

EPI CURUS

Oxford University Press

*London Edinburgh Glasgow Copenhagen
New York Toronto Melbourne Cape Town
Bombay Calcutta Madras Shanghai
Humphrey Milford Publisher to the UNIVERSITY*

EPICURUS

THE EXTANT REMAINS

WITH SHORT CRITICAL APPARATUS

TRANSLATION AND NOTES

BY

CYRIL BAILEY, M.A.

*Jowett Fellow and Classical Tutor of
Balliol College, Oxford*

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
1926

Printed in England
At the OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
By John Johnson
Printer to the University

P R E F A C E

AN interest in Lucretius took me back many years ago, as it has others, to the study of the remains of Epicurus, without which the true meaning of the Latin poet cannot be fully understood. The great work of Usener placed at one's disposal all that was then available for the knowledge of Epicurus, and with the exception of the Vatican Gnomologium nothing has since been added.¹ But the study of *Epicurea* brought me to the conclusion that something more than a mere text was needed: the work of Brieger, Giussani, Tohte, and others on certain portions of the Epicurean theory had at once shed light and raised new problems, and I was thus led to set about making my own text, translation, and commentary. Since I have been at work, there have appeared the German translation of Kochalsky, the Italian translation and brief commentary of Bignone, and quite recently the new Teubner text of von der Muehll. Each of these—and especially in my view the work of Bignone—have greatly advanced the study of Epicurus, but there is

¹ For certain fragments of the Περὶ Φύσεως see Commentary, p. 391.

still no complete¹ translation in English and no complete commentary in any language.

In the circumstances it seems worth while to publish the result of a good many years' work on the Epicurean text. But I do so with much hesitation. No one can be more fully aware than I am of the extreme difficulty of the writings of Epicurus, and the necessarily tentative character of any solution of their many *cruces*: I would repeat with fervour the words of Usener, 'nunc cum librum manibus emitto, sentio me hominem et inconstantem fuisse'. But I trust that I have shed some light on dark places and at least have made it clear where the problems lie and what are the data for their solution. I hope to follow up this work shortly with a volume of critical essays on the system of Epicurus, where it will be possible to deal with some of the problems at greater length.

My debt to many predecessors in Epicurean studies is great, and will become obvious in the commentary, but I think that after Usener I owe most to two great Italian scholars, Giussani and Bignone.

C. B.

OXFORD, September, 1924.

¹ Many of the important passages have been translated by Mr. R. D. Hicks in his *Stoic and Epicurean* (1910), but I do not always find myself in agreement with his versions. His translation of Diogenes Laertius in the Loeb series unfortunately appeared too late for me to use it. For the same reason I have been unable to use the translation of the Letters and the *Kúplai Δόξαι* by A. Ernout in his Commentary on Lucretius I, II.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION. MSS. and editions	9
TEXT AND TRANSLATION.	
Epistula ad Herodotum	18
Epistula ad Pythoclea	56
Epistula ad Menoeceum	82
Κύριαι Δόξαι	94
Fragmenta	106
Vita Epicuri	140
COMMENTARY.	
Letter to Herodotus	173
Letter to Pythocles	275
Letter to Menoeceus	327
Principal Doctrines	344
Fragments	375
Life of Epicurus	401
BIBLIOGRAPHY	423
INDEX OF PRINCIPAL TERMS	425

FRONTISPIECE. Epicurus, from the bust in the *Museo Capitolino*, Rome.

INTRODUCTION

MSS. AND EDITIONS.

By far the greater part of the extant remains of Epicurus—the three letters, the *Kύπιαι Δόξαι*, and many of the surviving fragments—are embodied in the tenth book of Diogenes Laertius. The book purports to be a ‘Life’ of Epicurus and is compiled in haphazard fashion from many doxographical sources, the quotations occurring from time to time in the course of the narrative. Thus the problem of the text of Epicurus is for the most part that of the MS. sources for Diogenes. Six MSS. (BFGHPQ) were used by Usener in the preparation of his great edition (1887): for a full account of them his preface should be consulted. These six have recently been re-read, and Usener’s report of the readings of the principal codices checked and occasionally corrected by P. von der Muehll (1922), who has added readings from five more MSS. (TDWCoZ) of which the last two are the most important. A brief account, based on the work of Usener and von der Muehll, will suffice for this edition in which I have been guided entirely by their reports.

The MSS. of Diogenes fall into two main classes, not, according to Usener, representing any ancient cleavage of tradition, but both derived during the Middle Ages from the same source, the one class representing a careful copying, the other more negligent work: this is shown by the occasional unexpected agreement of the chief representatives of the two classes, B and F.

- B I. The oldest representative of the first class is B, the Codex Borbonicus gr. iii. B. 29 (formerly 253), a parchment codex of the twelfth century, in the public library at Naples: it was corrected by a hand of the fourteenth century whose readings not infrequently agree with those of Co.

INTRODUCTION

P Later than B, but almost more important, is P, the Codex Parisinus gr. 1759, a paper codex of the beginning of the fourteenth century. It is described by Usener as 'the twin' of B, but von der Muehll is inclined to regard it as representing another family of the same stock. P has unfortunately been much corrected and the corrections have often obscured or obliterated its original readings: von der Muehll distinguishes P² (Usener's P¹) who derived his readings from another copy of the same family and P³ (Usener's P²) who corrected the text later by the vulgate tradition.

We are, however, often able to recover the original reading of P from two other MSS. which appear to have been copied from P before it was corrected. For this purpose Usener relies Q mostly on the authority of Q, the Codex Parisinus gr. 1758, a paper codex made in the fourteenth century or at the beginning of the fifteenth. Von der Muehll prefers to quote a MS. which he has himself collated from photographs and Co which he refers to as Co, the Codex Constantinopolitanus - Veteris Serail. ('The Old Seraglio'): this MS. was written in the fourteenth or fifteenth century (the last page being added later in the sixteenth). These two, or one or other of them, frequently confirm the original text of P, and in other places, where P's reading has been obscured, may be taken to preserve it.

H Belonging to the same class, though of lesser importance, are H, the Codex Laurentianus LXIX. 35 of the fourteenth century, also a copy of P, but later than Q and made after the W correction of P and therefore embodying a mixed text, and W, the Codex Vaticanus gr. 140 of the fourteenth century (one of von der Muehll's MSS.), which he believes, though with less certainty, to be also derived from P.

F II. The chief MS. of the second class, derived more carelessly from the same original tradition as the first class, is F, the Codex Laurentianus LXIX. 13, a large parchment MS., attributed by Usener to the twelfth and by von der Muehll to the thirteenth century. Usener is, however, of opinion that it is an

unscholarly copy and cannot be taken by itself to represent the tradition of the second class.

Z Von der Muehll finds the necessary support for F in Z, the Codex Lobcowicensis Raudnitzianus, which he has himself collated. This codex again has been much corrected and von der Muehll believes that after it had already received the additions of Z² and Z³ it was the source of the first printed edition of Diogenes.

f The *editio princeps* was published by Froben at Basle in 1523 and is said in the preface to be a transcript of the MS. of Matthew Aurigathus, professor at Wittenberg. The MS. would appear to have been a bad copy of the corrected Z. This printed text has therefore derivatively the authority of a MS. and is accordingly quoted by Usener in support of F. (I have not myself quoted it, except where readings rest on its sole authority.)

Von der Muehll points out the frequency with which we find in support of a reading the combination FP³Zf this combination may be taken to represent the second class. Its best readings, however, are not infrequently due to conjecture rather than to tradition, and von der Muehll is of opinion that Usener is sometimes mistaken in attributing too great importance to them.

G The remaining MS quoted by Usener is G, the Codex Laurentianus LXIX. 28, a paper MS., said to be of the fourteenth century. It appears to represent a mixed tradition of T the two classes. Von der Muehll refers also occasionally to T, D the Codex Urbinas Vat. gr. 109, and to D, the Codex Borbonicus Φ gr. iii. B. 28. He has also made some use of Φ, an epitome of Diogenes Laertius in Codex Vaticanus gr. 96, made, as he thinks, at the time of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, which is available when from time to time it quotes passages *in extenso*. A less valuable epitome of the same character is Ψ, found in the Codex Palatinus Vaticanus gr. 93 and dated 1338.

The MSS. of Diogenes were enriched by a considerable body of scholia, often references to other passages in Epicurus or

INTRODUCTION

amplifications of or comments on the text: these have become interwoven into the text and are especially frequent in the letters to Herodotus and to Pythocles. Sometimes, where they are accompanied by references (e.g. to the Ηερόδοτος) it is easy to detect them, but in other places the task of disentangling text and gloss is extremely difficult and delicate. Most modern editors would agree that Usener was too ready to assume 'gloss, scholium, or *additamentum*', and that many phrases thus excluded by him can be restored to the text. Von der Muehll is of opinion that it is the intrusion of these additions in the letter to Pythocles which has caused its dislocated and incoherent appearance, and that it was in origin a genuine work of Epicurus' own hand. I am myself more inclined to hold the opinion of Usener that it is an Epicurean compilation.

With the earlier editions of Diogenes or of the tenth book Usener has dealt in his Introduction (pp. xv–xvi), and recent criticism has not altered his opinions. They fall naturally into two classes. The editors of the sixteenth century had access only to inferior MSS. and used them unscientifically. Of the *editio princeps* of Froben (1523) I have already spoken. Stephanus (1570) relied on G and another inferior MS. Marianus 393: Sambucus (1566) used the Venetus, Vaticanus, and Borbonicus, and made some corrections, but did not consult the MSS. constantly or with judgement. To the same class belong the editions of Aldobrandinus (1594) and Menagius (1664). Yet to each and all of these earlier editors are due certain conjectural restorations which still find a place in modern texts.

In the seventeenth century Gassendi revived the serious study of Epicureanism and may be said to have introduced the theory of atomism to the modern world. But though he too has contributed permanent emendations to the text, he was a poor Greek scholar, and in his edition of Book X (1649) showed no respect for tradition and practically re-wrote the text. Meibom (1692) in Usener's view did still greater damage to the text. Schneider (1813) was able to some extent to repair the harm done, but Huebner (1828) again returned to the tradition of

Meibom, and Cobet (1862), though he derived assistance from F and from his own scholarship, could not get free from it.

Hermann Usener's great work *Epicurea* appeared in 1887, and is the foundation of all modern study of Epicurus. By collecting together from the whole range of classical literature citations from Epicurus and allusions to his theories, he established a store-house of information on Epicureanism and in many cases parallels which serve to illustrate and often to explain the text of Epicurus himself. But almost more important were his services to the text. The way for a scientific study of the MS. tradition had been prepared by Wachsmuth who had collated the Italian MSS. and Bonner who had collated the two Paris MSS. (P and Q). Usener threw over the whole previous tradition of printed editions and made a fresh start from the scientific study of the MSS. and their relations to one another. His text is accordingly established on a far sounder basis and he has himself made important and valuable corrections. At the same time he is not what would now be called a conservative editor, and in dealing with passages which he could not understand he was too apt either to introduce violent emendations or to assume the intrusion of a gloss or scholium. But a glance at the critical apparatus in this edition or that of von der Muehl will show how often his corrections have been accepted, and any future work must take the form of a re-examination of the evidence on the lines which he laid down.

The work of Usener naturally gave an impetus to the study of Epicurus, and since his edition there has been published a considerable body of essays and articles, dealing for the most part with individual points in the Epicurean theory, but in many instances also making contributions to the elucidation of the text. Of these the most important are the works of Brieger and Giussani. Brieger, who already in 1882 had published a commentary on the letter to Herodotus, added a second pamphlet in 1893 *Epikurs Lehre von der Seele*, in which there is a further study of the text: he is too apt to indulge in wild emendation, but has made a few useful suggestions. More stimulating and

INTRODUCTION

valuable are the essays of Giussani in his edition of Lucretius (1896-8) : he showed wonderful penetration in the understanding and elucidation of Epicurean ideas, but again was too reckless in his dealings with the text to have left much of permanent value. Useful work has also been done by Arndt, Cröner, Diels, R. D. Hicks, P. Merbach, R. Philippson, and H. Weil.

Within the last ten years two translations of Epicurus have been published containing critical notes on the text. The German translation of A. Kochalsky (1914) introduces a considerable number of emendations, but they seem to me on the whole arbitrary and too often to take the form of re-writing. Of greater importance is the Italian translation of E. Bignone (1920) : in brief foot-notes and some appendices he has made most penetrating comments on the text and in not a few places suggested corrections of his own which are of great value. I am, however, inclined to think that he is too prone to suppose that words have fallen out and to restore the text by additions. The Teubner text of von der Muehl (1922) came into my hands after I had practically completed my work. Its great value is the re-examination of the MSS. and the addition of readings from other MSS. not made by Usener. The editor also appears to me to use very sound judgement as between readings and conjectures and to have established a good text, with which I am happy to find myself in general agreement. I have endeavoured to introduce from his critical apparatus the necessary modifications of Usener's report of the readings of his MSS. together with the evidence gleaned from the additional MSS. The tendency of all these three recent critics is to a more conservative text than that of Usener, and with this tendency I am fully in accord. In the many difficult places which still remain I have used my judgement to the best of my ability in choosing between the alternatives available and in a few have introduced corrections of my own. But I doubt whether any editor could claim to have produced a fully satisfactory text.

For the fragments the text must necessarily depend on the MSS. of the authors from whom they are cited, except for the

Vatican Gnomologium. This is contained in *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1950*, a MS. of the fourteenth century. It was first published by C. Wotke, with some notes by Usener and Gomperz in *Wiener Studien*, vol. x (1888). Von der Muehll has collated the MS. again from photographs and in some cases has corrected the readings reported by Wotke. In the majority of these excerpts the text is fairly sound, but there are some in which it still remains very uncertain.

SIGLA

- I. B codex Borbonicus Neapolitanus gr. m. B. 29 (saec. xii).
P codex Parisinus gr. 1759 (saec. xiv).
Q codex Parisinus gr. 1758 (saec. xiv vel xv init.).
Co codex Constantinopolitanus Veteris Testam. (saec. xiv vel xv)
H codex Laurentianus LXIX. 35 (saec. xiv)
W codex Vaticanus gr. 140 (saec. xiv).
II. F codex Laurentianus LXIX. 13 (saec. xii vel xiii).
Z codex Lobcowicensis Raudnitzianus VI. fc. 38.
f editio Frobeniana Basiliensis (anni MDXXXIII)
G codex Laurentianus LXIX. 28 (saec. xiv).
T codex Urbinas Vat. gr. 109 (saec. xv).
D codex Borbonicus Neapolitanus gr. m. B. 28.

E P I C U R U S

I

ΕΠΙΚΟΥΤΡΟΣ ΗΡΟΔΟΤΩΙ ΧΑΙΡΕΙΝ

- 35 Τοῖς μὴ δυναμένοις, ὁ Ἡρόδοτε, ἔκαστα τῶν περὶ φύσεως ἀναγεγραμμένων ἡμῖν ἐξακριβοῦν μηδὲ τὰς μείζους τῶν συντεταγμένων βίβλους διαθρεύν ἐπιτομὴν τῆς ὅλης πραγματείας εἰς τὸ κατασχεῖν τῷ ὀλοσχερωτάτῳ γε δοξῶν τὴν
 5 μνήμην ἵκανῷς αὐτοῖς παρεσκεύασα, ἵνα παρ' ἐκάστους τῶν καιρῶν ἐν τοῖς κυριωτάτοις βοηθεῦν αὐτοῖς δύνωνται, καθ' ὅσον ἀν ἐφάπτωνται τῆς περὶ φύσεως θεωρίας. καὶ τοὺς προβεβηκότας δὲ ἵκανῷς ἐν τῇ τῶν ὅλων ἐπιβλέψει τὸν τύπον τῆς ὅλης πραγματείας τὸν κατεπτοιχειωμένον δεῖ
 10 μνημονεύειν. τῆς γὰρ ἀθρόας ἐπιβολῆς πυκτὸν δεόμεθα,
- 36 τῆς δὲ κατὰ μέρος οὐχ ὅμοίως. | βαδιστέον μὲν οὖν ἐπ'
 5 ἐκεῖνα καὶ συνεχῶς ἐν τῇ μνήμῃ τὸ τοσοῦτον ποιητέον, ἀφ' οὗ ἡ τε κυριωτάτη ἐπιβολὴ ἐπὶ τὰ πράγματα ἔσται καὶ δὴ καὶ τὸ κατὰ μέρος ἀκριβώματα πᾶν ἐξευρήσεται, τῷ ὀλοσχερω-
 5 τάτων τύπῳ εὐ περιειλημμένων καὶ μιημονευομένων. ἐπεὶ
 καὶ τοῦ τετελεστουργημένου τοῦτο κυριώτατον τοῦ παντὸς ἀκριβώματος γίνεται, τὸ ταῦς ἐπιβολαῖς ὑξέως δύνασθαι
 χρῆσθαι, καὶ τοῦτο γίνοιτο ἀν ἀπάντων πρὸς ἀπλὰ στοι-
 χειώματα καὶ φωτὰς συναγομένων. οὐ γὰρ οἶον τε τὸ
 10 πύκνωμα τῆς συνεχοῦς τῶν ὅλων περιοδείας εἶναι μὴ δυνα-

35 3. βίβλους] βίβλους Usener : βίβλων Meibom 4 γε δοξῶν
 Usener in commentario : δὲ δοξῶν B. δεδοξῶν P¹QCo : δοξῶν
 FGHP² 5. αὐτοῖς] ἀν τις Usener. fortasse αὐτὸς Brieger παρε-
 σκεύασα ἵνα ΗΡ³Ζ : παρεσκεύασα... ἵνα cum litura F : παρεσκεύασαν ἀ
 QP⁴Co¹. παρεσκεύασα ἀ BGC⁵Co² 6 αὐτοῖς Schneider . αὐτοῖς
 libri 7 καὶ] καὶ δὴ καὶ Giussani 8 προβεβηκότας Casaubon :
 προβεβληκότας libri 36 1 ἐπ' ἐκεῖνα καὶ Gassendi : καὶ ἐπ' ἐκεῖνα
 libri 2 ἐν τῇ] ἐν τε Usener . ἐν δὲ Muehll 8 (τοῦτο γίνοιτο ἀν
 ἀπάντων) supplevi : pro καὶ scripsit ἐκάστων Usener : (περὶ τῶν κατὰ

I

EPICURUS TO HERODOTUS

35 FOR those who are unable, Herodotus, to work in detail *Introduction*: through all that I have written about nature, or to peruse the largei books which I have composed, I have already prepared at sufficient length an epitome of the whole system, that they may keep adequately in mind at least the most general principles in each department, in order that as occasion arises they may be able to assist themselves on the most important points, in so far as they undertake the study of nature. But those also who have made considerable progress in the survey of the main principles ought to bear in mind the scheme of the whole system set forth in its essentials. For we have frequent need of the general view, but not so often of the detailed exposition. Indeed it is necessary to go back on the main principles, and constantly to fix in one's memory enough to give one the most essential comprehension of the truth. And in fact the accurate knowledge of details will be fully discovered, if the general principles in the various departments are thoroughly grasped and borne in mind, for even in the case of one fully initiated the most essential feature in all accurate knowledge is the capacity to make a rapid use of observation and mental apprehension, and (this can be done if everything) is summed up in elementary principles and formulae. For it is not possible for any one to abbreviate the complete course through the whole system, if he cannot embrace in his own mind by means of short

μέρος καὶ περὶ τῶν δλων) supplevit Bignone 9 συναγομένων] συναγομένοις Muehll. ἀναγνημένων Usener 10 εἴναι] εἰδέναι Meibom δυναμένοι Thomas: δυνάμενον libri

need of this
epitome for
advanced
students.

μένου διὰ βραχεῶν φωνῶν ἅπαν ἐμπειριλαβεῖν ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ
 37 καὶ κατὰ μέρος ἀν ἔξακριβωθέν. | ὅθεν δὴ πᾶσι χρησίμης
 οὖσης τοῦ φυσιολογίᾳ τῆς τοιαύτης ὁδοῦ, παρεγ-
 γνῶν τὸ συνεχὲς ἐνέργημα ἐν φυσιολογίᾳ καὶ τοιούτῳ μάλιστα
 ἐγγαληνίζων τῷ βίῳ ἐποίησά σοι καὶ τοιαύτην τινὰ ἐπιτομὴν
 5 καὶ στοιχεώσω τῶν δλων δοξῶν.

Πρῶτον μὲν οὖν τὰ ὑποτεταγμένα τοῖς φθόγγοις, ὃ
 Ἡρόδοτε, δεῖ εἰλήφεναι, ὥσπερ ἀν τὰ δοξαζόμενα ἡ ζητούμενα
 ἡ ἀπορούμενα ἔχωμεν εἰς ταῦτα ἀναγαγόντες ἐπικρίνειν, καὶ
 μὴ ἄκριτα πάντα ἡμῖν *(ἢ)* εἰς ἀπειφον ἀποδεικνύουσιν ἡ
 38 κενοὺς φθόγγους ἔχωμεν. | ἀνάγκη γὰρ τὸ πρῶτον ἐννόημα
 καθ' ἕκαστον φθόγγον βλέπεσθαι καὶ μηθὲν ἀποδείξεως
 προσδεῖσθαι, εἴπερ ἔξομεν τὸ ζητούμενον ἡ ἀπορούμενον καὶ
 δοξαζόμενον ἐφ' ὃ ἀνάδξομεν. ἔτι τε κατὰ τὰς αἰσθήσεις
 5 δεῖ πάντα τηρεῖν καὶ ἀπλῶς *(κατὰ)* τὰς παρούσας ἐπιβολὰς
 εἴτε διανοίας εἴθ' ὅτου δήποτε τῶν κριτηρίων, δμοίως δὲ κατὰ
 τὰ ὑπάρχοντα πάθη, ὅπως ἀν καὶ τὸ προσμένον καὶ τὸ ἄδηλον
 ἔχωμεν οἷς σημειωτόμεθα.

Ταῦτα δεῖ διαλαβόντας συνορᾶν ἥδη περὶ τῶν ἀδήλων.
 10 πρῶτον μὲν διτὶ οὐδὲν γίνεται ἐκ τοῦ μὴ οὗτος. πᾶν γὰρ
 ἐκ παντὸς ἐγίνετ' ἀν σπερμάτων γε οὐθὲν προσδεόμενον. |
 39 καὶ εἰ ἐφθείρετο δὲ τὸ ἀφανιζόμενον εἰς τὸ μὴ οὖν, πάντα
 ἀν ἀπωλώλει τὰ πράγματα, οὐκ οὕτων εἰς ἀ διελύνετο. καὶ
 μὴν καὶ τὸ πᾶν ἀεὶ τοιοῦτον ἦν οἶον εὑν ἐστι, καὶ ἀεὶ τοιοῦτον
 ἐσται. οὐθὲν γάρ ἐστιν εἰς ὃ μεταβάλλει. παρὰ γὰρ τὸ
 5 πᾶν οὐθὲν ἐστιν, ὃ ἀν εἰσελθὸν εἰς αὐτὸν τὴν μεταβολὴν
 ποιήσαιτο.

II αὐτῷ Schneider: αὐτῷ libri
 Usener. παρεγγιώντων FH¹P²Z: παρεγγιώντ P¹: παρεγγυ . τὸ B :
 παρεγγυώ τὸ Gassendi 3 ἐνέργημα F Usener: ἐνάργημα BGH
 PQCO τοιούτων Hirzel. τὸ τούτων libri: τοιούτος ὧν Bignone
 4 ἐγγαληνίζων τῷ Usener· ἐγγαληνίζοντω P¹CoF²: ἐιταληνίζων τῷ B¹
 ἐγγαληνιζόντων F¹P²Z ἐποίησά σοι Usener: ποιήσασθαι libri
 9 *(ἢ)* Roeper *(ἢ)* Usener· ἡ G 38 4 ἔτι τε Arndt εἴτε libri
 εἴτε Gassendi: ἐπειτα Usener, in commentario ἐπειτεν κατὰ
 seclusis Bignone καὶ Muehll 5 πάντα] πάντων Bignone. πάντως
 Muehll *(κατὰ)* supplevit Gassendi 6 κατὰ Giussani. καὶ
 libri: καὶ *(κατὰ)* Gassendi 9 δεὶ Cohet: δὲ libri post
 διαλαβόντας *(δεὶ)* Arndt 11 ἐγίνετ'] ἐγίνετ' P¹Co 39 2 οὕτων
 F: οὕτων τῶν codd cett 4 εἰς ὃ ὃ Brieger μεταβάλλει]
 μεταβαλεῖ Usener 6 ποιήσαιτο] ποιήσαι Usener. ποιήσαι *(δύναι)το*
 Cronert

formulae all that might be set out with accuracy in detail.

37 Wherefore since the method I have described is valuable to all those who are accustomed to the investigation of nature, I who urge upon others the constant occupation in the investigation of nature, and find my own peace chiefly in a life so occupied, have composed for you another epitome on these lines, summing up the first principles of the whole doctrine.

First of all, Herodotus, we must grasp the ideas attached to words, in order that we may be able to refer to them and so to judge the inferences of opinion or problems of investigation or reflection, so that we may not either leave everything uncertain and go on explaining to infinity or 38 use words devoid of meaning. For this purpose it is essential that the first mental image associated with each word should be regarded, and that there should be no need of explanation, if we are really to have a standard to which to refer a problem of investigation or reflection or a mental inference. And besides we must keep all our investigations in accord with our sensations, and in particular with the immediate apprehensions whether of the mind or of any one of the instruments of judgement, and likewise in accord with the feelings existing in us, in order that we may have indications whereby we may judge both the problem of sense-perception and the unseen.

Having made these points clear, we must now consider II. *The Universe and its Constituents.* First of all, that nothing is created out of that which does not exist: for if it were, everything would be created out of everything 39 with no need of seeds. And again, if that which disappears were destroyed into that which did not exist, all things would have perished, since that into which they were dissolved would not exist. Furthermore, the universe always was such as it is now, and always will be the same. For there is nothing into which it changes: for outside the universe there is nothing which could come into it and bring about the change.

I *Methods of procedure.*
I Words to be used in their first meaning.

a The standards of judgement.

A Imperceptible things.

i Nothing is created out of nothing.

a Nothing is destroyed into nothing.

3 The universe is ever the same.

Αλλὰ μὴν καὶ τὸ πᾶν ἔστι *(σώματα καὶ τόπος)*. σώματα μὲν γὰρ ὡς ἔστιν, αὐτὴν ἡ αἰσθησις ἐπὶ πάντων μαρτυρεῖ, καθ' ἦν ἀναγκαῖον τὸ ἄδηλον τῷ λογισμῷ τεκμαίρεσθαι, ὥστε προεῖπον τὸ πρόσθεν· | εἰ *(δέ)* μὴ ἦν ὁ κενὸν καὶ χώραν καὶ ἀναφῆ φύσιν ὀνομάζομεν, οὐκ ἀν εἶχε τὰ σώματα ὅπου ἦν οὐδὲ δι' οὐ ἐκιεῦτο, καθάπερ φαίνεται κινούμενα. παρὰ δὲ ταῦτα οὐθὲν οὐδὲ ἐπινοηθῆναι δύναται οὔτε περιληπτικῶς οὔτε 5 ἀναλόγως τοῖς περιληπτοῖς, ὡς καθ' ὅλας φύσεις λαμβανόμενα καὶ μὴ ὡς τὰ τούτων συμπτώματα ἡ συμβεβηκότα λεγόμενα. καὶ μὴν καὶ τῶν σωμάτων τὰ μέν ἔστι συγκρίσεις, τὰ δ' 41 ἔξ ὀν αἱ συγκρίσεις πεποίηνται | ταῦτα δέ ἔστιν ἄτομα καὶ ἀμετάβλητα, εἰπερ μὴ μέλλει πάγτα εἰς τὸ μὴ δύν φθαρήσεσθαι ἀλλ' ἵσχυντα τι ὑπομένειν ἐν ταῖς διαλύσεσι τῶν συγκρίσεων, πλήρη τὴν φύσιν ὄντα, οὐκ ἔχοντα ὅπῃ ἢ ὅπως διαλυθήσεται. 5 ὥστε τὰς ἀρχὰς ἀτόμους ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι σωμάτων φύσεις.

Αλλὰ μὴν καὶ τὸ πᾶν ἄπειρον ἔστι. τὸ γὰρ πεπερασμένον ἄκρον ἔχει τὸ δὲ ἄκρον παρ' ἔτερον τι θεωρεῖται. ὥστε οὐκ ἔχοντας ἄκρον πέρας οὐκ ἔχει πέρας δὲ οὐκ ἔχοντας ἄπειρον ἀν εἴη καὶ οὐ πεπερασμένον. καὶ μὴν καὶ τῷ πλήρθει τῶν 10 σωμάτων ἄπειρον ἔστι τὸ πᾶν καὶ τῷ μεγέθει τοῦ κειμού. | εἴτε γὰρ ἦν τὸ κειμὸν ἄπειρον, τὰ δὲ σώματα ὡρισμένα, οὐδαμοῦ ἀν ἔμενε τὰ σώματα, ἀλλ' ἐφέρετο κατὰ τὸ ἄπειρον κενὸν διεσπαρμένα, οὐκ ἔχοντα τὰ ὑπερείδοντα καὶ στέλλοντα κατὰ τὰς ἀνακοπάς. εἴτε τὸ κειμὸν ἦν ὡρισμένον, οὐκ ἀν εἶχε τὰ ἄπειρα σώματα ὅπου ἐνέστη.

Πρός τε τούτους τὰ ἄτομα τῶν σωμάτων καὶ μεστά, ἐξ

7 *(σώματα καὶ τόπος)* supplevit Usener 10 τὸ πρόσθεν] τόπος δὲ Usener 40 I *(δέ)* supplevit Gassendi δ BG: ὃν FHPQ: δὲ Usener 4 οὐδὲ Usener: οὐτε libri περιληπτικῶς *(οἱ Usener: περιληπτῶς libr. cett.* 5-7 ὡς . . λαμβανόμενα . . λεγόμενα] ὅσα . . λαμβάνομεν . . λέγομεν Usener 7 καὶ τῶν B¹P¹QCo: καὶ ταῦτὸν FHPZ 41 3 ἵσχυντα τι scripsi *(idem Bignone): λεγόμενα libri λεγόμενα τι Usener: (ἵσχυοντα τινα in notis mss. Rohde) ὑπομένειν] ὑπομένειν Cronert 4 ὅντα Usener: ὅτα libri: ὄντα καὶ Meibom. οὖν δι Bignone 7 τὸ δὲ FHPQ: τὸ γὰρ BG post θεωρεῖται Usener ἀλλὰ μὴν τὸ πᾶν οὐ παρ' ἔτερον τι θεωρεῖται supplendum censuit 42 5 ἐνέστη BFGP²: ἐνέστη H¹Q*

Scholia

39.7 post ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ legitur τοῦτο καὶ ἐν τῇ Μεγάλῃ ἐπιτομῇ φησι κατ' ἀρχὴν καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀ Περὶ φύσεως ἀλλὰ μὴν . . ἀρχὴν om. Z ἀ BHPQ: πρώτη FZ

Moreover, the universe is (bodies and space): for that bodies exist sense itself witnesses in the experience of all men, and in accordance with the evidence of sense we must of necessity judge of the imperceptible by reasoning,
 40 as I have already said. And if there were not that which we term void and place and intangible existence, bodies would have nowhere to exist and nothing through which to move, as they are seen to move. And besides these two nothing can even be thought of either by conception or on the analogy of things conceivable such as could be grasped as whole existences and not spoken of as the accidents or properties of such existences. Furthermore, among bodies some are compounds, and others those of
 41 which compounds are formed. And these latter are Body exists indivisible and unalterable (if, that is, all things are not to be destroyed into the non-existent, but something permanent is to remain behind at the dissolution of compounds) they are completely solid in nature, and can by no means be dissolved in any part. So it must needs be that the first-beginnings are indivisible corporeal existences.

Moreover, the universe is boundless. For that which is bounded has an extreme point. and the extreme point is seen against something else. So that as it has no extreme point, it has no limit, and as it has no limit, it must be
 42 boundless and not bounded. Furthermore, the infinite is boundless both in the number of the bodies and in the extent of the void. For if on the one hand the void were boundless, and the bodies limited in number, the bodies could not stay anywhere, but would be carried about and scattered through the infinite void, not having other bodies to support them and keep them in place by means of collisions. But if, on the other hand, the void were limited, the infinite bodies would not have room wherein to take their place.

Besides this the indivisible and solid bodies, out of Scholia
 40 7 post καὶ τῶν legitur τοῦτο καὶ ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ Περὶ φύσεως καὶ τῇ
 ἵδ καὶ τῇ Μεγάλῃ ἐπιτομῇ
 καὶ τῇ BGHP Q: καὶ τῇ τῇ FP^s

D. Differences of shape in the atoms—
 but not infinite differences.

ῶν καὶ αἱ συγκρίσεις γίνονται καὶ εἰς ἡ διαλύονται, ἀπερίληπτά
ἔστι ταῖς διαφορᾶς τῶν σχημάτων· οὐ γὰρ δυνατὸν γενέσθαι
τὰς τοσαύτας διαφορὰς ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν σχημάτων περιειλημ-
ιο μένων. καὶ καθ' ἑκάστην δὲ σχημάτισιν ἀπλῶς ἀπειροὶ εἰσιν
αἱ ὅμοιαι, ταῖς δὲ διαφορᾶς οὐχ ἀπλῶς ἀπειροὶ ἀλλὰ μόνον
ἀπερίληπτοι. |

43 Κινοῦνταί τε συνεχῶς αἱ ἄτομοι τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ αἱ μὲν . . .
εἰς μακρὰν ἀπ' ἀλλήλων διαστάμεναι, αἱ δὲ αὖ τὸν παλμὸν
ἴσχουσιν, δταν τύχωσι τῇ περιπλοκῇ κεκλιμέναι ἡ στεγαζό-
μεναι παρὰ τῶν πλεκτικῶν. | ἡ τε γὰρ τοῦ κενοῦ φύσις ἡ
διορίζουσα ἑκάστην αὐτὴν τούτο παρασκευάζει, τὴν ὑπέρεισιν
οὐχ οὐα τε οὐσα ποιεῖσθαι· ἡ τε στερεότης ἡ ὑπάρχουσα
αὐταῖς κατὰ τὴν σύγκρουσιν τὸν ἀποπαλμὸν ποιεῖ, ἐφ' ὅποσον
5 διν ἡ περιπλοκὴ τὴν ἀποκατάστασιν ἐκ τῆς συγκρούσεως διδῷ.
ἀρχὴ δὲ τούτων οὐκ ἔστιν, αἰτίων τῶν ἀτόμων οὐσῶν καὶ
τοῦ κενοῦ. |

45 Ἡ τοσαύτη δὴ φωνὴ τούτων πάντων μνημονευομένων τὸν
ἰκανὸν τύπον ὑποβάλλει τῆς τῶν ὄντων φύσεως ἐπιοῖας.

'Αλλὰ μὴν καὶ κόσμοι ἀπειροὶ εἰσὶν οἵ θ' ὅμοιοι τούτῳ
καὶ οἱ ἀνόμοιοι. αἱ τε γὰρ ἄτομοι ἀπειροὶ οὐσαι, ὡς ἄρτι
5 ἀπεδείχθη, φέρονται καὶ πορρωτάτῳ. οὐ γὰρ κατανήλωνται
αἱ τοιαῦται ἄτομοι, ἐξ ὧν ἀν γένοιτο κόσμος ἡ ὑφ' ὧν ἀν
ποιηθείη, οὗτ' εἰς ἔνα οὕτ' εἰς πεπερασμένους, οὕθ' δσοι
τοιοῦτοι οὗθ' δσοι διάφοροι τούτοις. ὥστε οὐδὲν τὸ ἐμποδο-
στατῆσόν ἔστι πρὸς τὴν ἀπειρίαν τῶν κόσμων. |

9 αὐτῶν om G 43 1 lacunam post καὶ αἱ μὲν indicavit
Bignone, ante eadem verba Usener 2 οὐ Usener (in commen-
tario) αὐτὸν librī · αἰτοῦ Brieger 3 [ἴσχουσιν] Brieger
τῇ περιπλοκῇ Usener: τὴν περιπλοκήν librī 4 παρὰ G: περὶ¹
BHPQ 44 2 αὐτὴν] αὐτῶν G 6 αἰτίων] αἰδίων H. Weil
45 1 δι BPQ δὲ G 2 (ταῖς περὶ) ante τῆς inseruit Usener
ἐπινοίας Z f Bignone ἐπινοίας librī cett. Usener 3 οἵ θ' B²GH
PQCo: εἴθ' B¹FZ 4 καὶ οἱ GHPQCo: καὶ BFZ¹: εἴτ' f

Scholia

43 12 post ἀπερίληπτοι legitur οὐδε γάρ φησιν ἐνδοτέρω εἰς ἀπειρον
τὴν τομὴν τυγχάνειν, λέγει δέ, ἐπειδὴ αἱ πιστήτες μεταβάλλονται, εἰ
μέλλει τις μὴ καὶ τοῖς μεγέθεσιν ἀπλῶς εἰς ἀπειρον αὐτὰς ἐκβάλλειν
λέγει] λήγει C. F. Hermann: λήγειν Usener εἰ μέλλει . . .
ἐμβάλλειν in textu retinuit Muehll μέλλει librī plerique:
μέλλοι BG

43 1 post αἱ ἄτομοι legitur φησὶ δὲ ἐνδοτέρω καὶ ισοταχῶς αὐτὰς
κινεῖσθαι τοῦ κενοῦ τὴν εἰξιν ὁμοίαν παρεχομένου καὶ τῇ κουφοτάτῃ καὶ
τῇ βαρυτῇ
εἰξιν Kuhn: Ιξιν B: ιξιν librī cett.

which too the compounds are created and into which they are dissolved, have an incomprehensible number of varieties in shape for it is not possible that such great varieties of things should arise from the same (atomic) shapes, if they are limited in number. And so in each shape the atoms are quite infinite in number, but their differences of shape are not quite infinite, but only incomprehensible in number.

- 43 And the atoms move continuously for all time, some of them (falling straight down, others swerving, and others recoiling from their collisions. And of the latter, some are borne on) separating to a long distance from one another, while others again recoil and recoil, whenever they chance to be checked by the interlacing with others, or else shut in by atoms interlaced around them. For on the one hand the nature of the void which separates each atom by itself brings this about, as it is not able to afford resistance, and on the other hand the hardness which belongs to the atoms makes them recoil after collision to as great a distance as the interlacing permits separation after the collision. And these motions have no beginning, since the atoms and the void are the cause.
- 44 These brief sayings, if all these points are borne in mind, afford a sufficient outline for our understanding of the nature of existing things.

Furthermore, there are infinite worlds both like and unlike this world of ours. For the atoms being infinite in number, as was proved already, are borne on far out into space. For those atoms, which are of such nature that a world could be created out of them or made by them, have not been used up either on one world or on a limited number of worlds, nor again on all the worlds which are alike, or on those which are different from these. So that there nowhere exists an obstacle to the infinite number of the worlds.

Scholia

44. 7 post τοῦ κενοῦ legitur φησὶ δ' ἐνδοτέρω μηδὲ ποιότητά τινα περὶ τὰς ἀτόμους εἶναι πλὴν σχήματος καὶ μεγέθους καὶ βάρους· τὸ δὲ χρῶμα παρὰ τὴν θεσὺν τῶν ἀτόμων ἀλλάττεσθαι ἐν ταῖς Δώδεκα στοιχείωσεσι φησει. πᾶν δὲ μέγεθος μὴ εἶναι περὶ αὐτάς οὐδέποτε γοῦν ἀτομος ὄφθη αἰσθῆσει παρὰ libr. plerique. περὶ HQ δώδεκα libr. plerique: iB BPCo

46^a Καὶ μὴν καὶ τύποι ὁμοιοσχήμονες τοῖς στερεμνίοις εἰσί,
λεπτότησιν ἀπέχοντες μακρὰν τῶν φαινομένων. οὕτε γὰρ
ἀποστάσεις ἀδυνατοῦντι ἐν τῷ περιέχοντι γίνεσθαι τοιαῦται
οὐτ' ἐπιτηδειότητες τῆς κατεργασίας τῶν κοιλωμάτων καὶ
5 λεπτοτήτων γίνεσθαι, οὔτε ἀπόρροιαι τὴν ἔξῆς θέσιν καὶ βάσιν
διατηροῦσαι, ἢν περ καὶ ἐν τοῖς στερεμνίοις εἶχον· τούτους
δὲ τοὺς τύπους εἴδωλα προσταγορεύομεν. |

47^a Εἰθ' ὅτι τὰ εἴδωλα τὰς λεπτότησιν ἀνυπερβλήτοις κέχρηται,
οὐθὲν ἀντιμαρτυρεῖ τῶν φαινομένων· οὗτοι καὶ τάχη ἀνυπέρ-
βλητα ἔχει, πάντα πόρον σύμμετρον ἔχοντα πρὸς {τῷ} τῷ
ἀπορρῷ αὐτῶν μηθὲν ἀντικόπτειν ἡ δλίγα ἀντικόπτειν, πολλαῖς
48 δὲ καὶ ἀπείροις εὐθὺς ἀντικόπτειν τι. | πρὸς τε τούτοις, ὅτι
ἡ γένεσις τῶν εἰδώλων ἄμα νοήματι συμβαίνει. καὶ γὰρ
ρέυστις ἀπὸ τῶν σωμάτων τοῦ ἐπιπολῆς συνεχής, οὐκ ἐπίδηλος
τῇ μειώσει διὰ τὴν ἀνταναπλήρωσιν, σώζουσα τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ
5 στερεμνίου θέσιν καὶ τάξιν τῶν ἀτόμων ἐπὶ πολὺν χρόνον,
εἰ καὶ ἐνίστε συγχεομένη, καὶ συστάσεις ἐν τῷ περιέχοιτι
όξειαι διὰ τὸ μὴ δεῦν κατὰ βάθος τὸ συμπλήρωμα γίνεσθαι,
καὶ ἄλλοι δὲ τρόποι τινὲς γεννητικοὶ τῶν τοιούτων φύσεών
εἰσιν. οὐθὲν γὰρ τούτων ἀντιμαρτυρεῖται τὰς αἰσθήσεσιν,
10 ἀν βλέπῃ τις τίνα τρόπον τὰς ἐναργείας, τίνα καὶ τὰς
συμπαθείας ἀπὸ τῶν ἔξωθεν πρὸς ήμᾶς ἀνοίσει. |

49 Δεῖ δὲ καὶ νομίζειν, ἐπεισιώτος τιὸς ἀπὸ τῶν ἔξωθεν
τὰς μορφὰς ὄραν ήμᾶς καὶ διαρογεῖσθαι· οὐ γὰρ ἀν ἐναποσφρα-
γίσαιτο τὰ ἔξω τὴν ἑαυτῶν φύσιν τοῦ τε χρώματος καὶ τῆς
μορφῆς διὰ τοῦ ἀέρος τοῦ μεταξὺ ήμῶν τε κάκενων, οὐδὲ
5 διὰ τῶν ἀκτίνων ἡ οὖν δή ποτε ῥευμάτων ἀφ' ήμῶν πρὸς

46^a 3 ἀποστάσεις] συστάσεις Gassendi 4 τῆς scripsi· τοὺς
BΡ' QCo· τὰς FHP^b: τὰς GTI πρὸς Usener 5 λεπτοτήτων]
λειτητῶν Usener γίνεσθαι del. Kühn 46 καὶ μὴν καὶ . . .
47 κατασχεῖν τὸ στοιχεῖον has duas sententias suadente Giussani ad
δῆ 61, 62 transstuli 47^a 1 εἰθ' FPQ: εἰθ' B^cG H 3 {τῷ} supplevit
Meibom: {τὸ} Tescari 4 ἀπορρῷ scripsi collato Lucr. IV. 205. ἀπείρω
libri: {μὴ} ἀπείρω Bignone: τὸ ἀπείροις Muehll: post ἀπείρω aliquid
intercidisse suspicabatur Tescari πολλαῖς πολλοῖς Usener in com-
mentario 48 3 ἐπιπολῆς Z^df: ἐπὶ πολλῆς libr. cett. (ἐπιπολῆς
P^e) συνεχῆς P^f mg: συνυοῦχῆς librī 4 τῇ μειώσει Usener: σημειώσει
BGHPQ: ἡ μειώσει F 6 post συγχεομένη supplet ὑπάρχει H mg.
9 ἀντιμαρτυρεῖται H. Weil: ἀντιμαρτυρεῖ BGHPQCoZ: μαρτυρεῖ F
10 τις τίνα scripsi: τις τίνα librī ἐναργείας Gassendi ἐνεργείας librī
τίνα Usener: τίνα librī 11 ἀνοίσει B: ἀνοίσην FHPQCoZ. ἀνεισι G

- 46* Moreover, there are images like in shape to the solid III. *Sense-*
 bodies, far surpassing perceptible things in their subtlety ^{perception} A *Sight.*
 of texture. For it is not impossible that such emanations ¹ The
 should be formed in that which surrounds the objects, nor
 that there should be opportunities for the formation of such
 hollow and thin frames, nor that there should be effluences
 which preserve the respective position and order which they
 had before in the solid bodies: these images we call idols.
- 47* Next, nothing among perceptible things contradicts the ² Their
 belief that the images have unsurpassable fineness of ^{subtlety and} speed.
 texture. And for this reason they have also unsurpassable speed of motion, since the movement of all their atoms
 is uniform, and besides nothing or very few things hinder
 their emission by collisions, whereas a body composed of
 many or infinite atoms is at once hindered by collisions.
- 48 Besides this (nothing contradicts the belief) that the ³ Their
 creation of the idols takes place as quick as thought. For immediate
 the flow of atoms from the surface of bodies is continuous,
 yet it cannot be detected by any lessening in the size of
 the object because of the constant filling up of what is lost.
 The flow of images preserves for a long time the position
 and order of the atoms in the solid body, though it is
 occasionally confused. Moreover compound idols are
 quickly formed in the air around, because it is not necessary
 for their substance to be filled in deep inside: and
 besides there are certain other methods in which existences
 of this sort are produced. For not one of these beliefs is
 contradicted by our sensations, if one looks to see in
 what way sensation will bring us the clear visions from
 external objects, and in what way again the corresponding
 sequence of qualities and movements.
- 49 Now we must suppose too that it is when something ⁴ The method
 enters us from external objects that we not only see but ^{of sight and} thought.
 think of their shapes. For external objects could not make
 on us an impression of the nature of their own colour and
 shape by means of the air which lies between us and
 them, nor again by means of the rays or effluences of any

49 2 ἀν ἐνποσφραγίσαιτο Cobet: ἀ μὲν (ἀν GZ³) ἀποσφραγίσαιτο
 libri 5 τῶν] τινῶν Usener

ἐκεῖνα παραγωμένων, οὕτως ὡς τύπων τινῶν ἐπεισιόντων
ἡμῖν ἀπὸ τῶν πραγμάτων ὁμοχρόων τε καὶ ὁμοιομόρφων κατὰ
τὸ ἐνάρμοττον μέγεθος εἰς τὴν ὅψιν ἢ τὴν διάνοιαν, ὡκέως

50 ταῖς φοραῖς χρωμένων, | εἴτα διὰ ταύτην τὴν αἵτιαν τοῦ ἐνὸς
καὶ συνεχοῦς τὴν φαντασίαν ἀποδιδόντων καὶ τὴν συμπάθειαν
ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑποκειμένου σωζόντων κατὰ τὸν ἐκεῖθεν σύμμετρον
ἐπερεισμὸν ἐκ τῆς κατὰ βάθος ἐν τῷ στερεμνίφ τῶν ἀτόμων

5 πάλσεως. καὶ ἦν ἀν λάβωμεν φαντασίαν ἐπιβλητικῶς τῇ
διανοίᾳ ἢ τοῖς αἰσθητηρίοις εἴτε μορφῇς εἴτε συμβεβηκότων,
μορφή ἐστιν αὗτη τοῦ στερεμνίου, γνωμένη κατὰ τὸ ἔξῆς
πύκνωμα ἢ ἐγκατάλειμμα τοῦ εἰδώλου τὸ δὲ ψεῦδος καὶ τὸ
διημαρτημένον ἐν τῷ προσδοξαζομένῳ ἀεί ἐστιν (ἐπὶ τοῦ

10 προσμένοντος) ἐπιμαρτυρηθήσεσθαι ἢ μὴ ἀντιμαρτυρηθήσεσθαι,

55 εἶτ' οὐκ ἐπιμαρτυρουμένου (ἢ ἀντιμαρτυρουμένου). | ἢ τε γὰρ
ὁμοιότης τῶν φαντασμῶν οἷον εἰ ἐν εἰκόνι λαμβανομένων
ἢ λαθ' ὑπνους γνωμένων ἢ κατ' ἄλλας τινὰς ἐπιβολὰς τῆς
διανοίας ἢ τῶν λοιπῶν κριτηρίων οὐκ ἀν ποτε ὑπῆρχε τοῖς

5 οὖσί τε καὶ ἀληθέστι προσαγορευομένοις, εἰ μὴ ἦν τινα καὶ
τοιαῦτα προσβαλλόμενα· τὸ δὲ διημαρτημένον οὐκ ἀν ὑπῆρχεν,
εἰ μὴ ἐλαμβάνομεν καὶ ἄλλην τινὰ κίνησιν ἐν ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς
συνημμένην μὲν (τῇ φανταστικῇ ἐπιβολῇ), διάληψιν δὲ
ἔχουσαν· κατὰ δὲ ταύτην, ἐὰν μὲν μὴ ἐπιμαρτυρηθῇ ἢ ἀντι-

10 μαρτυρηθῇ, τὸ ψεῦδος γίνεται· ἐὰν δὲ ἐπιμαρτυρηθῇ ἢ μὴ
ἀντιμαρτυρηθῇ, τὸ ἀληθές. | καὶ ταύτην οὖν σφόδρα γε δεῖ
τὴν δόξαν κατέχειν, ἵνα μήτε τὰ κριτήρια ἀναιρῆται τὰ κατὰ
τὰς ἐναργείας μήτε τὸ διημαρτημένον ὁμοίως βεβαιούμενον
πάντα συνταράττῃ.

7 ὁμοχρόων Ross: ἀπὸ χρυσῶν libri 9 φοραῖς H mg μορ-
φαῖς libri 50 2 ἀποδιδόντων σωζόντων Usener: ἀποδιδόντως
... σωζόντος libri 5 πάλσεως TlD Usener: πλάσεως FHPQCoZ.

π... BG ἀν λάβωμεν TlD Gassendi: ἀγαλάβωμεν libri cett.

8 ἐγκατάλειμμα τοῦ Ζ³. ἐγκαταλείμματος FGZ¹. ἐγκαταλείμματος B:

ἐγκαταλήματος HPQCo 9 (ἐπὶ τοῦ προσμένοντος) supplevit Usener

11 (ἢ ἀντιμαρτυρουμένου) supplevit Usener 51 2 οἷον εἰ] οἷον ἢ
Usener 6 τοιαῦτα Gassendi. ταῦτα libri προσβαλλόμενα

Usener: πρὸς δὲ (ἀ F) βάλλομεν libri τὸ δὲ] τὸ τε Usener

8 (τῇ φανταστικῇ ἐπιβολῇ) ex glossemate § 50 adscripto supplevit
Usener 52 3 ἐναργείας Gassendi. ἐνεργείας libri

Scholia

50 ΙΙ post ἐπιμαρτυρουμένου legitur κατά τινα κίνησιν ἐν ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς
συνημμένην τῇ φανταστικῇ ἐπιβολῇ, διάληψιν δὲ ἔχουσαν, καθ' ἦν τὸ

sort which pass from us to them—nearly so well as if models, similar in colour and shape, leave the objects and enter according to their respective size either into our sight or into our mind, moving along swiftly, and so by this means reproducing the image of a single continuous thing and preserving the corresponding sequence of qualities and movements from the original object as the result of their uniform contact with us, kept up by the vibration of the atoms deep in the interior of the concrete body.

And every image which we obtain by an act of apprehension on the part of the mind or of the sense-organs,⁵ whether of shape or of properties, this image is the shape (or the properties) of the concrete object, and is produced by the constant repetition of the image or the impression it has left. Now falsehood and error always lie in the addition of opinion with regard to (what is waiting) to be confirmed or not contradicted, and then is not confirmed (or is contradicted). For the similarity between the things which exist, which we call real, and the images received as a likeness of things and produced either in sleep or through some other acts of apprehension on the part of the mind or the other instruments of judgement, could never be, unless there were some effluences of this nature actually brought into contact with our senses. And error would not exist unless another kind of movement too were produced inside ourselves, closely linked to the apprehension of images, but differing from it, and it is owing to this, supposing it is not confirmed, or is contradicted, that falsehood arises, but if it is confirmed or not contradicted, it is true. Therefore we must do our best to keep this doctrine in mind, in order that on the one hand the standards of judgement dependent on the clear visions may not be undermined, and on the other error may not be as firmly established as truth and so throw all into confusion.

Scholia

ψεῦδος γίνεται.

Scholion usque ab ἐπιμαρτυρηθίσεσθαι incipere credit Muehll τινα κίνησιν Usener: τὴν ἀκίνητον libri τὴν κίνησιν Menagius ἔχουσαν Gassendi: ἔχουσην libri

⁵¹ 9 post κατὰ δὲ ταῦτη legitur τὴν συνημμένην τῇ φανταστικῇ ἐπιβολῇ, διάληψιν δὲ ἔχουσαν ἔχουσαν P³H: ἔχουσης BGP¹QCo: ἔχουσαι F

5 'Αλλὰ μὴν καὶ τὸ ἀκούειν γίνεται ῥεύματός τυνος φερομένοι
ἀπὸ τοῦ φωνοῦντος ἢ ἡχοῦντος ἢ ψοφοῦντος ἢ δπως δήποτε
ἀκουστικὸν πάθος παρασκευάζοντος. τὸ δὲ ῥεῦμα τοῦτο εἰς
δημοιμερεῖς ὅγκους διασπείρεται, ἔμα τινὰ διασφέζουντας συμ-
πάθειαν πρὸς ἄλλήλους καὶ ἐνότητα ἰδιότροπον διατείνουσαν
10 πρὸς τὸ ἀποστεῖλαν, καὶ τὴν ἐπαίσθησιν τὴν ἐπ' ἑκείνου ὡς
τὰ πολλὰ ποιῶνταν, εἰ δὲ μή γε, τὸ ἔξωθεν μόρον ἔνδηλον
53 παρασκευάζουσαν. | ἄτεν γὰρ ἀναφερομένης τινὸς ἐκεῖθεν συμ-
παθείας οὐκ ἀν γένοιτο ἢ τοιαύτη ἐπαίσθησις. οὐκ αὐτὸν
οὖν δεῖ νομίζειν τὸν ἀέρα ὑπὸ τῆς προιεμένης φωνῆς ἢ καὶ
τῶν ὁμογενῶν σχηματίζεσθαι (πολλὴν γὰρ ἔνδειαν ἔχει τοῦτο
5 πάσχειν ὑπ' ἑκείνης), ἀλλ' εὐθὺς τὴν γινομένην πληγὴν ἐν
ἡμῖν, ὅταν φωνὴν ἀφίωμεν, τοιαύτῃν ἐκθλιψιν ὅγκων τινῶν
ῥεύματος πνευματώδους ἀποτελεστικῶι ποιεῖσθαι, ἢ τὸ πάθος
τὸ ἀκουστικὸν ἡμῖν παρασκευάζει.

