L. 3,15; 5,8 – 19; 6,7 – 8); the problem in a work of fiction is to know how far this is the character's view and how far the author's. The other passage is the assertion that it doesn't matter what happens to the body in death (S. 115,17 – 8 cf. L. 3,870 – 911); this is attributed to the 'I' of the story and seems to be sympathetically presented.

There are other passages which seem to come from Epicurus without the mediation of Lucretius. Such is the excellent poem 'Parvula securo' (fr. 46), where the emphasis on simplicity of living is authentically Epicurean. Such is Eumolpus's

> *Ego sic semper et ubique vixi, ut ultimam quamque lucem tanquam non redituram consumerem* (S. 99,1 cf. USENER, Epicurea [op. cit. I, p. 2261 above], 490),

though here again there is a question whether this is Petronius or merely Eumolpus. So too the passage of epic seems to contain an Epicurean attack on war (S. 119,13; 124,249).

A second element which RAITH claims more dubiously as Epicurean is the ethology or characterology of the 'Satyricon'. There are undoubtedly parallels with the sort of literature represented in Theophrastus's 'Characters', and RAITH claims that this was mediated through Philodemus. This part of the case must be called 'not proven'.

Finally there is a certain mood of hedonism exemplified by a second direct reference of Epicurus. The text reads

> *ipse pater veri doctus Epicurus in arte iussit, et hoc vitam dixit habere* τέλος (S. 132)

where the context is 'making love'. *Doctus* is unmetrical, and most editors read *doctos Epicurus amare*. It is unwise to build much on an emendation. However, the passage does seem to ascribe to Epicurus the teaching that love is the aim of life. This may be ironical; certainly Epicurus never said any such thing. But the love-poem mentioned above (fr. 54) tries (again perhaps whimsically) to link Epicureanism and love. Within the writing of Petronius and within what we know of his life there is a type of hedonism which might come from a free interpretation of Epicurus.

Along these lines Trimalchio's banquet seems to be a satirical attack on *luxuria*. His *carpe diem* is overeating and its obvious conclusion is death from overindulgence. Overeating has led him to constipation (S. 47,4 – 6); sexual overindulgence leads to impotence (S. 129). In this way we can see Epicureanism behind 'The Satyricon' as much as we can see Isis-worship behind Apuleius's 'Metamorphoses'.

This accords with Petronius's life. Tacitus charges him with *ignavia* (contrasted with *industria*); he was indifferent to himself; he had a certain straightforwardness; in Nero's company his vices were perhaps only feigned; he had a scientific knowledge of pleasure (Tac., Ann. 16,18). Further his closest friend was Flavius Scaevinus, who before he got caught up in the conspiracy against Nero led a life of retirement in search of pleasure, which has an Epicurean ring about it. We do not know enough to say whether Petronius and Scaevinus were members of an Epicurean *contubernium*. I do not think that there is much doubt that Petronius was exposed to Epicureanism and sympathetic towards it.

One last point. 'Ludus de Morte Claudii' cannot be by Seneca according to G. BAGNANI (Arbiter of Elegance, Phoenix Suppl. 2 [Toronto 1954]) who has suggested that it may be by Petronius. The gods in welcoming Claudius say that he can't be an Epicurean god: οὔτε αὐτὸς πρᾶγμα ἔχει τι οὔτε ἄλλοις παρέχει. This is an almost verbal quotation from Epicurus (D. L. 10,139), and comes from someone who knows Epicureanism accurately.

See G. HIGHET, Petronius the Moralist, TAPA 72 (1941), 176–94; O. RAITH, Petronius, ein Epikureer (Nürnberg 1963); W. R. NETHERCUT, Petronius, Epicurean and Moralist, C. Bull. 43 (1967), 53–5; cf. J. P. SULLIVAN, Petronius' 'Satyricon' and its Neronian Context, ANRW II, 32,3, ed. W. HAASE (Berlin – New York 1985), pp. 1666–1686, esp. 1669. – K. BRINGMANN, Senecas 'Apocolocyntosis': Ein Forschungsbericht 1959–1982, ANRW II, 32,2, ed. W. HAASE (Berlin – New York 1985), pp. 885–914, esp. 885 ff. ('Verfasser und Datierung des Werkes'). – A. D. LEEMAN, Tacite sur Pétrone. Mort et liberté, ASNP III/8 (1978), 421–434.

4. Other Epicureans of the First Century

Some known Epicureans of this period are: Philostratus in his life of Apollonius of Tyana says that the sage studied with Epicureans at Aegae in Cilicia. Philostratus is an exceedingly unreliable source and may be merely projecting back in time a *contubernium* of his own day. It is odd however to make his hero study an uncongenial creed so that one is inclined to think that he received it as part of the traditon about Apollonius. Pompedius is mentioned by Josephus (Ant. 19,32) as a senator who held most of the offices of state, but, that apart, was an Epicurean. (Despite Hirtius, Pansa and others, Epicureans were still not expected to hold public office.) He spoke harshly of Caligula, who had his mistress, the actress Quintilia, tortured, but, seeing her bravery, acquitted them both. Dio (59,26,4 [Exc. Vales.]) calls him Pomponius and charges him with actual conspiracy. Josephus's version is the more probable. SWAN conjectures that Πομπήδιος should read Πομπώνιος and that Pompedius may be P. Pomponius Secundus, *consul suffectus* in 44, legate of Upper Germany, where he won *triumphalis honos* in 50, highly esteemed tragic poet (Quint. Inst. or. 10,1,98). His Epicurean affinities and unique public career appear in Tacitus (Ann. 5,8), who says that Pomponius endured his troubles with equanimity, *aequus* being an Epicurean rather than a Stoic term (cf. Hor. Od. 2,3,1: *aequam memento rebus in arduis / servare mentem*).

There is also a Diodorus, mentioned by Seneca in 'De Beata Vita' (19,1) as having recently committed suicide; the date may be about A. D. 60.

Finally, there are: Annaeus Serenus, *praefectus vigilum* under Nero, who died of eating poisonous fungi in A. D. 63, and subject of a notable tribute by Seneca who also addressed to him the treatises 'De Constantia Sapientis' and 'De Tranquillitate Animae' (the latter on a particularly appropriate theme) (Sen. Ep., 63,14; Tac. Ann. 13,13; Plin., NH. 22,23,47; for his Epicureanism see Sen., Const. Sap. 15,4). Aufidius Bassus: friend of Seneca and an Epicurean (Sen., Ep. 30,14); his 'Bellum Germanicum' was praised by Quintilian (10,1,102). Lucilius, Seneca's correspondent, seemingly an Epicurean (Sen., Ep. 23,9). 'Aetna', if it is his, shows clear knowledge of Lucretius. Pollius Felix, friend of Statius, expressly Epicurean (Silv. 2,2,113 cf. 140 note too 3 pr. *dulcissimo et ... quiete dignissimo*).

On Pompedius – Pomponius see P. M. SWAN, A Consular Epicurean under the Early Principate, Phoenix 30 (1976), 54 – 60, and on his fame as a poet L. DURET, Dans l'ombre des plus grands: II. Poètes et prosateurs mal connus de la latinité d'argent, ANRW II, 32,5, ed. W. HAASE (Berlin – New York 1986), 3163 – 3170. For Annaeus Serenus, addressee of Seneca's Const. sap. and Tranq. an., cf. K. ABEL, Seneca. Leben und Leistung, ANRW II, 32,2, ed. W. HAASE (Berlin – New York 1985), 722 – 726, and J.-M. ANDRÉ, Sénèque: 'De breuitate uitae', 'De constantia sapientis', 'De tranquillitate animi', 'De otio', ANRW II, 36,3, ed. W. HAASE (Berlin – New York 1989), 1756 – 1764, 1764 – 1772. On Aufidius Bassus see L. DURET, Dans l'ombre des plus grands: II (op. cit.), 3277 – 3280 (among other places, see Indices, p. 3325), and, e. g., M. M. SAGE, Tacitus' Historical Works: a Survey and Appraisal, ANRW II, 33,2, ed. W. HAASE (Berlin – New York 1990), 1004 – 1005. On Lucilius, Seneca's friend, G. MAZZOLI, Le 'Epistulae Morales ad Lucilium' di Seneca. Valore letterario e filosofico, ANRW II, 36,3, ed. W. HAASE (Berlin – New York 1989), 1853 – 1855 ('*Destinatario*'). On the 'Aetna' F. R. D. GOODYEAR, The 'Aetna': Thought, Antecedents, and Style, ANRW II, 32,1, ed. W. HAASE (Berlin – New York 1984), 344 – 363.

5. Seneca

We come now to Seneca and his circle. Seneca's knowledge of Epicurus is deep and wide and it may, in summary form, be useful to have the main references.

From the letters: 2,5 (E., fr. 475); 4,10 (E., fr. 200; 477 "from someone else's Garden"); 6,6 (Epicurus's *contubernium*); 7,11 (E., fr. 208); 8,7 – 8 (E., fr. 199; he is rereading Epicurus); 9,1 (E., fr. 174); 9,8 (E., fr. 175); 9,20 (E., fr. 474); 11,8 (E., fr. 210); 12,10 – 1 ("It is an evil to live under constraint; but there is no constraint to live under constraint"); 13,16 – 7 (E., fr. 494, not, says Seneca, a commonplace); 14,7 – 8 (E., Ep. 3; slightly odd that Lucilius is not expected to recognize it, and Seneca is not sure of the source); 15,9 (E., fr. 491); 16,7 (E. fr. 201); 17,11 (E., fr. 479); 18,9 (simplicity: 18,6 refers to Cynics not Epicureans); 18,14 (E., fr. 484); 19,9 (Maecenas); 19,10 (E., fr. 542); 20,9 – 11 (E., fr. 206); 21,2 – 4 (E., fr. 132); 21,7 – 10 (E., fr. 135: warmly appreciative); 22,5 – 6 (E., fr. 133); 22,13 – 14 (E., fr. 495), 23,0 (E., fr. 493); 24,18 (E. on mythology); 24,22 – 3 (E., fr. 496; 498; 497); 25,4 – 6 (E., fr. 211; 209); 26,8 (E., fr. 205); 27,2 (Epicurean view of conscience); 27,9 (E., fr. 477);

28,6 (hurly-burly of public life); 28,9 (E., fr. 522); 29,10 (E., fr. 187); 30,14 (E., fr. 503); 33,1 – 2 (appreciation of maxims); 33,4 (authority of Epicurus); 36,9 – 10 (D. L. 10,124 – 5); 39,6 (*utilitas* and *voluptates*); 46,1 (Lucilius's *dulcedo*, like Livy's or Epicurus's); 48 (Epicurean and Stoic friendship contrasted); 50,9 (*philosophia ... dulcis est*); 51,8 (critical: *si voluptati cessero, cedendum est dolori*); 52,3 – 4 (E., fr. 192); 55,4 – 5 (rejection of λάθε βιώσας); 55,8 – 9 (praise of *tranquillitas* and *amicitia* as *voluptas*); 56 (praise of *otium*); 59 (*vitium esse voluptatem*; but 59,17 *non potest gaudere, nisi fortis, nisi iustus, nisi temperans* is Epicurean); 60 (a highly Epicurean letter parallel to Juvenal 10); 66,18 – 9 (E., fr. 601); 66,45 (E., fr. 434); 66,47 – 8 (E., fr. 449; 138); 67,15 (E., fr. 601); 68 (*otium* as a Stoic pursuit, but 68,10 shows it as normally an Epicurean theme); 72,9 (void); 73,10 – 2 (*otium*); 79,15 – 6 (E., fr. 188; 43; more important, the evidence that whatever its position in the late Republic, Epicureanism had now spread among the common people); 89,11 (E., fr. 242); 90,35 (attack on λάθε βιώσας and *dieux fainéants*); 92,25 (E., fr. 138); 95,11 (L. 1,54 ff.); 97,13 – 5 (E., fr. 532; but Seneca disagrees with the rejection of natural justice); 98,9 (story of Metrodorus); 99,25 – 8 (quotation from Metrodorus); 102,27 – 8 (some Epicurean language); 104,3 (Epicurean friendship seems to be prevailing over Stoic suicide); 105 (means to ἀταραξία); 106,8 (L. 1,304); 110,6 – 7 (L. 2,55 – 56: criticized); 118,2 (attack on ambition seems Epicurean); 123 (an attack on Epicurean *voluptas*, but not without the approval of Epicurean phrases, e. g. 123,16 *mors malum non est*); 124 (more rejection of Epicurean *voluptas*).

From the treatises: Const. Sap. 1,1 (*ceteri* are Epicureans); 15,4 (E KD 16: the whole treatise is addressed to the Epicureans); Ira 1,1,1 (*aliquid quieti placidique*); 1,2,1 (attack on war); 1,10,2 (*otium*); 3,6,3 (λάθε βιώσας, rather oddly based on Democritus); Clem. 1,3,2 (Stoic and Epicurean arguments for *clementia*); Cons. ad Marc. 7,2 (the argument from animal feeling is Epicurean: L. 3,741 – 53); Vit. Beat. 7,1 (KD 5); 11,1 – 2 (pleasure and virtue); 12 – 3 (strong approval of Epicurus); 15 (criticism of pleasure); 18,1 (defence of E.); 19,1 (Diodorus the Epicurean); 27,5 (Epicurus as a spendthrift): the whole treatise shows a close awareness of Epicureanism: it is addressed to Gallio; Otio 1,4 (Seneca admits the Epicurean nature of the theme); 3,2 (E., fr. 9); 5,6 (L. 1,72 – 3; followed by Epicurean and Stoic physics); 7,3 (E., fr. 442); Tranq. An. 2 (ἀταραξία again based on Democritus); 6,2 (acceptance that for some people *utilior negotio quies est*, though Seneca will not make it universal); the absence of direct reference to Epicurus seems deliberate policy); Brev. Vit. (strongly Epicurean in mood throughout) 14,1 (L. 1,72); 14,2 (*cum Epicuro quiescere*); 16,2 (E., fr. 496; L. 3,79); 19,1 (*tranquilliora, tutiora, maiora*: he includes pleasure in a list of otherwise Stoic goals); Cons ad Pol. 1,2 (destruction of universe); 4,3 (L. 5,222); 5,1 (dead take no pleasure in our grief); 6,4 (Polybius cannot *a tumultu rerum in otium ruris quieti confugere*); 10,2 (ingratitude for past pleasures cf. Ben. 3,4,1); 104 (L. 3,971); Ben. 2,29,1 (L. 5,195 – 234); 3,41 (ingratitude for past blessings cited from E.); 4,1,2 (rejection of *utilitates*); 4,2,1 (attack on Epicureans, *delicata et umbraticia turba*: note that there are plenty of them); 4,4 (Epicurean theology); 4,11 (attack on

utilitas); 4,13,1 (attack on *voluptas* and *otium*); 4,16,1 (Epicurean utilitarianism specified though not named); 4,19,1 – 4 (attack on Epicurean theology); 7,2 (attack on pleasure).

From the plays: Thyestes 391 – 403 (chorus: λάθε βιώσας); Phaedra 972 – 88 (chorus: divine indifference); Troades 401 (chorus: *mors individua est, noxia corpori / nec parcens animae*).

From other works QN 1 pr. 13 (attack on Epicurean cosmology); 4,3,3 (L. 1,314: not named); 6,20,4 – 6 (Epicurus on earthquakes); Matrim. fr. 45 (E., fr. 19).

This amounts to a lively and considerable knowledge of Epicureanism. Certainly Seneca was reading Epicurus during the first block of letters to Lucilius: perhaps Lucilius was an Epicurean (Ep. 23,9 *Epicuri tui*), and this would explain it. Further, USENER (Epicurea IV) argued cogently that Seneca at this time had access to a *gnomologion* of Epicurean maxims (without suggesting that this was his sole source). But Seneca has been familiar with Epicurus for years before, and in 'De Constantia Sapientis' (perhaps written as early as A. D. 41 – 2) claims to know his Epicurus better than does the Epicurean Serenus (15,4). As we have seen, he had other Epicurean friends. But there is no indication that they introduced Seneca to the philosophy. I have argued elsewhere that Seneca's brother (M. Annaeus Novatus, later Gallio) was an Epicurean. In the tribute in QN 4 pr. 9 – 11 Seneca singles out his general companionableness, and his lack of interest in money, and calls him by the technical term *dulcis*; so does Statius (Silv. 2,7,32); 'De Beata Vita', addressed to Gallio, shows a close knowledge and warm appreciation of Epicurus, and its conflation in our manuscripts with 'De Otio' suggests that the latter, clearly addressed to an Epicurean, may also have been for Gallio. It is also quite likely that an Epicurean, having Epicurus on desire and fear, might invite a philosophically-minded younger brother to plug a gap by writing on anger. And all this is highly compatible with Gallio "caring for none of these things" (Acts 18,12 – 7).

