

"Not Neo-Epicurean, But Epicurean"

Post by "Eikadistes" of June 16, 2023 at 1:21 PM

A footnote on page 299 of the translation reads as follows: "215. The *βιβλιακοί* are 'Epicureans by the book,' or at least so they claimed. The school encouraged verbal disputations over the texts of the founders like those of Demetrius Laco's *Textual Problems*. See Sedley 1998, 62-93; and Del Mastro's (2014, 184-87) reconstruction of the title *Πρὸς τοὺς φασκοβιβλιακοὺς* A, in P.Herc. 1005/862 (partially published in Angeli 1988a" (Armstrong and McOsker).

It corresponds with the following text from On Anger (Columns 45.16 – 46.12):

"... [45.16] so that I amazed at those who want to be textbook Epicureans [*βυβλι'ακοίς*], that they ignored these and the things I mentioned before, and as a result tried to demonstrate that, according to our Founders, 'the sage will become wrathful.' [45.23] And their proofs that he will become enraged are very far from establishing that he will become enraged according to every notion of rage, as they ought to have, since nowhere do they establish both anger and rage as separate categories, nor that 'he (the wise man) will become angry' in the sense common (to both words), as we will show. [45.33] It is clear that both in magnitude and quality rage differs from anger and is not natural. [45.37] But they have reasoned wrongly about when anger and rage are referred to the same thing and when they are not just as they fail in their opinion about whether the sage does or does not fall into a 'rage'--I think this clear to those who have followed what we have indicated in our discussion of the subject. [46.6] So, then, having laid down these things on our own behalf and concerning us, with arguments that prove it, in support of there being a natural kind of anger, we have [indeed] replied that the sage will become angry." (Philodemus, translated by Armstrong and McOsker 2020)