Καὶ μὴν καὶ τὴν ὑπομνήματον, ὥσπερ καὶ τὴν ἀκοήν,
10 οὐκ ἀν ποτε οὐθὲν πάθος ἐργάσασθαι, εἰ μὴ ὅγκοι τινὲς ἡσαν
ἀπὸ τοῦ πλάγματος ἀποφερόμενοι σύμμετροι πρὸς τὸ τοῦτο
τὸ αἰσθητήριον κινεῖν, οἱ μὲν τοῖοι τεταραγμένως καὶ ἀλλο-
τρίως, οἱ δὲ τοῖοι ἀταράχως καὶ οἰκείως ἔχοιτες. |

54 Καὶ μὴν καὶ τὰς ἀτόμους γομιστέον μηδεμίαν ποιώτητα
τῶν φαινομένων προσφέρεσθαι πλὴν σχήματος καὶ βάρους
καὶ μεγέθους καὶ δσα ἐξ ἀνάγκης σχήματι συμφυῇ ἐστι.
ποιώτης γὰρ πᾶσα μεταβάλλει: αἱ δὲ ἀτομοι οὐδὲν μεταβάλ-
5 λουσιν, ἐπειδήπερ δεῖ τι ὑπομένειν ἐν ταῖς διαλύσεσι τῶν
συγκρίσεων στερεὸν καὶ ἀδιάλυτον, ὃ τὰς μεταβολὰς οὐκ εἰς
τὸ μὴ δν ποιήσεται οὐδὲ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ δντος, ἀλλὰ κατὰ μετα-
θέσεις (τινῶν), τινῶν δὲ καὶ προσύδους καὶ ἀφόδους. ὅθεν
ἀναγκαῖον τὰ μὲν μετατιθέμενα ἄφθαρτα εἶναι καὶ τὴν τοῦ
10 μεταβάλλοντος φύσιν οὐκ ἔχοντα, ὅγκους δὲ καὶ σχημα-

5 ῥεύματος Gassendi: πνεύματος libri	10 ὡς τὰ πολλὰ] ut glos- se clausit Usener 11 ποιῶνταν. . παρασκευάζουσαν] πνοῦντας .
παρασκευάζοντας Usener	53 5 πάσχειν Meibom: πάσχων B ² GHPQ πάσχον B ¹ F 6 ἐκθλιψιν Bιεγει· ἐλίθην B: ἐκληθην P ¹ QH ² Co: ἐκ FGHP ² Z: ἔγκλισιν Usener 6γκων τινῶν P ¹ QCo.
τινῶν ὅγκων FGHP ² Z: ὅγκων τινὸς B Usener	7 ἀποτελεστικῶν]
ἀποτελεστικήν Usener	II πρὸς τὸ FG πρὸς BHPQ 54 3 σχή- ματι Kuhn: σχήματος libri 4 οἵδει Zf. οὐδὲ cett. 5 διὶ BP ¹ : αἱ FGZ. δὴ Co 8 (τινῶν) Bignone: ἐν πολλοῖς (sc. lemma) libri plerique: ἐκ πολλοῦ Z: μὲν πολλῶν Gassendi: ἐν πολλοῖς . . . ἀφό- δους ut variam lectionem seclusit Usener 9 μὲν Kochalsky. μὴ libri: δὴ Usener

Moreover, hearing too results when a current is carried off from the object speaking or sounding or making a noise, or causing in any other way a sensation of hearing. Now this current is split up into particles, each like the whole, which at the same time preserve a correspondence of qualities with one another and a unity of character which stretches right back to the object which emitted the sound · this unity it is which in most cases produces comprehension in the recipient, or, if not, merely makes

B Hearing.
Hearing is due to an effluence from the object, which splits up into similar particles, which preserve the character of the original

- 53 manifest the presence of the external object. For without the transference from the object of some correspondence of qualities, comprehension of this nature could not result. We must not then suppose that the actual air is moulded into shape by the voice which is emitted or by other similar sounds—for it will be very far from being so acted upon by it—but that the blow which takes place inside us, when we emit our voice, causes at once a squeezing out of certain particles, which produce a stream of breath, of such a character as to afford us the sensation of hearing

Furthermore, we must suppose that smell too, just like hearing, could never bring about any sensation, unless there were certain particles carried off from the object of suitable size to stir this sense-organ, some of them in a manner disorderly and alien to it, others in a regular manner and akin in nature.

C Smell is similarly caused by effluences

- 54 Moreover, we must suppose that the atoms do not IV *The Atoms.* possess any of the qualities belonging to perceptible things, except shape, weight, and size, and all that necessarily goes with shape. For every quality changes, but the atoms do not change at all, since there must needs be something which remains solid and indissoluble at the dissolution of compounds, which can cause changes; not changes into the non-existent or from the non-existent, but changes effected by the shifting of position of some particles, and by the addition or departure of others. For this reason it is essential that the bodies which shift their position should be imperishable and should not possess the nature of what changes, but parts and configuration of their own For thus much must needs remain constant

*A. Their properties shape, weight, and size
1 Other qualities change, but there must be something constant to prevent complete destruction*

τισμοὺς ἰδίους· τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ἀναγκαῖον ὑπομένειν· | καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς παρ' ἡμῖν μετασχηματιζομένοις κατὰ τὴν περιαἱρεσιν τὸ σχῆμα ἐνυπάρχον λαμβάνεται, αἱ δὲ ποιότητες οὐκ ἐνυπάρχουσαι ἐν τῷ μεταβάλλοντι, ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνο καταλείπεται, ἀλλ' 5 ἔξ διον τοῦ σώματος ἀπολλύμεναι. ἵκανα οὖν τὰ ὑπολειπόμενα τὰντα τὰς τῶν συγκρίσεων διαφορὰς ποιεῖν, ἐπειδὴ περ ὑπολειπεσθαί γέ τινα ἀναγκαῖον καὶ (μὴ) εἰς τὸ μὴ δν φθείρεσθαι.

'Αλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ δεῖ νομίζειν πᾶν μέγεθος ἐν ταῖς ἀτόμοις 10 ὑπάρχειν, ἵνα μὴ τὰ φαινόμενα ἀντιμαρτυρῇ παραλλαγὰς δέ τινας μεγεθῶν νομιστέον εἶναι. βέλτιον γὰρ καὶ τούτου προσόντος τὰ κατὰ τὰ πάθη καὶ τὰς αἰσθήσεις γινόμενα 56 ἀποδοθήσεται. | πᾶν δὲ μέγεθος ὑπάρχον οὔτε χρήσιμόν ἐστι πρὸς τὰς τῶν ποιοτήτων διαφοράς, ἀφίχθαι τε ἄμ' ἔδει καὶ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ὅρατὰς ἀτόμους· ὃ οὐθεωρεῖται γιγάντειον, οὐδ' ὅπως ἀν γένοιτο ὄρατὴ ἄτομος ἔστιν ἐπιωνῆσαι.

5 Πρὸς δὲ τούτοις οὐδὲ δεῖ νομίζειν ἐν τῷ ὡρισμένῳ σώματι ἀπείρους ὅγκους εἶναι οὐδὲ ὅπηλίκους οὖν. ὥστε οὐ μόνον τὴν εἰς ἀπειρον τομὴν ἐπὶ τοῦλαττον ἀναιρετέον, ἵνα μὴ πάντα ἀσθενῆ ποιῶμεν καν ταῖς περιλήψεσι τῶν ἀθρόων εἰς τὸ μὴ δν ἀναγκαζόμεθα τὰ ὄντα θλίβοντες καταναλίσκειν, 10 ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν μετάβασιν μὴ νομιστέον γενέσθαι ἐν τοῖς ὡρισμένοις εἰς ἀπειρον μηδ' (ἐπὶ) τοῦλαττον. | οὔτε γὰρ ὅπως, ἐπειδὰν ἀπαξ τις εἴπη ὅτι ἀπειρος ὅγκοι ἐν τινι ὑπάρχουσιν ἡ ὅπηλίκοι οὖν, ἔστι νοήσαι, πῶς τ' ἀν ἔτι τοῦτο πεπερασμένον εἴη τὸ μέγεθος; (πηλίκοι γάρ τινες 5 δῆλον ὡς οἱ ἀπειροί εἰσιν ὅγκοι· καὶ οὗτοι ὅπηλίκοι ἀν ποτε ὕστιν, ἀπειρον ἀν ἦν καὶ τὸ μέγεθος.) ἄκρον τε ἔχοντος τοῦ πεπερασμένου διαληπτόν, εἰ μὴ καὶ καθ' ἔαυτὸ θεωρητόν, οὐκ ἔστι μὴ οὐ καὶ τὸ ἔξῆς τούτου τοιοῦτον νοεῖν καὶ οὕτω

11 τοῦτο] ταῦτα Melbom [ὑπομένειν] Usener
 55 7 καὶ (μὴ) Aldobrandinus . καὶ libri : οὐκ Usener : καὶ μηδὲν Bignone 9 οὐδὲ δεῖ Gassendi οὐδὲ ἀλι libri 56 1 ὑπάρχον] ὑπάρχειν Usener 2 ἄμ' ἔδει Usener : ἀμέλει (ἀμέλλει H¹) libri : ἀν ἔδει Weil 3 οὐδὲ Usener οὐθ' libri 4 ὄρατὴ ἄτομος ut glossema seclusit Usener 8 καν Usener : καὶ libri ἀθρόων B : ἀτόμων F 11 μηδ' (ἐπὶ) Gassendi : μηδὲ vel μὴ δὲ libri 57 2 ὅπως] om F Giussani 3 ἥ] οἱ Usener 5 οἱ] om. FGHP³ post οὗτοι addunt ἔξ ζω omnes libri excepto B 6 ἔχοντος Gassendi · ἔχοντες libri 7 θεωρητόν Co Usener. θεωρητέον libr. cett. 8 μὴ οὐ BP¹Q : μὴ cett. οὕτω PCoF²Z : τοῦτο BF¹ : οὐ τῷ Giussani

55 For even in things perceptible to us which change their shape by the withdrawal of matter it is seen that shape remains to them, whereas the qualities do not remain in the changing object, in the way in which shape is left behind, but are lost from the entire body. Now these particles which are left behind are sufficient to cause the differences in compound bodies, since it is essential that some things should be left behind and not be destroyed into the non-existent.

Moreover, we must not either suppose that every size ^a exists among the atoms, in order that the evidence of phenomena may not contradict us, but we must suppose that there are some variations of size. For if this be the case, we can give a better account of what occurs in our feelings and sensations. But the existence of atoms of every size is not required to explain the differences of qualities in things, and at the same time some atoms would be bound to come within our ken and be visible, but this is never seen to be the case, nor is it possible to imagine how an atom could become visible.

Besides this we must not suppose that in a limited body ^b there can be infinite parts or parts of every degree of smallness. Therefore, we must not only do away with division into smaller and smaller parts to infinity, in order that we may not make all things weak, and so in the composition of aggregate bodies be compelled to crush and squander the things that exist into the non-existent, but we must not either suppose that in limited bodies there is a possibility of continuing to infinity in passing even to smaller and smaller parts. For if once one says that there are infinite parts in a body or parts of any degree of smallness, it is not possible to conceive how this should be, and indeed how could the body any longer be limited in size? (For it is obvious that these infinite particles must be of some size or other; and however small they may be, the size of the body too would be infinite.) And again, since the limited body has an extreme point, which is distinguishable, even though not perceptible by itself, you cannot conceive that the succeeding point to it is not

^a The atoms have varieties of size, but not all sizes.

^b For then some would become visible

^a The parts of the atoms of a limited body cannot be infinite in number or infinitely small

^b For, if they are, (a) the body cannot be limited in size, and (b) in the enumeration of extreme points it is not possible to continue to infinity

- κατὰ τὸ ἔξῆς εἰς τοῦμπροσθεν βαδίζοντι εἰς τὸ ἀπειρον
 58 οὐπάρχειν κατὰ τὸ τοιωτον ἀφικνεῖσθαι τῇ ἐννοίᾳ. | τὸ τε
 ἐλάχιστον τὸ ἐν τῇ αἰσθήσει δεῖ κατανοεῖν διτε οὔτε τοιωτόν
 ἐστω οἷον τὸ τὰς μεταβάσεις ἔχον οὔτε πάντη πάντως
 ἀνδρούιον, ἀλλ' ἔχον μὲν τινα κοινότητα τῶν μεταβατῶν,
 5 διάληψιν δὲ μερῶν οὐκ ἔχον ἀλλ' ὅταν διὰ τὴν τῆς κοινότη-
 τος προσεμφέρειαν οἰηθῶμεν διαλήψεσθαι τι αὐτοῦ, τὸ μὲν
 ἐπιτάδε, τὸ δὲ ἐπέκεινα, τὸ ίσον ήμūν δεῖ προσπίπτειν. ἔξῆς
 τε θεωροῦμεν ταῦτα ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου καταρχόμενοι καὶ οὐκ
 ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ, οὐδὲ μέρεσι μερῶν ἀπόδιμενα, ἀλλ' ἡ ἐν τῇ
 10 ίδιότητι τῇ ἑαυτῶν τὰ μεγέθη καταμετροῦντα, τὰ πλειόν
 καὶ τὰ ἐλάττω ἐλαττον. ταύτη τῇ ἀναλογίᾳ νομιστέον καὶ τὸ
 59 ἐν τῇ ἀτόμῳ ἐλάχιστον κεχρῆσθαι. | μικρότητι γὰρ ἐκεῖνο δῆλον
 ως διαφέρει τοῦ κατὰ τὴν αἰσθήσιν θεωρουμένου, ἀναλογίᾳ
 δὲ τῇ αὐτῇ κέχρηται. ἐπει περ καὶ διτε μέγεθος ἔχει ἡ ἄτομος,
 κατὰ τὴν *(τῶν)* ἐνταῦθα ἀναλογίαν κατηγορήσαμεν, μικρόν
 5 τι μόνον μακρῶν ἐκβάλλοντες. ἔτι τε τὰ ἐλάχιστα καὶ
 ἀμιγῆ πέρατα δεῖ νομίζειν, τῶν μηκῶν τὸ καταμέτρημα ἐξ
 αὐτῶν πρώτων τοῖς μείζοσι καὶ ἐλάττοσι παρασκευάζοντα,
 τῇ διὰ λόγου θεωρίᾳ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσφάτων. ἡ γὰρ κοινότης ἡ
 10 ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῖς πρὸς τὰ ἀμετάβολα ἵκανή τὸ μέχρι τούτου
 συντελέσαι· συμφόρησιν δὲ ἐκ τούτων κίνησιν ἔχόντων οὐχ
 οἶν τε γενέσθαι. |
- 60 Καὶ μὴν καὶ τοῦ ἀπειρον ως μὲν ἀνωτάτῳ ἡ κατωτάτῳ
 οὐ δεῖ κατηγορεῖν τὸ ἄνω ἡ κάτω· εἰς μέντοι τὸ ὑπὲρ
 κεφαλῆς, ὅθεν ἀν στῶμεν, εἰς ἀπειρον ἄγειν *(ἐν)*δὲν μηδέποτε
 φανεῖσθαι τοῦτο ήμūν· ἡ τὸ ὑποκάτω τοῦ νοηθέντος εἰς
- 9 Βαδίζοντι Usener: βαδίζοντα libri 10 κατὰ] καὶ τὸ Muehll
 (τὸ) supplevit Schneider 58 4 μεταβατῶν Schneider: μετα-
 βάντων libri 5 ἀλλ' ὅταν Cobet: ἀλλ' ὅτε (ἄλλοτε ΗΡΩ) libri
 59 3 κέχρηται Gassendi: κεχρῆσθαι libri 4 *(τῶν)* supplevit Usener
 5 μακρῶν Usener: μακρὸν libri ἐκβάλλοντες] ἐκβαλόντες Usener
 6 ἀμιγῆ] ἀμερῆ von Arntum μηκῶν ΒΡΙQ: μικρῶν F: μικρῶν GHΠΖ
 7 αὐτῶν Usener: αὐτῶν libri πρώτων ΗΡΩ: πρώτον BFGZ post
 παρασκευάζοντα hiatum indicavit Usener 9 ἀμετάβολα] ἀμετά-
 βατα Usener: μεταβατὰ von Arntum 10 τούτων] τούτων ως] τῶν
 Bignone ἔχόντων] *(οὐκ)* ἔχόντων Bniger 60 1 ἀνωτάτῳ
 Usener: ἀνωτάτῳ libri ἡ GHΠCoZ: καὶ BFQ κατωτάτῳ Usener:
 κατωτάτῳ libri 2 post κατηγορεῖν hiatum indicavit Usener εἰς
 μέντοι ΗΠΙQCo: ἴσμεν τοι B: μέντοι FGHΠΖ 3 στῶμεν
 ΒΗΡΠCo: τὸ μὲν FGZ ἄγειν *(ἐν)*δὲν scripsi: ἄγειν δὲν *(δὲν FG)* libri.
 τεῖνον Usener: ἄγειν *(έξ)*δὲν Giussani: ἄγειν *(νοοῦσι, δῆλον)* Bignone

similar in character, or that if you go on in this way from one point to another, it should be possible for you to proceed to infinity marking such points in your mind.

- 58 We must notice also that the least thing in sensation is ^a The minimum visible has extension without parts neither exactly like that which admits of progression from one part to another, nor again is it in every respect wholly unlike it, but it has a certain affinity with such bodies, yet cannot be divided into parts. But when on the analogy of this resemblance we think to divide off parts of it, one on the one side and another on the other, it must needs be that another point like the first meets our view. And we look at these points in succession starting from the first, not within the limits of the same point nor in contact part with part, but yet by means of their own proper characteristics measuring the size of bodies, more in a greater body and fewer in a smaller. Now we must suppose that the least part in the atom too bears the same relation to the whole; for though in smallness it is obvious that it exceeds that which is seen by sensation, yet it has the same relations. For indeed we have already declared on the ground of its relation to sensible bodies that the atom has size, only we placed it far below them in smallness. Further, we must consider these least indivisible points as boundary-marks, providing in themselves as primary units the measure of size for the atoms, both for the smaller and the greater, in our contemplation of these unseen bodies by means of thought. For the affinity which the least parts of the atom have to the homogeneous parts (of sensible things) is sufficient to justify our conclusion to this extent. but that they should ever come together as bodies with motion is quite impossible.

- 60 [Furthermore, in the infinite we must not speak of 'up' or 'down', as though with reference to an absolute highest or lowest—and indeed we must say that, though it is possible to proceed to infinity in the direction above our heads from wherever we take our stand, the absolute highest point will never appear to us—nor yet can that which passes beneath the point thought of to infinity be at the
- ^a and is the ultimate measure of size
Similarly, there are least indivisible parts in the atom, which are the units of measurement.]
[In what sense there is motion upward and downward in the infinite]

ζ ἀπειρον δμα ἀνω τε εἶναι καὶ κάτω πρὸς τὸ αὐτό τοῦτο γὰρ ἀδύνατον διανοηθῆναι. ὅστε ἔστι μίαν λαβεῖν φορὰν τὴν ἀνω νοούμενην εἰς ἀπειρον καὶ μίαν τὴν κάτω, ἀν καὶ μυριάκις πρὸς τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἐπάνω τὸ παρ' ἡμῶν φερόμενον (ἐσ) τοὺς ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς ἡμῶν τόπους ἀφικνῆται ἢ ἐπὶ τὴν ιο κεφαλὴν τῶν ὑποκάτω τὸ παρ' ἡμῶν κάτω φερόμενον· ἢ γὰρ ὅλη φορὰ οὐθὲν ἥττον ἐκατέρα ἐκατέρᾳ ἀντικειμένη ἐπ' ἄπειρον νοεῖται. |

61 Καὶ μὴν καὶ ἴστοταχεῖς ἀναγκαῖον τὰς ἀτόμους εἶναι, ὅταν διὰ τοῦ κενοῦ εἰσφέρωνται μηθεὺς ἀντικόπτοντος. οὔτε γὰρ τὰ βαρέα θάττον οἰσθήσεται τῶν μικρῶν καὶ κούφων, ὅταν γε δὴ μηδὲν ἀπαντᾷ αὐτοῖς· οὔτε τὰ μικρὰ τῶν μεγαλῶν, 5 πάντα πόρον σύμμετρον ἔχοντα, ὅταν μηδὲν μηδὲ ἐκείνοις ἀντικόπτῃ· οὕθ' ἡ ἀνω οὕθ' ἡ εἰς τὸ πλάγιον διὰ τῶν κρούνεων φορά, οὕθ' ἡ κάτω διὰ τῶν ἰδίων βαρῶν. ἐφ' ὁπόσου γὰρ ἀν κατίσχῃ ἐκατέρ(α αὐτ)ῶν, ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον δμα νοήματι τὴν φορὰν σχήσει, ἔως (ἄν τι) ἀντικόψῃ, ἢ ἔξωθεν 10 ἡ ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου βάρους πρὸς τὴν τοῦ πλήξαντος δύναμιν. |

46^b 62 καὶ μὴν καὶ ἡ διὰ τοῦ κενοῦ φορὰ κατὰ μηδεμίαν ἀπάντησιν τῶν ἀντικοφόντων γινομένη πᾶν μῆκος περιληπτὸν ἐν ἀπει- νοήτῳ χρόνῳ συντελεῖ. βράδους γὰρ καὶ τάχους ἀντικοπῇ καὶ οὐκ ἀντικοπῇ δμοίωμα λαμβάνει. | ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ κατὰ

62 τὰς συγκρίσεις θάττων ἐτέρας ῥηθήσεται τῶν ἀτόμων ἴστοταχῶν οὐσῶν, τῷ ἐφ' ἔνα τόπον φέρεσθαι τὰς ἐν τοῖς ἀθροίσμασιν ἀτόμους καὶ κατὰ τὸν ἐλάχιστον συνεχῆ χρόνον, 5 εἰ μὴ ἐφ' ἔνα κατὰ τοὺς λόγῳ θεωρητοὺς χρόνους, ἀλλὰ

9 (ἐσ) supplevit Usener 61 2 εἰσφέρωνται GH^aP²: εἰσφέρωντα P¹Q: εἰσφέρονται FH¹. εἰσφέροντε B: εἰς (ἔνα τόπον) φέρωνται Brieger 3 τὰ βαρέα] τὰ (μεγάλα καὶ) βαρέα Usener in commentario μικρῶν καὶ delevit Gassendi 4 ἀπαντᾷ Usener: ἀπαντᾶ BP¹Co: ἀπαντᾶ F: ἀπαντᾶ libr. cett. post τὰ μικρὰ supplevit βραδύτερον Usener 5 ἔχοντα] ἔχοντων Giussani 8 ἐκατέρ(α αὐτ)ῶν scripsi: ἐκατέρων libri: ἐκάτερον Usener 9 (ἄν τι) supplevit Usener 10 πρὸς τὴν τοῦ πλήξαντος δύναμιν ut glossema seclusit Usener: πρὸς τὴν (έκ) τοῦ πλ. δύν. Bignone 46 1-4 καὶ μην καὶ . . . δμοίωμα λαμβάνει hunc locum ex § 40 petitum huc inseri iussit Giussani 2 ἀντικοφόντων Usener: ἀντικοφαντών libri: ἀντικοπόντων Giussani 3 βράδους BGH^aP¹Q: βραδύτερος FH¹P³Z 62 1 καὶ delevit Brieger 2 θάττων Z³f: θάττον codd. cett.: (οὐ) θαττών Usener ῥηθῆσεται] οἰσθήσεται Kuhn: φωρηθῆσεται Brieger 3 τῷ] καὶ τὸ F unde κιν τῷ vel καὶ (κατὰ) τὸ coniecit Bignone 4 καὶ delevit Usener τὸν ἐλάχιστον Meibom: τῶν ἐλαχιστῶν libri 5 εἰ

same time both up and down in reference to the same thing: for it is impossible to think this. So that it is possible to consider as one single motion that which is thought of as the upwards motion to infinity and as another the downward motion, even though that which passes from us into the regions above our heads arrives countless times at the feet of beings above and that which passes downwards from us at the head of beings below; for none the less the whole motions are thought of as opposed, the one to the other, to infinity.]

- 61** Moreover, the atoms must move with equal speed, when they are borne onwards through the void, nothing colliding with them. For neither will the heavy move more quickly than the small and light, when, that is, nothing meets them: nor again the small more quickly than the great, having their whole course uniform, when nothing collides with them either: nor is the motion upwards or sideways owing to blows (quicker), nor again that downwards owing to their own weight. For as long as either of the two motions prevails, so long will it have a course as quick as thought, until something checks it either from outside or from its own weight counteracting the force of that which dealt the blow. Moreover, their passage through the void, when it takes place without meeting any bodies which might collide, accomplishes every comprehensible distance in an inconceivably short time. For it is collision and its absence which take the outward appearance of slowness and quickness. Moreover, it will be said that in compound bodies too one atom is faster than another, though as a matter of fact all are equal in speed. This will be said because even in the least period of continuous time all the atoms in aggregate bodies move towards one place, even though in moments of time perceptible only by thought they do not move towards one place but are constantly jostling one against another, until the continuity
- C The motions of the atoms. All move always at equal rate 'as quick as thought', neither weight nor direction making any difference.
- 46^b** Their speed is inconceivably great
- 62** In compound bodies too all atoms really move at the same pace, though an inference from perception might deny this

μὴ] ἡ μὴ Usener: εἴτα μὴ Giussani: εἰς (καὶ) μὴ Muehll κατὰ τοὺς λόγῳ θεωρητούς χρόνους ut glossema seclusit Usener

πυκνὸν ἀντικόπτουσιν, ἐως ἀν ὑπὸ τὴν αἰσθησιν τὸ συνεχὲς τῆς φορᾶς γίνηται. τὸ γὰρ προσδοξαζόμενον περὶ τοῦ ἀοράτου, ὡς ἀρα καὶ οἱ διὰ λόγου θεωρητοὶ χρόνοι τὸ συνεχὲς τῆς φορᾶς ἔξουσιν, οὐκ ἀληθές ἐστιν ἐπὶ τῶν τοιούτων.

10 ἐπεὶ τό γε θεωρούμενον πᾶν ἡ κατ' ἐπιβολὴν λαμβανόμενον
 47^b τῇ διανοίᾳ ἀληθές ἐστιν. | οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ ἄμα κατὰ τοὺς διὰ λόγου θεωρητὸὺς χρόνους καὶ τὸ φερόμενον σῶμα ἐπὶ τοὺς πλείους τόπους ἀφικνεῖται (ἀδιανόητον γάρ, καὶ τοῦτο συναφικινούμενον ἐν αἰσθητῷ χρόνῳ ὅθεν δήποθεν τοῦ ἀπειρονούμενον) οὐκ ἔξι οὖν ἀν περιλάβωμεν τὴν φορὰν τόπουν ἐσται ἀφιστάμενον· ἀντικοπῇ γάρ διοιον ἐσται, καν μέχρι τοσούτου τὸ τάχος τῆς φορᾶς μὴ ἀντικοπτὸν καταλίπωμεν. χρήσιμον δὴ καὶ τοῦτο κατασχεῖν τὸ στοιχεῖον. |

63 Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα δεῖ συνορᾶν ἀναφέροιτα ἐπὶ τὰς αἰσθήσεις καὶ τὰ πάθη (οὕτω γὰρ ἡ βεβαιοτάτη πίστις ἐσται), ὅτι ἡ ψυχὴ σῶμά ἐστι λεπτομερὲς παρ' ὅλον τὸ ἀθροισμα παρεσπαρμένον, προσεμφερέστατον δὲ πιεύματι θερμοῦ τινα κράσιν 5 ἔχοντι καὶ πῆ μὲν τούτῳ προσεμφερές, πῆ δὲ τούτῳ. ἐστι δὲ τὸ μέρος πολλὴν παραλλαγὴν εἰληφὸς τῇ λεπτομερείᾳ καὶ αὐτῶν τούτων, συμπαθὲς δὲ τούτῳ μᾶλλον καὶ τῷ λοιπῷ ἀθροίσματι τοῦτο δὲ πᾶν αἱ δυνάμεις τῆς ψυχῆς δῆλον *(ποιοῦσι)* καὶ τὰ πάθη καὶ αἱ εὐκινησίαι καὶ αἱ διανοήσεις 10 καὶ ὧν στερόμενοι θυήσκομεν. καὶ μὴν καὶ ὅτι ἔχει ἡ ψυχὴ τῆς αἰσθήσεως τὴν πλείστην αἰτίαν, δεῖ κατέχειν· |
 64 οὐ μὴν εἰλήφει ἀν ταύτην, εἰ μὴ ὑπὸ τοῦ λοιποῦ ἀθροίσματος ἐστεγάζετο πως. τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν ἀθροισμα παρασκευάσαν ἐκείνῃ τὴν αἰτίαν ταύτην μετελληφε καὶ αὐτὸ τοιούτου συμπτώματος παρ' ἐκείνης, οὐ μέντοι πάντων ὧν ἐκείνη κέκτηται· 5 διὸ ἀπαλλαγείσης τῆς ψυχῆς οὐκ ἔχει τὴν αἰσθησιν. οὐ

6 ἀντικόπτουσιν Gassendi . ἀντικόπτωσιν libri 47^b 1-8 οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ . . . τὸ στοιχεῖον hunc locum ex § 47 petitum hoc transferrit iussit Giussani 1 οὐδὲ ἄμα] οὐδὲ ἄμα Usener . οὐδιμῆ Bignone 2 καὶ τὸ φερόμενον Usener : κατὰ τὸ φερόμενον libri : οὐτὸ τὸ φερόμενον Muehll : καὶ τάποφερόμενον Bignone 3 *συναφικινούμενον*] οὐτ' ἀφικινούμενον Usener . οὗτε συναφικινούμενον Giussani 6 τοσούτου libri plerique : τούτου BG 7 ἀντικοπτὸν scripsi : ἀντικόπτων Usener : ἀντικοπέον B (sine accentu) GHP¹Q : ἀντικοπτίον FP²Z 63 4 πιεύματι] σπέρματι F 5 ἐστι δὲ τὸ μέρος] ἐστι δὲ τι μέρος Woltjer : ἐπι δὲ τοῦ μέρους Usener : ἐστι δὲ τὸ γ μέρος Diels 8 δῆλον *(ποιοῦσι)* Brüger : δῆλον libri : δῆλοντι Gassendi : διῆγον Usener

of their movement comes under the ken of sensation. For the addition of opinion with regard to the unseen, that the moments perceptible only by thought will also contain continuity of motion, is not true in such cases; for we must remember that it is what we observe with the senses or grasp with the mind by an apprehension that

^{47^b} is true. Nor must it either be supposed that in moments perceptible only by thought the moving body too passes to the several places to which its component atoms move (for this too is unthinkable, and in that case, when it arrives all together in a sensible period of time from any point that may be in the infinite void, it would not be taking its departure from the place from which we apprehend its motion); for the motion of the whole body will be the outward expression of its internal collisions, even though up to the limits of perception we suppose the speed of its motion not to be retarded by collision. It is of advantage to grasp this first principle as well.

⁶³ Next, referring always to the sensations and the feelings ^{v. *The soul.*} (for in this way you will obtain the most trustworthy ¹ It is composed of fine ground of belief), you must consider that the soul is a body of fine particles distributed throughout the whole structure, and most resembling wind with a certain admixture of heat, and in some respects like to one of these and in some to the other. There is also the part which is many degrees more advanced even than these in fineness of composition, and for this reason is more capable of feeling in harmony with the rest of the structure as well. Now all this is made manifest by the activities of the soul and the feelings and the readiness of its movements and its processes of thought and by what we lose at the moment of death. Further, you must grasp that the soul possesses ^{2. The soul has sensation owing to its protection within the body, to which it then communicates sensation.}

⁶⁴ the chief cause of sensation: yet it could not have acquired sensation, unless it were in some way enclosed by the rest of the structure. And this in its turn having afforded the soul this cause of sensation acquires itself too a share in this contingent capacity from the soul. Yet it does not acquire all the capacities which the soul possesses: and therefore when the soul is released from the body, the

γὰρ αὐτὸν ἐν ἑαυτῷ ταύτην ἐκέκτητο τὴν δύναμιν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐτέρῳ
άμα συγγεγενημένῳ αὐτῷ παρεσκεύαζεν, διὰ τῆς συντελε-
σθείσης περὶ αὐτὸν δυνάμεως κατὰ τὴν κίνησιν σύμπτωμα
αἰσθητικὸν εὐθὺς ἀποτελοῦν ἑαυτῷ ἀπεδίδον κατὰ τὴν δμού-
ρησιν καὶ συμπάθειαν καὶ ἑκείνῳ, καθάπερ εἶπον. | διὸ δὴ

65 καὶ ἐνυπάρχουσα ἡ ψυχὴ οὐδέποτε ἄλλου τινὸς μέρους ἀπηλλαγ-
μένου ἀναισθητήσει ἀλλ᾽ ἀν καὶ ταύτης ἔνυπαπόληται τοῦ
στεγάζοντος λυθέντος εἴθ' ὅλου εἴτε καὶ μέρους τωός, ἐάν

5 περ διαμένῃ, ἔχει τὴν αἰσθησιν τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν ἀθροισμα
διαμένον καὶ ὅλου καὶ κατὰ μέρος οὐκ ἔχει τὴν αἰσθησιν
ἐκείνου ἀπηλλαγμένου, δοσον ποτὲ ἐστὶ τὸ συντεῖνον τῶν
ἀτόμων πλῆθος εἰς τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς φύσιν. καὶ μὴν καὶ
διαλυομένου τοῦ ὅλου ἀθροίσματος ἡ ψυχὴ διασπείρεται

66 10 καὶ οὐκέτι ἔχει τὰς αὐτὰς δυνάμεις οὐδὲ κινεῖται, ὥστε οὐδὲ
αἰσθησιν κέκτηται | οὐ γὰρ οἶδον τε νοεῖν αὐτὸν αἰσθανόμενον
μὴ (δύν) ἐν τούτῳ τῷ συστήματι καὶ ταῖς κινήσεσι ταύταις
χρώμενον, ὅταν τὰ στεγάζοντα καὶ περιέχοντα μὴ τοιαῦτα ἦ,
ἐν οἷς νῦν οὖσα ἔχει ταύτας τὰς κινήσεις. | ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ

67 15 τόδε γε δεῖ προσκατανοεῖν ὅτι τὸ ἀσώματον λέγεται κατὰ
τὴν πλείστην δύμιλαν τοῦ δύνωματος ἐπὶ τοῦ καθ' ἑαυτὸν νοη-
θέντος ἀν. καθ' ἑαυτὸν δὲ οὐκ ἐστι νοῆσαι τὸ ἀσώματον

5 πλὴν τοῦ κενοῦ· τὸ δὲ κενὸν οὔτε ποιῆσαι οὔτε παθεῖν
δύναται, ἀλλὰ κίνησιν μόνον δι' ἑαυτοῦ τοῖς σώμασι παρέ-

64 6 ἐτέρῳ . . . συγγεγενημένῳ Brieger: ἐτέρῳ . . . συγγεγενη-
μένῳ libri: ἐπερον . . . συγγεγενημένον Usener 8 αὐτὸν libri

plerique: αὐτῷ B¹Z κίνησιν BP¹Q: δύνησιν FHP³: δύνησιν
GZ 65 3 ἀναισθητήσει Kuhn: ἀναισθήσει B ἀναισθησία libr.

cett.: ἀναισθητεί Schneider ἀλλ' δὲ ἀν FP³: ἀλλὰ ἀν libr. cett.
ταύτης Usener: ταύτη libri ἔνυπαπόληται G: ἔνυπαπόληται FHPQ:

ἔνυπαπόληται BCo 5 ἔχει Usener: δὲν libri: σφέσει Muehll
6 καὶ κατὰ μέρος FG: κατὰ μέρος BHPQC: καὶ μέρος Usener

9 διαλυομένου F: διαλυομένου B: λυομένου libr. cett. 10 κινεῖται]
κινήσεις Bignone: (τὰς αὐτὰς κινήσεις) supplendum censuit Brieger

66 1 αὐτὸν τὸ Usener 2 (δύν) supplendum suspicatus est Usener
4 οἷς] οἷοις coniecit Usener 67 2 ὅτι] ὅτι Usener λέγεται

Bignone: λέγει γὰρ libri: λέγομεν Muehll: verba λέγει γὰρ κατὰ τὴν
πλείστην δύμιλαν ut glossema seclusit Usener 3 καθ' ἑαυτὸν

Stephanus: καθ' ἑαυτὸν libri 5 οὔτε] οὐδὲ coniecit Usener

Scholia

67 1 post καὶ τόδε legitur λέγει ἐν ἄλλοις καὶ ἔξ ἀτόμων αὐτὴν
συγκεισθαι λεστάτων καὶ στρογγυλωτάτων, πολλῷ τινι διαφερουσῶν τῶν
τοῦ πυρός· καὶ τὸ μέν τι ἄλογον αὐτῆς, δ τῷ λοιπῷ παρεσπάθαι σώματι·
τὸ δὲ λογικὸν ἐν τῷ θώρακι, ὡς δῆλον ἔκ τε τῶν φέβων καὶ τῆς χαρᾶς.

body no longer has sensation. For it never possessed this power in itself, but used to afford opportunity for it to another existence, brought into being at the same time with itself: and this existence, owing to the power now consummated within itself as a result of motion, used spontaneously to produce for itself the capacity of sensation and then to communicate it to the body as well, in virtue of its contact and correspondence of movement, as I have

- 65** already said. Therefore, so long as the soul remains in the body, even though some other part of the body be lost, it will never lose sensation; nay more, whatever portions of the soul may perish too, when that which enclosed it is removed either in whole or in part, if the soul continues to exist at all, it will retain sensation. On the other hand the rest of the structure, though it continues to exist either as a whole or in part, does not retain sensation, if it has once lost that sum of atoms, however small it be, which together goes to produce the nature of the soul. Moreover, if the whole structure is dissolved, the soul is dispersed and no longer has the same powers nor performs its movements, so that it does not possess sensation either.
- 66** For it is impossible to imagine it with sensation, if it is not in this organism and cannot effect these movements, when what encloses and surrounds it is no longer the same as the surroundings in which it now exists and performs these movements. Furthermore, we must clearly comprehend as well, that the incorporeal in the general acceptation of the term is applied to that which could be thought of as such as an independent existence. Now it is impossible to conceive the incorporeal as a separate existence, except the void: and the void can neither act nor be acted upon, but only provides opportunity of motion
- Even though parts of the body be lost the soul still has sensation;
- but if the soul be lost, the body ceases to feel;
- and so does the soul, when the body is broken up
- 4 The soul cannot be incorporeal, for if it were like the only incorporeal independent existence, the void, it could not act or be acted on.

Scholia

ὑπνον τε γίνεσθαι τῶν τῆς ψυχῆς μερῶν τῶν παρ' ὅλην τὴν σύγκρισιν παρεσπαρμένων ἐγκατεχόμενουν ή διαφορούμενων, ἵνα συμπιπτόντων τοῖς ἐπερισμοῖς. τὸ τε σπερμάτιον ὁλῶν τῶν σωμάτων φέρεσθαι

μὲν τι εριτ. vat. Cobet μέντοι libri παρεσπάθει Schneider: παρεσπάθη B²: παρεσπάθει B¹FGHPQCo: παρεσπάθει Z θώρακι libri plerique: σώματα GZ συμπιπτόντων] ἐμπιπτόντων F: unde ἐκπιπτόντων Giussani ἐπερισμοῖς Usener: ποργμοῖς BHP¹Q: πορμοῖς F (sc. ἐπερμοῖς): ἐσπαρμένοις GZ: πάροις Traversarius

χεται. ὁσθ' οἱ λέγοντες ἀσώματον εἴναι τὴν ψυχὴν ματάζουσιν. οὐθὲν γὰρ ἀν ἐδύνατο ποιεῖν οὔτε πάσχειν, εἰ τὴν τοιαῦτην δὲν δὲν ἐναργῶς ἀμφότερα ταῦτα διαλαμβάνεται περὶ τὴν ψυχὴν τὰ συμπτώματα. | ταῦτα οὖν πάντα τὰ διαλογίσματα (τὰ) περὶ ψυχῆς ἀνάγων τις ἐπὶ τὰ πάθη καὶ τὰς αἰσθήσεις, μυημονεύων τῶν ἐν ἀρχῇ ῥηθέντων, ίκανῶς κατόψεται τοῖς τύποις ἐμπειρειλημένα εἰς τὸ (καὶ τὰ) κατὰ μέρος ἀπὸ 5 τούτων ἔξακριβονθαι βεβαίως.

'Αλλὰ μὴν καὶ τὰ σχήματα καὶ τὰ χρώματα καὶ τὰ μεγέθη καὶ τὰ βάρη καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα κατηγορεῖται σώματος ὡσανεὶ συμβεβηκότα ἢ πᾶσιν ἢ τοῖς ὄρατοῖς καὶ κατὰ τὴν αἰσθήσιν αὐτῶν γνωστοῖς, οὐθ' ὡς καθ' ἑαυτάς εἰσι φύσεις δοξαστέον (οὐ γὰρ δυνατὸν ἐπινοῆσαι τοῦτο), | οὔτε δλως ὡς οὐκ εἰσών, οὐθ' ὡς ἔτερ' ἄττα προσυπάρχοντα τούτῳ ἀσώματα, οὐθ' ὡς μόρια τούτου, ἀλλ' ὡς τὸ δλον σῶμα καθόλου μὲν (ἐκ) τούτων πάντων τὴν ἑαυτοῦ φύσιν ἔχον ἀίδιον, οὐχ οἶον δὲν εἴναι (ἐκ) 5 συμπεφορημένων (ῶσπερ ὅταν ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν ὅγκων μετέξον ἀθροισμα συστῆ ἦτοι τῶν πρώτων ἢ τῶν τοῦ δλον μεγεθῶν τοῦδε τωὸς ἐλαττόνων), ἀλλὰ μόνον, ὡς λέγω, ἐκ τούτων ἀπάντων τὴν ἑαυτοῦ φύσιν ἔχον ἀίδιον. καὶ ἐπιβολὰς μὲν ἔχοντα ἴδιας πάντα ταῦτά ἔστι καὶ διαλήψεις, συμπαρακολουθοῦντος δὲ τοῦ ἀθρόου καὶ οὐθαμῆ ἀποσχιζομένου, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν ἀθρόαν ἔννοιαν τοῦ σώματος κατηγορίαν εἰληφότος. |

70 Καὶ μὴν καὶ τοῖς σώμασι συμπίπτει πολλάκις καὶ οὐκ ἀίδιον παρακολουθεῖν * * * * οὐτ' ἐν τοῖς ἀοράτοις εἴναι οὔτε ἀσώματα.

9 διαλαμβάνεται scripsi. διαλαμβάνει libri : διαλαμβάνεις Bignone: διπλαμβάνομεν Meibom: συμβάνει Usener 68 2 (το) supplevit Usener 4 (καὶ τὰ) supplevit Usener 7 βάρη Usener: βαρέα ἢ libri : ὡς ἀν δεῖ συμβεβηκότα Galesius ὡς δὲν εἰς αὐτὰ βεβηκότα libri : ὡς ἀν δεῖ συμβεβηκότα Bignone 9 αὐτῶν γνωστοῖς P³: αὐτοῖς γνωστοῖς libr. cett.: σώματος γνωστά Usener 69 2 οὐθ' ὡς Gassendi: ὡς οὐθ' (οὐθ' FQ) libri ἔτερ' ἄττα Usener: ἔτερα τὰ libri 3 (ἐκ) supplevit Meibom 4 (ἐκ) supplevi 5 συμπεφορημένων BQP¹C⁰: συμπεφωρημένον F 6 μεγέθῶν μερῶν Schneider 7 τοῦδε τινος Usener: τοῦ δέ τιος libri 8 [εἰναῦν] ἑαυτῶν HPQ 10 οὐθαμῆ Usener: οὐθαμῆ BΡ¹Q: οὐδιμῆ libr. cett. ἀποσχιζομένον] ἀποσχιζομένου B: ἀποσχιζόμενα Usener 11 εἰληφότος] εἰληφότι Usener 70 2 παρακολουθεῖν libr. plerique: παρακολουθεῖ B: παρακολουθεῖ ἀγ' Bignone: post παρακολουθεῖ lacunam indicavit Usener εἴναι

through itself to bodies. So that those who say that the soul is incorporeal are talking idly. For it would not be able to act or be acted on in any respect, if it were of this nature. But as it is, both these occurrences are clearly

- 68 distinguished in respect of the soul. Now if one refers all These general principles will supply a basis for details.
- these reasonings about the soul to the standards of feeling and sensation and remembers what was said at the outset, he will see that they are sufficiently embraced in these general formulae to enable him to work out with certainty on this basis the details of the system as well.

Moreover, as regards shape and colour and size and weight and all other things that are predicated of body, as though they were concomitant properties either of all things or of things visible or recognizable through the sensation of these qualities, we must not suppose that they are either independent existences (for it is impossible to imagine that), nor that they absolutely do not exist, nor that they are some other kind of incorporeal existence accompanying body, nor that they are material parts of body: rather we should suppose that the whole body in its totality owes its own permanent existence to all these, yet not in the sense that it is composed of properties brought together to form it (as when, for instance, a larger structure is put together out of the parts which compose it, whether the first units of size or other parts smaller than itself, whatever it is), but only, as I say, that it owes its own permanent existence to all of them. All these properties have their own peculiar means of being perceived and distinguished, provided always that the aggregate body goes along with them and is never wrested from them, but in virtue of its comprehension as an aggregate of qualities acquires the predicate of body.

- 70 Furthermore, there often happen to bodies and yet do not permanently accompany them (accidents, of which we must suppose neither that they do not exist at all nor that they have the nature of a whole body), nor that they can be classed among unseen things nor as incorporeal. So
- scripsi: καὶ libri: ζῶται Usener: καὶ ἀνασθήτοις δοξαστέον εἰναὶ Bignone*
- ² Accidents are not incorporeal existences, &c., but qualities and so on attached to body, but not permanently.

ώστε δὴ κατὰ τὴν πλείστην φορὰν τούτῳ τῷ δύνματι χρώμενοι φανερὰ ποιοῦμεν τὰ συμπτώματα οὗτε τὴν τοῦ δλου φύσια
 5 ἔχειν, δὲ συλλαβόντες κατὰ τὸ ἀθρόου σῶμα προσαγορεύομεν,
 οὗτε τὴν τῶν ἀλδιον παρακολουθούντων, ὃν ἀνεν σῶμα οὐ δυνατὸν νοεῖσθαι. κατ' ἐπιβολὰς δ' ἄν τινας παρακολου-
 71 θοῦντος τοῦ ἀθρόου ἔκαστα προσαγορευθεῖη, | ἀλλ' ὅτε δήποτε
 ἔκαστα συμβαίνοντα θεωρεῖται, οὐκ ἀλδιον τῶν συμπτωμάτων παρακολουθούντων.
 καὶ οὐκ ἔξελατέον ἐκ τοῦ οὗτος ταύτην τὴν ἐναργείαν, ὅτε οὐκ ἔχει τὴν τοῦ δλου φύσιν φ συμ-
 5 βαίνει οὐδὲ τὴν τῶν ἀλδιον παρακολουθούντων, οὐδ' αὖ καθ'
 αὐτὰ νομιστέον (οὐδὲ γάρ τοῦτο διανοητέον οὗτος ἐπὶ τούτων οὗτος ἐπὶ τῶν ἀλδιον συμβεβήκοτων), ἀλλ' διερ καὶ φαίνεται,
 συμπτώματα πάντα κατὰ τὰ σῶματα νομιστέον, καὶ οὐκ
 10 ἀλδιον παρακολουθοῦντα οὐδ' αὖ φύσεως καθ' ἔαυτὰ τάγμα
 10 ἔχοντα, ἀλλ' δι τρόπου αὐτὴν ἡ αἰσθησις τὴν ἰδιότητα ποιεῖ θεωρεῖται. |

72 Καὶ μὴν καὶ τόδε γε δεῖ προσκατανοῆσαι σφοδρῶς· τὸν γάρ δὴ χρόνον οὐ ζητητέον ὥσπερ καὶ τὰ λοιπά, ὅσα ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ ζητοῦμεν ἀνάγοντες ἐπὶ τὰς βλεπομένας παρ' ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς προλήψεις, ἀλλ' αὐτὸν τὸ ἐνάργημα, καθ' ὃ τὸν 5 πολὺν ἦ διάγον χρόνον ἀναφωνοῦμεν, συγγενικῶς τοῦτο ἐπιφέροντας ἀναλογιστέον. καὶ οὗτε διαλέκτους ὡς βελτίους μεταληπτέον, ἀλλ' αὐταῖς ταῖς ὑπαρχούσαις κατ' αὐτοῦ χρηστέον· οὗτε ἄλλο τι κατ' αὐτοῦ κατηγορητέον ὡς τὴν αὐτὴν οὐσίαν ἔχον τῷ ἰδιώματι τούτῳ (καὶ γάρ τοῦτο ποιοῦσι 10 τινές), ἀλλὰ μόνον φ συμπλέκομεν τὸ ἰδιον τοῦτο καὶ παρα-
 73 μετροῦμεν, μάλιστα ἐπιλογιστέον. | καὶ γάρ τοῦτο οὐκ ἀπο-
 δείξεις προσδεῖται ἀλλ' ἐπιλογισμοῦ, ὅτι ταῖς ἡμέραις καὶ

5 δ FGZ: διν ΗΡΩCο: ἦν B 6 ἀλδιον BF: ἀλδιον libr cett.
 8 post προσαγορευθεῖη lacunam indicavit Usener 71 ι ὅτε]
 ὅτῳ Usener 2 ἀλδιον Meibom: ἀλδιον librī 4 ἐναργείαν] ἐνερ-
 γειαν GH δ F¹GZ: διανοητέον] διανοητὸν Bernays 5 ἀλδιον PCο: ἀλδιον
 BGZ 6 διανοητέον] διανοητὸν Bernays 7 ἀλδιον] ἀλδιον
 BFGZ 8 πάντα κατὰ τὰ σῶματα Bignone: πάντα τὰ σῶματα
 librī: πάντα σῶματος Usener: πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα Muehll 10 ἀλλ'
 διν] ἀλλον P¹Q: ἀλλ' ὁ διν coniecit Bignone 11 θεωρεῖται]
 θεωρεῖσθαι vel θεωρητέον suspicatus est Usener 72 6 ἐπιφέροντας
 scripsit: περιφέροντας librī: ἐπιφέροντας Usener 7-8 κατ' αὐτοῦ
 ... κατ' αὐτοῦ Gassendi: καθ' αὐτοῦ ... καθ' αὐτοῦ librī 9 ἔχον
 Usener: ἔχοντος librī (ἔχοντ H) 10 τοῦτο BΗP¹Q: τοῦτο FGP²

Scholia

71 4 post συμβαίνει legitur δ δὴ καὶ σῶμα προσαγορεύομεν: in textu
 retinuit Muehll

- that when according to the most general usage we employ this name, we make it clear that accidents have neither the nature of the whole, which we comprehend in its aggregate and call body, nor that of the qualities which permanently accompany it, without which a given body cannot be conceived. But as the result of certain acts of apprehension, provided the aggregate body goes along
- 71 with them, they might each be given this name, but only on occasions when each one of them is seen to occur, since accidents are not permanent accompaniments. And we must not banish this clear vision from the realm of existence, because it does not possess the nature of the whole to which it is joined nor that of the permanent accompaniments, nor must we suppose that such contingencies exist independently (for this is inconceivable both with regard to them and to the permanent properties), but, just as it appears in sensation, we must think of them all as accidents occurring to bodies, and that not as permanent accompaniments, or again as having in themselves a place in the ranks of material existence; rather they are seen to be just what our actual sensation shows their proper character to be.
- 72 Moreover, you must firmly grasp this point as well; we
- 73 Time is not recognizable by a concept, as are concrete things and qualities, but is a special kind of accident.
- must not look for time, as we do for all other things which we look for in an object, by referring them to the general conceptions which we perceive in our own minds, but we must take the direct intuition, in accordance with which we speak of 'a long time' or 'a short time', and examine it, applying our intuition to time as we do to other things. Neither must we search for expressions as likely to be better, but employ just those which are in common use about it. Nor again must we predicate of time anything else as having the same essential nature as this special perception, as some people do, but we must turn our thoughts particularly to that only with which we associate this peculiar perception and by which we measure it. For indeed this requires no demonstration, but only reflection, to show that it is with days and nights and their divisions

ταῖς νυξὶ συμπλέκομεν καὶ τοῖς τούτων μέρεσιν, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τοῖς πάθεσι καὶ ταῖς ἀπαθεσίαις, καὶ κινήσεσι καὶ 5 στάσεσιν, ἵδιόν τι σύμπτωμα περὶ ταῦτα πάλιν αὐτὸν τοῦτο ἐνομοῦντες, καθ' ὃ χρόνον διομάζομεν.

'Επὶ τε τοῖς προειρημένοις τοὺς κόσμους δεῖ καὶ πᾶπαν σύγκρισιν πεπερασμένην τὸ δόμοιοειδὲς τοῖς θεωρουμένοις πυκνῶς ἔχουσαν ιομίζειν γεγονέναι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀπείρου, πάντων 10 τούτων ἐκ συστροφῶν ἰδίων ἀποκεκριμένων καὶ μειζόνων καὶ ἐλαττόνων· καὶ πάλιν διαλύεσθαι πάντα, τὰ μὲν θάττον, τὰ δὲ βραδύτερον, καὶ τὰ μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν τοιῶνδε, τὰ δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν τοιῶνδε πάσχοντα. | ἔτι δὲ καὶ τοὺς κόσμους οὕτε ἐξ ἀνάγκης δεῖ ιομίζειν ἕνα σχηματισμὸν ἔχοντας * * * * * οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀν ἀποδείξειν οὐδέτες, ὡς {ἐν} μὲν τῷ τοιούτῳ καὶ οὐκ ἀν ἐμπειρειλήφθη τὰ τοιάδα σπέρματα, ἐξ ὧν ζῷά τε καὶ φυτὰ 5 καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ πάντα {τὰ} θεωρούμενα συνισταται, ἐν δὲ τῷ τοιούτῳ οὐκ ἀν ἐδυνήθη. |

75 'Αλλὰ μὴν ὑποληπτέον καὶ τὴν φύσιν πολλὰ καὶ παντοῦα ὑπὸ αὐτῶν τῶν πραγμάτων διδαχθῆναι τε καὶ ἀναγκασθῆναι τὸν δὲ λογισμὸν τὰ ὑπὸ ταύτης παρεγγυηθέντα ὑστερον ἔξακριβον καὶ προσεξενύρσκειν ἐν μὲν τισὶ θάττον, ἐν δὲ 5 τισὶ βραδύτερον καὶ ἐν μὲν τισὶ περιόδοις καὶ χρόνοις ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀπείρου† * *, ἐν δὲ τισὶ καὶ ἐλάττον. δῆθεν καὶ τὰ ὄντα ἐξ ἀρχῆς μὴ θέσει γενέσθαι, ἀλλ' αἰτάς τὰς

73 5 πάλιν] πάντα Usener 7 τοὺς κόσμους] τούς {τε} κόσμους suspicatus est Usener 8 ὄμοιοειδεῖς FPQCo: ὄμοιειδεῖς BGHZ 13 πάσχοντα FGH¹P²Z. τοῦτο σχόδη BP¹Q: τοῦτο πάσχοντα H² 74 2 post ἔχοντας verba genuina scholio intruso expulsa esse indicavit Usener 3 {ἐν} supplevit Gassendi 5 {τα} supplevit Schneider 75 2 αἴτῶν τῶν BHQ¹: τῶν αἴτῶν F: τῶν αἴτῶν τῶν GCoZ 3 ὑστερον BP¹Q: καὶ ὑστερον codd cett. 5 ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀπείρου ut glossema seclusit Usener ἀποτομήν pro ἀπὸ τῶν legendo: retinuit Bignone qui {φάθησιν μείζους παρασκευάζεσθαι λύσεις} addere voluit Lacunam indicavit Usener 6 καὶ Usener: κατ' libri

Scholia

73 6 post ὄνομάζομεν legitur φησὶ δὲ τοῦτο καὶ ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ Περὶ φύσεως καὶ ἐν τῇ Μεγάλῃ ἐπιτομῇ

τῇ δευτέρᾳ libri plerique: τῇ β FGZ

13 post πάσχοντα legitur δῆλον οὖν ὡς καὶ φθαρτούς φησι τοὺς κόσμους μεταβαλλόντων τῶν μερῶν. καὶ ἐν ἀλλοις τὴν γῆν τῷ ἀέρι ἐποχεῖσθαι.