See J. FERGUSON, Was Gallio an Epicurean?, Palaeologia 7 (1958), 111 – 4. Also H. MUTSCHMANN, Seneca und Epikur, Hermes 50 (1915), 321 – 56; A. SACHELLI, Lineamenti epicurei nello Stoicismo di Seneca (Genoa 1925); R. SCHOTTLÄNDER, Epikureisches bei Seneca, Philologus 94 (1955), 133 – 48; A. GRILLI, Seneca ed Epicuro, fr. 522 Us., Paideia 12 (1957), 337 – 8; J.-M. ANDRÉ, Recherches sur l'otium romain, Annales litt. de l'Univ. de Besançon 52 (Paris 1962); P. GRIMAL, Sénèque et la pensée grecque, Bull. Ass. G. Budé (1966), 317 – 30; J.-M. ANDRÉ, Sénèque et l'Epicurisme, Actes VIIIe Congrès G. Budé (Paris 1969), 469 – 80. I have not been able to see O. WEISSENFELS, De Seneca Epicureo (Berlin 1886), in which he argued for the similarities between Stoic and Epicurean philosophies once you delve beneath the surface; nor H. SCHILDHAUER, Seneca und Epikur (Diss. Greifswald 1932); nor L. CAMPESE, Seneca e l'Epicureismo (Benevento 1960). Lastly, see C. E. MANNING, Seneca's 98th Letter, and the praemeditatio futuri mali, Mnemosyne ser. IV, 24 (1976), 301 – 304 (cf. R. J. NEWMAN, Cotidie meditare. Theory and Practice of the meditatio in Imperial Stoicism, ANRW II, 36,3, ed. W. HAASE [Berlin – New York 1989], 1474 – 1517); J. M. RIST, Seneca and Stoic Orthodoxy, ANRW II, 36,3, ed. W. HAASE (Berlin – New York 1989), 1993 – 2012; G. MAZZOLI, Le 'Epistulae Morales ad Lucilium' di Seneca. Valore letterario e filosofico, ibid. 1823 – 1877, esp. 1853 – 1855 ('*Destinatario*').

6. Herculaneum and the *villa surburbana dei papiri*

Of great importance to the history of Epicureanism is the *villa suburbana dei papiri* at Herculaneum, the villa of the Pisones. Its primary interest is for the late Republic, when its owner was L. Calpurnius Piso, and the plethora of Philodemus manuscripts strongly suggests Philodemus' views were associated with the house. But the villa and its library were redecorated in the first century A. D., and it seems that the bronze and marble portraits in the library date mostly from the redecoration. The busts include patrons of the arts like Ptolemy III, literary figures like Sappho and Demosthenes, and a variety of philosophers including Epicurus and Hermarchus. Their appearance does not oblige one to think that the villa remained a centre of Epicureanism, since Aristotle and Zeno the Stoic also appear. One might argue the contrary, that these were survivals from the Epicurean period into a more eclectic attitude. But at least they were still there. The Epicurean philosophers were visible, and of course the Epicurean texts were available to be read in this library right up to A. D. 79.

On Philodemus, see especially E. Asmis, Philodemus' Epicureanism, below in this same volume (ANRW II, 36,4), 2369 – 2406; see also T. Dorandi, Filodemo: gli orientamenti della ricerca attuale, below in this same volume (ANRW II, 36,4), 2328 – 2368 and Id., Filodemo storico del pensiero antico, ibid., 2407 – 2423.

7. Pap. Oxy. 215

There is a similar piece of evidence from Egypt. Pap. Oxy. 215 is an extract from a philosophical work, written by some Hellenistic philosopher attacking popular religion and fear of the gods. The original work was probably written some time in the late Hellenistic Age, but it was still being copied in the first century A. D. in Egypt.

8. Other Latin Writers and Epicureanism

Some references to Epicureanism in Silver Latin writers may be noted in passing:

A. Persius

Persius is a Stoic. But he begins his first satire with a double reference to Lucretius: *O curas hominum! o quantum est in rebus inane!* (1,1 cf. L. 2,14; 1,330). There are other Lucretian phrases; 6,3 (L. 4,531); 6,61 (L. 2,79); and an awareness of the Epicurean critique of religion (2,24). But his one reference to Epicurus is unsympathetic: he sems to suggest that his *gigni / de nihilo nihilum, in nihilum nil posse reverti* is the delirium of an invalid in his second childhood (3,83 – 4).

B. Quintilian

There are a few references in Quintilian (e.g. 2,17,15; 5,7,35; 7,3,5; 10,1,124; 10,2,15; 12,2,24). Quintilian has taken the trouble to find out what he is talking about. He treats the Epicureans as a significant and active school of thought. But he is fundamantally unsympathetic for two reasons. One is that the Epicureans abjured literary graces, and therefore were useless to him for training orators. The other is that he is an unabashed Ciceronian, and thus follows his master's prejudices.

C. Statius

Statius was a friend of a known Epicurean, Pollius Felix: above p. 2280: he calls him *dulcis* (Silv. 3 pr.). He also applies *dulcis* to Gallio (Silv. 2,7,32), a probable Epicurean: above p. 2282. He is one of the rare people to mention Lucretius by name (Silv. 2,7,76) and he certainly knows Lucretius's poem (Silv. 4,6,36; L. 5,8). There is at least the possibility that he is himself a member of the *contubernium*. And, going one stage further, if so, the application of *dulcis* to Septimius Severus (Silv. 4,5,34) suggests that he might also be involved.

See J. FERGUSON, Was Gallio an Epicurean?, Palaeologia 7 (1958), 111–4. On Statius and Lucretius (among others) see L. DURET, De Lucrèce aux Silves de Stace (A propos des Silves V 3, 19–28), REL 58 (1980), 344–362. Cf. H.-J. VAN DAM, Statius, 'Silvae'. Forschungsbericht 1974–1984, ANRW II, 32,5, ed. W. HAASE (Berlin – New York 1986), 2727–2753, esp. 2740 f. ('Auctores').

D. Valerius Flaccus

Valerius Flaccus claims that Jupiter dislikes *otium* (1,500).

E. Silius

Silius is a Stoic. He puts an address into the mouth of Voluptas which is based on Epicureanism: pacifism (13,55 ff.), the avoidance of pain (15,46 ff.), *usus* (15,55), the ἀταραξία of the deity (15,58 *imperturbata placidus tenet otia mente*, a splendid line for anyone, and for Silius miraculous), death as the end (15,63 ff.). Silius's understanding does not run deep, but he knows his texts.

F. Pliny the Elder

A piece of unexpected Epicureanism suddenly appears in the middle of the Elder Pliny's voluminous 'Natural History' (7,55,188–90). It is a clear statement of the Epicurean view of death. The myths are described as childish nonsense; there is no sensation after death, only the same *securitas* as before birth. Yet Pliny's attitude to the gods' providential intervention in human affairs is not Epicurean (2,5,26): he believes in their intervention. So we have the spectacle of a learned Roman who can accept some parts of Epicurean

belief but not others, but who has assuredly derived his knowledge from Epicurean sources. Elsewhere (19,19,51) he describes Epicurus as *otii magister*.

See S. CITRONI MARCHETTI, Filosofia e ideologia nella 'Naturalis historia' di Plinio, ANRW II, 36,5, ed. W. HAASE (Berlin – New York 1991), forthcoming.

G. Codex Vossianus Q. 86

In Codex Vossianus Q. 86 there appear two anonymous poems which appear to be Epicurean. They appear in RIESE, Anthologia Latina 433 and 440. The first is a praise of the simple life of retirement, a repudiation of war, politics and public life, and the consequent elimination of fear and winning of peace. These seem to be Epicurean sentiments. The second is not quite so clear: it consists mostly of poetical commonplaces, but ends in praise of the quiet life. Unfortunately there is no indication of date or provenance. Stylistically the poems seem to belong to the first century A. D., though they might possibly be a little later.

(I am grateful to Dr. E. J. KENNEY for allowing me to consult him about the date.)

9. Concluding observations

Lastly the Methodist doctors continued to keep alive a highly modified Epicureanism in this century. Unhappily the main exponent of the school at this period was a charlatan named Thessalus, who won influence by flattering Nero: only in his stress on clinical experience is he commendable.

No doubt, then, during this period, of the prominence of Epicureanism at Rome, at Alexandria, and with a wide spread over the Greek-speaking East.

V. *The Second Century A. D.*

1. Plotina

Plotina, Trajan's consort, was an avowed Epicurean, who looked after the interests of the school at Athens (ILS 7784; SIG ^{3}834). In A. D. 121 she petitioned Hadrian to change the rules governing appointment of the school's director in the interests of Popillius Theotimus (the insistence that the head of the school be a Roman citizen narrowed the field). The petition was successful. Epicureanism and Christianity in many ways ran parallel. Christianity seems to have reached the royal family in the late first century in the person of Flavius Clemens; Epicureanism was not far behind.

See H. TEMPORINI, Die Frauen am Hofe Trajans. Ein Beitrag zur Stellung der Augustae im Prinzipat (Berlin – New York 1978).

2. Tacitus

There is a small but vital passage in Tacitus (Ann. 6,22): *multis insitam opinionem non initia nostri, non finem, non denique homines dis curae.* Epicureanism was for Tacitus a very vigorous option, and he was tempted towards it. Clearly there was a strong Epicurean school at Rome at the beginning of the century.

See M. M. SAGE, Tacitus' Historical Works: A Survey and Appraisal, ANRW II, 33,2, ed. W. HAASE (Berlin – New York 1990), 947 with note 479 (bibliography), cf. 943 n. 456, 944 n. 464, and J.-M. ANDRÉ, Tacite et la philosophie, ANRW II, 33,4, ed. W. HAASE (forthcoming).

3. Plutarch

Plutarch offers so much material that we can here do no more than note the bare outlines. First, he is sternly, almost fanatically, opposed to Epicurus and all his works: the opposition is to strong that we feel that he is repressing something within himself; Lamprias' catalogue contains critical works which have not survived, as well as the familiar treatises. Secondly, he has studied and knows intimately the writings of Epicurus and Colotes. He cites almost two hundred passages of Epicurus, some of them several times, and not only in his explicitly anti-Epicurean writings (e. g. Mor. 99 A where the quotation has become a part of Plutarch's own thought; 474 C). Thirdly, we can see the things which particularly offended him. They are the Epicurean attack on religion, on the oracles which he himself cherished, on providence, on what he regards as the very foundation, or framework of human society (Col. 31); and the attack on public life, which leads him to an essay in criticism of λάθε βιώσας (Mor. 1128 A cf. 465 F; 778 C). From this it is clear that though he bases his polemic on past writings, he does no more than assail textbooks of the movement, as a humanist may still assail the Bible. Plutarch, like a twentieth-century humanist, is attacking a contemporary movement (Mor. 398 B). He valued the oracle of Delphi and the public life of Chaeronea. He saw Epicureanism as endangering both. He gives a fascinating account of a deliberate attempt of Epicureans in Cilicia to get into government circles and turn them towards rationalism (Mor. 434 D ff.). We have the impression therefore that in Plutarch's time Epicureanism was flourishing and on the increase in Attica and Boeotia, as well as in Asia Minor.

See J. J. HARTMAN, De Plutarcho Scriptore et Philosopho (Leyden 1916); R. WESTMAN, Plutarch gegen Kolotes, Acta Philosophica Fennica 7 (Helsingfors 1955); W. C. HELMBOLD and E. N. O'NEIL, Plutarch's Quotations, Philological Monographs 19 (Baltimore 1959). For bibliography until 1984, see J. P. HERSHBELL, Plutarch and Epicureanism, ANRW II, 36,5, ed. W. HAASE (Berlin – New York 1991), forthcoming.

4. Juvenal

GILBERT HIGHET made the initially surprising suggestion that Juvenal was converted to Epicureanism in later life. This is overstated. The thirteenth

satire is not the work of someone indebted to any particular master (13,120–3). But HIGHET was right to draw attention to the Epicureanism in Juvenal's poetry. It emerges in the fourth book; HIGHET is surely wrong in suggesting that the attack on women in the sixth satire has anything Epicurean; it is neither Epicurean, nor Stoic, but Cynic. The great exposition of Epicurean attitudes is the tenth satire. We tend to call it (after JOHNSON) 'The Vanity of Human Wishes', but, as HIGHET says, a better title would be 'The Dangers of Ambition'. The lesson is λάθε βιώσας. The object we set ourselves should be the Epicurean *mens sana in corpore sano* (10,356); note the emphasis on *utile* (10,348). Pure Epicureanism it is not. *Mens sana in corpore sano* is the object of prayer, and the gods govern human life (10,346–9). Otherwise it could come from Epicurus.

This long poem is followed by two shorter ones, each a tribute to friendship. In Epicurean terms it would be natural to follow the negative with the positive, and the eleventh extols the pleasure of a simple meal with a friend. *Voluptates commendat rarior usus* (11,206–8) is admirably Epicurean. The twelfth interweaves with the theme of friendship the note of warning: the disastrous pursuit of riches and disaster at sea are parallel and at times identical examples of folly. The philosopher stands apart from them: *suave mari magno* (L. 2,1).

In the last poems also the Epicurean mood recurs: in the attack on Fortune (14,315–6), in the approval of Epicurus's simplicity of living (14,319), in the attack on religious bigotry (15). It may even be that the fragmentary sixteenth satire was originally an extended attack on militarism.

HIGHET has not made his case for Juvenal as an Epicurean convert. But he has shown clearly that in later life Juvenal adopts Epicurean attitudes which are not discernible before. This means that he probably encountered an Epicurean community in Rome, and was keenly attracted. Certainly we can say that under Hadrian there was no problem about publishing statements favourable to Epicurus.

See G. HIGHET, The Philosophy of Juvenal, TAPA 80 (1949), 254–70; R. MARACHE, Juvénal, peintre de la société de son temps, ANRW II, 33,1, ed. W. HAASE (Berlin – New York 1989), 592–639.

5. Hadrian

This brings us to Hadrian himself. HIGHET in a review of Mme. YOURCENAR's 'Memoirs of Hadrian', wrote that "Hadrian thought and thought profoundly. If he did so, he must have had a philosophy. It is clear from his poems, from his attitude to the arts, and from his frivolity, that he must have been a follower of Epicurus. He was an Epicurean statesman. He believed in this world and its pleasures, and he knew that its pleasures could be achieved only by wisdom. Wisdom, for Hadrian, was the means; enjoyment and lightness of heart were the end. His successors were to be Stoics, working for duty alone and believing in the stern rule of inevitable law. But the principle

of the Epicurean is λάθε βιώσας, 'live in hiding'. Was that the ultimate secret of the man who was monarch of the world?"

At first sight implausible, even fantastic, but it was Plotina who brought Hadrian into Trajan's entourage and Plotina who managed the succession. Even in building the temple of Olympian Zeus at Athens he took up a project of the Epicurean convert Antiochus Epiphanes. *Tranquillitas* appears on his coins. The historian decribes him as *pacis magis quam belli cupidus* (SHA, H 10); he himself said openly *plus se otio adeptum quam armis alios* (Epit. de Caes. 14,10). He lived simply; yet he pursued *voluptas* (SHA, H 14). And he valued friendship.

One curious sidelight. He adopted Aelius Verus *vitae laetissimae* (SHA, Ael. 5). It needn't mean very much. But Verus invented a dish of sows' udders, pheasant, peacock, ham in pastry and wild boar. There were five ingredients, but they called it the *tetrapharmakon* (ibid. cf. H. 21). This seems like an Epicurean in-joke.

A true Epicurean, of course, could not be emperor of the world, any more than a true Christian could. Hadrian, in his restless journeys, was not a member of an Epicurean *contubernium*. No Epicurean would have treated Antinous as Hadrian did. He patronized philosophers of other schools, including Epictetus. He showed cruelty as well as friendship. But there is a lot that seems Epicurean.

animula vagula blandula
hospes comesque corporis,
quae nunc abibis in loca,
pallidula rigida nudula,
nec, ut soles, dabis iocos?

Pleasure in life, and nothing after death.

See G. HIGHET, Talents and Geniuses (New York 1959), 172; P. STEINMETZ, Lyrische Dichtung im zweiten Jahrhundert n. Chr., ANRW II, 33,1, ed. W. HAASE (Berlin – New York 1989), 272 – 274; S. A. STERTZ, „Semper in omnibus varius": The Emperor Hadrian and Intellectuals, ANRW II, 34,1, ed. W. HAASE (in preparation); J.-M. ANDRÉ, Hadrien écrivain et protecteur des lettres, ibid. (in preparation).

