Epicurean Mission and Membership from the Early Garden to the Late-Roman Republic

A thesis presented for the degree of Master of Theology (by research)
at the University of Aberdeen.

Erlend D. MacGillivray

M.A. hons. (Aberdeen)

2010

I confirm that I am the sole author of this thesis, and that it has never been accepted in any previous application for a degree. All quotations have been distinguished by quotations marks and the sources of the information specified has been acknowledged.

Table of Contents

Introduction

I: Philosophical Schools and Epicurean Missionaries

Until relatively recently the structure and format of ancient Graeco-Roman philosophical schools has received little sustained scholarly reflection[1]-although the concept has been frequently appealed to- as we will see. From those scholars acquainted with ancient philosophy, there will be, I suspect, far more who feel competent in their abilities to navigate their way through differences between the atomism of Epicureans and the hylomorphism of Aristotelians, than will be able to outline the differences in the distinctive character of their respective schools. This focus is perhaps understandable since the legacy left to us from these great classical entities has been their formulation of ideas- not their community structures.[2] Indeed, many scholars have questioned the availability of sources that are available for us to reconstruct the character of the ancient philosophical schools.[3] While scholars such as Norman DeWitt are correct to note that there is few, or no, extended sources left to us from these ancient philosophical schools which outline directly their normal school life and routine, there is though, I believe, a remarkable amount we

---

[1] To avoid confusion I shall use the upper case 'School' to refer to the intellectual tradition of a philosophical position, and the lower case, 'school' when talking about the community or institution.

[2] L. Alexander (1994), 60: 'If we learned anything from the last twenty years of New Testament scholarship, it is that 'thought' does not operate in a kind of disembodied noetic sphere independent of personal and social structuring...until relatively recently, histories of the schools tended to confine their interests to ideas'. Wayne A Meeks, (1983) 83, can also comment that: 'Students of ancient philosophy have given relative little attention to the form and organization of the schools themselves.'

[3] N. W. DeWitt (1954) 205-211, opens his study, 205, proclaiming that: 'Ancient writers afford us but little information concerning the internal organization and working of philosophical schools, such matters being universally known at the time and seemingly unworthy of mention.' DeWitt though does attempt to bring out some conclusions on the character of Epicurean schools, based upon the finds of Philodemus' works in Herculaneum.

can know about their character through re-reading old and familiar writings. Indeed, over the past forty to fifty years, judging by the number of scholars discussing and reflecting on various aspects of this question, there seems to be an increasing, though not perhaps widespread, confidence that a reconstruction of the ancient philosophical schools' character is possible. The field so far has been mainly dominated by a succession of smaller, focused, studies- as we will see- but there have been several larger studies devoted to aspects relating to this topic. For example, in 1975 when New Testament scholar R. Alan Culpepper examined the concept of the 'Johannine School ' he considered and outlined the nature of the communities surrounding the original four great classical philosophical schools, Platonic, Aristotelian, Epicurean and Stoic, as well as considering the Pythagorean communities.[4] A decade ago H. Gregory Snyder furnished us with a study which looked at the four major schools' respective use of texts and the relationship(s) between pupil and teacher,[5] and took the results to compare with the Jewish intellectual Philo, the Essene community at Qumran, and the use of books in Palestine generally. Meanwhile, classical scholar Raffaella Cribiore has given us perhaps the most focused and extended study on the topic of the ancient school: examining the school of the rhetorician Libanius and its students, daily routines, networks and teaching procedure.[6] Cribiore has demonstrated that with a sustained re-examination of the primary sources there is a remarkable amount of information we can glean about the nature of respective schools and teachers.

   Though much of the scholarship on philosophical schools has come from members working within a department of New Testament studies, there has been a curious, and wholly unwarranted, neglect by those scholars who have committed themselves to examining and explicating the cultural context surrounding the New Testament churches, to consider the philosophical school as relevant for comparison.[7] This might be, at least in

---

[4] A. R. Culpepper (1975).

[5] G. Snyder. (2000).

[6] R. Cribiore, (2007).

[7] For example, P. A. Harland, (2003), extensively compared Christianity to other groups in antiquity, yet he failed to include an even cursory discussion on the place of philosophical schools. James D. G. Dunn, (2008), 610, has also commented on this absence and bemoans that: 'the "philosophical school", which provides parallels noted by some, but [is] too often disregarded'.

part, a reaction to the overly confident approbation of the philosophical school model by previous generations of scholars;[8] as well as perhaps a more general reticence to assign an overt Graeco-Roman philosophical influence to the formation of early Christianity- which was, after all, a dominating theory of New Testament scholarship until the mid-20th century. Yet I believe that the reasons are also probably based on a series of mistaken assumptions about what constituted and who belonged to a philosophical school; ideas of exclusivity to the elite, of a numerically negligible member base, of a purely academic, esoteric pursuit which was devoid of any meaningful contact with, or aspiration to reach the surrounding society. All of these factors would, of course, automatically preclude assuming that any meaningful comparison can be made between the predominantly uneducated and poor constituents of the early Church, and a group of elite scholastics found on the periphery of daily life.

However, while understanding philosophical schools as entities, and the practical side of philosophical training is, by necessity, a project that will demand the attention of numerous scholars and monographs. The intended purpose of this thesis is to look at one particular area, in one particular school- the missionary character of the Epicurean school.

II: The Epicurean School in Scholarship

The image of the Epicurean Garden community has marked our understanding of Epicureanism since classical times. For Roman writers the Epicurean Garden even became a popular motif for a surrounding that engendered philosophical contemplation. For example, the poet Statius (ca.45-96 C.E.) described his patron's, Manilius P. Vopiscus, villa by making such a comparison:

> To be sure, your character ponders weighty matters here, here your fruitful calm and unruffled virtue are sheltered, and sensible elegance free of the luxury of enjoyments; Epicurus himself would have abandoned his Garden, [and] would have departed from Athens, in favour of this place.[9]

---

[8] E.g. H. Conzelmann's suggestion (1966) that Paul operated a school modelled on the philosophical schools, dedicated to training Christians and operating as a missions hub.

[9] Statius, *Silvae*, 1.3.90-4, E. Courtney (1990) 19, trans. C. J. Castner (1990) 38.

Meanwhile Pliny (23-79 C.E) noted that:

> Nowadays indeed under the name of gardens people possess the luxury of regular farms and country houses actually within the city. This practice was first introduced at Athens by that connoisseur of luxurious ease. Epicurus; down to his day the custom had not existed of having country dwellings in towns.[10]

Yet, despite the popularity of such analogies, we are not privy to a lot of information regarding the Garden's nature. This is because, despite being one of the four great philosophical Schools, much of what we know about the origins of the Epicurean movement, and its beliefs and practices, are obscured a lack of primary source material. That this lacuna in our knowledge should exist should help introduce us to the fact that Epicurean philosophy went through a notable variance in its popularity over its near thousand year existence; but that it ultimately failed to continue to grasp the ancient and medieval minds. The Epicureans' materialistic outlook and functional atheism made them increasingly unpopular throughout the Mid to Late Roman Empire. The last pagan Emperor, Julian, who tried to turn the Roman world's gaze back upon the old gods, hailed the fact that the deities had, by his time, seen fit to destroy the books of the Epicureans.[11] The impulse to repudiate all things Epicurean only intensified with the succession from the pagan world, to the Christian (and Islamic) world that followed. Additionally, another main reason for the School's or decline was also that it did/could not integrate itself within the synthesizing process of Middle and Neo-Platonism. It was therefore a philosophical tradition that failed to be taken up, and transported into, the Middle Ages. Only because of Epicureanism's prestige from being considered one of the four great Athenian Schools did any remnant of prestige remain; existing as a sort of vestigial organ to the otherwise still relevant, and venerated, philosophies from the Academy, Lyceum and Stoa. Indeed, chance seems to have played a greater role in preserving Epicureanism for us than any continual line of human devotees to the philosophy had. Had it not been for the inclusion of their history in the final instalment in Diogenes Laertius' *Lives of the*

---

[10] Pliny, *Natural History* XIX. 50-51, André J. (1964) 43, trans. H. Rackman (1961) 453.

[11] Julian, *Epistles*,89B

Philosophers (henceforth *D.L.*), the carbonizing effects of an volcanic eruption in 79 CE, and the prescience of an Epicurean votary to make a record of Epicurean letters in stone, rather than parchment- coupled with 1500 years of residential abandonment of the area- we would have perhaps known little of this once prestigious school of philosophy.

Yet, while we must note the lack of sources' material, we have, I believe, the ability to reconstruct the Epicurean school's characteristics from the available evidence that we do have. Indeed, after a careful study of the varying source material that has been left to us, we will start to see a surprisingly informative and, reassuringly, corroborative picture of the Epicurean school begin to emerge.

III: Epicurean Missionaries?

While I have drawn attention to the fact that our traditional presentation, and concept, of philosophical schools has been limited to consider their intellectual formulations, and not their praxis, in some sense this is less true for Epicureanism. While the other philosophical schools have entered our common lexicon as analogies referring to their beliefs/reactions; one might talk about 'Platonic love', or a 'Stoic disposition' for example, the adjective 'Epicurean' has entered our language to depict a certain type of lifestyle. Probably the most commonly used cultural reference to 'Epicureanism' is when it is utilized to prefix the introduction to hedonism or luxurious living.[12] Meanwhile, the second most commonly used analogy is perhaps (in an unusual partnering of images) is the characterization of the 'Epicurean' hermit.[13]

---

[12] R. M. Dunn (1998) 33, and J. Sloan (2003) 101, references the notion of 'Epicurean luxury' to describe the leisured life. The most fertile time for such comparisons was in the classically literate late 19th century period, where such references abound. See for example J. B. Bouton's (1884) recount of his leisurely, first-class, train ride from Paris to pre-revolutionary Russia, which was given the title *Roundabout to Moscow: An Epicurean Journey.*

[13] This is an idea that has permeated European literature. From Leibniz's Epicurean recluse in his Conversation *du marquis de pianese et du pere emery eremite*, to D. H. Lawrence's Egbert in his *England, my England*, the portrayal of the 'Epicurean hermit' can emerge.

The problem with such abiding images is that they contain both hints of truth and exaggeration. Such portrayals have ultimately coloured, consciously or not, our perception of the nature of the School, its scope, aims, and character. In a context where few expansive narratives on the life of the school survive, it is often hard without careful exegetical work, to keep in check where such exaggerations are warranted, and where they have exerted a distorting effect.

Related to this, it soon becomes apparent that scholarship can also offer two competing, and ultimately antithetical, images to introduce their readers to the Epicurean movement. Either they can be represented as a group of pioneering missionaries,[14] held as the predecessor of the Christian missionary movement and impulse- especially in regards to their inclusion of the non-elite members of society-[15]or they can be coloured to look like an essentially reclusive group of intellectuals, contented to remain in isolated dialogue with each other- safe in their garden community.[16] That such conflicting images can be concurrently be portrayed in modern scholarship is surely testament to an underlying perception that we have an inadequate supply of primary source material on this question, and so scholars have not been engendered with the motivation to begin looking and refining such images.[17]

---

[14] See A. A. Long (1987), citing in support N. DeWitt's similar suggestion of their missionary status, DeWitt (1954) 329.

[15] A. Shanks (2005) 110, states that Epicureanism was 'a missionary movement, seeking to recruit followers, quite indiscriminately, from all social classes, including slaves, women as well as men. No other school of Greek philosophy was ever a missionary movement in the way that Epicureanism was; it was, in that regard, the Christian church's one and only real Mediterranean predecessor'. While J. Ferguson (1974) 36, claimed that the Christian scholar 'Clement grew up in a world of Epicurean missionary endeavour.'

[16] E.g. B. Frischer (1982) G. Roskam (2007). See also W. A. Simmons (2008) 297.

[17] T. Enberg-Pedersen (1995), 62: 'It may be easier to find parallels for this aspect of Pauline mission among the philosophical schools, especially the Pythagoreans and Epicureans. Unfortunately we have little reliable information on the former, and there is still much to investigate about the later.'; and D. Clay's (1982) 489, in his critique of B. Frischer's work (1984) asked: '[o]ne cannot help wonder what a book on *Epicureanism and Philosophical Recruitment in Ancient Greece* would have been like.' I hope, in part, that this thesis will satisfy this lacuna in our knowledge.

Furthermore, this failure to refine this image is also likely representative of the lack of sustained effort to understand the philosophical schools' practical characteristics; the issue only being raised as a stop-gap before moving on to more important questions of dogmatics. Indeed, although this is a paradox that has been noted by some,[18] more often than not the issue is sidestepped and left unresolved by others.

IV: The concept of 'Mission' in Antiquity

Before we proceed to consider the Epicurean movement and its specific characteristics, we will need to spend time understanding the *a priori* assumptions and perceptions that scholars are apt to bring to bear upon on this conversation. In particular, it has become apparent that all too often scholars have rarely stopped to consider, and explicate for their readers, their working definition of mission and accessibility. Furthermore, they have almost uniformly not provided the reader with an account of the conceptual framework by which they are answering the question of whether or not the Epicurean movement can rightly be called a 'missionary' movement.[19]

It is particularly revealing to compare this near dearth of deliberation in classical philosophical scholarship, with the recent extensive reflections that have been offered on the concept of mission in antiquity by Second Temple Jewish and early Christian scholarship. As this is a topic that already has several monographs devoted to the topic it will be impossible to provide only but the very briefest of accounts of their various conclusions.[20] One of the

---

[18] Goodman (1994) 36, notes that: 'It is not clear how Epicurean *apatheia* or Cynic distain are aided by the spread of their teaching, and if no such casual link could be found it might even appear as a betrayal of principles to expend energy and raise passion precisely in the dissemination of the message that such behaviour was not worthwhile. But the existence of Cynic street preachers, shows that such logic was often ignored. Illogical behaviour should not, perhaps, surprise too much. Greater emphasis should be put on the psychological argument against a proselytizing rather than educational mission. Consciousness of their role as teachers to the unenlightened enhanced the philosopher's consciousness of their own superiority and gave extra value to their doctrines.'

[19] This is particularly evident in the case of G. Roskam's study (2007).

[20] For an extensive overview of scholarship's deliberation on this topic see J. D. G. Dunn (2009) 299 n.247.

most interesting aspects to have emerged from these discussions is the repeated observation that the ancient conception of mission was a more complex and multifaceted phenomena than we have been apt to consider. This realization emerged after a near century-and-a-half dispute over whether Second Temple Judaism held the antecedents that gave rise to the Christian concept of mission. An older view in scholarship believed that there was such a dependence, and they made a compelling case for this based upon showing the regular induction of Gentiles into Judaism, and in demonstrating that Gentile 'god-fearers' were a frequent presence on the sidelines of Jewish society.[21] But it soon became apparent that the conclusions that they drew from these results were faulty; namely that, although there was a substantial presence, and acceptance, of Gentiles in Jewish communities, there was little sign of Jewish proselytizing efforts or evangelists that they presumed were required to explain their presence.[22] The answer, as John Dickson in his recent work on mission in Jewish and Pauline communities reveals, is rather than taking our concept of 'mission', which tends to suggest that this was a dynamic which existed as a composite entity, we should instead work within the realization that there existed a continuum of missionary practices in antiquity. In particular, Dickson's study is most useful because of the stress it lays on how communities could orient themselves towards converting/including others- and not just conceiving of mission in an overtly public, aggressive sense, which Dickson points out, significantly, only made up one part of this missionary continuum.[23] Along similar lines Clifford Bedell has argued that Jewish synagogues seem to have emitted a form of 'sacred magnetism' to Gentiles; arguing that this should be start to be considered in scholarship as being a legitimate, and if not intentional, capitalized, form of missionary attitude.[24]

---

[21] E.g. G. Smith (1897) and A. V. Harnack (1924).

[22] See M. F. Bird (2010)

[23] J. Dickson (2003) 11-85.

[24] C. H. Bedell (1998) 25. It would also seem to me that too often it has been the case that philosophical concepts of membership and mission are also left out consideration by Second Temple Jewish, and New Testament scholars. This idea of the separation of active and passive forms of missionary activity, which has taken classical Jewish and Christian scholars a lot of effort to formulate, and has been presented largely theoretically, is a reality that was acknowledged by the ancient philosophers when they analyzed their own attraction of followers. For example Diogenes Laertius (*D.L.*), 9.112, records that Hieronymus the Peripatetic noted that 'Just as with the

Martin Goodman meanwhile has attempted to give a useful break-down of ancient types of missionary endeavour; holding that the ancient conception of outreach can be classed into four type:[25] 1) information, not unlike the process of advertising; 2) educational, promotion with the intended result of enlightening their audience; 3) apologetic, defending and explicating the truth of their worldview to support their status in society; 4) proselytism, attempting to convert, change and bring people into their group. It is this last group as Goodman notes where most scholars have turned to define their conception of mission[26], and WH they utilize to answer the question of whether or not we can define a respective group's missionary activities and inclination. The result is, of course, an obscuring of the existence, and viability, of the other three categories, and reveal how a group might decide to orient themselves to include, or inform, the outsider.[27] Indeed, as Eckhard J. Schnabel has shown, the Apostle Paul's missionary practice, whose missionary practices we can surely take to be representative of the early Christian missionary movement as a whole, was an altogether more inconspicuous process than many of the overt forms of mission that characterized the medieval and modern practice of mission.[28] Paul's missionary efforts were usually expended in synagogues or private houses, and we only have limited examples of his use of marketplaces and lecture halls.[29]

Scythians those who are in light shoot as well as those who pursue, so, among philosophers, some catch their disciples by pursuing them, some by fleeing from them', trans. R. D. Hicks (1972) 523; or as Frischer (1982) 47, puts it: philosophical conversion could be achieved through 'active pursuit' or 'passive flight'.

[25] Goodman (1994) 3-6. The above summary of his suggestions is adapted from Dickson (2003) 8.

[26] M. F. Bird, (2010) 150, has also concluded that in answering questions about ancient mission: 'it depends entirely on how one defines mission and conversion. Labels of "missionary" or "non-missionary" are potentially anachronistic, freighted, and misleading if they presuppose equivalence with modern missionary religions.'

[27] M. Goodman (1994) 6.

[28] E. J. Schnabel (2008) 340-341.

[29] For full discussion see Schnabel (2008) 287-306. On the example of Paul preaching in the agora Schnabel also warns, 297, that: 'It would be inappropriate, however, to interpret Paul's preaching in the central city square as "mass evangelism", particularly

Yet, while studies such as the ones listed above are useful and needed conversation partners, there has yet to emerge any fully working, composite schema by which to understand the ancient conception, or perhaps better 'disposition,' towards missionary activity. Indeed, it is doubtful if such a goal can be reached in only all but the broadest of strokes (such as Goodman's work). Indeed, as the results of their respective works have ably shown, it is only a case-by-case examination of individual groups that can allow an accurately defined picture to fully emerge. With this background in place we now turn to examine the Epicurean movement and its mission.

---

if one thinks of the organized mass rallies of later evangelists such as George Whitefield or Billy Graham'.

Chapter One: Mission in the Garden

I: The Isolated Garden?

Despite the notable lack of extensive sources that outline the practical life of the Epicurean school, the notion that the Epicurean Garden was an exclusive and introverted community has been, as noted above, a popular suggestion. One of the most frustrating elements of this proposal though is that it has rarely been subjected to any form of sustained reflection. More often than not it is presented as an axiomatic truth of the nature of the Epicurean school. For example, scholars such as Alan Culpepper can note that: 'Epicurus had no intention of competing with other schools in educating the youth of Athens[…] Instead of establishing himself in a public gymnasium he bought a house and garden and confined his activities to his own property';[1] while Paul Zanker argued that 'they [the Epicureans] never taught publicly but instead withdrew to Epicurus' garden outside the city, the *Kepos*, to live together- more like a gathering of friends, a commune, or a sect than school.'[2] Similarly Norman DeWitt posited that the reason there was little recorded animosity/ interaction between the first generation of Stoics and Epicureans was because while other philosophical schools, such as the Stoics, sought to disseminate their philosophy to all Athenian males; Epicurus operated a 'residential college or private school, removing himself from such discussions.'[3] None of these scholars though have sought to explain in

---

[1] A. R. Culpepper (1975) 103-104.

[2] P. Zanker (1995) 113.

[3] N. DeWitt (1954) 332. Diogenes Laertius in his *Live of the Philosophers*, (*D.L.*) 10.26, also notes that: '[Epicurus' writings] amount to about three hundred rolls, and contain not a single citation from other authors; it is Epicurus himself who speaks throughout' H. S. Long (1964) 506, trans. R. D. Hicks (1972) 556. Yet, while this might be true, we lack enough extant discussions from Epicurus himself to make such as judgement. We also have evidence to contrary, having at least six polemically- styled titles included in the works of Epicurus- see Clay (1998) 17. Furthermore, Diogenes noted, *D.L.* 10.8, that Epicurus was interested enough to give his a long list of rival philosophers pet names, including: Nausiphanes, Plato, Aristotle, Proagoras, Herclitus, Democritus (Lerocritus), Antidorus (Sannidorus), the Cynics, the Dialectians and Pyrrho.

any depth why such a conclusion has been reached. Nevertheless it is introduced to us as an evident truism revealing the nature of the Epicurean school, and they proceed to filter their discussion of the dynamics of the school via this understanding.

At most though we only have a few snippets and hints that talk about the Epicurean desire for seclusion, and these expressions are almost uniformly extant in texts which have removed them from their surrounding context and purpose. For example Diogenes recorded Epicurus' statement that: 'material prosperity arises in most genuine form in the security of a quiet private life withdrawn from the multitude.'[4] This passage probably offers the greatest support for the scholars I have listed above and their assumption about the Epicurean desire for seclusion.[5] But to move from this and suggest that the Epicureans took this attitude of seclusion to apply to every aspect of their life and the school's, stopping them to consider the interaction and outreach to others, and become an insular group, cannot be supported on this ground alone.

Yet it is not just the Epicurean aspiration for privacy that has led some to posit their exclusivist nature, but also the school's communal nature. When the idea of the Epicurean desire for a quiet garden retreat is attached to their communal living it seems, to some, that the Garden must have been a self-sustaining, reclusive society. Although again we must caution ourselves by noting that we are left with surprisingly few primary sources from which to examine whether such an interplay or dynamic existed. Nor can we tell how such a format would define their understanding of those found outside of the Garden. Most comments referencing their communal life are allusions; such as Epicurus' statement that: 'the agreeable life [is] in each other's society,'[6] or when he references the insiders of the group as belonging to 'the household.'[7] Ancient commentators and historians of the Epicurean movement are equally laconic in their recording of the school's communal nature. Diogenes Laertius, for example, remarked that: 'friends indeed came to him

---

[4] *KD* 14= *D.L.* 10.143: καὶ εὐπορία εἰλικρινεστάτη γίνεται ἡ ἐκ τῆς ἡσυχίας καὶ ἐκχωρήσεως τῶν πολλῶν ἀσφάλεια; trans R. D. Hicks (1972) 667.

[5] E. J. Schnabel (2008) 297, notes the difference between the practice of public elementary education, and seclusion preferred in higher education in the Graeco-Roman world, most noticeable by the hiring out, or ownership of private halls and schools.

[6] *D.L.* 154 = *KD* 40, trans R. D. Hicks (1972) 677.

[7] E.g. P.Herc. 1232 Fr. 8.

[Epicurus] from all parts and lived with him in his garden,'[8] and in a subsequent statement he relayed for his readers the information that the members of the Garden enjoyed 'the common life.'[9] One of the only notable insights that we have received is that their goods were held individually, and were not communally shared-[10]something that would have separated them from other communal philosophical groups such as the Pythagoreans, or, at least the portrayal of, Philo's Therapeutae.[11]

II: The Epicurean Removal from Society?

For some, such as Bernard Frischer,[12] the reclusive nature of the Epicurean School can be posited because of his understanding of the Epicurean fear of the outside world's power to influence people to accede to its corrupting values- with such fears forcing the Epicureans to remain isolated and protected in the Garden. From this perspective Frischer has argued that Epicurean 'recruitment must be passively pursued, otherwise interaction with the world would endanger their peace of mind.'[13] To support this notion Frischer cites numerous allusions that Epicurus makes the requirement to 'protect oneself from mankind,'[14] but ultimately Frischer does not offer much to support this foundational component of this theory.[15] However, he does believe, mainly because of their evident

---

[8] *D. L.* 10.1: 'οἱ καὶ πανταχόθεν πρὸς αὐτόν ἀφικοῦντο καὶ συνεβίουν αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ κήπῳ'; H. S. Long (1964) 494, trans. R. D. Hicks (1972) 526.

[9] *D.L.*10.17, R. D. Hicks (1972) 545. It is unclear though if this means a communal life, or that people who wished to affiliate themselves with the school gathered together in the garden.

[10] *D. L.* 10.11.

[11] See *De Vita Contemplativa*, 30-33.

[12] Frischer (1982).

[13] Frischer (1982) 49. He also argued that Epicureans had 'rules limiting contact with the outside world' xiv; and that, 35, they had a 'practical secession into a nearly autonomous alternative community'.

[14] *KD* 6, 13, 40, Frischer (1982) 59.

[15] In his critical review of Frischer's work, D. Clay (1984) argues that the entire premise of Frischer's suggestion lies on a faulty, and untested, presupposition of Epicurean withdrawal. Meanwhile Roskam (2007) 59, notes that although Frischer is correct that no large-scale campaigns would have occurred, he argues that Frischer

success in replicating and preserving the school, that the Epicureans had a motivation to preserve, and spread, their philosophy. But how could they access these new converts who lived in the outside world, if they had to keep their philosophy hidden and muted behind a garden wall? Their solution, according to Frischer, was an innovative one. They placed statues of Epicurus in prominent urban settings to advertise their existence and lead the curious to the Garden, all the while remaining safely incubated within their community.

Although this is perhaps a particularly strong rendering of the Epicurean fear of the outside world, variants on this theme are, as we have noted, are common.[16] Yet, we must note that the Epicureans were not as dogmatic in their abstinence, and fearful of engaging with the outside world, as has frequently been portrayed.[17] For example at *D.L.*10.120 we learn that Epicurus taught that the Epicurean can serve as a juror, consider the future of his/her property, make sure that their reputation within the rest of society is maintained, and that they can go to state festivals. Even Plutarch, who normally expends his efforts portraying the Epicureans as an eccentric group, notes that:

> Not even Epicurus believes that men who are eager for honour and glory
> should lead an inactive life, but that they should fulfil their natures by
> engaging in politics and entering life, on the ground that, because of their

---

overstates their isolation, noting that 'the fact that Epicurus opts for the sequestered life does not imply that he forbids his followers to leave the Garden.'

[16] M. C. Nussbaum (1996) 118, 119: perhaps gives us the most vivid (and unfounded) description of their this fear by depicting a young Nikidion entering the Garden and stating that: 'It is a perquisite for being an Epicurean pupil that Nikidion be able to leave her occupations in the city and enter the Epicurean community, in which she will live from then on....[she] will probably have to bring her savings and jewellery with her, and if she has any children, she will probably be urged to leave them behind...In going to the Garden she has decided to separate herself from her old way of life in the city, and so long as she is there, to live a life devoted entirely to the philosophical community...[to] a world suspicious of all external ties.'

[17] J. Warren (2009) 10, also, briefly, notes this.

natural dispositions, they are more likely to be disturbed and harmed by inactivity if they do not obtain what they desire.[18]

And he can also relay that:

> Epicurus is his *Problems* declares that the wise man is a theatre-lover, who gets more joy than anyone else from festival concerts and shows[19]

We also, I believe, need to challenge our commonly held conceptions on what marks out a flight to privacy,[20] and point out the notable laxity in discussions to consider and understand the ancient conceptions of privacy- but nevertheless reference the concept.[21] For instance Plutarch's comments on L. Licinius Lucullus' famous garden retreat and villa, was that they:

> were open to everyone and the walkways around them and the study rooms readily received Greeks who went there as if to a refuge of the Muses and spent time with each other in pleasurable flight from their other pressing needs. Often he himself spent time there going on walks with the literary scholars and he

---

[18] Plutarch, *De Tran. An.* 465F-466A, W. R. Paton, Pohlenz W. R., M. and Sieveking W, trans W. C. Helmbold (2001) 466, 52, cited in Roskam (2007) 52.

[19] *Against Epicurean Happpiness* 1095c, trans. A. A. Long and D. N. Sedley (1987) 156.

[20] The lack of the ancient concept, and necessity, of privacy has increasingly been noted and referenced by scholars. See J. H. Hellerman (2005) 179.This aspect of classical life has also been noted by Biblical socio-scientists; see Pilch and Malina (1998) xxxii, for example.

[21] Another observation is to note that when Augustine hailed Bishop Ambrose's ability to read silently, he supposes he derived his talent because of his motivation to read books without being questioned by over-hearers- *Confessions*, 6.3. Y. L. Too (2009) notes from this that: 'It would appear from the narrative that the eyewitness author is only one of several people present while the bishop reads his texts, so that it would appear that there is no assumption that the reading should be a solitary, and so unsociable, activity.'

obtained for the political individuals what they needed. On the whole, his house was a home and a Greek *prytaneum* [a public hall] for those arriving in Rome."[22]

This is an insightful passage that does much to show the general sense of community that surrounded the ancient library and learning community. But more than this, as Yun Lee Too notes; they:

> may be private, but Plutarch's account of them problematizes any contemporary concept of private- that is, reserved for its owner….[it was] a common, public space, for it is in principle open to everyone although it is doubtful that any random individual at Rome could have walked into Lucullus' house to consult its book collection.[23]

Although we can't cite this as evidence of the communal nature of the Epicurean Garden it does provide us with an important nudge to re-evaluate what, to us, looks like the desire and provision for seclusion, and supplies us with a useful backdrop for the forthcoming discussions.

III: Live unnoticed

The final reason that some have made in support of the theory that Epicureans disengaged from missionary activities is a more relevant one; not so much because of the accuracy of their line of argument, but because the discussion utilizes texts and ideas that help us to define our understanding of Epicurean mission. That is, namely, to consider how the Epicurean demand to 'live unknown,'[24] to live a life free from the surrounding false desire for prestige, political and social achievement, and prominence, might inform any missional impulse that the Epicureans would otherwise have had.

---

[22] Plutarch *Lucullus* 42.1-2, trans. Too (2009) 228.

[23] Too (2009) 228-229. On the social aspect Too further comments that: 'The reference to the *prytaneum* suggests that the general's books are not the only focus of his text collections: Lucullus' libraries become the pretext for the social gatherings that take place in the general's home.'

[24] *Fr.* 551 Usner : Λάθε βιώσας.