δῆλοι . . . καὶ in textu retinuit et post καὶ * * * {καὶ ἐν τῇ . . . Περὶ φύσεως} adiecit Muehll φθαρτοὺς BPCo: φθάρτας F: ἀφθάρ-

τοὺς GZ τοὺς κόσμους libri plerique: τὸν κόσμον F

74 2 post ἔχοντας legitur ἀλλὰ καὶ διαφόρους αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ β Περὶ φύσεως φησιν οὓς μὲν γὰρ σφαιροειδεῖς, καὶ φοειδεῖς ἄλλους, καὶ ἀλλοιο-

that we associate it, and likewise also with internal feelings or absence of feeling, and with movements and states of rest; in connexion with these last again we think of this very perception as a peculiar kind of accident, and in virtue of this we call it time.

And in addition to what we have already said we must believe that worlds, and indeed every limited compound body which continuously exhibits a similar appearance to the things we see, were created from the infinite, and that all such things, greater and less alike, were separated off from individual agglomerations of matter; and that all are again dissolved, some more quickly, some more slowly, some suffering from one set of causes, others from another.

74 And further we must believe that these worlds were neither (created) all of necessity with one configuration (nor yet with every kind of shape). Furthermore, we must believe that in all worlds there are living creatures and plants and other things we see in this world; for indeed no one could prove that in a world of one kind there might or might not have been included the kinds of seeds from which living things and plants and all the rest of the things we see are composed, and that in a world of another kind they could not have been.

75 Moreover, we must suppose that human nature too was taught and constrained to do many things of every kind merely by circumstances; and that later on reasoning elaborated what had been suggested by nature and made further inventions, in some matters quickly, in others slowly, at some epochs and times (making great advances), and lesser again at others. And so names too were not at first deliberately given to things, but men's natures according to their different nationalities had their own

Scholia

σχήμας ἔτέρους: οὐ μέντοι πᾶν σχῆμα ἔχειν. οὐδὲ ζῷα εἶναι ἀποκριθέντα
ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀπείρου

verbum ἀλλὰ in textu retinunt Muehl. Περὶ φύσεως Brieger.

περὶ αὐτοῦ BHP¹QCo: περὶ τούτου FGZ: περὶ (φύσεως) αὐτὸς

Usener. ἔχειν libri plerique. ἔχεται β οὐ μέντοι . . . ἀπείρου
in textu retinere voluit Brieger.

6 post ἐδυνήθη legitur ὡσαΐτως δὲ καὶ ἐντραφῆναι. τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ
τρόπον καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς νομιστέον

τὸν αὐτὸν . . . νομιστέον in textu retinuit Muehl

VII *Worlds, their creation, destruction, shapes, and contents*

I *Worlds are created out of the void by means of separate aggregations of matter and are similarly dissolved*

2 *Worlds are of various shapes.*

3 *In them all there are animals, &c., as in ours.*

The arts were taught by nature and developed by reason

a Language thus originated from

φύσεις τῶν ἀνθρώπων καθ' ἔκαστα ἔθνη ίδια πασχούσας
πάθη καὶ ίδια λαμβανούσας φαντάσματα ίδιως τὸν ἀέρα
ιο ἐκπέμπειν στελλόμενον ὑφ' ἔκαστων τῶν παθῶν καὶ τῶν
φαντασμάτων, ὡς ἂν ποτε καὶ ἡ παρὰ τοὺς τόπους τῶν ἔθνων
76 διαφορὰ εἴη· | ὑστερον δὲ κοινῶς καθ' ἔκαστα ἔθνη τὰ ίδια
τεθῆναι πρὸς τὸ τὰς δηλώσεις ἥττον ἀμφιβόλους γενέσθαι
ἀλλήλοις καὶ συντομωτέρως δηλουμένας· τωὰ δὲ καὶ οὐ
συνορώμενα πράγματα εἰσφέροντας τοὺς συνειδότας παρεγ-
5 γνῆσαι τινὰς φθόγγους τοὺς (μὲν) ἀναγκασθέντας ἀναφωνῆσαι,
τοὺς δὲ τῷ λογισμῷ ἐλομένους κατὰ τὴν πλείστην αἰτίαν
οὗτως ἔρμηνεῦσαι.

77 Καὶ μὴν (καὶ τὴν) ἐν τοῖς μετεώροις φορὰν καὶ τροπὴν
καὶ ἔκλειψιν καὶ ἀνατολὴν καὶ δύσιν καὶ τὰ σύστοιχα τούτοις
ιο μῆτε λειτουργοῦντος τινὸς νομίζειν δεῖ γενέσθαι καὶ διατάτ-
τοντος ἡ διατάξαντος καὶ ἄμα τὴν πᾶσαν μακαριότητα ἔχοντος
μετὰ ἀφθαρσίας | (οὐ γάρ συμφωνοῦσι πραγματεῖαι καὶ
φροντίδες καὶ δργαὶ καὶ χάριτες μακαριότητι, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ
καὶ φόβῳ καὶ προσδεήσει τῶν πλησίον ταῦτα γίνεται), μῆτε
αὖ πῦρ ἄμα ὅντα συνεστραμμένον τὴν μακαριότητα κεκτημένα
5 κατὰ βούλησιν τὰς κινήσεις ταύτας λαμβάνειν ἀλλὰ πᾶν
τὸ σέμινωμα τηρεῖν κατὰ πάντα δύναματα φερόμενα ἐπὶ τὰς
τοιαύτας ἐννοίας, ἵνα μηδὲ ὑπεναυτλαὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν (γένωνται)
τῷ σεμνώματι δόξαι· εἰ δὲ μή, τὸν μέγιστον τάραχον ἐν
ταῖς ψυχαῖς αὐτὴ ἡ ὑπεναυτιότης παρασκευάσει. δθειν δὴ
10 κατὰ τὰς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐναπολήψεις τῶν συστροφῶν τούτων
ἐν τῇ τοῦ κόσμου γενέσει δεῖ δοξάζειν καὶ τὴν ἀνάγκην
ταύτην καὶ περίοδον συντελεῖσθαι. |

78 Καὶ μὴν καὶ (τὸ) τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν κυριωτάτων αἰτίαν ἐξακρι-
βῶσαι φυσιολογίας ἔργον εἶναι δεῖ νομίζειν, καὶ τὸ μακάριον

12 εἰν] ἡ Usener 76 3 ἀλλήλοις Meibom : ἀλλήλους F · ἀλλήλαις libr. cett. 5 τοὺς (μὲν) Schneider: τοὺς libri: seclusit Usener 6 ἐλο-
μένους] ἐπομένους Schneider αἰτίαν] φαντασίαν suspicatus est Usener
8 (καὶ τὴν) supplevit Usener II διατάξαντος GHZ: διατάξοντος
ΒΕΡΠΟΣ 77 2 ἀλλ' ἢν ΡΙΩCο: ἀλλὰ ἐν B: ἀλλ' FGHP²Z
4 αὖ πῦρ ἄμφι (άμα H) ὅντα P³GHZ: ἀν πυρα μαοντα P¹Q: λυπνα μα-
οντα B¹: λυπνα μα δητα B². αὖ πῦρ ὅντα F: αὐν πυρὸς ἄμμη δητα
M. Casaubon: αὐν πυρὸς ἀνάμμητα Usener συνεστραμμένον] συνε-
στραμμένον Usener 6 φερόμενα] φερόμενον Usener 7 ἵνα Usener:
ἵνα libri μ δ' υπεναντίαι...δόξαι] μηδέν υπεναντιον...δόξη Merbom
(γένωνται) supplevit Gassendi 9 αὐτὴ ἡ ΗΡΠΟΣ: αὐτὴν ἡ B: αὐτη

peculiar feelings and received their peculiar impressions, natural sounds, caused by feelings and impressions,

⁷⁶ to the differences made in the different nations by the places of their abode as well. And then later on by common consent in each nationality special names were deliberately given in order to make their meanings less ambiguous to one another and more briefly demonstrated. And sometimes those who were acquainted with them brought in things hitherto unknown and introduced sounds for them, on some occasions being naturally constrained to utter them, and on others choosing them by reasoning in accordance with the prevailing mode of formation, and thus making their meaning clear.

Furthermore, the motions of the heavenly bodies and their turnings and eclipses and risings and settings, and kindred phenomena to these, must not be thought to be due to any being who controls and ordains or has ordained them ^{X. Celestial Phenomena} ^{i. Their causes} ^(a) and at the same time enjoys perfect bliss together with immortality (for trouble and care and anger and kindness are not consistent with a life of blessedness, but these things come to pass where there is weakness and fear and dependence on neighbours). Nor again must we believe that they, which are but fire agglomerated in a mass, possess blessedness, and voluntarily take upon themselves these movements. But we must preserve their full majestic significance in all expressions which we apply to such conceptions, in order that there may not arise out of them opinions contrary to this notion of majesty. Otherwise this very contradiction will cause the greatest disturbance in men's souls. Therefore we must believe that it is due to the original inclusion of matter in such agglomerations during the birth-process of the world that this law of regular succession is also brought about.

Furthermore, we must believe that to discover accurately ² the knowledge of the cause of the most essential facts is the function of the science of nature, and that blessedness for us in the know-

FGZ 10 κατὰ Μειδομ : καὶ λιβρ 11 γενέσει] συστάσει FGZ
78 I (τὸ) supplevit Usener

ἐν τῇ περὶ μετέωρων γνώσει ἐνταῦθα πεπτωκέναι καὶ ἐν τῷ τῶν φύσεις αἱ θεωρούμεναι κατὰ τὰ μετέωρα ταυτί, καὶ δόσα συγγενῆ πρὸς τὴν εἰς τοῦτο ἀκρίβειαν. ἔτι τε οὐ τὸ πλεοναχῶς ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις εἶναι καὶ τὸ ἐνδεχόμενον καὶ ἄλλως πως ἔχειν, ἀλλ' ἀπλῶς μὴ εἶναι ἐν ἀφθάρτῳ καὶ μακαρίᾳ φύσει τῶν διάκρισιν ὑποβαλλόντων ἡ τάραχον μηθέν· καὶ τοῦτο καταλαβεῖν τῇ διανοίᾳ ἔστιν ἀπλῶς εἶναι. | τὸ δὲ ἐν τῇ ἱστορίᾳ πεπτωκός τῆς δύσεως καὶ ἀνατολῆς καὶ τροπῆς καὶ ἐκλείψεως καὶ δόσα συγγενῆ τούτοις μηθὲν ἔτι πρὸς τὸ μακάριον τῆς γνώσεως συντείνειν, ἀλλ' ὅμοιως τοὺς φόβους 5 ἔχειν τοὺς ταῦτα κατιδόντας, τίνες δὲ αἱ φύσεις ἀγνοοῦντας καὶ τίνες αἱ κυριώταται αἰτίαι, καὶ εἰ μὴ προσήδεισαν ταῦτα· τάχα δὲ καὶ πλείους, ὅταν τὸ θάμβος ἐκ τῆς τούτων προσκατανοησεως μὴ δύνηται τὴν λύσιν λαμβάνειν καὶ τὴν περὶ τῶν κυριωτάτων οἰκονομίαν. διὸ δὴ κανὶ πλείους αἰτίας εὑρίσκωμεν 10 τροπῶν καὶ δύσεων καὶ ἀνατολῶν καὶ ἐκλείψεων καὶ τῶν τοιουτορόπων, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐν τοῖς κατὰ μέρος γινομένοις 80 ἦν, | οὐ δεῖ νομίζειν τὴν ὑπὲρ τούτων χρείαν ἀκρίβειαν μὴ ἀπειληφέναι, δση πρὸς τὸ ἀτάραχον καὶ μακάριον ἡμῶν συντείνει. ὥστε παραθεωροῦντας ποσαχῶς παρ' ἡμῖν τὸ ὅμοιον γίνεται, αἰτιολογητέον ὑπέρ τε τῶν μετέωρων καὶ 5 παντὸς τοῦ ἀδήλου, καταφρονοῦντας τῶν οὗτε (τὸ) μοναχῶς ἔχον ἡ γινόμενον γνωριζόντων οὕτε τὸ πλεοναχῶς συμβαῖνον (ἐπὶ τῶν) τὴν ἐκ τῶν ἀποστημάτων φαντασίαν παραδιδόντων, ἔτι τε ἀγνοοῦντων καὶ ἐν ποίοις οὐκ ἔστιν ἀταρακτῆσαι. ἀνὶ οὖν οἰώμεθα καὶ ὡδὶ πως ἐνδεχόμενον αὐτὸν γίνεσθαι καὶ 10 ἐφ' οἷοις ὅμοιως ἔστιν ἀταρακτῆσαι, αὐτὸν τὸ δτι πλεοναχῶς γίνεται γνωρίζοντες, ὥσπερ κανὶ δτι ὡδὶ πως γίνεται εἰδῶμεν,

3 ἐν τῇ . . . γνώσει seclusit Usener ἐνταῦθά (τε) suspicatus
 est Usener 4 τίνες Z[¶]: τινὶς libri 5 συγγενῆ] συντίνει
 Usener. (τούτοις συντείνει) supplevit Kochalsky 6 ἐνδεχό-
 μενον Schneider: ἐνδεχομένω B: ἐνδεχομένως FHPQC^o: ἐνδεχο-
 μένας GZ 79 4 τῆς γνώσεως] τὰς γνώσεις Usener 5 κατι-
 δόντας] κατειδότας Usener 8 καὶ] κατὰ Gassendi 9 κανὶ¹
 Usener: καὶ libri εύρισκωμεν Usener: εύρισκομεν libri 10 τῶν
 τοιουτορόπων Meibom: τῶν τοιούτων τρόπων (τροπῶν FGHQ[¶]Z)
 libri 12 ἡ Usener: ἡ H: ἡ libr. cett. 80 5 οὗτε (τὸ)
 Gassendi: οὐδὲ libri (οὐδὲν Co) 7 (ἐπὶ τῶν) supplevit Bignone:
 τὴν (τ') Usener παραδιδόντων] παριδόντων Usener 8 εὐ] ἐπὶ²
 coniecit Schneider 9 καὶ ante ἐφ' οἷοις seclusit Usener 10 ἐφ'
 οἷοις FP[¶]Z: ἐν ποίοις P[¶]QCo ἔστιν GH: om. libr. cett.

ledge of celestial phenomena lies in this and in the understanding of the nature of the existences seen in these celestial phenomena, and of all else that is akin to the exact knowledge requisite for our happiness : in knowing too that what occurs in several ways or is capable of being otherwise has no place here, but that nothing which suggests doubt or alarm can be included at all in that which is naturally immortal and blessed. Now this we

79 can ascertain by our mind is absolutely the case. But what falls within the investigation of risings and settings and turnings and eclipses, and all that is akin to this, is no longer of any value for the happiness which knowledge brings, but persons who have perceived all this, but yet do not know what are the natures of these things and what are the essential causes, are still in fear, just as if they did not know these things at all : indeed, their fear may be even greater, since the wonder which arises out of the observation of these things cannot discover any solution or realize the regulation of the essentials. And for this

80 been the case already in our investigation of detail, we must not suppose that our inquiry into these things has not reached sufficient accuracy to contribute to our peace of mind and happiness. So we must carefully consider in how many ways a similar phenomenon is produced on earth, when we reason about the causes of celestial phenomena and all that is imperceptible to the senses ; and we must despise those persons who do not recognize either what exists or comes into being in one way only, or that

which may occur in several ways in the case of things which can only be seen by us from a distance, and further are not aware under what conditions it is impossible to have peace of mind. If, therefore, we think that a phenomenon probably occurs in some such particular way, and that in circumstances under which it is equally possible for us to be at peace, when we realize that it may occur in several ways, we shall be just as little disturbed as if we know that it occurs in some such particular way.

bodies, &c.,
is certain and
essential for
our happiness,

but not the
knowledge of
the detailed
causes of
their working.

We must
therefore be
content even
if we find
several causes
for the same
phenomenon.

We must
reason about
celestial
phenomena
on the analogy
of things on
earth, and not
be disturbed,
if we find
several causes
at work

ἀταρακτήσομεν. | ἐπὶ δὲ τούτοις δλως ἀπασιν ἐκεῖνο δεῖ κατανοεῖν, δτι τάραχος δ κυριώτατος ταῖς ἀνθρωπίναις ψυχαῖς γίνεται ἐν τῷ ταῦτα μακάριά τε δοξάζεω καὶ ἀφθαρτα, καὶ ὑπεναντίας ἔχειν τούτοις βουλήσεις ἄμα καὶ πράξεις καὶ 5 αἰτίας, καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰώνιῳ τι δεινὸν ἀεὶ προσδοκᾶν ἡ ὑποπτεύειν κατὰ τοὺς μύθους εἴτε καὶ αὐτὴν τὴν ἀναισθησίαν τὴν ἐν τῷ τεθύναι φοβουμένους ὥσπερ οὖσαν κατ' αὐτούς, καὶ ἐν τῷ μὴ δόξαις ταῦτα πάσχειν ἀλλ' ἀλόγῳ γέ τωι παραστάσει, 82 δθεν μὴ δρίζοντας τὸ δεινὸν τὴν ἵσην ἡ καὶ ἐπιτεταμένην ταραχὴν λαμβάνειν ὡς εἰ καὶ ἐδόξαζον ταῦτα. | ἡ δὲ ἀταραξία τὸ τούτων πάντων ἀπολελύσθαι καὶ συνεχῆ μνήμην ἔχειν τῶν δλων καὶ κυριωτάτων.

"Οθεν τοῖς πάθεσι προσεκτέον τοῖς παροῦσι καὶ ταῖς 5 αἰσθήσεσι, κατὰ μὲν τὸ κοινὸν ταῖς κοιναῖς, κατὰ δὲ τὸ ἴδιον ταῖς ἴδιαις, καὶ πάσῃ τῇ παρούσῃ καθ' ἕκαστον τῶν κριτηρίων ἐναργείᾳ. ὅν γὰρ τούτοις προσέχωμεν, τὸ δθεν δ τάραχος καὶ δ φόβος ἐγίνετο ἐξαιτιολογήσομεν δρθῶς καὶ ἀπολύσομεν, ὑπέρ τε μετεώρων αἰτιολογοῦντες καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν τοῦ τῶν ἀεὶ παρεμπιπτόντων, δσα φοβεῖ τὸν λοιπὸν ἐσχάτως.

Ταῦτά σοι, ὁ Ἡρόδοτε, ἔστι κεφαλαιωδέστατα ὑπὲρ τῆς 83 τῶν δλων φύσεως ἐπιτετμημένα, | ὥστε ἀν γένοιτο οὗτος ὁ λόγος δυνατὸς κατασχεθῆ^(ναι) μετ' ἀκριβείας οἷμαι, ἐὰν μὴ καὶ πρὸς ἀπαντα βαδίσῃ τις τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἀκριβωμάτων, ἀσύμβλητον αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν λοιπὸν ἀνθρώπους ἀδρότητα 5 λήψεσθαι. καὶ γὰρ καὶ καθαρὰ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ποιήσει πολλὰ τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἐξακριβουμένων κατὰ τὴν δλην πραγματείαν ἡμῖν, καὶ αὐτὰ ταῦτα ἐν μνήμῃ τιθέμενα συνεχῶς βοηθήσει. τοιαῦτα γάρ ἔστιν, ὥστε καὶ τὸν ^(καὶ τὰ) κατὰ μέρος ἦδη

81 1 δλως BHPCo · ὄλοις FQ : om. GZ 2 τάραχος ^(μὲν)
suspicatus est Usener 3 ταῦτα] ταῦτα Muehll δοξάζειν
(εἶναι) Usener 4 τούτοις libr. plerique: ταύτας F : τούτῳ Usener
5 ἀεὶ Usener: καὶ librī : ἡ Muehll 6 εἴτε καὶ αὐτὴν Casaubon :
εἴτε κατὰ ταῦτην librī 7 κατ' Casaubon. καὶ librī 8 ἀλλ' ἀλόγῳ
BGHP⁸: ἀλλὰ λόγῳ FP⁹Q 10 ὡς scripsi: τῷ BGZ . τὸ
FHPQC¹⁰: τῷ Usener εἴ καὶ ἐδόξασον] εἰκαίως δοξάζοντι Usener
82 2 τὸ] τῷ Usener 4 πάθεσι Bonnet: πᾶσι librī 11 fortasse
(τὰ) κεφαλαιωδέστατα 83 1 ἀν γένοιτο] ἔαν γένηται Usener
οὗτος ὁ λόγος δυνατὸς libr. plerique: δυνατὸς οὗτος ὁ λόγος F
2 κατασχεθῆ^(ναι) Bockemuller: κατασχέθη H: κατεσχέθη libr. cett.:
κατασχεθεῖς Gassendi 4 ἀσύμβλητον BHPCQ : ἀσύγκριτον FGZ
5 καθαρὰ Gassendi; καθαρὰν librī 6 ἐξακριβουμένων Gassendi :

- 81 And besides all these matters in general we must grasp s. *The causes of men's fears.*
 this point, that the principal disturbance in the minds of The two chief causes of unrest of mind are
 men arises because they think that these celestial bodies are blessed and immortal, and yet have wills and actions and motives inconsistent with these attributes ; and because (a) the belief that the heavenly bodies are divine, and (b) the fear of eternal punishment or of annihilation after death.
 they are always expecting or imagining some everlasting misery, such as is depicted in legends, or even fear the loss of feeling in death as though it would concern them themselves ; and, again, because they are brought to this pass not by reasoned opinion, but rather by some irrational presentiment, and therefore, as they do not know the limits of pain, they suffer a disturbance equally great or even more extensive than if they had reached this belief by opinion.
- 82 But peace of mind is being delivered from all this, and having a constant memory of the general and most essential principles. Peace of mind is freedom from these fears

Wherefore we must pay attention to internal feelings and to external sensations in general and in particular, according as the subject is general or particular, and to every immediate intuition in accordance with each of the standards of judgement. For if we pay attention to these, we shall rightly trace the causes whence arose our mental disturbance and fear, and, by learning the true causes of celestial phenomena and all other occurrences that come to pass from time to time, we shall free ourselves from all which produces the utmost fear in other men.

- Here, Herodotus, is my treatise on the chief points Conclusion.
 83 concerning the nature of the general principles, abridged This summary will be of value both to the advanced student and to the more general inquirer.
 so that my account would be easy to grasp with accuracy. I think that, even if one were unable to proceed to all the detailed particulars of the system, he would from this obtain an unrivalled strength compared with other men. For indeed he will clear up for himself many of the detailed points by reference to our general system, and these very principles, if he stores them in his mind, will constantly aid him. For such is their character that even those who are at present engaged in working out the

ἐξακριβοῦντας ἵκανῶς· ἡ καὶ τελείωσ, εἰς τὰς τοιαύτας ἀναλύοντας ἐπιβολὰς τὰς πλείστας τῶν περιοδειῶν ὑπὲρ τῆς δλῆς φύσεως ποιεῖσθαι· δσοι δὲ μὴ παντελῶς αὐτῶν τῶν ἀποτελουμένων, ἐκ τούτων εἰσὶν οἱ κατὰ τὸν ἄνευ φθόγγων τρόπον τὴν ἅμα νοήματι περίοδον τῶν κυριωτάτων πρὸς γαληνισμὸν ποιοῦνται.

II δσοι H : δσα libr. cett. 12 εἰσὶν οἱ scripsi : εἰσὶν ἡ libr :
ἵκανην Usener : δση δὴ ἡ Bignone ἄνευ φθόγγων] ἄνεύφθογγον
P⁸Q : ἄνευ φθόνον H

details to a considerable degree, or even completely, will be able to carry out the greater part of their investigations into the nature of the whole by conducting their analysis in reference to such a survey as this. And as for all who are not fully among those on the way to being perfected, some of them can from this summary obtain a hasty view of the most important matters without oral instruction so as to secure peace of mind.

II

ΕΠΙΚΟΥΤΡΟΣ ΠΤΘΟΚΑΛΕΙ ΧΑΙΡΕΙΝ

84 "Ηνεγκέ μοι Κλέων ἐπιστολὴν παρὰ σοῦ, ἐν ᾧ φιλοφρονούμενός τε περὶ ἡμᾶς διετέλεις ἀξίως τῆς ἡμετέρας περὶ σεαυτὸν σπουδῆς, καὶ οὐκ ἀπιθάνως ἐπειρῶ μνημονεύειν τῶν εἰς μακάριον βίου συντεινόντων διαλογισμῶν, ἐδέον τε σεαυτῷ περὶ τῶν μετεώρων σύντομον καὶ εὐπερίγραφον διαλογισμὸν ἀποστεῖλαι, ἵνα ἁρδίως μνημονεύῃς· τὰ γὰρ ἐν ἄλλοις ἡμῶν γεγραμμένα δυσμνημόνευτα εἶναι, καίτοι, ὡς ἔφης, συνεχῶς αὐτὰ βαστάζεις. ἡμεῖς δὲ ἥδεως τε σοῦ τὴν δέησιν ἀπεδεξάμεθα καὶ ἐλπίσω ἥδείας συνεσχέθημεν. | γράψαντες οὖν τὰ λοιπὰ πάντα συντελούμεν ἅπερ ἥξιστος πολλοῖς καὶ ἄλλοις ἐσόμενα χρήσιμα τὰ διαλογίσματα ταῦτα, καὶ μάλιστα τοῖς νεωστὶ φυσιολογίας γνησίου γενομένοις καὶ τοῖς εἰς ἀσχολίας 5 βαθυτέρας τῶν ἐγκυκλίων τωὸς ἐμπεπλεγμένοις. καλῶς δὴ αὐτὰ διάλαβε, καὶ διὰ μνήμης ἔχων ὀξέως αὐτὰ περιόδευε μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν ὡν ἐν τῇ μικρῷ ἐπιτομῇ πρὸς Ἡρόδοτον ἀπεστείλαμεν.

85 Πρῶτον μὲν οὖν μὴ ἄλλο τι τέλος ἐκ τῆς περὶ μετεώρων 10 γνώσεως εἴτε κατὰ συναφίην λεγομένων εἴτε αὐτοτελῶς νομίζειν εἶναι ἢ περ ἀταραξίαν καὶ πίστιν βέβαιον, καθάπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν λοιπῶν. | μήτε τὸ ἀδύνατον καὶ παραβιάζεσθαι μήτε δύοιαν κατὰ πάντα τὴν θεωρίαν ἔχειν ἢ τοῖς περὶ βίων λόγοις ἢ τοῖς κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἄλλων φυσικῶν προβλημάτων κάθαρσιν, οἷον ὅτι τὸ πᾶν σώματα καὶ ἀναφῆς φύσις ἔστιν ἢ ὅτι ἄτομα 5 (τὰ) στοιχεῖα, καὶ πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα δὴ ὅσα μοναχὴν ἔχει

84. 7 καίτοι] καδύνατον Cronert

ζειν libri: βιστάζοντι Usener

9 ἐκ εἰκός Kochalsky

supplevit Gassendi

4 σώματα Usener:

8 βιστάζεις Casaubon: βιστά-

ζειν 2 λοιπὰ πάτα] λείποντα con-

iescit Usener

10 post νομίζειν (δεῖ)

Kochalsky:

ante μήτε transposuit Kochalsky: καὶ (ἀπρακτον)

Bignone

5 (τὰ) adiecit Schneider

τοιαῦτα δὴ ὅσα Bignone:

τοιαῦτα ὅσα libri: τοιαῦτα ὅσα Schneider

II

EPICURUS TO PYTHOCLES

84 CLEON brought me a letter from you in which you continue to express a kindly feeling towards me, which is a just return for my interest in you, and you attempt with some success to recall the arguments which lead to a life of blessedness. You ask me to send you a brief argument about the phenomena of the sky in a short sketch, that you may easily recall it to mind. For you say that what I have written in my other works is hard to remember, even though, as you state, you constantly have them in your hands. I was glad to receive your request and felt constrained to answer it by pleasant expectations for the future. Therefore, as I have finished all my other writings I now intend to accomplish your request, feeling that these arguments will be of value to many other persons as well, and especially to those who have but recently tasted the genuine inquiry into nature, and also to those who are involved too deeply in the business of some regular occupation. Therefore lay good hold on it, keep it in mind, and go through it all keenly, together with the rest which I sent in the small epitome to Herodotus.

First of all then we must not suppose that any other object is to be gained from the knowledge of the phenomena of the sky, whether they are dealt with in connexion with other doctrines or independently, than peace of mind and a sure confidence, just as in all other branches of study. We must not try to force an impossible explanation, nor employ a method of inquiry like our reasoning either about the modes of life or with respect to the solution of other physical problems: witness such propositions as that 'the universe consists of bodies and the intangible', or that 'the elements are indivisible', and all

*Introduction.
Pythocles'
request.*

*Epicurus'
consent.
general use-
fulness of the
letter.*

*Purpose of
investigation
the quiet life.*

*Its principles
investigation
of heavenly
phenomena
differs from
that of ethics
or physics.*

τοῖς φαινομένοις συμφωνίαν· δπερ ἐπὶ τῶν μετεώρων οὐχ ὑπάρχει, ἀλλὰ ταῦτα γε πλεοναχὴν ἔχει καὶ τῆς γενέσεως αἰτίαν καὶ τῆς οὐσίας ταῖς αἰσθήσεσι σύμφωνον κατηγορίαν.
 87 οὐ γάρ κατὰ ἀξιώματα κενὰ καὶ νομοθεσίας φυσιολογητέον,
 ἀλλ' ὡς τὰ φαινόμενα ἐκκαλεῖται· | οὐ γάρ ἥδη ἀλογίας καὶ
 κενῆς δόξης δὲ βίος ἡμῶν ἔχει χρέαν, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἀθορύβως
 ἡμᾶς ζῆν. πάντα μὲν οὖν γίνεται ἀσείστως κατὰ πάντων
 {τῶν} κατὰ πλεοναχὸν τρόπουν ἐκκαθαιρομένων συμφώνως
 5 τοῖς φαινομένοις, δταν τις τὸ πιθανολογούμενον ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν
 δεούτως καταλίπῃ· δταν δέ τις τὸ μὲν ἀπολίπῃ, τὸ δὲ ἐκβάλῃ
 δμοίως σύμφωνον δι τῷ φαινομένῳ, δῆλον δτι καὶ ἐκ παντὸς
 ἐκπίπτει φυσιολογῆματος, ἐπὶ δὲ τὸν μῦθον καταρρεῖ. σημεῖα
 δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς μετεώροις συντελουμένων φέρειν τῶν παρ'
 10 ήμῖν τινα φαινομένων, δι τεωρεῖται ἢ ὑπάρχει, καὶ οὐ τὰ
 ἐν μετεώροις φαινόμενα· ταῦτα γάρ ἐνδέχεται πλεοναχῶς
 88 γενέσθαι. | τὸ μέντοι φάντασμα ἐκάστου τηρητέον καὶ ἐπὶ
 τὰ συναπτόμενα τούτῳ διαιρετέον δι οὐκ ἀντιμαρτυρεῖται τοῖς
 παρ' ήμῖν γινομένοις πλεοναχῶς συντελεῖσθαι.

Κόσμος ἐστὶ περιοχή τις οὐρανοῦ, ἄστρα τε καὶ γῆν καὶ
 5 πάντα τὰ φαινόμενα περιέχουσα, οὐ λυομένου πάντα τὰ ἐν
 αὐτῷ σύγχυσιν λήψεται, ἀποτομὴν ἔχουσα ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀπείρου
 καὶ καταλήγουσα ἐν πέρατι ἡ ἀραιῶ ἡ πυκνῷ καὶ ἡ ἐν
 περιαγομένῳ ἡ ἐν στάσιν ἔχουσι καὶ στρογγύλην ἡ τρέγωνον
 10 ἡ οἷαν δή ποτε {ἔχουσα} περιγραφήν. πανταχῶς γάρ ἐνδέ-
 χεται· τῶν γάρ φαινομένων οὐδὲν ἀντιμαρτυρεῖ {ἐν} τῷδε
 89 τῷ κόσμῳ, ἐν φῇ ληγον οὐκ ἐστὶ καταλαβεῖν. | δτι δὲ καὶ
 τοιοῦτοι κόσμοι εἰσὶν ἀπειροι τὸ πλῆθος, ἐστὶ καταλαβεῖν,
 καὶ δτι καὶ ὁ τοιοῦτος δύναται κόσμος γίνεσθαι καὶ ἐν κόσμῳ

7 ὑπάρχει Gassendi: ὑπάρχειν libri 87 ι ἥδη ἀλογίας FHP⁸Z:
 Ιδιαλογίας BP¹QCo unde Ιδιολογίας Stephanus 3 κατὰ] καὶ
 Usener: om. Cronert πάντων {τῶν} Bignone πάντα τῶν HP¹Q:
 πάντων libr. cett. 9 δὲ ἐπὶ Usener: δέ τι BP¹QCo: δέ τινα FHP⁸Z:
 δὲ πιθανὰ Bignone [φέρειν] φέρει Kuhn 10 ἡ Woltjer:
 ἡ libri οὐδὲ οὐτως F unde οὐχ ὡς Cronert 88 ι ἐκάστου]
 ἐκάστου coniecit Usener ἐπὶ] ετι Usener 5 οὐ λυομένου . . .
 λήψεται huc transtuli, post πυκνῷ καὶ habent libri, ut additamen-
 tum seclusit Usener 7 καὶ καταλήγουσα . . . πυκνῷ ut addita-
 mentum seclusit Usener ante ἡ ἐν περιαγομένῳ addunt καὶ
 ληγουσα libri (καὶ ληγουσα Gassendi) scilicet ε καὶ καταλήγουσα
 repetitum: de his tribus versibus vid. commentarium nostrum
 8 ἐν στάσιν Gassendi: ἐνστασιν libri 9 {ἔχουσα} addidi παν-
 ταχῶς] πανταχοῦ H⁸Q 10 (ἐν) τῷδε Usener: τῷδε libri (τῷδε F)

such statements in circumstances where there is only one explanation which harmonizes with phenomena. For this is not so with the things above us : they admit of more than one cause of coming into being and more than one account of their nature which harmonizes with our sensations. For we must not conduct scientific investigation by means of empty assumptions and arbitrary principles, 87 but follow the lead of phenomena : for our life has not now any place for irrational belief and groundless imaginings, but we must live free from trouble. Now all goes on without disturbance as far as regards each of those things which may be explained in several ways so as to harmonize with what we perceive, when one admits, as we are bound to do, probable theories about them. But when one accepts one theory and rejects another, which harmonizes just as well with the phenomenon, it is obvious that he altogether leaves the path of scientific inquiry and has recourse to myth. Now we can obtain indications of what happens above from some of the phenomena on earth : for we can observe how they come to pass, though we cannot observe the phenomena in the sky : for they may be produced in 88 several ways. Yet we must never desert the appearance of each of these phenomena, and further, as regards what is associated with it, must distinguish those things whose production in several ways is not contradicted by phenomena on earth.

A world is a circumscribed portion of sky, containing I *Worlds*
heavenly bodies and an earth and all the heavenly phenomena, whose dissolution will cause all within it to fall into confusion : it is a piece cut off from the infinite and ends Definition of
in a boundary either rare or dense, either revolving or stationary : its outline may be spherical or three-cornered, or any kind of shape. For all such conditions are possible, seeing that no phenomenon is evidence against this in our world, in which it is not possible to perceive an ending. 89 And that such worlds are infinite in number we can be sure, and also that such a world may come into being both inside another world and in an interworld, by which we Worlds
infinite in
number
Place of
formation.

καὶ ἔν μετακοσμίῳ, δ λέγομεν μεταῖν κόσμων διάστημα, ἐν 5 πολυκένω τόπῳ καὶ οὐκ ἐν μεγάλῳ εἰλικρινῇ καὶ κενῷ, καθάπερ τινὲς φασίν, ἐπιτηδείων τινῶν σπερμάτων ρύντων ἀφ' ἐνδὸς κόσμου ἡ μετακοσμίου ἡ καὶ ἀπὸ πλειόνων κατὰ μικρὸν προσθέσεις τε καὶ διαρθρώσεις καὶ μεταστάσεις ποιούντων ἐπ' ἄλλον τόπον, ἐὰν οὕτω τύχῃ, καὶ ἐπαρδεύσεις ἐκ τῶν 10 ἔχοντων ἐπιτηδείως ἔως τελειώσεως καὶ διαμοήῆς ἐφ' ὅσον τὰ ὑποβληθέντα θεμέλια τὴν προσδοχὴν δύναται ποιεῖσθαι. | 90 οὐ γὰρ ἀθροισμὸν δεῖ μόνον γενέσθαι οὐδὲ δῦνον ἐν ᾧ ἐνδέχεται κόσμου γίνεσθαι κενῷ κατὰ τὸ δοξαζόμενον ἐξ ἀνάγκης, αὔξεσθαι τε, ἔως ἂν ἐτέρῳ προσκρούσῃ, καθάπερ τῶν φυσικῶν καλουμενῶν φησί τις. τοῦτο γὰρ μαχόμενόν ἐστι τοῖς φαινο- 5 μένοις.

"Ηλιός τε καὶ σελήνη καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἄστρα (οὐ) καθ' ἔαυτὰ γενόμενα ὑστερον ἐμπειρελαμβάνετο ὑπὸ τοῦ κόσμου, ἀλλ' εὐθὺς διεπλάττετο καὶ αὔξησιν ἐλάμβανεν κατὰ προσκρόσεις καὶ δωήσεις λεπτομερῶν τινῶν φύσεων, ἥτοι πνευματικῶν 10 ἡ πυροειδῶν ἡ τὸ συναμφότερον· καὶ γὰρ ταῦτα οὕτως ἡ αἴσθησις ὑποβάλλει. | τὸ δὲ μέγεθος ἥλιου τε (καὶ σελήνης) καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἄστρων κατὰ μὲν τὸ πρὸς ἡμᾶς τηλικοῦτάν ἐστι τὸ ἥλικον φαίνεται· κατὰ δὲ τὸ καθ' αὐτὸν ἥτοι μεῖζον τοῦ ὁραμένου ἡ μικρῷ ἔλαττον ἡ τηλικοῦτον. οὕτω γὰρ καὶ 5 τὰ παρ' ἡμῖν πυρὰ ἐξ ἀποστήματος θεωρούμενα κατὰ τὴν αἴσθησιν θεωρεῖται. καὶ πᾶν δὲ εἰς τοῦτο τὸ μέρος ἐνστήμα ράδίως διαλυθήσεται, ἐάν τις τοῖς ἐναργήμασι προσέχῃ, ὅπερ 91 ἐν τοῖς περὶ φύσεως βιβλίοις δείκνυμεν. | ἀιγατολὰς καὶ δύσεις ἥλιου καὶ σελήνης καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἄστρων καὶ κατὰ ἄναψιν

89 4 καὶ ἔν scripsi: καὶ libri: κάν coniecit Usener 5 εἰλικρινεῖ καὶ εἰλικρινεῖ Zeller 6 τινὲς Casaubon: τινὰ libri 7 ἡ καὶ FHP²Z: ἡ BP¹QCo 10 διαμοήῆς] διαμοήῆς Usener ἐφ' ὅσον FP³: ἐφύσουν B. ἐφ' δ H(P¹)QCo 90 1 δίνον P²QCo: δένον HP¹: δεινὸν BFZ 6 (οὐ) adiecit Aldobrandinus 91 1 (καὶ σελήνης) adiecit Usener 2 μὲν τὸ Schneider: μέντοι libri 3 καθ' αὐτὸν Usener καθ' αὐτὸν P¹: καθ' αὐτήν Q: κατ' αὐτὸν FHP²Z: κατ' αὐτὸν BH⁴ 4 post τηλικοῦτον libri οὐχ ἄμα habent, quod ut glossema seclusi. emendaverunt τυχόν Lachmann, τυγχάνει Usener 8 βιβλίοις] βιβλίοι. Usener 92 2 post ἄναψιν Usener (τε) adiecit

Scholia

90 7 post τοῦ κόσμου verba καὶ δόσα γε δὴ σώζει habent HPQ, 8 post διάμβαντι codd. eidem ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ γῆ καὶ θάλαττα: eadem verba

mean a space between worlds; it will be in a place with much void, and not in a large empty space quite void, as some say: this occurs when seeds of the right kind have rushed in from a single world or interworld, or from several: little by little they make junctions and articulations, and cause changes of position to another place, as it may happen, and produce irrigations of the appropriate matter until the period of completion and stability, which lasts as long as the underlying foundations are capable of

90 receiving additions. For it is not merely necessary for a gathering of atoms to take place, nor indeed for a whirl and nothing more to be set in motion, as is supposed, by necessity, in an empty space in which it is possible for a world to come into being, nor can the world go on increasing until it collides with another world, as one of the so-called physical philosophers says. For this is a contradiction of phenomena.

Sun and moon and the other stars were not created by themselves and subsequently taken in by the world, but were fashioned in it from the first and gradually grew in size by the aggregations and whirlings of bodies of minute parts, either windy or fiery or both, for this is what our sensation suggests. The size of sun (and moon) and the other stars is for us what it appears to be; and in reality it is either (slightly) greater than what we see or slightly less or the same size: for so too fires on earth when looked at from a distance seem to the senses. And every objection at this point will easily be dissipated, if we pay attention to the clear vision, as I show in my books about

92 nature. The risings and settings of the sun, moon, and other heavenly bodies may be due to kindling and extinc-

Scholia.

alias alii disponunt codices

καὶ ὅσα . . . σώζει in textu retinunt Muehll
συνῆ Usener

σώζει] fortasse

91 3 post φάνεται legitur τοῦτο καὶ ἐν τῇ ἴα Περὶ φύσεως “εἰ γάρ”, φησι, “τὸ μέγεθος διὰ τὸ διάστημα ἀπεβεβλήκει, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἀν τὴν χρόνῳ”. ἀλλ’ οὐ γάρ τοιτῷ συμμετρότερον διάστημα οὐθέν ἔστι
ἀπεβεβλήκει Usener: ἀποβεβλήκει libri ἀλλ’ οὐ Usener: ἀλλο
(ἄλλω B) libri, Muehll, qui verba ἀλλο γάρ . . οὐθέν ἔστι in
textu retinunt συμμετρότερον libri plerique: συμμετρώτερον
B'Z: συμμετρούμενον Lachmann

γενέσθαι δύνασθαι καὶ κατὰ σθέσιν, τοιαύτης οὕσης περιστάσεως καὶ καθ' ἐκατέρους τὸν τόπους ὥστε τὰ προειρημένα
 5 ἀποτελεῖσθαι· οὐδὲν γάρ τῶν φαινομένων ἀντιμαρτυρεῖ. (καὶ)
 κατ' ἐκφάνειάν τε ὑπὲρ γῆς καὶ πάλιν ἐπιπροσθέτησιν τὸ
 προειρημένου δύνατ' διν συντελεῖσθαι· οὐδὲ γάρ τι τῶν φαινο-
 μένων ἀντιμαρτυρεῖ. τὰς τε κινήσεις αὐτῶν οὐκ ἀδύνατον
 μὲν γίνεσθαι κατὰ τὴν τοῦ δλου οὐρανοῦ δύνην, ἢ τούτου μὲν
 10 στάπιν, αὐτῶν δὲ δύνην κατὰ τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐν τῇ γενέσει
 93 τοῦ κόσμου ἀνάγκην ἀπογεννθεῖσαν ἐπ' ἀνατολῆ· | * * * * *
 τάτῃ θερμασίᾳ κατά τινα ἐπινέμησιν τοῦ πυρὸς ἀεὶ ἐπὶ τὸν
 ἔχῆς τόπους λίντος. τροπὰς ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης ἐνδέχεται
 μὲν γίνεσθαι κατὰ λόξωσιν οὐρανοῦ οὗτω τοῖς χρόνοις κατη-
 5 ναγκασμένου· δμοίως δὲ καὶ κατὰ ἀέρος ἀντέξωσιν ἢ καὶ
 ὕλης ἀεὶ ἐπιτηδείας ἔχομένως ἐμπιπραμένης, τῆς δὲ ἐκλειπούσης·
 ἢ καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς τοιαύτην δύνην κατειληθῆναι τοῖς ἀστροῖς
 τούτοις, ὥσθ' οἷόν τιν' ἐλικα κωεῖσθαι. πάντα γάρ τὰ
 10 τοιαῦτα καὶ τὰ τούτοις συγγενῆ οὐθενὶ τῶν ἐναργημάτων
 διαφωνεῖ, ἐάν τις ἐπὶ τῶν τοιούτων μερῶν ἔχόμενος τοῦ
 δυνατοῦ εἰς τὸ σύμφωνον τοῖς φαινομένοις ἐκαστον τούτων
 δύνηται ἀνάγειν, μὴ φοβούμενος τὰς ἀνδραποδώδεις ἀστρο-
 λόγων τεχνιτεῖς. |

94 Κενώσεις τε σελήνης καὶ πάλιν πληρώσεις καὶ κατὰ
 στροφὴν τοῦ σώματος τούτου δύναιντ' ἀν γίνεσθαι καὶ κατὰ
 σχηματισμοὺς ἀέρος δμοίως, ἔτι τε καὶ κατὰ προσθετήσεις
 καὶ κατὰ πάντας τρόπους, καθ' οὓς καὶ τὰ παρ' ἡμῖν φαινό-
 5 μενα ἐκκαλεῖται εἰς τὰς τούτου τοῦ ἐίδους ἀποδόσεις, ἐάν
 μή τις τὸν μοναχῆ τρόπον κατηγαπηκὼς τοὺς ἄλλους κενῶς
 ἀποδοκιμάζῃ, οὐ τεθεωρηκὼς τί δυνατὸν ἀνθρώπῳ θεωρῆσαι

3 δύνασθαι] δυνατὸν Usener κατὰ] seclusit Usener 4 καὶ
 κπθ' ἐκατέρους τὸν τόπους] τρόπους Meibom: ut additamentum
 seclusit Usener 5 (καὶ) addidit Usener 6 ἐπιπροσθέτησιν] ἐπι-
 πρόσθησιν Cobet 93 I post ἀνατολῆ lacunam indicavit Usener
 collato Lucr. v. 519-525 . . . τάτῃ edd.: τὰ (τα B) τῇ BP¹: el
 τατῇ Q: εἴτα τῇ FZ: εἴτα τῇ libr. cett.: σφραδοτάτῃ coniecit
 Usener: ἐπιτηδειστάτῃ Bignone 6 ἔχομένως Usener: ἔχομένως
 BP¹QCo ἔχομένης FHP⁸Z ἐμπιπραμένης HZ: ἐμπιπραμένοις
 FPQCo δὲ ἐκλειπούσης Usener: δὲ καταλιπούσης librī: δὲ κατα-
 λιπομένης Muehll 8 οἵων τιν' Usener: οἵον τε librī: 9 οὐθενὶ
 Usener: οὐθὲν BPQ: οὐδὲν FH 12 ἀνάγειν Schneider: ἐπάγειν
 B: ἀπάγειν libr. cett.: ἐπανάγειν Muehll 13 τεχνιτεῖς F:
 τεχνιτεῖς B: τεχνητεῖς HPQ 94 I κενώσεις . . . πληρώσεις]

tion, the composition of the surrounding matter at the places of rising and setting being such as to lead to these results : for nothing in phenomena is against it. Or again, the effect in question might be produced by their appearance over the top of the earth, and again the interposition of the earth in front of them : for once more nothing in phenomena is against it. Their motions may (*e*) Their not impossibly be due to the revolution of the whole ^{motions.} heaven, or else it may remain stationary, and they may revolve owing to the natural impulse towards the east,
 93 which was produced at the beginning of the world by an excessive heat owing to a spreading of the fire which is always moving on to the regions nearest in succession. The tropics of sun and moon may be caused (*f*) The owing to an obliquity of the whole heaven, which is constrained into this position in the successive seasons ; or equally well by an outward impulsion of a current of air, or because the appropriate material successively catches fire, as the former fails ; or again, from the beginning this particular form of revolution may have been assigned to these stars, so that they move in a kind of spiral. For all these and kindred explanations are not at variance with any clear-seen facts, if one always clings in such departments of inquiry to the possible and can refer each point to what is in agreement with phenomena without fearing the slavish artifices of the astronomers.

94 The wanings of the moon and its subsequent waxings (*g*) *The Moon.* (⁽¹⁾*its phases* ; might be due to the revolution of its own body, or equally well to successive conformations of the atmosphere, or again to the interposition of other bodies ; they may be accounted for in all the ways in which phenomena on earth invite us to such explanations of these phases ; provided only one does not become enamoured of the method of the single cause and groundlessly put the others out of court, without having considered what it is possible

κένωσις . . . πλήρωσις Usener κατὰ στροφὴν Gassendi : καταστροφὴν libri 2 δύναντ' Meibom : δύναντ' libri 3 κατὰ προσθετήσεις] κατ' ἐπιπροσθήσεις Cobet 6 κενῶς] κενούς F : ὡς κενούς Cobet 7 οὐ τεθεωρηκὼς Cobet : οὐτε θεωρητικῶς (θεωρητικῶς B¹) libri τι Usener : τι libri (bis)

καὶ τί ἀδύνατον, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀδύνατα θεωρεῖν ἐπιθυμῶν.
 ἔτι τε ἐνδέχεται τὴν σελήνην ἐξ ἑαυτῆς ἔχειν τὸ φῶς,
 95 ἐνδέχεται δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου. | καὶ γὰρ παρ' ἡμῖν θεωρεῖται
 πολλὰ μὲν ἐξ ἑαυτῶν ἔχοντα, πολλὰ δὲ ἀφ' ἑτέρων. καὶ
 οὐθὲν ἐμποδοστατεῖ τῶν ἐν τοῖς μετεώροις φαινομένων, ἐάν
 5 τις τοῦ πλεοναχοῦ τρόπου ἀεὶ μνήμην ἔχῃ καὶ τὰς ἀκολούθους
 αὐτοῖς ὑποθέσεις ἄμα καὶ αἰτίας συνθεωρῆι καὶ μὴ ἀναβλέπων
 εἰς τὰ ἀνακόλουθα ταῦτ' ὅγκοι ματαίως καὶ καταρρέπῃ ἄλλοτε
 ἄλλως ἐπὶ τὸν μοναχὸν τρόπουν. ἡ δὲ ἐμφασις τοῦ προσώπου
 ἐν αὐτῇ δύναται μὲν γίνεσθαι καὶ κατὰ παραλλαγὴν μερῶν
 96 καὶ κατ' ἐπιπροσθέτησιν, καὶ ὅσοι ποτ' ἀν τρόποι θεωροῦντο
 τὸ σύμφωνον τοῖς φαινομένοις κεκτημένοι. | ἐπὶ πάντων γὰρ
 τῶν μετεώρων τὴν τοιαύτην ἰχνεύειν οὐ προετέοι. ἦν γάρ
 τις ἡ μαχόμενος τοῖς ἐναργήμασι, οὐδέποτε μὴ δυνήσεται
 ἀταραξίας γνησίου μεταλαβεῖν.

5 "Εκλειψις ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης δύναται μὲν γίνεσθαι καὶ
 κατὰ σβέσω, καθάπερ καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν τοῦτο θεωρεῖται γινό-
 μενον· καὶ ἡδη κατ' ἐπιπροσθέτησιν ἄλλων τινῶν, ἡ γῆς ἡ
 ἀοράτου τινὸς ἡ ἑτέρου τοιούτου. καὶ ὥδε τοὺς οἰκείους
 97 ἄλληλοις τρόπους συνθεωρητέον, καὶ τὰς ἄμα συγκυρήσεις
 τινῶν διτὶ οὐκ ἀδύνατον γίνεσθαι. | ἔτι τε τάξις περιόδου,
 καθάπερ ἔντα καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν τῶν τυχόντων γίνεται, λαμ-
 βανέσθω· καὶ ἡ θελα φύσις πρὸς ταῦτα μηδαμῇ προσαγέσθω,
 ἀλλ' ἀλειτούργητος διατηρείσθω καὶ ἐν τῇ πάσῃ μακαριότητι.
 5 ὡς εἴ τοῦτο μὴ πραχθήσεται, ἀπασα ἡ τῶν μετεώρων αἰτιο-
 λογία ματαία ἔσται, καθάπερ τισὶν ἡδη ἐγένετο οὐ δυνατοῦ

8 ἀδύνατα P¹: ἀ δυνατὰ Q: τὰ δυνατὰ P² 9 ἐνδέχεται (μὲν) Usener in commentario 95 5 αὐτῷς H¹: αὐτῷ Gassendi
 6 ταῦτ' ὅγκοι μιταίως B: ταυτὸν κυματίως PQ: ταῦτὸν κυματέον H
 9 ἐπιπροσθέτησιν] ἐπιπρόσθησιν Cobet ποτ' Usener: πάντα libri
 96 2 [ἰχνεύειν] ἰχνεύσιν Usener προετέον BPQ. προσθετέον FHZ
 3 τις ἡ Usener: τίσιν P¹Q: τίσι P²: τισὶ B: τισὶ cett. μαχό-
 μενος Gassendi: μαχομένοις BP¹QCo: βαλλομένοις FH¹Z 7 ἡδη]
 ἔτι Meibom: δὴ καὶ Cobet ἐπιπροσθέτησιν FP²Z: ἐπιπρόσθεσιν
 BP¹Co· ἐπιπρόσθησιν Cobet 8 ἀοράτους coniecit Usener (in
 praefatione): οὐρανοῦ libri· σελήνης Woltjer: fortasse (σελήνης ἡ)
 ἀοράτου τινὸς ἡ scripsi: ἡ τινὸς libri: ἡ omittendum censuit
 Usener vel in ἡμῖν vertendum 9 συγκυρήσεις BP²H²QCo:
 συγκρίσεις libr. cett. 97 5 ἡ BF. ἡ περὶ PCo: περὶ Z ἀιτιο-
 λογία F¹: ἀιτιολογία libr. cett.

Scholia

96 10 post γίνεσθαι legitur ἐν δὲ τῇ ἔβ Περὶ φύσεως ταῦτα λέγει καὶ

for a man to observe and what is not, and desiring therefore to observe what is impossible. Next the moon may (a) its light; 95 have her light from herself or from the sun. For on earth too we see many things shining with their own, and many with reflected light. Nor is any celestial phenomenon against these explanations, if one always remembers the method of manifold causes and investigates hypotheses and explanations consistent with them, and does not look to inconsistent notions and emphasize them without cause and so fall back in different ways on different occasions on the method of the single cause. The impression of a face (3) the face in the moon may be due to the variation of its parts or to interposition or to any one of many causes which might be observed, all in harmony with phenomena. For in the case of all celestial phenomena this process of investigation must never be abandoned · for if one is in opposition to clear-seen facts, he can never have his part in true peace of mind.

The eclipse of sun and moon may take place both owing (4) Eclipses. to their extinction, as we see this effect is produced on earth, or again by the interposition of some other bodies, either the earth or some unseen body or something else of this sort. And in this way we must consider together the causes that suit with one another and realize that it is not impossible that some should coincide at the same time. 97 Next the regularity of the periods of the heavenly bodies (i) Periods. must be understood in the same way as such regularity is seen in some of the events that happen on earth. And do not let the divine nature be introduced at any point into these considerations, but let it be preserved free from burdensome duties and in entire blessedness. For if this principle is not observed, the whole discussion of causes in celestial phenomena is in vain, as it has already been for certain persons who have not clung to the

Scholia

πρός, ἥλιον ἐκλείπειν σελήνης ἐπισκοπούσης, σελήνη δὲ τοῦ τῆς γῆς σκιάσματος, ἀλλὰ καὶ κατ' ἄναχώρησιν. τούτῳ δέ καὶ Διογένης δ 'Επικούρεος ἐν τῇ ἀ τῶν Ἐπιλέκτων

ταῦτα Usener: ταῦτα (ταῦτην H) libri

πρός BHPQ: τὸν

πρός FZ¹: τὸν Z²

τρόπου ἐφαψαμένοις, εἰς δὲ τὸ μάταιον ἐκπεσοῦσι τὸ καθ' ἔνα τρόπου μόνον οἰεσθαι γίνεσθαι, τοὺς δ' ἄλλους πάντας τοὺς κατὰ τὸ ἐνδεχόμενον ἐκβάλλειν εἰς τε τὸ ἀδιανόητον ^{το} φερομένους καὶ τὰ φαινόμενα, ἢ δεῖ σημεῖα ἀποδέχεσθαι, μὴ δυναμένους συνθεωρεῖν. |

98 Μήκη υγικῶν καὶ ἡμερῶν παραλλάττοντα καὶ παρὰ τὸ ταχέις ἥλιον κινήσεις γίνεσθαι καὶ πάλιν βραδεῖς ὑπὲρ γῆς, παρὰ τὸ μήκη τόπων παραλλάττοντα (διέναι), καὶ (παρὰ τὸ) τόπους τινὰς περαιοῦν τάχιον ἢ βραδύτερον, ὡς καὶ παρ' ἥμιν τινα θεωρεῖται, οἷς συμφώνως δεῖ λέγειν ἐπὶ τῶν μετεώρων. οἱ δὲ τὸ ἐν λαμβάνοντες τοῖς τε φαινομένοις μάχονται καὶ τοῦ εἰ δυνατὸν ἀνθρώπῳ θεωρῆσαι διαπεπτώκασι.