6. Some known Epicureans of the Second Century

The following Epicureans also are known in the second century (apart from those already discussed):

A) Diogenianus: below, V.7, p. 2289 f.;
B) Diogenes of Oenoanda: below, V.8, p. 2290 ff.; also others whom he mentions are:
C) Antonius, author of a work against which Galen directed his treatise 'De propriorum animi cuiusdam affectuum dignotione et curatione'. We know nothing about him: he is probably not the φιλομαθὴς καὶ φιλόσοφος to whom

the spurious treatise 'On the Pulse' is dedicated. He might possibly be 'the herbalist' (Comp. Med. 2,1) or 'the druggist' (ib. 9,4);
D) Celsus, Lucian's friend, who wrote a book against magic; Lucian dedicated 'Alexander, The False Prophet' to him; Origen in the following century confuses him with the Celsus who wrote a Platonist critique of Christianity entitled 'The True Word';
E) Lepidus, mentioned by Lucian (Alex. 25,43) as the central figure in an Epicurean confraternity at Amastris: he held high office, including the priesthood of Augustus (CIG 4149);
F) Timocrates of Heraclea, mentioned by Lucian, again as having a considerable following (Alex. 57);
G) Zenobius, mentioned by Simplicius (ad Ar., Phys. 489, 21 D);
H) Brettius, mentioned by Plutarch (Mor. 396 D; 673 C; 720 E) as an Epicurean convert, philosopher, and mathematician;
I) An imperial corrector, of senatorial rank, who paid a visit to Epictetus (Arrian, Epict. 3,7): his name is unknown;
J) Nicomedes: below, 5.14 (c);
K) C. Minicius: below, 5,14 (c); and
L) Philocrates, father and son: below, 5,14 (d).

7. Diogenianus

Nothing is known about Diogenianus, but from references by Christian authors he probably wrote in the second century A. D. He composed an attack on Chrysippus's doctrine of Fate which is cited by Christian authors (Eusebius, P. E. 4,3; 6,8; Theodoret, Therapeut. 10,19 – 20). The fragments were collected by A. GERCKE (Chrysippea, Jahrbücher für klassische Philologie, Suppl. 14,2 [Leipzig 1885], 748 ff.). There is a somewhat miscellaneous collection of titles of anthologies recorded by the 'Suda' as the work of a grammarian of that name in the reign of Hadrian, and he may have been responsible for the surviving collection of proverbs. There are no grounds at all for equating this jackdaw with the Epicurean critic, except the accident of possessing the same name in the same century.

Diogenianus counters Chrysippus's citation of fatalistic passages from Homer with others which point to control of our own destinies. When Chrysippus introduces arguments from word-origins to show a human belief in Fate, Diogenianus answers that since the Stoics think the majority of mankind fools, it is likely that there will be some foolish uses of language: it will be noted that he assumes an Epicurean view of the origin of language at the *thesis* stage: human not divine. It seems odd that he cites the pursuit of pleasure as an example of folly, but for the Epicureans uncalculating pursuit of pleasure was indeed folly; and the other ends, e. g. wealth, reputation and political power, were foolish through and through. He goes on to point out that ordinary people do not, in fact, attribute everything to Fate; they may invoke the gods, human responsibility, or nature or Chance. Chrysippus's

paradoxical attempt to retain freewill within a deterministic system comes in for some rough handling: here again we see the Epicurean concern for freewill. Diogenianus also attacks Chrysippus's argument to determinism on the basis of prophecy. Diogenianus allows the prophets a few lucky hits, a large number of misses, but says that nothing can be built on that. It is here that he explicitly cites with approval the views of Epicurus by name. But suppose happiness is prophesied. There is no additional joy; humans only overanticipate and are disappointed. The prospect of trouble depresses more than the prospect of joy encourages. And it can't be avoided: witness the parents of Oedipus and Paris. (The good Epicurean does not notice that he is contradicting himself to score a point.)

The manuscripts of the second series of quotations call Diogenianus a Peripatetic. This is clearly wrong: the next citation comes from Alexander of Aphrodisias, and this may have affected the assignation. The critique is Epicurean, and not very profound, but standard and sensible. It is not the work of an isolated individual. It provides evidence for a lively Epicurean school.

See M. ISNARDI PARENTE, Diogeniano, gli epicurei e la 'tyche', below in this same volume (ANRW II, 36,4), 2424 – 2445.

8. Diogenes of Oenoanda

The most remarkable relic of Epicureanism under the Roman empire is the great inscription found in the small town of Oenoanda. Oenoanda was in Lycia, but so far to the north that for a long time it remained largely independent of the Lycian League. The town was small, though finely built walls still remain.

Diogenes, it has been reasonably argued, came from a leading family of Lycia. (There is a good account in CHILTON p. xix.) On his father's side he was perhaps descended from the Moles who was priest of the temple of Caesar at Xanthus during Augustus's reign (OGIS 2,555). His own father, Simonides, was not, however, a Roman citizen. On his mother's side honours flowed to him thick and fast. He belonged to the Licinnii. C. Licinnius Musaeus had been Lyciarch and chief priest of the imperial cult and been granted citizenship under Nero, and from him came a succession of senators and even consuls as well as leaders in their local communities. An inscription (IGRR 3,500) traces the family tree of "Licinnia Flavilla and her relative Diogenes". Licinnia was born somewhere around A. D. 115, and Flavianus Diogenes in the 150s. The inscription dates from somewhere towards the end of the second century, and the great proclamation of Epicureanism is of similar date. The man who put up the latter must have had considerable wealth and influence. It is a reasonable assumption that this Flavianus Diogenes was the author of it. If so, there is an example of Epicureanism in a leading family of Lycia. There is no indication that other members of the family were Epicureans, and some indication that they were not, in view of their record of political office. (Sulpicius Justus,

another member of the family, was proconsul of Lycia and Pamphylia at about the time the inscription appeared.) Epicureans ought not to hold political office, but it is not a safe assumption that they didn't. None the less, it is probably better to treat this as an isolated conversion than a family commitment. There is a sense in which the inscription suggests a convert.

Along one side of the city-centre Diogenes put an inscription. It was just under 50 metres long and ran in four bands, the lowest being roughly at eye level or below, and the top about $10\,^1/_2$ feet above the ground. Diogenes sees the desperate need of mankind. He has two things he is burning to say. First that human beings suffer from an obsessive, groundless fear of death. Second that the highest good is to be found in peace of mind. He is old; there are too many in need for him to approach each individually; and he remembers foreign visitors and future generations. So he uses the inscription to proclaim his for salvation.

The fragments which survive – more are still being discovered – have been classified with general agreement under a number of headings or chapters:

a) first there are the fragments of a treatise on physics. These are scanty remains of what must have been a major exposition. They include a review of previous physical theories, an account of atomism, a section on astronomy, an important and fascinating section on the evolution of civilization, parallel to that in Lucretius (5,925 ff.), and a defence against charges of atheism;
b) a short treatise on the doctrine of innumerable worlds, originally written in Rhodes;
c) a treatise on ethics, of which nearly half survives. In his introduction Diogenes states that philosophy is a means to happiness not to riches or renown. He goes on to say that he has offered this public statement not least for those who are wrongly called foreigners. National boundaries are artificial; a human has a natural home, the universe. This is the first explicit statement of Epicurean cosmopolitanism. In a notable passage he asks the reader not to read causally or to accept what is read hastily and uncritically, but to join in a common systematic exploration. The ethical system which follows is straightforward orthodox Epicureanism. Happiness or pleasure is the end of life, but pleasures are not to be pursued unquestioningly, since they may involve painful consequences. The things which stand in the way of happiness are fears (of death, of the gods, and of pain) and desires outrunning natural bounds; these must be eliminated or kept under strict control. This whole treatise is interlarded with citations from Epicurus's 'Sovereign Doctrines';
d) a collection of miscellaneous maxims of uncertain authorship. They show some Ionic dialect, which suggests that if by Epicurus himself they are early; they might be by one of his early disciples; or they might belong to the second century B. C.; or they might be of varied origin. They are not original with Diogenes himself, but are an indication of the reverence continually felt for the founder and traditions of the school;
e) a collection of miscellaneous fragments. The size of the lettering suggests that they came from the same band of inscription, though the blocks are of

different sizes. They do not come from a single treatise. One is a general statement about the inscription, parallel to, but independent of the introduction. One contained Diogenes's will. One is part of a letter to some friends – a practical commentary on the Epicurean stress on friendship. One is part of a letter from someone to his mother. The tone and content seem unsuited to Diogenes, and it may be by Epicurus himself;
f) scanty fragments of a treatise on old age. The theme was a commonplace in the Hellenistic Age: Cicero's 'De Senectute' is a good example.

The purpose of the inscription is clear. According to CHILTON it is a kind of gigantic Wayside Pulpit. It is an exposition of Epicurean philosophy for the person in the street. This explains the absence of the first part of Epicurean philosophy, the logic or *canonice*: it was not suited to popular exposition. For the rest the exposition is traditional and orthodox, and the band of 'Sovereign Doctrines' and other maxims cited are guarantees of orthodoxy. The only notable divergence is in the warm supranationalism, and that is not really a divergence, for there is nothing in Epicureanism which contradicts it, though the influence of Cynics and Stoics and the practical achievements of Rome may have played their part in moulding Diogenes's thought here.

The letters to Antipater (frr. 15 – 20) and to his friends (fr. 51) give some indication of other contemporary Epicureans.

There is a group associated with Rhodes – Menneas, Carus (the *cognomen* of Lucretius, and perhaps a descendant or later relative), Dionysius, and an unnamed woman. Philodemus refers to an Epicurean school at Rhodes in the first century B. C., and it looks very much as if this school continued in existence for 200 or more years. In addition there is a reference to Theodoridas of Lindos as embarking on the study of philosophy (fr. 16).

In writing to Antipater Diogenes refers to friends in Athens, Chalcis and Thebes. We shall be fairly safe in assuming that this implies Epicurean *contubernia* in those three cities. Antipater himself was presumably associated with one of them.

What of Oenoanda? It seems unlikely that as fervent an Epicurean as Diogenes was completely isolated, and the friends referred to in the will (fr. 50), published as it was in an Epicurean context, are likely to have been Epicureans. It is unlikely to have been a large community, and by all the traditions is likely to have been quietist.

Whether the inscription made new converts immediataly or later, we do not know. Nor do we know how long it lasted. It is a reasonable hypothesis that it was dismantled by Christians, perhaps early in the fifth century when the Christians were on the offensive. No doubt many of the blocks were reused in new buildings, but we may reasonably assume that for the best part of two centuries, salvation according to Epicurus was proclaimed to the people of Oenoanda.

See C. W. CHILTON (transl. and comm.), Diogenes of Oenoanda: The Fragments (Oxford 1971); and an unpublished dissertation by GEORGE HOFFMAN, University of Minnesota. See also C. GALLAVOTTI, La critica di Empedocle in Diogene di Enoanda, Museum Criticum

10 – 12 (1975 – 77), 243 – 249 for the fragments of Diogenes as an interesting testimony to Epicurean criticism of Empedocles. See also D. CLAY, The Philosophical Inscription of Diogenes of Oenoanda: New Discoveries 1969 – 1983, below in this same volume (ANRW II, 36,4), 2446 – 2559.

9. Lucian

The evidence of Lucian is important. He was patently attracted by the school, and the rationalizing Epicurean Celsus was a personal friend (Alex. 1,21). In 'Philosophies for Sale' (19) the Epicurean is speedily sold – for more than the Cynic or Sceptic, but appreciably less than the Pythagorean, Stoic or Academic. He is described by Democritus out of Aristippus, as impious, amiable, and fond of sweet food. In 'Icaromenippus' (16; 26; 32) also the Epicureans receive strong criticism. But the attacks are conventional and do not run deep. But in 'Zeus Refuted' (7) the arguments brought by Cyniscus are Epicurean; in 'Zeus the Tragedian' Damis is sympathetically treated; in 'The Banquet' the Epicurean Hermon similarly has a good rôle, though there is some criticism of his being an Epicurean and holding a priesthood (9), which suggests that some Epicureans were compromising with the traditional religion; in 'Hermotimus' there is no criticism of the Epicureans of the kind found in 'Philosophies for Sale' or 'Icaromenippus'.

'Alexander' contains a very fine tribute to the Epicureans. It is a tribute to the pervasive missionary zeal of Epicureanism at this time that the false prophet should wage war on Epicurus without truce or negotiation (25). Pythagoreans, Platonists and Stoics supported him; Epicureans and Christians were his enemies (25; 38). Lucian is moved to a remarkable tribute. It is understandable that, writing to an Epicurean, he should say that it needed an Epicurus to unmask Alexander (17). But the tribute to Κύριαι Δόξαι is Lucian's own:

> "The villain had no idea what benefits that book brings its readers, the quality of the peace, tranquillity and freedom it produces, liberating them from fears, apparitions, omens, vain aspirations and uncontrolled desires, and implanting in them intelligence and truth, and really purifying their minds, not with tricks, squills and rubbish of that sort, but with right reason, truth and openness" (47).

At the end he says that he was proud to strike a blow for Epicurus the Liberator (61).

I cannot understand why W. R. HALLIDAY in 'The Pagan Background of Early Christianity' (Ancient World 1 [Liverpool 1925], 177) finds evidence in Lucian that Epicureanism was going under. I should say that the evidence points, for Asia Minor, in exactly the opposite direction.

See M. CASTER, Lucien et la pensée religieuse de son temps, Collection d'études anciennes G. Budé (Paris 1937).

10. Writers more or less hostile to Epicureanism

Naturally there are more or less hostile references from writers of different schools, and it will suffice to mention several.

A. Epictetus

Epictetus speaks as a Stoic. He can be courteous enough to an Epicurean whom he encounters (3,7), but really he thinks of Epicureans as scoundrels whose lives are dominated by food and sex (3,24,38). Still he has read Epicurus and quotes or alludes to many of the main doctrines (1,12; 1,20; 1,23; 2,9; 2,19; 2,20; 2,22; 2,23; fr. 14 [52]), though he tends to misrepresent them and always speaks unsympathetically.

B. Marcus Aurelius

The openness and tolerance of Marcus Aurelius are remarkable by contrast, and reminiscent of Seneca. He will, for example, quote with approval Epicurus on pain (7,33; 7,64, 9,41) or on thinking about great men (11.26 emended). He evidently thinks that Epicurus offers the only rational alternative to Stoicism: the theme 'Either Providence or Atoms' recurs often (4,3,2; 8,17; 9,28; 9,39; 10,6; 11,18,1); he sets the alternatives between an Epicurean and Stoic view of death (7,31), an Epicurean and Stoic physics (7,50). Of course Marcus is on the side of the angels rather than on the atoms. But all indications are that he regards Epicureanism as a serious alternative philosophy contending for his and the world's allegiance.

See E. AMIS, The Stoicism of Marcus Aurelius, ANRW II, 36,3, ed. W. HAASE (Berlin – New York 1989), 2249 -- 2252 ('Stoicism and Atomism').

C. Apuleius

Apuleius was a Platonist. His writings are full of references to Lucretius; it is uncertain how much this means: the archaizing Fronto was happy to admire Lucretius's concern for words, to encourage young Marcus to sonorous extracts, and to quote sublime passages. But Apuleius, who at one point simply calls Epicurus a natural philosopher accused of atheism (Apol. 27), at another gives a minutely accurate account of Epicurus's theory of vision, which is not based on Lucretius, since he renders εἴδωλα not by *effigies* or *simulacra* but *exuviae* (Apol. 15). Further the 'Metamorphoses' bears witness to the permeating power of the philosophy of *voluptas*. Psyche and Cupid's child is *Voluptas* (6,24) and in the last book *voluptas* moves from the crude pleasures of sex (11,15) to the service of Isis (11.24).

See P. STEINMETZ, Lyrische Dichtung im zweiten Jahrhundert n. Chr., ANRW II, 33,1, ed. W. HAASE (Berlin – New York 1989), 283 – 287, who deals with Epicurean reminiscences in the poetic fragments of Apuleius' work.

D. Aulus Gellius

Aulus Gellius is interesting for his favourable treatment of Epicurus. He studied at Athens with his friend Taurus (9,5), and writes of the fame of Epicurus (17.21), and quotes accurately his philosophy of pleasure as the absence of pain (2,6,12; 9,5), and his views on speech (5,15) and vision (5,16), and rebukes Plutarch for his unfair treatment of Epicurus (2,8 – 9). This last evokes from him a remarkable tribute: *Sed Epicurus, cuiusmodi homost, non inscitia videtur partem istam synlogismi praetermisisse* (2,8,6). Gellius may or may not be an Epicurean, but this meant that the past was alive for him. There is no means of telling how far his *rapport* with the long-dead Epicurus was aroused by or given to contemporary exponents of the creed.

