

# About This Subforum - Everyone Please Read!

**Post by "Cassius" of October 30, 2020 at 3:20 PM**

We could mix Lucretius in there in a similar category as Philodemus. Some people seem to think there are substantial differences between Epicurus and Lucretius -- I don't think that at all, but given the time difference there are certainly possibilities that he didn't get everything right despite his best efforts.

I think I posted on Philodemus elsewhere that I think there is a big issue with corruption of texts and issues with reconstruction in evaluating him.

Every discussion turns into a discussion of evidence, doesn't it? The best I can say is that every time we hit a controversial issue we have to look closely at the state of the text to determine how much confidence we have in that. If the text is fragmentary and we're relying on reconstructions and have large amounts of missing context, then sometimes even something Cicero or even Plutarch records could actually be more reliable.

My classic example of this is the "tetrapharmakon." It seems to be very clear, but there is little or no (I always hedge and say "little or no" but I think the truth is, there is NO) context from surrounding paragraphs to tell us who was saying this, or why. And since what I read in the tetrapharmakon seems to be a gross oversimplification of the first four PDs, which I think it was intended to mirror, then I don't accept any implication of the tetrapharmakon that conflicts with the first four PDs.

So considering the ranking of Philodemus vs DeWitt, there are definitely caveats that have to be considered that separate them.