In particular this Epicurean tenet has been suggested by some to prohibit missionary work. For example Geert Roskam makes this connection,[25] and cites Epicurus' statement that the wise man should: 'found a school, but not in such a manner to draw the crowd after him; and will give readings in public, but not willingly.'[26] To back up this correlation Roskam, and others,[27] might have also included the following two passages from Epicurus, preserved by Seneca, which relay a similar concern:

> I have never wished to cater to the crowd; for what I know, they do not
> approve, and what they approve, I do not know.[28]

And:

> I write this for you, not for the many; for we are for each other a
> sufficiently big audience.[29]

---

[25] Roskam (2007) 59, 84.

[26] *D.L.* 10.120: καὶ σχολήν κατασκευάσειν, ἀλλ᾽ οὐχ ὥστ᾽ ὀχλαγωγῆσαι; R. D. Hicks (1972) 647. Roskam (2007) 39, believes that 'the qualifying restriction recalls the perspective of the maxim 'λάθε βιώσας.'

[27] Frischer (1982) 49, and E. Asmis (2001) 210, also note this passage. Asmis comments, 210, that: 'although the Epicureans proposed to educate any one at all, they did not aim their teaching at the masses. While non-elitist, Epicurean education is aimed at the individual, not the crowd. Epicurus has nothing but contempt for the "many."'

[28] Seneca *Ep.* 29.10, L. D. Reynolds (1965) 82, trans. R. M. Gummere (1967) 209; *Numquam volui populo placere. Nam quae ego scio, non probat populus; quae probat populus, ego nescio.* A similar statement is found from the *Parisinus codex*, 1168, f.115fr- *Maxims of Epicurus*, where Epicurus is recorded as stating that: 'I never desired to please the many, for I did not learn the things which please them, and what I did learn was far removed from their perception', trans. G. W. Leibniz (1991) 53.

[29] Seneca, *Ep.* 7.11, L. D. Reynolds (1965) 14, trans. B. Inwood and L. P. Gerson (1994) 82: '*ego non multis, sed tibi; satis enim magnum alter alteri theatrum sumus.*'

These quotes certainly demonstrate that the more forceful suggestions on the Epicurean movement providing a precedent for the Christian missionary habit are problematic. We should not expect to find Epicureans hawking their message on the street-corners of Athens, like the Cynics,[30] or expect to see them attempt to entice a crowd to gather around them.[31] However, to extrapolate from the Epicurean trepidation to engage in overt public proselytism/showmanship, and suggest that there was a general aversion in Epicureanism to *any* form of propagation at *any* level, is both erroneous,[32] and a highly simplistic view of ancient forms of mission.[33] It is also leaves a weighty problem for scholars such as Roskam to consider, for the Epicurean school successfully reproduced itself, establishing schools around the Eastern-Mediterranean basin in the first few generations of the school, and sustained its existence for nearly a millennium. It is hard for any scholar who maintains a faulty conception of ancient mission to account for the evident success of the Epicurean

[30] On Cynic missionary tactics see G. Dowling (1996).

[31] For instance P. O'Grady (2008) 57,65, sums up Plato's description, from *Hippias Minor*, of Hippias, as being: ' a man who is rich elegantly dressed, popular, sought-after and entertaining... In all those places and especially during times of festivals such as the Olympic Games, he attracted eager audiences to her him deliver talks. Through his travels and his accomplishments, he become well known and popular...he attracted an audience and made twenty minas, which was, apparently, a handsome sum.'

[32] Clay (1984) 487, also notes that this passage can be over-interpreted, and he notes that it might be that 'Epicurus shared Pyrrho's distate for public displays of the sophists.'

[33] Fears over the composure and sobriety of 'the mass' or 'rabble, was seemingly a common one, especially for the educated elite in Athens. See J. Ober's study (1998) for instance. A valuable expression of this can be seen from *Ps. Xen.* 1.5, which opines that: 'among the best people there is a minimum wantonness and injustice but a maximum of scrupulous care for what is good, whereas among the common people there is a maximum of ignorance, disorder, a wickedness', trans. Ober (1998) 17. While *Polyb.* VI 56.10-11: 'If it were possible to compose a polity of wise men, perhaps such a course would not be necessary; but since every multitude is lightminded and full of lawless desires, irrational anger, and violent spiritedness...'- trans. E. Adler (2003), 68.

franchise- and to explain its enduring longevity. The result of this misinformed presupposition is also significant, for throughout his study Roskam utilizes the Epicurean abstinence to propagate (even in the most simplest of forms) as a test of orthodoxy, and he is forced, (as we will see) to make a series of innovative, and to my mind problematic, attempts to explain away clear examples of the Epicurean mission.[34] Epicurean scholarship looks, I suggest, to be wrestling with the same types of tensions and apparent contradictions in their historical record that lead to Jewish/New Testament scholarship's re-evaluation of their conception and approach to mission.

Furthermore, there is a need to inform this discussion by pointing out that we start to see similar statements being issued from rival philosophical schools at this time which recognize that they had an obdurate problem in trying to attract, or make comprehensible, their philosophical dogmas to the general populace[35]- and that also express a distain for the virtues of the mob at the same time. Yet their taking their philosophy into their respective schools, and their voiced distrust of the ability of the crowd to understand, or sympathetically analyze their efforts, didn't enact a reclusive mentality, or result in these communities not propagating their work. Indeed, we will see that the schools retained, at least when viewed from the conceptions of previous generations scholars, a surprising toleration for the inclusion of onlookers and occasional visitors in their communities.

---

[34] See Roskam (2007) 84, 102-103, 139-142.

[35] Ober (1998) 196, observes Plato's position on the: 'irrelevance of any philosophical attempt to persuade the mass audience.' Perhaps the best insight into Plato's attitude with regards to the masses is his metaphor in book 6 of the *Republic*, of the pilot (philosopher) guiding a ship and its sailors (the masses). In it at, *Rep.* 6.489, states that: 'You are right in affirming that the finest spirits among the philosophers are of no service to the multitude…For it is not the natural course of things that the pilot should beg the sailors to be ruled by him or that wise men should go to the doors of the rich...star-gazing ideologist to the true pilots," "just so," he said. "hence, and under these conditions, we cannot expect that the noblest pursuit should be highly esteemed by those whose way of life is quite the contrary.' See also the discussion in W. Jaeger (1945) 263-278, who, when referencing *Rep.* 494, argues, 270, that: 'The mob does not know what is good and right in itself...Plato thinks it is self-contradictory to speak of a philosophical crowd. The crowd's natural attitude to philosophy is hostility.'

Nevertheless, the passages above, and the concept of 'live unknown' have allowed us to start sharpening our understanding of the Epicurean attitude towards mission. In the continuum of missionary practice that we posited existed in antiquity, we have reached our first demarcation point where we see that the first generation of Epicurean movement appears to have strongly distanced itself from public proselytism, and that they lacked the desire to gain the ear of the crowd.[36]

IV: Mission and Accessibility in the First Generation

So, do we have any more information that helps us build up, and clarify, our understanding of mission in the first few generations of the Epicurean school, and on their amenability to include outsiders into the community? I believe that we do. There are, in fact, a number of highly relevant sources on the structure of the Epicurean community that have, strikingly, rarely found themselves informing scholarly pronouncements on the Epicurean school- or on its conception of membership and mission.

First of all, in a (highly fragmented) text that belongs within the cache of Epicurean works found in the 'Villa of Papyri' in Herculaneum, we have a record from Philodemus on Epicurus' invitation of outsiders to their communal meal:

> … he invites these very people to join in a feast, just as he invites others- all those who are members of his household and he asks them to exclude none of the "outsiders" who are well disposed both to him and to his friends. In doing this, they will not be engaged in gathering the masses, something which is a form of meaningless "demagogy" and unworthy of the natural philosopher; rather in practising what is congenial to their nature, they will remember all those who are well disposed to us so that they can join on their blessed day in making the sacred offerings that are fitted to [...] of the friends[37]

---

[36] This is a suggestion that is also concomitant with the lack of any evidence of overt Epicurean missionary action at this time. In this regard, I can agree with Frischer's (1982) 50, remarks on: 'the silence of our richly anecdotal sources about public lectures, appearances, and proselytizing by Epicurus or his followers'.

[37] PHerc. 1232 Fr. 8 Col 1.1-21 Trans. Clay (1998) 81-82, Greek text found at 80-81:

[κα]λεῖν εὐωχ[εῖσ]θαι αὐτούς τε κα[θ]ὼς καὶ τ[οὺς] ἄλλους, τούς τε [κ]ὰτα τῆν οἰκ[ίαν] ἄπαντας καὶ [τ]ῶν ἔξωθεν [μηδέν]α παραλείποντας, ὅσοι τ[ὰ]ς εὐνοίας

Again we see that Epicurus' distaste for the masses' inclusion in philosophy is expressed,[38] yet, at the same time, Epicurus expects, and demands, that outsiders who are well-disposed to the School should be included within their gatherings. Their status as those who were not normally associated with the school is also surely confirmed by the qualifying remarks that this invitation was not an attempt to engage the masses. Evidently it was believed this action might have been (mistakenly) interpreted as legitimizing such an effort. Furthermore, while we are not informed on the exact identity of this group, and while they are not pictured as fully initiated, or educated, in Epicurean dogmas, they still knew enough of the philosophy to have a positive disposition towards it- and also for this opinion to be known by the members of the school. But, in any case, this source's survival is particularly providential for it perfectly illustrates the type of distinction and nuance that I have been arguing we need to understand before we start to broach the question of Epicurean mission and membership; namely that the same source can state its disapproval of attracting the crowd, yet on the other hand seek the inclusion of outsiders into its community.

Another source on the communal meal also dispenses salient information to us on the practical side of the school's life. In a little-known text from Philodemus, he relays that:

> I wonder at the perplexity of the pupils of that "philosopher of Athens." If they cared to know where this doctrine was laid down they might have consulted the philosophers at one of the meetings of the school on the

---

[καὶ] [τὰς] ἐαυ[τ]οῦ [κα]ὶ τὰ[ς τ]ῶν ἑαυτοῦ φίλον ἔχουσιν. [ο]ὐ γάρ δημαγωγήσειν τοῦ[τ]ο πράττοντας τὴν κενήν καὶ ἀφυσιολόγη[τ]ον δημαγωγίαν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν τοῖς φύσεω[ς οἰ]κείοις ἐνεργοῦντας.

[38] Asmis (2001) 211, also notes this portion of the text to show the Epicurean distaste for crowds.

twentieth of the month, or any of the regular associates of Zeno, who lives in Athens, not in Persia.[39]

Philodemus' statements here are part of a larger rejoinder to a group of Epicureans from Athens and Rhodes who have accused him of holding divergent views on the use of rhetoric to the standard Epicurean position on the art. The defence that Philodemus offers here is that they should have acquainted themselves with the current Athenian scholarch, Zeno, and his associates- who Philodemus expects will validate his orthodoxy. Yet Philodemus did not just tell them to approach the school to make their inquiries, but to approach it when the school met on the twentieth- a metonym for the communal meal.[40] The communal meal again seems to be the appropriate, and expected, occasion for interested outsiders to present themselves to the school, and apparently ask questions if they needed to.[41]

Furthermore, this dynamic is also known to Plutarch, who asked:

What is the meaning of your common meals? And what of the gatherings of your associates and the fine people who join them?[42]

The distinction that is again (briefly) provided is between more formal members-the associates-and an undefined reference to those people who join with them.[43]

---

[39] Philodemus, *On Rhetoric* I 95,18, trans H. M. Hubbell (1920) 281. Please note that despite efforts I have yet to obtain the Greek text behind Hubbell's translation. For a discussion on the availability of the Greek text see C. Chandler (2006) ix.

[40] *D.L.* 10.18.

[41] See also M. Ebner's (2007) study on the importance of the meal in antiquity for group identity, and as the place for intellectual discussion.

[42] Plutarch, *Is Live Unknown* 3.1129A, trans. D. Clay (1998) 92. 'τί γὰρ αἱ κοιναὶ τράπεζαί; τί δὲ αἱ τῶν ἐπιτηδέων καὶ καλῶν συνοδοὶ.'

[43] Although he doesn't elaborate on the exact nature of these outsiders, D. Clay (1998) 85, does note that: "This distinction between Epicurus' close associates- "those of his household"- and the well meaning "outsiders" who are invited to join them in this private celebration might be implicit in T20 [=Plutarch, *Live Unknown* 3.1129A],

While we have bemoaned the lack of precision in the sources to delineate for us who could fit into this group of well disposed outsiders, we have, perhaps, an extant account of just one such visitor (though not to the meal). During his youth Cicero informs us that he spent time in Athens where he, and some friends, would go to lectures at the Epicurean school there during the presidency of the scholarchs Phædrus and Zeno.[44] This is significant because Cicero, although interested in the philosophy, was not a member of the school, and, indeed, was even at this time forming a distaste for its tenets.[45] Moreover, if we combine this with another passage from Cicero,[46] we see that communal living was still being practised in the school; demonstrating that the presence of full-time students and observing outsiders was still occurring.

Another source that has again been largely absent in discussions helping us understand the Epicurean attitude towards mission is Epicurus' *Letter to Pythocles*-a text that we will study in greater detail later.[47] The text (an epitome of Epicurean teaching) introduces two types of readers that it envisages will read its contents: those who are new to Epicureanism, and 'those who are caught up in the more demanding routines of life'[48]:

---

where Plutarch speaks of the "gatherings of your associates (ἐπιτηδείων) and the fine people who join them".

[44] Cicero, *De Fin.* V.

[45] *De. Fin*. I.16 'Every day we used to discuss in practice what we had heard at the lecture, and there was never only dispute as to what I could understand; the question was, what I could accept as true' trans. H. Rackman (1989) 19: '*cotidieque inter nos ea quae audiebamus conferebamus, neque erat umquam controversia quid ego intellegerem, sed quid probarem'*.

[46] Cicero, *De Fin*. I.

[47] It should be noted though that the text's provenance is disputed; yet even those scholars willing to countenance that it might be pseudographical take it to be representative of the early Epicurean School.

[48] *D.L.* 10.85 καὶ τοῖς εἰς ἀσχολίας βαθυτέρας τῶν ἐγκυκλίων τινός ἐμπεπλεγμέοις; trans. R. D. Hicks (1972) 613. O. Makridis (2005) 29, translates it: 'to those who happen to be tangled up in some pursuit more profound than the study of the compendious discourses'. M. Z. Zevort (1847) meanwhile translated it: 'et á ceux

i.e. those interested in Epicureanism, but still otherwise engaged in daily life and who would benefit from this summary of the philosophy. We cannot be exact in defining who this unspecified later group was. Most likely they were either people known to Pythocles and his group, but who couldn't commit themselves to become regular members of their circle, or either that the text was meant to serve independently of Pythocles and function as a supplementary work to those interested in Epicureanism.[49] In any case, we see Epicurus' intention that the text will function in a missional sense; informing and introducing Epicurean philosophy to those who are, at least yet, not fully fledged members of any Epicurean school. This presents the character of Epicureanism as being intentionally more inclusive to outsiders- even orienting its texts to accommodate them.

We also have direct evidence of Epicurus' attempts to coax people into adhering to the philosophy. For example Epicurus could argue with a potentially interested student that:

> At present you reject our philosophy, but later perhaps you will
> wish, when your hostility has been banished, to open the congenial
> entrances to our community, and you will turn away from the
> speeches of the rhetoricians, in order that you might hear something
> of our tenets. After that we confidently hope that you too will knock
> very soon at the doors at philosophy…[50]

---

auxquels les embarrass et les affaries ordinaries de la vie ne laissent que peu de loisir.'

[49] Perhaps one such Epicurean sympathizer would have been Mithres, a Syrian court official who had some sort of connection to the school, and a reciprocal relationship with Epicurus- See H. A. Fischel (1973) 133. Epicurus even sent Metrodorus (one of the founders of Epicureanism with Epicurus) to his aid when he was arrested- see Plutarch *Adv. Col.* 3.

[50] Diogenes Oenoanda fr.127 Smith. '[τῆς ἀλλο]πριότητος οἴξαι τὰ[ς εἰς] τὸ συνελθον ἡμῶν [συν] παθεῖς εἰσόδους , ν καὶ τῶν ῥητορικῶν ἀπο κάμψεις λόγων ὅπως ἀκούσης τι τῶν ἡμῖν ἀρεσκόντων. ν ἔνθεν σε καὶ κατελπίζομεν τὴν ταχίστην τὰς φιλοσοφίας κρούσειν θύ Ι ρας.' On this passage's attribution to Epicurus see Smith (1939) 559-560.

Additionally, another fragment shows Epicurus' efforts to induce potential converts even over long distances. In part of a letter preserved by Seneca we find that Epicurus wrote to an official in the court of Lysimachus, one of the successors to Alexander the Great's Empire,[51] arguing that if: "you are attracted by fame, my letters will make you more renowned than all the things which you cherish and which make you cherished."[52] These surviving dialogues suggest that while Epicurus considered efforts to engage the mob to be distasteful, he had little reticence in selectively engaging individuals for the philosophy's cause.

We also, significantly, have corroborating evidence for the Epicurean missionary inclination. Diogenes Laertius records a quip by Arcesilaus (head of the Academy 264-241), which he produced when someone asked him:

> Why it was that pupils from all the other schools went over to Epicurus, but converts were never made from the Epicureans; "Because men may become eunuchs, but a eunuch never becomes a man", was his answer.[53]

This passage shows both the influence of Epicureanism at his time, but also their receptiveness to induct new recruits. Moreover, it appears to relay to us that the frequency of their induction had become a topic of conversation.

We also have an example that shows that the tenets of Epicureanism were a familiar commodity in the intellectual store of ideas that existed during Epicurus' lifetime. In his *Letter to Menoeceus* Epicurus responds to the accusation that his philosophy was merely an apologetic for enjoying 'women, fish or other delicacies of

---

[51] See J. S. Byrant (1996) 404.

[52] Seneca, *Ep*. 21.2-3, trans. B. Inwood (1998) 77; "*Si gloria," inquit, "tangeris, notiorem te epistulae meae facient quam omnia ista, quae colis et propter quae coleris*."

[53] *D.L.* 4.43, H. S. Long (1964) 556, trans. R. D. Hicks (1972) 421. Frischer, (1982) 51, also notes this passage and also cites the example of Cronius, a former pupil of Eudoxus, who was recruited into the Epicurean school as evidence of Epicurean influence beyond just the Garden. *D.L.* 10.9 also speaks of those attracted by the charm of Epicurus' doctrines.

the table…[as] some believe who do not know...our philosophy.'[54] While this certainly implies that such critics were not fully aware of Epicureanism, or were, for their own reasons, distorting its teachings- as later critics such as Cicero and Plutarch would do- it does show that Epicureanism had become sufficiently well known at the time for it to *become* misrepresented. It also highlights Epicurus' knowledge of this distortion, as well as his motivation to address it.

V: Epicurean Characteristics, and their Contemporary Parallels

While I hope that the evidence above is sufficiently detailed to suggest that the Epicurean understanding of mission is a more complex and nuanced phenomenon than has more often been presented to us, I will attempt to show that the dynamic of inclusion that we have argued for in the Epicurean school was replicated in other philosophical schools at the time; suggesting that this interplay between privacy/openness and a core/fluidity of members was a normative feature of philosophical schools in antiquity. In particular the Academy offers, I believe, the most fertile area ground for such a demonstration, particularly as it has many shared features with the Epicurean school: both schools were founded in a garden,[55] both believed (though in different ways) that the current political and social life was damaging to the development of a philosophically oriented mind,[56] and, as we have already noted, both

---

[54] *D.L.* 10.132, trans. R. D. Hicks (1972) 657.

[55] It should also be noted that the Academy was a further outside of Athens than the Garden was- and one would pass by the Garden on the way to the Academy. See Cicero *De Fin* 1.1.

[56] For example at *Theat*. 173, Plato jovially remarks that the philosopher will be so engrossed in their studies that they will not know where the marketplace, the law courts or the public assembly are. W. Jaeger (1945) 269, concludes on Plato's recurring description of the development of the philosopher that: 'the life of the philosopher in this world seems tragic: it seems that only a miracle, a divine chance, can permit a philosopher to grow up in it; and most such natures go bad before they are ever fully grown...Public meetings, law-courts, the theatres, the army, and all other assemblies where an excited crowd applauds or boos the speeches or an orator- these are the places where men of every age are moulded, no young man, no private

had a shared congruity between them on the futility of issuing philosophical discourses to the multitude.[57] So it is all the more significant when we realize that while some scholars have previously opined that the Academy was a rigid, perhaps secluded, organization,[58] Platonic scholars have begun to point out that alongside the depiction of the dedicated students of the Academy there is a surprising number of sources that mention peripheral, or visiting, members to the school.[59] For example, we have records of lectures being open to the public,[60] of visitors listening and taunting Plato's during one of his discourses,[61] of outsiders walking through the Academy's garden and overhearing students in dialogue,[62] and that the

---

individual can withstand its power. In such a position the individual is bound to follow the crowd's approval or disapproval, and to take its judgements of conduct.'

[57] See also *Gorgias* 485 where Plato's opponent tells him that he has observed that philosophy makes people 'avoid the real world and the marketplace in which, as the poet says, men become distinguished. He creeps into a corner for the rest of his life and talks in a whisper with three or four admiring youths;' trans. A. A. Anderson and B. Jowett (1994) 57.

[58] For example Debra Nails (1995) 214, has suggested that the Academy was a closed community, with initiation under the supervision of Plato, who would pick only the brightest, and most perceptive students to fill its ranks, while T. Morgan (1998) 21, argued that 'there is no indication anywhere in his dialogues or in what we know of the Academy that teaching was open to all.'

[59] See especially Dillon (2003) 2-16, and E. J. Watts (2007). Watts,10, comments that: 'In the Academy, there seems to have been two gradations of students: casual hearers who sought to acquire a basic understanding of philosophy.' Sara S. Monoson,(2000), 142, though has, rightly, in my view, cautioned that: 'we must not accept uncritically the notion that someone who is said to have frequented the Academy during some portion of his life can be identified as a serious "pupil" of Plato.'

[60] Aristoxenus, *Harmonics,* 2.1-2, and Proclus *On Plato's Parmenides* 127c.

[61] *Athenaeus* II 59d-f.

[62] Epicrates *Fr.*11. 9-27. On this passage J. Dillon (2003) 8, argues that 'Comedy this may be, but it can also be seen as a valuable glimpse of real-life by an eyewitness'.

Academy was one stop for a student making a tour of respective schools of philosophy.[63] We also have a record of Plato's works reaching beyond the periphery of the school's walls and attracting a woman called Axiothea from Phelious[64] and a farmer called Nerinthos from Corinth[65] to journey to the Academy.

While this is a dynamic that is still to be fully explored by scholarship,[66] we can also point to indications that reveal this to have been a standard feature of philosophical schools throughout antiquity. For instance, John Dillon has shown that Porphyry had three types of students: '1) wealthy patrons, 2) close companions, and 3) more casual auditors',[67] and that Plotinus' lectures were notably informal- apparently being open to all.[68] Additionally, we can see that the Stoic Epictetus also had 'open sessions' and we have records of visitors observing his lectures.[69]

Although necessarily brief, this overview should have made some of the proposed distinguishing, or aberrant, features of the Garden began to fade into a shared background between the schools, and reveal that the philosophical schools (including the Garden) had a shared consanguinity of traits and attitudes which were far more open to include interested outsiders than previous scholarship has acknowledged.

VI: Conclusion

---

[63] E.g. Theodectes of Phaselis appears to have made a tour of philosophical schools, including Isocrates, Plato and Aristotle- See W.C. K. Guthrie (1986) 73.

[64] Epicrates *Fr.* 11 9-27.

[65] Themistius *Or.* 23.295 c-d.

[66] A further interesting observation that might need more deliberation comes from Dillon,(2003), 7 who believes that Aelian's story, *Varia Historia* 3.19, of Plato's retreating to his house with his companions, once a critical Aristotle challenged him might suggest that Plato's house was reserved for specially invited friends, but that the garden was open for interested parties.

[67] J. Dillon (2004) 403.

[68] J. Dillion (2004) 406, also observes that curious visitors from town could apparently also listen in to the school-*VPlot.* chp. 3.

[69] See M. Trapp (2007) 20, A. A. Long (2002) 44-45; Clarke (1971) 85-92.

Despite the concerns that I raised at the opening of this study on the highly
fragmented, and incomplete, records that we have available for us to reconstruct the
early Epicurean movement, we actually find ourselves in a more positive position
than we might have imagined. Indeed, we can be, I believe, confident in our ability to
build up and clarify our understanding of the early Epicurean attitude towards
mission/inclusion. After recording this evidence we have seen that the Epicurean
school's true disposition was different from what many scholars have been given to
present us with; describing them as a cloistered and reclusive commune, scared, or
just too ambivalent, to propagate their philosophy and compete with their
competitors. But, neither have we found much evidence to support the notion that
they were the progenitors of a classical missionary movement, comparable with the
Cynics or with the modern televangelist or street-preacher. The Epicureans in fact
exhibited an altogether more restrained form of inclusion; opening themselves up to
consider and include outsiders, orienting their texts to serve those on the periphery of
the school, and we have seen that there is evidence that they were (in part) successful
in this mission. While there are certainly more specific questions and definitions we
would like to see answered, and some of these will be answered at least in regards to
later generations, our understanding of the Epicurean missionary movement has
begun to be sharpened.

Chapter Two: Epicurean Doctrine and the Missionary Impulse

I :Relevance

It might be considered strange after the cautions I have raised in the introduction about the need to reacquaint ourselves with the practical, and not intellectual, features of philosophical groups, that I will start this section by considering Epicurean beliefs and doctrines. Yet, understanding any groups' potential missionary spirit and concept of membership should be undergirded by trying to understand the group's ideological presuppositions. It should be a simple truth that a world-view that, for example, believes that it is both pertinent and accessible to the surrounding society will conceive of any missionary duty, and purpose in its survival, differently than a group that perceives of itself in a narrower spectrum of relevance and comprehensibility to society. The contents and shape of a group's doctrines will all inform, create, or nullify, any understanding of a missionary impulse.

Platonic philosophy was, for example, framed, though not entirely, to considering issues relevant to the proper governance of the *polis*. What mattered to Platonists was, broadly, a top-down, politically referenced philosophy;[1] not engagement between individuals as with other philosophies. So what of the tenets of Epicureanism? How narrow was their perception of their philosophy's relevance and openness?[2]

Epicurean teaching in comparison with its main philosophical competitors, oriented itself around providing answers to more corporeal, rather than ethereal concerns. Though questions were still approached using a complex philosophical route and methodology, their concerns were those that resonated with that of

---

[1] See S. S. Wohlin (1960) 27-32; and M Schofield (2006).

[2] As I will attempt to show there have been many accurate, and I believe highly insightful, observations from scholars relating to various components of Epicurean belief that help us answer this question. However, almost all have been curiously fleeting and secondary remarks, issued when considering other facets of the Epicurean movement.

common human experience- namely seeking the regulation of pleasure and pain.[3] Attempting to resolve this problem put them in line with every member of society, from every background.[4] Although many would doubtlessley find the answers that an Epicurean advocate would supply to be insufficient, or that their methodology was too complex or obscure, they were addressing an issue of immediate resonance to society. Other philosophies would have appeared entirely irrelevant to those enthralled in the struggles of daily life with their philosophical disputes appearing scholastic or arcane.[5] Epicurus himself reveals his understanding of the necessity for philosophy to have a relevance with daily, common life, when he argues that:

> Empty are the words of that philosopher who offers therapy for no human
> suffering. For just as there is no use in medical expertise if it does not
> give therapy for bodily diseases, so too there is no use in philosophy if it

---

[3] So H. Klauck and B. Neil, (2003) 77: 'Epicureans and the Stoics enjoyed the widest possible influence, and they specialized in an activity that one could call in modern language pastoral care, life counselling...thus the [Epicurean and Stoics] philosophical schools were the only serious rivals to Christianity in this field.' While M. A. Holowchak (2004) 88, meanwhile argues that: 'Epicurean wisdom, unlike that of Aristotle, is wholly practical'

[4] Perhaps Diogenes, *D. L.* 10.9, is thinking of this when he claims large number of people (in numbers to rival cities) were attracted to the 'siren charms' of Epicureanism.

[5] As Monica R. Gale (2001) 8, has noted although 'Epicureans divided their philosophy under three main headings: ethics physics…and canonic or epistemology…Of these, the first was unquestionably the most important to both Epicurus himself and his followers: our ultimate aim in life should be, in Epicurus' view, to achieve true happiness, and the study of physics and epistemology is only important in so far as it contributes to this goal.' M. P. O. Morford, (2002) 99: 'The ideal of pleasure and the superficial intelligibility of the school's doctrines were attractive just because they were not austere and impossible to achieve (as were the ideals of the Stoics) or full of intellectual subtleties (as were those of the Academics and Peripatetics). See also P. F. Esler (2000) 63.

does not expel the suffering of the soul.[6]

So we see that Epicurus' reproached the philosophers and their 'empty words'[7] precisely because he considered their systems to be void of a concern to address problems of common humanity- slighting them to the point of almost entirely dismissing their worthiness.[8]

It should probably be worth mentioning that the Epicurean belief in their message's relevancy was, no doubt, an accurate one, at least in terms of their aims, if not the process, by which they approached philosophical problems. In a similar passage Epicurus argues that:

> I would rather speak with the frankness of a natural philosopher, and reveal the things which are expedient to all mankind, even if no one is going to understand me, than assent to the received opinions and reap the adulation lavishly bestowed by the multitude…One should not pretend to philosophize, but actually philosophize. For what we need is not the semblance of health, but real health.[9]

While this passage confirms that Epicurus believed that his philosophy was 'expedient to all mankind' (συμφέροντα πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις), Epicurus concedes that not every person will understand its dictates- though he will nevertheless still carry on teaching it with full frankness. As this line of thought trails off we receive little insight into the category of people that Epicurus envisages as not comprehending his philosophy. But this is nonetheless a highly insightful remark

---

[6] Porphyry, *Ad Marcellam* 31, (Usener 221), trans. A. A. Long and D. N. Sedley (1987) 155.

[7] 'κενός ἐκείνου φιλοσόφου λόγος'.

[8] Isocrates, *Antidosis* 261, similarly noted that philosophers 'who are skilled in geometry and studies that sort…benefit their pupils not so much as they profess…Most men see in such studies nothing but empty talk and hair-splitting, for none of these disciplines has any useful application either to private or to public affairs.'

[9] *S.V.* 29, 54- H. S. Long (1964) 147, trans. A. A. Long and D. N. Sedley (1987), 155. See a similar statement in *S.V.* 45.

that posterity has preserved for us, and one that again shows the dynamics in Epicureanism between their belief in the relevance/accessibility of their doctrines, and their disdain for trying to bring the philosophy down to appeal to the masses.