E. Cleonides

Cleonides, another Stoic (2,1,107 B) complains that whereas the Epicureans used to be banished, men have now become corrupted by luxury and honour them and their writings, and belief in providence is actually fading.

F. Dio of Prusa

Dio of Prusa is an interesting study. Consciously and publicly he stands against the Epicureans and all their works. He stands against their exaltation of pleasure and their attitude to the gods (12,36), against their doctrine of withdrawal (20.8). But, in fact, he absorbed many Epicurean attitudes. There is a very interesting example in the third discourse on kingship (3,86 ff.). This contains an Epicurean account of friendship, but not wholly Epicurean, since he divorces pleasure from utility (3,91). Yet he praises friendship as combining pleasure with utility; more, as offering security (3.85). All this suggests an Epicurean derivation.

G. Numenius

Numenius was by any standard an eccentric, something of a Pythagorean and Platonist, with enough sympathies to refer to Plato as Moses speaking Attic. But I still find unexpected his treatment of the Epicureans (fr. 1 apud Eus., PE 14,5). He pays tribute to their consistency, unanimity and consequent persuasiveness:

> "The school of Epicurus resembles a true Platonic Republic, free from dissension, possessing a single common mind and a single judgement. From this have been, are, and seemingly will be willing followers."

This is clear evidence of a flourishing school expected to continue. Furthermore, Numenius came from Apamea in Syria, and perhaps his work is evidence of the situation in that part of the world.

See M. FREDE, Numenios, ANRW II, 36,2, ed. W. HAASE (Berlin – New York 1987), 1034 – 1075.

H. Aristocles

Aristocles reinforces Numenius's evidence, and testifies to the continuing and consistent witness of the Epicureans in his own day (Eus., PE 14,21).

I. Sextus Empiricus

Sextus Empiricus is notably fair-minded. He preserves for us the best account of Epicurean sense-perception (Adv. Math. 7,203 ff.); he has an amusing polemic against Epicurus's corporeal and philosophical gods (ibid. 9,178 – 9); he is also familiar with conflicts of interpretation of Epicurean doctrine (ibid. 9.58). Epicureanism was certainly to him a live issue (cf. ibid. 1,299; 9,22 etc.).

J. Atticus

Atticus, the Platonist leader near the end of the century, is familiar with Epicurean doctrine, not merely the remote gods and the absence of providence, but subtler points such as the βελπόνας ἀπορροίας (fr. 3 = Eus., PE 15,5,3 ff.).

See C. MORESCHINI, Attico: una figura singolare del medioplatonismo, ANRW II, 36,1, ed. W. HAASE (Berlin – New York 1987), 477 – 491.

K. Athenaeus

Athenaeus in his extraordinary miscellany has plenty of knowledge of Epicurus: 3,101 – 4 (passages from comedy and a Stoic attack); 5,186 – 7, 177 B. 179 D. 182 A. 187 C (transposition of text: Epicurus's symposium of philosophers only, without libations); 5,211 (Hellenistic Epicurean named Diogenes); 5,215 B (Epicurean philosopher named Lysias dictator of Tarsus); 7,278 – 80 (more quotations from comedy and from Timon, and from Epicurus fr. 67; 409; 70); 7,281 E (Dionysius of Heracleia abandons the Porch for the Garden); 7,298 D (anecdotes of an Epicurean); 8,354 B – C (E., fr. 152); 12,511 E (E., fr. 295); 12,513 A (pleasure-seeking); 12,545 – 7 (E., fr. 413; 409; 123; 315: banishment of Epicureans from Rome and Messenia); 13,588 D (Epicurus and Leontion cf. 585 D, 593 B); 13,611 B (Diotimus attacked Epicurus and was put to death by Zeno the Epicurean). It is mainly superficial and hostile. It gives no indication of contemporary Epicureanism; the most it tells us is that texts were readily accessible in Egypt or Rome at this period.

L. Aetius

Aetius and the doxographic tradition preserve for us a certain amount about Epicurean physics. But the tradition is historical, and tells us nothing about contemporary Epicureanism.

11. Second Century A. D. references to Epicurus

The early second century saw the finest of all Methodist practitioners: Soranus was a great gynaecologist, who won the admiration of Galen, for all the latter's scorn of Methodism. Soranus is not to be considered an Epicurean, but his respectful awareness of Epicurus shows that Alexandrian Methodism was helping to keep the tradition alive. When Agrippa's Odeon in the Agora at Athens was remodelled about the middle of the century the new stairway was decorated with pairs of seated statues of philosophers, one pair for each of the four main schools, Platonist, Aristotelian, Stoic and Epicurean. Marcus Aurelius visited Athens in A. D. 176 and established there chairs in the four main schools of philosophy, endowed by public money – Platonist, Aristotelian, Stoic and Epicurean: the appointments were left to Herodes Atticus (DC 71,31,3: Philostratus, V. S. 2,2,1; Tatian, ad Gr. 19; Lucian, Eun. 3).

See J.-M. ANDRÉ, Les écoles philosophiques aux deux premiers siècles de l'Empire, ANRW II, 36,1, ed. W. HAASE (Berlin – New York 1987), 51 – 74 (*'Les écoles à l'apogée du 'siècle d'or'*').

12. Epitaphs and Epicurean sentiments

It is convenient here to say something about the evidence of epitaphs. Both in Greek and Latin a number of epitaphs of the imperial period express the absence of any faith in a life after death. Unfortunately, these are not always dated in the epigraphical publications and subsequent studies, but it may be taken for granted that the majority of them date from the second or third century A. D. I propose therefore to summarize the evidence briefly here, and to specify later only those which are almost certainly of later date.

A common formula on epitaphs is of the type οὐκ ἤμην, ἐγενόμην, οὐκ εἰμί, οὐ μέλει μοι, or in Latin *non fui, fui, non sum, non curo* (or sometimes *non desidero*); this last is so standard that it is abbreviated to *n.f.f.n.s.n.c.* (CIL 5,1813, 2893) (for various versions and variations CIL 2,1434; 5,1939. 3415. 8974; 6,4532. 9258. 13528. 14672. 19683. 22215. 23391. 26003. 29884; 8,2885. 3463. 27736; 9,4840; 10,2070. 2311; 13,488; KAIBEL 595; 615; 1117 a). The formula in various forms is found in Rome, Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa, Lydia, Phrygia and Pontus. Curiously only one such expression has appeared in Syria (Rec. d'arch. orient. 5,27). There would not seem much doubt that the formula derives from Epicureanism, or that where it appears it indicates the permeation of Epicurean ways of thinking, but it should be regarded with caution as an expression of an active Epicureanism.

A number of formulae express the theme (often with a pun on *vive* and *bibe*) of "Eat, drink and be merry": *es, bibe, ludi veni* and the like. Such is the veteran soldier's *dum vixi bibi libenter: bibite vos qui vivitis* (BÜCHELER, CE 85, 118, 185, 187, 243 – 5, 366, 409, 856, 1231, 1317, 1499, 2070, 2207; KAIBEL 128 – 9, 261, 362, 439, 646 a, 699; SEG 4,104; IG 14,1288). These express what one might call a popular Epicureanism. Again it is evidence of

the diffusion of Epicurean ideas rather than of an active Epicureanism. One (BÜCHELER, CE 1317) comes from the tomb of a priest of Sabazios, hardly likely to be an Epicurean. They come from Rome, Tarraco, Puteoli, Interamna, Nomentum, Viminacium, Athens, Cotiaeum, and Antioch in Pisidia.

Some of the expressions of nihilism are more philosophic. One of the most interesting comes from Rome (KAIBEL 595). It is the epitaph of a Greek doctor named Nicomedes. His exact age is given, which suggests that this life only matters. The familiar formula is even more Epicurean οὐκ ἤμην καὶ ἐγενόμην, οὐκ εἰμὶ καὶ οὐ λυποῦμαι. For him death is characterized by being without pain. The date is second century. This is as explicit as one could find. From Eretria similarly a dead man proclaims his escape from troubles: "I lie as impervious as stone or iron" (KAIBEL 513). An epitaph from Larisa declares that there is no more affliction for the dead (IG 9,2,640). In Latin a similar sentiment is found in Verona (BÜCHELER, CE 1095). Perhaps too the explicit mention of the pleasures of life may be Epicurean (ibid. 186). An inscription from Cartagena (ibid. 979) combines the two: *[ut b]one non meminit, sic mala ne timeat.* This is certainly Epicurean: see the stress on fear (cf. L. 3,898 ff.). Also probably Epicurean is the philosophical *sumus mortales, immortales non sumus* from Mutina (ibid. 191). So too (ibid. 420) *omnia cum vita pereunt et inania fiunt*, despite the inconsistent hope of a blessed reunion. A poem from Narbo sounds highly Lucretian (ibid. 1202):

dum sis in vita dolor est amittere vitam;
dum simul occidimus, omnia dispicias.
orbem sub leges si habeas dum vivis, ad Orchum
quid valet? hic nulla est divitis ambitio.

Epicurean in its utilitarianism is the line from Brixia (ibid. 1493):

ulterius nihil est morte neque utilius.

One inscription proclaims the dead to have been brought up an Epicurean from early youth (KAIBEL 419). This is one Philocrates, son of Philocrates. He came from Sidon and was buried in Orchomenus; Epicurean communities in both places may safely be assumed.

See J. A. TOLMAN, A Study of the Sepulchral Inscriptions in Buecheler's „Carmina Epigraphica Latina" (Chicago 1910); F. CUMONT, Non fui, fui, non sum, Mus. Belge 32 (1928), 73–85; A. BRELICH, Aspetti della morte nelle iscrizione sepolcrali dell'impero Romano (Budapest 1937); R. LATTIMORE, Themes in Greek and Roman Epitaphs (Urbana 1962).

13. Epicureanism and Early Christian Writers

We come now to the evidence of the Christians for whom a general hostility can be expected, despite their alliance with the Epicureans in exposing the superstitious fraudulence of Alexander.

Useful works here are W. SCHMIDT's entry in RAC cited in the introduction, and M. SORDI, Cristianesimo e cultura nell'impero romano, Vetera Christianorum 18 (1981), 129–142 which deals partly with Christian attitudes to Epicureanism.

A. Justin

Justin was a philosopher and a Platonist before his conversion. He is capable of giving a perfectly acceptable account of Epicureanism:

> "Epicurus, an Athenian, son of Neocles, says that the first principles of things that exist are bodies, perceptible by reason, admitting no void, ungenerated, indestructible, incapable of fragmentation, admitting no formation or alteration of their parts, and so perceptible by reason alone." (Exh. ad Gr. 4).

But his general position is that Christianity is the culmination of all human systems of philosophy; in this he draws a distinction between real and nominal philosophers, and counts the Epicureans in the last category. This means that in the 'Apology' he maligns them as atheists, wicked men who pay later for their immoral pleasures in life, sexual libertines, to be classified with the worst elements in society (Apol. 1,4; 1,7; 1,14; 1,26; 2,7; 2,12; 2,15).

See W. SCHMID, Epikur, Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum (= RAC) V (Stuttgart 1962), 781 (= ID., Ausgewählte philologische Schriften, ed. H. ERBSE and J. KÜPPERS [Berlin – New York 1984], 234 f.).

B. Athenagoras

Athenagoras provides another glimpse of the teaching of the Epicureans. Unfortunately nothing is known about him, except that his 'Plea' dates from the late 170s. We can discount the evidence of Philip of Side (MIGNE, PG 6,182), which associates him with the catechetical school at Alexandria, as a convert from Platonism, since it is unreliable in detail. Still, Athenagoras has a reasonably sound knowledge of Middle Platonism, neo-Pythagoreanism and empire Stoicism, even though his knowledge of earlier texts is largely drawn from handbooks (Plea 6,2). There are three interesting features of his relationships to the Epicureans. First, he clearly alludes to them both in his 'Plea' (13,3), where he couples the thought of death as a sleep and a forgetting with the popular picture of "Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die", and in his work 'On the Resurrection' (19,3), where he takes the same popular quotation and links it with Hegesias's doctrine of insensibility rather than Epicurus's doctrine of pleasure, showing a clear awareness of both, and of the distinction between them (Epicurus, Ep. 1,81). He further identifies their doctrines of the chance formation of the world and the τέλος as freedom from pain (Plea 25,3; Res. 24,5). Second, he does not refer to Epicurus by name, but calls the Epicureans "of no little repute". Third, and in some ways most interesting, Athenagoras is not averse from borrowing from the Greeks to refute the Greeks, and his attack on the pagan deities is mounted with weapons from the armoury of Euhemerus, Epicurus, and the Sceptics (Plea 5,2; 6,4; 7,2; 22,1 – 12; 28 – 30). It is the assimilation of Epicureanism that is here important.

C. Irenaeus

Irenaeus is very slight by comparison. The Epicurean denial of providence is a commonplace (3,24,2); he claims that they also deny moral differences (2,32,2), and wants to attribute the Gnostic heretics' *pleroma* and void to Epicurean influence.

See SCHMID, RAC V, 799 (= ID., Ausgew. philol. Schriften, 249).

D. Theophilus of Antioch

Theophilus was reputedly the sixth bishop of Antioch (Eusebius, HE 4,24), and was writing under Marcus Aurelius and Commodus. He refers freely to pagan authors, but in such a garbled and uncritical way as to cause wonder whether he has read any of the authors he mentions. Little can be built on the three references to Epicurus in his three books 'To Autolycus'. He has a stock picture of Epicurus as denying Providence (2,4; 3,2); well and good, except that he puts Chrysippus in the same boat (2.4) and calls Epicurus an atheist, which he was not (3,6). Further he suggests that Epicurus and the Stoics joined in encouraging incest and homosexuality (3,6). This is based on a passage in Zeno's 'Republic' (DL 7,188), and has nothing to do with Epicurus. There is no sympathetic understanding of pagan authors to be found in Justin, Athenagoras or Clement. The most we can say is that Theophilus thinks Epicurus worth attacking.

E. Minucius Felix

The most important of the Christian documents is Minucius Felix's 'Octavius'; its date and relationship to Tertullian's 'Apology' remain uncertain, and the fact that I am treating it under the second century must not be taken as a dogmatic affirmation of its date. Caecilius (5,2; 13,1) is a sceptic, but a good case can be made out that Minucius and Octavius were originally Epicureans. At the outset Minucius uses of Octavius terms like *contubernalis* (1,1), *socius* and *comes* (1,4) and speaks of their *convictus* and *familiaritas* (1,5). He describes Octavius as *vir eximius et sanctus* (1,3), precisely the language which Lucian applies to Epicurus (Lucian, Alex. 61). The language with which he expresses his joy at Octavius's return is technical Epicurean language (2,2 cf. Epic., Sent. Vat. 52; fr. 32; Cic., TD 1,48). The mutual 'correction' is Epicurean (3,1; 14,2 cf. Philodemus, περὶ παρρησίας 22,1–9). There are two translations from Epicurus (11,3 cf. Epic., Sent. Vat. 74; 31,7 cf. Epic., Men. 132) and allusions which are so close as to be all but quotations (40,1 cf. Epic., Sent. Vat. 74; 40,4 cf. Epic., fr. 1). There are also parallels with Lucretius (2,1 cf. L. 5,230; 5,4 cf. L. 1,235; 5,7–9 cf. L. 5,417; 34,1–4 cf. L. 5,407–16 and others). And the Epicureans are twice mentioned by name (19,8; 34,3).

The work is set in Ostia, but its associations are with North Africa. It is not clear how far one should think that it indicates Epicurean communities

there, but from the evidence of Apuleius's knowledge and of Arnobius and Lactantius in the next century it seems probable.

See ADELAIDE D. SIMPSON, Epicureans, Christians, Atheists in the Second Century, TAPA 72 (1941), 372 ff.

F. Isidore (?)

There is one other piece of evidence from the Christian fringe. Isidore, son of the Gnostic Basilides, put forward a doctrine of desire which is sheerly Epicurean: clothing is natural and necessary; sex natural but not necessary (Clem. Al., Str. 3,1,2 ff.). It seems certain that this means that there was an active group of Epicureans at Alexandria which had influenced him.