99 Επισημασίαι δύνανται γίνεσθαι καὶ κατὰ συγκυρήσεις ^{το} καιρῶν, καθάπερ ἐν τοῖς ἐμφανέσι παρ' ἥμιν ζῷοις, καὶ παρ' ἔτεροιστεις ἀέρος καὶ μεταβολάς ἀμφότερα γὰρ ταῦτα οὐ μάχεται τοῖς φαινομένοις. | ἐπὶ δὲ ποίοις παρὰ τοῦτο ἢ τοῦτο τὸ αἴτιον γίνεται, οὐκ ἔστι συνιδεῖν.

100 Νέφη δύνανται γίνεσθαι καὶ συνίστασθαι καὶ παρὰ πιλήσεις ἀέρος (κατὰ) πνευμάτων συνώσεις καὶ παρὰ περιπλοκὰς ἀλλη-
5 λούχων ἀτόμων καὶ ἐπιτηδείων εἰς τὸ τοῦτο τελέσαι καὶ κατὰ ρέυμάτων συλλογὴν ἀπό τε γῆς καὶ ὑδάτων· καὶ κατ' ἄλλους δὲ τρόπους πλείους αἱ τῶν τοιούτων συστάσεις οὐκ ἀδυνατοῦσι συντελεῖσθαι. ἦδη δ' ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἢ μὲν Θλιβομένων, ἢ δὲ μεταβαλλόντων ὕδατα συντελεῖσθαι, | ἔτι τε πνευμάτων καταφορῇ ἀπὸ ἐπιτηδείων τύπων καὶ δι' ἀέρος κινουμένων, βιαιοτέρας ἐπαρδεύσεως γινομένης ἀπό τινων ἀθροισμάτων ἐπιτηδείων εἰς τὰς τοιαύτας ἐπιπέμψεις.

7 τὸ καθ'] τῷ καθ' Z Usener 10 ἀ δεῖ BP : ἀ δεῖ (ἢ sscr.) H : ἀ δὴ Q : δὴ FZ 11 συνθεωρεῖν Meibom: σὺν θεῶν χαίρειν libri 98 3 παρὰ τὸ . . . ἢ βραδύτερον ut glossema seclusit Usener παραλλάττοντα] παραλλάττειν Gassendi: post παραλλάττοντα plura verba intercidisse suspicuntur est Bignone (διέναι) adieci exempli causa (παρὰ τὸ) adieci 4 περαιοῦν Usener: περαιοῦντα libri ἢ βραδύτερον post ἥμιν habent libri; huc transtulit Gassendi post βραδύτερον vereor ne clausula tota interciderit. De toto hoc loco vid. commentatorum 7 εἰ] ἢ Usener 9 γίνεσθαι BP'Q: γενέσθαι FHP³Z 11 ἔτεροιστεις Usener: ἔτέροις ὥστε libri μεταβολὰς Kuhn: μεταβολῆς libri 99 1 ἐπὶ Usener. ἔτι FHP³Z: ἦδη BP'QCo 4 (κατὰ) adieci: (διὰ) Bignone πνευμάτων συνώσεις (συνώσεως libri)] ut glossema seclusit Usener, qui in praefatione πνευμάτων συνώσεις coniecerat. (ἢ) πν. συν. Meibom: (καὶ) πν. συν. Kuhn 8 ἀπ'

method of possible explanations, but have fallen back on the useless course of thinking that things could only happen in one way, and of rejecting all other ways in harmony with what is possible, being driven thus to what is inconceivable and being unable to compare earthly phenomena, which we must accept as indications.

98 The successive changes in the length of nights and days (J) Length of may be due to the fact that the sun's movements above the earth become fast and then slow again because he passes across regions of unequal length or because he traverses some regions more quickly or more slowly, (or again to the quicker or slower gathering of the fires that make the sun), as we observe occurs with some things on earth, with which we must be in harmony in speaking of celestial phenomena. But those who assume one cause fight against the evidence of phenomena and fail to ask whether it is possible for men to make such observations.

Signs of the weather may occur owing to the coincidence (K) Weather-
of occasions, as happens with animals we can all see on signs.
earth, and also through alterations and changes in the atmosphere. For both these are in accordance with phenomena. But under what circumstances the cause is produced by this or that, we cannot perceive.

99 100 Clouds may be produced and formed both by the con- III Meteorology-
densation of the atmosphere owing to compression by (a) Clouds.
winds and by the interlacing of atoms clinging to one another and suitable for producing this result, and again by the gathering of streams from earth and the waters: and there are several other ways in which the formation of such things may not impossibly be brought about. And (b) Rain.
from them again rain may be produced if they are squeezed in one part or changed in another, or again by a downward current of wind moving through the atmosphere from appropriate places, a more violent shower being produced from certain conglomerations of atoms suited to create such downfalls.

Kuhn: ἐπ' libri 100 Ι πνευμάτων καταφορᾶ Usener: πνεύματα
κατὰ ἀποφορὰν libri: ῥευμάτων κατὰ ἀποφορὰν Bignone 2 καὶ δι'
ἀέρος] δι' ἀέρος P^oZ

5 Βροντὰς ἐνδέχεται γίνεσθαι καὶ κατὰ πνεύματος ἐν τοῖς κοιλώμασι τῶν νεφῶν ἀνεληπιν, καθάπερ ἐν τοῖς ἡμετέροις ἀγγείοις, καὶ παρὰ πυρὸς πεπνευματωμένου βόμβου ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ κατὰ ρήξεις δὲ νεφῶν καὶ διαστάσεις καὶ κατὰ παρατρήψεις νεφῶν καὶ κατάξεις πῆξιν εἰληφότων κρυσταλλοειδῆ· καὶ
10 τὸ δόλον καὶ τοῦτο τὸ μέρος πλεοναχῶς γίνεσθαι λέγειν ἐκκαλεῖται τὰ φαινόμενα.]

101 Καὶ ἀστραπὰς δ' ὥσπαντας γίνονται κατὰ πλείους τρόπους· καὶ γάρ κατὰ παράτριψιν καὶ σύγκρουσιν νεφῶν δὲ πυρὸς ἀποτελεστικὸς σχηματισμὸς ἔξολισθαίνων ἀστραπὴν γεννᾶ· καὶ κατ' ἐκριπτισμὸν ἐκ τῶν νεφῶν ὑπὸ πνευμάτων τῶν
5 τοιούτων σωμάτων ἢ τὴν λαμπηδόνα ταύτην παρασκευάζει, καὶ κατ' ἐκπιασμόν, θλίψεως τῶν νεφῶν γωμένης εἴθ' ὑπὸ ἀλλήλων εἴθ' ὑπὸ πνευμάτων· καὶ κατ' ἐμπεριληψιν δὲ τοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀστρων κατεσπαρμένου φωτός, εἴτα συνελαυνομένου ὑπὸ τῆς κινήσεως νεφῶν τε καὶ πνευμάτων καὶ διεκπίπτοντος
10 διὰ τῶν νεφῶν· ἡ κατὰ διήθησιν (διὰ) τῶν νεφῶν τοῦ λεπτομερεστάτου φωτός, ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ πυρὸς μέφη συνεφλέχθαι καὶ τὰς βροντὰς ἀποτελεῖσθαι κατὰ τὴν τούτου κίνησιν· καὶ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἐκπύρωσιν τὴν γινομένην διὰ τε
102 συντονίαν φορᾶς καὶ διὰ σφοδρὰν κατελησιν | καὶ κατὰ ρήξεις δὲ νεφῶν ὑπὸ πνευμάτων ἐκπτωσίν τε πυρὸς ἀποτελεστικῶν ἀτόμων καὶ τὸ τῆς ἀστραπῆς φάντασμα ἀποτελουστῶν· καὶ κατ' ἄλλους δὲ πλείους τρόπους ῥάδίως ἔσται καθορᾶν ἔχό-
5 μενον ἀεὶ τῶν φαινομένων καὶ τὸ τούτοις δόμοιον δυνάμενον συνθεωρεῖν. προτερεῖ δὲ ἀστραπὴ βροντῆς ἐν τοιῷδε τῷ περιστάσει νεφῶν καὶ διὰ τὸ ἄμα τῷ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐμπίπτειν ἐξωθεῖσθαι τὸν ἀστραπῆς ἀποτελεστικὸν σχηματισμόν, ὑστερον δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα ἀνειλούμενον τὸν βόμβον ἀποτελεῖν τούτον·
10 καὶ κατ' ἐκπτωσιν δὲ ἀμφοτέρων ἄμα, τῷ τάχει συντονωτέρῳ κεχρῆσθαι πρὸς ἡμᾶς τὴν ἀστραπήν, ὑστερεῖν δὲ τὴν βροντήν, |
103 καθάπερ ἐπ' ἐνίων ἐξ ἀποστήματος θεωρουμένων καὶ πληγάς τινας ποιουμένων.

8 διαστάσεις] διασπάσεις Usener 9 κατάξεις Froben: τάξεις BΗΡQСo: διαστάσεις F: τάσεις Usener 10 2 καὶ ante σύ-
κρουσιν] ἡ copiecit Usener 8 κατεσπαρμένου Schneider: κατε-
σπειραμένου libri 10 (διὰ) adiecit Schneider 11 ἡ Bignone:
ἡ libri. ἡ ἀπὸ... 12 ἀποτελεῖσθαι ut additamentum seclusit Usener συνεφλέχθαι Usener: συνειλέχθαι libri 12 κατὰ Bignone: καὶ κατὰ

Thunder may be produced by the rushing about of wind (*c*) Thunder in the hollows of the clouds, as happens in vessels on earth, or by the reverberation of fire filled with wind inside them, or by the rending and tearing of clouds, or by the friction and bursting of clouds when they have been congealed into a form like ice: phenomena demand that we should say that this department of celestial events, just like them all, may be caused in several ways.

- 101 And lightnings too are produced in several ways: for (*d*) Lightning. both owing to the friction and collision of clouds a conformation of atoms which produces fire slips out and gives birth to the lightning, and owing to wind bodies which give rise to this flash are dashed from the clouds: or compression may be the cause, when clouds are squeezed either by one another or by the wind. Or again it may be that the light scattered abroad from the heavenly bodies is taken in by the clouds, and then is driven together by the movement of the clouds and wind, and falls out through the clouds; or else light composed of most subtle particles may filter through the clouds, whereby the clouds may be set on fire by the flame and thunder produced by the movement of the fire.
- 102 Or the wind may be fired owing to the strain of motion and its violent rotation. or clouds may be rent by wind and atoms fall out which produce fire and cause the appearance of lightning. And several other methods may easily be observed, if one clings always to phenomena and can compare what is akin to these things. Lightning precedes (*e*) Why lightning thunder in such a conformation of the clouds, either because precedes at the moment when the wind dashes in, the formation of thunder atoms which gives rise to lightning is driven out, but afterwards the wind whirls about and produces the reverberation; or because they both dash out at the same moment, but lightning moves at a higher speed towards us, and thunder comes after, as in the case of some things seen at a distance and producing blows.
- 103 libri: καὶ Usener. καὶ κατὰ τὴν σῆξιν καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἥγην τούτου κίνησιν sup-
plendum censuit Bignone 102 2 ἐκπτωσίν τε Usener: ἐκπτωσίν τῶν libri 5 δὲ Usener: καὶ libri 10 κατ' ἐκπτωσίν scripsi: κατέμπτωσιν Β (unde καὶ ἐμπτωσιν edd.): κατέμπτωσιν Π¹. καὶ ἐμπτωσιν P²CoF

Κεραυνοὺς ἐνδέχεται γίνεσθαι καὶ κατὰ πλείονας πνευμάτων συλλογὰς καὶ κατεύλησιν ἴσχυράν τε ἐκπύρωσιν καὶ κατάρρηξιν 5 μέρους καὶ ἐκπτωσιν ἴσχυροτέραν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς κάτω τόπους, τῆς ρήξεως γινομένης διὰ τὸ τοὺς ἔξῆς τόπους πυκνοτέρους εἶναι διὰ πλήσιων νεφῶν· καὶ κατ' αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν τοῦ πυρὸς ἐκπτωσιν ἀνειλούμενου, καθὰ καὶ βροντὴν ἐνδέχεται γίνεσθαι, πλείονος γενομένου καὶ πνευματωθέντος ἴσχυρότερον καὶ 10 ρήξαντος τὸ νέφος διὰ τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι ὑποχωρεῖν εἰς τὰ ἔξῆς, τῷ πλησιών γίνεσθαι ἀεὶ πρὸς ἄλληλα. | καὶ κατ' ἄλλους δὲ τρόπους πλείονας ἐνδέχεται κεραυνοὺς ἀποτελεῖσθαι· μόνον δὲ μῆθος ἀπέστω· ἀπέσται δέ, ἐάν τις καλῶς τοὺς φαινομένοις ἀκολουθῶν περὶ τῶν ἀφανῶν σημειώται.

5 Πρηστῆρας ἐνδέχεται γίνεσθαι καὶ κατὰ κάθεσιν νέφους εἰς τοὺς κάτω τόπους στυλοειδῶς ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἀθρόου ὡσθέντος καὶ διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος πολλοῦ φερομένου, ἀμα καὶ τὸ νέφος εἰς τὸ πλάγιον ὡθοῦντος τοῦ ἐκτὸς πνεύματος· καὶ κατὰ περίστασιν δὲ πνεύματος εἰς κύκλον, ἀέρος τιὸς 10 ἐπισυνωθουμένου ἀνωθεν· καὶ ρύσεως πολλῆς πνευμάτων γενομένης καὶ οὐ δυναμένης εἰς τὰ πλάγια διαρρῦναι διὰ τὴν πέριξ τοῦ ἀέρος πλησιών. | καὶ ἔως μὲν γῆς τοῦ πρηστῆρος καθιεμένου στρόβιλοι γίγνονται, ὡς ἀν καὶ ἡ ἀπογένησις κατὰ τὴν κίνησιν τοῦ πνεύματος γίνηται· ἔως δὲ θαλάττης δῖνοι ἀποτελοῦνται.

5 Σεισμοὺς ἐνδέχεται γίνεσθαι καὶ κατὰ πνεύματος ἐν τῇ γῇ ἀπόληψι καὶ παρὰ μικροὺς ὅγκους αὐτῆς παράθεσιν καὶ συνεχῆ κίνησιν, δ τὴν κράδανσιν τῇ γῇ παρασκευάζει. καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦτο ἡ ἔξωθεν ἐμπεριλαμβάνει (ἢ) ἐκ τοῦ πίπτεω εἴσω ἐδάφη εἰς ἀντροειδεῖς τόπους τῆς γῆς ἐκπνευματοῦντα 10 τὸν ἐπειλημμένον ἀέρα. (καὶ) κατ' αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν διάδοσιν

103 4 κατάρρηξιν FH. κατὰ ρήξιν BP¹QCo 7 διὰ πλησιών P²Q: διὰ πειλησιν B: διαπειλησιν F: διὰ πλησιών (P¹)H νεφῶν BP¹Q: τῶν νεφῶν cett. κατ' αὐτὴν Usener: κατὰ ταῦτην libri 104 5 κατὰ κάθεσιν BP¹F²Co: κατάθεσιν F'. κατὰ θέσιν ZP⁸ mg.f. 6 στυλοειδῶς Usener ἀλλοειδῶς libri 7 πολλοῦ] κύκλῳ Usener 8 πλάγιον Usener πλησίον libri 105 2 ὡς ἀν ... γίνηται ut gloss-sema seclusit Usener (qui ὡς ἀναγκιώς . . . δίνησιν . . . γίνεται scripsit) 6 ἀπόληψιν] ἀπόληψιν suspicatus est Usener 7 δὲ τὴν Usener: ὅταν libri κράδανσιν B² mg.: κράδαστον B. κραδαστὸν cett.: τὸν κραδασμὸν Casaubon παρασκευάζει F: παρασκευάζῃ cett. 8 (ἢ) adiecit Meibom 9 εἴσω Diels (vid. Usener, praefat. xx): εἰς libri ἐκπνευματοῦντα Usener: ἐκ πνευμάτων libri 10 ἐπειλημμένον

Thunderbolts may occur because there are frequent (*f.*) Thunderbolts gatherings of wind, which whirls about and is fanned into a fierce flame, and then a portion of it breaks off and rushes violently on the places beneath, the breaking taking place because the regions approached are successively denser owing to the condensation of clouds. or as the result of the actual outburst of the whirling fire, in the same way that thunder may be produced, when the fire becomes too great and is too violently fanned by wind and so breaks through the cloud, because it cannot retreat to the next regions owing to the constant condensation of clouds one on the other. And thunderbolts may be produced in other ways too Only superstition must be excluded, as it will, if one successfully follows the lead of seen phenomena to gain indications about the invisible.

104

Cyclones may be produced either by the driving down VI *Atmo-*
of a cloud into the regions below in the form of a pillar, *spheric and*
because it is pushed by the wind gathered inside it and is *terrestrial* phenomena
driven on by the violence of the wind, while at the same (a) *Cyclones.*
time the wind outside impels it sideways; or by wind forming into circular motion, while mist is simultaneously thrust down from above; or when a great rush of wind takes place and cannot pass through sideways owing to the surrounding condensation of the atmosphere. And when the spout is let down on to the land, whirlwinds are produced in all the various ways in which their creation may occur owing to the movement of the wind, but if it reaches the sea it produces waterspouts.

105

Earthquakes may be brought about both because wind (*b.*) Earth-
is caught up in the earth, so that the earth is dislocated in quakes.
small masses and is continually shaken, and that causes it to sway. This wind it either takes into itself from outside, or else because masses of ground fall in into cavernous places in the earth and fan into wind the air that is imprisoned in them. And again, earthquakes may be brought

P¹Q mg. Co : ἐπιλημένον B : πεπιλημένον FHP⁸Z (καὶ) κατ' αὐτὴν
Usener : κατὰ ταύτην libri

Scholia

ΙΟΩ ΙΙ post γίνεσθαι legitur τὸ μὲν πολὺ πρὸς ὅρος τι ὑψηλόν, ἐν φ
μάλιστα κεραυνοῦ πίπτουσιν

τῆς κινήσεως ἐκ τῶν πτώσεων ἔδαφῶν πολλῶν καὶ πάλιν
ἀνταπόδοσιν, δταν πυκνώμασι σφοδροτέροις τῆς γῆς ἀπαυτήσῃ,
ἐνδέχεται σεισμὸς ἀποτελεῖσθαι, | καὶ κατ' ἄλλους δὲ πλείους
τρόπους τὰς κινήσεις ταύτας τῆς γῆς γίνεσθαι.

* * * * *

Τὰ δὲ πνεύματα συμβαίνει γίνεσθαι κατὰ χρόνον ἄλλο-
φυλλας τωδεῖς καὶ κατὰ μικρὸν παρεισδυνομένης, καὶ καθ'
5 ὑδατος ἀφθόνου συλλογήν. τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πνεύματα γίνεται
καὶ δλίγων πεσόντων εἰς τὰ πολλὰ κοιλάματα, διαδόσεως
τούτων γινομένης.

Χάλαζα συντελεῖται καὶ κατὰ πῆξιν ἰσχυροτέραν, πάντοθεν
δὲ πνευματωδῶν περίστασιν τινῶν καὶ καταμέρισιν καὶ *(κατὰ)*
10 πῆξιν μετριωτέραν ὑδατοειδῶν των *(καὶ)* ὅμοιν ῥῆξιν, ἀμα
τὴν τε σύνωσιν αὐτῶν ποιουμένην καὶ τὴν διάρρηξιν πρὸς
τὸ κατὰ μέρη συνίστασθαι πηγηνύμενα καὶ κατὰ ἀθροότητα. |
107 ή δὲ περιφέρεια οὐκ ἀδυνάτως μὲν ἔχει γίνεσθαι πάντοθεν
τῶν ἄκρων ἀποτηκομένων καὶ ἐν τῇ συστάσει πάντοθεν, ὡς
λέγεται, κατὰ μέρη δμαλῶς περιπταμένων εἴτε ὑδατοειδῶν
τινῶν εἴτε πνευματωδῶν.

5 Χιώνα δὲ ἐνδέχεται συντελεῖσθαι καὶ ὑδατος λεπτοῦ ἐκχεο-
μένου ἐκ τῶν νεφῶν διὰ πόρων συμμετρίας καὶ θλίψεις
ἐπιτηδείων νεφῶν δεὶς ὑπὸ πνευμάτων σφοδράς, εἴτα τούτου
πῆξιν ἐν τῇ φορᾷ λαμβάνοντος διά τινα ἰσχυρὰν ἐν τοῖς
κατωτέρω τόποις τῶν νεφῶν ψυχρασίας περίστασιν καὶ κατὰ
10 πῆξιν δ' ἐν τοῖς νέφεσιν δμαλῆ ἀραιότητα ἔχουσιν τοιαύτη
πρόσεσις ἐκ τῶν νεφῶν γίνοιτο ἀν πρὸς ἄλληλα θλιβομένων
ὑδατοειδῶν καὶ συμπαρακειμένων ἢ οἷονεὶ σύνωσιν ποιούμενα
108 χάλαζαν ἀποτελεῖ, δ μάλιστα γίνεται ἐν τῷ ἀέρι. | καὶ κατὰ

12 ἀνταπόδοσιν Gassendi: ἀνταποδίδωσιν libri 106 3 post
πνεύματα addendum *(ταῦτα)* suspicatus est Usener 5 τὰ δὲ
λοιπὰ] τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν Bignone 6 δλίγων F: δλίγον cett.:
corruptum suspicatus est Usener 9 καὶ καταμέρισιν scripsi: καὶ κατὰ μέρισιν libri *(καταμέρησιν F)*: κάτα μέρισιν Usener *(κατὰ)*
adieci Meibom 10 πῆξιν H: τῆξιν BPQCo *(καὶ)* adieci: *(πνευ-*
ματωδῶν δὲ τινῶν) Usener ὅμοιν ῥῆξιν] ὁμορησιν Usener 107 3 post
12 ἀθροότητα Gassendi: ἀθρότητα libri 107 2 ἀποτηκομένων
Sambucus: ἀποτηκομένων B: ἀποτηκομένων HPQCo: ἀποτηκομένων
F² 3 κατὰ Aldobrandinus: καὶ τὰ libri ὑδατοειδῶν] ὑδατοποιῶν F
6 διὰ πόρων Kuhn: διαφόρων BP¹Co: διαφορῶν FP³QZ: διαφόρων H
θλίψεις Usener: θλίψεως libri 7 δεὶς Bignone: καὶ libri: om.
Usener ὑπὸ πνευμάτων Gassendi: ὑπομνήματος libri σφοδράς

about by the actual spreading of the movement which results from the fall of many such masses of ground and the return shock, when the first motion comes into collision 106 with more densely packed bodies of earth. There are also many other ways in which these motions of the earth may be caused.

* * * * *

The winds may be produced when from time to time (*c*) (?Volca-
some alien matter is continually and gradually forcing its ^{noes}). way in, or owing to the gathering of a vast quantity of water. The other winds arise when a few (currents of air) fall into many hollow spaces, and cause a spreading of wind.

107 Hail is produced both by a powerful congelation, when (*d*) Hail. certain windy bodies form together from all sides and split up : also by a more moderate congelation of watery bodies and their simultaneous division, which causes at one and the same time their coagulation and separation, so that they cling together as they freeze in their separate parts as well as in their whole masses. Their circular shape may possibly arise because the corners melt off all round or because at their conformation bodies, whether watery or windy, come together evenly from all directions part by part, as is alleged.

Snow may be produced when fine particles of rain are (*e*) Snow. poured out of the clouds owing to the existence of pores of suitable shape and the strong and constant compression by winds of clouds of the right kind ; and then the water is congealed in its descent owing to some conformation of excessive coldness in the clouds in the lower regions. Or else owing to congelation in clouds of uniform thinness an exudation of this kind might arise from watery clouds lying side by side and rubbing against one another : for they produce hail by causing coagulation, a process most frequent in the atmosphere. Or else, owing to the friction of

Usener : σπορᾶς libri 9 κατωτέρω Cobet : κατώτερον BHPQ : κατωτάρους FZ 10 ὄμαλη BP¹Q : ὄμαλη cett. ἔχουσιν Meibom : ἔχουσαν BP¹QCo : ἔχουσα cett. τοιαύτη Z : τοιαύτην cett. 11 post θλιβομένων (τῶν) inseruit Usener 13 ἀρι] ἕπει Usener

τριψώ δὲ νεφῶν πῆξω εἰληφότων ἀπόπαλσιν ἀν λαμβάνοι
τὸ τῆς χιόνος τοῦτο ἀθροισμα. καὶ κατ' ἄλλους δὲ τρόπους
ἐνδέχεται χιόνα συντελεῖσθαι.

5 Δρόσος συντελεῖται καὶ κατὰ σύνοδον πρὸς ἄλληλα ἐκ τοῦ
ἀέρος τῶν τοιούτων, ἢ τῆς τοιαύτης ὑγρασίας ἀποτελεστικὰ
γίνεται· καὶ κατὰ φορὰν δὲ ἡ ἀπὸ νοτερῶν τόπων ἡ ὕδατα
κεκτημένων, ἐν οἷς τόποις μάλιστα δρόσος συντελεῖται,
εἴτα σύνοδον τούτων εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ λαβόντων καὶ ἀποτέλεσιν
10 ὑγρασίας καὶ πάλι φορὰν ἐπὶ τοὺς κάτω τόπους, καθάπερ
δμοίων καὶ παρ' ἥμιν ἐπὶ πλεόνων τοιαῦτά τινα (θεωρεῖται. |
109 καὶ πάχη δὲ μεταβαλλομένων) συντελεῖται τῶν δρόσων,
τοιούτων τινῶν πῆξιν τινα λαβόντων διὰ περίστασίν τινα
ἀέρος ψυχροῦ.

Κρύσταλλος συντελεῖται καὶ κατ' ἔκθλιψιν μὲν τοῦ περι-
5 φεροῦσ σχηματισμοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος, σύνωσιν δὲ τῶν σκαληνῶν
καὶ δξυγωνίων τῶν ἐν τῷ ὕδατι ὑπαρχόντων· καὶ κατὰ ἔξωθεν
δὲ τῶν τοιούτων πρόσκρισιν, ἢ συνελαθέντα πῆξιν τῷ ὕδατι
παρεσκεύασε, ποσὰ τῶν περιφερῶν ἐκθλίψαντα.

Ίρις γίνεται κατὰ πρόσλαμψιν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου πρὸς ἀέρα
10 ὕδατοειδῆ· ἡ κατὰ πρόσκρισιν ἰδίαν τοῦ τε φωτὸς καὶ τοῦ
ἀέρος, ἡ τὰ τῶν χρωμάτων τούτων ἴδιώματα ποιήσει εἴτε
πάντα εἴτε μονοειδῶς ἀφ' οὗ πάλι ἀπολάμποντος τὰ ὄμο-
ροῦντα τοῦ ἀέρος χρῶσιν τοιαύτην λήψεται, οἷαν θεωροῦμεν,
110 κατὰ πρόσλαμψιν πρὸς τὰ μέρη. | τὸ δὲ τῆς περιφερείας
τοῦτο φάντασμα γίνεται διὰ τὸ τὸ διάστημα πάντοθεν ἵσον
ὑπὸ τῆς ὄψεως θεωρεῖσθαι, ἡ σύνωσιν τοιαύτην λαμβανούσων
τῶν ἐν τῷ ἀέρι ἀτόμων ἡ ἐν τοῖς νέφεσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ
5 ἀέρος ἀποφερομένων περιφέρειάν τινα καθίεσθαι τὴν σύγκρισιν
ταῦτην.

108 2 ἀν λαμβάνοι τὸ Schneider: ἀναλαμβάνοιτο BΡ¹Q: ἀναλαμβάνοι
τὸ cett. 7 κατὰ φορὰν] κατ' ἀναφορὰν Bignone κατὰ (ἀπὸ)φορὰν
Muehli 8 οἷοι Usener. τοῖς libri: οἵ Meibom 9 post
ἀποτέλεσιν Bignone παχυτέρας supplevit 11 post τοιαῦτά τινα
lacunam suspicatus est Gassendi: (θεωρεῖται. καὶ πάχη δὲ μεταβα-
λομένων) supplevi, (συντελούμενα θεωρεῖται. καὶ πάχη δὲ οὐ διαφερόν-
τως) Usener 109 2 τοιούτων τινῶν Usener: τοιούτων τινὰ B
τούτων cum litura P: τούτων cett. 6 κατὰ] κατὰ (τὴν) Schneider,
fortasse recte 7 συνελαθέντα Gassendi: συνελασθέτα BΗPQ:
συντελεσθέντα F 9 ἀπὸ τοῦ scripsi: ὑπὸ τοῦ BΗPQ: τοῦ F
10 κατὰ πρόσκρισιν scripsi: κατ' (κατὰ H) ἀέρος φύσιν libri: κατὰ κρᾶσιν

congealed clouds, these nuclei of snow may find occasion to break off. And there are many other ways in which snow may be produced.

Dew may be produced both when such particles as are (f) Dew and productive of this kind of moisture issue from the atmosphere and meet one another, and also when particles rise from moist regions or regions containing water, in which dew is most naturally produced, and then meet together and cause moisture to be produced, and afterwards fall back on the ground below, as (is) frequently (seen) to be the case in phenomena on earth as well. (And frost is produced by a change) in the dew-particles, when such particles as we have described undergo a definite kind of congelation owing to the neighbourhood of a cold atmosphere.

109

Ice is caused both by the squeezing out from the water (g) Ice. of particles of round formation and the driving together of the triangular and acute-angled particles which exist already in the water, and again by the addition from without of particles of this kind, which when driven together produce a congelation in the water, by squeezing out a certain number of the round particles.

The rainbow is caused by light shining from the sun on (h) The rainbow. to watery atmosphere: or else by a peculiar union of light and air, which can produce the special qualities of these colours whether all together or separately; from it as it reflects back again the neighbouring regions of the air can take the tint which we see, by means of the shining of the light on to its various parts. The appearance of its round Its shape shape is caused because it is perceived by our sight at equal distance from all its points, or else because the atoms in the air or those in the clouds which are derived from the same air, are pressed together in this manner, and so the combination spreads out in a round shape.

no Usener: κατὰ σύμφυσιν Bignone

FZ: ταῦτην cett.

Meibom: τομῶν libri αὐτοῦ ἀέρος]

Usener: 13 τοιπότην Gassendi: τὰ libri

Meibom: τομῶν libri αὐτοῦ ἀέρος]

Usener: 5 post ἀέρος

libri προσφερομένουν πρὸς τὴν σελήνην habent (e versu 8)

Meibom: τομῶν (v. 4) καθίεσθαι libri

Usener: ταῦτα

4 ἀτόμων

Usener: 5 post ἀέρος

libri προσφερομένουν libri ἀτόμων habent, sc. lectionem emendatam verbi

Meibom: καθίεσθαι libri

"Αλως περὶ τὴν σελήνην γίνεται καὶ πάντοθεν ἀέρος προσφερομένου πρὸς τὴν σελήνην ἡ τὰ ἀπ' αὐτῆς ρεύματα ἀποφερόμενα δμαλῶς ἀναστέλλοντος ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἐφ' ὅσον ιο κύκλῳ περιστῆσαι εἰς τὸ νεφοειδὲς τοῦτο καὶ μὴ τὸ παράπαν διακρῖναι, ἡ καὶ τὸν πέριξ αὐτῆς ἀέρα ἀναστέλλοντος συμμέτρως πάντοθεν εἰς τὸ περιφερὲς τὸ περὶ αὐτὴν καὶ παχυμερὲς περιστῆσαι. | ὃ γίνεται κατὰ μέρη τινὰ ἥτοι ἔξωθεν βιασαμένου τινὸς ρεύματος ἡ τῆς θερμασίας ἐπιτηδείως πόρων ἐπιλαμβανομένης εἰς τὸ τοῦτο ἀπεργάσασθαι.

III Κομῆται ἀστέρες γίνονται ἥτοι πυρὸς ἐν τόποις τισὶ διὰ 5 χρόνων τινῶν ἐν τοῖς μετεώροις συντρεφομένου περιστάσεως γινομένης, ἡ ἰδίαν τινὰ κλίνησιν διὰ χρόνων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἵσχοντος ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς, ὥστε τὰ τοιαῦτα ἀστρα ἀναφανῆναι ἡ αὐτὰ ἐν χρόνοις τισὶν ὅρμησαι διὰ τινα περίστασιν καὶ εἰς τοὺς καθ' ἡμᾶς τόπους ἐλθεῖν καὶ ἐκφανῆ γενέσθαι. τὴν ιο τε ἀφάνισιν τούτων γίνεσθαι παρὰ τὰς ἀντικειμένας ταύταις αἰτίας. |

νιιι Τινὰ ἀστρα στρέφεται αὐτοῦ ὃ συμβαίνει οὐ μόνον τῷ τὸ μέρος τοῦτο τοῦ κόσμου ἐστάναι, περὶ δὲ τὸ λοιπὸν στρέφεται, καθάπερ τινές φασι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ δίνην ἀέρος ἔγκυκλον αὐτῷ περιεστάναι, ἡ κωλυτικὴ γίνεται τοῦ περιπολεῦ ὡς 5 καὶ τὰ ἄλλα· ἡ καὶ διὰ τὸ ἔξῆς μὲν αὐτοῖς ὑλην ἐπιτηδείαν μὴ εἶναι, ἐν δὲ τούτῳ τῷ τόπῳ ἐν φεγγία κείμενα θεωρεῖται. | καὶ κατ' ἄλλους δὲ πλείονας τρόπους τοῦτο δυνατὸν συντελεῖσθαι, ἐάν τις δύνηται τὸ σύμφωνον τοῖς φαωμένοις συλλογίζεσθαι.

νιιii Τινὰ τῶν ἀστρων πλανᾶσθαι, εἰ οὕτω ταῖς κινήσεσι χρώμενα συμβαίνει, | τινὰ δὲ μὴ (οὕτω) κινεῖσθαι ἐνδέχεται μὲν καὶ παρὰ τὸ κύκλῳ κιωνύμενα ἐξ ἀρχῆς οὕτω κατηναγκάσθαι, ὥστε τὰ μὲν κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν δίνην φέρεσθαι δμαλὴν οὖσαν, τὰ δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἄμα τισὶν ἀνωμαλίαις χρωμένην ἐνδέχεται

7 καὶ Usener : καὶ κατὰ libri 9 ἀναστέλλοντος Meibom : ἀναστέλλοντα libri 10 περιστῆσαι εἰς Usener : περὶ τῆς εἰς libri : περιστῆσης Meibom 11 διακρίναι Usener : διακρίνῃ libri αὐτῆς ἀέρα B : ἀέρα αὐτῆς cett. III 2 ἐπιτηδείως scripsi : ἐπιτηδείων libri 7 ἡ αὐτὰ . . . II altias tanquam si repetantur priora seclusit Usener 113 I ἀστρα στρέφεται scripsi : ἀναστρέφεται libri : ἀστρα στρέφεσθαι Usener δ] om. Usener 2 τὸ λοιπὸν] τὰ λοιπὰ Schneider 4 αὐτῷ] αὐτοῖς Gassendi 10 συμβαίνει FP²? H¹ : συμβαίνειν cett. 113 I (οὕτω) adieci : δ ὁμαλῶς Usener pro δὲ μη : κινεῖσθαι seclusit Bignone 3 δμαλὴν] δμαλὴ Usener

A halo round the moon is caused either when air is (*s.*) The carried towards the moon from all sides, or when the air ^{moon's halo.} checks the effluences carried from the moon so equably that it forms them into this cloudy ring all round without any gaps or differences, or else when it checks the air round the moon uniformly on all sides so as to make that which encircles it round and thick in texture. This comes to pass in different parts either because some current outside forces the air or because heat blocks the passages in such a way as to produce this effect.

Comets occur either when fire is collected together in v. *Further* certain regions at certain intervals of time in the upper air ^{celestial} because some gathering of matter takes place, or when at (*a.*) Comets certain intervals the heaven above us has some peculiar movement, so that stars of this nature are revealed, or when they themselves at certain seasons start to move on account of some gathering of matter and come into the regions within our ken and appear visible. And their disappearance occurs owing to the opposite causes to these.

Some stars 'revolve in their place' (as Homer says), which (*b.*) Fixed comes to pass not only because this part of the world is ^{stars.} stationary and round it the rest revolves, as some say, but also because a whirl of air is formed in a ring round it, which prevents their moving about as do the other stars: or else it is because there is not a succession of appropriate fuel for them, but only in this place in which they are seen fixed. And there are many other ways in which this may be brought about, if one is able to infer what is in agreement with phenomena.

That some of the stars should wander in their course, if (*c.*) Planets indeed it is the case that their movements are such, while ^{and regular} stars. others do not move in this manner, may be due to the reason that from the first as they moved in their circles they were so constrained by necessity that some of them move along the same regular orbit, and others along one which is associated with certain irregularities: or it may

4 κατὰ τὴν ἄμεια τισὶν] κατά τινα δίνησιν Usener: κατά τιν' ἀλλήν τισὶν Bignone

5 δὲ καὶ καθ' οὐς τόπους φέρεται οὐ μὲν παρεκτάσεις ἀέρος εἶναι δμαλᾶς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸν συνωθούσας κατὰ τὸ ἔξῆς δμαλῶς τε ἐκκαούσας, οὐ δὲ ἀνωμαλεῖς ὥστε τὰς θεωρουμένας παραλλαγὰς συντελεῖσθαι. τὸ δὲ μίαν αἰτίαν τούτων ἀποδιδόναι, πλεοναχῶς τῶν φαινομένων ἐκκαλουμένων, μανικὸν καὶ οὐ ιο καθηκόντως πραττόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν τὴν ματαλαν ἀστρολογίαν ἔξηλωκότων καὶ εἰς τὸ κενὸν αἰτίας τινῶν ἀποδιδόντων, ὅταν τὴν θελαν φύσιν μηθαμῇ λειτουργιῶν ἀπολύωσι. |

πι4 Τινὰ ἀστρα ὑπολειπόμενα τινῶν θεωρεῖσθαι συμβάλνει καὶ παρὰ τὸ βραδύτερον συμπεριφέρεσθαι τὸν αὐτὸν κύκλον περιόντα, καὶ παρὰ τὸ τὴν ἐναντίαν κινεῖσθαι ἀντισπώμενα ὑπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς δίνης· καὶ παρὰ τὸ περιφέρεσθαι τὰ μὲν διὰ 5 πλείονος τόπου, τὰ δὲ δι' ἐλάττουν, τὴν αὐτὴν δίνην περικυλοῦντα. τὸ δὲ ἀπλῶς ἀποφαίνεσθαι περὶ τούτων καθηκόν ἐστι τοῖς τερατεύεσθαι τι πρὸς τοὺς πολλοὺς βουλομένοις.

Οἱ λεγόμενοι ἀστέρες ἐκπίπτειν καὶ παρὰ μέρος κατὰ παράτριψιν ἐαυτῶν δύνανται συντελεῖσθαι καὶ παρὰ ἐκπτωσιν 10 οὐ ἀν ἡ ἐκπνευμάτωσις γένηται, καθάπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀστραπῶν ἐλέγομεν· | καὶ κατὰ σύνοδον δὲ ἀτόμων πυρὸς ἀποτελεστικῶν, συμφυλίας γενομένης εἰς τὸ τοῦτο τελέσαι, καὶ κίνησιν οὐ 15 ἀν ἡ δρμῇ ἔξ ἀρχῆς κατὰ τὴν σύνοδον γένηται· καὶ κατὰ πνεύματος δὲ συλλογὴν ἐν πυκνώμασί τισιν διμιχλοειδέσι 5 καὶ ἐκπύρωσιν τούτου διὰ τὴν κατελησιν, εἰτ' ἐπέκρηξιν τῶν περιέχοντων, καὶ ἐφ' δν ἀν τόπου ἡ δρμῇ γένηται τῆς φορᾶς, εἰς τοῦτον φερομένου. καὶ ἄλλοι δὲ τρόποι εἰς τὸ τοῦτο τελέσαι διμύθητοι εἰσιν.

Αἱ δ' ἐπισημασίαι αἱ γινόμεναι ἐπὶ τισι ζῷοις κατὰ συγκύτιο ρῆμα γίνονται τοῦ καιροῦ. οὐ γάρ τὰ ζῷα ἀνάγκην τινὰ

5 οὐ μὲν B: οὐ μὲν P¹QH²: οὐ FHP³Z 6 δμαλᾶς FHP⁴Z: δμαλεῖς BP¹Q 7 οὐ δὲ BF: οὐδὲ cett. ἀνωμαλεῖς FPQ: ἀνωμαλεῖς B: ἀνωμαλῶς H 11 τινῶν] ἀστρων Usener: πάντων Bignone 114 3 περιόντα Froben: περιόντα libri 4 τῆς αὐτῆς] τοιαύτης Usener 8 κατὰ παράτριψιν Usener: καὶ παρὰ τρίψιν libri 9 [ἐαυτῶν] νεφῶν Usener: ἀστρων Bignone, fortasse recte παρὰ πυρὸς Usener 10 ἀστραπῶν] ἀστρων F¹ 115 2 συμφυλίας H²PQ. συμφυλίας FH¹Z: σ(υμ)φυλίας B καὶ Usener: καὶ κατὰ libri οὐ] οἱ coniescit Usener 4 πνεύματος] πνεύματων... τούτων (5)... φερομένων (7) Muehll 5 καὶ Usener: κατὰ libri τούτων Usener: τούτων libri ἐπέκρηξιν FHP: ἐπ' ἐκριξι B: ἐπεκρῆψιν Q: ἐκρηξιν coni. Usener: ἐκρηξι (ἐκ) Muehll 7 φερομένου

be that among the regions to which they are carried in some places there are regular tracts of air which urge them on successively in the same direction and provide flame for them regularly, while in other places the tracts are irregular, so that the aberrations which we observe result. But to assign a single cause for these occurrences, when phenomena demand several explanations, is madness, and is quite wrongly practised by persons who are partisans of the foolish notions of astrology, by which they give futile explanations of the causes of certain occurrences, and all the time do not by any means free the divine nature from the burden of responsibilities.

114 That some stars should be seen to be left behind by others is caused because though they move round in the same orbit they are carried along more slowly, and also because they really move in the opposite direction though they are dragged back by the same revolution: also because some are carried round through a greater space and some through a lesser, though all perform the same revolution. But to give a single explanation of these occurrences is only suitable to those who wish to make a show to the many.

115 What are called falling stars may be produced in part by the rubbing of star against star, and by the falling out of the fragments wherever an outburst of wind occurs, as we explained in the case of lightning-flashes: or else by the meeting of atoms productive of fire, when a gathering of kindred material occurs to cause this, and a movement in the direction of the impulse which results from the original meeting; or else by a gathering of wind in certain dense and misty formations, and its ignition as it whirls round, and then its bursting out of what encloses it and its rush towards the spot to which the impulse of its flight tends. And there are other ways in which this result may be brought about, quite free from superstition.

The signs of the weather which are given by certain animals result from mere coincidence of occasion. For the animals do not exert any compulsion for winter to

Usener: φερομένης λιβη 8 ἀμύθητοι] ἀνύστιμοι Usener: ἀμυθοι
Lortzing

πιβ

προσφέρεται τοῦ ἀποτελεσθῆναι χειμῶνα, οὐδὲ κάθηται τις
θεῖα φύσις παρατηροῦσα τὰς τῶν ζῴων τούτων ἔξθους
κάπειτα τὰς ἐπισημασίας ταύτας ἐπιτελεῖ. | οὐδὲ γάρ (ἀν)
εἰς τὸ τυχὸν ζῷον καν (εἰ) μικρὸν χαριέστερον εἴη, τοιαύτη
μωρία ἐμπέσοι, μὴ δτε εἰς παντελή εὑδαιμονίαν κεκτημένον.

Ταῦτα δὴ πάντα, Πυθόκλεις, μυημόνευσον· κατὰ πολὺ τε
γάρ τοῦ μύθου ἐκβήσῃ καὶ τὰ δόμογενῆ τούτοις συνορᾶν
δυνήσῃ. μάλιστα δὲ σεαυτὸν ἀπόδος εἰς τὴν τῶν ἀρχῶν
καὶ ἀπειρίας καὶ τῶν συγγενῶν τούτοις θεωρίαν, ἔτι δὲ
κριτηρίων καὶ παθῶν, καὶ οὖ ἔνεκεν ταῦτα ἐκλογιζόμεθα.
ταῦτα γάρ μάλιστα συνθεωρούμενα ῥᾳδίως τὰς περὶ τῶν
ιο κατὰ μέρος αἰτίας συνορᾶν ποιήσει. οἱ δὲ ταῦτα μὴ κατα-
γαπήσαντες ἢ μάλιστα οὗτ' (ἀν) αὐτὰ ταῦτα καλῶς συνθεω-
ρήσαιεν οὗτε οὖ ἔνεκεν δεῖ θεωρεῖν ταῦτα περιεποίησαντο.

116 I (ἀν) supplevit Cobet	2 (εἰ) adiecit Usener	μικρὸν
F : μικρῷ cett.	3 ἐμπέσοι Usener : ἐκπέση libri :	ēκπέσοι Cobet
6 ἀπόδος εἰς BP ^a QCo : ἀποδώσεις P ⁱ ?FZ	9 ῥᾳδίως BF : ῥαδίας	
HP ⁱ Q	11 ἢ Kuhn : ἢ libri	οὗτ' (ἀν) Usener : οὗτε BHPQ :
ἢ F		

come to an end, nor is there some divine nature which sits and watches the outgoings of these animals and then fulfils the signs they give. For not even the lowest animal, although 'a small thing gives the greater pleasure', would be seized by such foolishness, much less one who was possessed of perfect happiness.

All these things, Pythocles, you must bear in mind; for *Conclusion* thus you will escape in most things from superstition and will be enabled to understand what is akin to them. And most of all give yourself up to the study of the beginnings and of infinity and of the things akin to them, and also of the criteria of truth and of the feelings, and of the purpose for which we reason out these things. For these points when they are thoroughly studied will most easily enable you to understand the causes of the details. But those who have not thoroughly taken these things to heart could not rightly study them in themselves, nor have they made their own the reason for observing them.

III

ΕΠΙΚΟΤΡΟΣ ΜΕΝΟΙΚΕΙ ΧΑΙΡΕΙΝ

122

Μήτε νέος τις ὀν μελλέτω φιλοσοφεῖν, μήτε γέρων ὑπάρχων κοπιάτω φιλοσοφῶν. οὗτε γὰρ ἄωρος οὐδεὶς ἐστιν οὔτε πάρωρος πρὸς τὸ κατὰ ψυχὴν ὑγιαίνον. δὸς δὲ λέγων ἡ μῆπω τοῦ φιλοσοφεῖν ὑπάρχειν ἡ παρεληλυθέναι τὴν ὥραν 5 ὅδιοις ἐστι τῷ λέγοντι πρὸς εὐδαιμονίαν ἡ μῆπω παρεῖναι τὴν ὥραν ἡ μηκέτ' εἶναι. ὥστε φιλοσοφητέον καὶ νέψι καὶ γέρουντι, τῷ μὲν ὅπως γηράσκων νεάσῃ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς διὰ τὴν χάριν τῶν γεγονότων, τῷ δὲ ὅπως νέος ἄμα καὶ παλαιὸς 10 ἢ διὰ τὴν ἀφοβίαν τῶν μελλόντων. μελετᾶν οὖν χρὴ τὰ ποιούντα τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν, εἴ περ παρούσης μὲν αὐτῆς πάντα ἔχομεν, ἀπούσης δὲ πάντα πράττομεν εἰς τὸ ταῦτην ἔχειν. |

123

Α δέ σοι συνεχῶς παρήγγελλον, ταῦτα καὶ πράττε καὶ μελέτα, στοιχεῖα τοῦ καλῶς ζῆν ταῦτ' εἶναι διαλαμβάνων. πρῶτον μὲν τὸν θεὸν ζῷον ἀφθαρτὸν καὶ μακάριον νομίζων, ὡς ἡ κοινὴ τοῦ θεοῦ νόησις ὑπεγράφη, μηθὲν μήτε τῆς 5 ἀφθαρσίας ἀλλότριον μήτε τῆς μακαριώτητος ἀνοίκειον αὐτῷ προσάπτε· πᾶν δὲ τὸ φυλάττειν αὐτὸν δυνάμενον τὴν μετὰ ἀφθαρσίας μακαριώτητα περὶ αὐτὸν δόξαζε. θεοὶ μὲν γὰρ εἰσὶν ἐναργῆς γὰρ αὐτῶν ἐστιν ἡ γνῶσις. οἷος δ' αὐτοὺς *(οἱ)* πολλοὶ νομίζουσιν, οὐκ εἰσὶν οὐδὲ γὰρ φυλάττουσιν 10 αὐτοὺς οἶοις νομίζουσι. ἀσεβῆς δὲ οὐχ δ τοὺς τῶν πολλῶν θεοὺς ἀναιρῶν, ἀλλ' ὁ τὰς τῶν πολλῶν δόξας θεοῖς προσά-

122 3 ὑγιαίνον libr. plerique: ὑγιαίνων B: ὑγιαίνειν cit. Clemens
 4 ἡ ante μῆπω] εἰ B: om. Q post ὑπάρχειν habent δραν librī: om.
 Usener · (τὴν) ὥραν Cobet 5 μῆπω Clemens: μὴ librī 6 μηκέτ'
 Clemens: μηκέτι librī (μὴ F) 8 χάριν] χαρὰν Ritter 123 8 γάρ]
 μὲν γὰρ PIZ 9 (οἱ) supplevit Gassendi νομίζουσιν] νοοῦσιν
 Usener

III

EPICURUS TO MENOECUS

122 LET no one when young delay to study philosophy, nor *Introduction.* when he is old grow weary of his study. For no one can come too early or too late to secure the health of his soul. *Both young and old must study philosophy.* And the man who says that the age for philosophy has either not yet come or has gone by is like the man who says that the age for happiness is not yet come to him, or has passed away. Wherefore both when young and old a man must study philosophy, that as he grows old he may be young in blessings through the grateful recollection of what has been, and that in youth he may be old as well, since he will know no fear of what is to come. We must then meditate on the things that make our happiness, seeing that when that is with us we have all, but when it is absent we do all to win it.

123 The things which I used unceasingly to commend to *First principles.* you, these do and practice, considering them to be the ¹ *The nature* first principles of the good life. First of all believe that of the gods god is a being immortal and blessed, even as the common idea of a god is engraved on men's minds, and do not assign to him anything alien to his immortality or ill-suited to his blessedness : but believe about him everything that can uphold his blessedness and immortality. For gods there are, since the knowledge of them is by clear vision. But they are not such as the many believe them to be : for but their indeed they do not consistently represent them as they ^{nature is not such as is} believe them to be. And the impious man is not he who popularly denies the gods of the many, but he who attaches to the ^{supposed,}

πτων. | οὐ γὰρ προλήψεις εἰσὶν ἀλλ' ὑπολήψεις ψευδεῖς αἱ τῶν πολλῶν ὑπὲρ θεῶν ἀποφάσεις, ἔνθεν αἱ μέγισται βλάβαι τε τοῖς κακοῖς ἐκ θεῶν ἐπάγονται καὶ ὡφέλειαι (τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς). ταῖς γὰρ ἰδίαις οἰκειούμενοι διὰ παντὸς ἀρετᾶς 5 τοὺς δμοίους ἀποδέχονται, πᾶν τὸ μὴ τοισθον ὡς ἀλλότριον νομίζοντες.

Συνέθιζε δὲ ἐν τῷ νομίζειν μηδὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἶναι τὸν θάνατον· ἐπεὶ πᾶν ἀγαθὸν καὶ κακὸν ἐν αἰσθήσει στέρησις δέ ἐστιν αἰσθήσεως ὁ θάνατος. ὅθεν γνῶσις δρθῆ τοῦ μηδὲν 10 εἶναι πρὸς ἡμᾶς τὸν θάνατον ἀπολαυστὸν ποιεῖ τὸ τῆς ζωῆς θυητόν, οὐκ ἄπειρον προστιθεῖσα χρόνον, ἀλλὰ τὸν τῆς ἀθανασίας ἀφελομένη πόθον. | οὐθὲν γάρ ἐστιν ἐν τῷ ζῆν δεινὸν τῷ κατειληφότι γυησίως τὸ μηδὲν ὑπάρχειν ἐν τῷ μὴ ζῆν δεινόν. ὥστε μάταιος ὁ λέγων δεδιέναι τὸν θάνατον οὐχ ὅτι λυπήσει παρών, ἀλλ' ὅτι λυπεῖ μέλλων. ὁ γὰρ 5 παρὸν οὐκ ἐνοχλεῖ, προσδοκάμενον κενῶς λυπεῖ. τὸ φρικωδέστατον οὖν τῶν κακῶν ὁ θάνατος οὐθὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ἐπειδήπερ δταν μὲν ἡμεῖς ὅμεν, ὁ θάνατος οὐ πάρεστιν. δταν δ' ὁ θάνατος παρῇ, τόθ' ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐσμέν. οὗτε οὖν πρὸς τοὺς ζῶντάς ἐστιν οὗτε πρὸς τοὺς τετελευτηκότας, ἐπειδήπερ περὶ 10 οὓς μὲν οὐκ ἐστιν, οἱ δ' οὐκέτ' εἰσίν.

‘Αλλ’ οἱ πολλοὶ τὸν θάνατον δτε μὲν ὡς μέγιστον τῶν κακῶν φεύγουσιν, δτε δὲ ὡς ἀνάπαυσιν τῶν ἐν τῷ ζῆν (κακῶν ποθοῦσιν). | δ δὲ σοφὸς οὗτε παραιτεῖται τὸ ζῆν οὗτε φοβεῖται τὸ μὴ ζῆν· οὗτε γὰρ αὐτῷ προσίσταται τὸ ζῆν οὗτε δοξάζεται κακὸν εἶναι τι τὸ μὴ ζῆν. ὥσπερ δὲ σιτίον οὐ τὸ πλεῖον πάντως ἀλλὰ τὸ ἥδιστον αἴρεται, οὗτο καὶ χρόνον οὐ τὸν 5 μήκιστον ἀλλὰ τὸν ἥδιστον καρπίζεται.

‘Ο δὲ παραγγέλλων τὸν μὲν νέον καλῶς ζῆν, τὸν δὲ γέροντα καλῶς καταστρέφειν εὐήθης ἐστὶν οὐ μόνον διὰ τὸ τῆς ζωῆς ἀσπαστόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὸ τὴν αὐτὴν εἶναι μελέτην

124 3 βλάβαι τε Usener: βλάβαι αἵτιαι libri: fortasse βλάβαι τοῖς αἰτίοις (τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς) supplevit Gassendi 6 νομίζοντες] ut falsum suspicatus est Usener. ἀποδοκιμάζοντες Kochalsky 11 ἀπειρον Aldobrandinus. ἀπορον libri post ἀλλὰ τὸν (ἀπορον) supplevit Bignone 125 5 παρὸν ΗΡ^Q: παρὸν BFP^IZ 10 οὐκέτι Usener in commentario: οὐκέτι libri 12 τῷ] τῷ εκ τὸ correectum B (κακῶν... τὸ ζῆν) supplevit Usener (excepto quod ποθοῦσιν scripsit Casaubon, αἴρονται Usener) 126 2 δοξάζεται] δοξάζει Richards 3 δὲ Usener: δὲ τὸ libri 4 ἥδιστον] ἥδιον Usener

124 gods the beliefs of the many. For the statements of the many about the gods are not conceptions derived from sensation, but false suppositions, according to which the greatest misfortunes befall the wicked and the greatest blessings (the good) by the gift of the gods. For men being accustomed always to their own virtues welcome those like themselves, but regard all that is not of their nature as alien.