II: Pleasure

The Epicurean desire for pleasure was the kernel from which the rest of the philosophy would grow. Yet this pivotal Epicurean teaching has been often misunderstood, and although redressing, albeit briefly, the popular conception about Epicurean pleasure might seem to be the within the purview of a different thesis, again our understanding of the outworking of Epicurean doctrine has a particular significance in helping us realize the relevancy and accessibility of the Garden community.

   While the common image that Epicureanism was a defence for opulence has been expunged from modern scholarship, still 'Epicurean' can be appealed to in contemporary culture as a metonym for hedonism.[10] A philosophy though which advocated the possession and enjoyment of luxuries as the best way to live life would require its adherents to have the financial facility to equip such a lifestyle. Any discussion raised here on the relevance of Epicureanism would have to be heavily diluted, and we would be forced to admit that the presence and adoption of Epicureanism would only have commended itself to members of a small section of society. Yet the Epicurean desire for pleasure led its devotees to the opposite, almost antithetical position to the view expressed above.

  The Epicureans sought to argue for the fulfilment of life through contentment with a more modest form of existence. Epicurus' statement below on the nature of pleasure is decidedly opposed to the desire for profligacy, telling his followers to:

> be contented with little if we have not much, being honestly persuaded
> that they have the sweetest enjoyment of luxury who stand least in need
> of it and that whatever is natural is easily procured and only the vain and
> worthless hard to win...It is not an unbroken succession of drinking-bouts

---

[10] M V. Hubbard (2010) 90, noted that while 'Epicurean' can be used to describe hedonism: 'It is no small irony then, that Epicurus was not, in the modern sense of the word at least, an Epicurean.'

and of revelry, not sexual love, not the enjoyment of the fish and other delicacies of a luxurious table, which produce a pleasant life; it is sober reasoning, searching out the grounds of every choice and avoidance, and banishing those beliefs through which the greatest tumults take possession of the soul. Of all this, the beginning and the greatest good is prudence.[11]

While memorably he also argued that 'Your discourse will appear more impressive, believe you me, if you are lying on a cheap bed and wearing rags. For it will not only be uttered then, but proven.'[12] Meanwhile Lucretius, a Roman Epicurean, paints for the readers a masterfully simple and thoroughly engrossing picture of the pleasured life; one which is not based on the possession of: 'nocturnal banquets in your hall, nor (having) your house gleam with silver and shine with gold, nor (in) music resound from gilded, panelled ceilings- than when friends, stretched out together on the soft grass by a stream beneath the branches of a tall tree, fulfil their bodily needs at small expense.[13] These, and other expressions of daily modesty,[14] unveil Epicurean pleasure

---

[11] *D.L.* 10.130,132. H. S. Long (1964) 555, trans. R. D. Hicks (1972) 655. See also *S.V.* 25, 59, 68.

[12] Recorded at Seneca *Ep.* 20.9. Trans B. Inwood and L. P. Gerson (2007) '*Magnificentior, mihi crede, sermo tuus in grabato videbitur et in panno. Non enim dicentur tantum illa, sed probabuntur.*'

[13] *De Rerum Natura* 2.24-36.

[14] Epicurus could also boast that he could live on less than a copper coin a day- Seneca *Ep.* 18.9. Diogenes also notes, *D. L.* 10.11, that Epicurus requested 'a little pot of cheese, that, when I like, I may fare sumptuously,' which Diogenes, adds wryly, comes from the man 'who laid down that pleasure was the end of life'. Diogenes of Oenoanda, *Fr.*29, Col. 1. 8- Col 3.1, *trans* Chilton 10 (1971), an

Epicurean adherent from the 2nd century C.E., notes that 'we have not hastened to undertake the same study so that any of the above rewards should come to us also, but so that we may be happy, gaining possession of the end and purpose of life sought by nature. And what this end is, and that neither wealth can provide it, nor political reputation, nor kingship, nor a life of luxury, nor a rich table, nor the pleasure of exquisite love affairs, nor anything else, but only philosophy...'

again in an altogether more humble, obtainable asset- and it is an image that cuts into the perception of the essentially removed aspect of Epicurean philosophy. Epicureanism also exhibits, as we have seen with Epicurean attitudes towards engaging with society, a remarkable toleration of observance/practice of activities that it ultimately finds to be deficient or problematic; believing that the properly trained mind can find enjoyment from it without fear of compromising their dedication to true pleasure.[15] For example the Epicurean can still frequent state banquets, know about poetry etc...[16] Therefore our understanding of the Epicurean attitude towards pleasure must be reconfigured to realize that is was a thoroughly accessible, desirable image; one that, even from the vantage point of modernity is still a thoroughly appealing proposition. As Bernard Frischer briefly opined:

> with Epicurus a new spirit enters Greek philosophy, one that is light, warm, and humane. Epicurus' emphasis on pleasure and his toleration of the active pleasures of sex, food, and physical beauty are new, as is his dictum that 'we must laugh and philosophize at the same time.'[17]

It is also an image where the Epicurus who railed against the empty talk of philosophers, who showed little reference to daily human life, finds its home.[18]

III: Education

As we have seen, different philosophical groups have presumed to initiate, convert and orientate their philosophy to address vastly differently educated

---

[15] On this see E. Asmis (1991) 246.

[16] *D.L.* 10.120, 121.

[17] S. V. 41, B. Frischer (1982), 61.

[18] There is also a distinctly individualistic focus in Epicurean philosophy, as opposed to more politically focused philosophies as R. M. Strozier (2002) 157, helpfully observers that 'Since Epicurus is more concerned with well-being than physics, and since well-being is defined individually, his philosophy marks the shift away from the relationship between politics and individual ethics.' Michael Erler (2009) 49, opines that 'Epicurus' teachings could be tapped according to the need for the planning of one's own life, without having to enrol in a philosophical system.'

groups; from trying to gain the ear of the leisured elite, to addressing the common crowd in the urban centres of Greece. Gaining a properly constructed and accurately focused understanding of the breadth, or indeed restriction, of the Epicurean attitude towards education as an enterprise, and what levels and type of education the Epicureans presupposed their audience/readers would have had will be a recurring theme throughout this thesis. But the general position of Epicureanism towards education, or the more general ancient concept of *paideia,* is also worth considering, especially as it appears to have been a distinctive part of the movement.[19]

We have several expressions of disregard and scepticism towards education from Epicurean sources. Epicurus, somewhat famously, advised Pythocles to 'hoist all sail, my dear boy, and steer clear of all education'[20] and he congratulated 'Appelles, for embarking on philosophy while still untainted by any *paideia.*'[21] As with politics, the education that was largely provided in the Greek world was, for the Epicureans, considered as corrupting influence that led men and women away from pursuing the true means of gaining happiness. Unfortunately though the incomplete historical record leaves us without a systematic or detailed picture of the Epicurean disposition towards education.[22] Scholarship has not been able to issue a suitable informative or consensus conclusion on the precise character of the Epicurean position on education. There are nevertheless some key marking points to help us start to focus our understanding.

Opining that Epicureans reject education wholesale, as the comments above on their own without any surrounding context would indicate, would be problematic.

---

[19] On this further see J. M. Snyder (1991) 102.

[20] *D.L.* 10.6, H. S. Long (1964) 497, R. D. Hicks (1972) 533..

[21] Atheneaus 588a (Usener 117) trans. A. A. Long and D. N. Sedley, (1987) 155. Epicurus also argued. *S.V.* 45, that *paideia* 'is an object of rivalry among many', and *S.V.* 54, 'we must free ourselves from the prison of public education and politics', while Plutarch records that Epicurus companion Metrodorus claimed it was no shame to not know on whose side Hector was, or what the first lines of Homer's poems were.

[22] See though C. Chandler (2006) 1-5, for a recent study/overview on the Epicurean stance towards education.

For example later Epicureans devotees, and Epicurus himself, show the awareness and use and of education- not least in the production of literature and disputation on a number of highly intellectual themes. It does seem that the true Epicurean understanding of education must have had several layers of nuances. Epicurus' demand for ignorance of education was not as unbending as it might have seemed had we only had access to his comments praising Pythocles' ignorance, quoted above. Elsewhere Epicurus argued that 'only the wise man will be able to converse correctly about music and poetry, without however actually writing poems himself.'[23] This would seem to more fit a mindset which allowed, and desired, knowledgeable abstention from education (or at least poetry); but one should know enough to be an engaging conversation partner.[24] Presumably we might allow ourselves to posit that the difference is that Pythocles is praised for his ignorance as he was, as the passage indicates, just commencing his philosophical study, while the already 'wise man' of *D.L.* 10.21 can engage with the larger labours of education, safe from the fear that he cannot accurately delineate for himself the harmful and illusionary forces behind it. Again this picture, I suggest, conforms to the Epicurean strain of toleration noted above.

  Although we cannot know, although perhaps another project will be able to provide the needed definition, the true reality and nuances of Epicurean disengagement towards education presently remains only partially focused and available for historical reconstruction. [25] Yet it seems that in the Garden the lack of education was a boon, for there would be less problems in deconstructing their false ideas. This perception and critique towards those entrenched in high culture and education would also bestow into the very character of Epicureanism, I will

---

[23] *D.L.* 10.121, H. S. Long (1964) 551, trans. R. D. Hicks (1972) 647.

[24] E. Asmis (1991) 246 : 'The Epicurean wise person does not forsake the objects of sense perception in the pursuit of truth; for wisdom consists precisely in enjoying sensory experiences and having correct opinions about them.'

[25] For example, our lack of detailed knowledge can allow views such as H. A. Fischel's (1997) 20, that Epicurus' demanded students abandon 'all culture…and reject all other knowledge,' and also provide room for N. DeWitt's (1954) 44, argument that the scholarly opinion on Epicurus' disregard for *paideia* was a 'fallacy', and a 'wilful misrepresentation' of position merely sceptical towards geometry and arithmetic.

argue, an orientation that considered and included less academically polished adherents that so far hasn't been fully unpacked by scholarship.

In any case, that advanced education, particularly in the arts of geometry and rhetoric that marked other philosophical enterprises, was seemingly a requirement obviated in the Garden would undoubtedly make the philosophy more accessible to the general populace.[26] Although the Epicurean world-view could satisfy those looking for sustained intellectual discourse, and its world-view could be applied to examine a range of intellectual topics, the foundational tenets in Epicureanism could be grasped without deep training in *paideia*.[27] Cicero in fact repeatedly ruminates on this facet

---

[26] Both P. Gordon and E. Asmis briefly, though unfortunately not for any extended duration, reflect on this facet of early Epicureanism. P. Gordon (1996) 85, argues that: 'Epicurus' contempt for traditional education (especially geometry and rhetoric) would have made philosophical discussion in the Garden accessible to women (and slaves) who had not had access to traditional schooling.', while E. Asmis (2003), 143, states that Epicurus: 'viewed traditional education as an outright hindrance…the only true education, Epicurus held, is Epicurean philosophy. Epicurus designed his teaching in such a way that not just the affluent, but the most lowly working person, including the slave, would have enough time to do philosophy.' Plutarch, *A Pleasant Life* 1093c bemusedly comments that 'They [the Epicureans] even reject the pleasures which come from mathematics' trans B. Inwood and L. P. Gerson (1998) 97.

[27] P. Hadot (2002) 108, importantly notes that: 'Epicureanism and Stoicism were addressed to everyone: rich and poor, male and female, free citizen and slaves. Whoever adopted the Epicurean or Stoic way of life and put it into practice would be considered a philosopher, even if he or she did not develop a philosophical discourse, either written or oral.' Though I would like to carefully to add some qualifications that Epicureanism did not address the masses or the mob, M. B. Trapp (2007) 149, observes that: '[Epicureans had] an earnest desire to benefit humanity at large by opening its eyes to the gospel of Epicurus, which more than any other philosophical program emphasized the sheer simplicity of becoming truly happy'. See also comments in C. Gill (2006) 103. This is in contrast, as T. J. Morgan (1999) 21, notes, to: 'the heights of Plato's instruction in virtue do in fact depend on the pupils' being literate- indeed, on his having had a highly intellectual preparatory education.'

of Epicureanism. For instance he claimed that is 'the easiest (*facillimis*) system,'[28] and he comments that:

> He [Epicurus] seems to you to be lacking in education. The reason is that he thought no education worthy of that name unless it contributed to our training for a happy life….Was he to occupy himself like Plato, in music, geometry, arithmetic, and astronomy, which, starting from false premises, cannot be true and which, even if they were true, would not help us live more pleasant, and therefore better lives.'[29]

Furthermore, in the following passage he explicitly relates the simplicity of their message with its successful dispersal:

> 'nor is his [Epicurus'] subject difficult, like the physicists, or technical like the mathematicians. Rather is a clear and straightforward topic, widely familiar to the public.'[30]

IV: Was the Garden Accessible?

So, if the character of Epicurean philosophy does, as I believe, conform to a group that would find itself open to potentially cater for a broad inclusion of outsiders, and has the motivating ideological framework to formulate a missionary impulse, do we have any evidence to substantiate this? I believe we do have evidence that the early Epicureans included in their school members from across a broad spectrum of

---

[28] *De Fin* I.13.

[29] *De Fin.* 1.71-72, L. D. Reynolds (1998) 34, trans. M C. Nussbaum (1996) 121: (Nussbaum incorrectly cites this as *De Fin* 1.17). ' *Qui quod tibi parum videtur eruditus, ea causa est, quod nullam eruditionem esse duxit, nisi quae beatae vitae disciplinam iuvaret...aut se, ut Plato, in musicis, geometria, numeris, astris contereret, quae et a falsis initiis profecta vera esse non possunt et, si essent vera, nihil afferrent, quo iucundius, id est quo melius viveremus.*'

[30] *De Fin* 2.15, L. D. Reynolds(1998) 44, trans. J. Annas (2001) 31; '*nec de re obscura, ut physici, aut artificiosa, ut mathematici, sed de illustri et facili et iam in vulgus pervagata.*'

society, particularly from those groups normally isolated from philosophical schooling and unrepresented in our classical sources.

The Epicureans accepted both young and old members,[31] and we have at least one instance of a slave who joined the group, who also went onto to become an eminent member of the Garden.[32] There was also a large contingent of women present in the garden, and we have the ability to list seven of their names.[33] Their presence combined with the lack of higher education for women in Athens at this time again suggests that Epicurean would accept people who came to them without higher education.[34] Though other schools could have, on occasion, women adherents, e.g. Axiothea in Plato's Academy[35], the Garden was divergent in that it established for itself this coterie of women in its ranks, and not merely allowed the occasionally, anomalous, woman member the ability to join to group.[36]

---

[31] *D.L.* 10.122 'Let no one be slow to seek wisdom when he is young nor weary…for no age is too early or too late', H. S. Long (1964) 552, trans. R. D. Hicks (1972) 649. This is in contrast, for example to Callicles who Plato portrays, *Gorgias* 4851-b, as arguing that: 'It is a good thing to engage in philosophy just as so far as it is an aid to education, and it is no disgrace for a youth to study it, but when a man is now growing older still dies philosophy, the situation becomes ridiculous' trans. Woodhead (1953) 268.

[32] That there was a slave called Mys was apparently recorded by Myronianus in his Historical Parallels and preserved by *D. L.* 10.3, who goes on to record, *D.L.*10.10, his eminence in the group.

[33] For a useful study on women in the Garden see P. Gordon (2004).

[34] See M. C. Nussbaum (1996) 117. Interestingly though Cicero *De Nat. De.* 1.33.93 claims that Leontium wrote a book refuting Theophrastus.

[35] *D. L.* 3.46`

[36] Jane Snyder (1991) 101, perhaps goes too far in stating that the Garden advocated the 'emancipation of women', and a further danger of overextending our conclusions from these examples is seen when Snyder's remarks that there were several slaves in the garden, 101. We actually have only one example of a slave in the Garden- that of Mys. It was also a common accusation in ancient writings that these women were '*hetairai*' (female, usually including sexual, companions). It is also surprising for the

On the broadness of Epicurean philosophy Elizabeth Asmis opined that:

> Epicurus' philosophy is addressed to anyone at all- not only to both young
> and old, but also to both male and female, salve and master, educated and
> uneducated, rich and poor. It is defiantly non-elitist. Distinctions of age,
> wealth, sex, education, social standing, are eliminated.[37]

For Elizabeth Asmis it was only the individual who restricts their participation in
Epicureanism, for the education was open for all. Yet we must note that there were some
restrictions. Epicurus also added that 'not every bodily constitution nor every nationality
would permit a man to become wise'[38]- presumably meaning that the physically
handicapped, and some races, would have been denied access.[39] While such stipulations
don't give the Garden the same modern appeal of egalitarianism, it does nevertheless seems
to have been a remarkable open and divergent school, a reality that is concomitant with the
evidence provided above. Education, wealth, social and political connections were not
important,[40] and, moreover, their philosophy was a system that saw itself to be pertinent to
mankind generally, so the inclusion of such a unusual mix of members should not surprise

claims find little evidence and such accusations were part of the exaggerated
polemical exchange of the Graceo-Roman world. As P. Gordon's (2004) study has
shown, that contemporary scholars have frequently assumed this claim's validity is
surprising.

[37] E. Asmis (2004) 221.

[38] *D.L.* 10.117, H. S. Long (1964) 549, trans. R. D. Hicks (1972) 643.

[39] Asmis (2001) 209 n.2, believed that Epicurus' appeal to race was in reference to
non-Greeks, and she also points to *K.D.* 32 (=*D.L.* 150) where Epicurus argues that
certain 'tribes' like animals 'could not or would not form mutual covenants.'
Precisely who Epicurus was referring to in with both stipulations we cannot be
certain.

[40] G. Roskam (2007) 17, summarizes the Epicurean position as being one where
'neither the famous politicians nor the celebrated orators... should be regarded as
paradigms worthy of imitation, but the man who quietly enjoys the uncomplicated
pleasures of a simple and sequestered life.'

us, and indeed confirms the facet, and attractiveness,[41] of the Epicurean movement.

---

[41] R. A. Belliotti (2009) 103, also proposes to his readers, though doesn't expand upon, that there were three allures that Epicureanism had for potential converts, first that 'the pleasure principle was congenial to many citizens for whom political and military success were long shots,' and that: 'the doctrines of this school seemed easier to grasp than some of the nuanced renderings of their competitors' and finally 'Epicurean prescriptions were less demanding than austere, lofty Stoic ideals.'

Chapter Three: Epicurean Philosophy and Therapeutic Strategies

I: Therapeutic Strategies

Ancient philosophy's primary conception of itself as a way of life, supported but not reduced to its theoretical dogmas, is perhaps one the most conspicuous differences between ancient and modern philosophy. Classical philosophers did not perceive themselves to be responsible to just oversee the intellectual advance of their students alone; instead their pedagogical talents were expended to teach knowledge for therapeutic ends. The student who merely acquired knowledge without it effecting a change in his/her lifestyle and worldview was, to the ancient mind, to be no philosopher at all.[1] To provoke this change in their adherents the various philosophical Schools sought to habituate, and train their adherents to have the correct worldview through creating various exercises.[2] This shared goal meant that the Schools, despite their vast dogmatic differences, often employed the same therapeutic techniques.[3]

   Scholars have, with varying enthusiasm, referenced and tried to focus contemporary scholarships' minds upon this facet of ancient philosophy- and with good reason.[4] Understanding the therapeutic ends of Graeco-Roman philosophy can, for example, help us place the conflict between the philosophical Schools and early Christianity in

---

[1] On this see J. Glucker (1978) *passim*. P. Hadot (1995) 270, also bemoans that modern philosophical education was unrecognizable to the ancients, and that in its scholasticism it is 'no longer directed toward people who were to be educated with a view to becoming fully developed human beings.'

[2] Philo of Alexandria, *Her.* 253, outlines many of these strategies, opining that: 'all the elements of practice are food fit for eating: inquiry, examination, reading, listening to instruction, concentration, perseverance, self-mastery, and power to treat things indifferent as indeed indifferent.'

[3] R. Sorabji (2000) 212, notes that 'Ancient philosophical therapy relied heavily on exercises…many exercises were free of doctrinal presuppositions, and were consequently interchangeable among schools.'

[4] In particular see the efforts of M. C. Nussbaum (1994) and P. Hadot (1995).

context.[5] Both, after all, shared a mission of propagating their therapeutic ends, buttressed by a theoretical worldview. However, this therapeutic purpose of philosophy is often ignored by scholars in preference to study their intellectual formations that were formed as supports for these ends;[6] or it is a reality that, if it has received an introduction, often fails to continue to supply the historian's understanding of the respective philosophical Schools' texts and movements. In some senses this is entirely understandable. The modern philosophical lecturer or scholar approaches, lectures and writes on philosophy with entirely different aims, expectations and purposes than those of their ancient counterparts. Yet, I will argue that when the historian continues to view ancient philosophy therapeutically, they are viewing philosophy as the ancients did, and that they have the ability to unmask hidden nuances behind the purposes and motivations behind philosophical texts and movements.

II: Epicurean Memorization

I will focus on one particular exercise- the art of memorization. Memorization was, in many ways, the hallmark of ancient education, with Hellenistic schoolchildren being introduced to the pedagogical aims of memorization through remembering

---

[5] See for example Porphyry's *Adversus Christianos*. E. A. Judge (2008) 620, meanwhile, in a study on the context of Christianity in the ancient world, reminds his readers that theology and ethics were the purview of philosophy- not the religious cults. This can, I believe, help explain why the critics of Christianity in antiquity were almost universally philosophers.

[6] This is not a practice that is restricted to the study of Graeco-Roman philosophy. I. Dunderberg (2008) *passim*, has shown that a comparable situation, and distortion, has effected the study of Gnosticism; where scholars prefer to structure their discussions around doctrinal issues, and so miss the very aims of their myths- their therapeutic value and practical outcome- see especially 20-31. The notable exception in Epicurean scholarship is V. Tsouna's work (2007) on Philodemus, which devotes a chapter, 74-91, to look at his use of therapeutic exercises. It is from Tsouna that I have adopted the term 'therapeutic exercises' rather than Hadot's preferred category of 'spiritual exercises'- which V. Tsouna (2007) 74. n.7, finds to be problematic.

portions of Homer's work, and other poets, for example.[7] Yet, the Epicurean efforts to expedite, and depend upon, this memorization of the School's texts and beliefs was distinctive, and Epicurean therapeutic exercises coalesced around memorization. By committing the School's doctrines to memory, the systematic presentation of the School's tenets, it was believed, would be a constant cognitive presence, and habituate the pupil's mind to the enact the appropriate response in every situation throughout life.[8] For this prescient reason the urge memorize was a constant refrain in Epicurus' writings,[9] and it became a hallmark of the School as a philosophy. Even Epicurus' last words were reputed to an appeal to: 'friends remember my teachings,'[10] and Cicero could jibe the Epicureans on their memorization of their texts.[11]

Additionally the philosophical commentator Diocles of Magnesia, according to Diogenes Laertius, made the following observation that that Epicurus 'used to train (ἐγύμναζε) his friends in committing (ἔχειν) his treatises to memory (μνήμης)'[12]. The careful reader will have already noticed that Diocles did not declare that Epicurus helped his companions to memorize his writings, but, rather, trained them on the *art* of keeping them in their memory- or to use more modern parlance, on their therapeutic exercises.

Though works devoted to examining these exercises in ancient philosophy have fought ably to introduce this context of philosophy to its rightful place in contemporary scholarship, the systematic overview that these studies bring can tend,

---

[7] See R. Cribiore (2001) 232, 262, and also Y. Too (2010) 173-191, for the place of memorization in ancient education.

[8] Epicurus urges his followers when they: 'spend time in the other activities of life, (to) never cease to utter the words of the correct philosophy.'

[9] As D. Clay (1998) 24, has noted ' This expectation (of memorization) is clear from the letters: *Ad Hdt.* 35-37, 45:1-2; 68.3;82-83; *Ad Pyth.* 84-85; c.f. 95.4 and 116.4; and *Ad Men.* 123.1-2; 127.4; 135.5.'

[10] *D.L.* 10.16 'τοῖς τε φίλοις παραγγείλαντα τῆν δογμάτων μεμνῆσθαι', trans. R. D. Hicks (1972) 545.

[11] *De Fin.* 2.7.20 'who among you has not learned Epicurus' *Principle Doctrines* by heart?' See also Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura* 1.40.113.

[12] *D.L.* 10.12.

I suggest, to obscure the variances that existed between the Schools' respective practices- as well as glossing over chronological developments in their use.[13] Though in later centuries Stoic philosophers would show a desire to adopt the use of mnemonic aids, as did individual writers such as Galen and the Stoically inclined Emperor Marcus Aurelius;[14] as a normative and foundational exercise it was a distinctly Epicurean phenomenon- and it remained so until the late Republic/Early Empire.[15] Indeed, some early philosophers could object to the use of memorization as a therapeutic exercise. Plato, for example, could argue that that a letter produced for the sake of memorization was of little use. He stated that: 'and now you, father of these letters, have in your fondness for them said what is the opposite of their real effect. For this will produce a forgetting in the souls of those who learn these letters as they fail to exercise their memory, because those who put trust in writing recollect from the outside with foreign signs, rather than from themselves recollecting from within by themselves.'[16]

III: Epicurean Epitomes

While memorization is evidently key to the Epicurean School, the problem with placing it at the heart of their pedagogical practice is that philosophy was, and is, not

---

[13] P. Hadot's (1995) 56, presents the abridging of philosophical works as a generic practice across the Schools. R. Sorabji's work (2000) on spiritual exercises though he seems to restrict talking about memorization as a specific practice of the Epicurean school, 216-217- but he doesn't expand, or place this within the context of the other Schools.

[14] See a list in Hadot (1995) 111 n.25, and 122 n. 37.

[15] D. Clay (1983) 80,'Epicurus was the first Greek philosopher to demand that his disciples memorize and constantly rehearse'.

[16] Plato *Phaedrus* 275- translation taken from D. W. Hyland (2008) 119. E. Amsis 216, notes that in contrast to Epicurus' desire for memorization Plato 'regarded memorization as the antithesis of philosophical inquiry', but unfortunately doesn't produce any supporting evidence for this ascertain. For further support of this point see M Burnyeat and M. J. Levett , (1990) 100, and, on Plato's criticism on the practice of memorizing as expressed in his *Theaetetus*, see K. Wood (2005) 43, who concludes that for Plato 'memorization is not philosophy'.

an endeavour especially given to brevity or terseness. The memorization of its key texts would be an all but impossible project for the initiate.[17] The tension between trying to fuse the highly technical nature of Epicurean philosophy with the necessity to reduce its dogmatic teaching into a memorable form though resolved itself through innovation, and changed how their philosophy was recorded and dispersed in antiquity- their use of the epitome.[18] Three of these Epicurean epitomes are extant, preserved in the writings of Diogenes Laertius.[19] Furthermore, as a boon to historians who are perhaps more used to having to deduce and debate the intended purpose and audience(s) of ancient texts, two of them have an unusual concern to outline their intended use and audience. In the preface to the *Letter to Herodotus*, Epicurus notes that it was produced for:

> For those who are unable to study in its detail each of my separate treatments
> of physical matters or to examine with care my more extensive writings, I
> have prepared an epitome of my philosophy as a whole with an eye to
> presenting my most general views at least so that they can be properly
> grasped and remembered (μνήμην). My aim has been to enable my readers
> to come to their own aid in the most critical matters and on any occasion in
> so far as they have made progress in the understanding of nature. Those too
> who have made sufficient progress in the theoretical view of the general
> truths of nature should memorize (μνημονεύειν) the outline of my entire

---

[17] D. Clay (1984) 60, also observes this.

[18] That is, a summary/abridgement of Epicurean teaching. N Lazaridis' (2007) 38, study of popular wisdom sayings/literature in Egyptian and Greek culture, refers to the genre of the epitome as 'the philosophical epitome'. It is unsure just how much credit we can give the Epicureans to developing widespread use of epitomes. C. K Rothschild (2004) 217, holds that the genre either originated with Epicurus, or within his literary milieu. I am unaware of another example of a philosophical School using the epitome until the late 1st century CE. If the Epicureans did not invent the epitome as a genre, they almost certainly normalized them. See also P. Gordon (1998) 25. D. Clay (1984) 60.

[19] The *Letter to Herodotus (D.L.* 35-83), *Letter to Pythocles* (*D.L.*84-116), and the *Letter to Menoeceus* (*D.L.*122-135).

philosophy as I have reduced it to elementary form…(we) need to memorize (μνήμη) only as much as will enable us to form a master conception which can be applied to cases and clear up those problems calling for their particular explanation. This is possible only once the most general scheme of my philosophy has been mastered and memorized (μνημονευομένων)…to summon up rapidly his concepts is of critical importance, and this is impossible unless what he knows has been reduced to elementary propositions and simple formulas. For there can be no adequate condensation of the complete round of my general teaching if it fails to encompass in concise formulations the possible explanations of matters of details as well…Given then the usefulness of such a method for all those who have gained some experience in the study of nature, I have drawn up for you an elementary presentation of my general doctrines in the form of an epitome...[20]

The purpose of this summary should not be in any doubt. In the preface alone to the epitome Epicurus appeals no less than four times to its purpose being for memorization (highlighted in Greek in the text). Yet the audience that is presupposed is of more interest for the subject of this thesis.

   The first audience that Epicurus envisages his epitome as serving are those who are unable to study his unabridged work- though he doesn't specify if this was through lack of time or ability on their part.[21] The consensus in scholarship seems to be that the novice was in view here- the neophyte who has yet to build enough intellectual muscle to tackle the full works of Epicurus. Yet the congruity amongst scholars on this conclusion masks the reality that Epicurus might just as easily be referring those adherents outside of the main group, willing and keen to learn, but held in their novice status due to other commitments.[22] There is though another category of reader that Epicurus presents to us

---

[20] *D.L.* 10.35-36, H. S. Long (1964) 511, trans. taken from Clay (1998) 10-11.

[21] The word for ability, δυναμένοις, can be used in both senses.

[22] i.e. the well-disposed outsiders we see who were to be invited to the school's meal at *S.V.* 29.

which hasn't featured much in scholarly discussion on this text- the mature student.[23] It is the student who has already learned the teachings in their unabridged form, but is required to use the epitome to memorize them. Furthermore, Epicurus also argues that these summaries are 'useful for *all* who take take up natural science.'[24]

This advocacy for students to use summaries might seem to modern readers to be strange, but, again, the purpose of Epicurean philosophy was not to gather information, or gain mere intellectual assent from its pupils- it was rather an exercise of therapy. This dissonance between modern and ancient perceptions seems, therefore, to have hidden from view one of the main recipients of this epitome from scholarly view- for what else can summaries be intended to be used for, but to help the beginner?

Recalling Plato's aversion to the memorization process, it is also interesting that Epicurus argued, specifically, for the understanding of the epitome separately to the memorization process that the brevity of the epitome was meant to expedite. He asked the reader to '*grasp* and remember' the teachings, and informed them that they are expected to both understand and memorize the epitome.[25] This stands in contrast to Voula Tsouna's construal of Epicurean memorization as a process with a rather passive form of knowledge, where the faithful recitation of the epitome makes the adherent 'end up having true beliefs or knowledge'.[26] The reader's responsibility though is twofold, not singular.