14. The Talmud and Epicureanism

It will be convenient here to present the evidence from the Talmud. The Talmud was compiled across several centuries, but it is not wrong to see references to the Epicureans as applying to the second century. In general, 'Epicurean' is a term of abuse applied to heretics; this should lead us to be cautious when it is similarly applied by Christians. But this does not mean that there was no Epicurean influence. To put it in modern terms, the government in America or South Africa may fling the term 'communist' at many who have nothing to do with Moscow or Beijing; but the charge would not be very effective if there were no communists anywhere in the world: indeed it is effective precisely because communism is an influential force. So that when R. Joseph defines an Epicurean as a man who asks "What have the rabbis done for us? They read and study for their own benefit" or when R. Lazarus says (Pirke Aboth 2,18) "Be diligent to learn the Torah, so as to have an answer to Epicurus" (or "an Epicurus") or when (Sifre on Num. 11,2) an Epicurean is described as a man who has broken the Lord's commandment, it does not mean very much. The general condemnation (Sanhedrin 11,1) may mean a little more: "The following have no place in the world to come: he who says that the resurrection of the dead is not indicated in the Torah, he who says the Torah is not from heaven, and the Epicureans." And there are some echoes of genuine Epicurean objections in some of the debates in the Azzadah. For example, asked by a Roman matron what God was doing after the six days of creation (a typical Epicurean gibe) R. Jose ben Halafta replied "Matching off pairs destined to enter wedlock". Another rabbi in answer to a similar question put by king Ptolemy in Rome (an unlikely combination) said "From that day on the fires of Gehenna are kept burning for evildoers; woe to the world for God's judgements". Again R. Abbahu spoke of successive universes created by God, a continuous process of creation (cf. Genesis Rabbah 3,7).

15. Summary

To sum up then the evidence of the second century: a) there was Epicureanism at Rome at the beginning of the century: thereafter there is no firm evidence either way; b) during this century Epicureanism becomes established: one empress is Epicurean, one emperor is at least influenced by the teaching and another, though committed to another school, is constructively tolerant. At Athens Epicureanism is publicly acknowledged as respectable, and one of the four accepted schools, and a chair is officially endowed; c) there is evidence in the Greek world of widespread Epicurean success and missionary activity; d) there are some signs of Epicureanism in Africa; e) in general USENER's cautious comment is amply justified (lxxiv): *permulti certe fuere multumque valuit disciplina sub Antoninis.*

VI. The Third Century A. D.

1. Christian Writers continued

We continue with the Christian evidence, which remains substantial.

A. Tertullian

Tertullian is more interested in advocacy rather than fair dealing. But through his works runs a knowledge of Epicureanism, which he uses as his immediate purpose directs him. Certainly he sees the Epicureans as a major contemporary school (Apol. 3). One problem is that he regards Epicurus as the spiritual ancestor of his *bête noire* Marcion. Already in the 190s he is flinging at the Marcionites their doctrine that the soul perishes (Praescr. Haer. 7 cf. Res. Carn. 1; Test. An. 1; Monog. 10). He speaks of *Epicuri stupor* with seeming reference to his *stupens deus*, a god whom he describes as *otiosum et inexercitum et ut ita dixerim neminem humanis rebus*, a concept which he attributes to Marcion (An. 3,2; Apol. 47; Nat. 2,28; Marc. 1,25; 2,16). At the same time he flings Lucretius's line about the corporeality of the soul at Marcion in an attack on his alleged docetism, calling it a sentence worth a place in the world's wisdom (Marc. 4,8; An. 5). Similarly he accepts and makes his own the Epicurean criticism of physical determinism (Res. Carn. 58,5). In his work on the soul he alludes freely to Epicurus's views. Some of this is based on a medical treatise by Soranus. But he coordinates his secondary source with primary and other secondary sources: Epicurus himself, Lucretius and Cicero for sure, and perhaps others. He is not content to follow the doxographers, and cites doctrines, including the atomic theory of the soul (5,2) and sleep as *deminutionem spiritus animalis* (43,2), which are not found in the doxographical tradition. In quoting Epicurus he is more accurate than

Cicero (42,1). Tertullian takes Epicurus's views very seriously and devises his own theories to answer him. The citation of fulfilled dreams to answer the theory that all dreams are fallacious may be a commonplace (46,2). But his answer to Epicurus's view that the senses never deceive us and that δόξα is the source of all error is his own – "that the senses are forced by special causes to transmit images of the objects in a form given to them by these causes" (17). He is one with the Epicureans on the indispensability of the senses for human life, but feels that their theory endangers the unity of the soul.

The general impression is left of a flourishing philosophical school, from which Tertullian is prepared to take weapons to use in argument, but which he basically regards as a serious rival to the emergent church. See further Spect. 28; 30; Nat. 2,3,4; 2,4,15 (*quod super nos nihil ad nos*); Apol. 38; 45; An. 15 (mind in breast); 17; 19,7 – 8; 24; 37,5; 51,5; 53,3 – 4; 58,4 – 5 (all from Lucretius); Res. Carn. 2,1.

See J. H. WASZINK (ed.), Tertullian: De Anima, with commentary (Amsterdam 1947); also SCHMID, RAC V, 797 ff. and passim (= ID., Ausgew. philol. Schriften, 247 ff. and passim).

B. Hippolytus of Rome

Hippolytus has a full and fair account of Epicurean doctrine. The universe is composed of atoms and void i. e. matter and space. The atoms are minute and indivisible. From these come all things animate and inanimate, including deity. Deity is eternal and incorruptible, living a life of ease in the μετακόσμια. On earth there is no providence, only chance. The end of wisdom is pleasure; some have interpreted this in terms of satisfying desires, others have exercised it through virtue. The souls of human beings are dissolved with their bodies; there are no tribunals in Hades; the wrongdoer who escapes detection is beyond trial (Ref. Her. 1,19 cf. 10.3).

C. Clement of Alexandria

Clement of Alexandria seems the sanest of the Church Fathers. He is sympathetic to Greek culture, which he sees as the forerunner of Christ for the Greeks. But he is unsympathetic to the Epicureans, whom he regards as the weeds in the cornfield of Greek philosophy (Str. 6,68), standing to it as heresies stand to the Church. So he rejects the Epicureans as atheists who abolish providence (Str. 1,1,1, 1,11,50; 6,8,67; Protr. 66).

This wholesale rejection probably conceals a detailed knowledge of Epicureanism. We may note his definiton of faith as πρόληψις ἑκούσιος (Str. 2,8,4); his careful account of Epicurus's theory of truth in terms of sensation and preconception (Str. 2,16,3; 4,66 cf. DL 10,33); his distinction between natural and necessary, and natural and unnecessary desires (Str. 3,1,3 cf. Epic., fr. 456 U); his use of a phrase which has subsquently been found in an Epicurean papyrus (Str. 3,9,67; P. Oxy. 215,2,7 τῇ τῶν νόμων συμπεριφορᾷ); his doctrine of abstention from present pleasures for the sake of greater ones (Str.

7,12,69); his awareness of Epicurus's scorn of culture (Str. 1,3,22). Epicureanism was certainly a living creed in Clement's Alexandria, and works of Epicureans were well represented in his private library.

See SCHMID, RAC V, 781 f., 791, 803 f., 807 ff. and passim (= ID., Ausgew. philol. Schriften, 235, 242 f., 253, 257 f. and passim).

D. Origen

Origen is strongly and consistently anti-Epicurean; he invites his Christian hearers to neglect no aspect of Greek philosophy except the Epicurean; his chief reason is their denial of providence, but he also mocks their belief that corporeal reality is primary and incorporeal reality secondary (Prayer 5,1: 27,8; Greg. Thaum., Orat. Paneg. 13,154 ff.).

The main evidence comes from 'Contra Celsum'. Origen confuses the author of 'The True Word' with Lucian's Epicurean friend; his confusion influences THEODOR KEIM and ADOLF V. HARNACK. In fact 'The True Word' is clearly the work of a Platonist, as Origen realized, saying that it was "in his other works" that his Epicureanism became apparent, and that he was either a covert Epicurean or a convert from Epicureanism (1,8; 1,68; 3,22; 3,35; 3,80; 4,4; 4,54; 4,83; 6,26; 6,47). None the less the confusion is not without interest. Origen expects an Epicurean attack on Christianity in the previous generation, and he thinks it important enough to answer for his own day. Once again, there is indication of the vitality of Epicureanism.

What is more, Origen's own knowledge of Epicureanism does not come from 'The True Word', which was Platonist. Some of the references are very general and pick up the Epicurean denial of providence (1,10; 1,13; 1,21; 2,13; 4,4; 4,75; 5,3), or of magic (1,24; 4,86) or of life after death (1,10; 2,60; 3,80) or of oracles (3,35; 7,3; 8,45). He is aware of Epicurean use of allegorical interpretation (1,20), and of the atomic structure of the gods (4,14: not in USENER). A reference to the 'alleged physicians' who follow Epicurus is of some interest. There were Epicurean doctors, but the Epicureans claimed to offer "the prescription for spiritual health" and it is this that he has in mind (3,75). He knows the limits of Epicurean interest in education (3,49; 4,36). Some passages show a deeper knowledge. There is a discussion of names, the more interesting because incidental, in which Origen shows an accurate knowledge of the Epicurean theory of the natural origin of language, "the first men having burst out with sounds applicable to objects", and distinguishes it from the different Stoic theory of natural origin (1,24 cf. Epic., fr. 334; DL 10,75; L. 5,1028 ff.). So too with Epicurus's ethical hedonism. Of course, Origen derides them for taking pleasure as the highest good, but he fairly presents Epicurus's understanding of pleasure as "a healthy condition of the body and sure confidence in this" (3,80; Epic., fr. 68). In discussing different theories of justice he properly identifies the Epicurean willingness to endure trouble in order to avoid more (5,47). Later again he rightly states the Epicurean view that one should avoid adultery not because it is contrary to nature for a rational man to corrupt a woman, but because pleasure is the

highest good, and the man who commits adultery faces danger and punishment (7.63; Epic., fr. 535). The indications are that Origen has taken pains to learn the writings of Epicurus himself, not as a piece of historical research, but as the 'Bible' of the contemporary Epicureanism which he wished to refute.

See H. CHADWICK, Origen: Contra Celsum, translation with introduction and notes (Cambridge 1953); also SCHMID, RAV V, 791f. (= ID., Ausgew. philol. Schriften, 243).

E. Pseudo-Clement

The pseudo-Clementine 'Recognitions' have a superficial account of the atomic theory of the formation of the world (8,15,17–9). The author does not know, as Epicurus evidently did, that objects fall with equal velocity in a vacuum, and uses this as a point of criticism. He throws at the atomists the jibing questions "How can the universe stand without props? And on what do those props rest?" not seeing that the same is applicable to any theory of the universe. His only point of substance is the suggestion that insensible atoms cannot produce intelligible order.

F. Dionysius of Alexandria

Dionysius of Alexandria is far more important. He was beyond doubt the ablest of Origen's pupils, and it was perhaps while he was head of the catechetical school that he wrote 'Περὶ φύσεως', the first systematic Christian critique of Epicureanism, presented in the form of a letter to his son Timothy. Two substantial fragments of this have survived in Eusebius (PE 14,23–7).

The first passage deals with atomism. Dionysius regards atomism no less satisfactory than other classical cosmologies, but he distinguishes accurately between the views of Democritus and Epicurus about the size of atoms. Atomic theory implies the formation of the world by chance. But parallels from weaving, building, and the like, suggest a divine mind behind the order of the universe. Disorder cannot produce order. Further, Epicurus contradicts himself. All atoms are in essence the same; how then can some things be more lasting than others? The Epicureans answer that some combinations are more lasting. But discriminate combinations imply a discerning combiner, a master-craftsman, a commander-in-chief. To talk about a natural tendency to combine is to inject a kind of pseudo-democracy into the system. If we consider the regularity of night and day, or of the seasons, and think that the atoms produce these, we should worship the atoms. We are back to democracy among the forces of nature; it is no use trying to attribute orderly results to random movements.

The second passage is rather more theological. The human body is fearfully and wonderfully made, and implies a maker. Can the atoms design statues? No, say the Epicureans, humans do that. Exactly, answers Dionysius: it requires intelligence. Can the unintelligent atoms, which can't even make statues, play the roles of the creative gods and Muses? Epicurus has read his own desire for a quiet life into his picture of the gods. At this point Dionysius

is diverted to attack Democritus's doctrine of Fortune. He reverts to the offensive against the idleness of the gods. People try to help their fellows. Even philosophers teach; how dare Epicurus and Democritus put forward gods who do nothing? Epicurus is imposing his own desire for pleasure on us. And he is inconsistent; he scatters divine expletives round his work – presumably to avoid the charge of atheism. Look at the world around you: you will see that the Biblical account of creation is true.

Four short fragments from other sources really add nothing to Dionysius's account. Dionysius's temper is admirable. FELTOE (xxii) has spoken of his "clear grasp of their tenets, together with much genuine humour and entire absence of bitterness in criticizing them". What is important is that his sources do not seem to be obvious ones. The reasonable conclusion is that there was a large and flourishing Epicurean school at Alexandria, which he felt he had to combat, and that he had encountered its members in discussion, and probably that they had writings of their own, interpreting Epicurus fairly in their own context.

See C. L. FELTOE, The Letters and Other Remains of Dionysius of Alexandria (Cambridge 1904); also SCHMID, RAC V, 782 (= ID., Ausgew. philol. Schriften, 235 f.).

G. Arnobius

We now turn back to Latin Africa. Arnobius was a convert to Christianity, and there has been a lot of discussion as to whether Arnobius had been an Epicurean. The case was made a century ago by KLUSSMANN. There undoubtedly are a large number of Epicurean references in Arnobius, mostly sympathetic. A high proportion of them derive from Lucretius, whom he is continually adapting to Christian ends. Some however come from other sources, Varro and Cicero in particular: RÖHRICHT was certainly wrong in supposing that Lucretius was his only source. The fact that Arnobius criticizes Epicurean theories as 'obstinate' (1,31) does not mean that he did not once hold them, and in book five he is far more vigorously critical of Stoicism. It also seems that Arnobius shared some of the superstitions of religion which Epicurus and Lucretius attacked. He was hardly a 'pure' Epicurean, but MARCHESI goes much too far in calling him an *„avversario sdegnoso"* of Epicureanism. Arnobius is not the most intelligent writer, and he may well have held incompatible positions without realizing it. He was no doubt something of an eclectic. What matters here is not whether Arnobius was a committed Epicurean, but that he had been systematically exposed to Epicureanism in North Africa in the second half of the third century. For, although the sources he quotes are ancient, the Epicureanism of which he writes is a living creed.

The main passages are: 1,2 (L. 2,147–9; 5,96); 1,3 (plague at Athens: L. 6,1138 ff.); 1,11 (hellebore poisonous: L. 4,640; 1,17 (cf. 3,25; 6,2; 7,5; 7,36: god cannot be angry: assimilated Epicureanism combined with an extraordinary ignorance of the Old Testament); 1,17 (L. 3,288); 1,20 (L. 2,290); 1,31 (L. 2, 646–51); 1,31 (attack on the 'obstinate' theories); 1,33 (Epicurean not from L. but perhaps from Cic., ND 1,43); 1,38 (L. 5,1–54: praise of Epicurus

transferred to Christ, whom Arnobius treats as a lecturer on physics and metaphysics); 1,59 (rejection of style, not from L.); 2,2 (L. 2,717); 2,5 (attack on 'random' theories): 2,7 (L. 2,871; 3,445 – 69); 2,9 (direct reference to Epicurus); 2,10 (L. 1,635 – 704); 2,14 (immortality, echoing L. 3); 2,16 (L. 1,183; 4,636); 2,23 (L. 4,552); 2,76 (L. 3,161 – 7); 2,27 (L. 3,971); 2,29 (L. 3,114; also a general allusion to Epicurean theology and ethics); 2,30 (direct reference to Epicurus; also use of an Epicurean argument against the mythology of Hades); 2,32 ("we have received from the highest authority the view that souls are established not far from the gaping jaws of death": is this a reference to Epicurus or Christ? The ambiguity is significant; see 2,37 (L. 4,1026; 5,165 – 9; 5,174 – 6); 2,56 – 7 (L. 1,146 – 58; 2,296 – 307; also general Epicurean views, among others, on origin of matter, gods and souls); 2,58 (L. 1,31; 1,472; 2,934; also a clear and correct allusion to Epicurean physics in which stars were regarded as being the size they appear); 2,61 (the same point, treated as a living issue); 2,66 (an account of the emergence of civilization in Epicurean terms); 3,8 (gods have no bodies: not in L., perhaps from Cic., ND 1,33,92 cf. 2,23,59); 3,10 (4,1168 unexpected citation from L.; only reference to L. by name); 3,25 (Epicurean critique of character of gods); 3,28 (allusion to Epicurean theology); 3,33 (*natura rerum*); 4,8 (L. 3,721); 4,29 (mention of Epicurus's disciple Nicagoras: DL 10,20); 4,37 (Epicurean theology); 6,2 (Epicurean theology); 6,3 (L. 2,27 – 8); 6,10 (renewal of moon: L. 731 – 50); 6,15 (L. 2,865); 7,4 (Epicurean theology: also L. 6,1223); 7,5 (Epicurean χειμών of the feelings, not in Lucretius); 7,17 (L. 6,955); 7,23 (L. 2,651); 7,28 (L.1,304); 7,39 (L. 6,50 – 5); 7,43 (L. 6,1098); 7,49 (L. 2,428).