Become accustomed to the belief that death is nothing to us. For all good and evil consists in sensation, but death is deprivation of sensation. And therefore a right understanding that death is nothing to us makes the mortality of life enjoyable, not because it adds to it an infinite span of time, but because it takes away the craving for immortality.

125 For there is nothing terrible in life for the man who has truly comprehended that there is nothing terrible in not living. So that the man speaks but idly who says that he fears death not because it will be painful when it comes, but because it is painful in anticipation. For that which gives no trouble when it comes, is but an empty pain in anticipation. So death, the most terrifying of ills, is nothing to us, since so long as we exist, death is not with us; but when death comes, then we do not exist. It does not then concern either the living or the dead, since for the former it is not, and the latter are no more.

But the many at one moment shun death as the greatest of evils, at another (yearn for it) as a respite from the (evils) in life. (But the wise man neither seeks to escape life) nor fears the cessation of life, for neither does life offend him nor does the absence of life seem to be any evil. And just as with food he does not seek simply the larger share and nothing else, but rather the most pleasant, so he seeks to enjoy not the longest period of time, but the most pleasant.

And he who counsels the young man to live well, but the old man to make a good end, is foolish, not merely because of the desirability of life, but also because it is the

<sup>a. Death
Death is
nothing to us.</sup>

This makes
life pleasant
and death no
terror.

Nor is its
anticipation
painful:

It is nothing
to living or
dead.

We should
not shun life
or fear death.

We want a
pleasant life,
not a long

To live well
is to learn to
die well.

τοῦ καλῶς ζῆν καὶ τοῦ καλῶς ἀποθυῆσκειν. πολὺ δὲ χείρων
ιο καὶ δ λέγων καλὸν μὲν μὴ φῦναι,

φύντα δ' ὅπως ὀκιστα πύλας Ἀΐδαο περῆσαι. |

127 Εἰ μὲν γὰρ πεποιθὼς τοῦτό φησι, πῶς οὐκ ἀπέρχεται ἐκ
τοῦ ζῆν; ἐν ἑτοίμῳ γὰρ αὐτῷ τοῦτ' ἔστιν, εἴ περ ἦν
βεβουλευμένον αὐτῷ βεβαίως· εἰ δὲ μωκώμενος, μάταιος
ἐν τοῖς οὐκ ἐπιδεχομένοις.

5 Μυημονευτέον δὲ ὡς τὸ μέλλον οὔτε ἡμέτερον οὔτε πάντως
οὐχ ἡμέτερον, ἵνα μήτε πάντως προσμένωμεν ὡς ἐσόμενον
μήτε ἀπελπίζωμεν ὡς πάντως οὐκ ἐσόμενον.

'Αναλογιστέον δὲ ὡς τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν αἱ μέν εἰσι φυσικαὶ,
αἱ δὲ κεναὶ, καὶ τῶν φυσικῶν αἱ μὲν ἀναγκαῖαι, αἱ δὲ φυσικαὶ
10 μόνον· τῶν δ' ἀναγκαίων αἱ μὲν πρὸς εὑδαιμονίαν εἰσὶν
ἀναγκαῖαι, αἱ δὲ πρὸς τὴν τοῦ σώματος ἀοχλησίαν, αἱ δὲ
128 πρὸς αὐτὸν τὸ ζῆν. | τούτων γὰρ ἀπλανῆς θεωρία πᾶσαν
αἵρεσιν καὶ φυγὴν ἐπανάγειν οἶδεν ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ σώματος
ὑγίειαν καὶ τὴν *(τῆς ψυχῆς)* ἀταραξίαν, ἐπεὶ τοῦτο τοῦ
μακαρίως ζῆν ἔστι τέλος. τούτου γὰρ χάριν πάντα πράττομεν,
5 ὅπως μήτε ἀλγῶμεν μήτε ταρβῶμεν. ὅταν δὲ ἀπαξ τοῦτο
περὶ ἡμᾶς γένηται, λύεται πᾶς ὁ τῆς ψυχῆς χειμών, οὐκ
ἔχοντος τοῦ ζώου βαδίζειν ὡς πρὸς ἐνδέον τι καὶ ζητεῖν
ἐτερον φέτος τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τὸ τοῦ σώματος ἀγαθὸν συμ-
πληρώσεται. τότε γὰρ ἡδονῆς χρείαν ἔχομεν, ὅταν ἐκ τοῦ
10 μὴ παρεῖναι τὴν ἡδονὴν ἀλγῶμεν. *(ὅταν δὲ μὴ ἀλγῶμεν)*,
οὐκέτι τῆς ἡδονῆς δεύμεθα. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὴν ἡδονὴν ἀρχὴν
129 καὶ τέλος λέγομεν εἴναι τοῦ μακαρίως ζῆν. | ταύτην γὰρ
ἀγαθὸν πρῶτον καὶ συγγενικὸν ἔγνωμεν, καὶ ἀπὸ ταύτης
καταρχόμεθα πάσης αἰρέσεως καὶ φυγῆς καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτης
καταυτῶμεν ὡς κανόνι τῷ πάθει πᾶν ἀγαθὸν κρίνοντες.

5 Καὶ ἐπεὶ πρῶτον ἀγαθὸν τοῦτο καὶ σύμφυτον, διὰ τοῦτο
καὶ οὐ πᾶσαν ἡδονὴν αἰρούμεθα, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὅτε πολλὰς

9 χείρων libr. plerique: χείρον B¹HZ 127 1 ἐκ τοῦ] τοῦ Usener
5 οὔτε ἡμέτερον P² in margine: om. libr. οὔτε πάντως ἡμέτερον
εριτομε Vaticana 128 2 ἐπανάγειν BP¹Q: ἐπαναγαγεῖν libr. cert.
3 *(τῆς ψυχῆς)* supplavit B²: om. B¹: τοῦ σώματος FHPQZCo
4 πάντα BHP¹: ἀπαντά FP⁸QZ 8 τὸ ante τοῦ] om. BF συμπλη-
ρώσεται ep. Vat. Usener: συμπληρώσ(η)ται cum litura B²: συμπλη-
ρώσηται H¹PQCo: συμπληρωθήσεται FZ 10 (ὅταν δὲ μὴ ἀλγῶμεν)
supplavit Gassendi: μηδὲν pro μὴ Usener: μηκέτι coniecit Muehill
129 6 καὶ οὐ BP⁸Z: καὶ FP¹QCo

same training which teaches to live well and to die well.

Yet much worse still is the man who says it is good not to be born, but

'once born make haste to pass the gates of Death'. It is foolish to say it is good to die at once

127 For if he says this from conviction why does he not pass away out of life? For it is open to him to do so, if he had firmly made up his mind to this. But if he speaks in jest, his words are idle among men who cannot receive them.

We must then bear in mind that the future is neither ours, nor yet wholly not ours, so that we may not altogether expect it as sure to come, nor abandon hope of it, as if it will certainly not come.

We must consider that of desires some are natural, others vain, and of the natural some are necessary and others merely natural; and of the necessary some are necessary for happiness, others for the repose of the body, and others for very life.

128 The right understanding of these facts enables us to refer all choice and avoidance to the health of the body and (the soul's) freedom from disturbance, since this is the aim of the life of blessedness. For it is to obtain this end that we always act, namely, to avoid pain and fear. And when this is once secured for us, all the tempest of the soul is dispersed, since the living creature has not to wander as though in search of something that is missing, and to look for some other thing by which he can fulfil the good of the soul and the good of the body. For it is then that we have need of pleasure, when we feel pain owing to the absence of pleasure; (but when we do not feel pain), we no longer need pleasure. And for this cause we call pleasure the beginning and end of the blessed life. For we recognize pleasure as the first good innate in us, and from pleasure we begin every act of choice and avoidance, and to pleasure we return again, using the feeling as the standard by which we judge every good.

129 And since pleasure is the first good and natural to us, for this very reason we do not choose every pleasure, but sometimes we pass over many pleasures, when greater

a. Pleasure is in itself always good, but not all

ἡδονὰς ὑπερβαίνομεν, ὅταν πλεῖστον ἡμῖν τὸ δυσχερὲς ἐκ τούτων ἔπηται· καὶ πολλὰς ἀλγηδόνας ἡδουνῶν κρείττους νομίζομεν,
 10 ἐπειδὴν μείζων ἡμῖν ἡδονὴ παρακολούθῃ πολὺν χρόνον ὑπο-
 μεναστὶ τὰς ἀλγηδόνας. πᾶσα οὖν ἡδονὴ διὰ τὸ φύσια
 ἔχειν οἰκεῖαν ἀγαθὸν, οὐ πᾶσα μέντοι αἱρετή· καθάπερ καὶ
 ἀλγηδῶν πᾶσα κακόν, οὐ πᾶσα δὲ ἀεὶ φευκτὴ πεφυκυῖα. |
 130 τῇ μέντοι συμμετρίσει καὶ συμφερόντων καὶ ἀσυμφόρων
 βλέψει ταῦτα πάντα κρίνειν καθήκει. χρώμεθα γὰρ τῷ μὲν
 ἀγαθῷ κατά τινας χρόνους ὡς κακῷ, τῷ δὲ κακῷ τοῦμπταλι
 ὡς ἀγαθῷ.

5 Καὶ τὴν αὐτάρκειαν δὲ ἀγαθὸν μέγα νομίζομεν, οὐχ ἵνα
 πάντως τοῖς δλίγοις χρώμεθα, ἀλλ’ δπως ἐὰν μὴ ἔχωμεν
 τὰ πολλά, τοῖς δλίγοις χρώμεθα, πεπεισμένοι γνησίως δτι
 ἥδιστα πολυτελεῖας ἀπολαύσουσιν οἱ ἥκιστα ταῦτης δεόμενοι,
 καὶ δτι τὸ μὲν φυσικὸν πάν εὐπόριστόν ἔστι, τὸ δὲ κενὸν
 10 δυσπόριστον. οἱ τε λιτοὶ χυλοὶ ἵσην πολυτελεῖ διαίτῃ τὴν
 ἡδονὴν ἐπιφέρουσιν, ὅταν ἄπαν τὸ ἀλγοῦν κατ’ ἔνδειαν
 131 ἔξαιρεθῇ· | καὶ μᾶζα καὶ ὕδωρ τὴν ἀκροτάτην ἀποδίδωσιν
 ἥδοινήν, ἐπειδὴν ἐνδέων τις αὐτὰ προσενέγκηται. τὸ συνεθίζειν
 οὖν ἐν ταῖς ἀπλαῖς καὶ οὐ πολυτελέσι διαίταις καὶ ὑγιείας
 5 ἐστὶ συμπληρωτικὸν καὶ πρὸς τὰς ἀναγκαῖας τοῦ βίου χρήσεις
 5 ἀοκνον ποιεῖ τὸν ἀνθρωπον καὶ τοῖς πολυτελέσιν ἐκ διαλειμ-
 μάτων προσερχομένους κρείττους ἡμᾶς διατίθησι καὶ πρὸς τὴν
 τύχην ἀφόβους παρασκευάζει.

“Οταν οὖν λέγωμεν ἡδονὴν τέλος ὑπάρχειν, οὐ τὰς τῶν
 ἀσώτων ἡδονὰς καὶ τὰς ἐν ἀπολαύσει κεψέντας λέγομεν, ὡς
 10 τινες ἀγνοοῦντες καὶ οὐχ διμολογοῦντες ἢ κακῶς ἐκδεχόμενοι
 νομίζοντες, ἀλλὰ τὸ μήτε ἀλγεῖν κατὰ σῶμα μήτε ταράττεσθαι
 132 κατὰ ψυχήν· | οὐ γὰρ πότοι καὶ κῶμοι συνεέροντες οὐδὲ ἀπο-
 λαύσεις παῖδων καὶ γυναικῶν οὐδὲ ἰχθύων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων,
 ὅσα φέρει πολυτελῆς τράπεζα, τὸν ἥδονν γεννᾷ βίον, ἀλλὰ
 μῆφων λογισμὸς καὶ τὰς αἰτίας ἔξερενῶν πάστης αἱρέσεως

11 μέντοι] μέντοι (^γ) Usener 130 2 βλέψει] ἐπιβλέψει coniescit
 Usener 3 τοῦμπταλιν HP³QC⁰: τὸ ἐμπταλιν FZ: ὅτ’ ἀν πάλιν B
 unde τάμπταλιν Usener 7 χρώμεθα] ἀρκώμεθα Cobet 10 οἱ τε]
 οἱ γὰρ Usener: δτι τε Muehll πολυτελεῖ P³H²QC⁰Z³: πολυτέλει(ει)
 F: πολυτέλειαν B³H¹P¹Z¹ 11 ἡδονὴν] ἀηδαν Usener ἀταν] ἀπαξ
 Usener 131 6 προσερχομένους GZ: προσερχομένοις BFHPQCo

discomfort accrues to us as the result of them : and pleasures are similarly we think many pains better than pleasures, since to be chosen, because of a greater pleasure comes to us when we have endured pains accompanying for a long time. Every pleasure then because of its natural pain kinship to us is good, yet not every pleasure is to be chosen : even as every pain also is an evil, yet not all are always of a nature to be avoided. Yet by a scale of comparison and by the consideration of advantages and disadvantages we must form our judgement on all these matters. For the good on certain occasions we treat as bad, and conversely the bad as good.

130 And again independence of desire we think a great good—not that we may at all times enjoy but a few things, but that, if we do not possess many, we may enjoy the few in the genuine persuasion that those have the sweetest pleasure in luxury who least need it, and that all that is natural is easy to be obtained, but that which is superfluous is hard. And so plain savours bring us a pleasure equal to a luxurious diet, when all the pain due to want is removed ; and bread and water produce the highest pleasure, when one who needs them puts them to his lips. To grow accustomed therefore to simple and not luxurious diet gives us health to the full, and makes a man alert for the needful employments of life, and when after long intervals we approach luxuries disposes us better towards them, and fits us to be fearless of fortune.

131 When, therefore, we maintain that pleasure is the end, 4. Pleasure then does not we do not mean the pleasures of profligates and those that consist in sensuality, as is supposed by some who are either ignorant or disagree with us or do not understand, but freedom from pain in the body and from trouble in the mind. For it is not continuous drinkings and revellings, nor the satisfaction of lusts, nor the enjoyment of fish and other luxuries of the wealthy table, which produce a pleasant life, but sober reasoning, searching out the motives for all choice and avoidance, and banishing mere

³ We must be content with a little, and so shall enjoy luxury more, if it comes.

Simple diet secures health and alertness.

9 καὶ τὰς Rossii: καὶ τὰς τῶν libri
λαυσις Usener.

132 Ι ἀπολαύσεις] ἀπό-

5 καὶ φυγῆς καὶ τὰς δόξας ἔξελαύνων, ἐξ ὧν πλεῖστος τὰς ψυχὰς καταλαμβάνει θόρυβος.

Τούτων δὲ πάντων ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ μέγιστον ἀγαθὸν φρόνησις.
 διὸ καὶ φιλοσοφίας τιμιώτερον ὑπάρχει φρόνησις, ἐξ ἣς αἱ λοιπαὶ πάσαι πεφύκασιν ἀρεταῖ, διδάσκουσα ὡς οὐκ ἔστιν
 10 ἡδέως ζῆν ἀνευ τοῦ φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαῖως (οὐδὲ φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαῖως) ἀνευ τοῦ ἡδέως. συμ-
 πεφύκασι γὰρ αἱ ἀρεταῖ τῷ ζῆν ἡδέως, καὶ τὸ ζῆν ἡδέως
 133 τούτων ἔστιν ἀχώριστον. ἐπεὶ τίνα νομίζεις εἶναι κρείττονα τοῦ καὶ περὶ θεῶν δστια δοξάζοντος καὶ περὶ θανάτου διὰ παντὸς ἀφόβως ἔχοντος καὶ τὸ τῆς φύσεως ἐπιλελογισμένου τέλος, καὶ τὸ μὲν τῶν ἀγαθῶν πέρας ὡς ἔστιν εὐσυμπλήρωτόν
 5 τε καὶ εὐπόριστον διαλαμβάνοντος, τὸ δὲ τῶν κακῶν ὡς ἡ χρόνους ἡ πόνους ἔχει βραχεῖς, τὴν δὲ ὑπό τινων δεσπότιν εἰσαγομένην πάντων ἔγγελῶντος (εἴμαρμένην; * * * * * ὧν ἂ μὲν κατ' ἀνάγκην γίνεται) ἢ δὲ ἀπὸ τύχης, ἢ δὲ παρ' ἡμᾶς διὰ τὸ τὴν μὲν ἀνάγκην ἀνηπεύθυνον εἶναι, τὴν δὲ τύχην
 10 ἀστατον ὄραν, τὸ δὲ παρ' ἡμᾶς ἀδέσποτον, φὶ καὶ τὸ μεμπτὸν
 134 καὶ τὸ ἐναντίον παρακολουθεῖν πέφυκεν | (ἐπεὶ κρείττον ἦν τῷ περὶ θεῶν μύθῳ κατακολουθεῖν ἢ τῇ τῶν φυσικῶν εἴμαρμένῃ δουλεύειν δ μὲν γὰρ ἐλπίδα παραιτήσεως ὑπογράφει θεῶν διὰ τιμῆς, ἢ δὲ ἀπαραίτητον ἔχει τὴν ἀνάγκην). τὴν δὲ 5 τύχην οὕτε θεόν, ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ νομίζουσιν, ὑπολαμβάνων (οὐθὲν γὰρ ἀτάκτως θεῷ πράττεται) οὕτε (πάντων) ἀβέβαιον αἰτίαν (οὐκ) οἴεται μὲν γὰρ ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακὸν ἐκ ταύτης πρὸς τὸ μακαρίως ζῆν ἀνθρώποις δίδοσθαι, ἀρχὰς μέντοι μεγάλων ἀγαθῶν ἢ κακῶν ὑπὸ ταύτης χορηγεῖσθαι), | κρείττον εἴναι νομίζει εὐλογίστως ἀτυχεῖν ἢ ἀλογίστως εὐτυχεῖν (βέλτιον

5 ἐξ δυν B: ἀφ' οὐ Z: om. libr. cett. 9 διδάσκουσα Usener · διδάσκουσαι (διδασκουσ[αι] H) librī διδασκούσης Rossi 10 (οἰδὲ φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαῖως) supplevit Stephanus 133 3 ἐπι-
 λελογισμένου codd. plerique: ἐπιλελογισμένον FP^bZ 7 ἔγγε-
 λῶντος scripsi: ἀγγελῶντος P¹Q¹: ἀγγελῶντος P²Q²: ἀγγελοι-
 τος BFHZ. ἀνελότος Kuhn. διαγελῶντος Usener (εἴμαρμένη) supplevit Usener nonnulla intercidisse manifestum est: extre-
 mat lacunam δυν ἃ μὲν κατ' ἀνάγκην γίνεται (γίνονται scripsit) supplevit Bignone: καὶ μᾶλλον ἃ μὲν κατ' ἀνάγκην γίγνεσθαι λέγοντος post εἴμαρ-
 μένην Usener 134 4 post ἀνάγκην graviter interpunkxi, levius
 Usener 5 ὑπολαμβάνων] ὑπολαμβάνοντος Usener 6 (πάντων)
 supplevi. μεγίστων ἀγαθῶν ἢ κακῶν post αἰτίαν Bignone ἀβέβαιον]

opinions, to which are due the greatest disturbance of the spirit.

Of all this the beginning and the greatest good is prudence. Wherefore prudence is a more precious thing even than philosophy: for from prudence are sprung all the other virtues, and it teaches us that it is not possible to live pleasantly without living prudently and honourably and justly, (nor, again, to live a life of prudence, honour, and justice) without living pleasantly. For the virtues are by nature bound up with the pleasant life, and the pleasant life is inseparable from them. For indeed who, think you, is a better man than he who holds reverent opinions concerning the gods, and is at all times free from fear of death, and has reasoned out the end ordained by nature? He understands that the limit of good things is easy to fulfil and easy to attain, whereas the course of ills is either short in time or slight in pain: he laughs at (destiny), whom some have introduced as the mistress of all things. (He thinks that with us lies the chief power in determining events, some of which happen by necessity) and some by chance, and some are within our control; for while necessity cannot be called to account, he sees that chance is inconstant, but that which is in our control is subject to no master, and to it are naturally attached praise and blame. For, indeed, it were better to follow the myths about the gods than to become a slave to the destiny of the natural philosophers: for the former suggests a hope of placating the gods by worship, whereas the latter involves a necessity which knows no placation. As to chance, he does not regard it as a god as most men do (for in a god's acts there is no disorder), nor as an uncertain cause (of all things) for he does not believe that good and evil are given by chance to man for the framing of a blessed life, but that opportunities for great good and great evil are afforded by it. He therefore thinks it better to be unfortunate in reasonable action than to prosper in unreason.

5 The greatest thing is prudence, which teaches all other virtues, and they secure a pleasant life. The prudent man is superior to all others. He knows the limits of good and evil, and is not the slave of necessity.

which is worse than belief in popular religion. He regards chance, too, as an opportunity for good, but prefers prudence with misfortune to prosperity with folly.

βέβαιος Lewy 7 (οὐκ) supplevit Usener 8 μὴ ante δίδουσθαι inseruit Gassendi 135 2 νομίζει scripsi . νομίζειν F . νομίζων BHPQ : νομίζοντος Usener βέλτιστον Usener

γὰρ ἐν ταῖς πράξεσι τὸ καλῶς κριθὲν (σφαλῆναι μᾶλλον ἢ τὸ κακῶς κριθὲν) δρθωθῆναι διὰ ταύτην).

5 Ταῦτα οὖν καὶ τὰ τούτοις συγγενῆ μελέτα πρὸς σεαυτὸν ἡμέρας καὶ υπότιμος πρός (τε) τὸν δμοιον σεαυτῷ, καὶ οὐδέποτε οὖθ' ὑπάρ οὕτ' ὅναρ διαταραχθῆσῃ. ζήσεις δὲ ὡς θεὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποις. οὐθὲν γὰρ ἔοικε θυητῷ ζῷῳ ἀνθρωπος ἐν ἀθανάτοις ἀγαθοῖς.

3 γὰρ] δ' αὐτὸν Bignone (σφαλῆναι μᾶλλον ἢ τὸ κακῶς κριθὲν) inseruit: (μὴ δρθωθῆναι ἢ τὸ μὴ καλῶς κριθὲν) Madvig 5 σεαυτὸν Gassendi: ἔαυτὸν libri 6 (τε) inseruit Usener 8 ζῶν Ζδ: ζῶ[ν] B*: ζῶον HPQCoZ¹ ζῶον δ F

For it is better in a man's actions that what is well chosen (should fail, rather than that what is ill chosen) should be successful owing to chance.

Meditate therefore on these things and things akin to *Peroration.*
them night and day by yourself, and with a companion
like to yourself, and never shall you be disturbed waking
or asleep, but you shall live like a god among men. For ^{make you a}
a man who lives among immortal blessings is not like ^{god among}
to a mortal being ^{men.}

IV

ΚΤΡΙΑΙ ΔΟΞΑΙ

139 I. Τὸ μακάριον καὶ ἄφθαρτον οὔτε αὐτὸ πράγματα ἔχει οὔτε ἄλλῳ παρέχει, ὥστε οὔτε δργαῖς οὔτε χάρισι συνέχεται· ἐν ἀσθενεῖ γὰρ πᾶν τὸ τοιοῦτον.

II. 'Ο θάνατος οὐδὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς· τὸ γὰρ διαλυθὲν ἀναι-

5 σθητεῖ· τὸ δ' ἀναισθητοῦν οὐδὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς.

III. "Ορος τοῦ μεγέθους τῶν ἡδονῶν ἡ παντὸς τοῦ ἀλ-

γοῦντος ὑπεξαίρεσις. ὅπου δ' ἀν τὸ ἡδόμενον ἐνῇ, καθ' δν ἀν χρόνον ἢ, οὐκ ἔστι τὸ ἀλγοῦν ἡ τὸ λυπούμενον ἡ τὸ συναμφότερον. |

140 IV. Οὐ χρονίζει τὸ ἀλγοῦν συνεχῶς ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ, ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν ἀκρον τὸν ἐλάχιστον χρόνον πάρεστι, τὸ δὲ μόνον ὑπερτεῖνον τὸ ἡδόμενον κατὰ σάρκα οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας συμ-
βαίνει. αἱ δὲ πολυχρόνιοι τῶν ἀρρωστιῶν πλεονάζον ἔχουσι 5 τὸ ἡδόμενον ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ ἢ περ τὸ ἀλγοῦν.

V. Οὐκ ἔστιν ἡδέως ζῆν ἄνευ τοῦ φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως (οὐδὲ φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως) ἄνευ τοῦ ἡδέως. ὅτῳ δὲ τοῦτο μὴ ὑπάρχει, οὐ ζῆ φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως, (καὶ ὅτῳ ἐκεῖνο μὴ) ὑπάρχει, οὐκ ἔστι τοῦτον τὸ ἡδέως ζῆν.

VI. "Ενεκα τοῦ θαρρεῖν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἦν κατὰ φύσιν ἀγαθόν, ἐξ ὧν ἀν ποτε τοῦτο οἴς τ' ἢ παρασκευάζεσθαι. |

139 3 ἀσθενεῖ] ἀσθενείᾳ Sent. Vat. I 8 τὸ λυπούμενον] om.
τὸ ΒΡΙQCο 140 3 συμβαίνει] συμμένει Bywater 7 (οὐδὲ
φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως) supplevit Gassendi, cf. Diog. Oen.
54 8 δὲ τοῦτο] δ' ἐν τοῦτων Usener οὐ ζῆ . . . 9 ὑπάρχει om.
Sent. Vat. V οὐ] οἷον Usener : ἐξ οὐ Bignone ζῆ scripsi : {γ.
libri : ζῆ Gassendi 9 (καὶ ὅτῳ ἐκεῖνο μὴ) supplevi 11 ην
Usener : ή libri 12 ἀγαθόν] fortasse ἀγαθά Usener : num adden-
dum (ταῦτα ζητεῖν)? τοῦτο τις Meibom

Scholia

139 3 post τὸ τοιοῦτον legitur ἐν ἄλλοις δέ φησι τοὺς θεοὺς λόγῳ
θεωρητούς, οὓς μὲν κατ' ἀριθμὸν ὑφεστῶτας, οὓς δὲ κατὰ διατάξειν εἰς τῆς

IV

PRINCIPAL DOCTRINES

- 139 I. THE blessed and immortal nature knows no trouble ^{The divine} itself nor causes trouble to any other, so that it is never ^{nature.} constrained by anger or favour. For all such things exist only in the weak.
- II. Death is nothing to us · for that which is dissolved Death. is without sensation ; and that which lacks sensation is nothing to us.
- III. The limit of quantity in pleasures is the removal of ^{The limit of} all that is painful. Wherever pleasure is present, as long ^{pleasure.} as it is there, there is neither pain of body nor of mind, nor of both at once
- 140 IV. Pain does not last continuously in the flesh, but the ^{Bodily pain} acutest pain is there for a very short time, and even that ^{its strength and length} which just exceeds the pleasure in the flesh does not continue for many days at once. But chronic illnesses permit a predominance of pleasure over pain in the flesh.
- V. It is not possible to live pleasantly without living ^{Connexion of} prudently and honourably and justly, [nor again to live ^{pleasure and virtue.} a life of prudence, honour, and justice] without living pleasantly. And the man who does not possess the pleasant life, is not living prudently and honourably and justly, [and the man who does not possess the virtuous life], cannot possibly live pleasantly.
- VI. To secure protection from men anything ^{is a Protection} natural good, by which you may be able to attain this end.
- Scholia
- συνεχούς ἐπιρρύσεως τῶν ὄμοιών εἰδώλων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸν ἀποτελεσμένων,
ἀνθρωποειδέσις
οὐδὲ μὲν . . . οὐδὲ δέ] οὐδὲ μὲν . . . ως δὲ Gassendi ὄμοιδειαν
HPSQCo: ὄμοιδιαν BZ: ὄμοιειδιαν F ἀποτελεσμένων libri
plerique: τετελεσμένων F: ἀποτελεσμένους Kuhn
140 11 post κατὰ φύσιν legitur ἀρχῆς καὶ βασιλείας. retinuit Muehll

141 VII. Ἐνδοξοι καὶ περίβλεπτοι τινες ἐβουλήθησαν γενέσθαι, τὴν ἔξ ἀνθρώπων ἀσφάλειαν σύντα νομίζοντες περιποιήσεσθαι. ὥστε εἰ μὲν ἀσφαλῆς ὁ τῶν τοιούτων βίος, ἀπέλαβον τὸ τῆς φύσεως ἀγαθόν· εἰ δὲ μὴ ἀσφαλῆς, οὐκ ἔχουσιν οὐδὲν εἴκετα ἔξ ἀρχῆς κατὰ τὸ τῆς φύσεως οἰκεῖον ὡρέχθησαν.

VIII. Οὐδεμίᾳ ἡδονῇ καθ' ἑαυτὸν κακόν· ἀλλὰ τὰ τινῶν ἡδουνῶν ποιητικὰ πολλαπλασίους ἐπιφέρει τὰς δχλήσεις τῶν ἡδουνῶν. |

142 IX. Εἰ κατεπυκνοῦτο πᾶσα ἡδονή, καὶ χρόνῳ καὶ περὶ δλον τὸ ἀθροισμα ὑπῆρχεν ἢ τὰ κυριώτατα μέρη τῆς φύσεως, οὐκ ἀν ποτε διέφερον ἀλλήλων αἱ ἡδοναί.

X. Εἰ τὰ ποιητικὰ τῶν περὶ τὸν ἀσώτους ἡδουνῶν ἔλυε τὸν φόβοντας τῆς διανοίας τούς τε περὶ μετεώρων καὶ θανάτου καὶ ἀλγηδόνων, ἔτι τε τὸ πέρας τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν (καὶ τῶν ἀλγηδόνων) ἐδίδασκεν, οὐκ ἀν ποτε εἶχομεν ὅ τι μεμψαίμεθα αὐτοῖς, πανταχόθεν ἐκπληρουμένοις τῶν ἡδουνῶν καὶ οὐθαμδόθεν οὕτε τὸ ἀλγοῦν οὕτε τὸ λυπούμενον ἔχοντα, δπερ ἔστι τὸ το κακόν.

XI. Εἰ μηθὲν ἡμᾶς αἱ τῶν μετεώρων ὑποψίαι ἡνώχλουν καὶ αἱ περὶ θανάτου, μή ποτε πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἢ τι, ἔτι τε τὸ μὴ κατανοεῖν τὸν δρόν τῶν ἀλγηδόνων καὶ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν, οὐκ ἀν προσεδεόμεθα φυσιολογίας. |

143 XII. Οὐκ ἦν τὸ φοβούμενον λύειν ὑπὲρ τῶν κυριωτάτων μὴ κατειδότα τίς ἡ τοῦ σύμπαντος φύσις, ἀλλ' ὑποπτευόμενόν τι τῶν κατὰ τὸν μύθον. ὥστε οὐκ ἦν ἄνευ φυσιολογίας ἀκεράλους τὰς ἡδουνὰς ἀπολαμβάνειν.

5 XIII. Οὐθὲν ὄφελος ἦν τὴν κατ' ἀνθρώπους ἀσφάλειαν κατασκευάζεσθαι τῶν ἄνωθεν ὑπόπτων καθεστώτων καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ γῆς καὶ ἀπλῶς τῶν ἐν τῷ ἀπείρῳ.

XIV. Τῆς ἀσφαλείας τῆς ἔξ ἀνθρώπων γενομένης μέχρι

141 6 ἑαυτὸν BHP¹OCO : ἑαυτὴν FP⁸Z κακόν BHPQ : κακή FP³Z
 142 1 post ἡδονή, (καὶ μνήμῃ) supplevit Bignone : (καὶ τόνῳ) Cröner καὶ χρόνῳ FP⁸Z· τῷ . . . χρόνῳ B¹: τῷ καὶ χρόνῳ B²P¹CO: τῷ χρόνῳ Arndt περὶ δλον Rossi : περὶ ὃδὸν FP³Z: περίοδον BHP¹OCO 4 ἀστρούς] ἀσωμάτους FZ: εὐσωμάτους P³ 6 (καὶ τῶν ἀλγηδόνων) ex Diog. Oen. fr. 45 supplevit Bignone, cf. XI 7 μεμψαίμεθα] μεμψάμεθα B: ἐμεμψάμεθα Usener 8 ἐκπληρουμένοις Diog. Oen. Usener: εἰσπληρουμένοις libri 12 τε τὸ μὴ κατανοεῖν Lachelier: τετόλμηκα νοεῖν libri

141 VII. Some men wished to become famous and conspicuous, thinking that they would thus win for themselves safety from other men. Wherefore if the life of such men is safe, they have obtained the good which nature craves; but if it is not safe, they do not possess that for which they strove at first by the instinct of nature.

VIII. No pleasure is a bad thing in itself: but the impure means which produce some pleasures bring with them disturbances many times greater than the pleasures.

142 IX. If every pleasure could be intensified so that it lasted and influenced the whole organism or the most essential parts of our nature, pleasures would never differ from one another.

X. If the things that produce the pleasures of profligates could dispel the fears of the mind about the phenomena of the sky and death and its pains, and also teach the limits of desires (and of pains), we should never have cause to blame them: for they would be filling themselves full with pleasures from every source and never have pain of body or mind, which is the evil of life.

XI. If we were not troubled by our suspicions of the phenomena of the sky and about death, fearing that it concerns us, and also by our failure to grasp the limits of pains and desires, we should have no need of natural science.

143 XII. A man cannot dispel his fear about the most important matters if he does not know what is the nature of the universe but suspects the truth of some mythical story. So that without natural science it is not possible to attain our pleasures unalloyed.

XIII. There is no profit in securing protection in relation to men, if things above and things beneath the earth and indeed all in the boundless universe remain matters of suspicion.

XIV. The most unalloyed source of protection from men is retirement, which secures protection.

^{143 2} ὑποπτεύμενον] ὑποπτεύοντι Sent. Vat. XLIX: ὑποπτεύοντα
Usener in commentario

τινὸς δυνάμει τῷ ἔξοριστικῇ καὶ εὐπορίᾳ εἰλικρινεστάτῃ
ιο γίνεται ἡ ἐκ τῆς ἡσυχίας καὶ ἐκχωρήσεως τῶν πολλῶν
ἀσφάλεια. |

144 XV. Ὁ τῆς φύσεως πλοῦτος καὶ ὥρισται καὶ εὐπόριστός
ἐστιν· δὲ τῶν κενῶν δοξῶν εἰς ἀπειρον ἐκπέπτει.

XVI. Βραχέα σοφῷ τύχῃ παρεμπίπτει, τὰ δὲ μέγιστα καὶ
κυριώτατα δὲ λογισμὸς διώκηται καὶ κατὰ τὸν συνεχῆ χρόνον
5 τοῦ βίου διοικεῖ καὶ διοικήσει.

XVII. Ὁ δίκαιος ἀταρακτότατος, δὲ δὲ ἀδικος πλείστης
ταραχῆς γέμων.

XVIII. Οὐκ ἐπαύξεται ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ ἡ ἡδονή, ἐπειδὴν ἀπαξ
τὸ κατ' ἔνδειαν ἀλγοῦν ἔξαιρεθῆ, ἀλλὰ μόνον ποικίλλεται·
ιο τῆς δὲ διανοίας τὸ πέρας τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἡδονὴν ἀπεγέννησεν
ἢ τε τούτων αὐτῶν ἐκλόγισις καὶ τῶν ὅμογενῶν τούτοις, δια
τοὺς μεγίστους φόβους παρεσκεύαζε τῇ διανοίᾳ. |

145 XIX. Ὁ ἀπειρος χρόνος ἵσην ἔχει τὴν ἡδονὴν καὶ δὲ
πεπερασμένος, ἐάν τις αὐτῆς τὰ πέρατα καταμετρήσῃ τῷ
λογισμῷ.

XX. Ἡ μὲν σὰρξ ἀπέλαβε τὰ πέρατα τῆς ἡδονῆς ἀπειρα,
5 καὶ ἀπειρος αὐτὴν χρόνος παρεσκεύασεν. ἡ δὲ διάνοια, τοῦ
τῆς σαρκὸς τέλους καὶ πέρατος λαβθόντα τὸν ἐπιλογισμόν,
καὶ τοὺς ὑπὲρ τοῦ αἰώνος φόβους ἐκλύσασα τὸν παντελῆ βίου
παρεσκεύασεν, καὶ οὐθὲν ἔτι τοῦ ἀπειρον χρόνου προσδεή-
θημεν· ἀλλ' οὐτε ἔφυγε τὴν ἡδονὴν οὐθ' ἡνίκα τὴν ἔξαγωγὴν
ιο ἐκ τοῦ ζῆν τὰ πράγματα παρεσκεύαζεν, ὡς ἐλλείπουσά τι τοῦ
ἀρίστου βίου κατέστρεφεν. |

146 XXI. Ὁ τὰ πέρατα τοῦ βίου κατειδὼς οἶδεν ὡς εὐπόριστόν
ἐστι τὸ *(τὸ)* ἀλγοῦν κατ' ἔνδειαν ἔξαιρον καὶ τὸ τὸν δλον
βίου παντελῆ καθιστάν· ὥστε οὐδὲν προσδεῖται πραγμάτων
ἀγώνας κεκτημένων.

9 τινὶ Usener: τε libri, Bignone ἔξοριστικῃ Meibom: ἔξ-
ριστικῃ P^oZ: ἔξοριστικῃ F: ἔξαιριστικῃ BP^oQ: ἔξεριστικῃ H, unde
ἔξεριστικῃ Usener: ἔξεριστικῃ Bignone: ἔξεριστις ἢ coni. Usener
εὐπορίᾳ εἰλικρινεστάτῃ] εὐπορίᾳ εἰλικρινεστάτῃ f: εὐπορίᾳ εἰλικρι-
νεστέρᾳ Muehl. εἰλικρινεστάτῃ, ἐπεξεργαστικῳ>τάτῃ Bignone
ιο ἐκχωρήσεως HZ^o: ἔχωρήσεως BFPQCo^oZ^o 12 ἀσφάλεια] ἀδεια
conicerat Usener 144, 3 βραχέα BFP^o1: βραχέα HP^oQ τύχῃ]
tύχη Cobet 4 διώκηται Stobaeus: διώκηται (διώκει Z) libri: διώκησε
Usener καὶ om. Usener 5 τοῦ βίου] om. FCo^oZ διοικεῖ
καὶ διοικήσει ut glossema seclusit Usener 6 δ δικαιος] βίος add.
Diodorus Sent. Vat. XII 11 ἐκλόγισις BPQ: ἐκλόγησις FCo^oZ
145 5 καὶ] καν Diels ἀπειρος] ἀπειρον οὐκ ἀπειρος Bignone παρε-

men, which is secured to some extent by a certain force of expulsion, is in fact the immunity which results from a quiet life and the retirement from the world.

144 XV. The wealth demanded by nature is both limited ^{Nature's} wealth. and easily procured; that demanded by idle imaginings stretches on to infinity.

XVI. In but few things chance hinders a wise man, but Chance and the greatest and most important matters reason has ordained ^{reason in life} and throughout the whole period of life does and will ordain.

XVII. The just man is most free from trouble, the Justice and unjust most full of trouble.

XVIII. The pleasure in the flesh is not increased, when Limits of once the pain due to want is removed, but is only varied: bodily and mental and the limit as regards pleasure in the mind is begotten pleasure by the reasoned understanding of these very pleasures and of the emotions akin to them, which used to cause the greatest fear to the mind.

145 XIX. Infinite time contains no greater pleasure than Infinite time limited time, if one measures by reason the limits of does not increase pleasure pleasure.

XX. The flesh perceives the limits of pleasure as un- The flesh, limited and unlimited time is required to supply it. But reason, and pleasure. the mind, having attained a reasoned understanding of the ultimate good of the flesh and its limits and having dissipated the fears concerning the time to come, supplies us with the complete life, and we have no further need of infinite time: but neither does the mind shun pleasure, nor, when circumstances begin to bring about the departure from life, does it approach its end as though it fell short in any way of the best life.

XXI. He who has learned the limits of life knows that Pleasure that which removes the pain due to want and makes the without competition. whole of life complete is easy to obtain; so that there is no need of actions which involve competition.

σκένασεν] ἀρέσκοι ἄν Usener 7 τὸν παντελῆ] fortasse παντελῆ τὸν cf. XXI 8 χρόνον BP¹Q: βίου FHCo²Z προσεδέηθμεν FHCo³Z. προσεδέθμην PQ: προσεδέηθη (οὐ) μὴν Usener 9 οὗθ' H: οἰδὲ B: οὐδὲ F 11 κατέστρεφεν] κατέστρεψεν Bywater 146 2 (τὸ) supplevit Casaubon

5 XXII. Τὸν ὑφεστηκὸς δεῖ τέλος ἐπιλογίζεσθαι καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν ἐνάργειαν, ἐφ' ἣν τὰ δοξαζόμενα ἀνάγομεν εἰ τὸ μή, πάντα ἀκρισίας καὶ ταραχῆς ἔσται μεστά.

XXIII. Εἴ μάχῃ πᾶσαι τὰς αἰσθήσεις, οὐχ ἔξεις οὐδὲ διὰ φῆς αὐτῶν διεψεῦσθαι πρὸς τὸ ποιούμενος τὴν ἀναγωγὴν τοι κρίνης. |

147 XXIV. Εἴ τιν' ἐκβαλεῖς ἀπλῶς αἰσθησιν καὶ μὴ διαιρήσεις τὸ δοξαζόμενον κατὰ τὸ προσμένον καὶ τὸ παρὸν ἦδη κατὰ τὴν αἰσθησιν καὶ τὰ πάθη καὶ πᾶσαν φανταστικὴν ἐπιβολὴν τῆς διανοίας, συνταράξεις καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς αἰσθήσεις τῇ ματαίῳ 5 δόξῃ, ὥστε τὸ κριτήριον ἀπαντεῖς. εἰ δὲ βεβαιώσεις καὶ τὸ προσμένον διπαν ἐν ταῖς δοξαστικαῖς ἐννοίαις καὶ τὸ μὴ τὴν ἐπιμαρτύρησιν, οὐκ ἐκλείψεις τὸ διεψεῦσμένον, ὡς τετηρηκὼς ἔσει πᾶσαν ἀμφισβήτησιν κατὰ πᾶσαν κρίσιν τοῦ δρθῶς ή μὴ δρθῶς. |

148 XXV. Εἴ μὴ παρὰ πάντα καιρὸν ἐπανοίσεις ἔκαστον τῶν πραττομένων ἐπὶ τὸ τέλος τῆς φύσεως, ἀλλὰ προκαταστρέψεις εἴτε φυγὴν εἴτε διωξιν ποιούμενος εἰς ἄλλο τι, οὐκ ἔσονταί σοι τοῖς λόγοις αἱ πράξεις ἀκόλουθοι.

5 XXVI. Τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν ὅσαι μὴ ἐπ' ἀλγοῦν ἐπανάγουσιν, ἐὰν μὴ συμπληρωθῶσιν, οὐκ εἰσὶν ἀναγκαῖαι ἀλλ' εὐδιάχυτον τὴν ὅρεξιν ἔχουσιν, δταν δυσπόριστον ή (ἢ) βλάβης ἀπεργαστικαὶ δόξωσιν εἶναι.

XXVII. Ὡν ἡ σοφίᾳ παρασκευάζεται εἰς τὴν τοῦ ὅδου 10 βίου μακαριότητα, πολὺ μέγιστον ἔστιν ἡ τῆς φιλίας κτῆσις.

XXVIII. Ἡ αὐτὴ γνώμη θαρρεῖν τε ἐποίηστεν ὑπὲρ τοῦ μηδὲν αἰώνιον εἶναι δεινὸν μηδὲ πολυχρόνιον, καὶ τὴν ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς ὠρισμένοις ἀσφάλειαν φιλίας μάλιστα κατεῖδε συντελουμένην. |

149 XXIX. Τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν αἱ μέν εἰσι φυσικαὶ καὶ (ἀναγκαῖαι·

5 τέλος secludebat Schneider

147 1 ἐκβαλεῖς Cobet : ἐκβά-

λεῖς H¹ : ἐκβάλλεις codd. cett.

2 κατὰ codd. plerique : καὶ FCo²Z

Usener 4 ματαίῳ Usener : ματαίῳ HQ : ματαίᾳ FCo³Z

5 ἐκβαλεῖς Z⁵ : ἐκβάλλεις codd. cett.

7 ἐκλείψεις] ἐκλείψεις]

Bonnet 8 ὡς τετηρηκὼς] ὥστ' ἀνηρηκὼς vel ἔξηρηκὼς

Usener : δοτε τετηρηκὼς Merbach κατὰ Bignone : καὶ codd.

Usener : καὶ (ἀνηρηκὼς) Giussani 148 6 εὐδιάχυτον HQ

7 δυσπόριστον BP¹ : δυσπόριστοι F

η (ἢ) Usener : η B : η codd.

cett. 13 φιλίας] φιλίας Usener : φιλίᾳ vir doctus apud Madvig

κατεῖδε Madvig : κατεῖναι libri

149 1 φυσικαὶ καὶ (ἀναγκαῖαι·

XXII. We must consider both the real purpose and all the tests of the evidence of direct perception, to which we always refer the conclusions of opinion; otherwise, all will be full of doubt and confusion.

XXIII. If you fight against all sensations, you will have Rejection of no standard by which to judge even those of them which you say are false.

147 XXIV. If you reject any single sensation and fail to distinguish between the conclusion of opinion as to the appearance awaiting confirmation and that which is actually given by the sensation or feeling, or each intuitive apprehension of the mind, you will confound all other sensations as well with the same groundless opinion, so that you will reject every standard of judgement. And if among the mental images created by your opinion you affirm both that which awaits confirmation and that which does not, you will not escape error, since you will have preserved the whole cause of doubt in every judgement between what is right and what is wrong.

148 XXV. If on each occasion instead of referring your actions to the end of nature, you turn to some other nearer standard when you are making a choice or an avoidance, your actions will not be consistent with your principles.

XXVI. Of desires, all that do not lead to a sense of pain, if they are not satisfied, are not necessary, but involve a craving which is easily dispelled, when the object is hard to procure or they seem likely to produce harm.

XXVII. Of all the things which wisdom acquires to produce the blessedness of the complete life, far the greatest is the possession of friendship.

XXVIII. The same conviction which has given us confidence that there is nothing terrible that lasts for ever or even for long, has also seen the protection of friendship most fully completed in the limited evils of this life.

149 XXIX. Among desires some are natural (and necessary), Classification of desires

αἱ δὲ φυσικαὶ μὲν ὥν τοις ἀναγκαῖαις (δέ) supplevit Bignone ex Sent. Vat. XX. φυσικαὶ καὶ οὐκ ἀναγκαῖαι libri: φυσικαὶ καὶ ἀναγκαῖαι αἱ δὲ φυσικαὶ καὶ οὐκ ἀναγκαῖαι Stephanus

αὶ δὲ φυσικὰ μὲν) οὐκ ἀναγκαῖαι (δέ)· αἱ δὲ οὕτε φυσικὰ οὕτε ἀναγκαῖαι ἀλλὰ παρὰ κενὴν δόξαν γινόμεναι.

XXX. Ἐν αἷς τῶν φυσικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν, μὴ ἐπ' ἀλγοῦν
5 δὲ ἐπαναγονῶν, ἐὰν μὴ συντελεσθῶσιν, ὑπάρχει ἡ σπουδὴ⁵
σύντονος, παρὰ κενὴν δόξαν αὗται γίνονται, καὶ οὐ παρὰ τὴν
ἐαυτῶν φύσιν οὐ διαχέονται ἀλλὰ παρὰ τὴν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
κενοδοξίαν. |

150 XXXI. Τὸ τῆς φύσεως δίκαιον ἔστι σύμβολον τοῦ συμ-
φέροντος εἰς τὸ μὴ βλάπτειν ἀλλήλους μηδὲ βλάπτεσθαι.

XXXII. "Οσα τῶν ζῴων μὴ ἐδύνατο συνθήκας ποιεῖσθαι
τὰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ βλάπτειν ἀλληλα μηδὲ βλάπτεσθαι, πρὸς
5 ταῦτα οὐθὲν ἦν δίκαιον οὐδὲ ἀδικον· ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τῶν
ἔθνων δσα μὴ ἐδύνατο ἡ μὴ ἐβούλετο τὰς συνθήκας ποιεῖσθαι
τὰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ βλάπτειν μηδὲ βλάπτεσθαι.

XXXIII. Οὐκ ἦν τι καθ' ἑαυτὸν δικαιοσύνη, ἀλλ' ἐν ταῖς
μετ' ἀλλήλων συστροφαῖς καθ' ὅπηλίκους δή ποτε ἀεὶ τόπους
ιο συνθήκη τις ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ βλάπτειν ἦ βλάπτεσθαι. |

151 XXXIV. Ἡ ἀδικία οὐ καθ' ἑαυτὴν κακόν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ
κατὰ τὴν ὑποψίαν φόβῳ, εἰ μὴ λήσει τοὺς ὑπὲρ τῶν τοιούτων
ἐφεστηκότας κολαστάς.

XXXV. Οὐκ ἔστι τὸν λάθρᾳ τι ποιοῦντα ὡν συνέθεντο
5 πρὸς ἀλλήλους εἰς τὸ μὴ βλάπτειν μηδὲ βλάπτεσθαι, πιστεύειν
ὅτι λήσει, καὶ μυριάκις ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος λαυθάνῃ. μέχρι⁵
γάρ καταστροφῆς ἀδηλού εἰ καὶ λήσει.

XXXVI. Κατὰ μὲν (τὸ) κοινὸν πᾶσι τὸ δίκαιον τὸ αὐτό,
συμφέρον γάρ τι ἦν ἐν τῇ πρὸς ἀλλήλους κοινωνίᾳ· κατὰ
10 δὲ τὸ ἴδιον χώρας καὶ δσων δή ποτε αἰτίων οὐ πᾶσι συνέπεται
τὸ αὐτὸν δίκαιον εἶναι. |

152 XXXVII. Τὸ μὲν ἐπιμαρτυρούμενον ὅτι συμφέρει ἐν ταῖς

4 post φυσικῶν fortasse μὲν Usener 150 4 ἀλληλα Gassendi .
ἀλλὰ BFQH¹Z : ἀλλὰ . . P : ἀλλ' ἀν H¹ : ἀλλα Usener 5 ἦ
Usener : ἥ BHPIQ : ἥ οὐδὲ P² : ἐστιν οὐδὲ FCo³Z 151 4 ποιοῦν-
τα] κινοῦντα Madvig 6 ἐπὶ Sent. Vat. VI Menagius : ἀπὸ⁶
BQP¹ : ὑπὸ FP³Co³Z 8 (τὸ) supplevit Gassendi

Scholia

149 3 post γινόμεναι legitur φυσικὰς καὶ ἀναγκαῖας ἡγίται φ
'Επίκουρος τὰς ἀλγηδόνος ἀπολούσας, ὡς ποτὸν ἐπὶ δίψους φυσικὰς δὲ
οὐκ ἀναγκαῖας δὲ τὰς ποικιλλούσας μόνον τὴν ἰδονήν, μὴ ὑπεξιρουμένας δὲ
τὸ ἀλγημα, ὡς πολυτελῆ σιτία οὕτε δὲ φυσικὰς οὕτε ἀναγκαῖας, ὡς

some natural) but not necessary, and others neither natural nor necessary, but due to idle imagination.

XXX. Wherever in the case of desires which are physical, but do not lead to a sense of pain, if they are not fulfilled, the effort is intense, such pleasures are due to idle imagination, and it is not owing to their own nature that they fail to be dispelled, but owing to the empty imaginings of the man.

150 XXXI. The justice which arises from nature is a pledge of mutual advantage to restrain men from harming one another and save them from being harmed.

XXXII. For all living things which have not been able to make compacts not to harm one another or be harmed, nothing ever is either just or unjust; and likewise too for all tribes of men which have been unable or unwilling to make compacts not to harm or be harmed.

XXXIII. Justice never is anything in itself, but in the dealings of men with one another in any place whatever and at any time it is a kind of compact not to harm or be harmed.

151 XXXIV. Injustice is not an evil in itself, but only in consequence of the fear which attaches to the apprehension of being unable to escape those appointed to punish such actions.

XXXV. It is not possible for one who acts in secret contravention of the terms of the compact not to harm or be harmed, to be confident that he will escape detection, even if at present he escapes a thousand times. For up to the time of death it cannot be certain that he will indeed escape.

XXXVI. In its general aspect justice is the same for all, for it is a kind of mutual advantage in the dealings of men with one another: but with reference to the individual peculiarities of a country or any other circumstances the same thing does not turn out to be just for all.

152 XXXVII. Among actions which are sanctioned as just Test of just Scholia

στεφάνους καὶ ἀνδριάντων ἀγαθέστεις
ἀλγηθόντος Weil : ἀλγηθόντας libri δὲ post οὐκ ἀναγκαῖς om. FCo³Z

χρείαις τῆς πρὸς ἀλλήλους κοιωνίας τῶν νομισθέντων εἶναι δικαίων, ἔχει τὸ τοῦ δικαίου ἐνέχυρον, ἐάν τε τὸ αὐτὸ πᾶσι γένηται, ἐάν τε μὴ τὸ αὐτό. ἐὰν δὲ νόμον θῆται τις, μὴ 5 ἀποβαίνῃ δὲ κατὰ τὸ συμφέρον τῆς πρὸς ἀλλήλους κοιωνίας, οὐκέτι τοῦτο τὴν τοῦ δικαίου φύσιν ἔχει. καὶ μεταπόπτη τὸ κατὰ τὸ δίκαιον συμφέρον, χρόνον δέ τινα εἰς τὴν πρόληψιν ἐναρμόττη, οὐδὲν ἡττον ἐκεῖνον τὸν χρόνον ἢν δίκαιον τοῖς μὴ φωναῖς κεναῖς ἑαυτοὺς συνταράπτουσιν ἀλλ' 10 ιο εἰς τὰ πράγματα βλέπουσιν. |

153 XXXVIII. Ἐνθα μὴ καινῶν γενομένων τῶν περιεστώτων πραγμάτων ἀνεφάνη μὴ ἐναρμόττοντα εἰς τὴν πρόληψιν τὰ νομισθέντα δίκαια ἐπ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἔργων, οὐκ ἢν ταῦτα δίκαια. Ἐνθα δὲ καινῶν γενομένων τῶν πραγμάτων οὐκέτι συνέφερε 5 τὰ αὐτὰ δίκαια κείμενα, ἐνταῦθα δὲ τότε μὲν ἢν δίκαιοι, ὅτε συνέφερεν εἰς τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους κοιωνίαν τῶν συμπολιτευομένων ὕστερον δ' οὐκ ἢν ἔτι δίκαια, ὅτε μὴ συνέφερεν. |

154 XXXIX. Ὁ τὸ μὴ θαρροῦν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔξωθεν ἄριστα συστησάμενος οὗτος τὰ μὲν δυνατὰ ὅμοφυλα κατεσκευάσατο· τὰ δὲ μὴ δυνατὰ οὐκ ἀλλόφυλά γε· δσα δὲ μηδὲ τοῦτο δυνατὸς ἢν, ἀνεπίμικτος ἐγένετο, καὶ ἔξωρίσατο ὅσα τοῦτ' 5 ἐλυσιτέλει πράττειν.

XL. Ὅσοι τὴν δύναμιν ἔσχουν τοῦ τὸ θαρρεῖν μάλιστα ἐκ τῶν ὁμορούντων παρασκευάσασθαι, οὗτοι καὶ ἐβίωσαν μετ' ἀλλήλων ἥδιστα τὸ βεβαιώτατον πίστωμα ἔχοντες, καὶ πληρεστάτην οἰκειότητα ἀπολαβόντες οὐκ ὠδύραντο ὡς πρὸς ιο ἔλεον τὴν τοῦ τελευτήσαντος προκαταστροφήν.