The end of the *Letter to Herodotus* also offers the careful reader an equally revealing insight back into the first generation of the Epicurean School, with Epicurus arguing that the epitome is:

---

[23] R. M. Strozier (2002) 156, talks about the audience being 'clearly followers of Epicurus who are beginners or those content with an abbreviated version of his thought. See also R. A. Culpepper (1978) 114. See though M. C. Nussbaum (1994) 121, who acknowledges the epitomes' dual role of serving beginner and advanced pupil.

[24] *D. L.* 10.37, Ὅθεν δὴ πᾶσι χρησίμης οὔσης τοῖς ᾠκειωμένοις φυσιολογία τῆς τοιαύτης ὁδοῦ'

[25] *D. L.* 10.36 'περιειλημμένων καί μνημονευομένων', trans. R. D. Hicks (1972) 567.

[26] V. Tsouna (2009), 255. A. H. Armstrong (1987) 59, also argued that for Epicureans 'what is desired is not knowledge, but rather knowledge as *habitus*'.

capable, I think, if mastered with care, of making its student capable of
attaining a security incomparable with that of the rest of mankind, even if he
does not go on to solve all the problems connected with particulars. And,
what is more, he will be able, by himself, to arrive at the solutions to many of
the problems concerning particulars by keeping to the theoretical principles of
our philosophy, and these essential doctrines…are of such a kind that even
those who have not already gone into the problems connected with
particulars, either with tolerable or complete precision, can pass in review
most of the round of doctrines concerning the theoretical truths of nature by
reducing them to conceptions such as these. But on the other hand, those who
do not completely belong to this group of students perfected in this study can,
by depending on these essential doctrines, pass in review, without oral
instruction, the truths that are of overriding importance to their peace of
mind.[27]

 The length to which Epicurus goes in affirming the sufficiency of an epitome to equip
its reader is also an unusual concession for an author who has devoted himself to
produce of tomes of philosophy.[28] From the standpoint of the modern philosopher and
his/her goals in a modern university setting, to suggest that a summary of your chosen
field's teachings would suffice, and that the arguments, technicalities, and idioms of
your subject's teachings need not necessarily be learned to produce the suitable results
would be thought to be an unthinkable concession to laxity. Again though, with the
focus of ancient philosophy it is entirely understandable.

   Belief in the summaries' competence to instil the correct opinions also reveals to us
the belief in the Epicurean School that the benefits of Epicurean philosophy could be

---

[27] *D.L.* 10.83.

[28]   In the opening to the epitome Epicurus also stated*, D.L.* 10.35, that 'a
comprehensive view is often required, the details seldom,' H. S. Long (1964) 533,
trans. R. D. Hicks (1972) 565, (τῆς γὰρ ἀθρόας ἐπιβολῆς πυκνὸν δεόμεθα,
τῆς δὲ κατὰ μέρος οὐχ ὁμοίως).

gained relatively quickly/accessibly.[29] As well as helping us understand the early membership of the Epicurean school, this must inevitably lead us to question then what place the unabridged treatises of the School had, and how they would have functioned in conjunction with the summaries- a question that, at present, remains an unanswerable one; but will need to be recalled as we progress through the later generations of Epicurean devotees.

Additionally, this source offers us another view into the dynamics of Epicurean pedagogy as it envisages the epitome's use outside of the 'classroom'. In the opening section, *D.L.* 10.36, we are told that the epitome was produced so that the reader could come to their own aid (ἐν τοῖς κυριωτάτοις βοηθεῖν αὐτοῖς δύνωνται)′ on matters, and that this would enable them to understand the most critical parts of the philosophy: i.e. its teachings can be studied and learned without teaching or oral instruction.[30] The belief that epitomes could function as independent vehicles of education, allowing the individual to pursue philosophy is, perhaps again, a surprisingly concession.

This independent streak also stands in contrast to the common presentation of the necessity of communal and dialectical practice of ancient philosophy, and this is a contrast that is only sharpened when the background is the Epicurean School, which placed so much value on community, and on the corrective nature of communal life and learning. Again this is a further indication that the Epicurean School was more flexible in its character and outlook than scholars have been previously willing to consider. The old adages which still inform our discussion of the School and its character must be re-examined.[31] For example, this expressed acknowledgement of

---

[29] This curious feature of Epicurean education hasn't, to my knowledge, been explored, and no doubt more work needs to be done to fully appreciate this dynamic. A further indication though that this proposal is correct comes from *S.V.* 27 where Epicurus argues that: 'In other pursuits the reward comes at the end and is hard won. But in philosophy enjoyment keeps pace with knowledge.'- trans A. A. Long and D. N. Sedley (1987) 156.

[30] On the translation of phrase 'without oral instruction' see Clay (1983) 174, 175.

[31] Clay (1998) 16, though does argue, but does not expand on this insight, that the epitomes enabled Epicurean philosophy: 'to reach beyond the *kepos*, the fellow philosophers, and the life of Epicurus himself'.

independent learning, emancipated from a classroom setting should challenge the unfounded assumption that the Epicureans sought to keep a firm, and intractable control over their students- requiring the continual supervision of an instructor to safeguard against error or misunderstanding.[32]

The other epitome of interest to us is the *Letter to Pythocles,*[33] from which we learn that:

> 'to aid your memory (μνημονεύειν) you (Pythocles) ask me for a clear and concise statement respecting celestial phenomena; for what we have written on this subject elsewhere is, you tell me, hard to remember (μνημονεύῃς), although you have my books constantly with you…Many others beside you will find these reasonings useful, and especially those who have but recently made acquaintance with the true story of nature and those who are caught up in the more demanding routines of life. …once you have memorized

---

[32] M. C. Nussbaum (1994) 345, relays with confidence to her reader that the Epicurean student was to be placed firmly under the control of an unyielding teacher, and that they would be issued with a strong warning if they ventured in the wrong way. While the issue of Epicurean understanding and compliance to orthodoxy is a large issue best left to other studies, there is evidence that the doctrines and texts of the Epicurean school were not codified and strictly regulated as has been presumed in scholarship: see P. Gordon (1998) *passim*. The idea of an Epicurean push to impose orthodoxy and chase errors was foreign to Diogenes Laertius' perception of the school, who quotes, *D.L.* 10.12, Diocles' statement that Epicurus could have disagreements with Anaxagoras, one of his favourite pupils. This would suggest that a similar disposition existed between the Garden and the Academy, for Plato could have disagreements with prominent pupils Speusippus and Eudoxus. See M. Ostwald and J. P. Lynch (1994) 405.

[33] The third epitome, not discussed in any length here is the *Letter to Menoeceus D.L.* 10: 122-135. There is some dispute over the authenticity of the *Letter to Pythocles*, although in recent years more scholars seem comfortable in citing it as a genuine Epicurus letter. In any case I include it here as an example of Epicurean epitomes. See overview of the debate in Angeli (1988) 289-91.

(μνήμης) them make the rounds of them rapidly along with the other short epitome in my letter to Herodotus...[34]

The function of the epitome as a mnemonic device is again explicitly revealed throughout its preface, and, once more, the intended audience of the text is helpfully delineated for us, and would seem to support the suggestion that I made on the intended audiences we are presented with in the *Letter to Herodotus*. Here, we are told, there are three categories of recipients to be served by the epitome: the mature student, the beginner, and the affiliated member who it outside of daily interaction with the school.

The first recipient this time is the advanced student, Pythocles, whom we are informed has access to Epicurus' full philosophical treatises, and requested supplementary material not because of these work's length or incomprehensibility-but rather because of their incompatibility with the memorization process. The second envisaged reader are those students who are new to Epicureanism and are seeking an introduction to the philosophy to help orient themselves around its intellectual horizons. Thirdly the epitome was produced to provide those interested in Epicurean philosophy, but committed elsewhere, with an abridged form of the philosophy. The acceptance, and accommodation, of this later group again suggests that a conception of membership existed in the Garden that was more broader than contemporary scholarship currently allows for.

We also see confirmation that these summaries were intended to be 'published'; as seen with the reference to the existence of the *Letter to Herodotus,*[35] and the statement that many besides Pythocles (πολλοῖς καὶ ἄλλοις) would be interested in this epitome as well.

---

[34] *D. L.* 84, 85. H. S. Long (1964) 534, translation adapted from Clay (1984) 187.

[35] See Warren (2009) 18, also concludes this as does Pamela Gordon (1998) 54.

IV: Conclusion

These two epitomes, and other indications of Epicurean brevity,[36] reveal a School that had a deep conviction to the memorization process. But it also demonstrates that a far more accessible Epicurean School existed than we might have imagined previously.

The epitome's possible function as material for prosleytism, or as aids for propagation, has been largely, and correctly, rejected. There is no evidence, despite their extended description of their intended audience(s), to suggest that they were to be manufactured, or utilized, to propagate the philosophy to prospective members. They rather addressed those who had either joined, or already had an interest with the School.

However, it should be a uncontroversial suggestion that the comprehension level and intellectual concentration that was needed to understand an epitome would be less than that of a full philosophical work.[37] Elizabeth Asmis, who argues that the epitomes made the philosophy 'accessible to the ordinary person. Using everyday language,'[38] and she suggests that the common poor, slaves and uneducated were the intended readers. Yet, this seems to me to be an overstatement. The epitomes are not simplistic in their construction or language. Indeed, the language is complex and often times opaque.[39] This was not a practice in making a diluted form of the philosophy, where the depth of their teaching is traded off against their coherence.[40] Nor was Epicurus imbued with a desire to trivialize his philosophy to make his philosophy understandable to the common man- as we have seen. The truth is somewhere in the middle. In regards to the epitomes' complexity they are still

---

[36] Apart from the *Letter to Menoeceus,* the *Kyriai Doxai, D.L.* 139-154, a selection of forty aphorisms is almost certainly also designed for mnemonic purposes, as Cicero, *De Fin*. 2.7.20, intimated.

[37] Their length is small by the standards of philosophical treatises. My own (rough) word count for the epitomes is around: *Letter to Herodotus*, 4100; *Letter to Pythocles*, 2800, and the *Letter to Menoeceus* 1200.

[38] E. Asmis (2001) 218.

[39] D. N. Sedley (2006) 265, call the prose of the epitomes 'dense'.

[40] P. Hadot (1995) 60, preferred to note that their: 'systematic coherence was subordinated to spiritual effectiveness.'

challenging, and it is doubtful that anyone coming to them without a prior knowledge of Epicureanism would find them appealing or particularly understandable.[41]

However, in one more important way the epitomes are accessible and simplified, and this is a concern that scholarship, by devoting itself to answering questions of intellectual complexity, has missed. Once the intellectual teachings of the epitome (which are not undemanding) have been gleaned, it offers a simplified route towards the *therapeutic* end of the philosophy. [42] This is especially true for the advanced student, who, again we must labour, was equally intended to be served by the epitomes, and would not struggle with their intellectual content. But even the Epicurean beginner can be equipped through these small works to function entirely appropriately. It is remarkable given this repeatedly stated therapeutic goal of the philosophy that this aspect of the epitomes has not been explicated.

When we allow philosophy to define itself and its aims, and forgo our natural predilection to define their intellectual baggage we see they were on offer to provide a simplified route to therapeutic ends, on that, I argue, separated them from the more rigorous demands of other philosophies' exercise- which often presumed full knowledge was needed, and a full grasp of their treatises.[43]

---

[41] G. Synder (2000) 53-54: 'These were not mere popularizations aimed at outsiders, but documents for people who were already acquainted with Epicurus...designed chiefly for study purposes within the school.' See also P. H. De Lacy (1948) 20.*Meanwhile* P. Gordon (1996) 54,57, argues that 'even the exoteric writings of such as the *Letter to Menoeceus* are difficult and seem to have been written and with a small community in mind'. While D. Clay argues that 'His [Epicurus'] language bears the marks of an isolated and esoteric philosophical dialect that was current in Epicurus' garden early in the third century B.C. and understood and spoken only there and then'.

[42] It is interesting that we can, perhaps in some sense, draw support for this distinction that I am attempting to make by appealing to Cicero's record that Epicurus' polemical style was a 'thicket', *De Natura Deorum* 1.24.68, yet he can also call it the simplest philosophy, *De Fin.* 1.5.13.

[43] See again Hadot's comments quoted at 41 n.27.

Chapter Four:
The Epicurean Populists

I: Introduction Roman Epicureanism

As we move now to consider the missional character of the Epicurean School after its early years centred around the Garden, there are some noticeable features that will mark our study. In particular, it is noticeable that certain time periods have been strikingly more faithful in their preservation of Epicurean texts, and of the writings of their observers. We are inundated with a supply of source materials from within a relatively narrow-time band- indeed just one generation- from around 90-40 BCE. The provenance of these sources is also noteworthy for they have jumped across the Adriatic from their traditional homeland in Greece, to be found upon the Italian peninsula. The date and location should be immediately recognizable to anyone even vaguely familiar with classical antiquity, and should reveal that we are now dealing with texts originating from that most notable era of classical antiquity- the late Roman Republic.

II: Epicurean Populists

As we have seen, the foundational assumptions that underpinned the Epicurean worldview were relatively egalitarian in composition; with the philosophy believing itself to be pertinent and, potentially, accessible to a broad range of people. However, there was no Epicurean dalliance with popularism. The same bars that prevented the active propagation of philosophy to an open audience in many of the other philosophical Schools were also assumed by the Epicureans.[1] However, around the

---

[1] Perhaps it is useful to compare ancient philosophers with their physician counterparts. Both shared a view which saw their therapeutic services as both relevant and accessible to, potentially, every person. This is also a particular interesting comparison given the substantial overlap between ancient medicine and philosophy; see P. J. Van der Eijk (2005), or consider the types of problems that exercised the ancient physician Galen in his writings. Scholarship does not take the fact that there was no apparent supply of doctors freely giving their services to be somehow violating their views on the potential relevance of it. Understanding ancient

second century B.C.E a new character starts to make a presence in the writings of Epicureans and of their observers- that of the Epicurean populist who adapts the School's literature to suit their audience's ability to understand, or tolerate sustained intellectual tussling.

III: Philonides

The first person to tarred with this motif was Philonides of Laodicea (c. 200-130 BCE)- an Epicurean philosopher in the court of the Seleucid monarchs Antiochus IV Epiphanes (215-164BCE) and Demetrius I Soter c. 187 BCE - 150 BCE).[2]

Philonides did not appear to share the fate of some of his colleagues, and been gathered to be little more than a token, or trophy, philosopher- an apparently frequent position that the satirist Lucian could exploit.[3] Apart from his function as a philosopher Philonides appears to have become a trusted member of the court in his own right- even having honorary decrees issued in his name. But aside from his unusual political influence, we need to note that Philonides' career as an Epicurean-at-court was a historically irregular position. Any free space for a teacher of philosophy in the royal entourages of antiquity was more commonly filled by Platonic or Stoic scholars.[4] This phenomenon would, for example, lead the Epicurean inclined poet Horace to jibe at later Stoics for their texts' position to be 'nestling on cushions of silk'- i.e. to be the possessions of the rich.[5] Epicureanism, though, was always an unlikely candidate for upper-class approval. Their convictions were, after all, stridently antithetical to the prevailing ideals of success, honour, and public

---

intellectual mission should though, largely, be understood, I argue to us with such ease. Again our acquaintance with the practices and outworking of modern missionary impulses is distortive. For a study on the differing concepts of valuing others and seeing solidarity in antiquity see R. M. Rosen and I. Sluiter (2010).

[2] On Philonides' position and life at the court see DeWitt (1954) 53-54; W. R. Knorr (1985) 275-276; and D. Gera (1999).

[3] See his '*On Salaried Posts in Great Houses*', and its sequel '*The Fisherman*'; '*Philosophies for Sale*'; '*Apology for Philosophies for Sale*'; '*The Ignorant Book Collector*'.

[4] See a partial overview on this phenomenon by J. G. Gammie (1990) 151.

[5] Horace, *Ep.*8.15-16.

recognition that underpinned classical elite's life, although not all in the ruling classes disapproved of an Epicurean presence, as we see in the next chapter. This was though not an unqualified fissure from the Epicurean perspective; Epicurus allowed for just such a position when he permitted the Epicurean to 'pay court to a king'.[6] Yet, it is hard to conceive of the situation in which Philonides might have claimed to fulfil the overriding caveat that this provision was be only exercised 'if need be.'

In any case, Philonides appears to have behaved like any other court philosophers of the age, and he busied himself in the collection of books and in the setting up of a school.[7] We have little information on the later, other than its existence, although we do know he engaged the services of other Epicurean teachers to aid the school in whatever it structured its activities around.[8]

While Philonides' position as an Epicurean court philosopher gives us perhaps our first indication that he was not particularly disposed to let the more practical strictures of the School impede the effective propagation of Epicurean tenets, it was the charge of popularism that was laid out against him that is most pertinent for this study's purpose. Philodemus, a later Epicurean writer, remarked that Philonides: 'made epitomes of the letters of Epicurus, Metrodorus, Polyaenus, and Hermarchus, valuable for lazy youths and [epitomes] of letters arranged according to subject matter.'[9] Though we cannot verify Philodemus' analysis of his work (Philonides'

---

[6] *D.L.*10.120.

[7] Philonides is recorded to have left his books for his companions (γνώριμοι), PHerc. 1044 fr. 30.3-8. On the use of γνώριμοι for pupils in a philosophical school see Glucker (1978) 127-133, 182. C. F. Whitley (1979) 165, claims that Philonides set up a 'centre of Epicurean studies'. DeWitt (1954) 53, perhaps goes too far when he argues that Philonides made 'Antioch an outstanding centre of Epicureanism,' and he certainly does when he avers, 54, that the term Christian that was applied to the members of the early Church in Antioch, as recounted at *Acts* 26:11, 'to distinguish them from the disciples of Epicurus'.

[8] On this, and the use of καθηγητής to describe them see Glucker (1978) 131-132.

[9] *Vita Philon.* Col. 14.3-10, (ed. Gallo 1975 68); found in Snyder (2000) 242, n.64.: ʻΠεπόηκεν [sc. Φιλόνιδες] δέ νέοις ἀργοῖς ὠφελίμους καὶ [τ]ὰς ἐπιτομ ὰ ς τ[ῶν] ἐπιστολῶν τῶν Ἐπικούρ[ου], Μητροδώρου, Πολυαίνου, Ἑρμάρχου

writings are no longer extant), the shortening of the founders' *letters*, which were already abridged introductions to the philosophy, strongly supports the idea that his proposed audience was students desiring of only the slightest of introductions to the philosophy. His intention behind making this provision can only be, I suggest, attributed to a popularizing effort; either to help spread and expedite the philosophy's reach to those of little ability, or to help obtain the philosophical allegiance of those who had little toleration for complex philosophical speculation. Given though Philonides' vocation within/around the Seleucid royal court, it should be presumed that it was the former type of student that was being served. This would also correspond with Philodemus' analysis that they catered for 'lazy' (ἀργέω) youths.

IV: Demetrius Lacon

A similar, but more expansive critique comes from a contemporary of Philonides, the Epicurean scholar Demetrius Lacon (c. mid-late second century BCE),[10] who wrote against:

> those aiming for brevity, who try to accommodate the tradition of
> philosophical positions to the ability of their students- going almost so
> far as to exchange the standard introductory material. with this
> teaching,- show […] pleasing to the general crowd and doing
> this…Therefore, is not allowed […] for anyone to corrupt both the
> tradition about these things and the standard introductory material, for it
> is customary to do both in the service of brevity[11]

καὶ τῶν σ[υνηγ]μέ[νω]ν κατὰ γένος ἐπιστολῶν...' D. Obbink (1996) 76, also notes this passage.

[10] On Demetrius' life see V. Tsouna (2008) 1.

[11] *PHerc.* 1012 col. 51.1-21 (ed. Puglia (1988) 175); trans. Snyder (2000) 55:

ευντομί [ας γὰρ στο]χαζόμενοι καὶ κα[τὰ τὴν τῶ]ν ἀκουόντων διδαχὴν ἁρμοζόμενοι πολ[λάκις καὶ] τὴν παράδοσιν [τῶν δοκο]ύντων-ὅσον [δ]οὐ [καὶ τὴν εἰ]σαγωγήν ἐνα[λλάττοντε]ς ταύτηι τῆ[ι διδαχῆι- δει]κνύουσιν καὶ [..........] ʽἀρέσκοντε[ς τοῖς πολλο]ῖς τοῦτο ποιοῦ[ντες...] Ν τις ΕΙΚΑ[......]Ρ[......]Ο σύντομον [......] ΕΙ[......].Διόπερ ο[ὐδενὶ] μὲν ἔξεστιν ΕΥΝΕΚ[....]ΚΑ [...κ]ακοῦν καὶ την τούτων παράδοσιν καὶ τὴν

The topics upon which Demetrius' discussion centre around should be recognizable to us from our deliberation over Epicurean epitomes. Here though, the subjects of the nature, and extent of brevity used in Epicurean epitomes, and their potential utility as introductions/propagation pieces for Epicureanism to outsiders is being discussed in an inter-Epicurean dispute.

The resonance with Philodemus' complaint above, that epitomes were being modified for the sake of audience desire, is apparent. The repetition of this concern should indicate to us that this simplifying effort was not just the work of a few anomalous reneges, but that this is suggestive of a more broader, deep-seated, dynamic at work within the School. Here we see, from Demetrius' perception, that the traditional custom of epitomizing the philosophy, and the accommodation that this offered to those less familiar with Epicureanism, has been abused by a number of Epicureans adherents as a tool for a grand missionary endeavour. Unlike the antagonists of Demetrius' critique though they were not employing brevity to reach those surrounding a royal court, but attempting to woo the crowd [πολλοῖς] by it, and almost supplanting the standard introductions to the philosophy by doing so. [12] For Demetrius this was too far, and indeed a damaging move.[13] While Epicurus might have normalized the use of epitomes to expedite the affiliate members' introduction to the School's tenets, and to help those just beginning their pedagogical journey through Epicureanism, this was an entirely different proposition than structuring the philosophy to reach those largely ignorant of, and not already disposed towards Epicureanism. [14] We should

---

[εἰσαγωγήν, σ]υντομίας [γάρ χάριν εἴωθε]ν ἄμφω π[οιεῖν, ἀκόλου]θα δὲ διά μ[ε]ικ[ρῶν τᾶς καθηγ]ητής απο[δείζει...'

[12] The word used here, εἰσαγωγή, in such a context usually designate an epitome or presentation (oral or written) on the elementary features of a position/teaching. See for example see *Arr. Epict.1.29.23*, Epiphanius, *Panarion* 51.6.4; while Plotinus' introduction on defining categories was simply called εἰσαγωγή'.

[13] Demetrius' choice of word to describe the corruption that their work caused, κακοῦν, is a potent one, and is more usually associated with injury or destruction; e.g. see Homer, *Odyssey* 4.754; Herodotus, *Histories*, 3.82.4.

[14] Snyder's (2000) 55, analysis of this passage is that: 'apparently, certain Epicureans who sought to popularize their doctrines among the less educated many

also note that Demetrius' critique does not just inform us on the stance of the teachers, but also on the deportment of their students/audience who were apparently content to accept that adequate philosophical instruction could be gained from such works.[15]

V: Cicero

One of the most valuable commentators on the Epicurean movement during the time of the Late Republic was M. Tullius Cicero (106-43 BCE). Not only is the preservation of the observations of one of Rome's most productive and intellectually astute writers itself a remarkable resource, the time in which he provides this insight is also remarkably providential. Cicero's desire and facility to recount contemporary philosophical moods and movements occurred at a formative, and innovative time for Epicurean School- and philosophy in general.

The Mediterranean world was now, broadly, under the suzerainty of the Roman Empire, and its Hellenized east found itself now found itself to be the possession of a culture that had consistently shown hostility, disdain, or just plain misunderstanding towards their intellectual exports (such as rhetoric and philosophy).[16] Yet, there was little need for concern over their continuation; Romans were becoming aware of their inadequacies in such areas, and had started to adopt them as their own.[17] Yet this wasn't a

have taken Epicurus' habit of epitomizing as a warrant for extensive simplification, more than Demetrius would allow.'

[15] It is also important to note that Demetrius still recognized these popularizing teachers as being part of the Epicurean School. They were still for him working with the tradition [*paradosis*] of the School.

[16] Pliny the Elder, *Naturalis Historia* 29.13–14, records Cato the Elder's comments on the presence of Greek philosophers' and their speech, that: 'In due course, my son Marcus, I shall explain what I found out in Athens about these Greeks, and demonstrate what advantage there may be in looking into their writings (while not taking them too seriously). They are a worthless and unruly tribe. Take this as a prophecy when those folk give us their writings they will corrupt everything.' It says much for the coming adoption of philosophy in Rome that his grandson, Cato the Younger, otherwise a stalwart observer of Roman traditions, was to become a notable Stoic devotee.

[17] See Anderson (1993), Swain (1998),Whitmarsh (2004) (2005).

simple transfer for philosophy. Rome's lack of its own philosophical heritage provided few contours for the Schools' to orient themselves to, and the lack of established conventions or customs of who, and how philosophy was to be done forced, (or allowed) philosophy to adapt in new, perhaps surprising, ways. Though we cannot elaborate on this here in any great depth, it is notable that philosophy became increasingly detached from their mother schools back on mainland Greece,[18] that syncretistic pushes exerted themselves over philosophy, and that once the vigilance against philosophy in Roman society was (largely) discarded philosophy reached new levels of popularity that it had not managed to sustain in its previous host societies/cultures. But this broadening of appeal for philosophy also thinned it out. Knowledge of philosophy across society became an aspirational commodity, and many in Roman society would be looking for ways to expedite their induction into philosophy. This shift in the practice of philosophy was then perfectly suited, almost pre-empted by, to the innovations of the Epicureans simplifiers, and it is to Cicero's account of them, and Epicureanism, that we now will turn to.[19]

Cicero seemed to have had conflicting impulses towards Epicureanism. As a Hellenophile, Cicero could not but admire one of Greece's main philosophical exports. He attended, as we noted, Epicurean lectures in Athens during his youth. He could also find enough worth with the philosophy to credit its expositors such as the Epicurean poet Lucretius with having 'flashes of genius',[20] and to compliment Philodemus as being 'excellent and learned'.[21] Additionally, a sizeable number of Cicero's friends and senatorial colleagues were adherents of Epicureanism, or were at least sympathetic to its teachings. His constant epistolary companion, Atticus, was one such Epicurean adherent-

---

[18] See T. Bénatouïl (2009) 418.

[19] Cicero's accounts on Epicurean popularizers appear to be, largely, the only source that has informed scholarship on the existence of the Epicurean simplifiers. Almost all acknowledgements though on this movement are fleeting- often no more than just one sentence remarks. See this phenomenon demonstrated in: R. E. Latham, J. Godwin (1994) xxiii; Honderich (1995) 257; M. P. O. Morford (2000) 93; C. Brittain (2006) 117; A. W. Lintott (2008) 329; W. E. Leonard (2008) 55.

[20] 'lumina ingeni', Letters to Quintus 2.10.

[21] De Finibus II.119.

to name but one important example.[22] Cicero would also, interestingly, find himself petitioning the Roman aristocrat Gaius Memmius to save the remains of Epicurus' Garden from their planned destruction; thereby giving Cicero a claim to potentially have had a hand in continuing the longevity that Epicurus desired for his Garden estate- a concern expressed in his will.[23]

Cicero though was also a caustic critic of the philosophy. He found its intellectual pronouncements to be ideologically, and functionally, opposed to the proper motivations of the political state- something of defining importance to Cicero's life and career. The following critique portrays some sense of the urgency and passion with which Cicero's drive against Epicureanism could express itself:

'Against these [Epicurean teachings] we must struggle 'with foot and horse,' as the saying is, if our intention is to guard and maintain morality'.[24]

In relation to Cicero's stance towards Epicureanism, it is therefore his identity as fierce and unyielding critic of Epicureanism that he is chiefly remembered for. His displeasure at the doctrines and presence of Epicureanism also means that, despite his writings' indisputable ability to cast a light back into dim records of the Epicureans' past, his polemical intent and bias against the Epicurean School must always be borne in mind when we consider his observations.

The first text for our interest reads:

'Your [Epicurean] school indeed has the quite wonderful argument that there is no need for a would-be philosopher to be well read…Now you [Epicureans] are scouring every little village to gather in your collection of worthy but hardly erudite supporters.[25]

---

[22] For a detailed analysis of Atticus' affiliation with the School see C. J. Castner (1990) 57-61.

[23] *D.L.* 10.16-21

[24] *De Officiis* III 116, trans. E. Adler (2003) 45. See another passionate critique at *Tusc.* 3.50-51.

[25] Cicero *De fin 2*.12, Reynolds L. D. (1998) 42, trans. from A. Julia (2001) 70.

The two main themes of Cicero's accusation tally with the concerns outlined by Demetrius. Both claim to witness a drive in Epicureanism to promote their philosophy broadly, and to achieve their success by relegating the study of the books of the School to only of secondary, or rather negligible, concern. Both critics are also scathing about the audience they were trying to attract. On Cicero's account of their hailing from 'little villages', we need hardly entertain the notion that he was intending to convey that this movement had a prevalence, or pushing concern, to reach the more rural quarters of Italy for their cause. Cicero is instead appealing to the collective image that would have been evoked in his readers' minds by such a picture: that of the simple, though noble, rural inhabitant, implicitly contrasted with the sophisticated and educated urbanites.[26] This image was a well-worn one, but it was also a defining one. The word Latin word *urbanitas*, for example, carried the key connotations of sophistication and was, as Matthew Leigh noted: 'at heart the quality of being Roman'.[27] Perhaps no better quip can be provided to highlight this image potency and relevance in Cicero's account than to quote Horace's famous observation that: 'captive Greece made a captive of her rough invader [Rome] *and brought the arts to rustic Latium.*'[28] Cicero is communicating to his readers that this group was

---

[26] E.g. see the introduction to Dio's *Euboian Oration* and Cicero's comments at *De Orators* 3.12.44 and De *Natura Deorum* 2.74.

[27] M. Leigh (2001) 26.