See F. DAL PANE, Se Arnobio si è stato un epicureo: Lucrezio e gli apologeti cristiani Minucio Felice, Tertulliano, Cipriano, Lattanzio, Riv. di stor. antica 10 (1906), 405 – 35; 11 (1907), 222 – 36; F. GABARROU, Arnobe. Son œuvre (Paris 1921); E. KLUSSMANN, Arnobius und Lucrez, oder ein Durchgang durch den Epikuräismus zum Christenthum, Philologus 26 (1867), 362 – 6; G. E. MCCRACKEN, Arnobius: The Case Against the Pagans (Cork 1949); C. MARCHESI, Questioni arnobiani, Atti del r. Istituto Veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti 88 (1929), 1009 – 32; A. RÖHRICHT, Die Seelenlehre des Arnobius nach ihren Quellen und ihrer Entstehung untersucht (Hamburg (1893); also SCHMID, RAC V, 785 f., 810 (= ID., Ausgew. philol. Schriften, 237 ff., 258 f.).

2. References to the Epicureans which occur in other writers

A. Aelian

Aelian is hostile. In his work 'On Providence' (fr. 10), he tells how a former δᾳδοῦχος, corrupted by Epicurus, burst into the sanctuary of the temple to show that he would suffer no harm, but (in Aelian's eyes very properly) dies in agony. For Aelian, the Epicureans are mere pleasure-seakers. He acknowledges Epicurus's simplicity of living (VH 4,13), but Epicurus denies providence (2,31), and the Romans and the Messenians banished Epicureans as corrupters of youth (9,12). Aelian knows very little about the Epicureans,

but his hostility shows that he believed that the Epicureans were a danger in his own day.

B. Philostratus

Philostratus (as was seen) allows his hero Apollonius to study with Epicureans at Aegae, but he himself scorns Epicurus as a slave to the belly and its lusts (V. Ap. 1,7). However, he goes so far as to attribute to Apollonius the saying λάθε βιώσας (8,28). It seems probable that Philostratus's reference to Aegae means that there was an Epicurean school at Aegae of some long standing in his own day.

C. Galen

Galen in De Libris Suis 17 lists eight tracts written against the Epicureans. These are now lost: they were presumably sparked off by the work of Asclepiades, two centuries before, but atomistic views were probably still prevalent in medical circles: for example at De Usu Partium 1,21 (cf. 7,14; 11,8) he cites contemporaries who follow "the philosopher Epicurus and the doctor Asclepiades". Galen knew, and was interested in, Epicurus's work at first hand, and he alone preserves Epicurus's views on the magnet (De Facult. Nat. 1,14; E., fr. 293), though even there (1,47), Asclepiades intrudes.

D. Diogenes Laertius

Diogenes Laertius is a witness of major importance. Nothing is known about him. He may have been a Sceptic (9,109); his sympathies were certainly eclectic. One friend was interested in Epicurus (10,29) and his account of Epicurus is exceptionally full and warm. Further he may have had access to Epicurean commentaries on Aristotle. It seems quite certain that Diogenes was familiar with an Epicurean community who gave him access to the master's writings. Furthermore he offers very important evidence when he says (10.9) that by contrast with the other schools the succession among the Epicurean heads was unbroken. This shows that 'The Suda', which takes the succession only to the beginning of the Empire, and Numenius, who takes it only to Antiochus (Eus., PE 14,5–9) were simply drawing on out-of-date documents, and is yet another indication of the strength of the school.

See SCHMID, RAC V, 788 (= ID., Ausgew. philol. Schriften, 240 f.).

E. Longinus

Longinus wrote a work critical of the Stoic doctrine of the soul, cited by Eusebius (PE 15.21); in it he lumps together Epicurus and Chrysippus as wrongly extrapolating from the behaviour of matter to the behaviour of the soul; he does not think that the shape and disposition of atoms is capable of producing thought. Elsewhere (Porph., V. Plot. 20) he says that when he was

young, there were many philosophers, but that by the end of his life, there was a dearth. From his youth he mentions 9 Platonists, 3 Peripatetics and 8 Stoics. He does not mention Epicureans at all. This may be significant.

F. Alexander of Aphrodisias

Alexander of Aphrodisias is a very able Aristotelian commentator. He is also a fair and careful critic of Epicurean natural philosophy, and preserves information which we would not otherwise possess (e.g. E., fr. 289; 290). He has patently studied the works at first hand, but does not help us towards understanding contemporary Epicureanism. He tells us only that Epicurus's works were available in Peripatetic circles, and thought worthy of historical commentary.

G. Plotinus

Plotinus was not sympathetic to the Epicureans, though they are not as bad as the Gnostics: they only deny providence while the Gnostics actually blame providence (2,9,15). But they are persistent in their objections to the Neo-Platonic exaltation of nous, and concentrate their whole attention on pleasure (6,7,29). Similarly in the section on the immortality of the soul (4,7) he treats the atomic theory of the soul as contemporary. Plotinus thinks that they must be reckoned with, and, for example, in his section on time, concludes his summary of other views with a reference to the (unattributed) Epicurean view that time is an accompaniment or accident of motion (3.7.10). The reference to the persistent objections is most significant. We have a clear picture of a running philosophical battle, and the venue must presumably be Rome – or possibly Campania.

See J.P. DUMONT, Plotin et la doxographie épicurienne, dans: Néoplatonisme. Mélanges offerts à J. Trouillard (Fontenay 1981), 191–204; also SCHMID, RAC V, 800f. (= ID., Ausgew. philol. Schriften, 251f.).

H. Porphyry

Porphyry provides evidence of a different kind. He incorporates into one of his works a collection of *bons mots* taken from Epicurus, who is not mentioned by name (Marc. 27–31). Many of these are also found in Stobaeus; we may deduce that they were drawing on a common source, which HENRY CHADWICK (The Sentences of Sextus [Cambridge 1959]) implausibly suggested might be Neo-Pythagorean: Porphyry's Epicurean epigrams are not paralleled in 'The Pythagorean Sentences' or in 'The Sentences of Sextus'. It is important then, that such a collection was in

circulation and Porphyry had read it. Elsewhere too (e.g. Abst. 1,47–53) he refers to Epicurean teaching.

3. Epitaphs of the Third Century

There is a particularly interesting epitaph in the amphitheatre at Puteoli. It reads

DARDANIVS . CARVI AVARITIA METV SOLLICITVDINE . HOMINVM
L . VALERIO . VALERIANO . V . P . PRAEFECTO . MESOPOTAMIAE . ET . HOSROENAE.

It can be dated to the first half of the third century. DUNCAN-JONES, who has published the inscription (which I had independently recorded), thinks the moral claims of the first line are broadly Stoic. I would see them as quite clearly Epicurean. Epicurus stood against desire and fear as the disturbers of ἀταραξία. Here are specified desire, fear and disturbance. If this be accepted, we have evidence of an Epicurean in high office at this period, and, very possibly, of the continuance of Epicurean traditions in Campania, of which Valerianus was presumably a native.

See R. DUNCAN-JONES, Praefectus Mesopotamiae et Osrhoenae, CP 64 (1969), 229–33 (I owe this reference to Miss J.M. REYNOLDS); see also ID., Praefectus Mesopotamiae et Osrhoenae: a Postscript, CP 65 (1970), 107–9 (confirming the date, with full details of Valerianus's military and political career).

From Rome (KAIBEL 646) comes a long and clearly Epicurean polemic in Greek against traditional beliefs: "there is no boat in the lower world, no Charon to man the ferryboat, no Aeacus to hold the key, no Cerberus as watchdog. ..." This is from the third century or later.

A number of expressions of nihilism from Africa are likely to date from the third century. So, from Timgad, *[nil mihi post] fine(m) est: nil volo, nil cupio* (BÜCHELER, CE 2071); from Lambaesis (the tomb of M. Julius Alexander) *non fueras, nunc es, iterum nunc desinas esse* (ibid. 800); or again, *non fui, fui non sum, non desidero* (CIL 8,3463). The most interesting of these has been the subject of a monumental article by JÉRÔME CARCOPINO. At Lambaridi was found the tomb of Cornelia Urbanilla, wife of Tiberius Claudius Vitalis, "liberated from great danger". Her age is spelt out precisely as 28 years 10 months 12 days and 9 hours – a sure indication of an absence of faith in an afterlife. Associated with the tomb is the inscription οὐκ ἤμην, ἐγενόμην, οὐκ εἰμί, οὐ μέλει μοι, a representation of the dead woman on her couch, and a bearded figure, doctor or philosopher, conversing with another, who is skeleton-thin and nude. CARCOPINO argues that the figure is a doctor, that the formula has lost its Epicurean force, and that the context of the whole is Hermetic mysticism. I find this hard to accept. Even if the bearded man is doctor rather than philosopher, the medical analogy was familiar in Epicurean

circles. There is no indication of hope after death. This seems to me to be a symbol of a committed Epicureanism. The date is certainly late third century.

See J. CARCOPINO, Le Tombeau de Lambaridi et l'Hermétisme Africain, Rev. Arch 15 (1922), 211–301.

There is one tombstone from Tunisia of C. Artorius Celer, *philosophus Epicureus pius* (ILT 1614). This is of uncertain date, but can probably be put in the third century.

Anti-Christian formulations are not earlier than the late third century, and may belong to the early fourth. W. M. RAMSAY published a particularly good example from Eumeneia (Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia [Oxford 1895], 232). This life is all there is; it is pleasurable (ἡδύς), and only cowards rush off to resurrection. This is Epicurean and anti-Christian.

4. Summary

An impression of third century Epicureanism is that it was in decline. No longer can we name one committed Epicurean who remained so for life (apart from C. Artorius Celer, whose date is uncertain), though we may suspect that Arnobius at least had belonged to the sect, and we may think that we discern, through Diogenes Laertius, for example, or Philostratus, evidence of surviving Epicurean groups elsewhere. There is clear evidence that Epicurean works were in free circulation, and the intensity of opposition and concern for detailed refutation, whether from Christians or pagans, strongly suggests that Epicureanism was still offering a viable alternative and a challenge that was not negligible.

VII. The Fourth Century A.D.

1. Diocletian

Diocletian was a very remarkable person, and perhaps the most remarkable of all Roman emperors. He had been a militarist; he exercised supreme power and reorganized the empire; he consulted seers and oracles; his propaganda stressed *providentia deorum* and exalted Jupiter and Hercules. But in 305 he abdicated his position. It was part of his overall plan, but ill-health and the ambitions of Galerius may have pressed upon him. There are signs of something else: an exaltation of *quies Augustorum*, a welcome to retirement. And where did he retire? To the garden. Aurelius Victor tells the well-known story that Maximian tried to persuade him out of retirement, and he replied: "If only you could see the vegetables I've been growing at Salonae, you would never dream of pressing such a

suggestion." The contrast between λάθε βιώσας and the corridors of power, all seems very Epicurean.

2. Christian Writers and Epicureanism

The main evidence is from Christian writers.

A. Lactantius

Lactantius is of primary importance. He was almost certainly an associate of Arnobius, though he never mentions him by name, and has a far finer mind, and a far finer grasp of Christianity. He too has been claimed as a former Epicurean; certainly his detestation of war fits in with Epicurus as with the Christ; certainly too his knowledge of Epicureanism seems close and precise. As with Arnobius, much but not all is derived from Lucretius: Inst. 1,16 (L. 1,932); 1,21 (L. 1,83; 1,101; 2,14); 2,3 (L. 5,1198 – 1202; 6,52 – 3); 2,11 (L. 5,808); 3,14 (L. 5,6 – 8; 5,50 – 1); 3,16 (L. 5,335 – 7); 3,17 (L. 2,1101 – 4; 3,1 – 43/4; 3 generally); 3,27 (L. 1,64); 4,28 (L.1,932); 5,1 (L.1,19; 1,936 ff.); 6,10 (L. 2,991); 7,3 (L. 5,156 ff.); 7,5 (L. 5,165 – 7); 7,12 (L. 2,979 ff.; 3,434 – 620 which he follows very close for his discussion of the soul); 7,27 (L. 6,24 – 8: praise of Lucretius transferred to Christ); Ira Dei 8 (L. 2,646 – 51); 10 (L. 1,159 – 60; 1,205 – 7; and frequent general references); Op. Dei 5 (L. 2,357); 19 (L. 2,991). What is interesting about Lactantius's citations is that he uses them sometimes as targets (e. g. Op. Dei 6), and sometimes as weapons (e. g. Inst. 2,3; 7,1,10). This is certainly compatible with a basic sympathy linked to a partial rejection.

Further, his knowledge of Epicureanism is not only from Lucretius, or, Ciceronian though he is, from Cicero. For example at Inst. 7,5 he quotes Epicurus, fr. 371 to the effect that worship does not benefit the gods. Again his suggestion that Epicurus in taking away God's anger took away his beneficence (Ira Dei 4) does not arise in Lucretius; this again is from Epicurus (fr. 243; 366), though possibly mediated through Cicero; so too with the view that there was a god to provide a noun of blessedness, but no providence (Ira Dei 9; Epic., fr. 368). An intriguing passage refers to two Epicurean poets who speak indifferently of 'mind' and 'soul'; one is Lucretius, but who is the other?

In The Institutes 3,17 Lactantius has an extended criticism of Epicurean views. He says that the system's prosperity depended on pleasure not truth. Epicurus appealed to innate laziness, covetousness, quietism, sloth, timidity, irreligion, selfishness, misanthropy, thrift, desire to escape family troubles, delicateness, bravery, place-seeking, desire to avoid anxieties. That some of these are contradictory does not matter; Lactantius's case is that Epicurus argued *ad hominem* without care for consistency. The obverse to his assaults is an excellent summary of Epicurean ethic: retirement from business, financial graft, public office, athletic ambition, military service; the detachment of the gods; the wise man's self-sufficiency, solitude, simplicity of life, withdrawal

from family commitments; the doctrine that pain is the worst evil, yet that the wise man will be happy under torture, the injunction alike to pay court to kings and to avoid them. Epicurus saw the good subject to adversity, and therefore denied providence; he denied a natural order and saw only seeds floating in the void. Lactantius criticizes atomic theory. If the atoms are not hooked they cannot cohere; if hooked they become fragile; further, they cannot form an orderly universe without an ordering mind. He further claimed that Epicurus frees us from fear of death. Lactantius quotes, not from Lucretius: *quando nos sumus, mors non est: quando mors est, nos non sumus: mors ergo nihil ad nos* (DL 10,125). The Epicureans argue that souls perish and that there is no punishment after death. What could any crook say more? It becomes 'Each for himself' and an end to human society.

This is only one example of Lactantius's detailed knowledge, and his concern for a refutation. I do not think that there is any doubt that Lactantius has been exposed to Epicureanism as a living force, and that he sees it as a dangerous and seductive rival to Christianity. He says that they have always been more numerous than other sects.

For the modern literature see under Arnobius, above p. 2307. See also G. BARDY, Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum, I (1950), s. v. Arnobius, cols. 709 ff.; also SCHMID, RAC V, 784 ff. and passim (= ID., Ausgew. philol. Schriften, 237 and passim).

B. Eusebius

Eusebius's 'Preparation for the Gospel' is a document of importance for our survey. Eusebius was not looking at current beliefs; but deliberately and explicitly, looking at the past for a stock of commonplaces from pagan authors to use in defence of Christianity. The evidence is important in showing what was available in Eusebius's circle in the early fourth century. Four things are clear. First, Eusebius is familiar with Epicurus and his thought, and has an accurate knowledge of the principal tenets of the school. Second, he has not read Epicurus at first hand, but derives his information from the general doxographic tradition, or from earlier Christian writers such as Clement, Dionysius, or pagan sources such as Aristocles, Oenomaus, Numenius, or Plotinus. Third, Epicurean writings were still in circulation, and, he quotes extensively from Diogenianus (cf. above p. 2289 f.). Fourth, in his general references, where he is not quoting directly from an earlier source, there is nothing to suggest that Epicureanism was a live option to Eusebius's generation. Indeed elsewhere (Theoph. 1,1) he makes it clear that there is danger of an Epicurean takeover of the Church, which must be resisted. This (with Arnobius and Lactantius) is the clearest evidence we have of Epicureans finding a spiritual home in Christianity.

See SCHMID, RAC V, 782 (= ID., Ausgew. philol. Schriften, 235).

C. Athanasius

Athanasius (Inc. Verb. 2) speaks of the Epicureans in the present tense. He is concerned about their denial of design. The Greek is not easy, but the

general argument is clear. Random initiation could not produce ordered differences: everything would be all sun, all moon or all land. Separate arrangement implies causation. It is slightly different from the standard critique, and looks as if it may be original with Athanasius. The important thing is evidence of Epicurean activity in Alexandria early in the fourth century.