152 2 τῶν νομισθέντων εἶναι δικαίων seclusit Usener additamentum suspicans capitī sententiae destinatum 3 τὸ τοῦ F. τὸν τοῦ HPQ Usener ἐνέχυρον scripsi: εἶναι HP¹Q: χώραν εἶναι BF· τὸ ἐν τοῦ δικαίου χώρᾳ Muehl: alii alia 4 νόμον Usener: μόνον libri 9 ἀλλ' εἰς τὰ Usener: ἀλλὰ πλείστα libri: ἀλλ' ἀπλῶς εἰς τὰ Kochalsky

153 1 καινῶν Aldobrandinus: κενῶν libri: κοινῶν Z²f 2 ἐναρμόττοντα Usener (cf. XXXVII. 8): ἀρμόττοντα libri 4 καινῶν Gassendi: καὶ τῶν B: κενῶν HPQ 5 8ὲ BHPQ: δὴ F

154 1 τὸ μὴ] τὸ μὲν Usener (in commentario) 2 συστησάμενος] συστειλάμενος Usener (in commentario) 3 ὅσα δὲ Usener: ὅσα γε HPQ: ὅσα FCō²Z 4 ἔξωρίσατο Stephanus: ἔξωρίσατο H: ἔξωρίσατο BFPQ· ἔξηρέσατο Usener: ἔξηρέσατο Muehl τοῦτο HPQ: τούτω B: τοῦ F: τούτων Usener: τοῦτο Stephanus 5 ἐλυσιτέλει

by law, that which is proved on examination to be of advantage in the requirements of men's dealings with one another, has the guarantee of justice, whether it is the same for all or not. But if a man makes a law and it does not turn out to lead to advantage in men's dealings with each other, then it no longer has the essential nature of justice. And even if the advantage in the matter of justice shifts from one side to the other, but for a while accords with the general concept, it is none the less just for that period in the eyes of those who do not confound themselves with empty sounds but look to the actual facts.

153 XXXVIII. Where, provided the circumstances have not been altered, actions which were considered just, have been shown not to accord with the general concept in actual practice, then they are not just. But where, when circumstances have changed, the same actions which were sanctioned as just no longer lead to advantage, there they were just at the time when they were of advantage for the dealings of fellow-citizens with one another, but subsequently they are no longer just, when no longer of advantage.

154 XXXIX. The man who has best ordered the element of disquiet arising from external circumstances has made those things that he could akin to himself and the rest at least not alien : but with all to which he could not do even this, he has refrained from mixing, and has expelled from his life all which it was of advantage to treat thus.

XL. As many as possess the power to procure complete immunity from their neighbours, these also live most pleasantly with one another, since they have the most certain pledge of security, and after they have enjoyed the fullest intimacy, they do not lament the previous departure of a dead friend, as though he were to be pitied.

HPQ · λυσιτελές B: λυσιτελῆ F Usener 6 τὸν τὸ Meibom: τοῦ τε
BP: τοῦ FC^oZ 7 οὐτοί F: οὐτῶ codd. cett. Usener 8 ἥδιστα
τὸ Usener: ἥδιστον τὸν B: ἥδιστον. P: ἥδιστον καὶ Q: ἥδιστον
FHCoZ 9 πρὸς ἔλεον B: πρὸς σὲ δίεον HP^oQ: ἔλεον F^oC^oZ

V

FRAGMENTA EPICUREA

A.

SENTENTIAE VATICANAEE

Ἐπικούρου Προσφώνησις

I. = Κύριαι Δόξαι I.

II. = Κύριαι Δόξαι II.

III. = Κύριαι Δόξαι IV.

*IV. Πᾶσα ἀλγηδῶν εὐκαταφρόνητος· ἡ γὰρ σύντονον
ἔχονσα τὸ πονοῦν σύντομον ἔχει τὸν χρόνον, ἡ δὲ χρονί-
ζονσα περὶ τὴν σάρκα ἀβληχρὸν ἔχει τὸν πόνον.

V. = Κύριαι Δόξαι V.

VI. = Κύριαι Δόξαι XXXV.

VII. Ἀδικοῦντα λαθεῖν μὲν δύσκολον, πίστιν δὲ λαβεῖν
ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαθεῖν ἀδύνατον.

VIII = Κύριαι Δόξαι XV.

IX. Κακὸν ἀνάγκη, ἀλλ' οὐδεμία ἀνάγκη ζῆν μετὰ ἀνάγκης.

[X. Metrodorus. Μέμνησο δτι θυητὸς ὁν τῇ φύσει καὶ
λαβῶν χρόνον ὥρισμένον ἀνέβης τοῖς περὶ φύσεως διαλο-
γισμοῖς ἐπὶ τὴν ἀπειρίαν καὶ τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ κατεῖδες
τά τ' ἔόντα τά τ' ἐσσόμενα πρό τ' ἔόντα.]

*XI. Τῶν πλείστων ἀνθρώπων τὸ μὲν ἡσύχαζον ναρκᾶ, τὸ
δὲ κινούμενον λυττᾶ.

XII. = Κύριαι Δόξαι XVII.

XIII. = Κύριαι Δόξαι XXVII.

XIV. Γεγόναμεν ἀπαξ, διὸς δὲ οὐκ ἔστι γενέσθαι· δεῖ δὲ
τὸν αἰῶνα μηκέτ' εἶναι· σὺ δὲ οὐκ ὁν τῆς αὔριον (κύριος)

Sigla : V = Cod. Vaticanus Graecus 1950

IV 1 σύντονον Usener : σύντομον V IX 1 ἀνάγκη] (ζῆν ἐν) ἀνάγκη
Hartel X 1 δτι] Μενέστρατε διοι Clem. Alex. δν τῇ φύσει]
φὺς C. A. 2 λαβῶν] λαχῶν Gomperz χρόνον] βίον C. A. τοῖς

V

FRAGMENTS

A.

VATICAN COLLECTION

‘Epicurus’ Exhortation’

IV. All bodily suffering is negligible: for that which causes acute pain has short duration, and that which endures long in the flesh causes but mild pain.

VII. It is hard for an evil-doer to escape detection, but to obtain security for escaping is impossible.

IX. Necessity is an evil, but there is no necessity to live under the control of necessity.

[X. Remember that you are of mortal nature and have a limited time to live and have devoted yourself to discussions on nature for all time and eternity and have seen ‘things that are now and are to come and have been’.]

XI. For most men rest is stagnation and activity madness.

XIV. We are born once and cannot be born twice, but for all time must be no more. But you, who are not (master) of to-morrow, postpone your happiness: life is

... κατεῖδες] τῇ ψυχῇ ἔως ἐπὶ τὸν αἰώνα καὶ τὴν ἀπειρίαν τῶν πραγμάτων κατεῖδες καὶ C. A. 4 τά τ' ἔόντα om. C. A. XIV 2 κύριος om.

V. supplendum ex Stobaeo

ἀναβάλλῃ τὸ χάρον· δὲ βίος μελλησμῷ παραπόλλυται καὶ εἰς ἔκαστος ήμῶν ἀσχολούμενος ἀποθνήσκει.

*XV. Ἡθη ὁσπερ τὰ ήμῶν αὐτῶν ἴδια τιμῶμεν, ἢν τε χρηστὰ ἔχωμεν καὶ υπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ζηλώμεθα, ἢν τε μῆδοντα χρὴ (τὰ) τῶν πέλας, ἢν ἐπιεικεῖς ὁσιιν.

*XVI. Οὐδεὶς βλέπων τὸ κακὸν αἰρεῖται αὐτό, ἀλλὰ δελεασθεὶς ὡς ἀγαθῷ πρὸς τὸ μεῖζον αὐτοῦ κακὸν ἔθηρεύθη.

*XVII. Οὐ νέος μακαριστὸς ἀλλὰ γέρων βεβιωκὼς καλῶς· δὲ γὰρ νέος (ἐν) ἀκμῇ πολὺς ὑπὸ τῆς τύχης ἐτεροφρούων πλάζεται· δὲ γέρων καθάπερ ἐν λιμένι τῷ γήρᾳ καθώρμικεν τὰ πρότερον δυσελπιστούμενα τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀσφαλεῖ κατακλείστας χάριτι.

*XVIII. Ἀφαιρουμένης προσόψεως καὶ ὄμιλίας καὶ συναναστροφῆς ἔκλύεται τὸ ἔρωτικὸν πάθος.

*XIX. Τοῦ γεγονότος ἀμνήμων ἀγαθοῦ γέρων τήμερον γεγένηται.

XX = Κύριαι Δόξαι XXIX

*XXI. Οὐ βιαστέον τὴν φύσιν ἀλλὰ πειστέον· πεισόμεθα δὲ τὰς (τὰς) ἀναγκαίας ἐπιθυμίας ἐκπληροῦντες τὰς τε φυσικὰς ἀν μὴ βλάπτωσι, τὰς δὲ βλαβερὰς πικρῶς ἐλέγχουτες.

XXII. = Κύριαι Δόξαι XIX.

*XXIII. Πᾶσα φιλία δι' ἑαυτὴν αἱρετή· ἀρχὴν δ' εἴληφεν ἀπὸ τῆς ὥφελείας.

*XXIV. Ἐινύπνια οὐκ ἔλαχε φύσιν θείαν οὐδὲ μαντικὴν δύναμιν, ἀλλὰ γίνεται κατὰ ἔμπτωσιν εἰδώλων.

*XXV. Ἡ πενία μετρουμένη τῷ τῆς φύσεως τέλει μέγας ἐστὶ πλοῦτος· πλοῦτος δὲ μὴ δριζόμενος μεγάλη ἐστὶ πενία.

*XXVI. Δεῖ διαλαβεῖν δτι καὶ δ πολὺς λόγος καὶ δ βραχὺς εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ συντείνει τέλος.

*XXVII. Ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν ἄλλων ἐπιτηδευμάτων μόλις τελειω-

3 τὸ χαίρον] τὸν καιρὸν Stobaeus 4 εἰς] διὰ τοῦτο Stobaeus
 XV 1 τιμῶμεν] τιμώμενα Wotke 2 ζηλώμεθα Wilamowitz : ζηλούμεθα V : ζηλούμενα Weil post ἣν τε μὴ lacunam suspicatus est
 Wotke 3 χρῆ] χρήσις Usener (τὰ) supplevit Weil ἀν ἐπιεικεῖς Usener : ἀνεπιεικῶς V XVI I βλέπων Wotke : βλέπτων
 V 2 ἀγαθῶν V : ἀγαθὸν Usener πρὸς τὸ] προσὸν Usener :
 πρὸς τι Cronert αὐτοῦ] ἣν τοῦ Usener XVII 2 νέος (ἐν) ἀκμῇ
 scripsi : νέος ἀκμῇ V : νέος ἀκμῇ Cronert : ἔντος ἀκμῆς Usener
 πολὺς], πολλὰ Hartel 5 χάριτι] χάρακι Hartel XIX I ἀμνήμων]
 ἀμνημονῶν Wilamowitz ἀγαθοῦ Hartel : ἀγαθὸς V τήμερον]
 αὐθημερὸν coniecit Usener : τὴν φρόνησιν Gomperz XXI I παισό-

wasted in procrastination and each one of us dies without allowing himself leisure.

XV. We value our characters as something peculiar to ourselves, whether they are good and we are esteemed by men, or not; so ought we to value the characters of others, if they are well-disposed to us.

XVI. No one when he sees evil deliberately chooses it, but is enticed by it as being good in comparison with a greater evil and so pursues it.

XVII. It is not the young man who should be thought happy, but an old man who has lived a good life. For the young man at the height of his powers is unstable and is carried this way and that by fortune, like a headlong stream. But the old man has come to anchor in old age as though in port, and the good things for which before he hardly hoped he has brought into safe harbourage in his grateful recollections.

XVIII. Remove sight, association and contact, and the passion of love is at an end.

XIX. Forgetting the good that has been he has become old this very day

XXI. We must not violate nature, but obey her; and we shall obey her if we fulfil the necessary desires and also the physical, if they bring no harm to us, but sternly reject the harmful.

XXIII. All friendship is desirable in itself, though it starts from the need of help

XXIV. Dreams have no divine character nor any prophetic force, but they originate from the influx of images.

XXV. Poverty, when measured by the natural purpose of life, is great wealth, but unlimited wealth is great poverty.

XXVI. You must understand that whether the discourse be long or short it tends to the same end.

XXVII. In all other occupations the fruit comes pain-
μεθα scriptis : πεισομεν V 2 τάς {τ}' Usener: τὰς V XXIII 1 αι-
 βερή Usener : ἀπερή V XXV 2 εστι] ἐπὶ V XXVI 2 συντίνει
 Hartel . συντίνει V

Θεῖσιν δὲ καρπὸς ἔρχεται, ἐπὶ δὲ φιλοσοφίας συντρέχει τῇ γνώσει τὸ τερπνόν· οὐ γάρ μετὰ μάθησιν ἀπόλαυσις, ἀλλὰ ὅμα μάθησις καὶ ἀπόλαυσις.

*XXVIII. Οὕτε τὸν προχείρους εἰς φιλίαν οὕτε τὸν ὄκνη-ροὺς δοκιμαστέον· δεῖ δὲ καὶ παρακινδυνεύσαι χάριν φιλίας.

*XXIX. Παρησίᾳ γάρ ἔγωγε χρώμενος φυσιολογῶν χρη-σμαδεῦν τὰ συμφέροντα πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις μᾶλλον διν βουλούμενην καὶ μηδεὶς μέλλῃ συνήσεων, ἡ συγκατατιθέμενος ταῖς δόξαις καρπούσθαι τὸν πυκνὸν παραπίποντα παρὰ τῶν πολλῶν 5 ἔπαινον.

[XXX. Metrodorus. Ἐτοιμάζονται τινες διὰ βίου τὰ πρὸς τὸν βίον, οὐ συνορῶντες ὡς πᾶσιν ἡμῖν θανάσιμον ἔγκεχυται τὸ τῆς γενέσεως φάρμακον.]

XXXI. Πρὸς μὲν τάλλα δυνατὸν ἀσφάλειαν πορίσασθαι, χάριν δὲ θανάτου πάντες ἀνθρωποι πόλιων ἀτέλχιστον οἰκοῦμεν.

*XXXII. Ὁ τοῦ σοφοῦ σεβασμὸς ἀγαθὸν μέγα τῶν σεβο-μένων ἔστι.

XXXIII. Σαρκὸς φωνὴ τὸ μὴ πεωῆν, τὸ μὴ διψῆν, τὸ μὴ διγοῦν. ταῦτα γὰρ ἔχων τις καὶ ἐλπίζων ἔξειν καὶ (Διὶ) ὑπὲρ εὐδαιμονίας μαχέσαιτο.

*XXXIV. Οὐδὲν οὖτας χρέαν ἔχομεν τῆς χρείας παρὰ τῶν φίλων ὡς τῆς πίστεως τῆς περὶ τῆς χρείας.

*XXXV. Οὐ δέν λυμανεύσθαι τὰ παρόντα τῶν ἀπόντων ἐπιθυμίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἐπιλογίζεσθαι διτὶ καὶ ταῦτα τῶν εὐκτάλων ἦν.

[XXXVI. Ὁ Ἐπικούρου βίος τοῖς τῶν ἀλλων συγκρινόμενος ἔνεκεν ἡμερότητος καὶ αὐταρκείας μῆθος διν νομισθεΐ.]

*XXXVII. Ἀσθενὴς ἡ φύσις ἔστιν πρὸς τὸ κακόν, οὐ πρὸς τὸ ἀγαθόν· ἡδοναῖς μὲν γὰρ σώζεται, ἀλγηδόσι δὲ διαλύεται.

*XXXVIII Μικρὸς παντάπαιν, φῶτος πολλαὶ αἰτίαι εὔλογοι εἰς ἔξαγωγὴν βίου.

*XXXIX. Οὐθὲν ὁ τὴν χρέαν ἐπιζητῶν διὰ παντὸς φίλος οὐθὲν δὲ μηδέποτε συνάπτων· δὲ μὲν γὰρ καπηλεύει τῇ χάριτι

XXVII 3 μάθησιν Wotke: μάθησις V δμα Wotke: μετὰ V XXVIII 2 χάριν χάριν bis V XXIX 1 φυσιολογῶν χρησμαδεῦν Usener: φυσιολογῶ χρησμῶ. Δεῖ V: φυσιολόγῳ χρησμαδεῦν Cönenet XXXII 1 σεβασμὸς Usener: σεβαστὸς V: σεβαστὸς (λόγος) Eignopone ἀγαθὸν μέγα Usener: ἀγαθῶν μετὰ V τῶν σεβομένων] τῷ σεβομένῳ Usener XXXIII 2 καὶ (Διὶ) Hartel: καὶ V XXXVIII 1 μι-κρὸς] οἰκτρὸς Usener

fully after completion, but in philosophy pleasure goes hand in hand with knowledge; for enjoyment does not follow comprehension, but comprehension and enjoyment are simultaneous.

XXVIII. We must not approve either those who are always ready for friendship, or those who hang back, but for friendship's sake we must even run risks.

XXIX. In investigating nature I would prefer to speak openly and like an oracle to give answers serviceable to all mankind, even though no one should understand me, rather than to conform to popular opinions and so win the praise freely scattered by the mob.

[**XXX.** Some men throughout their lives gather together the means of life, for they do not see that the draught swallowed by all of us at birth is a draught of death.]

XXXI. Against all else it is possible to provide security, but as against death all of us mortals alike dwell in an unfortified city.

XXXII. The veneration of the wise man is a great blessing to those who venerate him.

XXXIII. The flesh cries out to be saved from hunger, thirst and cold. For if a man possess this safety and hope to possess it, he might rival even Zeus in happiness.

XXXIV. It is not so much our friends' help that helps us as the confidence of their help.

XXXV. We should not spoil what we have by desiring what we have not, but remember that what we have too was the gift of fortune.

[**XXXVI.** Epicurus' life when compared to other men's in respect of gentleness and self-sufficiency might be thought a mere legend.]

XXXVII. Nature is weak towards evil, not towards good: because it is saved by pleasures, but destroyed by pains.

XXXVIII. He is a little man in all respects who has many good reasons for quitting life.

XXXIX. He is no friend who is continually asking for help, nor he who never associates help with friendship.

τὴν ἀμοιβήν, δὲ ἀποκόπτει τὴν περὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος εὐελ-
πιστίαν.

*XL. 'Ο λέγων πάντα κατ' ἀνάγκην γίνεσθαι οὐδὲν ἐγκαλεῖν
ἔχει τῷ λέγοντι μὴ πάντα κατ' ἀνάγκην γίνεσθαι· αὐτὸς γάρ
τοῦτό φῆσι κατ' ἀνάγκην γίνεσθαι.

*XLI. Γελᾶν ὅμα δὲν καὶ φιλοσοφεῖν καὶ οἰκονομεῖν καὶ
τοὺς λοιποὺς οἰκειώμασι χρῆσθαι καὶ μηδαμῇ λήγειν τὰς ἐκ τῆς
δρθῆς φιλοσοφίας φωνὰς ἀφίεντας.

*XLII. 'Ο αὐτὸς χρόνος καὶ γενέσεως τοῦ μεγίστου ἀγαθοῦ
καὶ ἀπολαύσεως.

*XLIII. Φιλαργυρεῖν ἄδικα μὲν ἀσεβές, δίκαια δὲ αἰσχρόν·
ἀπρεπὲς γάρ ῥυπαρῶς φείδεσθαι καὶ μετὰ τοῦ δικαίου.

*XLIV. 'Ο σοφὸς εἰς τὰ ἀναγκαῖα συγκαθεὶς μᾶλλον ἐπί-
σταται μεταδιδόντας ἢ μεταλαμβάνειν τηλικοῦτον αὐταρκεῖας
εὑρε θηταυρόν.

*XLV Οὐ κόμπου οὐδὲ φωνῆς ἔργαστικοὺς οὐδὲ τὴν περι-
μάχητον παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς παιδείαν ἐνδεικνυμένους φυσιολογία
παρασκευάζει, ἀλλὰ σοβαρὸν καὶ αὐτάρκεις καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἴδοις
ἀγαθοῖς, οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῖς τῶν πραγμάτων μέγα φρονοῦντας.

*XLVI. Τὰς φαύλας συνηθείας ὕσπερ ἀνδρας πονηροὺς
πολὺν χρόνον μέγα βλάψαντας τελείως ἐκδιώκωμεν.

[XLVII. Metrodorus. Προκατείλημμαλ σε, ὡ τύχη, καὶ
πᾶσαν σὴν παρέσδυσσω ἐνέφραξα. καὶ οὔτε σοὶ οὔτε ἀλλῇ
οὐδεμίᾳ περιστάσει δώσομεν ἑαυτοὺς ἐκδότους· ἀλλ' θταν
ἡμᾶς τὸ χρεῶν ἔξαγγ, μέγα προσπτύσαντες τῷ ζῆν καὶ τοῖς
5 αὐτῷ κενώς περιπλαττομένοις ἀπιμεν ἐκ τοῦ ζῆν μετὰ καλοῦ
παιῶνος ἐπιφωνοῦντες ὡς εὐ ἡμῖν βεβίωται.]

*XLVIII. Πειράσθαι τὴν ὑστέραν τῆς προτέρας κρείττω
ποιεῖν, ἐως ἀν ἐν δδῷ ὅμεν ἐπειδὸν δ' ἐπὶ πέρας ἔλθωμεν,
ὅμαλῶς εὐφραίνεσθαι.

XL 3 post γίνεσθαι γέλων ex γελᾶν ad initium sententiae
sequentis addidit Usener XLI 1 γελᾶν om. Usener
μελετᾶν Cronert δὲν Wotke δέον V: δεῖ Leopold
2 λήγειν Usener: λέγειν V 3 δρθῆς Hartel: ὄργης V
XLII 2 ἀπολαύσεως Usener: ἀπολύσεως V XLIII 2 φείδεσθαι
Wotke: φείδε . . . V XLIV 1 συγκαθεῖς Usener: συγκριθεῖς
V: συγκλεισθεῖς Gomperz ἐπίσταται Usener: παρίσταται V
XLV 1 φωνῆς] (κενῆς) φωνῆς Usener 3 σοβαρούς] ἀφόβους Usener:
ἀθορύβους Gomperz. ἀσοβάρους Leopold XLVI 2 μέγα²
βλάψαντας Hartel: μεταβλάψαντας V: μεγάλα βλάψαντας Usener
XLVII 2 σὴν] (τὴν) σὴν coniecit Usener 5 περιπλαττομέ-
νοις] περιπλεκομένοις Usener 6 παιῶνος Usener: πλεόνος V

For the former barters kindly feeling for a practical return and the latter destroys the hope of good in the future.

XL. The man who says that all things come to pass by necessity cannot criticize one who denies that all things come to pass by necessity : for he admits that this too happens of necessity.

XLI. We must laugh and philosophize at the same time and do our household duties and employ our other faculties, and never cease proclaiming the sayings of the true philosophy.

XLII. The greatest blessing is created and enjoyed at the same moment.

XLIII. The love of money, if unjustly gained, is impious, and, if justly, shameful ; for it is unseemly to be merely parsimonious even with justice on one's side.

XLIV. The wise man when he has accommodated himself to straits knows better how to give than to receive : so great is the treasure of self-sufficiency which he has discovered.

XLV. The study of nature does not make men productive of boasting or bragging nor apt to display that culture which is the object of rivalry with the many, but high-spirited and self-sufficient, taking pride in the good things of their own minds and not of their circumstances.

XLVI. Our bad habits, like evil men who have long done us great harm, let us utterly drive from us.

XLVII. I have anticipated thee, Fortune, and entrenched myself against all thy secret attacks. And we will not give ourselves up as captives to thee or to any other circumstance ; but when it is time for us to go, spitting contempt on life and on those who here vainly cling to it, we will leave life crying aloud in a glorious triumph-song that we have lived well.

XLVIII. We must try to make the end of the journey better than the beginning, as long as we are journeying , but when we come to the end, we must be happy and content.

XLVIII Ι ὑστέραν . . . προτέρας] ὑστεραλαν . . . προτεραιας Usener
2 ἐν δδῷ Wotke : ἐν δ δδῷ V : ἐν προδδῷ Bignone : ἐν εὐδδῷ Cröner

XLIX. = Κύριαι Δόξαι XII.

L. = Κύριαι Δόξαι VIII.

*LI. Πυνθάνομαλ σου τὴν κατὰ σάρκα κίνησιν ἀφθονώτερον διακεῖσθαι πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἀφροδισίων ἔντευξιν. σὺ δὲ δταν μήτε τοὺς νόμους καταλύῃς μήτε τὰ καλῶς ἔθη κείμενα κινῆς μήτε τῶν πλησίουν τινὰ λυπῆς μήτε τὴν σάρκα καταξάνῃς μήτε τὰ ἀναγκαῖα καταναλίσκῃς, χρῶ ὡς βούλει τῇ σεαυτοῦ προαιρέσει. ἀμήχανον μέντοι γε τὸ μὴ οὐχ ἐνὶ γέ τινι τούτων συνέχεσθαι ἀφροδίσια γὰρ οὐδέποτε ἀνησκεν· ἀγαπητὸν δὲ εἰ μὴ ἔβλαψεν.

*LII. Ἡ φιλία περιχορεύει τὴν οἰκουμένην κηρύζοντα δὴ πᾶσιν ἡμῖν ἐγείρεσθαι ἐπὶ τὸν μακαρισμόν.

*LIII. Οὐδενὶ φθονητέον· ἀγαθοὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἄξιοι φθόνου, πονηροὶ δὲ δσφ ἀν μᾶλλον εὔτυχῶσι, τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον αὐτοῖς λυμαίνονται.

LIV. Οὐ προσποιεῖσθαι δεῖ φιλοσοφεῖν, ἀλλ' ὅντως φιλοσοφεῖν· οὐ γὰρ προσδεόμεθα τοῦ δοκεῖν ὑγιαίνειν, ἀλλὰ τοῦ κατ' ἀλήθειαν ὑγιαίνειν.

*LV. Θεραπευτέον τὰς συμφορὰς τῇ τῶν ἀπολλυμένων χάριτι καὶ τῷ γωώσκειν δτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀπρακτον ποιῆσαι τὸ γεγονός.

*LVI-LVII Ἀλγεῖ μὲν ὁ σοφὸς οὐ μᾶλλον στρεβλούμενος (αὐτὸς ἡ δρῶν στρεβλούμενον) τὸν φίλον . . . δὲ βίος αὐτοῦ πᾶς δι' ἀπιστίαν συγχυθῆσται καὶ ἀνακεχαιτισμένος ἔσται.

*LVIII. Ἐκλυτέον ἑαυτὸν ἐκ τοῦ περὶ τὰ ἐγκύκλια καὶ πολιτικὰ δεσμωτηρίου.

*LIX. Ἀπληστον οὐ γαστῆρ, ὥσπερ οἱ πολλοὶ φασι, ἀλλὰ δόξα ψευδῆς ὑπὲρ τοῦ γαστρὸς ἀορίστου πληρώματος.

LX. Πᾶς ὥσπερ ἄρτι γεγονὼς ἐκ τοῦ ζῆν ἀπέρχεται.

*LXI. Καλλίστη καὶ ἡ τῶν πλησίου δψις, τῆς πρώτης συγγενείας ὄμονοούσης, ἡ πολλὴν εἰς τοῦτο ποιουμένη σπουδήν.

LI 1 ἀφθονώτερον Usener· ἀφθονο^{τύ}V 2 ἀφροδισίων Usener· ἀφροδίσιον V ὅταν Usener: ὅτε V 3 καταλύῃς Wotke: καταλύεις V ἔθη Hartel ἔθει V 4 πλησίον Wotke: πλησίων V 5 καταναλίσκης Wotke: καταναλίσκεις V². καταγγιγνώσκεις VI 6 τὸ Usener: τὸ V LII 1 ἡ φίλια] ἡ φιλοσοφία Hartel: 'Ηλίου σφαίρα coniecit Usener 2 μακαρισμόν] μακάριον βίον Weil LIII 2 εὔτυχῶσι Wotke. ἐντυχῶσι V αὐτοῖς Wotke: αὐτοῖς V LV 3 γεγονός Usener: γένος V LVI-LVII ut unam sententiā lacunosa habet V: separavit Wotke I στρεβλούμενος τὸν φίλον] αὐτὸς ἡ δρῶν στρεβλούμενον supplevit Usener: στρεβλουμένου

L I. You tell me that the stimulus of the flesh makes you too prone to the pleasures of love. Provided that you do not break the laws or good customs and do not distress any of your neighbours or do harm to your body or squander your pittance, you may indulge your inclination as you please. Yet it is impossible not to come up against one or other of these barriers: for the pleasures of love never profited a man and he is lucky if they do him no harm.

L II. Friendship goes dancing round the world proclaiming to us all to awake to the praises of a happy life.

L III. We must envy no one: for the good do not deserve envy and the bad, the more they prosper, the more they injure themselves.

L IV. We must not pretend to study philosophy, but study it in reality: for it is not the appearance of health that we need, but real health.

L V. We must heal our misfortunes by the grateful recollection of what has been and by the recognition that it is impossible to make undone what has been done.

L VI-LVII. The wise man is not more pained when being tortured (himself, than when seeing) his friend (tortured): (but if his friend does him wrong), his whole life will be confounded by distrust and completely upset.

L VIII. We must release ourselves from the prison of affairs and politics.

L IX. It is not the stomach that is insatiable, as is generally said, but the false opinion that the stomach needs an unlimited amount to fill it.

L X. Every man passes out of life as though he had just been born.

L XI. Most beautiful too is the sight of those near and dear to us, when our original kinship makes us of one mind; for such sight is a great incitement to this end.

τὸν φίλον (ex cod. pal. gr. Heid. 129) (*καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ τεθνήξεται εἰ γὰρ πρόστεται*) *τὸν φίλον* Bignone: post *τὸν φίλον* fortasse suppleendum εἰ δὲ ἀδικήσει αὐτὸν ὁ φίλος L VIII 2 δεσμωτηρίου Usener: δεσμωτήρια V L IX 2 (τῆς γαστρὸς supplevit Usener LXI 1 πλησίον Wotke: πλησίων V δψις] σύναψις coniecit Usener 2 ή scripsi: ή εἰς vel εἰ V: ή Weil καὶ Hartel: κεῖς (δεῖ) Bignone ποιουμένη] ποιουμένης Usener

*LXII. Εἰ γὰρ κατὰ τὸ δέον δργαὶ γίγνονται τοῖς γεννήσασι πρὸς τὰ ἔκγονα, μάταιοι δήπουθέν ἐστι τὸ ἀντιτείνειν καὶ μὴ παραιτεῖσθαι συγγνώμης τυχεῖν· εἰ δὲ μὴ κατὰ τὸ δέον ἀλλὰ ἀλογώτερον, γελοῖον πάνυ τὸ προσεκκαίεν τὴν ἀλογίαν θυμό-
5 κατοχοῦντα, καὶ μὴ ζῆτεῖν μεταθεῖναι κατ' ἄλλους τρόπους εὐγνωμονοῦντα.

*LXIII. Ἐστι καὶ ἐν λιτότητι μεθόριος, ἡς δ ἀνεπιλόγιστος παραπλήσιόν τι πάσχει τῷ δὶ’ ἀοριστίαν ἐκπίπτοντι.

*LXIV. Ἀκολουθεῖν δεῖ τὸν παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἔπαινον αὐτόματον, ἡμᾶς δὲ γενέσθαι περὶ τὴν ἡμῶν λατρείαν.

*LXV. Μάταιόν ἐστι παρὰ θεῶν αἰτεῖσθαι ἢ τις ἑαυτῷ χορη-
γῆσαι ἵκανός ἐστι.

*LXVI. Συμπαθῶμεν τοῖς φίλοις οὐ θρηνοῦντες ἀλλὰ φροντίζοντες.

*LXVII. Ἐλεύθερος βίος οὐ δύναται κτήσασθαι χρήματα πολλὰ διὰ τὸ πρᾶγμα (μὴ) ῥάδιον εἶναι χωρὶς θητείας σχλων ἡ δυναστῶν, ἀλλὰ (σὺν) συνεχεῖ δαψιλεἴα πάντα κέκτηται· ἀν δέ που καὶ τύχη χρημάτων πολλῶν, καὶ ταῦτα ῥάδίως ἀν εἰς 5 τὴν τοῦ πλησίον εὔνοιαν διαμετρήσαι.

*LXVIII. Οὐδὲν ἵκανὸν φίδλιγον τὸ ἵκανόν.

*LXIX. Τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀχάριστον λίχνον ἐποίησε τὸ ζῷον εἰς ἄπειρον τῶν ἐν διατή ποικιλμάτων.

LXX. Μηδέν σοι ἐν βίῳ πραχθείη δ φόβον παρέξει σοι, εἰ γνωσθήσεται τῷ πλησίον.

*LXXI. Πρὸς πάσας τὰς ἐπιθυμίας προσακτέον τὸ ἐπερώτημα τοῦτο· τέ μοι γενήσεται ἀν τελεσθῆ τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ἐπιζητούμενον, καὶ τέ ἐαν μὴ τελεσθῆ;

LXXII. = Κύριαι Δόξαι XIII

*LXXIII. Καὶ τὸ γεγενήσθαί τινας ἀλγηδόνας περὶ σῶμα λυσιτελεῖ πρὸς φυλακὴν τῶν δύμειδῶν.

*LXXIV. Ἐν φιλολόγῳ συζητήσει πλεῖον ἡνυστεν δ ἡττηθείς, καθ’ δ προσέμαθεν.

LXII 2 ἔκγονα Wołke : γίγνοντα V 4 πάνι Weil : πάνι V : πάντως Muehll : σιγῶν Usener προσεκκαίειν Weil : πρὸς ἔκκλησιν V : πρὸς ἔκκλησιν Usener : πρὸς ἔκκανον Gomperz post ἀλογίαν Usener ἄγον inseruit θυμοκατοχοῦντα Cröner : θυμωκατοχοῦντα V : θυμῷ κατασχόντα Usener : θυμῷ κατέχοντα Weil 6 εὐγνωμονοῦντα Cröner : εὐγνωμονοῦντας V LXIII 1 λιτότητι μεθόριος Usener : λεπτότητι καθάριος V : λεπτότητι καθαρότης Muehll. LXVII 1 ἐλεύθερος] ἐλευθέριος coniecit Usener κτήσασθαι χρήματα Hartel : χρήσα-

LXII. Now if parents are justly angry with their children, it is certainly useless to fight against it and not to ask for pardon; but if their anger is unjust and irrational, it is quite ridiculous to add fuel to their irrational passion by nursing one's own indignation, and not to attempt to turn aside their wrath in other ways by gentleness.

LXIII. Frugality too has a limit, and the man who disregards it is in like case with him who errs through excess.

LXIV. Praise from others must come unasked: we must concern ourselves with the healing of our own lives.

LXV. It is vain to ask of the gods what a man is capable of supplying for himself.

LXVI. Let us show our feeling for our lost friends not by lamentation but by meditation.

LXVII. A free life cannot acquire many possessions, because this is not easy to do without servility to mobs or monarchs, yet it possesses all things in unfailing abundance; and if by chance it obtains many possessions, it is easy to distribute them so as to win the gratitude of neighbours.

LXVIII. Nothing is sufficient for him to whom what is sufficient seems little.

LXIX. The ungrateful greed of the soul makes the creature everlasting desire varieties of dainty food.

LXX. Let nothing be done in your life, which will cause you fear if it becomes known to your neighbour.

LXXI. Every desire must be confronted with this question: what will happen to me, if the object of my desire is accomplished and what if it is not?

LXXIII. The occurrence of certain bodily pains assists us in guarding against others like them.

LXXIV. In a philosophical discussion he who is worsted gains more in proportion as he learns more.

σθαι κτήματα V 2 (*μὴ*) supplevit Usener *θητείας* Hartel: *θηλεῖας*
V 3 (*σὺν*) supplevit Usener. (*έν*) Hartel *πάντα* πάντα τὰ
συμφέροντα coniecit Bignone 5 *διαμετρήσας* Wotke: *διαμετρήσας*
V LXVIII 1 *τὸν* *οὐχ?* LXIX 1 *λίχνων* V¹: *λέχνων* V¹
LXX 1 βίφ] (*τῷ*) *βίφ* coniecit Usener LXXIII 1 *γεγενῆσθαι*
Wotke: γενεσθαι (sic) V

*LXXV. Εἰς τὰ παρφκηχότα ἀγαθὰ ἀχάριστος φωνῇ η λέγουσα “Τέλος δρα μακροῦ βίου”.

*LXXVI. Τοιοῦτος εἴ γηράσκων δποῖν ἔγω παραιώ, καὶ διέγνωκας δποῖν ἐστι τὸ ἑαυτῷ φιλοσοφῆσαι καὶ οἶον τὸ τῇ Ἑλλάδι συγχαίρω σοι.

*LXXVII. Τῆς αὐταρκείας καρπὸς μέγιστος ἐλευθερία.

*LXXVIII. Ό γενναῖος περὶ σοφίαν καὶ φιλίαν μάλιστα γίγνεται ὡν τὸ μέν ἐστι θιητὸν ἀγαθόν, τὸ δ' ἀθάνατον.

*LXXIX. Ό ἀτάραχος ἑαυτῷ καὶ ἐτέρῳ δόχλητος.

*LXXX. *Εστιν πρώτη σωτηρίας μοῖρα τῆς ἡλικίας τήρησις καὶ φυλακὴ τῶν πάντα μολυνόντων κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τὰς οἰστρώδεις.

*LXXXI. Οὐ λύει τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ταραχὴν οὐδὲ τὴν ἀξιόλογον ἀπογεννᾷ χαρὰν οὔτε πλοῦτος ὑπάρχων ὁ μέγιστος οὐδ' ἡ παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς τιμὴ καὶ περίβλεψις οὔτ' ἄλλο τι τῶν παρὰ τὰς ἀδιορίστους αἰτίας.

LXXVI 1 τοιοῦτος] (δτι) τοιοῦτος Usener παραιώ Wotke .
 περαιώ V 2 διέγνωκας Usener : δὴ ἔγνωκας V τὸ post oīον Hartel :
 τῷ V LXXVIII 2 θιητὸν Hartel : θιητὸν V LXXX 1 ἐστι
 πρώτη Hartel : γενναῖφ Muehll : P(vel Γ)...ω V LXXXI 1 οὐδὲ
 τὴν] οὐδὲ τιν' Usener 4 ἀδιορίστους Usener : ἀξυρὶ στρους V

LXXV. Ungrateful towards the blessings of the past
is the saying, 'Wait till the end of a long life'.

LXXVI. You are in your old age just such as I urge
you to be, and you have seen the difference between
studying philosophy for oneself and proclaiming it to
Greece at large : I rejoice with you.

LXXVII. The greatest fruit of self-sufficiency is
freedom.

LXXVIII. The noble soul occupies itself with wisdom
and friendship : of these the one is a mortal good, the other
immortal.

LXXIX. The man who is serene causes no disturbance
to himself or to another.

LXXX. The first measure of security is to watch over
one's youth and to guard against what makes havoc of all
by means of pestering desires.

LXXXI. The disturbance of the soul cannot be ended
nor true joy created either by the possession of the greatest
wealth or by honour and respect in the eyes of the mob
or by anything else that is associated with causes of
unlimited desire.

B.

CERTORUM LIBRORUM RELIQUIAE.

I. Περὶ Αἰρέσεων καὶ Φυγῶν.

1. Ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἀταραξία καὶ ἀπονία καταστηματικαὶ εἰσιν· ἡδοναὶ· ἡ δὲ χαρὰ καὶ ἡ εὐφροσύνη κατὰ κίνησιν ἐνεργεῖαι βλέπονται.

II. Διαπορίαι.

2. Πράξει τινὰ δὲ σοφὸς ὁν οἱ νόμοι ἀπαγορεύουσιν, εἰδὼς δτι λήσει; οὐκ εὔδον τὸ ἀπλοῦν ἔστι κατηγόρημα.

III. Μικρὰ Ἐπιτομή.

3. Μαντικὴ οὖσα ἀνύπαρκτος, εἰ καὶ ὑπαρκτή, οὐδὲν παρ' ἡμᾶς ἡγητέα τὰ γινόμενα.

IV. Πρὸς Θεόφραστον.

4. Ἀλλὰ καὶ χωρὶς τούτου τοῦ μέρους οὐκ οἶδα δπως δεῖ τὰ ἐν σκότει ταῦτα δῆται χράματα ἔχειν.

V. Συμπόσιων.

5. Polyaenus. Οὗ φησιν εἶναι, ὃ Ἐπίκουρε, τὰς ὑπὸ τοῦ οἴνου διαθερμαστὰς; (ὑπέλαβέ τις) οὐ τὸ καθόλου θερμαντικὸν ἀποφανεῖσθαι τὸν οἴνον εἶναι. (καὶ μετὰ σμικρόν·) φαίνεται μὲν γὰρ τὸ καθόλου οὐκ εἶναι θερμαντικὸς δὲ οἴνος. τοῦδε δέ τινος δὲ τοσοῦτος εἶναι θερμαντικὸς ἀν δῆθείη.

6. Διὸ δὴ καθόλου μὲν οὐ δῆτέον τὸν οἴνον εἶναι θερμαντικόν, τῆς δὲ τοιαύτης φύσεως καὶ τῆς οὕτω διακειμένης θερμαντικὸν τὸν τοσοῦτον, ἡ τῆσδε τὸν τοσοῦτον εἶναι ψυκτικόν. ἔνεισι

1 Diog. Laert. x, § 136 1 post καὶ Usener ἡ inseruit 2 ἐνεργείᾳ]
 ἀναργείᾳ H. Ritter 2 Plut. adv. Col. 34, p. 1127 a 3 Diog.
 Laert. x, § 135 1 παρ' ἡμᾶς] πρὸς ἡμᾶς Meibom: παρὰ τὸ παρ' ἡμᾶς
 Bignone 4 Plut. adv. Col. 7, p. 1110 c 5 Plut. adv. Col. 6,

B.

REMAINS ASSIGNED TO CERTAIN BOOKS.

I. *Concerning Choice and Avoidance.*

1. Freedom from trouble in the mind and from pain in the body are static pleasures, but joy and exultation are considered as active pleasures involving motion.

II. *Problems.*

2. Will the wise man do things that the laws forbid, knowing that he will not be found out? A simple answer is not easy to find.

III. *The Shorter Summary.*

3. Prophecy does not exist, and even if it did exist, things that come to pass must be counted nothing to us.

IV. *Against Theophrastus.*

4. But even apart from this argument I do not know how one should say that things in the dark have colour.

V. *Symposium.*

5. Polyaenus: Do you, Epicurus, deny the existence of the warmth produced by wine? (Some one interrupted :) It does not appear that wine is unconditionally productive of heat.

(And a little later :) It seems that wine is not unconditionally productive of heat, but wine of a certain quantity might be said to produce heat in a certain body.

6. Therefore we must not speak of wine as unconditionally productive of heat, but rather say that a certain quantity of wine will produce heat in a certain body which is in a certain disposition, or that a different quantity

γὰρ τοιαῦται ἐν τῷ ἀθροίσματι φύσεις· ἐξ ὧν ἀν ψυχρὸν
5 συσταήν, εἰ, δέον γε, ἔτέραις παραζυγεῖσαι ψυχρασταὶ φύσιν
ἀποτελέσειαν· διθεν ἐξαπατώμενοι οἱ μὲν ψυκτικὸν τὸ καθόλου
φασὶν ἔναι τὸν οἶνον, οἱ δὲ θερμαντικόν.

7. Πολλάκις οὐδ' ἥλθεν εἰς τὸ σῶμα θερμαντικὴν ἐπιφέρων
ἢ ψυκτικὴν δύναμιν ὁ οἶνος, ἀλλὰ κινηθέντος τοῦ δύκου καὶ
γενομένης τῶν σωμάτων μεταστάσεως αἱ ποιοῦσαι τὸ θερμὸν
ἄτομοι νῦν μὲν συνῆλθον εἰς ταῦτα καὶ παρέσχον ὑπὸ πλήθους
5 θερμότητα καὶ πύρωσιν τῷ σώματι, νῦν δ' ἐκπεσοῦσαι
κατέψυξαν.

8. Συνουσίη ὡνησε μὲν οὐδέποτε, ἀγαπητὸν δ' εἰ μὴ
ἔβλαψε.

9. Θαυμαστὸν δή, εἰ σὺ μὲν οὐδὲν ἐξείργουν διὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν,
ὅς αὐτὸς ἀν φήσαις, τῶν κατὰ σεαυτὸν ἀπάντων νέος ἀν
πρεσβυτῶν ἀνδρῶν καὶ ἐνδόξων πολὺ ἐν τῇ ῥήτορικῇ δυνάμει
ὑπερέχειν . . . θαυμαστὸν δή φημι, εἰ σὺ μὲν οὐδὲν ἐξείργουν
διὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν ἐν τῇ ῥήτορικῇ δυνάμει προέχειν, δὲ δοκεῖ
τριβῆς εἶναι καὶ συνηθείας πολλῆς, τοῦ δὲ θεωρῆσαι τὰ πράγ-
ματα, ὡς ἔχει, διὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν ἐστιν ἐξείργεσθαι, οὐ μᾶλλον
ἀν δόξαι ἐπιστήμη αἰτία εἶναι ἡπερ τριβὴ καὶ συνήθεια.

VI. Περὶ Τέλους.

10. Οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε ἔχω τί νοήσω τάγαθόν, ἀφαιρῶν μὲν τὰς
διὰ χυλῶν ἡδονάς, ἀφαιρῶν δὲ τὰς δι' ἀφροδισίων, ἀφαιρῶν δὲ
τὰς δι' ἀκροαμάτων, ἀφαιρῶν δὲ καὶ τὰς διὰ μορφῆς κατ' ὅψιν
ἡδείας κινήσεις.

11. Τὸ γὰρ εὐσταθὲς σαρκὸς κατάστημα καὶ τὸ περὶ ταύτης
πιστὸν ἔλπισμα τὴν ἀκροτάτην χαρὰν καὶ βεβαιωτάτην ἔχει
τοῖς ἐπιλογίζεσθαι δυναμένοις.

12. Τιμητέον τὸ καλὸν καὶ τὰς ἀρετὰς καὶ τὰ τοιουτότροπα,
ἐὰν ἡδονὴν παρασκευάζῃ· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ παρασκευάζῃ, χαίρειν
ἔστεον.

5 εἰ, δέον γε,] sic interpusxi: εἰς δέον τε Wytttenbach: εἰ (εἰς) δέον
γε Bignone: ἢ αἴ γε Usener 7 Plut. adū. Col. 6, p. 1110 a
6 Diog. Laert. x, § 118 q.v. 9 Philodem. περὶ ῥήτορ. ὑπὸμ. ii, col. x
(Sudhaus Voll. Rhet. i. 102) 1 δὴ om. pap. 2 ὡς Sudhaus: τε
pap.: δτε Gomperz 7 οὐ Sudhaus: οὐ pap. 10 Athen. xii
546 e (cf. Diog. Laert. x, § 6) 1 ἔχω τί νοήσω Diog. Laert.: δύναμαι
νοῆσαι Athen. 3 κατ' ὅψιν ἡδείας κινήσεις om. Diog. Laert.
II Plut. contr. Ep. beat. 4, p. 1089 d 12 Athen. xii. 546 f

will produce cold in a different body. For in the compound body of wine there are certain particles out of which cold might be produced, if, as need arises, united with different particles they could form a structure which would cause cold. So that those are deceived who say that wine is unconditionally heating or cooling.

7. Wine often enters the body without exerting any power either of heating or of cooling, but when the structure is disturbed and an atomic re-arrangement takes place, the atoms which create heat at one time come together and by their number give heat and inflammation to the body, at another they retire and so cool it.

8. Sexual intercourse has never done a man good, and he is lucky if it has not harmed him.

9. It is strange indeed that you were not at all impeded by your youth, as you would say yourself, from attaining, young as you were, a distinction in the art of rhetoric far above all your contemporaries, even the experienced and famous. It is strange indeed, I say, that you were not at all impeded by your youth from winning distinction in the art of rhetoric, which seems to require much practice and habituation, whereas youth can be an impediment to the understanding of the true nature of the world, towards which knowledge might seem to contribute more than practice and habituation.

VI. *On the end of Life.*

10. I know not how I can conceive the good, if I withdraw the pleasures of taste, and withdraw the pleasures of love, and withdraw the pleasures of hearing, and withdraw the pleasurable emotions caused to sight by beautiful form.

11. The stable condition of well-being in the body and the sure hope of its continuance holds the fullest and surest joy for those who can rightly calculate it.

12. Beauty and virtue and the like are to be honoured, if they give pleasure; but if they do not give pleasure, we must bid them farewell.

VII. Περὶ Φύσεως.

Lib. I.

13. Ἡ τῶν δλων φύσις σώματά ἔστι καὶ κενόν.

14. Ἡ τῶν δυτων φύσις σώματά ἔστι καὶ τόπος.

Lib. XI.

15. Εἰ γὰρ τὸ μέγεθος διὰ τὸ διάστημα ἀπεβεβλήκει, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἀν τὴν χρόνον ἄλλο γὰρ τούτῳ συμμετρότερον διάστημα οὐθέν εἶται.

INCERTORUM LIBRORUM FRAGMENTA.

16. Ἀτομόν εἶται σῶμα στερεὸν ἀμέτοχον κενοῦ παρεμπλοκῆς· κενόν εἶται φύσις ἀναφής.

17. Ἄλλ' ἵτωσαν· εἶχε γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ὡδίνων τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ στόματος καύχησιν τὴν σοφιστικήν, καθάπερ καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοὶ τῶν ἀνδραπόδων.

C.

EPISTOLARUM FRAGMENTA.

18. Ὁ [ἐ]ὰν δ[ιανοῶν]ται, περὶ[γ]νουντ[αι] τῶ[ν] κατὰ τὴν [ἔ]γδειαν καὶ[ἱ] πε[ντά]χαν κακῶν.

19. Καν πόλ[ε]μος ή], δεινὸν οὐκ ἀ[ν] θέσθαι θεῶν εἴλε[ων δν]των. καθαρὰν τ[ὴν ζώην] διηχέναι καὶ διά]ξειν σὺν αὐτ[ῷ] Μάτρωνι θε[ῶν εἴ]λεων δυτων.

20. Λέγε δή μοι, Πολύαν', οἰσθ' ἀπερ ἡμῖν μεγάλη χαρὰ γεγένηται;

EPISTULAE AD PLURES DATAE.

Πρὸς τοὺς ἐν Μυτιλήνῃ φιλοσόφους.

21. Ταῦτα ἥγαγεν αὐτὸν εἰς ἔκστασιν τοιαύτην, ὥστε μοι λοιδορεῖσθαι καὶ ἀποκαλεῖν διδάσκαλον.

13 Sext. Emp. *adv. Dogm* iii. 333 14 Plut. *adv. Col.* II, p. 1112e15 Schol. ad *Eph. ad Pyth.* (Diog. Laert. x, § 91). Ι ἀπεβεβλήκει edd.: ἀποβεβλήκει libri 2 ἀλλο (ἄλλω Β)) ἀλλ οὐ Usener 16 Schol. ad *Dionys. Thr.* p. 660, 25 Bekk. 17 Diog. Laert. x, § 7. Ι ἀλλ' ἵτωσαν Usener: ἀλλ' εἴτως ἀλλ' BP¹Q: alii libri alia: ἀλλ' εἴ τις ἄλλος Stephanus εἶχε γὰρ ἐκεῖνος Usener: εἶχε γὰρ κείνον libri: εἶχε κάκαινος Stephanus 18 Philodem. *de Divitiae*, VH² iii. 85: restituit Gomperz 2 κακῶν Gomperz: καὶ δε. ν apogr. 19 Philodem. περὶ εὐσ. VH² ii. 107: restituit Gomperz Ι ἀν θέσθαι Usener:

VII. *On Nature.*

Book I.

13. The nature of the universe consists of bodies and void.

14. The nature of all existing things is bodies and space.

Book XI

15. For if it (*sc.* the sun) had lost its size through the distance, much more would it have lost its colour: for there is no other distance better adapted for such loss than that of the sun.

FROM UNCERTAIN WORKS.

16. The atom is a hard body free from any admixture of void; the void is intangible existence.

17. Away with them all: for he (Nausiphanes), like many another slave, was in travail with that wordy braggart, sophist.

C.

REMAINS OF LETTERS.

18. If they have this in mind, they are victorious over the evils of want and poverty

19. Even if war comes, he would not count it terrible, if the gods are propitious. He has led and will lead a pure life in Matro's company, by favour of the gods.

20. Tell me, Polyaenus, do you know what has been a great joy to us?

LETTERS TO SEVERAL PERSONS.

To the philosophers in Mytilene.

21. This drove him to such a state of fury that he abused me and ironically called me master.

ἀθεσθαι apogr. : ἔσεσθαι Gomperz 20 *Theo Progymn.* 2, t 1,
p. 169 Walz. *οὐσθ' ἀπερ ἡμῖν* Cronert: *συναπέριμεν* libri. *ἔστιν ἀ*
πρὶν μὲν Usener 2 *γεγένηται* Cronert: *γένηται* libri 21 Diog.
Laert. x, § 8 2 *διδάσκαλον]* δύσκολον proposuit Usener: *(μου*
ἐναρόν) adiecit Kochalsky

22. Οἶμαι δ' ἔγωγε τοὺς βαρυστόνους καὶ μαθητήν με δόξει
τοῦ πλεύμονος εἴναι, μετὰ μειρακίων τιῶν κραιπαλώντων
ἀκούσαντα.

Καὶ γὰρ ποιηρὸς ἄνθρωπος ἦν καὶ ἐπιτετηδευκῶς τοιαῦτα ἔξ
5 ὅν οὐ δυνατὸν εἰς σοφίαν ἐλθεῖν.

EPISTULAE AD SINGULOS DATAE.

Πρὸς Ἀνάξαρχον.

23. Ἐγὼ δ' ἐφ' ἡδονὰς συνεχεῖς παρακαλῶ καὶ οὐκ ἐπ'
ἀρετὰς κενὰς καὶ ματαλὰς καὶ ταραχώδεις ἔχουσας τῶν καρπῶν
τὰς ἐλπίδας.

Πρὸς Ἀπελλήν.

24. Μακαρίζω σε, ὁ Ἀπελλῆ, ὅτι καθαρὸς πάσης αἰκίας ἐπὶ
φιλοσοφίαν ὥρμησας.

Πρὸς Θεμίσταν.

25. Οἶστι τέ εἰμι, ἐὰν μὴ ὑμεῖς πρός με ἀφίκησθε, αὐ-
τὸς τρικύλιστος, δπου δὲν ὑμεῖς καὶ Θέμιστα παρακαλήτε,
ἀθεῖσθαι.

Πρὸς Ἰδομενέα.

26. Πέμπε οὖν ἀπαρχὰς ἡμῶν εἰς τὴν τοῦ ἱεροῦ σώματος
θεραπείαν ὑπέρ τε αὐτοῦ καὶ τέκνων· οὕτω γάρ μοι λέγειν
ἐπέρχεται.

27. *Ω πάντα τὰμὰ κινήματα τερπνὰ νομίσας ἐκ νέου.

28. Εἰ βούλει πλούσιον Πυθοκλέα ποιῆσαι, μὴ χρημάτων
προστίθει, τῆς δὲ ἐπιθυμίας ἀφαίρει.

29. Ἐξηλώσαμεν τὴν αὐτάρκειαν οὐχ δπως τοῖς εὐτελέσι
καὶ λιτοῖς πάντως χρώμεθα, ἀλλ' δπως θαρρῷμεν πρὸς αὐτά.