[28] *Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit, et artes intulit agresti Latio;* Horace, *Ep.*, 2.1.156. Philip Hardie (2001) 134: 'In Latin the terms denoting city-dweller (*urbanus*) and country-dweller (*rusticus*) had long been used in an evaluative sense to distinguish the civilized, urbane, and stylish in both life and literature from the boorish, rustic, and gauche.' As P. Garnsey and R. P. Saller (1987) 119, noted, educated Romans were 'contemptuous of the masses as 'rustics', who were unacquainted with the sophisticated culture of urban life', while R. MacMullen (1974) 15, comments that the city dwellers thought the rural inhabitants were: 'clumsy, brutish, ignorant, uncivilized'. Meeks (1983) 1-16, noted the importance of cities as the place for new ideas and intellectual movements, deciding to term his study into early Christian as 'The First *Urban* Christians'. This is not to say that all those outside of urban centres where viewed entire with derision. Their simple ways had an uncorrupted charm about them, especially for those involved in an

seeking out, or receiving their main reception from, the simple and intellectually unconnected; or, to borrow a phrase from Demetrius' account, the general crowd.[29] This would also presumably explain their audiences' lack of finding a dissonance between accepting that philosophy was something that could be obtainable without having to be well-read. Such actions imply, as Cicero puts it, that these people were only 'would be philosophers' (*philosophus futurus sit*).

 Additionally, it is important to remind ourselves that the polemical insults which Roman authors could use were well known commodities, and they utilized a familiar store of images and themes. The accusation of popularizing and simplifying intellectual positions for the poor or uneducated though was not, as far as I am aware, a recognizable frequent part of this repertoire.

In his *Tusculan Disputations* Cicero supplies for his reader the name of the progenitor of this popular and unsophisticated variety of Epicureanism; a certain C. Amafinius, who:

> by the publication of this work had the crowd's interest stirred and they
> flocked to the teaching he advocated in preference to any other, whether
> because it was so easy to grasp [*sive quod erat cognitu perfacilis*], or
> because of the seductive allurements of pleasure, or possibly also

---

increasingly corrupt and fractious political world. Cicero will often use the image of the simple rustic as K. Lomas (2006) 155, notes for: 'a rhetorical point- to be innocent, moral and virtuous rustics in contrast to the urban cynicism and corruption of his opponents.'

[29] A passing, but perceptive, observation on what this movement tells us for Epicurean understanding of mission comes from E. Adler (2003) 46: 'According to Cicero, this professedly most apolitical or anti-political of philosophies was actually the only philosophical school that had the character of a political movement, proselytizing among the unlearned and seeking the allegiance of the multitude. 'When he calls the Epicureans *plebeii philosphi* (*Tusc*. 1 55), he appears to mean not only that they are the plebs of the philosophers but also that they are the philosophers of the plebs, the philosophers who address the multitude and use them to take possession of all Italy.'

because, in the absence of any better teaching, they clung to what there was. After Amafinius again there came a number of imitators of the same system and by their writings took all Italy by storm: and whereas the chief proof that their arguments are stated without precision lies in the fact that their doctrine is so easily grasped and so much to the taste of the unlearned, they imagine this to be its main support.[30]

It is important to note first of all, especially as this does not seem to have been ruminated upon elsewhere, that for Cicero this movement was a later development within the Epicurean School.[31] This movement was not part of the normative or traditional practice of the Epicurean philosophy for Cicero, but rather an offshoot from it. Cicero's attack was restricted to pierce a certain innovation within the Epicurean School, and was not raised as a foil to attack Epicureanism generally.

Secondly, we see that the reason that is again supplied for their motivation was the promotion of Epicurean beliefs to the crowd; here narrowed down specifically to the uneducated (*indoctis*) crowd. Cicero tells us that so strong was their conviction on the worth of their simplying efforts, that there was no sense of inadequacy or insufficiency on their part. Instead, this movement reacted with surprising assurance; arguing that the chief argument was their writings' lack of precision (*quodque maximum argumentum est non illa subtiliter*) and the accessibility (*facile ediscantur*) that this offered. If reducing complexity at the expense of relaying precise philosophical dogma increases the comprehension, and therefore the appeal and

---

[30] *Tusculan Disputations* 4.3.7, M. Pohlenz (1965) 342-343, trans. J. E. King (1966) 335. See also Cicero's statement at *Tusc.* II.III.7.8: 'a class of men, who wish to be called philosophers (*qui se philosophos appellari volunt)* and are said to be responsible for quite a number of books in Latin…the writers claim to be indifferent to the definition, arrangement, precision and style I forbear to read what affords no pleasure'; trans. J. E. King (1966) 153, 155. This would appear to be another reference to this group of Epicureans. G. Reave (1985) 188, evidently believed so and confidently introduced this section to his readers as being one made 'in regards to Amafinius'.

[31] The exact dates of Amafinius' mission is not known. Most likely he operated during the century before Cicero. See Reale (1985) 118.

conversion to Epicureanism, then so be it. While Cicero's critique at this juncture might appear to be an obvious use of Roman polemical hyperbole, trying to point out the desensitized nature of your opponents to their vices, there is, as we will see later, perhaps evidence that such an attitude and argument existed.

Cicero also suggests to his reader that this movement was a popular one, commenting that this faction had taken 'all Italy by storm'(*Italiam totam occupaverunt*).[32] Though this is obviously an exaggerated statement, the theme of an Epicurean broad popularity was not countercultural enough to stop a similar sentiment being expressed by Diogenes Laertius who, in his opening discussion of the School, noted that there were 'so many [Epicureans] in number that they could hardly be counted by whole cities'.[33]

Cicero returns to describe this movement in another passage:

> You see, of course, since you've studied the same philosophical doctrines
> yourself, that we can't be like Amafinius or Rabirius. *They argue*
> *unsystematically* about what's under their noses in *ordinary language*;
> they have no *recourse to definition, division, or formal argument*; and, in
> fact, they consider the systematic study of speech and argument worthless.
> For our part, however, we must obey the precepts of the dialecticians and
> the orators as if they were laws, since our school thinks that dialectic and
> rhetoric are virtues. So we have no choice but to use novel terms- and
> since, as I said, the learned will prefer to find these from the Greeks, *while*

---

[32] C. E. Glad (1995) 103, briefly touches on this and states that: 'Although Cicero's claim that the Epicureans 'took Italy by storm' is an exaggeration, it reflects an awareness of a growing Epicurean presence during the last years of the Roman republic…The Epicureans were not closed within the confines of a private club a new evaluation of φιλοδοξία and public engagement emerged.' Furthermore, J. D. Minyard (1985) 18, fleetingly notes the significance that this and opines that: 'The existence of so may [sic] "parlor Epicureans" attracted to the Garden, but scarcely schoolmen, let alone true practitioners outside the rhetoric of their own salons, is a good indication of the degree to which the doctrine had penetrated the contemporary Roman world of ideas as both fashion and challenge.'

[33] *D.L.* 10.9, H. S. Long (1964) 498, trans. R. D. Hicks (1972) 537.

*the unlearned won't accept them even from us, the whole enterprise is
pointless*. As for physics, if I approved Epicurus', that is Democritus'
views, I could of course write about it as plainly (*plane*) as Amafinius.
Once you've done away with active causes, what's impressive about
writing about the chance interactions of corpuscles (his term for 'atoms')?
You know our physics: since it is constituted by an active cause and the
matter that active cause shapes and forms, it can't be done without
geometry. But how is anyone going to be able to do that in Latin? What
terms will they express it in, and who are they going to get to understand
it?[34]

Taunting Epicureans for their idiosyncratic manner of expressing and structuring their
ideas was a rather stale trope that was played out against them by their critics; but the
arraignment that they used simplicity and inadequate language was novel.[35] The
phrase 'ordinary/everyday language' (*vulgari sermone*) strongly implies that the
target for these writings were people who were content to read texts that expressed
themselves without sophistication or finesse-[36] so most likely those with, at most,
only middling literacy and reading skills.[37] This wasn't just a passing slight either.

---

[34] *Acad* 1.5, O. Pohlenz (1961) 2-3, trans C. Brittain (2006) 88-89.

[35] So T. Reinhardt, in J. N.Adams, M. Lapidge and T. Reinhardt (2006) 160, noted
that: 'the later charge [that Epicureans did not observe the rules of proper
philosophical method] is a charge which was levelled against Epicureans throughout
antiquity and is thus not peculiar to the early Roman Epicureans...The former to the
linguistic presentation, applies to the Roman Epicureans only.'

[36] On Cicero's uses of *vulagri* to describe that to do with the multitude or crowd see
Fin 3.1.3; *de Or* 1.58.248; *Off* 116.52. Although not on this passage J. N. Adams, M.
Lapidge and T. Reinhardt, (2006) 7, argued that 'Cic. *Fam.* 9.21.1, where the use of
'everyday words' is equated with 'plebeian language'- language usually excluded
from higher literary genres except to achieve a special effect'.

[37] Though I can find agreement with Reale's statement that, (1985) 188,'the books of
Epicurean philosophy of Amafinius and his followers had a fundamentally
popularizing character...and probably were limited to ethics or at least they pointed
out chiefly the practical aspects of Epicureanism…the movement of Amafinius must

Again Cicero's criticism intended to highlight the uneducated, and unsuitability of this group's intellectual efforts. The correct deportment in expressing your position was very important, and the type of style employed can reveal a lot about someone's erudition and intended audience. [38]

Geert Roskam though has attempted to challenge the conclusion that Cicero is recounting an effort of a popularizing form of Epicureanism. He has posited that Cicero's statements on the Epicurean attempts to reach a broad audience should be, although not stated by Cicero, narrowed down to only include the Roman 'intellectual upper-classes.'[39] This group, Roskam argues, still had little exposure to philosophy, and would therefore be receptive towards receiving simplified texts to help them begin their adjustment to the world of philosophical ideas. Roskam argues that Cicero's accounts can therefore:

> be explained by the vacuum concerning Greek philosophy which existed
> in Rome at that time [cf. Cicero, Tusc 4.6], rather than by the low
> intellectual level of its intended reader. Indeed, when Amafinius wished to
> fill this vacuum, he did not immediately compose the most specialised,
> technical, and abstract philosophical treatises, but preferred to write a
> general, easy, and concrete introduction to the most fundamental

---

have been *essentially popular* in character' (emphasis his).' I find his suggestion that 'they were, that is, meant for an illiterate public' a move not implied by the text. J. E. King (1927) 152, n.1 also made a similar claim.

[38] Producing sophisticated texts for the intellectual upper-classes was a quite demanding process, and would restrict it almost entirely to those who shared their educational background. W. A. Johnson (2010) 147, highlights Fronto's comments (ad. M. Caes. 4.3.6) that 'those "who give ourselves to serving the ears of the learned (*docti*),"....must continue to pursue "with utmost care" his study into "even the fine minutiae" of what constitutes proper Latin.' C. S. Kraus (2001) 42, also observed that 'correct Latinity and especially appropriate Latinity, was a mark of breeding, judgement and status.' Cicero at *De Or* 1.187 describes education as being the 'understanding of references, interpretation of words and rules of pronunciation', trans. T .J. Morgan (1998) 161.

[39] Roskam (2007) 84.

principles. In short, the uncomplicated character of Amafinius' work should neither be explained by his purpose of popularizing Epicurean philosophy, nor by his lack of erudition, but by justified pedagogical concerns.[40]

We need to first note that even granting Roskam's suggestion as a valid one, this is still an endeavour that should find its classification as a missionary effort. The formulation and production of texts to evangelize a certain class of people, though more restricted in numbers than an open propagation, is still a missionary enterprise. Roskam though does not attempt to re-evaluate his previously assumed position that Epicureans abstained from the desire, and practice, of spreading their philosophy. He seems to hold that by suggesting that a more limited number of adherents was being flirted with, that this can sidestep having to modify his understanding of the Epicurean disposition towards mission. Again I think that the warnings raised at the start of this study on the dangers of leaving unchecked the propensity to take the modern understanding of a missionary movement/attitude to define how we categorize and limit mission in antiquity should be restated again.

   Additionally, I do not see the connection that Roskam evidently makes between noting that Amafinius' movement produced uncomplicated introductions to Epicurean philosophy, and the support that he suggests ('indeed…') that this gives him to narrow his understanding of their audience down to just a intellectual upper-class one. Such texts could be employed- and arguably more effectively- to gain the attention of less educated and more broader section of Italian society. But, in any case, Roskam's rather quick treatment with the Epicurean popularizers runs into several problems.

   First of all, Roskam seems to be unaware of Demetrius' deliberations over a similar popularizing effort, and upon the resonance and substantiation that this insight brings both to Cicero's accounts, but also to our interpretation of them.

   The flow and depiction of Cicero's narrative also seems to outmanoeuvre the suggestion that upper-class intellectuals were being described, or that Cicero's readers would have picked up this cue. Cicero, after all, describes their audience as being part of the 'the crowd'; originating from little villages; lacking in erudition;

---

[40] Roskam (2007) 84-85.

gathering towards the philosophy out of naivety and inexperience; and being content with texts that simplified their contents and expression.[41] Only by stripping away the description of Cicero's account, and leaving the broadest narrative framework behind (that there were simplified texts produced by Epicureans, which people were responding to) can such an interpretation, I suggest, be sustained. It is therefore noticeable that Roskam does not quote any of the passages of Cicero above for his readers, but only cites the references to them- and doesn't include *De Fin* II.12.

Focusing on this suggestion though allows us to elaborate on the importance of the choice of Latin by Amafinius and his followers to be the vehicle of expression for their movement, and what this can tell us about the intentions that lay behind their mission.[42] The use of Latin is indicative of an intention to target a less educated reader. The intellectual upper-classes at the time of Cicero's account, as we will see, had developed the custom that turned into a reflex, to get their intellectual discussion from Greeks sources. [43] This was especially true with that most Greek of commodities- philosophy.[44] In fact, it was this interplay between the educated/less-

---

[41] See also T. D. Hill (2004) 60, who highlights the contrast that Cicero makes at *De. Part. Orat.* 90 between the 'uneducated' [*indocti*] and uncultured majority [*agrestes mutli*]; with the well-educated [*humani*] and refined good men [*politi boni*]. He also, 60, notes Cicero's belief that the art of governing and philosophizing was an activity of the elite, best left of out the hands of the masses. We can also point to Cicero's comments, *Tusc.* II 1.4:'For philosophy is content with few judges and of set purpose on her side avoids the multitude', trans. J. E. King (1966) 149.

[42] Again this is a feature of the movement that Roskam does not reference.

[43] As E. Rawson (1988) 44, notes the Roman elite's preference to consult Greek texts, observing that 'Vitruvius even remarks that readers can pursue their special interests, if they wish, in the works of the numerous Greek mathematicians and scientists that he lists, and Varro tells his wife that she can do the same with various Greek works on agriculture'. On the widespread familiarity and use of Greek amongst the Roman elite see from the mid second century B.C.E see Simon Swain (1998) for detailed study, as well as Bruno Rochette's recent study (2010) on the history of bilingualism in the Roman elite.

[44] W. E. Leonard (2008) 71, when talking about the context in which the contemporary Epicurean didactic poet Lucretius wrote, he observes that: 'The little

erudite Romans, and the desire for Greek/Latin for philosophy that was the *purpose* for Cicero's introduction of Amanfinus and Rabirius. Although, if precedent can be blamed, Roskam can hardly be faulted for omitting to provide this context, for I have not come across a discussion that does attempt to draw out the context of this section. Immediately before introducing our Epicurean simplifiers Cicero comments:

> I have come to the following view about people from our country who are seriously interested in it [philosophy]. If they have had the benefit of an education in Greek learning, they will read works in Greek rather than in our own language. But if they have taken against Greek arts or disciplines [i.e. the art and practice of philosophy], they won't care for Latin works, either, since the latter can't be understood without knowledge from the Greeks. As a result I have been unwilling to write works that would neither be intelligible to the unlearned nor something the learned cared to read (*itaque ea nolui scribere quae nec indocti intellegere possent nec docti legere curarent*).[45]

Cicero's comments on Amanfinius and Rabirius are interspaced between the above section and the observation that 'the learned will prefer to find these [philosophical truths] from the Greeks, while the unlearned won't accept them even from us, the whole enterprise [or writing philosophy in Latin] is pointless.'[46] We are meant to see that Roman intellectuals such as Cicero who might aspire to translate Greek philosophy into their mother tongue and language of the state, are left in a catch-22 that restrains any such intentions forming into actions.

---

evidence we have does not point to notable ignorance or horror of this system among the class of readers whom Lucretius wrote. Ever since the days of the Scipionic circle, after the Third Punic War, philosophy, *technical philosophy*, was, with literature and history and politics, one of the subjects of educated discourse' (emphasis mine).

[45] *Acad* 1.4, O. Pohlenz (1961) 2, trans. C. Brittain (2006) 88.

[46] *Acad* 1.5, O. Pohlenz (1961) 5, trans. C. Brittain (2006) 88; *Quae docti, ut dixi, a Graecis petere malent, indocti ne a nobis quidem accipient, ut frustra omnis suscipiatur labor.*

First, the convention for educated Romans was to receive their philosophy from Greek sources[47] and, secondly, any attempt to begin to convert the elites' allegiance to Latin philosophy faced a roadblock for Latin did not yet have the semantic range to express philosophical ideas and debates. Latin philosophical texts would always, largely, be regarded as deficient imitations by the educated or 'serious-minded'(*studio tenerentur)* until a large-scale Latinization of philosophy (or perhaps more accurately the philosophization of Latin) was undertaken.[48] The use of Latin indicates then that the simplifiers were targeting a less educated audience.

If we retain our interest in this passage further we come across another insight to help us understand both the context of this passage further, and in understanding the more general boundaries that the Roman educated elite would have enacted in their minds when efforts to simplify and distribute philosophy were mooted. In Varros' response to hearten Cicero in his attempt to begin to transport Greek philosophy into Latin, he comments:

> But I send friends who are interested in it [philosophy] to Greece, that is, I
> tell them go to the Greeks so they can draw these doctrines from their

---

[47] C. Brittain (2006) x, introduces Cicero's problem as being that: 'the intellectual elite was effectively bilingual in Latin and Greek, and philosophy was regarded as something best done in Greek.' J. Konig (2010) 27 observes that: 'Very few Greek authors of this period [mid to late second century CE] admit to knowledge of Latin language or Latin literature, presumably because it was not prestigious to do so- the real renown came from their status as representatives of specifically Greek traditions.'

[48] While this was a genuine problem that Cicero is recounting, it is obviously one that Cicero believed could be overcome, after all this conversation is the preface for just such an attempt. See also Varro's optimism that people will read Latin philosophy at *Acad* 1.10. On the simplifier's use of Latin G. Snyder (2000) 219, remarks that: 'the jump to Latin is highly significant: most people who enjoyed the leisure necessary to pursue their philosophy were probably skilled enough in Greek to read their philosophy in the original tongue. Coupled with the use of simplified reading materials, this suggests that Epicureans may have been extending their appeals to less literate members of society.'

original sources rather than pursuing derivative work in Latin. What I have done, however, to the extent that I could- and I'm not great admirer of my books- is to make known to our people subjects no one had yet taught and for which sources weren't available for interested people to consult…even in my *Satires*- the imitation (not translation) of Menippus I spiced up with a dash of humour- there's a good deal of profound philosophy in the mix, and quite a bit of dialectical language. I enticed less learned people into reading these parts by a dose of wit, which made them more easily understood. And in my laudatory *Portraits*, and especially in the introductions to my *Antiquities*, I tried to write in a philosophical way.[49]

Varro, or least in Cicero' characterization of him, was attempting to introduce philosophy to a broad audience by interjecting philosophical themes into more popular genres of Latin literature; but, as Varro labours, he was not attempting to translate philosophical truths in these works- but merely *imitate* them (*imitati, non interpretati*). Cicero immediately replies in agreement that Varro had: 'introduc[ed] the rudiments of philosophy at many points in a way that suffices to stimulate interest, although it is too slight to give instruction.'[50] So what does this mean? Reducing philosophical ideas to expedite their spread amongst a potentially broad audience was not abhorrent; but as Cicero's account twice seeks to makes clear, and in contrast to the example that prefaced this discussion, his work was not pretending to function as something that it was not. Teachings that simplified and flattened out the precision of philosophy should not mask their insufficiencies to their audiences, or fool them into thinking that they had received adequate knowledge from them to have received a philosophical education. This was, in part, the problem with the Epicurean simplifiers.

VI: Philodemus

---

[49] *Acad.* 1.8, trans. C. Brittain (2006) 90.

[50] *Acad* 1.9., O. Pohlenz (1961) 4, trans. C. Brittani (2006) 90; *philosophiamque multis locis incohasti, ad impellendum satis, ad edocendum parum*.

We return now to consider Philodemus' writings, this time looking at the events he describes that were contemporaneous to him that give us a further insight into the Epicurean popularisers. Though Philodemus was one of the most gifted expositors of Epicurean principles, his writings could frequently give recourse to document the more every-day features behind the Epicurean life, and inform us about his envisaged ideal for an Epicurean community; which we will explore in more depth later.

Here though we will look at the contents of his extant work that resonates with the discussion above. H. Gregory Snyder has, in particular, drawn our attention to several surviving portions of Philodemus' work that point to the inclusion of members from varying educational backgrounds within his circle, and also to passages where Philodemus challenges the growing misuse of epitomes, and their usurpation of Epicurean books.

On the inclusion of those less-well educated members, Philodemus notes that:

'Those who have been fortunate to have had good Greek training and […] who have been educated in basic studies, such people are able to understand the books. Having thought deeply about these things their entire lives [perhaps even] having composed similar treatises themselves, with all the acuity that requires, they can at the very least teach people how to uncover obscurities of one kind or another. But those who serve as manual labourers or are ill-bred, who have not learned letters[…]'[51]

The model that Philodemus visualizes for the Epicurean school is one where it intuitively provides training for those who present themselves to it who lacked a good Greek education, or who were not experienced in the handling of philosophical

---

[51] PHerc 1005 col.16.1-1 (ed. Angeli 1988: 183-4): trans. Snyder (2000) 58.
δ[ύ]ναν[ται] μ[ὲν] τοῖς [β]υβλίοις παρακολουθεῖν οἱ καὶ τετυχότες ἀγωγῆς Ἕλλησι καὶ [ο]ὐ [Πέρσαις] πρεπούσης καὶπαι[δευθέ]ντες ἐν μ[α]θήμασι, δι[δά]σκουσι καὶ [τ]ὰ τῶν ἐπιτετηδευκότων ἀσάφειαν ἐζευρίσκειν καὶ ὁμοειδῆ γ᾽, εἰ μηδέν ἕτερον, ἐκ παιδίου μέχρι γήρως φιλοσοφήσαντες καὶ τοσαῦτα καὶ τοιαῦτα ταῖς ἀκριβείαις συντεθεικότες. Ο[ἱ] δέ δουλεύσαντες ἐργατικῶς ἤ ἀνάγωγοι καὶ γράμματα μὴ μαθόντες [- - -.᾽

texts.[52] Unfortunately the rest of Philodemus' thought is no longer extant and it is not clear what further action(s) might have been mooted to help those most removed from the skills needed to understand philosophical methodology- here classed as manual labourers and illiterates. We might suppose that Philodemus was forced to concede that their lack of pedagogical background was too great, and would prevent them from studying Epicurean philosophy. Another text by Philodemus that was not noted by Snyder, though where he argues that even an illiterate slave has enough innate sense to understand epitomes,[53] can be used to augment the above erosion. This short pronouncement by Philodemus does much to clarify his mind's disposition on the accessibility and profitability of the philosophy to reach those lacking even the rudiments of educational training. Yet, whether those who lacked even the basics of literacy would be expected to progress and become practised at handling the full treatises, is not stated. However, taking Philodemus' anticipation of the provision of training for this end, and the resolution of the sources that we will look at below on the necessity of progression beyond epitomes, this would have been Philodemus' expectation- whether they could though is another matter we will look at below.

Though we will discuss the broader context of Philodemus' work and life later on, it would be remiss at this juncture not to inform our discussion by noting the intellectual and elite context of his life and vocation; specifically noting his employment by the well-connected G. Calpurnius Piso, who among other things was the father-in-law of Julius Caesar. We cannot then, I suggest, account for the origin of Philodemus' rather egalitarian disposition other than concluding its existence to be dependent upon his acceptance and imbuing of an Epicurean worldview, which sought to accommodate those of even middling or negligible education within their communities.[54]

---

[52] Snyder (2000) 59, call them 'less-well educated members of the group'.

[53] PHerc. 1005 17.6-9.

[54] This is in contrast to the sentiments raised in Gellius, *Attic Nights, praef.* 19; and Lucian *Satires* 26, that instruct those readers without proper learning to forgo reading their works. This general disregard for their work to engage with a broader audience be seen in also be seen, as C. S. Kraus (2000) 68, observed: 'Catullus and the New Poets claimed that their poetry was for a small and sophisticated audience of friends: everyone else ('the mob') will have to be

In another passage Philodemus comments that:

> and with respect to the reading and the writing of books, it is possible to understand them, and not to consider that type of literature which requires explanation as something worthless. With proper training, people can be taught to recognize as incompetent a writer who exceeds the proper length, or who omits necessary subjects, or someone who conducts himself in a manner unbecoming to the argument at hand.[55]

This section allows us to overhear an argument that was being played out within the Epicurean School at this time; a clash between those who believed that the in-depth and academically focused texts of the School were worthless, and those more intellectually focused scholars, such as Philodemus, who endeavoured to defend their continued use within the School. The opponent(s), or perhaps just the general viewpoint, that Philodemus was positioning himself against was not just apathetic or disinterested on the use of texts- they were *opposed* ideologically to them. This was, then, not the more muted and generous image that Roskam has attempted to couch the Epicurean simplifiers in- a group that merely tried to provide the Roman elite with the stepping stones to understand philosophy. They did not prevaricate in their minds before deciding to make a concession to forgo some of their teachings'

---

satisfied with 'long-winded Antimachus.' T. Morgan (1998) 248, also comments on Quintilian that: 'everybody who is not educated according to Quintilian, must be either subhuman or at any rate not fully realized as a human being' and, 258, 'The majority (of uneducated people) are dismissed without comment, presumably as wholly insignificant. The implication is that these [Graeco-Roman] authors regarded the majority of the population as intellectually insignificant, an idea which might have large implications for their theories of government.'

[55] PHerc. 1005 col.1.20.2-15, Snyder (2000) 59: 'καὶ ἐπ[ὶ] τῆς ἀναγώσεως καὶ γ[ραφῆς] τῶν βυβλίων [τούτοις δύ]ναται παρακολουθεῖν καί τό γένος [ο]ὐκ ἔχει πο[νη]ρὸν ὑπ ἐρ οὐ ἄ[λλα] συνδιαστελοῦμεν ὥσθ᾽ ὁ τὴν συμμετρίαν ὑπερβαίνων ἢ κολούων κἂν τοῖς ἱκανοῖς οὐ προσηκόντως ἀναστρεφόμενος [ἐζ]εταθήσεται κατὰ τὴν ὅλην ἀγωγήν οὐκ ἐγκα[θή]μενος.'

complexities. Their work might be more simple explications of Epicurean philosophy, but it was, they believed, all the more coherent for it. What advantage was there after all in making Epicureanism unintelligible to so many people it could help, laced as it was with so many complexities, and why bother sustaining a cache of esoteric texts that demanded that their readers undertake years of training before they could appreciate their scholastic, obscure contents? Their passionate belief in the panacea of Epicureanism combined with this muted form of anti-intellectualism to create a philosophical movement that both obviated and challenged the use of its intellectual tomes. This discussion does, of course seem to go a long way in verifying Cicero's statement about the early pioneers of Epicureanism in Italy who were not only content with the simplicity of their works, but took an pride in this as the main verification of their efforts.

Philodemus' response to them also prompted him to provide us with an insight into his ideas of how true mission and membership within the Epicurean School should be understood. Philodemus defended the use of books in the School by arguing that they *were* in fact accessible expressions of Epicurean ideals. All that was needed was to provide those who were sympathetic to the philosophy with the skills to unpack and value their contents. This was important for it should reveal to scholarship that though the two sides eventually branched off from each other, they shared a common starting point. Both had the same firm intention of making Epicurean tenets accessible to those who proved receptive to it, regardless of their educational background. It was how they interpreted and reacted to this impulse where the divergence and disruption within the School was created. The populist approach was based on the belief that the best method was to simplify and redact the philosophy, making it more palatable and comprehensible for a broad audience. The solution for the more academically, and conventionally, grounded Epicurean devotees was to provide coaching for individuals who wanted to learn the doctrinal structure that lay behind the vision of Epicureanism. While the popularizers were immutably set upon bringing the teaching *down* to a lower level to make it more understandable, Philodemus was no less committed to bring the less able student *up* to the level necessitated by the texts' complexities. This was then a balancing act that was characteristically Epicurean. A similar problem in the Platonic School, for example, need hardly have been imaged as emerging.

In another passage though Philodemus argues that:

the most shocking thing among the majority of Epicureans is this, namely
their unpardonable inactivity with respect to books[56]

It is perhaps here where Philodemus' frustration at having to wrestle with this position is best seen. It is, in fact, shocking to Philodemus that the Epicurean movement can maintain so many (apparently the majority) of its members who retracted from becoming dependent upon the School's books. We have no way of verifying Philonides' depiction of the demographical makeup of those who shared such a conviction. Such realities can only be relayed to us by those who were present at the time to witness, especially through their daily interactions with those in the movement. Their popularity within the School would explain though why they were a recurring theme in our sources, and would also align with Cicero's account that the simplified form of Epicureanism took Italy by storm.

Two more comments by Philodemus discuss this movement. In the following source Philodemus issued the dictum that:

one need only adapt the majority of what has been said to such {kinds of} frankness. It is hard work for those who are handling {a topic} by way of an epitome ἐπιτομικός to be precise about every kind, in the manner of those who dispose of each {kind} exhaustively.[57]

---

[56] PHerc. 1005 col. 14.13-18 (ed. Angeli 1988:180) trans. G. Snyder (2000) 57: 'οχετλιώτατο[ν] ἐκεῖν᾽ ἐστίν [ἐ]πὶ τοῖς πλείοσιν τῶν ᾽Επικουρείων ὅ τὴν ἐν τοῖς βυβλίοις ἀνενεργησίαν ἀπαραίτητον ποιεῖ.᾽ A similar critique can be found at PHerc. 182 col 45:16.22 (trans. Snyder (2000) 57): 'It is amazing that those who wish to be accurate readers and interpreters of the books of the School, having ignored these things [quotes from the Founders] as well as the things already mentioned, consequently have 'proven that according to the Founders, the wise man will be subject to anger.'

[57] *On Frank Speech* Fr 88 Col. VIIb, ἐφαρμόσαι γάρ μόνον δεῖ τὰ πλεῖστα τῶν εἰρημένων ταῖς τοιαύ[τ]αις παρρησίαις, ἔργον δὲ τοὺς ἐπιτομικῶς ἐξεργαζομένους πᾶν εἶδος ἀκρειβοῦν ὡς τοὺς ἀνελλιπῶ[ς] ἕκαστον ἐξοικονο[μ]οῦντας. Texts and translation from D. Konstan, D. Clay and C. E. Glad (1998) 191.

The claims of this text should be more than familiar to us from our previous deliberations; so much so that we might at first glance think that it need only be cited to reveal its existence. However, this text further clarifies Philodemus' attitude towards the use of epitomes in the daily pedagogical life of an Epicurean school.