D. Hilary of Poitiers

Hilary of Poitiers travelled in the East before settling in Gaul, and therefore one can never be quite certain whether his references apply to the east or to the west. The fact, however, that he addresses a vigorous polemic against Epicureanism (which he does not identify by name) to his own congregation suggests that there was an Epicurean movement in Gaul in the middle of the century large enough to be disturbing to the Christians. Hilary picks on four points: they scorn search for the knowledge of God; they take it for granted that there is no Creator; they assume that chance movements can lead to order and beauty; they think to escape judgement by claiming that a man comes into being or passes away through the operation of natural law. It is interesting that he does not mock their philosophy of pleasure (Hom. in Ps. 1,7).

See A. ZINGERLE, Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung des Hilarius von Poitiers, Sitz. Ber. Ak. Wien 8 (1885), 969; also SCHMID, RAC V, 776 and passim (= ID., Ausgew. philol. Schriften, 230 and passim).

E. Basil

Basil, a contemporary of Julian, offers some important evidence. His nine homilies on the Hexaemeron serve as an example. He does not in these addresses refer to Epicurus or to the Epicureans by name, but he twice alludes to their theories with apparent familiarity. Thus in commenting on the words 'God said' he makes clear that the voice of God is not a sound emitted by organs of speech (the Epicurean view) or air struck by the tongue (the Stoic view) (2,19 C). Again, in speaking generally of the creation he rejects the view of infinite universes, another Epicurean tenet. Similarly in his ninth letter he quotes with approval the saying λάθε βιώσας, without naming a source for it. And he is not afraid to make his own the Epicurean watchwords ἀλήθεια and ἀσφάλεια (Ep. 245). I find it hard to believe that Basil was not familiar with Epicureanism as a living faith, and indeed had not argued with Epicureans.

See SCHMID, RAC V, 782 f. (= ID., Ausgew. philol. Schriften, 236).

F. Gregory of Nazianzus

Gregory of Nazianzus in his speech (27) on 'How to philosophize about God' includes the precept 'Attack the atheism of Epicurus, and his atoms and his unphilosophic pleasure'. Elsewhere (Or., 28,8) he takes atomic theory as an example of absurdity. Gregory encourages attack on an absurd creed, but

not on a dead one. Further, the second oration (2,6–7) is almost a sermon on λάθε βιώσας. And in one of his poems he speaks fairly and favourably of Epicurus's disciplined moderation (Carm. Iamb. 17).

See SCHMID, RAC V, 803 ff. (= ID., Ausgew. philol. Schriften, 253 ff.).

G. Gregory of Nyssa

Gregory of Nyssa casts his work on Immortality in the form of a dialogue with his and Basil's sister Macrina. In the course of this Macrina identifies some features of Epicurean philosophy: that the framework of the world is fortuitous and mechanical; that there is no Providence; that human life is like a bubble (is this an unidentified quotation from Epicurus?); that life exists only as long as it is held together by the surrounding membrane of the body; and that the visible is the limit of existence, and the senses the only means of apprehension.

H. Eunomius

Eunomius was an Arian, who seems, judging from Gregory of Nyssa's criticisms, to have suggested some equivalence between the divine conception in Christian terms and Epicurus's system of atoms, space and fortuitous generation. ("What an idea of Epicurus?" says Gregory. "We don't believe in individual bodies, combinations of atoms, or collision and rebound of particles.") It looks as if Eunomius was trying to ease the way into Christianity for Epicureans (Greg. Nyss., C. Eun. 3,6,53).

I. Ambrose

Meantime in Italy Ambrose obtained his knowledge of Epicureanism primarily but not solely from Cicero. The 63rd letter, written to the church at Vercellae in 396, is very important. It shows familiarity with the writings of Epicurus, Hermarchus (the MS Demarchus is unknown) and Philodemus. He seems to know Filominus's 'Epitome' (63,13), but also some full works as well. Ambrose is arguing against sensualism in the church; he says that some people prefer to follow Epicurus rather than the apostles. It is clear that there was actual Epicurean influence; Ambrose expounds Epicurean doctrine in Epicurean terms to refute it, expects the congregation at Vercellae to know what he's talking about, and comments: "Since philosophy has rejected them, shouldn't the Church exclude them?" (63,20). Elsewhere Ambrose identifies correctly Epicurean espousal of pleasure (Off. Min. 2,2) and denial of providence (Off. Min. 1,13; 1,47; Noe 100), but these are commonplaces derived from Cicero. Still it is notable that in his treatise 'De Bono Mortis' he slips easily into Epicurean phraseology, although his argument is very different (7,30; 8,31); either it is very much a part of him, or he expects it to be meaningful to his hearers.

See W. LIEBICH, Ein Philodem-Zeugnis bei Ambrosius, Philologus 98 (1954), 116–131; T. DORANDI, Filodemo: gli orientamenti della ricerca attuale, below in this same volume (ANRW II, 36,4), 2354 with note 211; also SCHMID, RAC V, 787 (= ID., Ausgew. philol. Schriften, 240).

J. Pelagius

Pelagius may be taken as one example of the continued study of Lucretius; he is interested in his substance, not in his style (in Col. 2,8 cf. L. 1,149–50; in 1 Cor. 7,4 cf. L. 1,304).

K. Augustine

Epicurus and Epicureanism are a major target for Augustine's critical opposition e.g. Util. Cred. 10; CD 5,20; c. Iul. 4,3,21; Ep. 118; 155,2–3. He knows the main tenets: atomic theory including the emergence of life from the lifeless (e.g. CD 6,5; 8,5); innumerable worlds (CD 11,5); denial of the traditional gods (CD 18,41, a careful and accurate account); the place of sense-perception in reasoning (CD 8,7); pleasure as the *summum bonum* (CD 5,20 rightly linked with physical health; 19,1 with a correct distinction between static and kinetic pleasures; Sem. 150,7,8 cf. 140,23,56 [*summum bonum* physical]); the mortality of the soul (Mag. 13,41 a slightly odd passage; Enarr. in Ps. 74,22 where he suggests that the man who says "When I am dead I shall be nothing" is a student of Epicurus.) In one passage he shows an unexpected gleam of sympathy. He is identifying three types of error in reading: one, which he instances from Vergil, to take as true what the author intends as false; another, from Lucretius, to follow the author in taking the false to be true; still another, from Epicurus, to identify the truth which the author has presented without understanding (Util. Cred. 4,10). In general he is negative, even abusive. Epicurus is a dotard, admiring his own foolishness, rightly nicknamed 'the hog' (in Ps. 73,25). 'Epicurean' is naturally a term of abuse, levelled at Jovinian (Ep. 147,4) or Julian (c. Iul. 3,21,48; 4,3,21); interestingly, Julian returned the charge (c. Iul. 3,21,48; 6,14,44). But it is a term of abuse with substance behind it.

It is clear, as HAGENDAHL has pointed out, that the main source of his knowledge is Cicero, especially 'De Nature Deorum' (Ep. 118,30–1 = ND 1,109–10), 'Tusculanae Disputationes' (Ep. 155,2–3 = TD 2,17; 5,110–7; CD 5,20 = TD 5,74) and 'De Finibus' (c. Iul. 4,3,21 = Fin. 2,37; CD 5,20 = Fin. 2,69). He also knows Lucretius at first hand, and alludes to such phrases as *moles et machina mundi* (c. Acad. 3,11,25; Lucr. 5,96), *moenia mundi* (Trin. 4 pref.; Lucr. 1,72–3), and *primordia rerum* (Gen. ad litt. 9,17; Lucr. 1,55). His injunction *rationis vias pietate fretus ingredere* (Lib. Arb. 1,6,14) is clearly an echo of Lucretius:

ne forte rearis
inpia te rationis inire elementa viamque
indugredi sceleris (1,80–2)

He takes from him his definition of natural laws (Gen. ad litt. 9,17; Lucr. 1,75 – 7), and, more remarkably, four examples of optical illusion (Gen. ad litt. 12,25; Lucr. 4,387 ff.); these last were fairly standard, but the language betrays the source. And he refutes Lucretius by name for his doctrine of the atomic structure of the soul (Util. cred. 4,10).

Was Augustine then entirely dependent on the past? In 387 he says that there are virtually no philosophers except Platonists, Peripatetics and Cynics; this means that there were others but he is unsympathetic to them (C. Acad. 3,42). By 410 he says that the ashes of Stoicism and Epicureanism are already cold (Ep. 118,12); their views scarcely worth recalling in the schools of rhetoric (the same *caveat* applies); interestingly he says that Epicureanism flourished among the unlearned multitude (ibid. 14), but this may be merely from Cicero. That Augustine was not fighting dead giants from the past can be seen in an extended passage in the 'Confessions' (11,10 – 31). In this he answers the stock Epicurean question designed to disprove the doctrine that the world was created by God: "What was God doing before he created the universe?" He had assuredly faced this question in acutal controversy. He himself in his younger days argued for Epicureanism in all aspects except the denial of life after death: it was clearly for him a serious option. Furthermore his own doctrine of sensation, that the soul watches over each organ of the body, and notes its changes (Mus. 6,5,10; Ep. 118,29) is clearly intended as an answer to Epicurus's materialism. And at CD 12,11 he makes it clear that the Epicureans he is opposing are contemporary.

See H. HAGENDAHL, Augustine and the Latin Classics. 2 vols. (Göteborg 1967); also SCHMID, RAC V, 776, 789 and passim (= ID., Ausgew. philol. Schriften, 230, 241 and passim).

L. Jerome

Jerome adds little, except that he preserves some controversial details about the life of Lucretius. His knowledge of Epicureanism comes mostly from Lucretius and Cicero. The fact that in citing Porphyry 'De Abstinentia' without acknowledgement he takes a view of 'the Epicureans' and attributes it to Epicurus means nothing (Adv. Iovin. 2,11 – 2; Porph., Abst. 1,47 – 53). For Jerome Epicurus is pirimarily the apostle of pleasure (Anecd. Mareds. 3,2 p, 350,12), and he likes to call Jovinian "the Christian Epicurus" (Adv. Iovin. 1,1; 2,36; Ep. 33,5), as also did Augustine (Aug., Ep. 147,4). He also knows the doctrines of the indifference of God (Anecd. Mareds. 3,3 p, 83,4), of "nothing after death" (in Is. 7,22,12), and of simplicity of living (Adv. Iovin. 2,11). The most illuminating passage is when he interprets "We have no king but Caesar" to mean "We follow vice not virtue, Epicurus not Christ, Jovinian not the apostle Paul" (Adv. Iovin. 2,36). Here Epicurus seems to be the chief challenger to Christ.

See SCHMID, RAC V, 786 f. and passim (= ID., Ausgew. philol. Schriften, 239 f. and passim).

M. Paulinus of Nola

Paulinus of Nola offers an important piece of evidence. He was in correspondence with one Jovius, a poet with some interest in philosophical problems, which Paulinus is interested to discuss with him (Ep. 114 ff.). In a little poem (22) he urges him to abandon mythological and historical subjects for those which promise eternal life, and in treating the Creation to follow the Bible not Epicurus. This can only mean that Epicureanism was a serious alternative for Jovius.

N. Prudentius

Prudentius (Apotheosis 952 – 8) suggests that the god of the Manichees is atomic. This may be general abuse, but it does suggest that there was atomic philosophy somewhere in the air.

3. Non-Christian Writers

A. Julian the Apostate

The evidence of Julian is of major importance, because it has been wrongly used. In the fragmentary letter to a priest Julian says that the gods have acted providentially in that most of Epicurus's works have ceased to exist. Some interpreters have taken this seriously. It is, of course, just the thing a pietistic pagan like Julian would say; one can think of scores of times in the last century or so when Christians have made similar statements about humanism. The fact that Julian goes on to cite them as works to avoid, shows that they had not ceased to exist (301 C – D); the fact that he knows Epicurus's own doctrine of simplicity of life shows that Julian himself is familiar with them (Or. 6,195 B); the fact that he takes pains to attack λάθε βιώσας shows that some of his contemporaries were professing it (Ep. ad Them. 255 C; 259 B).

See SCHMID, RAC V, 776 (= ID., Ausgew. philol. Schriften, 230).

B. Themistius

Themistius treats Epicurus as a conventional sensualist (Or. 34,30); this suggests that Epicureanism was not found in the Christian capital of Constantinople.

C. Sallustius

Sallustius (9) explicitly meets the Epicurean assertion that providence would involve the gods in trouble, by suggesting that providence is an emanation like heat or the light of the sun. Epicurus in fact said much the same, as Sallustius obviously did not know. But he is answering a current criticism. He

has further to answer KD 1; his answer is not that the gods are angry, but that our sin erects a barrier (14).

D. Macrobius

Macrobius provides evidence that Epicurus's theories of vision are still subject to learned discussion at the end of the century (Sat. 7,14,3) – further evidence that Epicurus's works had not disappeared. What is more, he puts into the mouth of Symmachus a warning against following Epicurus in making pleasure the *summum bonum* (2,1,8); again we may reasonably conclude that some people were still doing just that.

E. Claudian

But the most interesting evidence of all comes from Claudian. Claudian explicitly says that he was once an Epicurean convert. His mind hesitated between a belief in providential gods or the rule of chance. The seeming injustice of the universe drove him to that philosophy which asserts that atoms drift in random motion, that new shapes emerge in the void through chance not design, and that gods do not exist in any meaningful sense or are indifferent to us (3,1 – 19). Elsewhere, in a brief summary of philosophic beliefs he describes the Epicureans as making atoms collide with unpurposed blows (17,82). Both passages contain echoes of Lucretius. CAMERON in his book 'Claudian' (Oxford 1970, 327) makes a shrewd case that the conversion is a piece of literary satire. But, even if he is right, the satire would have no point unless such a conversion were possible. Claudian provides irrefutable evidence that Epicureanism was very much alive, either in Alexandria or in Italy or in both.

See also S. GENNARO, Lucrezio e l'apologetica latina in Claudiano (Catonia 1958).

F. Sulpicius

To this we add with less certainty Sulpicius Lupercus Serbastus Junior. We do not know his name (Serbastus is odd), his date, his provenance or his beliefs. I have elsewhere argued for Gaul and the late fourth century. Two poems of his survive in the Codex Vossianus III (Riese, AL 648 – 9). The first, a collection of commonplaces of the theme of Time's destructive power, is in sapphics, but matter and language come from Lucretius: the perishability of all things is an Epicurean theme, and the poem contains Epicurean moralizing. The second poem, also with echoes of Lucretius, is on desires which outrun their natural bounds, another typically Epicurean subject; it is not unlike Juvenal's Epicurean 'Vanity of Human Wishes'. C. J. CLASSEN in an article of formidable learning argued, that Serbastus was a mere purveyor of philosophical and literary commonplaces, and that it would be unwise to associate him with any one school. Certainly we should not be dogmatic. None the less CLASSEN seems to underplay the Lucretian echoes, and one wonders how far

Lucretius survived except among those with Epicurean or similar sympathies. And when one has penetrated the barrage of parallels, and looks again at the poems, I still find myself thinking of the Epicureans. But certainty is not possible.

See J. FERGUSON, Sulpicius Lupercus Serbastus Iunior, Cl. et Med. 19 (1958), 120–8; C. J. CLASSEN, Sulpicius Lupercus, Cl. et Med. 21 (1960), 43–63.

4. Inscriptional evidence

A piece of archaeological evidence of exceptional importance has recently been found at Hadrumetum. It is a tomb, dating from the late third or early fourth century. A Romanized Greek, M. Eustorgius Heraclamon, proclaims the philosophical merits of his dead wife Concordia Exuperantia:

> *MIRI EXEMPLI ET PVDORIS CONCORDIAE EXVPERANTIAE M. EVSTORGIVS HERACLAMON LEONIDES MARITVS VXORI RARISSIME VNICAE FILOSOFAE IN PACE.*

He himself, like Diogenes of Oenoanda, bequeathes to the living a proclamation of a way of life, picked out for effect in a variety of colours:

> *VIVE* (i.e. *BIBE*) *LVDE DONA EVSTORGIVS DICIT DEVS ODIT VXORE (M) MALI MORI(S) A(C) FILIV(M) IN ALOGIA ET VSVRA EVSTORGIVS DICIT DEVS AMAT VIRGI [NEM V]ERA(M) ET FORMONSA(M) ET AMICOS BONOS EVSTORGIVS DICIT SIC HABETO AMICVM SPERANS QVIA LITIGAT VRVS ES QV(VM) ILLV* (i.e. *CVM ILLO*) *EVSTORGIVS DICIT VIBITE* (i.e. *BIBITE*) *IV[VENES DVM] POSSETIS VIV[ERE EVSTOR] GIVS [DICIT ...] VIVE ... EVS [TORGIVS DICIT PERGE P]ROTI [NVS EUSTORGIVS DIC]IT.* A third tomb has the words *COTBVLDEVS IN PACE* (i.e. *QVOD VVLT DEVS IN PACE*).