30. Τὴν μακαρίαν ἄγοντες καὶ ἄμα τελευτῶντες ἡμέραν τοῦ
βίου ἐγράφομεν ὑμῖν ταυτί· στραγγούρικά τε παρηκολούθει
καὶ δυσεντερικά πάθη ὑπερβολὴν οὐκ ἀπολείποντα τοῦ ἐν

22 Sext. Emp. *adv. Math.* 1. 3 4 ἄνθρωπος Usener: ἄνθρωπος
edd. 23 Plut. *adv. Col.* 17, p. 1117 a 24 Athen. xii, p. 588 a
(cf. Plut. *contr. Ep. beat.* 12, p. 1094 d) 1 δ' Ἀπελλῆ ex Plut. sup-
plevit Usener 2 οὗτος libri αἰκίας Bignone: αἰτίας libri: παιδεῖας
Wachsmuth 25 Diog. Laert. x, § 5 2 δποι Cobet

22. I suppose that those grumbler will believe me to be a disciple of The Mollusc and to have listened to his teaching in company with a few bibulous youths. For indeed the fellow was a bad man and his habits such as could never lead to wisdom.

LETTERS TO INDIVIDUALS.

To Anaxarchus.

23. But I summon you to continuous pleasures and not to vain and empty virtues which have but disturbing hopes of results.

To Apelles.

24. I congratulate you, Apelles, in that you have approached philosophy free from all contamination.

To Themista.

25. If you two don't come to me, I am capable of arriving with a hop, skip, and jump, wherever you and Themista summon me.

To Idomeneus.

26. Send us therefore offerings for the sustenance of our holy body on behalf of yourself and your children. this is how it occurs to me to put it.

27. O thou who hast from thy youth regarded all my promptings as sweet.

28. If you wish to make Pythocles rich, do not give him more money, but diminish his desire.

29. We think highly of frugality not that we may always keep to a cheap and simple diet, but that we may be free from desire regarding it.

30 On this truly happy day of my life, as I am at the point of death, I write this to you. The disease in my bladder and stomach are pursuing their course, lacking nothing of their natural severity: but against all this is the

26 Plut. *adv Col.* 18, p. 1117 d 27 Theo *Progymn.* 2, t. 1,
p. 169 Walz. 28 Stobaeus *Floril.* xvii. 24 1 χρημάτων VAB¹
χρήματα B²: χρήμασι Meineke 29 Stob. *Floril.* xvii. 14
2 πάντως B: πάντων AV 30 Diog. Laert. x, § 22 1 τελευτώντες
τελευταίαν Davis ex Cic. *de Fin.* ii. 30. 96 2 παρηκολούθει
Stephanus: παρηκολουθήκει libri

έκαυτοῖς μεγέθους· ἀντιπαρετάττετο δὲ πᾶσι ~~χούτοις~~ τὸ κατὰ
5 ψυχὴν χαῖρον ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν γεγονότων ἡμῖν διαλογισμῶν μῆμη.
τὸν δὲ ἀξίως τῆς ἐκ μειρακίου παραστάσεως πρὸς ἐμὲ καὶ
φιλοσοφίαν ἐπιμελοῦ τῶν παλδῶν Μητροδώρου.

Πρὸς Κωλώτην.

31. 'Ως σεβομένῳ γάρ σοι τὰ τότε ὑφ' ἡμῶν λεγόμενα
προσέπεσεν ἐπιθύμημα ἀφυσιολόγητον τοῦ περιπλακῆναι ἡμῖν
γονάτων ἐφαπτόμενον καὶ πάσης τῆς εἰθισμένης ἐπιλήψεως
γίνεσθαι κατὰ τὰς σεβάσεις τινῶν καὶ λιτάς· ἐποίεις οὖν καὶ
5 ἡμᾶς ἀνθιεροῦν σὲ αὐτὸν καὶ ἀντισέβεσθαι.

*Αφθαρτός μοι περιπάτει καὶ ἡμᾶς ἀφθάρτους διανοοῦ.

Πρὸς Λεόντιον.

32 Παιδὸν ἀναξ, φίλον Λεοντάριον, οἶου κροτοθορύβου ἡμᾶς
ἐνέπλησας ἀναγνόντας σου τὸ ἐπιστόλιον.

Πρὸς Πυθοκλέα.

33. Παιδείαν δὲ πᾶσαν, μακάριε, φεῦγε τὰκάτιον ἀράμενος.

34. Καθεδοῦμαι προσδοκῶν τὴν ἴμερτὴν καὶ Ισόθεόν σου
εἴσοδον.

EPISTULAE AD INCERTOS DATAE

Ad puerum aut puellam.

35. 'Α]φείγυμεθα εἰς Λάμψακον ὑγιαίνοντες ἔγω καὶ Πυθοκλῆς
καὶ Ἐρμ]αρχος καὶ Κ[τῆ]σιππος, καὶ ἐκεῖ κατειλήφαμεν ὑγ[ι]αί-
νοντας Θεμίσταν καὶ τὸν λοιπὸν [φίλο]λο[υ]ς. εὐ δὲ ποιεῖ[ι]ς
καὶ σὺ ε[ι] ὑγιαίνεις καὶ ἡ μ[ά]μη [σ]ου, καὶ πάπαι καὶ
5 Μάτρων[ι] πάντα πε[ι]θη[ι], ὁσπ[ε]ρ καὶ ἔ[μ]προσθεν. εὐ γὰρ
ἴσθι, ἡ αἵτία, δτι καὶ ἔγω καὶ ο[ι] λοιποὶ πάντες σε μέγα
φιλοῦμεν, ὅτι τούτοις πείθη πάντα.

7 φιλοσοφίαν· φιλοσοφίας libri 31 Plut. adū. Col. 17, p. 1117b
2 τοῦ Usener: τὸ libri 4 τινῶν Usener: τιμῶν libri: θεῶν Wyttens-
bach 32 Diog. Laert. x, § 5 2 ἐνέπλησας Suidas· ἐνέπλησεν
(ἐνέπλησε B) libri 33 Diog. Laert. x, § 6 Ι φεῦγε τὰκάτιον ἀρά-
μενος Gassendi: φεύγετε κατιδιαραμεν B: φεῦγε τε κατε δι. ἐραμεν

joy in my heart at the recollection of my conversations with you. Do you, as I might expect from your devotion from boyhood to me and to philosophy, take good care of the children of Metrodorus.

To Colotes.

31. In your feeling of reverence for what I was then saying you were seized with an unaccountable desire to embrace me and clasp my knees and show me all the signs of homage paid by men in prayers and supplications to others; so you made me return all these proofs of veneration and respect to you.

Go on thy way as an immortal and think of us too as immortal.

To Leontion.

32. Lord and Saviour, my dearest Leontion, what a hurrahing you drew from us, when we read aloud your dear letter.

To Pythocles.

33. Blest youth, set sail in your bark and flee from every form of culture.

34. I will sit down and wait for your lovely and godlike appearance.

LETTERS TO UNCERTAIN PERSONS.

To a boy or girl.

35. We have arrived at Lampsacus safe and sound, Pythocles and Hermarchus and Ctesippus and I, and there we found Themista and our other friends all well. I hope you too are well and your mamma, and that you are always obedient to pappa and Matro, as you used to be. Let me tell you that the reason that I and all the rest of us love you is that you are always obedient to them.

(in mg. '/. ai) P : φεύγετε κατὶ διέραμεν ΟΗ 34 Diog. Laert.
x, § 5 35 Vol. Herc. 176, col. 18 restituit Gomperz 4 σού
Usener: κατῆν Gomperz 6 αἰτία Gomperz ΝΑΠΙΑ pap.

Epistula supremorum dierum.

36. Ἐβδόμη γὰρ ἡμέρᾳ ὅτε ταῦτ' ἔγραφον, οὐχ[ὶ ἀπο]-κεχ[ώρη]κ[ε]ν [δὴ] [κατ[ὰ τὴν]] οὐρῆσιν [ἐ]μοὶ οὐθὲν καὶ ἀλγη-δόνες ἐνῆσαν τῶν ἐπὶ τὴν τελευταίαν ἡμέραν ἀγονισῶν. σὺ οὖν, ἦν τι γένηται, τὰ παιδία τὰ Μητροδώρου διοίκησον τέτταρα 5 η̄ πέντ' ἔτη μηθὲν πλεῖον δαπανῶν η̄ περ νῦν ε[ἰ]ς ἐμὲ δαπανᾶς κατ' ἐνιαυτόν.

Incertarum epistularum fragmenta.

37 Βρυάζω τῷ κατὰ τὸ σωμάτιον ἡδεῖ, ὕδατι καὶ ἀρτῳ χρώμενος, καὶ προσπτύνω τὰς ἐκ πολυτελείας ἡδοναῖς οὐ δι' αὐτάς, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὰ ἔξακολουθοῦντα αὐταῖς δυσχερῆ.

38 Ἐπιμελοῦ γάρ, καθάπερ σοι καὶ ἀπαλλαττομένῳ ἔλεγον, καὶ Ἀπολλοδώρου [τοῦ] ἀ[δελ]φοῦ. οὐ γὰρ κακὸς ὁν παρ[έχ]ει μο[ι] φρονίδα, εἴ τι πράττει, ὃν οὐ βούλεται.

39. Πέμψον μοι τυροῦ κυθριδίου, ἵν' ὅταν βούλωμαι πολυτε-λεύσασθαι δύνωμαι.

40. Δαιμονίως τε καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῶς ἐπιμελήθητε ἡμῶν τὰ περὶ τὴν τοῦ σίτου κομιδήν, καὶ οὐρανομήκη σημεῖα ἐνδέδειχθε τῆς πρὸς ἐμὲ εὐνοίας.

41 [Τὴν σύνταξιν ἡν̄ . . . συνε]τάξατο ἐμαντῶ[ι κ]αὶ ἐν 'Τπερβ[ορ]είοις ὁσιν ἀποστε[λε]ῖν, ταύτην καὶ μόνην ἐπιτάπτω. [ἐ]κατὸν γὰρ καὶ ε[ἰ]κοσι [δ]ρ[αχ]μὰ[ς μόν]ας κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν βούλομα[ι] παρ' ἐκατέρου λαμβάνειν.

5 "Ηνεγκέ μοι Κτήσιππος τὴν κα[τ]" ἐ[ν]ιαυτὸν σύνταξ[ι]ν ἥν ἀπέστειλας ὑπέρ τε τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ σεαυτοῦ.

42 Τιμίαν μὲν ἔξει ἀντίδοσιν τὴν [ὑπ' ἐ]μοῦ δοθεῖσαν αὐτῷ πα[ιδιάν].

43 Οὐδέποτε ὡρέχθην τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀρέσκειν. ἀ μὲν γὰρ ἐκείνοις ἥρεσκεν, οὐκ ἐμαθον· ἀ δ' ἥδειν ἐγώ, μακρὰν τὴν ἐκείνων αἰσθήσεως.

44. Ἀφυσιολόγητον μηδὲν ἥγον βοώσης τῆς σαρκὸς βοῶν τὴν ψυχήν. σαρκὸς δὲ φωνή· μὴ πεινῆν, μὴ διψῆν, μὴ

36 Philodem. *πραγματ.* VH³ 1. 128 : restituerunt Spengel Gomperz
 37 Stob. *Floril.* xvii. 34 38 Pap. Herc. 176, col. 8 39 Diog.
 Laert. x, § 11 1 κυθριδίουν] κυθρίδιουν f. Κυθρίδιου Menagius 40 Plut.
 contr. *Eph. beat.* 15, p 1097 e 1 δαιμονίως Usener : δαῶς libri. δαψι-
 λῶς Cobet 41 Philodem. *πραγματ* VH³ 1. 127 42 Philo-
 dem. *πραγματ.* VH³ 1. 118 1 ἀντίδοσιν scripsi : αἰνοῦσαν pap.

Letter written in his last days.

36. Seven days before writing this the stoppage became complete and I suffered pains such as bring men to their last day. If anything happens to me, do you look after the children of Metrodorus for four or five years, but do not spend any more on them than you now spend each year on me.

Letters to unknown recipients.

37. I am thrilled with pleasure in the body, when I live on bread and water, and I spit upon luxurious pleasures not for their own sake, but because of the inconveniences that follow them.

38. As I said to you when you were going away, take care also of his brother Apollodorus. He is not a bad boy, but causes me anxiety, when he does what he does not mean to do.

39. Send me some preserved cheese, that when I like I may have a feast.

40. You have looked after me wonderfully generously in sending me food, and have given proofs heaven-high of your good will to me.

41. The only contribution I require is that which . . ordered the disciples to send me, even if they are among the Hyperboreans. I wish to receive from each of you two a hundred and twenty drachmae a year and no more.

Ctesippus has brought me the annual contribution which you sent for your father and yourself.

42. He will have a valuable return in the instruction which I have given him.

43. I was never anxious to please the mob. For what pleased them, I did not know, and what I did know, was far removed from their comprehension.

44. Think it not unnatural that when the flesh cries aloud, the soul cries too. The flesh cries out to be saved from hunger, thirst, and cold. It is hard for the soul to

43 Gnomolog. cod. Par. 1168, f. 115r ^{3 αἰσθήσεως} edd.
δισθίσεως Par.

44 Porph. *ad Marc.* 30, p. 209, 7 Nauck

ρίγοῦν. καὶ ταῦτα τῇ ψυχῇ χαλεπὸν μὲν κωλύσαι, ἐπισφαλὲς δὲ παρακοῦσαι τῆς παραγγειλάσης φύσεως αὐτῇ διὰ τῆς προσ 5 φυοῦς αὐτῇ αὐταρκείας καθ' ἡμέραν.

45. Ὁ οὖν τῇ φύσει παρακολουθῶν καὶ μὴ ταῖς κεναῖς δόξαις ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτάρκης· πρὸς γὰρ τὸ τῇ φύσει ἀρκοῦν πᾶσα κτῆσίς ἐστι πλούτος, πρὸς δὲ τὰς ἀοράστους ὀρέξεις καὶ διέγιντος πλούτος ἐστιν (οὐ πλούτος ἀλλὰ πενία).

46. Ἐφ' ὅσον δ' ἀν ἀμηχανῆς, λήθῃ τῆς φύσεως ἀμηχανεῖς· σαντῷ γὰρ ἀοράστους φόβους καὶ ἐπιθυμίας προσβάλλεις.

47. = Sent. Vat. XIV.

48. Κρείττον δέ σοι θαρρεῖν ἐπὶ στιβάδος κατακειμένη ἥ ταράττεσθαι χρυσῆν ἔχουσῃ κλίνην καὶ πολυτελῆ τράπεζαν.

49 . . φέρων τὴν ἐπιστολὴν παρὰ σο[ῦ] καὶ τὸν διαλογισμὸν διν ἐπεπόησο περὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὅσοι μήτε τὴν ἀναλογίαν τὴν κατὰ τὰ φαιώμεν[α ἐ]ν τοῖς ἀοράστοις ο[ὗσα]ν ἥδυναντο συνιδεῖν μήτε τὴν συμφωνίαν τὴν ταῖς αἰσθήσεσιν 5 ὑπάρχουσαν πρὸς τὰ ἀοράτα καὶ πάλε[ν] ἀντιμαρτύρ[η]σιν . . .

50. Ἡδὲ ἥ φίλου μνήμη τεθνηκότος.

51. Μὴ φεύγε μικρὰ χαρίζεσθαι δόξεις γὰρ καὶ πρὸς τὰ μεγάλα τοιοῦτος εἴναι.

52. Ἐχθροῦ δεηθέντος μὴ ἀποστραφῆς τὴν ἀξίωσιν πλὴν ἀσφαλίζου σεαυτόν· οὐδὲν γὰρ κυνὸς διαφέρει.

D

INCERTAE SEDIS FRAGMENTA.

De Sapientia et Sapiente.

53 = Sent. Vat. LIV.

54 Κενὸς ἐκείνου φιλοσόφου λόγος, ὡφ' οὐ μηδὲν πάθος ἀνθρώπου θεραπεύεται· ὥσπερ γὰρ ἱατρικῆς οὐδὲν ὄφελος μὴ τὰς νόσους τῶν σωμάτων ἐκβαλλούσης, οὕτως οὐδὲ φιλοσοφίας, εἰ μὴ τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐκβάλλει πάθος.

3 τῇ ψυχῇ Nauck: τὴν ψυχὴν cod. 45 Porph. ad Marc. 27, p. 207, 31 Nauck 4 ἐστιν] οὐ πλούτος ἀλλὰ πενία adiecit Bignone: ἐστι πενία Usener 46 Porph ad Marc. 29, p. 209, 1 2 σαντῷ edd.: αὐτὸν cod. 47 Stob Floril. xvi. 28 48 Porph ad Marc. 29, p. 209, 3 I κατακειμένη . ἔχουσῃ] κατακειμένῳ... ἔχοντι Usener 49 Philodem πραγματ VH¹ i. 126 secundum lectionem Cronert 50 Plut. contr. Eph. beat. 28, p. 1105d 51 Maximus

repress these cries, and dangerous for it to disregard nature's appeal to her because of her own wonted independence day by day.

45. The man who follows nature and not vain opinions is independent in all things. For in reference to what is enough for nature every possession is riches, but in reference to unlimited desires even the greatest wealth is (not riches but poverty).

46. In so far as you are in difficulties, it is because you forget nature; for you create for yourself unlimited fears and desires.

48. It is better for you to be free of fear lying upon a pallet, than to have a golden couch and a rich table and be full of trouble.

49. . . . remembering your letter and your discussion about the men who are not able to see the analogy between phenomena and the unseen nor the harmony which exists between sensations and the unseen and again the contradiction .

50. Sweet is the memory of a dead friend.

51. Do not avoid conferring small favours for then you will seem to be of like character towards great things.

52. If your enemy makes a request to you, do not turn from his petition . but be on your guard , for he is like a dog.

D.

FRAGMENTS FROM UNCERTAIN SOURCES.

On philosophy.

54. Vain is the word of a philosopher which does not heal any suffering of man. For just as there is no profit in medicine if it does not expel the diseases of the body, so there is no profit in philosophy either, if it does not expel the suffering of the mind

Gnomol. c. 8

52 Maximus Gnomol. c. 66
Marc 31, p. 209, 23 Nauck (cf Stob Floril. lxxxii. 6) *54 Porph. ad*
λούσης Stob. : θεραπεύειν cod. *3 ἐκβαλ-*
4 πάθος] κακόν Stob.

Physica.

55. Οὐδὲν ξένον ἐν τῷ παντὶ ἀποτελεῖται παρὰ τὸν ἡδη γεγενημένον χρόνον ἄπειρον.

56. Οὐ γάρ μᾶλλον εὑδαίμονας καὶ ἀδιαλύτους νοήσομεν μὴ φωνοῦντας [μη]δ' [ἀλλα] λήλοις διαλεγομένους, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἐνεοῖς ἀνθρώποις δμοίους.

57. Ἡμ[εῖς γοῦν] θύμωμεν [δόσι]ως καὶ καλῶς οὖν [καθ]ήκει, καὶ [ἰ κ]αλῶ[ς] πάντα πράττωμεν [κα]τὰ τοὺς νόμους μ[η]θὲ[ν] ταῖς δόξαις α[ὐ]τοὺς ἐν τοῖς περὶ τῶν ἀρίστων κ[αὶ] σεμνοτάτων διαταράττοντες· [ἔτι] δὲ καὶ δίκαιο[ι] ὁμ[εν] ἀφ' ἣς δ ἔλε[γον δό]ξης· οὕτω γάρ [ἐν]δέχεται φυσ[ικῶς] ζῆν . . .

58. Εἰ ταῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων εὐχαῖς ὁ θεὸς κατηκολούθει, θάττον *(ἄν)* ἀπώλλυντο πάντες ἀνθρωποι, συνεχῶς πολλὰ καὶ χαλεπὰ κατ' ἀλλήλων εὐχόμενοι.

Ethica.

59. Ἀρχὴ καὶ ρίζα παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ ἡ τῆς γαστρὸς ἡδονή· καὶ τὰ σοφὰ καὶ τὰ περιττὰ ἐπὶ ταύτην ἔχει τὴν ἀναφοράν.

60 Τότε χρείαν ἔχομεν τῆς ἡδονῆς, ὅταν ἐκ τοῦ μὴ παρέναι αὐτὴν ἀλγῶμεν· ὅταν δὲ τοῦτο μὴ πάσχωμεν ἐν αἰσθήσει καθεστῶτες, τότε οὐδεμία χρεία τῆς ἡδονῆς· οὐν γάρ ἡ τῆς φύσεως ἡδονὴ τὴν ἀδικίαν ποιεῖ ἔξωθεν, ἀλλ' ἡ περὶ τὰς κενὰς δόξας ὅρεξις.

61. Τὸ γάρ ποιοῦν ἀνυπέρβλητον γῆθος τὸ τιπάρ' αὐτὸ τι πεφυγμένου μέγα κακόν· καὶ αὗτη φύσις ἀγαθοῦ, ἀν τις ὀρθῶς ἐπιβάλῃ, ἔπειτα σταθῆ, καὶ μὴ κενῶς περιπατῆ περὶ ἀγαθοῦ θρυλῶν.

62. Ἀμειών ἔστι τὸ οὐδεμίαι τούσδε τινὰς τοὺς πόνους, δπως ἡσθῶμεν ἡδονὰς μείζους· συμφέρει τῶνδε τινῶν ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν ἡδονῶν ἵνα μὴ ἀλγῶμεν ἀλγηδόνας χαλεπωτέρας.

63 Μηδὲ αἰτιώμεθα τὴν σάρκα ὡς τῶν μεγάλων κακῶν αἰτίαν μηδὲ εἰς τὰ πράγματα τρέπωμεν τὰς δυσφορίας.

55 Plut. *Strom.* fr. 8 56 Philodem *de Vict. deor VH*¹ vi 13
 57 Philodem. περὶ εὐσεβί *VH*² ii. 108, 9 restituit Gomperz i καὶ
 καλῶς scripsi : καὶ αλω charta : καὶ τὰλλα Gomperz 5 ζῆν
 Gomperz : την charta 58 Gnomolog. cod. Par. 1168, f. 115 r
 2 δν om. Par. ἀπώλλυντο edd : ἀπώλλουντο Par. 59 Athen. xi,
 p. 546 f 60 Stob. *Floril.* xvii. 35 4 ἡδονῇ] ζηδεια Usener.
 φωνῇ Cronert : ροπῇ Bignone 61 Plut. *contr. Ep. beat* 7, p. 1091 a

Physics.

55. Nothing new happens in the universe, if you consider the infinite time past.

56. We shall not be considering them any happier or less destructible, if we think of them as not speaking nor conversing with one another, but resembling dumb men.

57. Let us at least sacrifice piously and rightly where it is customary, and let us do all things rightly according to the laws not troubling ourselves with common beliefs in what concerns the noblest and holiest of beings. Further let us be free of any charge in regard to their opinion For thus can one live in conformity with nature . . .

58. If God listened to the prayers of men, all men would quickly have perished : for they are for ever praying for evil against one another.

Ethics.

59. The beginning and the root of all good is the pleasure of the stomach ; even wisdom and culture must be referred to this.

60. We have need of pleasure when we are in pain from its absence : but when we are not feeling such pain, though we are in a condition of sensation, we have no need of pleasure. For the pleasure which arises from nature does not produce wickedness, but rather the longing connected with vain fancies.

61. That which creates joy insuperable is the complete removal of a great evil. And this is the nature of good, if one can once grasp it rightly, and then hold by it, and not walk about babbling idly about the good.

62. It is better to endure these particular pains so that we may enjoy greater joys. It is well to abstain from these particular pleasures in order that we may not suffer more severe pains.

63. Let us not blame the flesh as the cause of great evils, nor blame circumstances for our distresses.

1 παρ' αὐτῷ] παρ' αὐτῷ Reiske πάραντα Usener : κατ' αὐτῷ Bignone
 3 ἐπιβάλῃ Usener : ἐπιβάλλῃ libri 62 Aristocles apud Euseb.
 Praep. evang. xiv. 21, 3, p. 769 a 63 Porph. ad Marc. 29,
 p. 208, 25 Nauck

64. Οἱ μεγάλοι πόνοι συντόμως ἔξαγουσιν, οἱ δὲ χρόνιοι μέγεθος οὐκ ἔχουσιν.

65. Ὁ γὰρ πόνος ὁ ὑπερβάλλων συνάψει θανάτῳ.

66. Ἐρωτι φιλοσοφίας ἀληθῶντος πᾶσα ταραχώδης καὶ ἐπί-
πονος ἐπιθυμία ἐκλύεται.

67. Χάρις τῇ μακαρίᾳ Φύσει δτι τὰ ἀναγκαῖα ἐποίησεν
εὐπόριστα, τὰ δὲ δυσπόριστα οὐκ ἀναγκαῖα.

68. Οὐ σπάνιον γε εὑρεῖν ἀνθρωπον (πένητα) πρὸς τὸ τῆς
φύσεως τέλος καὶ πλούσιον πρὸς τὰς κενὰς δόξας. οὐδεὶς
γὰρ τῶν ἀφρόνων οἷς ἔχει ἀρκεῖται, μᾶλλον δὲ οἷς οὐκ ἔχει
δόδυνάται. ὕσπερ οὖν οἱ πυρέττοντες διὰ κακοήθειαν τῆς
5 (νόσου) ἀεὶ διψώσι καὶ τῶν ἐναυτιωτάτων ἐπιθυμοῦσιν, οὗτοι
καὶ οἱ τὴν ψυχὴν κακῶς ἔχοντες διακειμένην πένουνται πάν-
των ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς πολυτρόπους ἐπιθυμίας ὑπὸ λαμπαργίας ἐμ-
πίπτουσιν.

69. Ὡι ὀλίγον οὐχ ἰκανόν, ἀλλὰ τούτῳ γε οὐδὲν ἰκανόν.

70. Πλουσιώτατον αὐτάρκεια πάντων.

71. Φοβούμενος ὁ πολὺς τὸ λιτὸν τῆς διαίτης διὰ τὸν
φόβον ἐπὶ πράξεις πορεύεται τὰς μάλιστ' ἀν τοῦτον παρ-
σκευαζόντας.

72. Πολλοὶ τοῦ πλούτου τυχόντες οὐ τὴν ἀπαλλαγὴν τῶν
κακῶν εὑρούν ἀλλὰ μεταβολὴν μειζόνων.

73. Ἐξ ἐργασίας θηριώδους οὐσίας μὲν πλῆθος σωρεύεται,
βίος δὲ ταλαιπωρος συνίσταται.

74. Ἡ γὰρ διὰ φόβου τις κακοδαιμονεῖ ἢ δι’ ἀόριστον καὶ
κενὴν ἐπιθυμίαν· ἡ τις χαλινῶν δύναται τὸν μακάριον ἔαντῳ
περιποιῆσαι λογισμόν.

75. Οὐκ ἀπορεῖν τούτων πόνος ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ φέρεις μᾶλλον
τὸν ἀνόητον ἐκ τῶν κενῶν δοξῶν πόνον.

76. Ἡ ταπεινὴ ψυχὴ τοῖς μὲν εὐημερήμασιν ἔχαννάθη, ταῖς
δὲ συμφοραῖς καθηρέθη.

77. Καὶ τὰ παρὰ τῆς τύχης μικρότερα (ἢ φύσις) διδάσκει

- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|--------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| 64 Plut. de Poet. aud 14, p. 36b | 65 Plut. contr. Ep. beat. 23,
p. 1103d | 66 Porph. ad Marc. 31, p. 209, 21 | 67 Stob. Floril.
xvii 23 | 68 Porph. ad Marc. 27, p. 208, 2 Nauck | 1 οὐ] om.
Usener πένητα supplevit Usener · om. cod. | 5 νόσου supplevit
Mai: om. cod. | 69 Aelian Var. hist. iv. 13 | 70 Clem Alex.
Strom. vi. 2, p. 266, 38 | 71 Porph. ad Marc 28, p. 208, 15 Nauck | 1 τὴν] τιν' Usener | 72 Porph. ad Marc 28, p. 208, 23 Nauck | 73 Porph. ad Marc. 28, p. 209, 5 Nauck | 1 θηριώδους Nauck |
|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|--------------------|--|--|-------------------|

64. Great pains quickly put an end to life ; long-enduring pains are not severe.

65. Excessive pain will bring you to death.

66. Through love of true philosophy every disturbing and troublesome desire is ended.

67. Thanks be to blessed Nature because she has made what is necessary easy to supply, and what is not easy unnecessary.

68. It is common to find a man who is (poor) in respect of the natural end of life and rich in empty fancies. For of the fools none is satisfied with what he has, but is grieved for what he has not. Just as men with fever through the malignance of their (disease) are always thirsty and desire the most injurious things, so too those whose mind is in an evil state are always poor in everything and in their greed are plunged into ever-changing desires.

69. Nothing satisfies the man who is not satisfied with a little.

70. Self-sufficiency is the greatest of all riches.

71. Most men fear frugality and through their fear are led to actions most likely to produce fear.

72. Many men when they have acquired riches have not found the escape from their ills but only a change to greater ills.

73. By means of occupations worthy of a beast abundance of riches is heaped up, but a miserable life results.

74. Unhappiness comes either through fear or through vain and unbridled desire but if a man curbs these, he can win for himself the blessedness of understanding.

75. It is not deprivation of these things which is pain, but rather the bearing of the useless pain that arises from vain fancies

76. The mean soul is puffed up by prosperity and cast down by misfortune.

77. (Nature) teaches us to pay little heed to what fortune

θρηνηδόους cod. 74 Porph. *ad Marc.* 29, p. 208, 30 Nauck
 75 Porph. *ad Marc.* 31, p. 209, 19 Nauck *Ι πόνος] κακὸν* coniecit
 Usener 76 Gnomolog. cod. Par 1168, f. 115, &c. 77 Porph.
ad Marc. 30, p. 209, 12 Nauck *Ι παρὰ τῆς τύχης* Usener : *περὶ τῆς*
ψυχῆς cod.

νυομίζειν, καὶ εὐτυχοῦντας μὲν γινώσκειν ἀτυχεῖν, δυστυχοῦντας δὲ μὴ παρὰ μέγα τίθεσθαι δύν τὸ εὐτυχεῖν, καὶ δέχεσθαι μὲν ἀθορύβως τὰ παρὰ τῆς τύχης ἀγαθό, παρατετάχθαι δὲ πρὸς τὰ παρ' αὐτῆς δοκοῦντα εἶναι κακά· ὡς ἐφήμερον μὲν πᾶν τὸ τῶν πολλῶν ἀγαθόν ἔστι καὶ κακόν, σοφία δὲ οὐδαμῶς τύχη κοινωνεῖ.

78. Ο τῆς αὔριον ἥκιστα δεόμενος ἥδιστα πρόσειστι πρὸς τὴν αὔριον.

79. Προσπτύω τῷ καλῷ καὶ τοῖς κενώς αὐτῷ θαυμάζουσιν, δταν μηδεμίαν ἡδουνὴν ποιῆι.

80 Δικαιοσύνης καρπὸς μέγιστος ἀταραξία.

81. Οἱ νόμοι χάριν τῶν σοφῶν κεῦνται, οὐχ δπως μὴ ἀδικῶσιν ἀλλ' δπως μὴ ἀδικῶνται.

82. Καν λαθεῖν δύνωνται, πίστιν περὶ τοῦ λαθεῖν λαβεῖν ἀδύνατόν ἔστιν δθεν δ (περὶ) τοῦ μέλλοντος ἀεὶ φόβος ἐγκείμενος οὐκ ἐὰν χαίρειν οὐδὲ θαρρεῖν ἐπὶ τοῖς παροῦσιν.

83 Οὐ παρόντος οὐδενὸς δ κεκτημένος [τὸ τοῦ] γένους τε[λ]ος [πα]ρα[πλησίω]ς ἔστιν ἀγαθ[ός].

84 Οὐκ ἔστιν ἄφοβον εἶναι φοβερὸν φαινόμενον.

85 Τὸ εὐδαιμον καὶ μακάριον οὐ χρημάτων πλῆθος οὐδὲ πραγμάτων δγκος οὐδ' ἀρχαί τωες ἔχουσπια οὐδὲ δυνάμεις, ἀλλ' ἀλυπία καὶ πραότης παθῶν καὶ διάθεσις ψυχῆς τὸ κατὰ φύσιν δρίζουσα.

86. Λάθε βιώσας.

87 Λέγειν δεῖ πῶς ἄριστα τὸ τῆς φύσεως τέλος συντηρήσει, καὶ πῶς τις ἐκῶν εἶναι μὴ πρόσειστιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐπὶ τὰς τῶν πληθῶν ἀρχάς.

3 παρὰ Usener: περὶ cod. ὁν Usener ὁν cod. 5 ante ὡς cod. καὶ habet: delevit Nauck 6 καὶ κακόν ex Gnomol. Byz. supplevit Usener: om. cod. post δὲ cod. καὶ ἐπιστήμην habet: om. Usener τύχη Usener: τύχης cod. 78 Plut. de Trang. anim. 16, p. 474 c 79 Athen. xii, p. 547 a 80 Clem. Alex. Strom. vi. 2, p. 266, 39 81 Stob. Floril. 43, 139 82 Plut. contr. Ep. beat. 6, p. 1090 c 83 Script. Epic. Incert VH³ vii. 21, col. xxviii 84 Gnomol. cod. Par 1168, f 115 u, etc. 85 Plut. de Poet. aud. c. 14, p. 37 a 86 Plut. εἰ καλώς εἴρηται τὸ λάθε βιώσας, p. 1128 sq. 87 Plut. adv Col 31, p. 1125 c

brings, and when we are prosperous to understand that we are unfortunate, and when we are unfortunate not to regard prosperity highly, and to receive unmoved the good things which come from fortune and to range ourselves boldly against the seeming evils which it brings: for all that the many regard as good or evil is fleeting, and wisdom has nothing in common with fortune

78. He who least needs to-morrow, will most gladly go to meet to-morrow.

79. I spit upon the beautiful and those who vainly admire it, when it does not produce any pleasure.

80. The greatest fruit of justice is serenity.

81. The laws exist for the sake of the wise, not that they may not do wrong, but that they may not suffer it.

82. Even if they are able to escape punishment, it is impossible to win security for escaping: and so the fear of the future which always presses upon them does not suffer them to be happy or to be free from anxiety in the present

83. The man who has attained the natural end of the human race will be equally good, even though no one is present.

84. A man who causes fear cannot be free from fear.

85. The happy and blessed state belongs not to abundance of riches or dignity of position or any office or power, but to freedom from pain and moderation in feelings and an attitude of mind which imposes the limits ordained by nature.

86. Live unknown.

87. We must say how best a man will maintain the natural end of life, and how no one will willingly at first aim at public office.

VI

VITA EPICURI

1 'Επίκουρος Νεοκλέους καὶ Χαιρεστράτης, Ἀθηναῖος, τῶν δήμων Γαργήτιος, γένους τοῦ τῶν Φιλαιδῶν, ὡς φησι Μητρόδωρος ἐν τῷ Περὶ εὐγενείας. τοῦτον φασὶν ἄλλοι τε καὶ Ἡρακλεῖδης ἐν τῇ Σωτίωνος ἐπιτομῇ κληρουχησάντων 5 Ἀθηναίων τὴν Σάμον ἐκεῖθι τραφῆναι δικτωκαιιδεκέτη δ' ἐλθεῖν εἰς Ἀθήνας, Ξενοκράτους μὲν ἐν Ἀκαδημείᾳ, Ἀριστοτέλους δὲ ἐν Χαλκίδῃ διατρίβοντος. τελευτήσαντος δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Μακεδόνος καὶ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐκπεσόντων ὑπὸ Περδίκκου μετελθεῖν εἰς Κολοφῶνα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα. | χρόνον δέ τινα διατρίψαντα αὐτόθι καὶ μαθητὰς ἀθροίσαντα πάλιν ἐπανελθεῖν εἰς Ἀθήνας ἐπὶ Ἀναξικράτους· καὶ μέχρι μὲν τινὸς κατ' ἐπιμιξίαν τοῖς ἄλλοις φιλοσοφεῖν, ἔπειτα ἵδιᾳ ἀποφαλ-
5 μεσθαι¹ τὴν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ κληθεῖσαν αἴρεσιν συστήσαντα. ἐφάφασθαι δὲ φιλοσοφίας αὐτὸς φησιν ἔτη γεγονὼς τετταρεσ-
καΐδεκα. Ἀπολλόδωρος δ' ὁ Ἐπικούρειος ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ περὶ τοῦ Ἐπικούρου βίου φησὶν ἐλθεῖν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ φιλοσοφίαν καταγνώντα τῶν γραμματιστῶν, ἐπειδὴ μὴ ἐδυνήθησαν ἐρμη-
10 ιον νεῦσται αὐτῷ τὰ περὶ τοῦ παρ' Ἡσιόδῳ χάους. φησὶ δὲ
"Ἐρμιππος γραμματοδιάσκαλον αὐτὸν γεγενῆσθαι, ἔπειτα
μέντοι περιτυχόντα τοὺς Δημοκρίτου βιβλίους, ἐπὶ φιλοσοφίαν
ἀξαι. | διὸ καὶ τὸν Τύμωνα φάσκειν περὶ αὐτοῦ
15 ὕστατος αὖ φυσικῶν καὶ κύντατος, ἐκ Σάμου ἐλθὼν
γραμμαδιδασκαλόντης, ἀναγωγότατος ζωόντων.

συνεφιλοσόφουν δ' αὐτῷ προτρεψαμένῳ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ τρεῖς 5 δύντες, Νεοκλῆς, Χαιρέδημος, Ἀριστόβουλος, καθά φησι Φιλόδημος ὁ Ἐπικούρειος ἐν τῷ δεκάτῳ τῆς τῶν φιλοσόφων

1 6 Ἀκαδημείᾳ Usener: ἀκαδημίᾳ libri 2 4 ἀποφαίνεσθαι²
τὴν Usener. ἀπο... τὴν B: ἀποστὴν Q. πῶς τὴν F: ... τὴν P³H:
ἀποστατεῖν τὴν Kochalsky 6 δὲ Usener τε libri τετταρεσκαί-
δεκα BPQH. ἰδ F 13 ἀξαι Hubner: ἀξαι B: ἀξαι FPQH

VI

LIFE OF EPICURUS

1 EPICURUS, son of Neocles and Chaerestrata, was an Athenian of the deme of Gargettus, and the family of the Philaidae, as Metrodorus says in his work on *Nobility of Birth*. Heraclides in his epitome of Sotion and others say that the Athenians having colonized Samos, Epicurus was brought up there. In his eighteenth year, as they say, he came to Athens, when Xenocrates was at the Academy and Aristotle was living in Chalcis. After the death of Alexander of Macedon, when the Athenians were driven out of Samos by Perdiccas, he went to join his father in 2 Colophon. Having stayed there some time and gathered disciples he returned again to Athens in the archonship of Anaxicrates. For a while he joined with others in the study of philosophy, but later taught independently, when he had founded the school called after him. He tells us himself that he first made acquaintance with philosophy at the age of fourteen. Apollodorus the Epicurean in the first book of his *Life of Epicurus* says that he took to philosophy because he despised the teachers of literature, since they were not able to explain to him the passage about Chaos in Hesiod. Hermippus says that Epicurus was at one time a schoolmaster and then after he met with the writings of Democritus, he took eagerly to philosophy.

3 And this is why Timon says about him :

'Last and most shameless of the scientists, infant school teacher from Samos, the most stubborn of all living beings'.

His three brothers, Neocles, Chaeredemus, and Aristobulus joined him in studying philosophy at his suggestion, according to Philodemus the Epicurean in the tenth book

συντάξεως. ἀλλὰ καὶ δοῦλος Μύσ δυνομα, καθά φησι Μυρωνιανὸς ἐν Ὁμοίοις ἴστορικοῖς κεφαλαίοις.

Διότιμος δ' ὁ Στωικὸς δυσμενῶς ἔχων πρὸς αὐτὸν πικρότατα
 10 αὐτὸν διαβέβληκεν, ἐπιστολὰς φέρων πεντήκοντα ἀστελγεῖς
 ὡς Ἐπικούρου· καὶ δὲ τὰ εἰς Χρύσιππον ἀναφερόμενα ἐπιστόλια
 4 ὡς Ἐπικούρου συντάξας. | ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ περὶ Ποσειδώνιον τὸν
 Στωικὸν καὶ Νικόλαος καὶ Σωτίων ἐν τοῖς δώδεκα τῶν ἐπι-
 γραφομένων Διοκλείων ἐλέγχων, ἢ ἐστι περὶ τῆς εἰκάδος, καὶ
 Διωνύσιος ὁ Ἀλικαρνασσεύς. καὶ γὰρ σὺν τῇ μητρὶ περιεόντα
 5 αὐτὸν εἰς τὰ οἰκίδια καθαρμὸν ἀναγινώσκειν, καὶ σὺν τῷ πατρὶ
 γράμματα διδάσκειν λυπροῦ τινος μισθαρίου. ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν
 ἀδελφῶν ἔνα προαγωγεύειν, καὶ Λεοντίῳ συνεῖναι τῇ ἑταίρᾳ·
 τὰ δὲ Δημοκρίτου περὶ τῶν ἀτόμων καὶ Ἀριστίππου περὶ τῆς
 10 ἥδουνῆς ὡς ἔδια λέγειν. μὴ εἴναι τε γυνησίως ἀστόν, ὡς
 Τιμοκράτης φησὶ καὶ Ἡρόδοτος ἐν τῷ Περὶ Ἐπικούρου
 ἐφηβείας. Μιθρῆν τε αἰσχρῶς κολακεύειν τὸν Λυσιμάχον
 διοικητήν, ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς Παιᾶνα καὶ ἄνακτα καλοῦντα. |
 5 ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἰδομενέα καὶ Ἡρόδοτον καὶ Τιμοκράτην τοὺς ἔκπυστα
 αὐτοῦ τὰ κρύφια ποιήσαντας ἔγκωμιάζειν καὶ κολακεύειν αὐτὸν
 τοῦτο. ἐν τε ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς πρὸς μὲν Λεόντιον “Παιᾶν ἄναξ,
 φίλον Λεοντάριον, οἶου κροτοθορύβου ἡμᾶς ἐνέπλησας ἀναγ-
 10 νόντας σου τὸ ἐπιστόλιον.” πρὸς δὲ Θεμίσταν τὴν Λεοντέως
 γυναῖκα “Οἶσι τε, φησίν, εἰμί, ἐὰν μὴ ὑμεῖς πρὸς με ἀφίκησθε,
 αὐτὸς τρικύλιστος, ὃπου ἀν ὑμεῖς καὶ Θεμίστα παρακαλῆτε,
 ὡθεῖσθαι.” πρὸς δὲ Πυθοκλέα ὡραῖον ὅντα “Καθεδοῦμαί,
 φησὶ, προσδοκῶν τὴν ἴμερτὴν καὶ ἵστοθεόν σου εἴσοδον.” καὶ
 15 πάλιν πρὸς Θεμίσταν γράφων τὸνομίζει αὐτῇ παρασεῖν τοῦ, καθά
 φησι Θεύδωρος ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ τῶν πρὸς Ἐπίκουρον. |
 6 καὶ δλλαις δὲ πολλαῖς ἑταίραις γράφειν, καὶ μάλιστα Λεοντίῳ,
 ἡς καὶ Μητρόδωρον ἐμασθῆναι. ἐν τε τῷ Περὶ τέλους γράφειν
 οὕτως. Οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε ἔχω τέ νοήσω τάγαθόν, ἀφαιρῶν μὲν

3 8 ἐν Ὁμοίοις Hubner . ἐν νόμοις libri τοῖς δωδεκάτῳ B, unde τῷ δωδεκάτῳ Gassendi τοῖς BFPQH τοῖς εἰκάδος Hubner. κδ libri τοῖς εἰκάδος Hubner. τοῖς 3 τῆς Froben. 9 ἀστὸν BΡΗ: αὐτὸν FQ 5 4 ἐνέπλησαν Suidas: ἐνέπλησεν (ἐνέπλησε) B) libri 7 ὅποι] ὅποι Cobet 10 νομίζει αὐτῇ παρανεῖν libri: νομίζειν αὐτὴν περανεῖν Froben, unde νομίζει αὐτὴν περανεῖν Bignone: ὀνομάζει αὐτὴν ἑταίραν (vel Ἀριάγνην) Usener: νομίζει αὐγὴν παρενεῖν Kochalsky: locus nondum sanatus

of his *Comparison of Philosophies*. Also a slave called Mys, as Muronianus says in his chapters on historical coincidences.

Diotimus the Stoic, who is ill-disposed to Epicurus, has calumniated him most bitterly by producing fifty lewd letters as Epicurus' work; so has the writer who has assigned to Epicurus the collection of 'billet-doux' which
4 were attributed to Chrysippus, and also Posidonius the Stoic and his followers, as well as Nicolaus and Seton in the twelve books of the 'Arguments of Diocles' which are named after the Epicurean celebration of The Twentieth; also Dionysius of Halicarnassus. For they say that he used to go round from house to house with his mother reading out the purification prayers, and assisted his father in elementary teaching for a miserable pittance. They add that one of his brothers prostituted himself and kept company with Leontion, the hetaera. Also that he took Democritus' atomic theory and Aristippus' theory of pleasure and taught them as his own. Further, that he was not an Athenian born, as Timocrates says, and Herodotus too in his book *The Youth of Epicurus*. He is also said to have used degrading flattery towards Mithres, the steward of Lysimachus, calling him in his letters both 'Saviour' and
5 'My lord'. Idomeneus too and Herodotus and Timocrates, who divulged his secrets, he is said to have praised and flattered all the same. And in his letters he wrote to Leontion, 'Lord and Saviour, my dearest Leontion, what a hurrahing you drew from us, as we read aloud your dear letter', and to Themista, Leonteus' wife, 'If you two don't come to me, I am capable of arriving with a hop, skip and jump, wherever you and Themista summon me'. And to Pythocles who was young and beautiful he writes, 'I will sit down and wait for your lovely and godlike appearance'. And again in writing to Themista he calls her (by a most flattering name), as Theodorus says in the fourth book of
6 his attack on Epicurus. They say that he wrote to many other women of pleasure and particularly to Leontion, with whom Metrodorus was also in love; and that in the treatise *On the End of Life* he wrote, 'I know not how I can conceive the good, if I withdraw the pleasures of

τὰς διὰ χνλῶν ἡδονάς, ἀφαιρῶν δὲ τὰς δὶ' ἀφροδισίων καὶ τὰς
 5 δὶ' ἀκροαμάτων καὶ τὰς δὶα μορφῆς. ἐν τε τῇ πρὸς Πυθοκλέα
 ἐπιστολῇ γράφειν Παιδείαν δὲ πᾶσαν, μακάριε, φεῦγε τάκατιον
 ἀράμενος. Ἐπίκτητός τε κιναιδολόγον αὐτὸν καλεῖ καὶ τὰ
 μάλιστα λοιδορεῖ. καὶ μὴν καὶ Τιμοκράτης ἐν τοῖς ἐπιγραφο-
 μένοις Εὐφραντοῖς δὲ Μητροδώρου μὲν ἀδελφός, μαθητὴς δὲ
 10 αὐτοῦ τῆς σχολῆς ἐκφοιτήσας φησὶ δὶς αὐτὸν τῆς ἡμέρας
 ἔμεν ἀπὸ τρυφῆς, ἑαυτὸν δὲ διηγεῖται μόγις ἐκφυγεῖν ἰσχῦσαι
 τὰς υγκτερινὰς ἐκείνας φιλοσοφίας καὶ τὴν μυστικὴν ἐκείνην
 7 συνδιαγωγήν | τόν τε Ἐπίκουρον πολλὰ κατὰ τὸν λόγον
 ἥγνοικέναι καὶ πολὺ μᾶλλον κατὰ τὸν βίον, τό τε σῶμα
 ἐλειεινῶς διακεῖσθαι, ὡς πολλῶν ἐτῶν μὴ δύνασθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ
 φορείου διαναστῆναι· μνᾶν τε ἀναλίσκειν ἡμερησίαν εἰς τὴν
 5 τράπεζαν, ὡς αὐτὸς ἐν τῇ πρὸς Λεόντιον ἐπιστολῇ γράφει καὶ
 ἐν ταῖς πρὸς τοὺς ἐν Μυτιλήνῃ φιλοσόφους. συνεῖναι τε
 αὐτῷ τε καὶ Μητροδώρῳ ἑταίρας καὶ ἄλλας, Μαρμάριον καὶ
 Ἡδεῖαν καὶ Ἐρώτιον καὶ Νικήδιον. καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἐπτὰ καὶ
 10 τριάκοντα βίβλοις ταῖς Περὶ φύσεως τὰ πλεῖστα ταῦτα λέγειν
 τοι καὶ ἀντιγράφειν ἐν αὐταῖς ἄλλοις τε καὶ Ναυσιφάνει τὰ
 πλεῖστα, καὶ αὐτῇ λέξει φάσκειν οὕτως, 'Αλλ' ἵτωσαι' εἶχε
 γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ὡδίνων τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ στόματος καύχησιν τὴν
 σοφιστικήν, καθάπερ καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοὶ τῶν ἀνδραπόδων. |
 8 καὶ αὐτὸν Ἐπίκουρον ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς περὶ Ναυσιφάνους
 λέγειν Ταῦτα ἡγαγεὶ αὐτὸν εἰς ἐκστασιν τοιαύτην, ὥστε μοι
 λοιδορεῖσθαι καὶ ἀποκαλεῖν διδάσκαλον. πλεύμονά τε αὐτοὶ
 ἐκάλει καὶ ἀγράμματον καὶ ἀπατεῶνα καὶ πόρνην τούς τε περὶ
 5 Πλάτωνα Διονυσοκόλακας καὶ αὐτὸν Πλάτωνα χρυσοῦν καὶ
 Ἀριστοτέλη ἄσωτον, *(δν)* καταφαγόντα τὴν πατρόφαν οὐσίαν
 στρατεύεσθαι καὶ φαρμακοπωλεῖν· φορμοφόρον τε Πρωταγόραν
 καὶ γραφέα Δημοκρίτον καὶ ἐν ταῖς κώμαις γράμματα διδά-

6 4 δὲ τὰς] δὲ καὶ τὰς Μειβομ
 PB¹ (ex μορφᾷ corr.): μορφᾶς QH . μορφῶν F 5 μορφῆς Athenaeus μορφᾶς
 ἀράμενος Gassendi· φεῦγετε κατιδιαραμεν B : φεύγε τε κατι δι / / ἐ¹
 ραμεν (in sing. /, ai) P : φεύγετε κατι διέραμεν QH 6 φεῦγετε κατι διέραμεν
 5 συνδιαγωγήν PQ : συναγωγήν BF : διαγωγήν H 7 6 ταῖς] τῇ Menagius
 7 Μαρμάριον Spengel ex Philodemo· μαρμάριον ΒΡΩΗ: μαρμά-
 ρειον F 9 ταῦτα Kuhn: ταῦτα libri: post ταῦτα Usener *(τε)*
 inseruit 10 ἄλλοι f : ἄλλαι BFPQH τὰ πλεῖστα uncinis
 inclusit Usener 11 ἄλλ' ἵτωσαν Usener. ἄλλ' εἴτως ἄλλ'
 B: alii libri alia. ἄλλ' εἰ τις ἄλλος Stephanus εἴχε
 γὰρ ἐκεῖνος Usener: εἴχε γὰρ κείνος libri · εἴχε κάκείνος Stephanus

taste and withdraw the pleasures of love and those of hearing and sight'. Again in the letter to Pythocles they say he wrote 'Blest youth, set sail in your bark and flee from every form of culture'. Epictetus moreover calls him a filthy talker and abuses him roundly. And even Timocrates, who was the brother of Metrodorus and a disciple of Epicurus, after he had abandoned the school, wrote in a book with the title *Pleasant Things* that Epicurus used to vomit twice a day owing to his luxurious living, and that he himself was scarcely able to escape from his philosophical disquisitions during the night and from the community of the initiates. He adds that Epicurus was profoundly ignorant of philosophy and still more so of practical life, that his body was miserably weak, so that for many years he was unable to rise from his portable couch. further, that he spent no less than a mina a day on his food, as Epicurus writes himself in the letter to Leontine and in the letters to the philosophers in Mytilene moreover, there were other women who lived with him and Metrodorus, named Mammarion and Hedeia and Eroton and Nicidion. He adds that in the thirty-seven books *On Nature* he repeats himself for the most part and attacks many other philosophers in them but Nausiphanes most of all, saying in his own words, 'Away with them all for Nausiphanes, like many another slave, was in travail with that wordy braggart, sophistic' He says that Epicurus himself in his letters about Nausiphanes said, 'This drove him to such a state of fury that he abused me and ironically called me "Master"'. He used to call Nausiphanes 'The mollusc', 'The illiterate', 'The cheat', 'The harlot'. The followers of Plato he called 'Flatterers of Dionysus' and Plato himself 'The golden man', and Aristotle 'The debauchee', saying that he devoured his inheritance and then enlisted and sold drugs Protagoras he called 'Porter' or 'Copier of Democritus', saying that he taught in the village schools. Herachitus he called

8 3 διδάσκαλον] δύσκολον coniecit Usener: (μου ἔαυτόν) adiecit Kochalsky 6 (δν) supplevit C. F. Harmann 7 στρατεύεσθαι] τερατεύεσθαι coniecit Usener

σκειν· Ἡράκλειτόν τε κυκητήν· καὶ Δημόκριτον Ληρόκριτον·
ιο καὶ Ἀντίδωρον Σαυνίδωρον· τούς τε Κυνικοὺς ἔχθροὺς τῆς
Ἐλλάδος· καὶ τοὺς διαλεκτικοὺς πολυφθόρους· Πύρρωνα δὲ
ἀμαθῆ καὶ ἀπαλένετον.

9 Μεμήνασι δ' οὗτοι. τῷ γὰρ ἀνδρὶ μάρτυρες ἴκανοὶ τῆς
ἀνυπερβλήτου πρὸς πάντας εὐγνωμοσύνης ἡ τε πατρὶς χαλ-
καῖς εἰκόσι τιμήσασα, οὐ τε φίλοι τοσοῦτοι τὸ πλῆθος ὡς
μηδ' ἀν πόλεσιν δλαις μετρεῖσθαι δύνασθαι, οὐ τε γνώριμοι
5 πάντες ταῖς δογματικαῖς αὐτοῦ σειρῇσι προσκατασχεθέντες,
πλὴν Μητροδώρου τοῦ Στρατονικέως πρὸς Καρνεάδην ἀποχωρή-
σαντος, τάχα βαρυνθέντος ταῖς ἀνυπερβλήτοις αὐτοῦ χρηστό-
τησιν· ἡ τε διαδοχή, πασῶν σχεδὸν ἐκλιπονσῶν τῶν ἀλλων,
ἐς ἀεὶ διαμένουσα καὶ νηρίθμους ἀρχὰς ἀπολύουσα ἄλλην ἐξ
10 ἄλλης τῶν γνωρίμων· | ἡ τε πρὸς τοὺς γονέας εὐχαριστία, καὶ
ἡ πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς εὐποίεια, πρὸς τε τοὺς οἰκέτας ἡμερότης,
ὡς δῆλον κάκ τῶν διαθηκῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ δτι αὐτοὶ συνεφιλο-
σόφουν αἴτῳ, ὃν ἦν ἐνδοξότατος ὁ προειρημένος Μῆνς καθόλου
5 τε ἡ πρὸς πάντας αὐτοῦ φιλανθρωπία. τῆς μὲν γὰρ πρὸς
θεοὺς δσιότητος καὶ πρὸς πατρίδα φιλίας ἀλεκτος ἡ διάθεσις.
ὑπερβολῇ γὰρ ἐπιεικέας οὐδὲ πολιτείας ἥψατο. καὶ χαλεπω-
τάτων δὲ καιρῶν κατασχόντων τηνικάδε τὴν Ἐλλάδα αὐτόθι
καταβιῶνται, δις ἡ τρὶς εἰς τοὺς περὶ τὴν Ἰωνίαν τόπους πρὸς
10 τοὺς φίλους διαδραμόντα· οὐ καὶ πανταχόθεν πρὸς αὐτὸν
ἀφικνοῦντο, καὶ συνεβίον αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ κήπῳ καθά φησι καὶ
Ἀπολλόδωρος, [δν καὶ δγδοήκοντα μνῶν πρίασθαι· Διοκλῆς
δὲ ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ τῆς ἐπιδρομῆς φησιν] εὔτελέστατα καὶ λιτότατα
11 διαιτώμενοι· | κοτύλῃ γοῦν, φησὶν, οἰνιδίουν ἡρκοῦντο· τὸ δὲ
πᾶν ὕδωρ ἦν αὐτοῖς ποτόν. τόν τε Ἐπίκουρον μὴ ἀξιοῦν εἰς
τὸ κοινὸν κατατίθεσθαι τὰς οὐσίας, καθάπερ τὸν Πυθαγόραν
κοινὰ τὰ φίλων λέγοντα· ἀπιστούντων γὰρ εἴναι τὸ τοιοῦτον
5 εἰ δ' ἀπίστων, οὐδὲ φίλων. αὐτὸς τε φησὶν ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστο-
λαῖς ὕδατι μόνον ἀρκεῖσθαι καὶ ἀρτῷ λιτῷ. καὶ Πέμψιν μοι

IO Κυνικοὺς Reinesius: κυζηνικοὺς libri: Κυρηναῖκοὺς Gassendi
II πολυφθόρους Bake· πολυφθονεροὺς BQ: πολὺ φθονεροὺς FPH
9 I τῷ γὰρ ἀνδρὶ Gassendi: τῶν γὰρ ἀνδρῶν libri 9 νηρίθμους
BF¹PQH¹: ἀνηρίθμους F²H² 10 9 εἰς τὸν BPQFH· εἰς om.
f Usemer II 4 τὰ τῶν Meibom

'The Muddler', Democritus Lerocritus ('Judge of nonsense'), Antidorus Sannidorus ('Maniac'), the Cynics 'Enemies of Hellas', the Logicians 'The destroyers', and Pyrrho 'The uneducated fool'.