Philodemus has now attempted to manoeuvre the argument against the simplifiers by challenging their key claim on the profitability of their works. He does this by arguing that their suggested reliance upon epitomes actually makes it *harder* for the pupil. The student who has chosen to monopolize their attention only with the summaries of the School is *not* well-equipped, or appreciative of the depth of Epicurean doctrines. In creating this position though Philodemus is staking out a position that runs contrary to the spirit of Epicurus' expressed enthusiasm on the sufficiency of his epitomes- noted in chapter three. While Epicurus tried, somewhat repetitively, to convince his readers of the benefits of using epitomes, Philodemus had to trim back the confidence towards epitomes that the founder had tried to instil.

So can we claim that a fissure has opened up between Epicurus and Philodemus over the use of epitomes? Yes and no. Despite Epicurus' unabashed pronouncements on the usefulness of epitomes, there were, as we noted, only three anticipated audiences for the epitomes envisaged in Epicurus' *Letters;* the beginner, the affiliated member, and the advanced member. The beginner was presumed by Epicurus to progress naturally to contemplate the full works, and only the affiliated member was not pictured as naturally expanding his/her study further. However, the affiliate member would have understood that to become a serious student of the philosophy, instead of being considered as just a well disposed, ancillary member of the circle, they would need to repeat the beginner's depicted journey, and follow their studies through to the full texts. Epicurus' confident statements on the use of epitomes were expressed within the context of a time where there was little expectation that his full works, of which there were many,[58] were liable to be replaced. This mindset/barrier could though no longer be presumed to exist by the time of Philodemus' writings where, according to our sources, there was a notable change in emphasis and the books of the School were starting to hold little defining

---

[58] Diogenes Laertius records that he wrote over three hundred rolls of works, *D.L.* 10.26.

importance for many Epicureans' conception of their philosophical life. [59] Therefore, later generations of Epicureans who remained faithful to the teaching and practice of the School and its texts had to try to bring their students' attention back onto the books of the School. To do so they found themselves being forced to forgo some of the founder's enthusiasm for the genre and begin to make more subdued remarks on their use.

It is surprising, given the evident discord that the misuse of epitomes was causing within the School, that Philodemus did not try to remove their influence altogether and propose their prohibition. Though some other rival Schools of the time were tentatively starting to use epitomes, mainly for therapeutic purposes,[60] the epitome was not part of the normative part of training in ancient philosophy. Why not then seek to abandon their use and consider them as superfluous? If students who were lacking in understanding could be trained to understand the expansive works of the philosophy wouldn't that suffice? Given the legitimacy of these points, it is perhaps then the best testament to the foundational role that epitomes had in Epicureanism that despite Philodemus' efforts to wean people away from their misplaced devotion to epitomes, he in fact continued their presence by *producing* a number of them.[61] Epitomes, though troublesome, continued then to be central to Epicurean pedagogical and therapeutic practices.

Finally, Philodemus expands our knowledge of the phenomenon of Epicurean simplifiers one more time; remarking that:

> the person who is familiar with us, and has even been instructed by us,
> and who claims to have actually read various writings and entire
> treatises, even if he gets a few things right, has only learned extracts,
> and is unacquainted with the particulars of the system. And as for

---

[59] This also cuts against understanding Graeco-Roman philosophers as being inseparable from their books, and depending upon them for their identity, as D. Sedley (1989) has proposed.

[60] For example see Philo's description on the use of epitomes for therapeutic results at *Spec. Leg.* 160-161.

[61] On his *Epitome on Conduct and Character, from the Lectures of Zeno,* see PHerc.182.

> those things which he is required to do, he looks to summaries, being
> as they say, like someone who navigates from a book.[62]

This text reveals something that is significant, and also perhaps unexpected. Though the primary themes of this source are again repetitions of previous concerns, Philodemus' ire in this passage is not being directed towards the members of a group of simple, Latinizing, populists, who advocated that their students should consider books worthless. Philodemus' criticism is instead being issued to members within, or known, to his circle who were expected and trained to use the full texts. Indeed, given their apparent acquaintance with Philodemus, we might suppose that some of his epitomes were being used to feign familiarity with his own work! [63] This should lead us to caution ourselves slightly in presenting a dual nature of Epicureanism too far. Although doubtless correct as a high abstract description of two competing emphases, we need to retract from making it a dichotomy.It was rather, I suggest, a spectrum, where advocates of at the end of the lines of extremity faced each other in opposition, but away from these ideological edges there was a certain amount of blurring. The compulsion and chance to misuse epitomes as an easier introduction to philosophy was a pan-Epicurean phenomenon.

But before we automatically assume that this shows that a more elite, educated circle was prone to such compromises, we should recall Philodemus' apparent efforts to include those of less than sufficient education into the School. We might reasonably suggest then that those who required training before they could start to comprehend the philosophy were the students most likely to find it hard to cease their reliance upon epitomes, and to begin exploiting the overview that epitomes provided to give them a pretend acquaintance with the full arguments.[64]

---

[62] *PHerc.* 1005 col 4.2-18 (ed. Angeli 1988: 172-3) trans. Snyder (2000) 55.

[63] The fluidity of terms we see used throughout Epicurean sources for summaries/epitomes is notable. The word Philodemus uses here, κεφαλαία, usually describes the summarizing of chief, or most salient points of an argument or position, usually done vocally- e.g. Plato *Gorgias* 453a.

[64] Perhaps, without attempting to stray into areas more properly covered by sociological studies, we can perhaps helpfully compare this ancient slide to depend

VII: Conclusion

It is perhaps this chapter where my confidence on the possibility to reconstruct parts of the Epicurean movement's history is best demonstrated. The effort and character of popularization in Epicureanism can be seen from a number of corroborating sources, and although many details about the movement and its successes remain hidden, we have, I believe, managed to create a fairly detailed picture. And this is a picture that casts a striking image; revealing what is surely one of antiquity's most distinctive philosophical movements. Further research must be given though to help further place their efforts in the larger context of the time; particularly looking at the rise of epitomes in rival Schools at this time, which has not yet been explored- or acknowledged- by contemporary scholarship. There is also potential, I believe, to set the Epicurean simplifiers' efforts more within the larger context of Roman attitudes to philosophy; and to understand their relationship *vis-a-vis* the activities of more missionary oriented philosophical movements such as Cynicism.

A final thought though must also be given. The reasons for their existence, although found within, I argue, the larger cultural movements of the time, but even that does not fully account for their existence. They were not, as we have seen, opportunists who saw an opening to distribute a more superficial form of philosophy to trump their rivals in a war of numbers. Furthermore, if we conceive of philosophy as being an intellectual pursuit, where one's chief goal is to understand as much as one can, then we can understand why scholarship has, largely, ignored and seen this group as something odd, and surely only of marginal concern. Reminding ourselves though that philosophy was chiefly a system that was given to serve therapeutic ends,

---

upon summary with a similar modern concern. In M. Platt's article (1991) 444, which details the teaching of American youth in the 1990's, he relays an story, interestingly also one from classical antiquity, that: "They (the pupils) come to class, most of them, without having done the assigned reading. They are not ashamed to admit it. The other day in class one blurted out, 'Do you realize there are no *Cliff Notes* on Thucydides?' Summaries, especially if a normative part of education, can start to become an expected, and unashamed, substitute for fuller texts.

we can see how a slimmed down version that was believed to provide the same results, was not something so completely unexpected.

Chapter Five: Roman Elites and Epicureanism

I: Introduction

Once they shed their traditional aversion to philosophy, the elite of Roman society soon started themselves to become students of philosophy, and spend their youth in Athens studying the various philosophical schools- indeed philosophical fluency became a requisite part of being considered educated/cultured.[1] It is to the Romans' interaction with philosophy that English, as A. A. Long observed,[2] owes its derivation of words such as 'virtue', 'substance', 'essence', 'element', 'principle', 'matter', 'form', 'potential', 'accident', (etc...). But when we think upon the specific gradations which the Roman elite channelled their newly found enthusiasm for philosophy down, we might first of all think of Stoicism; perhaps recalling that still some of the best known characters from Roman history were (at least credited with being) Stoics- namely Cato, Seneca[3], and Marcus Aurelius.[4] Platonic (and Peripatetic) philosophy's continued appeal under Roman suzerainty too is well-known, with our familiarity again being aided by well-known luminaries, such as Apuleius and

---

[1] See for example, Philostratus' record, *Vita Apoll.* 3.43, of Damis' response to being asked why he followed the neo-Pythagorean philosopher Apollonius (c.a. 1st century C.E.) as being: 'so that I might seem a wise man instead of an ignorant peasant, an educated man rather than a barbarian.' D. N. Sedley (2003) 186, observes that: 'It is difficult to think of a society where members of the upper class were more generally aware of philosophy than seems to have been the case in Imperial Rome. For some of them, indeed, that awareness will have been quite superficial and scarcely positive, but every senator or knight would have known the difference between the values of a Stoic and those of an Epicurean.' This is somewhat a generalization though for tensions could still arise between Roman society and philosophy. We should remind ourselves that Domitian would twice (perhaps for political reasons) expel philosophers from Rome- see Dio Cassius 67.13.3-4. G. Woolf (1994) 120-121, observes that: 'Roman responses to Hellenism consisted of a complex and partly incoherent mixture of adoption, adaptation, imitation, rejection and prohibition.'

[2] A. A. Long (2003) 185.

[3] Although see M. Erler (2009) 49-50 on Seneca's selective use of Epicureanism.

[4] On the Roman Stoics see G. Reydams-Schils (2006).

Plotinus- as well as by seeing its demonstrable influence on writers as diffuse in opinions as, Philo of Alexandria, Celsus, and Ammonius Saccus, for example.

Our response to Epicureanism though is, I suggest, often different. For a variety of reasons, to refer to 'Roman Epicureanism' seems odd, perhaps even oxymoronic. Epicureanism lacks those well-known personalities from Roman history that grasp our attention,[5] and its foundational tenets seem to grate against everything we know about the Romans' cherished ideas of the worth of pursuing political distinction.[6] In combination with this, the lack of Epicurean prominence in later Roman society (though certainly not existence[7]), and the frequent polemical salvos that Imperial writers issued against its doctrines, tends to confirm the notion that Epicureanism could only ever have been an intellectual curiosity, existing out on the penumbra of educated Roman society.[8] But despite Epicureanism's later, relative, obscurity,[9] and

---

[5] In part though this is an artificial situation caused by the belatedness and difficulties scholars have had in publishing and translating Epicurean works. Only recently have works of Philodemus been translated, e.g. his '*On Frank Criticism*' by Kostan, Clay, Glad (1998), and his '*On Poems*' (book 1 and 2) R. Janko (2003). More sections/books are forthcoming- see the important work of the 'Philodemus Project' of *UCLA* in overturning this lacuna.

[6] L. Morgan (2000) 342: 'The Roman male was trained from the cradle to value, and struggle for, military and political success and the status that went with them. Status meant being recognized for one's achievements: success without visibility was worthless.' Seneca's notes the difference between Epicureanism and Stoicism on this matter, remarking, *De Otio* 3.2, that 'Epicurus says: "The Sage will not engage in public affairs except in an emergency." Zeno says "He will engage in public affairs unless something prevents him.', trans. J . W. Basore (1970) 185.

[7] For a brief discussion on the presence of Epicureans during the Imperial age see M. Erler (2009) 59, G. Reale (1985) 49.

[8] W. Dodinger (1992) 108, for examples introduces Epicureanism as being perceived as 'alien' and 'devious' to Roman society, stating that, 109, Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* was a 'isolated flash of lighting' and that 'the Roman mind in the end remained stubbornly resistant to Epicureanism.'

[9] N. W. DeWitt (1954) 345, put it that Epicureanism in later centuries of the Roman Empire was 'forced to become anonymous.'

the apparent incompatibility of its doctrines to mesh with Roman mores, the early pioneers of Epicureanism to Roman Italy turned this seemingly most ill-fitted of host cultures to become one of the most receptive and eager audiences in the Schools' history.[10] My purpose here will be to try to assemble and analyze the available sources we have on Roman Epicureanism to establish the breadth of its popularity, and to see what the character of its constituents can tell us about Roman Epicureanism and its mission.[11]

II: Overview of Roman Epicureanism

The first recorded confluence between the Roman upper-class and Epicureanism occurred decades before the philosophy integrated itself into Roman society, but just as Rome's attention was beginning to fall upon Greece's borders.[12] In the late 2nd century BCE a young Roman named Titus Albucius, pre-empting the later habit of Roman aristocrats youths, spent time studying in Athens and, at least in sympathy, became an Epicurean.[13] Despite his Epicurean leanings he returned to a career in Roman politics, but when his station as Propraetor of Sardinia ended in political exile he was prompted to returned to Athens. On his return he seems to have devoted himself entirely to the pursuit of (Epicurean) philosophy; becoming, according to Cicero, 'learned' (*doctus*),[14] and to even have considered himself a Greek rather than

---

[10] D. Sedley (2009) 44: 'The age of Cicero is remarkable, and probably unique, for the degree of sheer civic respectability that Epicureanism had acquired. In an environment in which it was commonplace for members of the Roman elite to adopt a Greek philosophical allegiance, Epicureanism had come to be as widely an unabashedly espoused as any other creed.' While M. Erler (2009) 48, argues that: 'In the first two century AD, Epicurus' teachings were obviously also attractive for many of those who belonged to the city elites'. See also T. D. Hill (2004) 73.

[11] I do not claim this list to be exhaustive. The following section does in particular utilize Castner's (1990) prosopography of Roman Epicureans, as well as considering including epigraphical evidence that she did not include.

[12] On the dubious history recorded by Plutarch (*Pyrrh.* 20) on the Romans' meeting Epicureans during the Pyrrhic war see J. G. F. Powell (1995) 12.

[13] See *Pis.* 92 and *Bru.t* 131.

[14] *Brut.* 131, *De Fin*. 1.3.8-9.

Roman.[15] His enforced emigration and the cessation of his political career though seems, to my mind, to explain his zeal for Epicureanism; a philosophy which would, after all, reassure him that the life from which he was now eschewed from was in reality a meaningless diversion. Albucius' example is notable therefore not just because he represents the first recorded Roman aristocratic Epicurean, but because his life shows, I believe, two points on the spectrum of Roman allegiance to Epicureanism. That is a commitment that ranged from professing adherence/sympathy for the philosophy, but without letting it counter their desire to expedite their political careers, and to those devotees who seemed to concede to its strictures in full. Appreciating this dynamic is key, I believe, before we can properly judge Epicurean membership.

The first recorded occurrence of Epicureanism on the Roman mainland, and one of the first recorded sustained presences of philosophy there at all, comes from two fleeting references to two Epicureans philosophers, Alceus and Philiscus, who were, (for reason that are not entirely clear) expelled from Rome in either 173 or 154 BCE.[16] Apart from this brief insight, our available sources on Roman Epicureanism from this time remain silent, but when they re-emerge two to three generations later we find Epicureanism ensconced in a remarkably different environment, having been quietly assimilated into the intellectual discourse of elite of Roman society.

Without assembling a list of noted Roman Epicureans though, we would have been able to deduce their non-inconsequential presence on the generation of the Late-Republic based solely upon observing the efforts that their detractors enlisted to counter them. Again we might recall Cicero voiced a mission statement to fight 'horse and foot' against them,[17] and we can view the literary efforts that he expended for this purpose.[18] No such campaign, we should remember, was mounted against philosophies equally ill-equipped to match with traditional Roman, and Ciceronian,

---

[15] *Tus* 5.37.108

[16] *Aul. Gell.* 15.11 and *Ath.* 547. For a discussion on dating this event see G. Reale (1985) 187.

[17] *De Off*. III 116.

[18] As M. Morford (2002) 99, observes Cicero spent the first dialogue of *De Finibus* arguing against Epicurean ethics, and against its theology in the first book of his *De Natura Deorum.*

conceptions of public life, such as Cynicism.[19] Cicero himself talks about the numbers and ardour of the Epicureans that he found surrounded him; noting that:

> to me the highest good seems to be in the soul, to him in the body; to me in virtue, to him in pleasure. But they're the ones who fight about it and appeal to the loyalty of their neighbours- and indeed there are many who promptly come flying to their side. (*Et illi pugnant et quidem vicinorum fidem implorant; multi autem sunt qui statim convolent)* I'm the one who says that I'm not making a to-do about it; I'll take for done what they have done. For what is at issue here?...these people carry on with too much anger.[20]

 We don't though just have to rely just upon weighing the success of Epicureanism based just upon pronouncements of their popularity; we can witness their attendance on Cicero's life first-hand through his, and others', writings. For example, Cicero can name Epicurean devotes such as the Roman knight Lucius Saufeius,[21] the senator Gaius Velleius,[22] and the equestrian Lucius Saufeius.[23] Plutarch can also informs us about another Epicurean from the time, a certain Statilius, a friend of Brutus and Cato, who fought against Casear.[24]

   Aside from these examples, we can, perhaps surprisingly, note that some of Cicero's closet friends and confidants were receptive to Epicurean advances. Indeed,

---

[19] On Cynicism's more limited presence in Rome, and the Romans' response to it see M. Griffin (1996) 190-204.

[20] *Tusc.* III 50-51, trans. E. Adler (2003) 46. Cicero could also argue that Epicurus was; 'A famous philosopher, influential not just in Greece and Italy, but throughout all barbarian lands' (*Philosophus nobilis, a quo non solum Graecia et Italia sed etiam omnis barbaria commota est*) *De Fin.* II 49. At *De Nat. D.* 1.33.93, Cicero again records his perception that Epicureans were characteristically argumentative, but sensitive to critique.

[21] *Fam.* 15.16, 19, *Att*. 1.3.1, 15.

[22] *De Nat D.* 1.58.21.

[23] *Att.* 7.1 records his life spent in devotion to Epicureanism.

[24] *Brut.* 12.

only the Epicurean inclined L. Calpurnius Piso, one of Cicero's main rivals in the Senate, seems to have been an adversary of his.[25] Cicero himself acknowledges this unusual constituency of his friends (given his stance against Epicureanism); acknowledging, through his spokesman Lucillius, that: 'I stand firm against the Epicureans, although I know so many of them and they are such good people and such good friends to each other.'[26] Epicureanism's proximity to Cicero is probably best demonstrated by noting that Cicero's most famous confidant, T. Pomponius Atticus' was one such Epicurean devotee.[27] Cicero's letters also disclose several congenial discussions that he had had with colleagues on the subject of their Epicurean inclinations; see for example his teasing of C. Trebatius for becoming an Epicurean from his stay in Caesar's camp,[28] and his probing of C. Cassius Longinus' Epicureanism.[29]

Significantly we also learn from Cicero that Patro, who was to become the head of the Epicurean school at Athens, spent time in Rome, apparently mingling with the Roman elite. On him Cicero recorded that:

> With Patro the Epicurean I am in complete accord, except that I
> emphatically disagree with him in philosophy. But only in the early days

---

[25] See Cicero's *In Pisonem*. On his Epicureanism see *Pis* 42,92.

[26] *Acad* 2.115: 's*ustinuero Epicureos, tot meos familiares, tam bonos, tam inter se amantes viros.*

[27] See *De. Leg.* 1.21; 3.1 For a discussion on his Epicureanism see C. J. Castner (1990) 58-60.

[28] *Fam* 7.12.on this see J. G. F. Powell (1999) 28.

[29] See *Fam* 15.18.1. See L. Canfora (2007) 300. Cassius was also in Caesar's camp, *Brut* 36-37, and along with Stailius, this seem to indicate a significant presence of Epicureans in the Caesarian camp. It would seem to be such examples that lead R. A. Belliotti (2009) 108, to state that: 'Epicureanism was a popular philosophy among Caesar's soliders'. The example though of those fighting on the Republican side, such as Torquatus and Statilius, though demonstrates that Epicureanism transcended the political divide.

at Rome, while he showed deference to you and all your friends, did he cultivate my acquaintance in a special degree.[30]

His praise for the character of Epicureans does not stop there. Indeed, based upon Cicero's numerous polemical excursions against the materialistic ideology, what is perhaps more unanticipated is Cicero's capacity to give unqualified praise of the erudition and learning of the Epicureans known to him. He can, for example, compliment his chosen spokesman/interlocutor for Epicureanism in his *De Finibus,* L. Manlius Torquatus- a praetor and who fell under the Pompeian cause in African in 46 BCE- as being 'a man of profound learning.'[31] Moreover, in a discussion with L. Papirius Paetus, Cicero also remarks on their Epicurean acquaintance, M. Fabius Gallus, that:

> Truly I love this man, not only because of his very high degree of honesty and unusual propriety, but also because I am accustomed to use his excellent work in these disputes which I have with your-drinking partners the Epicureans (*combibonibus Epicuri<i>s*).[32]

Epicureanism then, even for a critic like Cicero, had integrated itself into the vibrant exchange of ideas, and was a topic for intellectual sparring with friends.[33] Cicero's association with this group probably also provided him with the amusing anecdote

---

[30]*Fam* 13.2, W. S. Watts (1982) 409, trans. R. Giovanni (1990) 37; '*Cum Patrone Epicurio mihi omnia sunt, nisi quod in philosophia vehementer ab eo dissentio. sed et initio Romae, cum te quoque et tuos omnis observabat, me coluit in primis et nuper.*'

[31] *De Fin.* 1.5.13: *'homine omni doctrina erudito'.*

[32] *Fam* 7.26, W. S. Watts (1982) 221, trans. C. J. Castner (1990) 43.

[33] Cicero also records another dialogue on Epicureanism between members of the Roman upper-class. At *De. Nat. De.* 1.6.15 he tells us that: 'when the topic of the immortal gods was made the subject of a very searching and thorough discussion at the house of my friend Gaius Cotta. It was the Latin Festival, and I had come at Cotta's express invitation to pay him a visit. I found him sitting in an alcove, engaged in debate with Gaius Velleius, a member of the Senate, accounted the by Epicureans as their chief Roman adherent at the time.'

that after a lecture in Campania on Epicureanism had ceased, the unnamed Epicurean lecturer gave time for questions to be asked by the audience; to which Paetus responded not by voicing an intellectual question as the lecturer had intended, but by asking who was to take the scholar to dinner?[34] While this scene offers a further insight into the manner in which Epicureanism dispersed, it perhaps also highlights the more easy attitude that Romans could display towards engaging with the complexities of philosophy, and the benefit they saw in merely associating with philosophy and its teachers.[35]

The lecture's setting though on Campanian soil is also noticeable for linking it with a noticeable concentration of references to Epicureanism in the region.[36] It was in the Campanian area that the Epicurean scholars Philodemus and Siro had their residences, and, as John D'Arms notes, where both the Epicureans Fabius and Cassius had farms or villas.[37] Another example of an Epicurean who settled in the region is seen from a first century BCE tomb from Neapolis, from a source that is curiously absent from most modern discussions on Roman Epicureanism, which states that:

<div align="center">

Gaius Stallius Hauranus watches this place

a member of the Epicurean chorus that flourishes in joy[38]

</div>

While this source provides us with another named Roman adherent of Epicureanism, and it openly testifies to the vibrancy of this community, its relevance for our purpose is also apparent when we note that Stallius had only previously been known through

---

[34] *Fam.* 9.25.2.

[35] *Fam* 9.26.1. Paetus' devotion to Epicureanism though might be apparent in that he is one of the few late-republican Roman elite Epicureans known to us who we cannot also assign a political career to. C. J. Castner, (1990) 43, argued that: '[t]he lack of career date indicates that Paetus may have practiced a sincere Epicurean withdrawal from politics.'

[36] D. Obbink (2007) 38, calls the region 'a hotbed of Epicureanism.'

[37] J. D'Arms (1970) 66.

[38] *Stallius Gaius has sedes Hauranus tuetur ex Epicureio gaudiuigente choro. CLE* 961= *CIL* 10.2971= *ILS* 7781, cited in Obbink (2007) 38. Obbink, 38, also discusses Stallius' life and business achievements.

his business and euergetistical, and not intellectual, efforts.[39] While apparently sincere in their pronouncement of adherence, and in the case of Stallius this was a defining identity, their commitment to Epicureanism was usually found to be placed serving an ancillary role to their business/political identity.

Another example of an Epicurean settler in Campania was M. Pompilius Andronicus, of whom Suetonius records that he was:

> a native of Syria,[and] because of his devotion to the Epicurean sect was considered somewhat indolent in his work as a grammarian and not qualified to conduct a school. Therefore, realizing that he was held in less esteem at Rome, not only than Antonius Gnipho, but than others of even less ability, he moved to Cumae, where he led a life of leisure and wrote many books. But he was so poor and needy that he was forced to sell that admirable little works of his, "Criticisms of the Annals of Ennius" to someone or other for sixteen thousand sesterces.[40]

If we accept Suetonius' account as accurate then we have evidence, that isn't always properly recognized,[41] of another full-time Epicurean scholar, like Philodemus and Siro, in Campania engaged in the production of many works (*otio vixit et multa composuit*).[42] Suetonius' summation of the reasons prompting his move from the bustling capital of Rome to Cumae, though appears to be, I suggest, based upon reading his familiarity with the later repudiation of Epicureanism in Roman society back to explain this move as a sign of being shunned. We have seen that the region was a hub of Epicurean activity, and his move was probably the calculation that the area was the most viable location to espouse Epicureanism to an interested and educated audience. We should also note that it was to this region where the Roman

---

[39] See K. J. Rigsby's (2008) study on his background and career.

[40] *Gram*. 8, R. L. Roth (1907) 260, Ludwig. *C. Suetoni Tranquilli Quae Supersunt Omnia.* Lipsiae: In Aedibus B. G. Teubneri,trans. C. J. Castner (1990) 56.

[41] The only discussion that I could find, apart from a brief analysis from C. J. Castner (1990) 57, was from R. A. Culpepper (1975) 120.

[42] J. D'Arms (1970) 67, puts his financial difficulties down to his lack of finding a benefactor to (at least sufficiently) support him.

elite would come to engage in intellectual/leisure pursuits, away from their political enterprises at Rome.[43]

III: Why was Roman Epicureanism Successful?

As we have seen, Epicureanism could count upon the, (at least voiced) support of = = a strong base of elite Roman adherents- and their example is all the more revealing when we compare this number to our inability to cite substantial followers of rival philosophies.[44] It wasn't just philosophers; the ubiquity of Epicureanism in Roman society at this time can also be demonstrated from Asclepiades [129/4-40 BCE], a physician from Bithynia who introduced a form of medicine to Rome that was dependent upon Epicurean atomism and materialism.[1] But why was this most apolitical of philosophies successful in attracting the elite that belonged to one of antiquities' most engaged, and politically active, groups?[45] Some scholars have tried to explain their success by connecting it with the larger political narrative of the time.

---

[43] C. Conors (2000) 215, in her article on the provenance elite Roman literature noted that 'the space most closely associated with elite Roman leisure [which included their more academic endeavours] is not at Rome at all, but in luxurious villas dotted along the bay of Naples.'

[44] In his essay on Stoicism in Rome David Sedley (2003) 30, notes that 'By the mid to late first century B.C., Rome had acquire what is probably as strong a claim as any city's to being a hub of Stoic activity...Admittedly, we know of surprisingly few Romans in this period who became Stoics'; and 63: 'Stoicism certainly had a considerable impact on Roman though in the late Republic, although card-carrying Roman Stoics at this date seem relatively few in number.'

[45] Yet we shouldn't image that Epicureanism was entirely removed from the sorts of antipathy that later Romans could more successfully voice. Cicero opined, *Tusc.* 3.51: that no Epicurean would: 'venture to advocate it (their viewpoints) in the Senate, at a public meeting, in front of an army or before the Censors', trans. E. J. King (1966) 287. And, *Tusc* 2.8, that: 'scarcely anyone beyond their adherents take up the works of Epicurus and Metrodorus'- although the people who were amenable to its cause were, as Cicero acknowledges through his writings, large in number. Two generations later though Seneca would comment that he can quote Epicurus' works without being an Epicurean as they are surely public property, *Ep. Ad. L*uc. 8.7.

It is argued that the political wars and proscriptions that scarred the last two generations of the Republic made the anti-political dogma of Epicureanism resonate with the zeitgeist of the age. John D Minyard, along with others, [46] has argued along such lines; opining that:

> The system [Epicureanism] was a coherent and detailed response to the events and developments [of Epicurus' time] which had undermined the world of the polis...It was natural that when Rome passed through similar trials, the Epicurean answer should find its audience, particularly when the dangers and frustrations of active participation in civic life increased so strikingly.

This answer seems to both neatly supply the reason behind the remarkable success of Roman Epicureanism, but also its chronological variance- revealing why the appeal of Epicurean allegiance waned once Roman society bedded down into the Principate. The danger though with answers that seem to offer such a complete and obvious resolution is that their comprehensiveness they often fail to prompt further evaluation or deliberation on their suggestions. This is unfortunate in this case because once a catalogue of Roman Epicureans is assembled its proposed explanatory power starts to look less and less tenable. While some Romans doubtlessly were attracted to Epicureanism because of its apolitical stance, and we can note that Atticus, Saufeius and Paetus did not have political careers that we can point to,[47] this was not the prevailing nature of Roman Epicureanism devotees. Indeed, remarkably most of the Roman Epicureans we know of, and whose existence we judge the success of Epicureanism from, are active politicians- or business men engaged in the politics of euergetism. Indeed a significant number of our sources come from, or record, Roman Epicureans being in dialogue about their Epicureanism while in army camps, fighting in one of antiquity's most politically decisive wars. Most Romans have, as we have

---

[46] J. D. Minyard (1985) 19. The same argument is made in M Goodman (2007) 27, and M. L. Clarke (1968) 20-24, and R. A. Belliotti (2009) 103, quotes him with approval.

[47] Although Saufeius' equestrian rank would, we should note, limit his options for political advance.

insisted, seem to have been content to voice their support for Epicureanism, but compromised on its teachings for their political advance.[48] From what we can tell, members of the educated elite Roman society weren't Epicureans *because* of its strictures against political life, rather they were Epicureanism *despite* of it.[49]

Understanding fully why Romans were attracted to Epicureanism is a topic that will need to be deliberated upon in another study. Yet, it is relevant to consider those factors here that touch upon the types of question that this thesis has sought to answer. For example, it would be remiss, I believe, not to suggest that the less ethereal nature of Epicureanism help to focus the more pragmatic Roman mind upon it. Some have, briefly, attempted to credit its success in this way; for example Mark Morford argued that:

> 'the ideals of pleasure and the superficial intelligibility of the school's
> doctrines were attractive just because they were not austere and

---

[48] C. J. Castner, (1990) 71, perhaps comes to the closest in supporting this view on the popularity of Roman Epicurean when she notes, xv, 71: 'The Romans were pragmatists and politicians, and any philosophy they favoured would only be a superficial and easily discarded allegiance. When it was socially useful, and did not interfere with political goals, they would profess adherence....most aristocratic Roman adherents did not attempt to reconcile their philosophical preferences with their public lives: the two areas were kept apart...Trebatius apparently carried on his legal career untroubled by the discrepancies Cicero pointed out to him'. This seems to have been a characteristic of Roman attitudes towards philosophy. See Cicero's comments, *De Fin* 4.7-16, regarding Stoics lecturers that: '[t]heir petty little syllogisms have all the efficacy of pin-pricks. Even those who accept the conclusions are not converted in their hearts.'