The general tenor of the thought expressed in these seven precepts is Epicurean. Some of it is popular Epicureanism, but the emphasis on friendship and the philosophic partnership between husband and wife point to something deeper. At the same time the phrase *in pace* and the religious expressions, combined with some of the decorative motifs surrounding the inscriptions, point to a Christian environment. It looks very much as though Eustorgius and Concordia Exuperantia have been Epicurean philosophers, and he, perhaps after her death, has been converted to Christianity. Certainly there is evidence of surviving Epicureanism absorbed by emergent Christianity.

See L. FOUCHER, Le tombeau d'un épicurien d'Hadrumète: Eustorgius, Bull. du comitée des travaux hist. et sci. (1955–6) (Paris 1958), 40–6 (cf. L'Année épigraphique 1960, p. 28 f.).

5. Busts of Epicurus

DE WITT (Epicurus and his Philosophy [op. cit. p. 2261], 101) has made an interesting suggestion. Epicurus' portrait is known from numerous busts. The Epicureans revered it; it was a feature in the cohesiveness of the school. The Christians began as a Jewish sect. Among the Jews representation of the human form was an offence, and there is no authentic likeness of Jesus. When Christian artists began to depict Jesus, it was with the iconography of a mythical figure, Orpheus, Apollo, Hermes, or the Good Shepherd, generally young and beardless. In the fourth century this changes, and Christ is depicted bearded, with a face not unlike that of Epicurus. DE WITT suggests that the fourth century saw an absorption of Epicureans into the church, and that the image of Christ was taken over from that of Epicurus. This is speculative, but there is evidence of Epicureans coming into the Christian community (above VI. 1. G., p. 2306; VII. 2. A., p. 2312; B., p. 2313; D., p. 2314). I do not however myself see a particular resemblance to Epicurus, and think it more likely that the type is that of a philosopher without any particular allegiance.

6. Summary

The evidence from the fourth century then is in some ways more extensive than that from the third. The Christian evidence has to be cautiously interpreted: JUNGKURTZ in an important article has suggested that 'Epicurean' is little more than a term of general abuse, and carries no specific significance. I think that this is overstated. But Basil and Hilary do seem to refute Epicureanism without mentioning it by name. There seems a considerable body of evidence suggesting that at this period former Epicureans were finding their way into the church. This suggests existing but declining groups in North Africa, Egypt, Gaul, Italy and Syria. Julian can legitimately be taken as evidence of decline; it would be unwise to take him as evidence of elimination. Claudian provides positive evidence of survival.

See R. JUNGKURTZ, Fathers, Heretics, Epicureans, J. Eccl. Hist. 17 (1966), 3–10.

VIII. The Fifth Century Onwards

1. Synesius

At the beginning of the century Synesius provides evidence about affairs at Athens, which he visited ca. A. D. 410: he found no philosophers, no painted porches, nothing but jars of Hymettus honey. The evidence is not quite reliable, since Plutarch (son of Nestorius) was continuing the Platonic tradition

at Athens at that very time. We cannot be certain that there were no Epicureans in like tradition. Synesius is presenting a cliché: a perhaps later epigram

> "You Athenians are always talking about your philosophers, Plato, Socrates, Epicurus, Aristotle. Actually, you've nothing left but Hymettus and its honey, the tombs of your dead and the shades of your sages; it's here at Constantinople that you must go for faith and wisdom" (CRAMER, Anecd. Gr. Par. 4,315)

suggests that pride in Epicurus, and some enthusiasm for philosophy, remained at Athens. Further, the evidence is for Athens alone. It is certainly not valid for Alexandria (where Hypatia was active for the Platonists). It would be quite wrong to extrapolate from Athens to Antioch, or Carthage, or Gaul.

2. Theodoretus

The most interesting evidence from the fifth century comes from Theodoretus, bishop of Cyrrhus. Theodoretus knew Antioch well, and Antioch remained one of the great cultural centres; it had been in the past, and doubtless still was, a centre of Epicurean teaching. Still, he was isolated in Cyrrhus, and it remains startling that he of all people should be a major source for our knowledge of some of the lost portions of ancient thought. In his 'Cure for the Diseases of the Greeks' he shows an accurate and detailed knowledge of Epicurus – whom he is not afraid to name. Of course he is prejudiced: his first summary reference is to Epicurus as a blasphemer (pref. 9), but this is in the context of his disbelief in Providence. He knows him as an Athenian, whose father was Neocles, and he knows him to be four generations (five counting inclusively) later than Democritus. He is familiar with his vocabulary of 'indivisible', 'atom', 'full' and 'void', and gives an accurate picture of basic atomic theory, including the image of specks dancing in a sunbeam, found in Lucretius, and presumably taken from Epicurus (4.9). He knows that the atoms are without beginning or end (2,11), that atoms and void are 'impassible' (4,13). He is familiar with the doctrine of infinite worlds, in the plural (4.15). He can explain, with proper technical terms, the doctrine of πρόληψις and κατάληψις (1,90), and has assimilated it into his own thought (2,41). He has a correct account of Epicurus's view of the composition (5,18), location (5,22) and mortality (5,24) of the soul; for Epicurus there is no life beyond the grave (11,17). He knows that Epicurus believed in God, but in a god who did not take trouble himself or impose it on others (6,6); he knows that Epicurus rejected Providence (6,6; pref. 9). He is familiar with Epicurus's teaching that pleasure is the end, and distinguishes it from Democritus's use of εὐθυμία (11,6), and interprets this in terms of simplicity of living (11,16), though he is too ready to seize the opportunity for a charge of impiety. He also speaks of Democritus and Epicurus as warning against marriage and the generation of children (17,24). In one of his letters (62) he cites with approval λάθε βιώσας, though without naming a source.

This adds up to much knowledge. There is the impression of wide reading, well-stocked notebooks and a good memory. Some of Theodoretus's knowledge of the Epicureans is no doubt at second hand, from Clement's 'Miscellanies' for example. His quotation from Diogenianus may come from Eusebius (10,19 – 20), though there are minor differences of reading which make me uncertain of this. Some of it may be from handbooks; this at least indicates that handbooks with Epicurean material were still in circulation. Certainly he drew on Aetius and the doxographic tradition. But it is hard not to think that he has a firsthand knowledge of Epicurus's own writing.

3. Epicureanism in the West

For the other writers the evidence is fragmentary. First the West.

A. Martianus Capella

Martianus Capella (Nupt. 78,10) puts in his paradise of intellectuals Linus and Homer, Orpheus and Aristoxenus, Plato and Archimedes, Heraclitus, Thales and Democritus, Pythagoras, Aristotle, Epicurus, Zeno, and Arcesilaus; the philosophy of each is summarized in a single word. This is derived from some Greek handbook translated into Latin, and Martianus patently does not know anything at first hand.

B. Salvian

Salvian too (Gub. Dei 1,1,5) has taken such knowledge as he has from some compendium; he speaks of *Epicureorum vel quorundam epicurizantium deliramenta ... qui sicut voluptatem cum virtute, sic Deum cum incuria et torpore iunxerunt.*

C. Orientius

Orientius is evidence to the continued circulation of Lucretius, and the derivation from Lucretius of substance as well as style. The main stylistic device is asyndeton (1,67; 1,187; 1,261; 1,490; 2,97). The following passages are worth noting for content: 1,179 *qua possunt voce loquuntur* (cf. L. 5,1057 – 84); 1,499 – 500 *et pelagi motus et saevas flare procellas / securus tuto litore prospicias* (cf. L. 2,1); 2,223 – 4 *non quod iam fuerat nihil est, si desinit esse, / et quod non sentis non iuvat an fuerit* (cf. L. 3,830 ff.); 2,255 *felix qui letum finem putat esse laborum, / quod, post ne timeat, caveat ante timens* (cf. L. 3,912 ff.); 2,263 *illic imperio quondam magnoque potentes* (cf. L. 3,1015 ff.).

D. Claudius Marius Victor

Claudius Marius Victor, an orator from Marseilles, wrote a work called 'Alethia' which starts from the creation and runs up to the destruction of

Sodom. He is familiar with Lucretius, as well as with Vergil and Ovid, and outlines for instructional purposes some philosophical doctrines including atomism and the eternity of matter (1,22 – 32). These are doubtless taken from a handbook.

E. Caelius Aurelianus

We should perhaps mention in passing Caelius Aurelianus, an African who was living in Rome in the early fifth century and whose enthusiasm for Methodism and Soranus is preserved in a large fragment of the latter's 'Acute and Chronic Diseases'.

F. Claudianus Mamertus

Claudianus Mamertus is a weightier witness. Here is someone with a genuine love for Greek culture, and a tendendcy to use Greek words like *aethera* or *asomaton*, a reader of Aristotle's 'Categories' in Latin, and one who alludes accurately to Plato's Theory of Forms, the scepticism of the New Academy and Epicurus's atomism (Stat. An. 2,12). When he called the supporters of Faustus of Riez the modern Epicureans and Cynics (2,9), it was a little more than casual abuse.

G. Apollinaris Sidonius

Sidonius honours the Platonic philosophy, though he knows it only in translation, and it is Plotinus rather than Plato that he knows. In writing to Eutropius (Ep. 1,6,5) he warns him not to get tangled up in the nets of luxury, i. e. the dogmas of Epicurus, who jettisons virtue and defines the *summum bonum* in terms of physical pleasure. There is no evidence that Sidonius was familiar with Epicurean philosophy, except through Porphyry. The language is ambiguous, and being ambiguous, it probably means "Don't seek pleasure (like Epicurus)" rather than "Don't follow Epicurus (and in consequence seek pleasure)".

H. Boethius

Boethius puts into the mouth of Philosophy a protest against the crowd of Epicureans and Stoics and others who tried to tear her away from Plato (Cons. Phil. 1,3). In reply he calls Epicurus one of Philosophy's household, and quotes "If god exists, where do evils come from? If god does not exist, where do good things come from?" (1,4). Later he identifies, to reject, Epicurus's doctrine of pleasure.

See SCHMID, RAC V, 797 (= ID., Ausgew. philol. Schriften, 248).

I. Fulgentius

Fulgentius tells how Vergil appeared to him in a vision and said: "If in the midst of so many Stoic truths I had not tasted something Epicurean I would not have been a pagan. The knowledge of the whole truth is not given to anyone except you for whom the Light of Truth shone." This shows grasp of both Vergil and Epicureanism.

For the Latin writers see further P. COURCELLE, Late Latin Writers and their Greek Sources, E. T. (Cambridge, Mass. 1969) (= ID., Les lettres grecques en occident. De Macrobe à Cassiodore [Paris 1948]).

4. Epicureanism in the East

A. Socrates

Socrates (HE 3,16) takes a balanced view of the reaction of the church to Greek culture. He points out that many Greek philosphers strenuously opposed the Epicureans and other contentious sophists who denied divine providence. He patently does not think of them as a present menace.

B. Synesius

Synesius in his whimsical 'Praise of Baldness' says that when his hair started falling out he began a panegyric of Epicurus – so indifferent did the gods seem to his looks. This is not serious, of course. But it is an indication that an ordinary reader would understand the reference to Epicurus, and also, I think, that the material for such a panegyric was at hand.

C. John Stobaeus

The evidence of John Stobaeus is of some importance. In the first place he draws his citations extensively from Porphyry. In the second place, in more than one instance he attributes passages to Pythagoras which Porphyry assigns to Epicurus (Stob. 101.13 = E., fr. 200; 82,6 = E., fr. 221; 5,28 = E., fr. 207). At the same time, Stobaeus does preserve passages from Epicurus rightly attested, some of which have come through the doxographic tradition, but some of which seem to be directly excerpted from Epicurus's own works. The explanation of this is uncertain. It has been suggested that there was a certain eclecticism in the schools, and other schools were glad to 'accommodate' Epicurus's less offensive maxims. It has been also suggested that there must have been further anthologizing between Porphyry and John Stobaeus, and that the arrangement was such as to blur the attributions. This last seems the most likely conjecture. But, anthologies apart, we may be fairly certain that Stobaeus had access to a library which contained some Epicurus, and that he

did not have access to – or possibly did not choose to find access to – a living Epicurean community.

See A. NAUCK, De florilegio quodam Leidensi, Philologus 9 (1854), 368; H. USENER, Epicurea (Leipzig 1887), lviii ff.

D. Proclus

Proclus in The Elements of Theology prop. 122 offers the Platonist answer to the Epicurean attack on Providence (KD 1): "All that is divine both exercises providence towards secondary existences and transcends the beings for which it provides; its providence involves no remission of its pure and unitary transcendence, nor does its separate unity annul its providence." This suggests that he thinks that the Epicurean critique is still current and needs answering.

E. Marinus

Marinus (V. Procl. 15) attributes to Proclus λάθε βιώσας: this suggests that by that time Epicureanism is forgotten.

F. Justinian and philosophy at Athens

In A.D. 529 Justinian decreed an end to the teaching of philosophy at Athens (Malalas 18,451). It is by no means certain how much was going on. There were Platonists, they took refuge first in Persia, and then in Alexandria (a significant pointer to openness there), and they were an important link in the chain with the Arab philosophers. One of these, Simplicius of Cilicia, also kept alive interest in Aristotle and the Stoic Epictetus. Of the Epicureans we hear nothing. Probably then the school at Athens had ceased to exist by the sixth century. We cannot be sure that this was true of all the *contubernia*, but the absence of positive evidence suggests that groups which may have survived were small, without public influence, and short-lasting. The evidence from this last period is very scanty and uncertain. By now the church was largely triumphant. Some Epicurean writings were still in circulation, and probably small Epicurean groups survived, at least in Antioch, and possibly elsewhere, e.g. in Athens and the province of Gaul. But Christian writers no longer have Epicureanism as a major target for their polemic, and all the indications are that by the middle of this period the Epicurean faith was largely dead.

IX. Conclusions

This survey has shown something of the complexity of the whole question of Epicureanism in the Roman empire. In the first place we have dealt with widely separated parts of that world, and it is rash to generalize from one to

another. Secondly, there was at some periods and in some areas a silence about the Epicureans. Thirdly, it is very hard to evaluate some evidence. For example, a) how far does the word 'Epicurean' from a Jew or Christian represent the existence of contemporary Epicureanism, and how far is it a term of general abuse? b) Does an attack upon what is clearly Epicurean philosophy mean that there is contemporary Epicureanism, or is it an attack upon the past? c) How far did Lucretius survive beyond Epicurean circles, and how far does extensive quotation from him suggest sympathy with his philosophy? d) When a hostile critic says that Epicureanism has virtually died out, is this evidence or wishful thinking? e) How far do general expressions of a philosophy of pleasure or of the annihilation of the soul represent an active Epicureanism?

The following matters seem relatively clear. Epicureanism was extremely prominent in upper-class and middle-class circles in Rome and Campania at the end of the Republic; it may at this time have spread to Gaul. Under Augustus it was discouraged at Rome, but remained prominent in Greece, Egypt and the near East. The first century A. D. saw something of a revival at Rome, and a wide spread in the Greek-speaking world. The second century was the period of most intensive and extensive missionary activity. Epicureanism penetrated to the royal house-hold, and throughout the century had either tolerance or approval. Plutarch offers hostile and Lucian favourable evidence of the vigour of the movement. This is the period of Diogenianus and Diogenes of Oenoanda. At Athens the school remains one of the four officially recognized. For the first time we can trace developments in Africa. In the second century Christianity and Epicureanism are side by side assailing superstition.

The third century brought a change. The evidence here is less certain, but in their different ways Diogenes Laertius and L. Valerius Valerianus suggest that at the beginning of the century the movement remained strong, and there are certainly indications of a spread in Africa. But Epicureanism and Christianity are now in conflict with one another. By the beginning of the next century Christianity had won, though only by accommodation with the prevailing sun-worship. Epicureans now came into the church, while retaining some of their characteristic beliefs about life. The school as a school declined, though it survived in places right through the century. From the fifth century the most interesting evidence is that which suggests pockets of belief in Gaul. Whether there were surviving communities (of whose existence we have no evidence in earlier centuries), or centres of refuge for an unpopular creed, it is hard to say. Over most of the Graeco-Roman world Epicureanism is no longer a serious option, no longer worth attacking, though there is evidence that Epicurean writings still circulated. Survival then was longer than other interpreters have suggested, but by the end of the fifth century there will have been few if any believers left, and Justinian merely banged an official nail into an already occupied coffin.