[49] Josephus can also reference, *A. J.* 19.1.32, an Epicurean senator at the time of Caligula who 'had gone through nearly all magistracies' but who was 'in other respects was an Epicurean and therefore was one who practised a life free from business.' See P. M. Swan (1979)

impossible to achieve (as were the ideals of the Stoics) or full of
intellectual subtleties (as were those of the Academics and Peripatetics).'[50]

While such a suggestion will need further elaboration, we can look for support for it
by appealing to the observation from contemporaries such as Cicero, who can, after
discussing the apparent deliberate obscurity of the pre-Socratic philosopher Herclitus'
words, can talk about the:

'obscurity of the subject-matter rather than the words used, as with Plato's
Timaeus. Now, Epicurus, in my view, does not set out to avoid speaking
plainly and directly. Nor is his subject difficult, like the physicist's, or
technical, like the mathematician's. Rather it is a clear and straightforward
topic, widely familiar to the public.'[51]

Another factor that should be integrated into any understanding of the success of Roman
Epicureanism is a more pragmatic one: that the Romans reacted towards the philosophy
that was most attentive in trying to gain, and sustain, their support. Reaching such a
conclusion is, at least in part, hard to deny when we consider the numbers of those who
are recorded to have devoted themselves to explicate Epicureanism on Roman soil. We
can point to proponents such as the exiled philosophers Alceus and Philscus; to
populists teachers and writers such as Amafinius and Rabirius; to the Epicurean scholars
in Campania Philodemus, Siro, and Pompilius; as well to the Epicurean poets Lucretius
and Catullus. This coterie of Italian-based Epicurean teachers and proponents is
remarkable. Indeed, Epicureanism seems to have acted with remarkable prescience in

---

[50] Mark Morford (2002) 99. R. A. Belliotti (2009) 103, also argued that: 'the
doctrines of this school seemed easier to grasp than some of the nuanced renderings
of their competitors; and Epicurean prescriptions were less demanding than austere,
lofty Stoic ideals.'

[51] *De Fin.* 2.15 trans C. Brittain (2006): '*aut cum rerum obscuritas, non verborum,
facit ut non intellegatur oratio, quails est in Timeo Platonis. Epicurus autem, ut
opinor, nec non vult si posit plane et aperte loqui, nec de re obscura, ut physici, aut
artificiosa, ut mathematici, sed de illustri et facili et iam in vulgus pervagata
loquitur.*'

apprehending Rome's nascent, and the advantages that integrating themselves into this new host culture's home ground would bring. Whether consciously or not, Epicureans were not content to merely gain the loyalty of the odd political exile, or visiting Roman aristocratic youth, who visited the Garden, or hope that their writings would passively reach amenable and interested readers. Rather, their reaction was to try to take the philosophy to Rome. This was then no isolated or foreign group, babbling to themselves. Through the concentration of their presence, and through their literature they seem to have sought to deliberately make Epicureanism a Roman philosophy.

But where did this facility and desire to spread geographically emerge from? In part, we can look to the first generation of the Epicurean School and observe that it could maintain schools in Athens, Lampsacus, and Mitylene.[52] It is also significant that when Epicureanism drops out of prominence in Roman elite society, the few extant sources that are left testify to Epicureanism's wide, and unusually wide presence. What is more notable though is that they are found in areas normally not associated with intellectual activity. Epicureans are found , for instance, from Amastris, a town on the Black Sea,[53] to Oenoanda, a mountain town in the centre of modern Turkey.[54] While more work will needlessly need to be done to unpack this dynamic, it does point to an unusual concern, and flexibility, to propagate the philosophy across a wide geographical area.[55] There is

---

[52] B. Frischer's, (1982) 40, remarks upon this network of Epicurean schools in the third century BCE, in contrast with the geographically localized position of the Academy.

[53] See Lucian's *Alexander*.

[54] As seen by Diogenes of Oenoanda's giant epigraph made to extol Epicureanism. See C. W. Chilton (1971).

[55] Discussions on this aspect on Epicureanism are normally brief, but insightful. D. Clay (1984) 489, arguing against those who wish to propose that Epicureanism was opposed to mission, asked the pointed question 'If so, one wonders how Epicureanism was able to establish itself first in Lampsacus and Ionia, then in Athens, and spread to Cyprus...Egypt, take control of all Italy (in Cicero's phrase, *Tusculans* 4.7), penetrate to Oenoanda in the high mountain plans of Lycia and Amastris on the Black Sea?' and, D. Clay (1999) 247: that 'From the point of view of the historian of philosophy, Oenoanda must seem one of the ends of the earth, as would Amastris on the Black Sea. See also Culpepper (1975) 118.

also the opportunity to link this dynamic back to the Epicurean popularizers and their intent to gain the general crowd's attention- even seeking out little villages, and according Cicero's curious comment that Epicureanism was extending even to barbarian lands.[56]

---

[56] *Tusc* III 50-51.

Chapter Six: Lucretius[1]

I: Introduction

The *De Rerum Natura*, a didactic poem outlining Epicurean tenets over 7,400 verses in Latin, is one of the greatest extant literary achievements of the Epicurean School, and has long stood at the forefront of scholarly research into Epicureanism.[2] It also represents one of Roman antiquity's great literary masterpieces- often credited along with Virgil's work for its prowess.[3] But, however much its virtues commend themselves to gain our attention, the life of the author behind it, Lucretius (ca.99-55 BCE),[4] remains something of a mystery to us.[5] Indeed, almost all that we know about his character, motives and concerns, is based upon inferences drawn from the text of his masterpiece.

For some this lacunae in our knowledge about someone who had such obvious and commendable talents has been considered peculiar-even sinister. Some have suggested that this silence indicates that his work was ignored or sidelined-[6] or even

---

[1] Please note that a chapter on the Epicurean scholar Philodemus was prepared, but due to space constraints it could not be included. Although we have explored Philodemus' sense of mission before, other sections of his writings continue to offer us a fascinating insight into his understanding of mission. I have, though, chosen to explore Lucretius' missionary purpose as he was a more significant, and enduring, force in introducing Epicureanism to a Roman audience. Philodemus' writings, despite their incontrovertible significance, did not seem to enjoy the same impact.

[2] See the selection of articles in M. R. Gale (2007) and S. Gillespie and P. Hardie (2007) which provide a good overview of both Lucretian scholarship and on Lucretius' enduring influence.

[3] See A. G. Traver (2002) 230-231.

[4] On the dating of life see B. A. Catto (1998) xii.

[5] We can discount as spurious Jerome's account, *Chron* 44, of Lucretius' love-potion induced insanity and suicide. For an account of this story's spread see L. A. Betensky (1980) 291 n.1.

[6] E.g. M. Hadas (1952) 69, L. MacDonald (1993) 33.

that the poem was the work of a hoaxer.[7] Yet such imaginative excursions are not warranted for the lack of biographical material for eminent Roman writers is not an infrequent, or anomalous, reality, and his work, despite suggestions, did become a document of recourse for successive generation of writers.[8]

II: Lucretius the Missionary

The contents of the *De Rerum Natura* have bestowed upon this unknown author the status of poet and philosopher, but, more interestingly for our concerns-and an area that has receive little sustained attention-[9] occasionally also with the title of 'missionary'.[10] For most scholars the appellation is issued, and considered warranted, because of Lucretius' frequent, and passionate appeals for his readers to assent to his arguments. Such requests are encountered regularly throughout the work; but the following example gives us as a particularly good insight into the effusive and direct tone that he could employ:

---

[7] A. Gerlo (1956).

[8] A similar historical record exists for Catullus- as both M. F. Smith (1986) ix, and Minyard (1985) 74, point out. We can also note that Lucian is only referenced by one contemporary writer- Galen at *Epid.* II.6, and we see a similar silence over Juvenal's life from his contemporaries. Perhaps a more appropriate example though is that of the Epicurean M. Fadius Gallus, who from Cicero's praise and apparent use of his works, *Fam* 7.26.1, 9.25.2, we can judge to have been a commendable exponent of Epicureanism- yet the only record of him to have survived from antiquity come from Cicero's letters .

[9] The notable exception is E. Adler's study (2003) 53-76, of Lucretius' intentions, which we will interact with below. There are though interesting and significant observations found throughout Epicurean scholarship that relate to our discussion. However, the lack of sustained attention or deliberation on this aspect of Lucretius' identity surely explains why Roskam (2007), for example, who denies the Epicurean impulse for mission, didn't feel pressured to engage with the evidence for Lucretius' expressly stated missionary concern- despite having a chapter dedicated to him- 83-99.

[10] Those who refer to Lucretius efforts as being a 'missionary' enterprise one include B. A. Catto (1998) ix; A. Glym-Jones (1999) 199; K. Freudenburg (2005), 155.

Just as men evidently feel that there is a weight on their minds which wearies with its oppression, if so they could also recognize from what causes it comes, and what makes so great a mountain of misery to lie on their hearts, they would not so live their lives as now we generally see them do, each ignorant of what he wants, each seeking always to change his place as if he could drop his burden....he is a sick man that does not know the cause of his complaint; for could he see that well, at once each would throw his business aside and first study to learn the nature of things, since the matter in doubt is not his state for one hour, but for eternity[11]

Appeals like the one above tend to give the impression that we are not so much reading a dispassionate academic discourse, but that we are, page after page, being pursued by an evangelist who is zealously trying to gain our compliance.[12] In fact, Lucretius' repeated recourse to turn his readers' attention onto the practical implications of his message is a distinctive feature of the work- and is concomitant with Epicurus' appeals for the practical end of philosophy to be prominent.[13] Furthering this impression, Lucretius also uses a conversational tone throughout his work; talking directly to the reader, pre-empting their objections, and urging them to

[11] *DRN* 3.1053-1059,1069-1073; C. Bailey (1963) 228-229, 230; trans. W. H. D Rouse and M. F. Smith (1997) 89.

[12] J. D. Minyard (1985) 69, comments that: '[i]n writing the *De Rerum Natura*, Lucretius was not simply unrolling his enthusiasm for a philosophy which, for some unaccounted and on the evidence unaccountable reason, was appealing to him personally...A merely personal interest in Epicureanism, if it perchance led to writing, would have led naturally to the usual kind of Epicurean writing.' G. Müller (2007) 234, meanwhile believes that Lucretius had the 'eagerness of a missionary to proclaim to everybody the one way to salvation'. See also comments by B. A. Catto (1998) ix. It is interesting that the phrase 'missionary zeal' is used to describe Lucretius' efforts occurs throughout Lucretian scholarship. See I. M. Hadas (1952) 73; R. D. Brown (1988) 28; M. R. Gale (1994) 50; B. A. Catto (1998) ix; and P. R. Hardie (2002) 150.

[13] See Porphyry, *Ad Marcellam* 31.

remain focused upon, and reactive to, the arguments that are unfolding before them. [14]
For example, Lucretius could write: 'But you say…,' 'now do you see…','listen
now', 'now you must of necessity confess that…' or 'I beg you apply your mind.' [15]

But who were these interjections being aimed at? The only explicit declaration from
Lucretius on the audience of his work's intention to convince a certain Memmius of
Epicureanism:

> You I crave as a partner in writing the verses, which I essay to fashion on
> the nature of things, for my friend Memmius.[16]

This Memmius is almost certainly the Gaius Memmius introduced to us in Cicero's
letter pleading with him not to destroy the Garden in Athens.[17] While Lucretius'
reason to select him as the student-interlocutor for the poem is not known, the topic,
for our concern, is largely moot. Whatever its opinion on the matter scholarship seems
to be unanimous in recognizing that his presence in the poem is a literary device, and
that behind his characterization stands a wider intended audience.[18] Addressing one
individual while attempting to reach a broad readership was, in fact, a feature of

---

[14] M. Gale (2001) 23: 'it has been estimated that Lucretius addresses us, on average,
once every seventeen lines.'

[15] E.g. *DRN* 1.803; 2.62,.885, 286, 1023; 5.556.

[16] *DRN* 1.24-26 '*te sociam studeo scribendis versibus esse quos ego de rerum
natura pangere conor Memmiadae nostro.*; C. Bailey (1963) 225.

[17] *Fam*, 13.1.

[18] M. Gale (2001) 23, 'Memmius' main role *within the* poem is, so to speak, to
mediate between us and the *praeceptor*, to give the teacher a pupil with whom we can
identify, whose errors we can be warned to avoid and whose progresses we can be
invited to emulate.'- (emphasis Gale's). See also J. Farrell (2001) 42. On *DRN* 3.933-
940. P. Toohey (1996) 97-98 comments that: 'Lucretius (and Nature) have been quite
specific in the identification of an addressee. The person being chided by Nature is
'one of us'. 'We', in this instance, are neither Memmius nor Epicurus. This is the
addressee behind most of the ubiquitous second-person forms within Lucretius'
poem...This slippage from the specific to the generalized addressee.'

didactic poetry, and of ancient literature in general.[19] But, while it might appear that there is little to learn from this dedication, the characterization that Lucretius interacts with and applies to Memmius is significant, especially as his role is to function as a non-Epicurean, whose conversion Lucretius is slowly inducing.[20]

It is though, I believe, Lucretius' famous simile comparing his work to a honeyed cup that holds the greatest insight into his missionary intentions:

> For just as physicians, when they are trying to give bitter wormwood to boys, first touch the rim all around the cup with the sweet golden liquor of honey, so that the boys' improvident youth may be tricked as far as the lips and meanwhile drink down the bitter juice of the wormwood, and though deceived not be cheated, but rather by this means be restored ad become healthy,- so now, since this reasoning (*ratio*) seems for the most part too

---

[19] For example A. Smith, (1998) 140, draws our attention to Servius' comments, *ad G. Pr*.26-39, that: 'these books [sc. The Georgics] are didactic, and so it is necessary that they be written to someone;...whence he writers to Manas just as Hesiod did to Perses, Lucretius to Memmius.'(*Et hi libri didascalici sunt, unde necesse est, ut ad aliquem scribantur;...unde ad Maecenatem scribit Hesiodus ad Persen, Lucretius ad Memmium.*' Other literature that was meant for a wider audience could also make similar dedications for their work. Luke's Gospel, for instance could open with dedication to a certain 'Theophilus'. For a survey on the Gospel's intended audience(s) see Bauckham (1997) and E. Klink (2010).

[20] As M. F. Smith (1986) xlix, notes: 'it would have been absurd if he had set out to reform and convert one who was already reformed and converted.' And on Lucretius dedication to Memmius xiii, that: 'in other words, the hopes of converting him.' It should be no surprise that Cicero's letter appealing for Memmius not to pull down the Garden indicates that Memmius was no Epicurean sympathizer. Indeed, C. J. Castner (1990) 103, observes that 'Cicero appears to be flattering Memmius by excluding him from the company of Epicureans'. One reference though that has curiously, to my knowledge, not been used to inform the discussion comes from Cicero, *Brut* 70, who comments that though Memmius was well read, he was scornful of Latin literature. This would making the proposal that Memmius was the benefactor behind Lucretius' Latin epic seem problematic.

harsh to those by whom it has not been handled, and the multitude (*vulgus*) shudders away from it, I wanted to expound our reasoning to you in sweet-speaking Pierian song and to touch it, so to speak, with the sweet honey of the Muses, in hopes that perhaps I might be able to hold your mind in our verses with such reasoning until you fully perceive the whole nature of things and fully feel the advantage…[21]

In this passage Lucretius explicitly relays his intentions to reach a non-Epicurean audience. In fact, we learn that poetry is only being used as a vehicle for this end. Lucretius tells us that he hopes that by lacing Epicurean teaching with poetry his readers, while marvelling at its construction and finesse, will be more receptive to consider the doctrinal teachings that underlie it- rather than retracting from it as they are presently apt to do.[22] We have then another example of an Epicurean from this period creating works that both try to reach and *appeal* to an non-Epicurean audience.

There is though more congruity between Lucretius' efforts and the efforts of the popularisers that we have seen. Specifically, we need to query why Lucretius, an otherwise staunchly orthodox Epicurean,[23] chose to craft his epic poem, when the manufacture of poetry, especially for philosophical discourse, was expressly forbidden by Epicurus.[24] While some (probably correctly) have suggested that Lucretius is showing his awareness of the shifting use and prominence of poetry since Epicurus issued this command,[25] Lucretius still had to make a move that went against the regulations that the School's founder laid out. The solution seems to be provided by the metaphor above. The prose of his work, as Lucretius labours, was not his guiding concern; it was in fact subservient to his greater ambition of imparting Epicurean teaching to an audience that he judged would otherwise find it unpalatable.

---

[21] *DRN*. 4.11-25; C. Bailey (1963) 302; trans E. Adler (2003) 53-54.

[22] Cicero *De Leg*. I.1: 'No tree can be planted by agriculture so enduring as one planted by the verse of a poet'-trans E. Adler (2003) 50.

[23] See D. Clay (1984) 37-38, and D. Sedley (1998) *passim*.

[24] *D.L*. 10.12-13, trans. R. D. Hicks (1972) 541. E. J. Kenny (1982) 216. 'Whether or not Lucretius intended it as such, he must surely have been aware that he was following an unorthodox and different course'.

[25] E.g. see G. Arrighetti (2006) and E. J. Kenney (2007) 94.

So, perhaps again we see that there was a move across Epicureanism (in a way that is still not properly acknowledged in scholarship) to innovate and push the boundaries/traditions of the School to expedite the Schools' message to outsiders- and not just with regards to simplifying the School's message.[26]

  Another facet of the metaphor which shows Lucretius' indebtedness to an Epicurean understanding of mission is his statements about mankind. In particular Eve Adler has noted the significance of Lucretius' presentation above and its division of the world into two distinct groups- between the Epicurean and the non-Epicurean, the enlightened and the *vulgus*.[27] There is, she notes, no envisaged barrier or distinction made for the second group- all are part of the composite group of the *vulgus*. While elsewhere, Lucretius elsewhere references his belief that there are:

> tiny traces of the natures are left which *ratio* cannot drive out of us, that nothing prevents us from living a life worthy of gods[28]

---

[26] Though she doesn't link this insight to Lucretius' idea of mission V. Tsouna's remarks (2009) 256, are important: 'poetry plays a subordinate role with regard to the transmission of Epicurean doctrine. As the physician smears with honey the rim of a cup in order to beguile the child to drink the wormwood and regain health, so the speaker uses poetry...Although the honey might appear at first glance necessary (for without the honey the child might refuse the wormwood, and, likewise, without the sweetness of the verses the addressee might turn away from Epicureanism)...the important thing is the medicine but not they honey, the philosophical content more than the poetic form.' R. E. Lantham and J. Godwin (1994) 244-255, also concluded that Lucretius used the genre of poetry despite the opposition from School tradition only because he viewed it as a means to an end.

[27] E. Adler (2003) 54, 'human beings who are unfamiliar with the Epicurean reasoning are thereby the *vulgus*...all non-Epicureans are a homogeneous class and Lucretius proposes to provide for Memmius as representative of his class.' E. J. Kenney (1983) 34, meanwhile argued that 'this passage does not explicitly state that the poem is intended for ordinary men, but it does imply a wider audience than might have been attracted by a purely technical treatise.'

[28] *DRN* 3.320-322; C. Bailey (1963) 318; trans. W. H. D Rouse and M. F. Smith (1997) 213.

Lucretius presents *ratio* (reason) as an ontological facet of humanity, and he stakes out Epicureanism's capacity to unlock it.[29] The same understanding that was expressed in the early Garden on the relevancy of their message as being for all mankind, and the same impulse that prompted contemporary Epicureans to take their message to the general crowd, seems to have been a shared part of Lucretius' worldview too.

III: Lucretius' Audience

Every author though, no matter how broad and potentially relevant they believe their chosen subject to be, knows they will have to decide upon a particular type of audience to serve. No literature, especially in the ancient world with the huge disparity it maintained across the social spectrum society, can be equally comprehensible or compelling to every audience. It was this realization, after all, in combination with the Epicurean belief in their message's relevancy, that triggered the dispute in the Epicurean School at this time on the appropriate ways to structure the School's message. Lucretius, despite any ideological beliefs that he had on the relevance of Epicureanism, though knew he had to choose a specific audience to pursue in preference to others- and it was undeniably the educated elite of Roman society that he chose to lure with prosaic abilities.

  The most obvious evidence of Lucretius' pursuit of this group is, of course, the complex constitution of the *De Rerum Natura*. Both linguistically and intellectually it is a sophisticated and demanding work, and it presupposes an audience that can give sustained attention to lengthy and technical arguments. It also expects a reader who

---

[29] E. Adler (2003) 72, notes that for Lucretius: 'The differences among men relevant to their ability to lead lives worthy of gods lie in the atomic substrata of their passions, not in their intellectual abilities.' C. Gill (2006) 103, has separately cited this passage and argued that: 'the Epicurean version of the idea that complete happiness is open to all human beings as such and is attainable through virtue and rational reflection in a way that is not constrained by one's inborn nature, upbringing or social situation.' Both Adler, 68, and Gill, 105, also observe that holding this view would separate Lucretius, (and Epicureans) from the culturally normative assumptions of the surrounding culture.

can recognize the subtle allusions and interplays that it makes with a host of Greek writers.[30] It was then a work which had the opposite motive to those Epicureans who argued that terseness and plainness would aid conversion. Lucretius realized that he needed to impress- not simplify.

 Merely noting though that the *De Rerum Natura's* intention was to influence the educated elite class, and even observing modern scholarship's appreciation of the work, doesn't provide us with sufficient cause to assert that it did enjoy influence or popularity in antiquity. Many writers would have had aspirations to for their works to journey through the social networks of the Roman upper-class,[31]and there was no guarantee of a particular work's success.[32] But, to its merit, the *De Rerum Natura* does seem to have achieved recognition. We have already noted that both Cicero and his brother Quintus were familiar with it, and that both could express their appreciation of its virtues. But perhaps the most generously expressed admiration for

---

[30] R. D. Brown (1982) 331, remarks that:'[t]races of Homer, Hesiod, Sappho, Aeschylus, Parmenides, Empedocles, Euripides, Thucydides and Plato, not to mention Epicurus, testify to the broad reading and culture of the poet.' While K. Volk (2002) 80 n.53 comments that: 'While earlier critics liked to think of Lucretius as an archaizing poet untouched by the ideals of the "new" (Neoteric, Callimachean) poetic ideals of his time, recent scholars have rightly pointed out his debt [to them].' It is important to note that some have argued that Lucretius lack of interaction with contemporary philosophical moods indicates that he was an isolated, disconnected figure. However, in his monograph devoted to the subject D. Sedley, (1998) has rightly commented 71-72,72:'Like any fundamentalist, he does not expect the numerous contributions made since the composition of his sacred scriptures, either by his school or by its critics, to have added anything worth taking into account...I do not mean to suggest that Lucretius was a recluse, either socially or intellectually. In every other respect he shows himself an acute observer of his own society, sensitive and subtle in argument and thoroughly versed in the literary tradition of both Italy and Greece, including Hellenistic as well as archaic Greek poetry.'

[31] For example T. Whitmarsh (2001) 185, notes that Plutarch, *Philosopher* 777a, could argue that while philosophy deserves to achieve maximal impact, but that it could only do so 'if it attaches itself to a man of power, politics and public life.'

[32] See Martial concerns at *Ep*. 11.1.

Lucretius' work comes from Ovid, who could exclaim that: 'the sublime verses of Lucretius will not perish until the final day gives the earth over to destruction.'[33] That Lucretius' poem should induce such laudable accolades from some of antiquity's best known writers, and in the case of Cicero even from a caustic critic of Epicureanism, is strong testament to the success of Lucretius' efforts.[34] Epicureanism now had a world-class poem in its service, dedicated to explicating its message to an educated Roman audience.[35] This was, then, never going to be the sort of literature that would be enjoyed by, or available to, readers without the very highest level of education.[36] And

---

[33] *Am.* 1.15.23-24.

[34] R. D. Brown (1982) 78, has forcefully challenged the curious suggestion that Lucreitus' work was neglected by assembling a list of authors who utilize the *De Rerum Natura*, including Nepos (*Att.* 12.14), Vitruvius (9. *Praef.* 17), Vellius (*Vel. Pat.* 2.36.2), Seneca (*Tranq. Amin.* 2.14), Pliny the Younger (*Ep.* 4.18), Statius (*Silv.* 2.7.76), Tacitus (*Dial.* 23.2), Fronto (*Ep.* 4.3.2)- as well as numerous later writers. See also a similar, though less expansive, argument from M. F. Smith (2003) xvii. On Virgil's use of Lucretius see the extensive work of P. R. Hardie (1986) 157-240.

[35] J. D. Minyard (1985) 75-76, comments that: 'He [Cicero] could see how far Epicureanism might go. Not only in the Italian towns, not only among his more serious friends and acquaintances, and not only in the shape of the parlor Epicureanism of the fancy salons of Piso and his like, but now, at the heart of Roman cultural accomplishment, the Garden was making its way and showing profound potential for subversion. No longer confined to the clumsy and unrefined prose renditions of strict doctrine, Epicureanism, quite unexpectedly, now had a big Latin poem to its credit...It was a real enemy now, and for the next ten years Cicero dismantled it in essay after essay.'

[36] A text that surely deserves to start being quoted in Lucretian scholarship in this regard is a record from Horace, *Ep.* 1.19.43-45, on the ridicule he received from common people for his poetry as being expressed as: 'Joker! You keep your stuff for the highest ears; you dote on your image, sure you're the sole source of poetic honey.' P. De May (2009) 3, argues that: '[f]ormal education in general, and poetry in particular, were the preserve of the upper classes, for though many Romans were schooled to read and write, only the well-born and the wealthy continued their education beyond those basic skills'. Although we can note that Juvenal, *Satires* 7.82-

we should note that the satirist Persius chose to picture a bemused centurion quoting from the *De Rerum Natura*, bringing an assembled crowd to laughter by then asking: 'is it over stuff like this that you grow pale?'[37]

But it is more than just the erudition and appreciation of his writing that discloses Lucretius' intended audience as being exclusively drawn the educated elite. His acquaintance with Graeco-Roman literature, coupled with his facility to work in both the Greek and Latin language, indicates that he was educated in, and intentionally using, the cultural lexicon of the Roman upper-class.[38] Several times he can also refer to his Roman heritage, calling Rome his *patria*,[39] and referring to Latin as 'our ancestral language.'[40] Lucretius has furthermore littered the poem with references and examples drawn from their lifestyle. As W. Y. Sellar stated: 'The position indicated by the whole tone of the poem is that of a man living in easy circumstances, and of one, who, though repelled by it, was yet familiar with the life of pleasure and luxury.'[41] And, as M. F. Smith observes, Lucretius addresses the aristocrat Memmius as an equal, can talk about attending the races and the theatre,[42] and that he can also describe with colour the boredom that can lead to continual moving from a city residence, to a villa in the country, and then back again.[43] But why, if Lucretius was focusing upon communicating with educated Romans who had the disposition to read lengthy discourses on philosophy, did he choose to write in Latin? Few in Lucretius' anticipated category of reader would not be able to handle a philosophical treatise in Greek- and Latin, as we recall, at this time had still to adapt to the new semantics of

---

7, could chide Statius for producing poetry that was manufactured to appeal to the general public.

[37] Sat. 3.77-84; *DRN* 1.150, 248.

[38] M Gale (2001) 22, makes the same point.

[39] *DRN* 1.41.

[40] *DRN* 1.832 '*partii sermonis egestas.*' See also 3.258-61.

[41] W. Y. Sellar (1892) 288, cited in M. F. Smith (1986) xiv.

[42] *DRN* 2.263-265, 4.990; DRN 416-417, 4.75-83, 978-983, 6.109-1002

[43] *DRN* 3.1060-1067. M. F. Smith (1986) xiv-xv. He also apparently witnessed a military exercise- probably on the Campus Martius *DRN* 2.40-43, 323-332. M. Gale (1994) 89, also brings out attention to Lucretius' detailed description, *DRN* 4. 1121-1139, of the lifestyle of the leisured elite.

philosophy. In fact Lucretius in fact describes his strain to convey Epicureanism in Latin:

> "nor do I fail to understand that it is difficult to make clear the dark discoveries of the Greeks in Latin verses, especially since we have often to employ new words because of the poverty of the language and the novelty of the matters; but still it is your merit, and the expected delight of your pleasant friendship that persuades me to undergo any labour, and entice me to spend the tranquil nights in wakefulness, seeking by what words and what poetry at least I at last may be able to display clear lights before your mind, whereby you may see into the heart of things hidden.[44]

The level of difficulty that he relates to us is largely masked to us from our later vantage point with our familiarity with subsequent exercises in Latin philosophy and didactic poetry. So why did Lucretius exert himself to complete this pioneering, arduous, task-[45] especially as the Roman elite at this time would have expected their philosophy to arrive in a Greek form.[46] Where did Lucretius get this obstinate desire that he describes above to fashion his didactic poem in Latin? The answer, I believe, is to be found by noting Lucretius' strong belief that it was the *format* of his work that contained its effectual power- and presumably its construction in Latin was also a carefully chosen part of this allure. If Epicureanism wished, it seems Lucretius had judged, to truly integrate itself into Roman society it must be expressed in Latin. If, as he says, he wanted to put Epicureanism before his reader's mind, he did so with the recognition that, though capable in Greek, they thought in Latin. If Epicureanism was

---

[44] *DRN* 1.136-145; C. Bailey (1963) 183; trans. W. H. D Rouse and M. F. Smith (1997) 15.

[45] This effort is perhaps best seen by noting James Warren's (2007) 22, observation that in just a few lines (*DRN* 1.54-61) Lucretius uses five different Latin words to translate the Greek word ἄτομος.

[46] As indeed we saw from Cicero's reference to Memmius' distate for Latin literature- see n.12. This has lead to some confusion. For example J. Farrell (2001) 42, notes that Lucretius' 'explanation rings false' and that it would be unlikely for Memmius to need 'the services of a Greek interpreter.'

to become a Roman, as well as Greek, philosophy (and we have seen his belief on the transcended reach of philosophy demonstrated above), then it would need to be translated into the language of the state.[47] We should remember that Cicero provides similar reason as motivating his efforts to manufacture philosophy away from their traditional Greek language, and into his native Latin.[48]

---

[47] J. D. Minyard (1985) 46,87 also concluded that: 'Had his purpose been purely explanatory, didactic, and descriptive, purely philosophical, this is what he should have done. Greek was well-known to his oligarchic audience- and the *De Rerum Natura* is nothing if not an oligarchic poem…[rather] he wants his poem to revaluate the literary heritage and rearrange Roman culture, to reform the language itself and the society based on it….This cannot be accomplished by ignoring the language that reflects and embeds the inherited social form of thought and motivates a pattern of life it fossilizes and inspires…He clearly believed that if Epicureanism was to take root in society at large, specifically in Roman society, it must reach out to the wider audience in the form and on the terms to which that audience was used.'

[48] *Acad* 1.3-10. See especially *Acad* 1.9 where Cicero claims that: 'We were strangers lost in our own city until your [Varro's] books played the role of hosts, leading us home so we could at last recognize ourselves and where we were', trans. C. Brittain (2006) 90.

Conclusion

In the introduction to this thesis we observed that two competing, and ultimately antithetical, images of classical Epicureanism are being concurrently presented in modern scholarship; with the Epicureans either being cast as prototypes for the later Christian missionary movement, or pictured as an isolated community, uninterested in trying to extend their message beyond the Garden's walls. However, utilizing the insights from generations of Second Temple Jewish scholarship which wrestled over seemingly conflicting evidence of Jewish attitudes to mission, the dispute I argued was best resolved by first appreciating the nuanced attitude towards mission that existed in intellectual groups in classical antiquity. The reason for the present disagreement is, I suggested, because the question of whether the Epicureans were a missionary movement has been answered while utilizing modern conceptions of mission and missionary work; concepts that do not prepare us to grasp and integrate the various tensions and nuances that we will meet. The Epicureans, like their contemporaries in the Stoa and Academy, maintained a more complex 'open-closed' dynamic with regards to mission and membership; an attitude that has features of both inclusion and amenability to non-members, but also of indifference towards propaganda and the overt publicizing of their respective teachings.

For the first generation of the Epicurean school there is repeated and corroborating evidence that there was a conscious effort to include well-disposed outsiders into the group. The most fertile area for such evidence came from records of their monthly communal meal, where the addition of well-disposed outsiders is seen to be a recurring concern of the extant source material. We also observed that the development of the philosophical epitome in Epicureanism was in part motivated by the aspiration to serve those who were prevented by other obligations with the time to join the community as full-time adherents. In addition we also explored several attempts by Epicurus himself to convince people to accede to the precepts of his philosophy, and we also noted remarks from their rivals on the success of the school at gathering new students into their community.

We then turned to probe Epicurean doctrine to try to understand this stance in greater detail, and to potentially uncover any of their dogmas that would either limited or broaden the school's accessibility to non-Epicureans. As we saw Epicurean philosophy was motivated by a broad cosmopolitanism, an unusual concern to include lesser-educated members from society into philosophical schooling, and they held a

strong belief in the benefit and resonance of their message to the commonality of humankind, and we observed their opponents' belief that their success was, in part, contingent upon their message's ability to be reduced into key simple, therapeutic points.

The Epicureans were then no isolationist community living within a garden compound, or a scholastic group content to merely recite philosophical truisms amongst themselves. Rather this was a community that was structured from the beginning, and with the ideological supports, to have an active concern to include outsiders, and to extend their philosophy beyond their immediate associates. Yet despite such characteristics, the Epicureans were not a community of evangelists or missionaries. The realization that the Epicureans had a strong aversion to the open propagation of philosophy also needs to be informing and pulling upon our understanding. This concern is probably best demonstrated by Epicurus' frequent refrains on the crowd's inability to respond correctly to philosophical truths, and his belief on the futility of trying to structure a message to appeal to a mass audience. The following passage probably best expresses this attitude:

> [I would rather] reveal the things which are expedient to all mankind, even
> if no one is going to understand me, than assent to the received opinions
> and reap the adulation lavishly bestowed by the multitude[49]

So although the school could show an effort and concern not witnessed in its main rivals to embrace and expedite the development of outsiders/beginners, and it could even on occasion be found pursuing specific individuals to persuade, there was little conception or drive to actively evangelize, or attempt to spike the interest the otherwise uninterested masses with the potency and legitimacy of their message. As with other contemporary philosophical schools it was assumed that if you were to be responsive to the philosophy that you would seek it out[50]- just as a patient would seek

---

[49] *S.V.* 29, 54- H. S. Long (1964) 147, trans. A. A. Long and D. N. Sedley (1987),

[50] J. Sellars (2006) 123, astute comments are worth quoting at length; that: 'like so many other ancient philosophers, (Stoics) think that *eudaimonia* is a good thing and that it is something universally desirable. It is the *summum bonum*, namely that for the sake of which everything is done but which is not itself done for the sake of anything

out a doctor, and not the other way around. [51] This explains why the epitomes, which some scholars have designated as also functioning as propaganda material, despite the long preface we are given on their designed use and varied intended audiences, make no hint at their possible use for convincing or introducing the philosophy to those with no prior interest.

Yet the picture is further complicated for scholars wanting a straightforward account of the Epicurean engagement with mission, for as we plotted the Epicurean movement across the generations of the school, and as philosophy moved westwards onto Roman soil, this open-closed dynamic came under pressure. Subsequent generations of Epicureans do not seem to have been merely content with the School's inclusion/amenability to outsiders; but rather they sought to actively proselytize their message to the commonality of society. The tension that Epicurus was aware of above between holding a message that was expedient for all mankind, but not fashioning it in a way to appeal to the majority of humankind was for some Epicureans strained to breaking point. Though it is hard to exactly judge the motives and circumstances that prompted the Epicurean popularisers, and further research will be needed to

---

else. There is no argument for this claim in *any* of the ancient schools, it is the great implicit assumption in ancient ethics. Yet this is no reason to be suspicious; on the contrary, we are more likely to be suspicious of the psychological well-being of someone who does not unequivocally accept that they want to be happy and to live well. In light of this we might say that Stoic ethics begins with a conditional. The conditional is "If you want to be happy, then..." ... their position might be summed up as "If you want to be happy and to live well, then you should try to become virtuous, for only virtue can bring you happiness." If you do not want to live well then Stoicism offers no argument to convince you that you should and has nothing further to offer you' (emphasis mine). See also a relevant discussion in J. N. Sevenster (1961) 216-218.

[51] One insight that deserves to start being quoted in such discussions is Epictetus' observations, *Discourses* III.XXIII 27-28,on this exact theme when he states that: 'Does a philosopher invite people to a lecture?- Is it not rather the case, as the sun draws to himself those to whom he is to do good? What physician ever invites a patient to come and be healed by him?' J. Souilhe (1963) 91, trans. A. Malherbe (1986) 123.

understand and place them within the larger context of the Second Sophistic age; we can though note that given that the abstinence from propagation seems to have been more of a shared cultural agreement amongst the schools, rather than a dogmatically informed opposition in Epicureanism, that we should not be particularly surprised that given appropriate circumstances that this aversion would be liable to degrade. The reasons motivating this change would also probably be reliant upon broad Epicurean cosmopolitanism, and their fundamental concern to include a cross-spectrum of society within their ranks to gain the therapy that their philosophy provided.[52] The successful implementation of this desire could, I proposed, be uniquely achieved in Epicureanism because of their philosophy's focus on dyadic teaching, rather than a more politically focused philosophy, and through the School's sanctioning and practice of producing epitomes of their philosophy for beginners. However others such as the Epicurean scholar Philodemus demonstrated the continuing observance of the open-closed dynamic in the school,[53] and he frequently critiqued the populists' efforts to simplify the philosophy into epitomes, and bemoaned their attacks on the value of serious philosophical texts.

Yet the change in Epicureanism to fashion texts that would draw people to their message was not just done through the utilization of brevity. Lucretius' great didactic poem the *De Rerum Natura* was explicitly crafted to lure educated Latin speakers through its finessed prose to consider the (at first usually distasteful), message of

---

[52] A later Epicurean Diogenes' of Oenoanda notes precisely this concern as motivating his open public display of Epicurean doctrines, Diogenes Oenoanda II, V-VI, *trans.* Chilton (1971) 3,4: 'seeing these men, therefore, living in this condition I grieved over their manner of existence and wept at the waste of time, and considered it the duty of a good man so far as it is in my power (to assist) those among them who are endowed with sense...since it is right that I should help also those who will come after me (for they too are mine even if they are not yet born) as well as being a kindly act to give assistance to the strangers living amongst us; since then the assistance from my work concerns a greater number I wished by making use of this colonnade to set forth in public the remedies which bring salvation.'

[53] Frischer (1982) 49, also noted Philodemus' statement (which finds perfect resonance with Epicurus' sentiments) that the sage had no need to proselytize himself to gain new students- Περὶ κακιῶν I, col. III.5 (C. Jensen 1933 19).

Epicureanism. Although some scholars have opined that his poem was an anomalous flash of interaction of between Epicureanism and educated Roman society, we found that we could establish a surprisingly large list of Epicurean adherents from the top of Roman society. Epicureanism was part of the general intellectual discourse of the time, and not restricted to a isolated, or peripheral philosophical community. Cicero's frequent comments on the numeracy of his Epicurean peers, and his numerous recollections at finding them present in friend's houses, at drinking parties, and hosting philosophical lectures, all testify to the vitality of Epicureanism and its success in positioning itself as a respected intellectual position in elite Rome society at Rome. But more this, the popularity and adherence to Epicureanism amongst the politically and business active Roman elite reveals the ability of Epicureanism to extend its membership beyond operating merely in specifically designed Epicurean communities and to include, as I have argued they had always done, well-disposed and interested members into their midst.

Bibliography

Primary References

André, J. *Pliny Histoire Naturelle.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1964.

Angeli, A. (1988). *Aglia Amici di Scuola: PHerc. 1005*. Naples: Bibliopolis.

Armstrong, A. H. (2006). *Plotinus*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Babbitt, F. C. (1927). *Plutarch's Moralia,*. London: W. Heinemann.

Bailey, S. (1989). *Cicero The letters to his brother Quintus*. London: Heinemann.

Benedict, E. (1959). *Plutarch's Moralia Volume XIV*. London: W. Heinemann.

Bernadotte, P. (1985). *Plutarch's Lives*. London: Heinemann.

Chandler, C.(2006). *Philodemus on Rhetoric: Books 1 and 2 ; Translation and Exegetical Essays*. New York: Routledge.

Chilton, C. W., & Diogenes. (1971). *Diogenes of Oenoanda: the fragments;*. London: Published for the University of Hull by Oxford University Press.

Cicero, M. T., & Brittain, C. (2006). *Cicero On Academic scepticism*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Pub.

Cicero, M. T., Annas, J., & Woolf, R. (2001). *Cicero On Moral ends*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Courtney, E. *P. Papini Stati Silvae: Recognovit Brevique Adnotatione Critica Instrvxit*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Fobes, F. H. (1949). *Letters of Alciphron, Aelian and Philostratus*. Cambridge, Harvard UP: Heinemann.

Gallo, Italo. *Frammenti Biografici Da Papiri*. Rome: Edizioni Dell'Ateneo, 1975.

Gunmere, R. M. (1994). *Seneca Moral essays 1-65*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Harmon, A. M. (1962). *Lucian.* London: WIlliam Heinemann.

Hicks, R. D. (1980). *Diogenes Laertius Lives of Eminent Philosophers: in two volumes.* Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press.

Hubbell, H. M. (1920). *The Rhetorica of Philodemus*. New Haven: Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Inwood, B., & Gerson, L. P. (1994). *The Epicurus Reader: selected writings and testimonia*. Indianapolis: Hackett.

Jensen, C. (1933) *Ein Neuer Brief Epikurs.: Widerhergestellt Und Erklärt Von Christian Jensen.* Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.

Julian, & Wright, W. C. (1913). *The works of the Emperor Julian,*. London: W. Heinemann.

Keyes, C. W. (2000). *Cicero De re publica ; De legibus*. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press.

King, J. E. (1960). *Cicero Tusculan Disputations*. Cambridge, Harvard UP.

Miller, W. (1975). *Cicero De Officiis*. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press.

Obbink, D. (1996). *Philodemus On piety.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Paton, W. R., M. Pohlenz, and Wilhelm Sieveking. *Moralia*. Michigan, USA: University of Michigan, 2001

Pohlenz, M. *M.* (1965) *Tusculanae Disputationes*. Stutgardiae: In Aedibus B. G. Teubneri.

Plasberg, Otto. (1961) *Academicorum Reliquiae Cum Lucullo*. Stutgardiae: In Aedibus B. G. Teubneri,

Rackam, H. (1961). *Pliny: Natural History*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Rackham, H. (1971). *Cicero De finibus bonorum et malorum*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Reynolds, L. D. *Cicero De Finibus Bonorum Et Malorum*. Oxford, UK: Oxford UP, 1998.

Reynolds, L. D. *L. Annaei Senecae Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales*. Oxford, UK: Oxford UP, 1965.

Roth, K. L. (1907) *C. Suetoni Tranquilli Quae Supersunt Omnia.* Lipsiae: In Aedibus B. G. Teubneri,

Rudd, N. (2004). *Horace Odes and epodes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Souilhe J. *Entretiens*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1963

Shackleton-Bailey, D. R. (2002). *Letters to Quintus and Brutus ; Letter fragments ; Letter to Octavian ; Invectives ; Handbook of electrioneering*. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press.

Shackleton-Bailey, D. R. (1999). *Letters to Atticus*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press: Harvard University Press.

Shackleton-Bailey, D. R. (2003). *Silvae*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Smith, M. F. (1975). *De rerum natura*. Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press.

Watt, W. S. *Cicero Epistulae Ad Familiares*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Woodhead, W. D. (1953). *Plato: Socratic Dialogues Containing the Euthyphro, the Crito, the Phaedo and the Gorgias*. Edinburgh: Nelson.

Secondary Works

Adler, E. (2003). *Vergil's Empire: political thought in the Aeneid*. Lanham: Rowman
    & Littlefield.

Alexander, L. (1994). Paul and the Hellenistic Schools: the Evidence of Galen, in T.
    Engberg-Pedersen (Ed.), *Paul in his Hellenistic Context* (pp. 60-83).
    Philadelphia: Ausburg/Fortress.

Anderson, A. A., & Jowett, B. (1994). *Plato's Gorgias: Benjamin Jowett's
    translation*. Millis, MA: Agora Publications.

Anderson, G. (1993). *The Second Sophistic: a cultural phenomenon in the Roman
    empire*. London: Routledge.

Armstrong, A. H. (1987). *Expectations of Immortality in Late Antiquity*. Milwaukee:
    Marquette University Press.

Asmis, E. (2001). Basic Education in Epicureanism, in Y. L. Too (Ed.), *Education in
    Greek and Roman Antiquity* (pp. 209-239). Leiden: Brill.

Asmis, E. (2003). Epicurean Economics. In D. Obbink & J. T. Fitzgerald & G.
    Holland (Eds.), *Philodemus and the New Testament World: Supplements to
    Novum Testamentum* (pp.133-176). Leiden: Brill.

Bedell, C. H. (1998). Mission in Intertestamental Judaism. In W. J. Larkin & J. F.
    Williams (Eds.), *Mission in the New Testament*. New York: Orbis Books, 21-
    29.

Belliotti, R. A. (2009). *Roman Philosophy and the Good life*. Lanham, MD:
    Lexington Books.

Bénatouïl, T. (2009). Philosophical Schools in Hellenistic and Roman Times. In M. L. Gill & P. Pellegrin (eds.), *Philosophical Schools in Hellenistic and Roman Times*. Edinburgh: Wiley Blackwell.

Betensky, A. (1980). Lucretius and Love. *The Classical World, 73* (5), 291-299.

Bird, M. F. (2010). *Crossing over sea and land: Jewish missionary activity in the Second Temple period*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

Bonnefoy, Y. (1992). *Roman and European mythologies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bouton, J. B. (1884). *Roundabout to Moscow, an Epicurean Journey:* New York: D. Appleton and Company.

Brown, R. D. (1987). *Lucretius on Love and Sex: a commentary on De rerum natura IV, 1030-1287, with prolegomena, text, and translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Bryant, J. M. (1996). *Moral Codes and Social Structure in Ancient Greece: a sociology of Greek ethics from Homer to the Epicureans and Stoics*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Burnyeat, M., Levett, M. J. (1990). *The Theaetetus of Plato*. Indianapolis: Hackett.

Castner, C. J. (1990). *Prosopography of Roman Epicureans: from the second century B.C. to the second century A.D.* Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang.

Catto, B. A. (1998). *Selections from De Rerum Natura*. Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci.

Chilton, C. W. *Diogenes of Oenoanda: the Fragments:* Oxford: Oxford UP, 1971.

Clarke, M. L. (1968). *Rhetoric at Rome: a historical survey*. New York: Barnes & Noble.

Clay, D. (1984). Review of Bernard Frischer's 'The Sculpted Word: Epicureanism and Philosophical Recruitment in Ancient Greece. *American Journal of Philology*, *105* (4), 484-489.

Clay, D. (1998). *Paradosis and Survival: Three Chapters in the History of Epicurean Philosophy*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Connors, C. (2001). Imperial Space and Time: The Literature of Leisure, in O. Taplin (Ed.), *Literature in the Roman World* (pp. 208-234). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Conzelmann, H. (1969). *Der erste Brief an die Korinther.* Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht.

Cribiore, R. (2001). *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Cribiore, R. (2007). *The School of Libanius in Late Antique Antioch*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Culpepper, R. A. (1975). *The Johannine school: an evaluation of the Johannine-school hypothesis based on an investigation of the nature of ancient schools*. Missoula, MT: Published by Scholars Press for the Society of Biblical Literature.

D'Arms, J. H. (1970). *Romans on the Bay of Naples; a social and cultural study of the villas and their owners from 150 B.C. to A.D. 400*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

DeWitt, N. W.. (1954). *Epicurus and his Philosophy.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Dickson, J. P. (2003). *Mission-commitment in Ancient Judaism and in the Pauline Communities: the shape, extent and background of early Christian mission*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Dillon, J. (2006). Philosophy as a Profession in Late Antiquity, in (eds.) S. Swain and M. Edwards, *Approaching Late Antiquity: The Transformation from Early to Late Empire,* (pp.401-418).Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press,

Dillon, J. M. (2003). *The Heirs of Plato: a study of the Old Academy, 347-274 B.C.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Downing, F. G., & Downing, F. G. (1998). *Cynics, Paul, and the Pauline churches: Cynics and Christian Origins II*. London: Routledge.

Dunderberg, I. (2008). *Beyond Gnosticism: myth, lifestyle, and society in the school of Valentinus*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Dunn, J. D. (2009). *Beginning from Jerusalem*. Grand Rapids, Mich: W.B. Eerdmans.

Dunn, R. M. (1998). *Geoffrey Scott and the Berenson circle: literary and aesthetic life in the early 20th century*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press.

Ebner, M. (Ed.). (2007). Mahl und Gruppenidentität. Philos Schrift De Vita Contemplativa als Paradigma. In M. Ebner (Author), *Herrenmahl und Gruppenidentität* (pp. 64-91). Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder.

Engberg-Pedersen, T. (1995). *Paul in his Hellenistic context*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Erler, M. (2009). Epicureanism in the Roman Empire. In J. Warren (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Epicureanism* (pp.29-45*)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Esler, P. F. (2000). *The Early Christian World*. London: Routledge.

Farrell, J. (2001). *Latin Language and Latin Culture: from ancient to modern times*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferguson, J. (1974). *Clement of Alexandria*. New York.

Fischel, H. A. (1973). *Rabbinic literature and Greco-Roman philosophy: a study of Epicurea and rhetorica in early Midrashic writings*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Freudenburg, K. (2005). *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire*. Cambridge,: Cambridge University Press.

Frischer, B. (1982) *The Sculpted Word: Epicureanism and Philosophical Recruitment in Ancient Greece*. Berkeley: University of California.

Gale, M. (2001). *Lucretius and the Didactic Epic*. London: Bristol Classical Press.

Gale, M. (Ed.). (2007). *Lucretius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gammie, J. G., & Perdue, L. G. (1990). *The Sage in Israel and the ancient Near East*. Winona Lake, IN.: Eisenbrauns.

Garnsey, P., & Saller, R. P. (1987). *The Roman Empire: economy, society, and culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gerlo, A. (1956). Pseudo-Lucretius? *L'Antiquité classique, 25*, 41-72.

Gill, C. (2006). *The Structured Self in Hellenistic and Roman thought*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gillespie, S., & Hardie, P. R. (Eds.). (2007). *The Companion to Lucretius*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Glad, C. E. (1995). *Paul and Philodemus: adaptability in Epicurean and early Christian psychagogy*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Glucker, J. (1978). *Antiochus and the Late Academy*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

Glyn-Jones, A. (1996). *Holding up a Mirror: how civilizations decline*. London: Century.

Goodman, M. (1994). *Mission and Conversion: Proselytizing in the Religious History of the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Goodman, M. (2007). *Rome and Jerusalem: the clash of ancient civilizations*. London: Allen Lane.

Gordon, P. (1996). *Epicurus in Lycia: the second-century world of Diogenes of Oenoanda*. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press.

Hadas, M., & Smith, M. (1952). *Heroes and Gods: spiritual biographies in antiquity*. New York: Harper & Row.

Hadot, P. (2002). *What is Ancient Philosophy?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hadot, P., Davidson, A. I., & Chase, M. (1995). *Philosophy as a Way of Life: spiritual exercises from Socrates to Foucault*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Hardie, P. (2001). Coming to Terms with the Empire: Poetry Between the Death of Caesar and the death of Virgil. In O. Taplin (Ed.), *Literature in the Roman World* (pp. 119-153). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harland, P. A. (2003). *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: claiming a place in ancient Mediterranean society*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Harnack, A.V. (1924) *Die Mission in Wort U. Tat.* Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs.

Harrison, R. P. (2008). *Gardens: an Essay on the Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hellerman, J. H. (2005). *Reconstructing Honor in Roman Philippi: Carmen Christi as cursus pudorum*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hill, T. (2004). *Ambitiosa mors: Suicide and the Self in Roman Thought and Literature*. New York: Routledge.

Holowchak, M. (2004). *Happiness and Greek ethical Thought*. London: Continuum.

Honderich, T. (1995). *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hubbard, M. V. (2010). *Christianity in the Greco-Roman World: a narrative introduction*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

Hyland, D. A. (2008). *Plato and the Question of beauty*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Jaeger, W. W., & Highet, G. (1945). *Paideia: the Ideals of Greek Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Johnson, W. A. (2010). *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire: a Study of Elite Communities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Judge, E. A. (2008). "On This Rock I Will Build My Ekklesia": Counter-Cultic Springs of Multiculturalism. In *The First Christians in the Roman World: Augustan and New Testament Essays (WUZNT)* (pp. 619-669). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Kenney, E. J. (1983). *Latin Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Klauck, H-J. (2003). *Magic and Paganism in Early Christianity: the World of the Acts of the Apostles*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Knorr, W. R. (1985). *The Ancient Tradition of Geometric Problems*. Cambridge, MA: Birkhäuser Boston.

Kraus, C. S. (2001). Forging a National Identity: Prose Literature down to the time of Augustus. In O. Taplin (Ed.), *Literature in the Roman World* (pp. 27-51). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Larkin, W. J., & Williams, J. F. (1998). *Mission in the New Testament: an Evangelical Approach*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Latham, R. E., & Godwin, J. (1994). *On the Nature of the Universe*. London: Penguin Books.

Lazaridis, N. (2007). *Wisdom in Loose form: the Language of Egyptian and Greek proverbs in collections of the Hellenistic and Roman periods*. Leiden: Brill.

Leibniz, G. W. (1953). *Discourse on Metaphysics.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Leigh, M. (2001). Primitivism and Power: the Beginnings of Latin Literature. In O. Taplin (Ed.), *Literature in the Roman World* (pp. 4-26). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lintott, A. W. (2008). *Cicero as Evidence: a Historian's companion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Long, A. A., & Sedley, D. N. (1987). *The Hellenistic philosophers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Long, H. S. (1964) *Diogenis Laertii: Vitae Philosophorum*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Malherbe, A. J. (1986) *Moral Exhortation: a Greco-Roman Sourcebook.* Philadelphia: Westminster.

Macmullen, R. (1974). *Roman Social Relations: 50 B.C. to A.D. 284*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Makridis, O. (2005). *Letters and sayings of Epicurus*. New York: Barnes & Noble Books.

McDonald, L. (1993). *The Early Origins of the Social Sciences*. Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Meeks, W. A. (1983). *The first urban Christians: the social world of the Apostle Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Minyard, J. D. (1985). *Lucretius and the Late Republic: an Essay in Roman Intellectual History*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Müller, G. (2004). The Conclusions of the Six Books of Lucretius. In M. Gale (Ed.), *Lucretius*, (pp.234-254).

Monoson, S. S. (2000). *Plato's Democratic Entanglements: Athenian Politics and the Practice of Philosophy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Morford, M. (2002). *The Roman Philosophers: from the Time of Cato the Censor to the Death of Marcus Aurelius*. London: Routledge.

Morgan, T. (1998). *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman worlds*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nails, D. (1995). *Agora, Academy, and the Conduct of Philosophy*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1994). *The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ober, J. (1998). *Political Dissent in Democratic Athens: Intellectual Critics of Popular Rule*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

O'Grady, P. (2008). Hippias. In *The Sophists: An Introduction* (pp.56-70) London: Gerald Duckworth, 56-70.

Pilch, J. J., & Malina, B. J. (1998). *Handbook of Biblical Social Values*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

Puglia, E. (1988). *Aporie testuali ed esegetiche in Epicuro : (PHerc. 1012)*. Napoles: Bibliopolis.

Guthrie, W. K. (1986). *Plato Protagoras and Meno*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Guthrie, W. K. C. (1975). *Plato, the man and his dialogues: earlier period.* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Platt, M. (1991). Souls Without Longing. *Interpretation*, 18.3, 415-65.

Powell, J. G. (1995). *Cicero the Philosopher: Twelve Papers*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Puglia, E. (1988). *Aporie testuali ed esegetiche in Epicuro : (PHerc. 1012)*. Napoli: Bibliopolis.

Rawson, E. (1985). *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Reale, G. (1985). *A History of Ancient Philosophy*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Reinhardt, T., Lapidge, M., & Adams, J. N. (2005). *Aspects of the Language of Latin prose (Proceedings of the British Academy Conference held in Oxford on 3-5 April 2003)*. Oxford: Published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press.

Reydams-Schils, G. J. (2005). *The Roman Stoics: Self, Responsibility, and Affection*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rigsby, K. J. (2008). Hauranus the Epicurean. *Classical Journal*, *104* (1), 19-22.

Roskam, G. (2007). *Live unnoticed = (Lathe biōsas) : on the vicissitudes of an Epicurean Doctrine*. Leiden: Brill.

Rothschild, C. K. (2003). *Luke-Acts and the Rhetoric of History: an Investigation of Early Christian Historiography*.

Schnabel, E. J. (2008). *Paul the Missionary: Realities, Strategies and Methods*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic.

Schofield, M. (2006). *Plato: Political Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sedley, D. N. (2003). The School from Zeno to Arius Didymus. In B. Inwood (Ed.), *Cambridge Companion to the Stoics* (pp. 7-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sedley, D. N. (2006). Epicurus' Argument for Atomism. In *Oxford studies in ancient philosophy* (pp.261-284)*.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sellars, J. (2006) *Stoicism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sellar, W. Y., & Lang, A. (1892). *The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Sevenster, J.N. (1961) *Paul and Seneca*. Leiden: Brill.

Shanks, A. (2005). *Faith in Honesty: the Essential Nature of Theology*. Aldershot, Hants, England: Ashgate Pub.

Simmons, W. A. (2008). *Peoples of the New Testament World: an illustrated guide*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

Sloan, J. (2003). *Oscar Wilde*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sluiter, I., & Rosen, R. M. (2010). *Valuing others in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden: Brill.

Smith, M. F. (1993). *The Epicurean inscription*. Napoli: Bibliopolis.

Smith, G. (1887). A *Short history of Christian missions.* Edinburgh: T T Clark.

Snyder, H. G. (2000). *Teachers and Texts in the Ancient World: Philosophers, Jews, and Christians*. London: Routledge.

Sorabji, R. (2000). *Emotion and Peace of Mind: from Stoic Agitation to Christian Temptation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Strozier, R. M. (2002). *Foucault, Subjectivity, and Identity: historical constructions of subject and self*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Swan, P. W. A Consular Epicurean Under the Early Principate, *Phoenix, 30, 1,* 56-60

Too, Y. L. (2009). *The Idea of the Library in the Ancient World*. Oxford: Oxford

    University Press.

Toohey, P. (1996). *Epic lessons: an Introduction to Ancient Didactic Poetry*. London:

    Routledge.

Trapp, M. B. (2007). *Philosophy in the Roman Empire: ethics, politics and society*.

    Aldershot, Hants, England: Ashgate.

Traver, A. G. (2002). *From Polis to Empire, the Ancient world, c. 800 B.C.-A.D. 500:*

    a biographical dictionary. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Tsouna, V. (2007). *The Ethics of Philodemus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tsouna, V. (2009). Epicurean Therapeutic Strategies. In J. Warren (Ed.), *The*

    Cambridge Companion to Epicureanism (pp. 249-265). Cambridge:

    Cambridge University press.

Van der Eijk, P. J. (2005). *Medicine and Philosophy in Classical Antiquity: doctors*

    and philosophers on nature, soul, health and disease. Cambridge: Cambridge

    University Press.

Volk, K. (2002). *The Poetics of Latin Didactic: Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, Manilius*.

    Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Warren, J. (2009) Introduction, in J. Warren *The Cambridge Companion to*

    Epicureanism (pp. 1-8). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Watts, E. J. (2007). Creating the Academy: Historical Discourse and the Shape of

    Community in the Old Academy. *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, *127*, 106-122.

Whitley, C. F. (1979). *Koheleth: his language and thought*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Whitmarsh, T. (2001). *Greek literature and the Roman empire: the politics of*

    imitation. Oxford : Oxford University Press.

Whitmarsh, T. (2004). *The Second Sophistic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press,
published for the Classical Association. Ftusc

Wolin, S. S. (1960). Plato: Political Philosophy verses Politics. In *Politics and Vision;
Continuity and Innovation in Western Political Thought (pp.27-62)*. Boston:
Little, Brown.

Wood, K. (2005). *Troubling Play: Meaning and Entity in Plato's Parmenides*.
Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Woolf, G. (1994). Becoming Roman, Staying Greek. Culture, Identity and the
Civilizing Process in the Roman East. In *Proceedings of the Cambridge
Philological Society*, 40, 116-143.

Zanker, P. (1995). *The Mask of Socrates: the Image of the Intellectual in Antiquity*.
Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Zevort, C. (1847). *Vies et doctrines des philosophes de l'antiquité*. Paris: Charpentier.