¶ But these calumniators are all mad. For Epicurus has witnesses enough and to spare to his unsurpassed kindness to all men. There is his country which honoured him with bronze statues, his friends so numerous that they could not even be reckoned by entire cities, and his disciples who all remained bound for ever by the charm of his teaching, except Metrodorus, son of Stratoniceus, who went over to Carneades, overweighted perhaps by Epicurus' excessive goodness. There is also the permanent continuance of the school after almost all the others had come to an end, and that though it had a countless succession of heads from among the disciples. There is again his grateful devotion to his parents, his generosity to his brothers, and his gentleness towards his servants, of whom the most notable was Mys already mentioned, as is proved by his will and the part they took in his philosophical discussions. In short there is his benevolence to all. Of his reverence towards the gods and his love of his country it would be impossible to speak adequately. But from excess of modesty he would not take any part in politics. Yet although Greece was at that time in great straits he continued to live there, and only once or twice made a voyage to Ionia and the neighbourhood to see his friends. But they came to him from all quarters, and took up their abode with him in the garden, as Apollodorus says [who adds that he bought it for eighty minae. Diocles in the third book of his *Course in Philosophy* confirms this], living a most frugal and simple life. Indeed, he says, they were satisfied with half a pint of wine, and for the most part drank water. He adds that Epicurus did not recommend them to put their belongings into a common stock, as did Pythagoras, who said that 'Friends have all in common'. For to do so implied distrust: and distrust could not go with friendship. Epicurus himself says in his letters that he was content with nothing but water and a bit of bread

τυροῦ, φησί, κυθριδίου, ἥν ὅταν βούλωμαι πολυτελεύσασθαι δύνωμαι. τοιοῦτος ἡν δ τὴν ἡδονὴν εἶναι τέλος δογματίζων. δν καὶ Ἀθήναιος δ' ἐπιγράμματος οὕτως ὑμεῖ |

- 12 ἄνθρωποι μοχθεῖτε τὰ χείρονα, καὶ διὰ κέρδος
ἀπληστοι νεικέων ἀρχετε καὶ πολέμων·
τᾶς φύσιος δ' ὁ πλοῦτος δρον τιὰ βαιὸν ἐπίσχει·
αἱ δὲ κεναὶ κρίσιες τὰν ἀπέραντον ὁδόν.
5 τοῦτο Νεοκλῆς πωντὸν τέκος ἢ παρὰ Μουσέων
ἔκλυεν ἢ Πυθοῦς ἐξ ἱερῶν τριπόδων.

εἰσόμεθα δὲ καὶ μᾶλλον προιώντες ἔκ τε τῶν δογμάτων ἔκ τε τῶν ρήτων αὐτοῦ.

- 10 Μάλιστα δ' ἀπεδέχετο, φησὶ Διοκλῆς, τῶν ἀρχαίων
Ἀναξαγόραι, καίτοι ἔν τισιν ἀντειρηκὼς αὐτῷ, καὶ Ἀρχέλαιον
τὸν Σωκράτους διδάσκαλον. ἐγύμνασε δέ, φησί, τὸν γυνωρί-
13 μονος καὶ διὰ μνήμης ἔχειν τὰ ἔαυτοῦ συγγράμματα. | Τοῦτον
Ἀπολλόδωρος ἐν Χρονικοῖς Ναυπιφάνους ἀκοῦσται φησὶ καὶ
Πραξιφάρους αὐτὸς δὲ οὐ φητιν, ἀλλ' ἔαυτοῦ, ἐν τῇ πρὸς
Εὐρύλοχον ἐπιστολῇ. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Λεύκιππόν τινα γεγενῆσθαι
5 φησὶ φιλοσοφον, οὗτε αὐτὸς οὗτε Ἐρμαρχος, διν ἔνιοι φασὶ⁵
καὶ Ἀπολλόδωρος ὁ Ἐπικούρειος διδάσκαλον Δημοκρίτου
γεγενῆσθαι. Δημήτριος δέ φησιν δι Μάγιης καὶ Ξενοκράτους
αὐτὸν ἀκοῦσται.

- 14 Κέχρηται δὲ λέξει κυρίᾳ κατὰ τῶν πραγμάτων, ἥν ὅτι
10 Ἰδιωτάτῃ ἐστίν, Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικὸς αἰτιάται. σαφῆς
δ' ἦν οὕτως, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ Περὶ μῆτορικῆς ἀξιοῦ μηδὲν ἄλλο
14 ἢ σαφήνειαν ἀπαιτεῖν | καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς ἀντὶ τοῦ
Χαίρειν Εὖ πράττειν καὶ Σπουδαίως ζῆγ.

'Αριστων δέ φησιν ἐν τῷ Ἐπικούρου βίῳ τὸν Κανόνα
γράψαι αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ Ναυπιφάνους Τρίποδος, οὐ καὶ ἀκοῦσται
5 φησιν αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ Παμφίλου τοῦ Πλατωνικοῦ ἐν Σάμῳ.
ἄρξασθαι τε φιλοσοφεῖν ἐτῶν ὑπάρχοντα δυοκαΐδεκα, ἀφηγή-
στασθαι δὲ τῆς σχολῆς ἐτῶν οἴτα δύο πρὸς τοῖς τριάκοντα.

7 κυθριδίου] κυθρίδιον f. Κυθνίου Menagius 12 2 ἀπληστοι
Usener: ἀπλειστον F: ἀπληστον lib. cett. 8 ρήτων BΡ'Q. ρημά-
των ΦΡ'Η 13 4 Εὐρύλοχον Menagius ex § 28 εὐρόλοκον Ρ'Q: οὐδιώδοκον BFP'Η 10 [ιδιωτάτη] ιδιωτικάτη Menagius ιδιω-
τική Bake 12 ἀπαιτεῖν] ἀσκεῖν Cobet. ἀπαιτῶν coniecit Usener
14 2 post Χαίρειν Usener γράψει inserere voluit 3 'Αριστων
Cobet. ἀριστον' οι libri: 'Αριστων δ π(εριπατητικος) Bignone:
'Αντίγονος Usener φησιν Cobet φασιν libri

'Send me,' he says, 'some preserved cheese, that when I like I may have a feast.' Such was the man who taught that the end is pleasure. Athenaeus sings his praise in an epigram :

- 12 Men toil at mean pursuits, for love of gain
 Insatiate they welcome war and strife;
 Their idle fancies lead on endless paths,
 But nature's wealth is set in narrow bounds.
 This truth the prudent son of Neocles
 Learnt from the Muses or Apollo's shrine.

The truth of this we shall know better as we go on from his own words and teaching.

Dioecles says that of the earlier philosophers he showed most sympathy with Anaxagoras, though on certain points he opposed him, and with Archelaus, the master of Socrates. And, he adds, he used to practise his disciples in getting 13 his writings by heart. Apollodorus in his *Chronicles* asserts that he listened to the teaching of Nausiphanes and Praxiphanes. Epicurus himself denies this in his letter to Eurylochus and says he was his own teacher. And indeed both Epicurus and Hermarchus deny that there ever was such a philosopher as Leucippus, whom Apollodorus the Epicurean and others say was the master of Democritus. Demetrius of Magnesia says that he was also a follower of Xenocrates.

He uses current diction to expound his theory, but Aristophanes the grammarian censures it as being too peculiar. But he was clear in expression, just as in his 14 book on *Rhetoric* he insists on clearness above everything. In his letters he used to say 'Prosper' or 'Live well', instead of the conventional introduction 'Be happy'.

Ariston in his *Life of Epicurus* says that he borrowed *The Canon* from the *Tripod* of Nausiphanes, whose pupil he says he was, as well as being a disciple of Pamphilus the Platonist in Samos. He states that Epicurus began philosophy at the age of twelve, and was at the head of his School at thirty-two.

Ἐγενυήθη δέ, φησὶν Ἀπολλόδωρος ἐν Χρονικοῖς, κατὰ τὸ
τρίτου ἔτος τῆς ἑνάτης καὶ ἑκατοστῆς δλυμπιάδος ἐπὶ¹⁰
Σωσιγένους ἀρχοντος μηνὸς γαμηλιῶνος ἐβδόμη, ἔτεσιν
15 ὕστερον τῆς Πλάτωνος τελευτῆς ἐπτά. | ὑπάρχοντα δ' αὐτὸν
ἔτῶν δύο καὶ τριάκοντα πρῶτον ἐν Μυτιλήνῃ καὶ Λαμψάκῳ
συστήσασθαι σχολὴν ἐπὶ ἔτη πέντε ἐπειθ' οὗτος εἰς Ἀθήνας
μετελθεῖν, καὶ τελευτῆσαι κατὰ τὸ δεύτερον ἔτος τῆς ἐβδόμης
5 καὶ ἑκατοστῆς καὶ ἑκατοστῆς δλυμπιάδος ἐπὶ Πινθαράτου ἔτη
βιώσαντα δύο πρὸς τοὺς ἐβδομήκοντα· τήν τε σχολὴν δια-
δέξασθαι "Ἐρμαρχον Ἀγεμόρτου Μυτιληναῖον. τελευτῆσαι δ'
10 αὐτὸν λίθῳ τῶν οὔρων ἐπισχεθέντων, ὡς φησὶ καὶ "Ἐρμαρχος
ἐν ἐπιστολαῖς, ἡμέρας νοσήσαντα τετταρεσκαλεκα. δτε καὶ
15 φησιν "Ἐρμιππος ἐμβάντα αὐτὸν εἰς πύελον χαλκῆν κεκρα-
μένην ὥδατι θερμῷ καὶ αἰτήσαντα ἄκρατον ῥοφῆσαι. | τοὺς τε
φίλους παραγγελαντα τῶν δογμάτων μεμνήσθαι, οὕτω τελευ-
τῆσαι. καὶ ἐστιν ἡμῶν εἰς αὐτὸν οὕτω.

Χαίρετε καὶ μέμνησθε τὰ δόγματα. τοῦτ' Ἐπίκουρος

5 ὕστατον εἶπε φίλοις τοῦπος ἀποφθίμενος.

Θερμὴν ἐς πύελον γὰρ ἐληλύθεεν καὶ ἄκρατον
ἐσπασεν, εἴτ' Ἀλδην ψυχρὸν ἐπεσπάσατο.

οὗτος μὲν ὁ βίος τἀνδρός, ηδε ⟨δὲ⟩ ἡ τελευτή.

Καὶ διέθετο ὡδε·

(ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ)

10 Κατὰ τάδε δῖωμι τὰ ἔμαυτοῦ πάντα Ἀμυνομάχῳ Φιλο-
κράτους Βατῆθεν καὶ Τιμοκράτει Δημητρίου Ποταμίῳ κατὰ
17 τὴν ἐν τῷ Μητρῷ ἀναγεγραμμένην ἑκατέρῳ δύσω, | ἐφ' φ τε
τὸν μὲν κῆπον καὶ τὰ προσόντα αὐτῷ παρέξουσιν Ἐρμάρχῳ
Ἀγεμόρτου Μυτιληναίῳ καὶ τοῖς συμφιλοσοφοῦσιν αὐτῷ καὶ
οἷς ἀν "Ἐρμαρχος καταλίπῃ διαδόχοις τῆς φιλοσοφίας, ἐνδια-
5 τρίβειν κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν. καὶ ἀεὶ δὲ τοῖς φιλοσοφοῦσιν ἀπὸ⁶
ἡμῶν, δπως ἀν συνδιασώσωσιν Ἀμυνομάχῳ καὶ Τιμοκράτει

10 ἐβδόμη Usener: ἐβδόμη B²; ἐβδόμης FPQH: om. B¹
15 9 τετταρεσκαΐδεκα B: τεσσαρεσκαΐδεκα Q: τετταρεσκαΐδεκα FP²:
τετταρεσκαΐδεκα H 16 4-7 in Anthol. Pal. vii. 106 inclusum
5 τοῦτος Usener: πρῶτος BFH: πρῶτον PQ: οἵσιν f Anthol.
6 ἐληλύθεεν Usener: ἐ λιληθεν ex ἐσληληθεν corr. B ἐσηλυθεν PQH
Anthol. καὶ BPQH Anthol.: καὶ τὸν Ff 8 ⟨δὲ⟩ supplevit
Stephanus 17 3 Ἀγεμόρτου Usener ex § 24: ἀγεμάρχου libri

He was born, says Apollodorus in the *Chronicles*, in the third year of the 109th Olympiad in the archonship of Sosigenes on the seventh day of the month Gamelion, ¹⁵ seven years after the death of Plato. When he was thirty-two he started his school first for five years at Mitylene and Lampsacus and then he migrated to Athens. There he died in the second year of the 127th Olympiad in the archonship of Pytharatus, at the age of seventy-two. Hermarchus of Mitylene, son of Agemortus, succeeded to the headship of the school. Epicurus died of a stone in the bladder, as Hermarchus also says in his letters, after an illness of fourteen days. Hermippus tells us that as he was dying he got into a bronze bath filled with hot water, and asked for a cup of unmixed wine, which he gulped ¹⁶ down. Then having adjured his friends to remember his teaching he expired. I have composed the following epigram on him :

'Farewell, remember my sayings.' Thus spake at his death Epicurus,

These the last words as he died spake he aloud to his friends.

Then in a hot bath he laid him, a goblet of wine he demanded,
Quaffed it, and soon the cold air quaffed he of Hades below.'

Such was Epicurus' life and such his death.

His will was as follows :

EPICURUS' WILL.

I hereby leave all my possessions to Amynomachus, son of Philocrates, of the deme of Bate, and Timocrates, son of Demetrius, of the deme of Potamos, according to the ¹⁷ form of gift to each registered in the Metroum, on condition that they make over the garden and all that goes with it to Hermarchus, son of Agemortus, of Mitylene, and to those who study philosophy with him and to those whom Hermarchus may leave as his successors in the school, for them to live there in the pursuit of philosophy. And to those who hereafter follow my philosophy I assign the right to live in the garden, that they may assist Amyno-

κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν, τὴν ἐν τῷ κήπῳ διατριβὴν παρακατατίθεμαι τοῖς τ' αὐτῶν κληρονόμοις, ἐν φῶ ἀν ποτε τρόπῳ ἀσφαλέστατον γῆ, δπως ἀν κάκενοι διατηρώσιν τὸν κήπον, καθάπερ καὶ αὐτοὶ 10 οἱς ἀν οἱ ἀπὸ ἡμῶν φιλοσοφοῦντες παραδίδωσιν.

Τὴν δ' οἰκίαν τὴν ἐν Μελίτῃ παρεχέτωσαν Ἀμυνόμαχος καὶ Τιμοκράτης ἐνοικεῖν Ἐρμάρχῳ καὶ τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ φιλοσοφοῦντιν, ἔως ἀν "Ἐρμαρχος" Σῇ. |

18 'Εκ δὲ τῶν γιωμένων προσόδων τῶν δεδομένων ἀφ' ἡμῶν Ἀμυνομάχῳ καὶ Τιμοκράτει κατὰ τὸ δυνατὸν μεριζέσθωσαν μεθ' Ἐρμάρχου σκοπούμενοι εἰς τε τὰ ἐναγίσματα τῷ τε πατρὶ καὶ τῇ μητρὶ καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, καὶ ἡμῖν εἰς τὴν εἰθιτμένην 5 ἄγεσθαι γενέθλιον ἡμέραν ἑκάστου ἔτους τῇ προτέρᾳ δεκάτῃ τοῦ γαμηλιῶνος, ὡσπερ καὶ εἰς τὴν γιωμένην σύνοδον ἑκάστου μηνὸς ταῖς εἰκάσι τῶν συμφιλοσοφούντων ἡμῖν εἰς τὴν ἡμῶν τε καὶ Μητροδώρου (μνήμην) κατατεταγμένην συντελείτωσαν δὲ καὶ τὴν τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμέραν τοῦ ποσειδεῶνος συντελεί- 10 τωσαν δὲ καὶ τὴν Πολυναίνου τοῦ μεταγειτνιῶνος, καθάπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς. |

19 'Επιμελείσθωσαν δὲ καὶ Ἀμυνόμαχος καὶ Τιμοκράτης τοῦ νιοῦ τοῦ Μητροδώρου Ἐπικούρου καὶ τοῦ νιοῦ τοῦ Πολυναίνου, φιλοσοφοῦντων αὐτῶν καὶ συζώντων μεθ' Ἐρμάρχου. ὡσαύτως δὲ τῆς θυγατρὸς τῆς Μητροδώρου τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν ποιείσθωσαν, 5 καὶ εἰς ἡλικίαν ἐλθοῦσαν ἐκδότωσαν φῶ ἀν "Ἐρμαρχος" ἐληταὶ τῶν φιλοσοφούντων μεθ' αὐτοῦ, οὗσης αὐτῆς εὐτάκτου καὶ πειθαρχούσης Ἐρμάρχῳ. διδύτωσαν δὲ Ἀμυνόμαχος καὶ Τιμοκράτης ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχούσων ἡμῶν προσόδων εἰς τροφὴν τούτοις, δ τι ἀν αὐτοῖς κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἐπιδέχεσθαι δοκῇ σκοπου- 10 μένοις μεθ' Ἐρμάρχου. |

20 Ποιείσθωσαν δὲ μεθ' αὐτῶν καὶ "Ἐρμαρχον κύριων τῶν προσόδων, ἵνα μετὰ τοῦ συγκαταγεγηρακότος ἡμῖν ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ καὶ καταλελειμένου ἡγεμόνος τῶν συμφιλοσοφούντων ἡμῖν ἔκαστα γίνηται. τὴν δὲ προΐκα τῷ θήλει παιδίῳ, ἐπειδὰν 5 εἰς ἡλικίαν ἐλθῃ, μερισάτωσαν Ἀμυνόμαχος καὶ Τιμοκράτης,

8 ἀν ποτε τρόπῳ Usener: ἀν ἀποτρέπω librī 9 διατηρῶσιν
Usener: διατηρείεν F: διατηροῖεν libr. cett 10 παραδιδῶσιν
BP¹Q: παραδίδωσι GHP²: παραδίδωσι F. παραδῶσι Usener
18 i ἀφ'] ἱφ' Kochalsky 6 ὡσπερ Usener: ὡστε librī: ἔτι δὲ
Casaubon 8 (μνήμην) supplevit Aldobrandinus collato Cic. de Fin.
ii. 31. 101 κατατεταγμένην] κατὰ (τὰ) τεταγμένα Usener 10 μετα-

machus and Timocrates to maintain it to the best of their power, and to their heirs, in whatever way may give the securest possession, that they too may preserve the garden, and after them those to whom the disciples of my school may hand it on.

The house in Melite Amynomachus and Timocrates shall assign for a dwelling to Hermarchus and to those who study philosophy with him, as long as Hermarchus shall live.

18 The income of the property left by me to Amynomachus and Timocrates shall be divided by them as far as possible, with the advice of Hermarchus, for the offerings in honour of my father and mother and brothers, and for the customary celebration of my birthday every year on the tenth of Gamelion, and likewise for the assembly of my disciples which takes place on the twentieth of each month, having been established in recollection of myself and Metrodorus. Let them also keep the day of my brothers in Poseideon and the day of Polyaenus in Metageitnion, as I have done myself.

19 Amynomachus and Timocrates shall take care of Epicurus, the son of Metrodorus, and of the son of Polyaenus, provided they devote themselves to philosophy and live with Hermarchus. Likewise they shall take care of Metrodorus' daughter, and when she comes of age shall give her in marriage to one of his disciples whom Hermarchus shall choose, provided she is well-behaved and obedient to Hermarchus. Amynomachus and Timocrates shall set aside for the maintenance of these children such sum out of the revenues of my estate as shall seem good to them each year in consultation with Hermarchus.

20 They shall give Hermarchus authority with themselves over the income, in order that everything may be done in consultation with the man who has grown old with me in the study of philosophy and has been left by me head of the school. The dowry for the girl, when she comes of age, shall be apportioned by Amynomachus and Timocrates,

δοσον ἀν ἐπιδέχηται ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ἀφαιροῦντες μετὰ τῆς Ἐρμάρχον γνώμης. ἐπιμελείσθωσαν δὲ καὶ Νικάνορος, καθάπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἵν' δοσοι τῶν φιλοσοφούντων ἡμῖν χρείαν ἔν τοις ἰδίοις παρεσχημένοι καὶ τὴν πᾶσαν οἰκειότητα ἐνδει-
ο δειγμένοι συγκαταγράσκειν μεθ' ἡμῶν προελούντο ἐν φιλο-
σοφίᾳ, μηδενὸς τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἐνδεεῖς καθεστήκωσι παρὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν δύναμιν. |

21 Δοῦναι δὲ τὰ βιβλία τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ἡμῖν πάντα Ἐρμάρχῳ.
ἔαν δέ τι τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων περὶ Ἐρμαρχον γένηται πρὸ τοῦ τὰ
Μητροδώρου παιδία εἰς ἡλικίαν ἐλθεῖν, δοῦναι Ἀμυνόμαχον
καὶ Τιμοκράτη, δπως ἀν εὐτακτούντων αὐτῶν ἔκαστα γένηται
5 τῶν ἀναγκαίων, κατὰ τὸ δυνατὸν ἀπὸ τῶν καταλειμμένων
ὑφ' ἡμῶν προσόδων. καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀπάντων ὡν συντετά-
χαμεν ἐπιμελείσθωσαν, δπως ἀν κατὰ τὸ ἐνδεχόμενον ἔκαστα
γέγνηται. ἀφίημι δὲ τῶν παῖδων ἐλεύθερον Μῆν, Νικίαν,
Λύκωνα. ἀφίημι δὲ καὶ Φαέδριον ἐλευθέραν. |

22 "Ηδη δὲ τελευτῶν γράφει πρὸς Ἰδομενέα τήνδε ἐπιστολήν.
Τὴν μακαρίαν ἄγοντες καὶ ἄμα τελευτῶντες ἡμέραν τοῦ βίου
ἐγράφομεν ὑμῖν ταυτὶ· στραγγούρικά τε παρηκολούθει καὶ
δυσεντερικὰ πάθη ὑπερβολὴν οὐκ ἀπολείποντα τοῦ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς
5 μεγέθους· ἀντιπαρετάττετο δὲ πᾶσι τούτοις τὸ κατὰ ψυχὴν
χαῖρον ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν γεγονότων ἡμῖν διαλογισμῶν μνῆμη. σὺ
δὲ δέξιας τῆς ἐκ μειρακίου παραστάσεως πρὸς ἐμὲ καὶ φιλο-
σοφίαν ἐπιμελοῦ τῶν παῖδων Μητροδώρου. καὶ διέθετο μὲν
ῶδε.

10 Μαθητὰς δὲ ἔσχε πολλοὺς μέν, σφόδρα δὲ ἐλλογίμους
Μητρόδωρον Ἀθηναίου ἢ Τιμοκράτους καὶ Σάνδης Λαμψα-
κηνόν· ὃς ἀφ' οὐ τὸν ἀνδρα ἔγνω, οὐκ ἀπέστη ἀπ' αὐτοῦ πλὴν
23 ἔξ μηνῶν εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν, ἔπειτα ἐπανῆλθε. | γέγονε δὲ ἀγαθὸς
πάντα, καθὰ καὶ Ἐπίκουρος ἐν προηγουμέναις γραφαῖς μαρτυρεῖ

II παρὰ Usener: ἐπὶ libri 21 2 γένηται F: γίνηται libr. cett.
6 δην FPQH ὡς BG 7 ἀν Usener· δὴ libri 9 ἐλευθέραιas P²GH:
ἐλευθέρα F¹: ἐλευθερία BF³P¹Q: ἐλευθερία Usener 22 2 τελευ-
τῶντες] τελευταίαν Davis ex Cic de Fin. II. 30. 96 3 παρηκολούθει
Stephanus: παρηκολούθκει libri 7 φιλοσοφίαν f: φιλοσοφίας libri
8 διέθετο Stephanus: ἔθετο libri 11 'Αθηναίου Duening: ἀθηναίου
libri ἥ] καὶ f Tιμοκράτους Duening: Τιμοκράτ' FPQ: τιμο-

who shall take a suitable sum from the capital with the approval of Hermarchus. They shall also take care of Nicanor, as I have done, to show that those who have studied with me and have met my needs from their own resources and shown me every mark of friendship and elected to grow old with me in the study of philosophy, may not lack for anything that is necessary, as far as lies in my power.

²¹ They are to give all the books that belong to me to Hermarchus. And if any mortal chance befall Hermarchus before Metrodorus' children come of age, Amynomachus and Timocrates shall as far as possible provide all that is necessary from the income of my estate, if the children are well-behaved. They shall carefully carry out all my other arrangements, so that each may be fulfilled as far as possible. Of my slaves I set free Mys, Nicias and Lycon, and I also set Phaedrium free.

²² When he was on the point of death he wrote the following letter to Idomeneus : 'On this truly happy day of my life, as I am at the point of death, I write this to you. The disease in my bladder and stomach are pursuing their course, lacking nothing of their natural severity : but against all this is the joy in my heart at the recollection of my conversations with you. Do you, as I might expect from your devotion from boyhood to me and to philosophy, take good care of the children of Metrodorus.' Such then was his will.

He had many disciples, but among the most distinguished was first Metrodorus, son of Athenaeus (or Timocrates) and Sande, of Lampsacus. From the time when he first came to know Epicurus he never left him, except when he went to his native city for six months, and then he came back
²³ He was a good man in all respects, as Epicurus too bears witness in prologues to his writings and in the third book

καὶ ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ Τιμοκράτους. τοιοῦτος δ' ὁν καὶ τὴν ἀδελφὴν
 Βατέδα ἔξεδοτο Ἰδομενεῖ, καὶ Λεόντιον τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἑταῖραν
 5 ἀναλαβὼν εἶχε παλλακήν. ἦν δὲ καὶ ἀκατάπληκτος πρὸς τε
 τὰς ὄχλησεις καὶ τὸν θάνατον, ὡς Ἐπίκουρος ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ
 Μητροδώρου φησί. φασὶ δὲ καὶ πρὸ ἐπτά ἐτῶν ἀντοῦ
 τελευτῆσαι πεντηκοστὸν τρίτον ἔτος ἄγοντα, καὶ αὐτὸς Ἐπί-
 κουρος ἐν ταῖς προειρημέναις διαθήκαις, ὡς προαπεληλυθότος
 10 αὐτοῦ δηλούντι, ἐπισκήπτει περὶ τῆς ἐπιμελείας αὐτοῦ τῶν
 παῖδων. [ἔσχε δὲ καὶ τὸν προειρημένον εἰκαῖν τινα ἀδελφὸν τοῦ
 Μητροδώρου Τιμοκράτην.] βιβλία δέ ἔστι τοῦ Μητροδώρου
 24 τάδε· | Πρὸς τοὺς ἱατροὺς τρία. Περὶ αἰσθήσεων. Πρὸς
 Τιμοκράτην. Περὶ μεγαλοψυχίας. Περὶ τῆς Ἐπικούρου
 ἀρρωστίας. Πρὸς τοὺς διαλεκτικούς. Πρὸς τοὺς σοφιστὰς
 ἐννέα. Περὶ τῆς ἐπὶ σοφίᾳ πορείας. Περὶ τῆς μεταβολῆς.
 5 Περὶ πλούτου. Πρὸς Δημόκριτον. Περὶ εὐγενείας.

"**Ην** καὶ Πολύαινος Ἀθηνοδώρου Λαμψακηνός, ἐπιεικῆς καὶ
 φιλικός, ὡς οἱ περὶ Φιλόδημον φασι.

Καὶ διαδεξάμενος αὐτὸν "Ερμαρχος Ἀγεμόρτου Μυτιλη-
 ναῖος, ἀνὴρ πατρὸς μὲν πένητος, τὰς δ' ὀρχὰς προσέχων
 10 ρήτορικοῖς. φέρεται καὶ τούτου βιβλία κάλλιστα τάδε· |
 25 'Επιστολικὰ περὶ Ἐμπεδοκλέους εἴκοσι καὶ δύο. Περὶ τῶν
 μαθημάτων. Πρὸς Πλάτωνα. Πρὸς Ἀριστοτέλην. ἐτελέντα
 δὲ παραλύσει, γενόμενος ἰκανὸς ἀνήρ.

Λεοντεύς τε Λαμψακηνὸς ὄμοιώς καὶ ἡ τούτου γυνὴ Θεμίστα,
 5 πρὸς ἥν καὶ γέγραφεν ὁ Ἐπίκουρος.

"Ἐτι τε Κωλώτης καὶ Ἰδομενεύς, καὶ αὐτοὶ Λαμψακηνοὶ.
 καὶ οὗτοι μὲν ἐλλόγιμοι. ὅν ἦν καὶ Πολύστρατος ὁ διαδεξά-
 μενος "Ερμαρχον ὃν διεδέξατο Διονύσιος· ὃν Βασιλεὺς.
 καὶ Ἀπολλόδωρος δ' ὁ Κηποτύραννος γέγονεν ἐλλόγιμος, ὃς
 10 ὑπὲρ τετρακόσια συνέγραψε βιβλία. δύο τε Πτολεμαῖοι
 Ἀλεξανδρεῖς, ὃ τε μέλας καὶ ὁ λευκός· Ζήνων τε ὁ Σιδώνιος,
 ἀκροατὴς Ἀπολλοδώρου, πολυγράφος ἀνήρ· καὶ Δημήτριος δ'
 26 ἐπικληθεὶς Λάκων· | Διογένης τε διατελέκτους

5 ἀκατάπληκτος Ff. ἀκατάληπτος BPQH 8 ἄγοντα Casaubon:
 ἄγοντος PQH: ἄγον(?) τες) B· ἀγώ F· II ἔσχε δὲ... 12 Τιμοκράτην
 ut glossema secludendum suasit Usener 24 7 φιλικός] φιλήκοος
 Cobet 25 2 μαθημάτων Casaubon: μαθητῶν libri 3 παρα-
 λύσει Menagius· παρὰ λυσίᾳ libri

of his *Timocrates*. Such was his character: his sister Batis he married to Idomeneus, and had for his own mistress Leontion the Athenian hetaera. He was imperturbable in the face of trouble and of death, as Epicurus says in the first book of his *Metrodorus*. They say that he died at the age of fifty-two, seven years before Epicurus, and of this Epicurus gives evidence, since in the will already quoted he makes provision for the care of his children, implying that he had already died. [He had also as a disciple Timocrates, Metrodorus' brother, who has been mentioned already, an aimless person.] Metrodorus' 24writings were as follows Three books *Against the Physicians*. *About sensations*. *To Timocrates*. *Concerning Magnanimity*. *About Epicurus' ill-health*. *Against the Logicians*. Nine books *Against the Sophists*. *Concerning the Path to Wisdom*. *Concerning Change*. *Concerning Wealth*. *Against Democritus*. *Concerning Nobility of Birth*.

There was also Polyaenus, son of Athenodorus, of Lampsacus, a modest and friendly man, as Philodemus and his followers say

25Also Hermarchus, Epicurus' successor, son of Agemortus, of Mytilene, the son of a poor father, and at first a student of rhetoric His best books are said to be these twenty-two essays in the form of letters *On Empedocles*. *On Science*. *Against Plato*. *Against Aristotle*. He was a good man and died of paralysis.

Likewise there was Lconteus of Lampsacus and his wife Themista, to whom Epicurus addressed one of his letters.

Also Colotes and Idomeneus, both of Lampsacus. They too were distinguished, as was also Polystratus who succeeded Hermarchus; then followed Dionysius and after him Basilides. Apollodorus the 'King of the Garden' was also famous, and wrote over four hundred volumes There were also the two Ptolemies of Alexandria, the Black and the White, Zeno of Sidon, a pupil of Apollodorus, a prolific writer, Demetrius called the Lachonian, Diogenes of Tarsus who wrote *Selected Lessons*, 26

σχολὰς συγγράψας· καὶ Ὡρίων, καὶ ἄλλοι οὐδεὶς οἱ γνήσιοι
Ἐπικούρειοι σοφιστὰς ἀποκαλοῦσιν.

Ἡσαν δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι Ἐπίκουροι τρεῖς· ὁ τε Λεοντέως οὗδε
5 καὶ Θεμίστας· ἔτερος Μάγυνης· τέταρτος ὁ πλομάχος.

Γέγονε δὲ πολυγραφώτατος ὁ Ἐπίκουρος, πάντας ὑπερβαλ-
λόμενος πλήθει βιβλίων. κύλινδροι μὲν γὰρ πρὸς τὸν
τριακοσίους εἰσὶ. γέγραπται δὲ μαρτύριον ἔξωθεν ἐν αὐτοῖς
οὐδέν, ἀλλ’ αὐτοῦ εἰσιν Ἐπικούρου φωναί. ἔξήλον δὲ αὐτὸν
10 Χρύσιππος ἐν πολυγραφίᾳ, καθά φησι Καρυεάδης παράσιτον
αὐτοῦ τῶν βιβλίων ἀποκαλῶν· “εἰ γάρ τι γράψαι δ

27 Ἐπίκουρος, φιλονεικεῖ τοσοῦτον γράψαι ὁ Χρύσιππος· | καὶ
διὰ τοῦτο καὶ πολλάκις ταῦτα γέγραφε καὶ τὸ ἐπελθόν, καὶ
ἀδιόρθωτα εἴακε τῷ ἐπεγεσθαι, καὶ τὰ μαρτύρια τοσαῦτά
5 ἐστιν ὡς ἐκείνων μόνων γέμειν τὰ βιβλία, καθάπερ καὶ παρὰ
Ζήνωνι ἐστιν εὑρεῖν καὶ παρὰ Ἀριστοτέλει”. καὶ τὰ συγ-
γράμματα μὲν Ἐπικούρῳ τοσαῦτα καὶ τηλικαῦτα. ὃν τὰ
βέλτιστα ἐστι τάδε· Περὶ φύσεως λέξις. Περὶ ἀτόμων καὶ
κενοῦ. Περὶ ἔρωτος. Ἐπιτομὴ τῶν πρὸς τὸν φυσικὸν.
Πρὸς τὸν Μεγαρικὸν. Διαπορίαι. Κύριαι δόξαι. Περὶ
10 αἰρέσεων καὶ φυγῶν. Περὶ τέλους. Περὶ κριτηρίου ἦ
Κανών. Χαιρέδημος. Περὶ θεῶν. Περὶ ὄσιότητος. Ἕγη-
28 σιάναξ. Περὶ βίων τέσσαρα. | Περὶ δικαιοπραγίας. Νεοκλῆς
πρὸς Θεμίσταν. Συμπόσιον. Εὐρύλοχος πρὸς Μητρόδωρον.
Περὶ τοῦ ὅρῶν. Περὶ τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀτόμῳ γωνίας. Περὶ ἀφῆσ.
Περὶ εἰμαρμένης. Περὶ παθῶν δόξαι πρὸς Τιμοκράτην.
5 Προγνωστικόν. Προτρεπτικός. Περὶ εἰδῶλων. Περὶ φαν-
τασίας. Ἀριστόβουλος. Περὶ μονισικῆς. Περὶ δικαιοσύνης
καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετῶν. Περὶ δώρων καὶ χάριτος. Πολυ-
μῆδης. Τιμοκράτης ἄβῃ. Μητρόδωρος ἄβῃ ῆδε. Ἀντί-
δωρος ἄβῃ. Περὶ νόσων δόξαι πρὸς Μιθρῆν. Καλλιστόλας.
10 Περὶ βασιλείας. Ἀναξιμένης. Ἐπιστολαί.

“Α δὲ αὐτῷ δοκεῖ ἐν αὐτοῖς, ἐκθέσθαι πειράσομαι τρεῖς
ἐπιστολὰς αὐτοῦ παραθέμενος, ἐν αἷς πᾶσαν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ

26 5 τέταρτος] τρίτος Cobet
12 φιλονεικεῖ] ἐφιλονεικεῖ Casaubon
10 φυγῶν Gassendi: φύτων librī
libri 11 ἀ Usener: μίαν librī
B²: οὐτῶν libr. cett.

9 αὐτοῦ Cobet: αὗται librī
27 3 εἴακε Cobet: «Δικε librī
28 9 νόσων Gassendi: νότων
αὐτῷ Usener: αὐτω· B¹: αὐτῷ[ν]
B²: οὐτῶν libr. cett.

Orion, and others whom the genuine Epicureans call Sophists.

There were three other Epicuruses, the son of Leonteus and Themista, another, who was a Magnesian, while the fourth was a drill-sergeant

Epicurus was a very prolific writer and exceeded all others in the bulk of his works, of which there are more than three hundred rolls. There is not in them one single citation from another author · it is all Epicurus' own words. Chrysippus tried to rival him in the amount of his writings, as Carneades tells us, calling him the parasite who fed on Epicurus' books. 'Whenever Epicurus wrote anything, Chrysippus felt bound in rivalry to write the equivalent; and this is why he often repeats himself and says whatever occurs to him, and has left a great deal uncorrected in his hurry; moreover, he has so many quotations that his books are filled with them and nothing else, a characteristic which one may observe also in the writings of Zeno and Aristotle.' Such are the numerous and important works of Epicurus, of which the best are the following · 1. *On Nature*, thirty-seven books, 2. *On atoms and void*, 3. *On Love*, 4. Epitome of the books *Against the Physicists*, 5. *Against the Megarians*, 6. *Problems*, 7. *Principal Doctrines*, 8. *On Choice and Avoidance*, 9. *On the End*, 10. *On the Criterion*, or *The Canon*, 11. *Chaeredemus*, 12. *On the Gods*, 13. *On Religion*, 14. *Hegesianax*, 15. *On Lives*, four books, 16. *On Just Action*, 17. *Neocles*, addressed to Themista, 18. *Symposium*, 19. *Eurylochus*, addressed to Metrodorus, 20. *On Vision*, 21. *On the corner in the atom*, 22. *On Touch*, 23. *On Fate*, 24. *On internal sensations*, maxims addressed to Timocrates, 25. *Prognostic*, 26. *The Protreptic*, 27. *On images*, 28. *On perception*, 29. *Aristobulus*, 30. *On Music*, 31. *On Justice and the other Virtues*, 32. *On gifts and gratitude*, 33. *Polymedes*, 34. *Timocrates*, three books, 35. *Metrodorus*, five books, 36. *Antidorus*, two books, 37. *On disease*, maxims addressed to Mithras, 38. *Callistolas*, 39. *On royal power*, 40. *Anaximenes*, 41. *Letters*.

I will now endeavour to expound the doctrines which he sets forth in these works and will put before you three

29 φιλοσοφίαν ἐπιτέμηται. | Θήγομεν δὲ καὶ τὰς Κυρίας αὐτοῦ δόξας καὶ εἴ τι ἔδοξεν ἐκλογῆς ἀξίως διεφθέγχθαι, ὥστε σὲ πανταχόθεν καταμαθέν τὸν ἄνδρα καὶ κρίνειν εἰδέναι. τὴν μὲν οὖν πρώτην ἐπιστολὴν γράφει πρὸς Ἡρόδοτον (ἢ τις ἐστὶ 5 περὶ τῶν φυσικῶν· τὴν δὲ δευτέραν πρὸς Πυθοκλέα) ἢ τις ἐστὶ περὶ τῶν μεταρσίων· τὴν τρίτην πρὸς Μενοικέα, ἐστι δ' ἐν αὐτῇ τὰ περὶ βίων. ἀρκτέον δὴ ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης, δλίγα προειπόντα περὶ τῆς διαιρέσεως τῆς κατ' αὐτὸν φιλοσοφίας. |

30 Διαιρέεται τοίνυν εἰς τρία, τό τε κανονικὸν καὶ φυσικὸν καὶ ήθικόν. τὸ μὲν οὖν κανονικὸν ἐφόδους ἐπὶ τὴν πραγματείαν ἔχει, καὶ ἐστιν ἐν ἐνὶ τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ Κανών. τὸ δὲ φυσικὸν τὴν περὶ φύσεως θεωρίαν πᾶσαν, καὶ ἐστιν ἐν ταῖς 5 Περὶ Φύσεως βίβλοις λέξι καὶ ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς κατὰ στοιχείον. τὸ δὲ ήθικὸν τὰ περὶ αἵρεσεως καὶ φυγῆς· ἐστι δὲ ἐν ταῖς Περὶ βίων βίβλοις καὶ ἐπιστολαῖς καὶ τῷ Περὶ τέλους. εἰλάθασι μέντοι τὸ κανονικὸν ὅμοι τῷ φυσικῷ τάττειν. καλοῦσπι δ' αὐτὸν περὶ κριτήριον καὶ ἀρχῆς, καὶ στοιχειωτικόν. 10 τὸ δὲ φυσικὸν περὶ γενέσεως καὶ φθορᾶς, καὶ περὶ φύσεως· τὸ δὲ ήθικὸν περὶ αἱρετῶν καὶ φευκτῶν, καὶ περὶ βίων καὶ τέλους. |

31 Τὴν διαλεκτικὴν ὡς παρέλκουσαν ἀποδοκιμάζουσιν. ἀρκεῖν γὰρ τοὺς φυσικοὺς χωρεῖν κατὰ τοὺς τῷ πραγμάτων φθόγγους. ἐν τοίνυν τῷ Κανόνι λέγων ἐστὶν δὲ Ἡπίκουρος κριτήρια τῆς ἀληθείας εἶναι τὰς αἰτθήσεις καὶ προλήψεις 5 καὶ τὰ πάθη· οἱ δὲ Ἡπίκουρειοι καὶ τὰς φαιταστικὰς ἐπιβολὰς τῆς διαινοίας. λέγει δὲ καὶ (αὐτὸς) ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἡρόδοτον ἐπιτομῇ καὶ ἐν ταῖς Κυρίαις δόξαις. πᾶσα γάρ, φησίν, αἰσθησις ἄλογός ἐστι καὶ μηδῆμης οὐδεμιᾶς δεκτική· οὔτε γὰρ ὑφ' αὐτῆς κινεῖται, οὔτε ὑφ' ἔτερου κινηθεῖσα δύναται τι 10 προσθεῖναι ἢ ἀφελεῖν. οὐδὲ ἐστι τὸ δυνάμενον αὐτὰς διελέγειαι· | οὔτε γὰρ ἡ ὁμογενῆς αἰσθησις τὴν ὁμογενῆ διὰ τὴν 32 Ισοσθένειαν· οὐθ' ἡ ἀνομογένεια τὴν ἀνομογένειαν, οὐ γὰρ

29 3 καὶ Usener: κάμε libri 4 ἢ τις . . . 5 Πυθοκλέα adiecit
Usener 30 5 κατὰ στοιχείον] κατεστοιχιωμένον coniecit Usener
7 καὶ τῷ Usener: καὶ τῷ Ff καὶ τῷ BΡQH: καὶ ἐν τῷ Meibom
31 4, καὶ προλήψεις] καὶ τὰς προλήψεις Gassendi, fortasse recte
6 (αὐτὸς) coniecit Usener. om libri 9 ὑφ' αὐτῆς F: ὑπ' αὐτῆς
P²: ἀπ' αὐτῆς BΡQH δύναται Gassendi: ἀδύνατε libri
32 1 ὁμογενῆς scripsi: ὁμογένεια libri ὁμογενῆ BFPQ: ὁμο-
γένειαν P²H

of his letters, in which he has abridged his whole philosophy. I will also give you the *Principal Doctrines*, and a selection from his sayings which seem most worthy of mention. You will thus be able to understand Epicurus from every point of view and could form a judgement on him. The first letter he writes to Herodotus (and it deals with Physics; the second is to Pythocles), and it deals with Celestial Phenomena; the third is to Menoeceus, and contains the moral teaching. We must begin with the first letter, but I will first speak briefly about the divisions of his philosophy.

- 30 It is divided into three parts, the Canonicon (or Procedure), the Physics and the Ethics. The Canonicon gives the method of approach to the system, and is contained in the work called *The Canon*. The Physics contains all the investigation into nature, and is contained in the thirty-seven books *On Nature* and in an abridged form in the letters. The Ethics deals with choice and avoidance, and is contained in the books *On Lives* and the letters and the book on *The End*. The Epicureans usually group the Canonicon with the Physics and state that it deals with the criterion of truth and the fundamental principles and contains the elements of the system. The Physics deals with creation and dissolution and with nature; the Ethics with things to be chosen or avoided, with the conduct of life and its purpose.
- 31 Logic they reject as misleading. For they say it is sufficient for physicists to be guided by what things say of themselves. Thus in *The Canon* Epicurus says that the tests of truth are the sensations and concepts and the feelings; the Epicureans add to these the intuitive apprehensions of the mind. And this he says himself too in the summary addressed to Herodotus and in the *Principal Doctrines*. For, he says, all sensation is irrational and does not admit of memory; for it is not set in motion by itself, nor when it is set in motion by something else, can it add to it or take from it. Nor is there anything which can refute the sensations. For a similar sensation cannot refute a similar because it is equivalent in validity,

τῶν αὐτῶν εἰσὶ κριτικαὶ οὗτε μὴν λόγος, πᾶς γὰρ λόγος ἀπὸ τῶν αἰσθήσεων ἥρτηται· οὐθὲν δὲ τὸ έτέραν, πάσαις δὲ γὰρ προσέχομεν. καὶ τὸ τὰ ἐπαισθήματα δὲ ὑφεστάναι πιστοῦται τὴν τῶν αἰσθήσεων ἀλήθειαν. ὑφέστηκε δὲ τὸ τε δρᾶν ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀκούειν, ὥσπερ τὸ ἀλγεῖν. δθεν καὶ περὶ τῶν ἀδήλων ἀπὸ τῶν φαινομένων χρὴ σημειοῦσθαι. καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἐπίνοιαι πᾶσαι ἀπὸ τῶν αἰσθήσεων γεγόνασι κατά τε ιο περίπτωσιν καὶ ἀναλογίαν καὶ δμοιότητα καὶ σύνθεσιν, συμβαλλομένου τι καὶ τοῦ λογισμοῦ. τά τε τῶν μανομένων φαντάσματα καὶ τὰς κατ' ὄντας ἀληθῆς, κινεῖ γάρ· τὸ δὲ μὴ ὄντον κινεῖ. |

33 Τὴν δὲ πρόληψιν λέγονται οίονεὶ κατάληψιν ἡ δόξαν δρθῆν ἡ ἔννοιαν ἡ καθολικὴν νόστιν ἐναποκειμένην, τουτέστι μνήμην τοῦ πολλάκις ἔξωθεν φανέντος, οἷον τὸ Τοιοῦτόν ἐστιν ἀνθρώπος· ἂμα γὰρ τῷ ῥήθηναι ἀνθρωπος εὐθὺς κατὰ πρόληψιν καὶ δὲ τύπος αὐτοῦ νοεῖται προηγούμενων τῶν αἰσθήσεων. παντὶ οὖν ὀνόματι τὸ πρώτως ὑποτεταγμένον ἐναργές ἐστι. καὶ οὐκ ἀν ἐξητήσαμεν τὸ ζητούμενον, εἰ μὴ πρότερον ἐγνώκειμεν αὐτό· οἷον Τὸ πόρρω ἐστῶς ἵππος ἐστὶν ἡ βοῦς· δεῖ γὰρ κατὰ πρόληψιν ἐγνωκέναι ποτὲ ἵππου καὶ βοὸς μορφήν. οὐδὲ ιο ἀν ὀνομάσαμέν τι μὴ πρότερον αὐτοῦ κατὰ πρόληψιν τὸν τύπον μαθόντες. ἐναργεῖς οὖν εἰσιν αἱ προλήψεις.

34 Καὶ τὸ δοξαστὸν ἀπὸ προτέρου τινὸς ἐναργοῦς ἥρτηται, ἐφ' δὲ ἀναφέροντες λέγομεν· οἷον Πόθεν Ἰσμεν εἰ τοῦτό ἐστιν ἀνθρωπος; | τὴν δὲ δόξαν καὶ ὑπόληψιν λέγονται, ἀληθῆ τέ φασι καὶ ψευδῆ· ἀν μὲν γὰρ ἐπιμαρτύρηται ἡ μὴ ἀντιμαρτύρηται, ἀληθῆ ἐναι· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἐπιμαρτύρηται ἡ ἀντιμαρτύρηται, ψευδῆ τυγχάνειν. δθεν τὰς προσμένουν εἰσήχθη· οἷον τὸ προσμεῖναι καὶ ἐγγὺς γενέσθαι τῷ πύργῳ καὶ μαθεῖν ὅποιος ἐγγὺς φαίνεται.

3 εἰσὶ κριτικαὶ FP³H : εἰς κριτικὸν P¹Q : εἰς κριτικῶν B Aldobrandinus . εἴρηται libri 5 ἐπαισθήματα B(P¹)Q : ἀνεπαί-
σθητα FP³H 12 (τὰ) supplevit Casaubon 33 6 ὑποτεταγ-
μένον Gassendi : ἐπιτεταγμένον libri 34 4 (τὸ) addidit Gassendi

nor a dissimilar a dissimilar, for the objects of which they are the criteria are not the same; nor again can reason, for all reason is dependent upon sensations; nor can one sensation refute another, for we attend to them all alike. Again, the fact of apperception confirms the truth of the sensations. And seeing and hearing are as much facts as feeling pain. From this it follows that as regards the imperceptible we must draw inferences from phenomena. For all thoughts have their origin in sensations by means of coincidence and analogy and similarity and combination, reasoning too contributing something. And the visions of the insane and those in dreams are true, for they cause movement, and that which does not exist cannot cause movement.

- 33 The concept they speak of as an apprehension or right opinion or thought or general idea stored within the mind, that is to say a recollection of what has often been presented from without, as for instance 'Such and such a thing is a man' - for the moment the word 'man' is spoken, immediately by means of the concept his form too is thought of, as the senses give us the information. Therefore the first signification of every name is immediate and clear evidence. And we could not look for the object of our search, unless we have first known it. For instance we ask 'Is that standing yonder a horse or a cow?'. to do this we must know by means of a concept the shape of horse and of cow. Otherwise we could not have named them, unless we previously knew their appearance by means of a concept. So the concepts are clear and immediate evidence.

- Further, the decision of opinion depends on some previous clear and immediate evidence, to which we refer when we express it: for instance, How do we know
 34 whether this is a man? Opinion they also call supposition, and say that it may be true or false: if it is confirmed or not contradicted, it is true; if it is not confirmed or is contradicted, it is false. For this reason was introduced the notion of the problem awaiting confirmation: for example, waiting to come near the tower and see how it looks to the near view.

Πάθη δὲ λέγουσιν εἶναι δύο, ἡδονὴν καὶ ἀλγηδόνα, ιστάμενα περὶ πᾶν ζῷου, καὶ τὴν μὲν οἰκεῖον, τὴν δὲ ἀλλότριον δι' ὃν κρίνεσθαι τὰς αἱρέσεις καὶ φυγάς. τῶν τε ζητήσεων εἶναι τὰς ιο μὲν περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων, τὰς δὲ περὶ ψιλῆν τὴν φωνῆν. καὶ ταῦτα δὲ περὶ τῆς διαιρέσεως καὶ τοῦ κριτηρίου στοιχειωδῶς.

'Ανιτέον δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν.

Sequitur epistola ad Herodotum.

83 Καὶ ἦδε μέν ἐστιν αὐτῷ ἐπιστολὴ περὶ τῶν φυσικῶν· περὶ δὲ τῶν μετεώρων ἦδε.

Sequitur epistola ad Pythoclem.

116 Ταῦτα αὐτῷ καὶ περὶ τῶν μετεώρων δοκεῖ· | περὶ δὲ τῶν βιωτικῶν, καὶ ὅπως χρὴ τὰ μὲν ἡμᾶς αἱρέσθαι, τὰ δὲ ἐκφεύγειν, οὐτωσὶ γράφει. Πρότερον δὲ διέλθωμεν ἢ τε αὐτῷ δοκεῖ περὶ τοῦ σοφοῦ καὶ τοῖς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. βλάβας ἔξι ἀνθρώπων ἡ διὰ μῆτος ἡ διὰ φθόνου ἡ διὰ καταφρόνησιν γίνεσθαι, ὃν τὸν σοφὸν λογισμῷ περιγίνεσθαι. ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν ἀπαξ γενούμενον σοφὸν μηκέτι τὴν ἐναντίαν λαμβάνειν διάθεσιν μηδὲ πλάττειν ἑκόντα. πάθεσι μᾶλλον συσχεθῆσεσθαι, *(δ)* οὐκ ἀνέμποδίσαι πρὸς τὴν σοφίαν. οὐδὲ μὴν ἐκ ιο πάσης σώματος ἔξεως σοφὸν γενέσθαι ἀνέοδον ἐν παντὶ ἔθνει. |
 117 118 κἀν στρεβλωθῆ δὲ ὁ σοφὸς εἶναι αὐτὸν εὐδαίμονα. μόνον τε χάριν ἔξειν τὸν σοφόν, καὶ ἐπὶ φίλοις καὶ παροῦσι καὶ ἀπούσιν δομοῖς διαιτε_(λεῖν) εὐλογοῦντα. ὅτε μέντοι στρεβλοῦται, ἔνθα καὶ μύξει καὶ οἰλμάξει. γυναικί τε οὐ μιγήσεσθαι τὸν σοφὸν
 5 ἢ οἱ νόμοι ἀπαγορεύουσιν, ὡς φησι Διογένης ἐν τῇ ἐπιτομῇ τῶν Ἐπικούρου ἡθικῶν δογμάτων. οὐδὲ κολάσειν οἰκέτας, ἐλεήσειν μέντοι καὶ συγγνώμην τινὶ ἔξειν τῶν σπουδαίων. ἐρασθῆσεσθαι τὸν σοφὸν οὐ δοκεῖ αὐτοῖς, οὐδὲ ταφῆς φροντιεῖν. οὐδὲ θεόπεμπτον εἶναι τὸν ἔρωτα, ὡς Διογένης ἐν τῷ
 10 . . . οὐδὲ βῆτορεύσειν καλῶς. συνουσίη δέ, φασίν, ὕνησε

11 δε] δὴ coniecit Usener
spectandum notavit Usener

117 3 ἢ τε αὐτῷ] δὲ αὐτῷ τε ex-
spectandum notavit Usener
μᾶλλον] μὴν Usener: μὴν ὡς πᾶλλον Kochalsky
118 3 διαιτε_(λεῖν)] εὐλογοῦντα. ὅτε Kochalsky: διά
τε libri: δόδουχοτε B¹: δόδιον ὅτε B⁹: δόδους χ' ὅτε Q: δόδον. ὅτε P:
δόδοι. ὅτε FH: λόγου (καὶ διὰ πράξεως λέναι) ὅτε Usener: 4 μύξει
FP¹. μύξει B¹Q
οἰλμάξει FP²QH. οἰλμάξει: B: οἰλμάξει: ει: P
6 οὐδὲ Usener: οὐτε libri: 7 τῶν σπουδαίων F: τὸν σπουδαῖον

The internal sensations they say are two, pleasure and pain, which occur to every living creature, and the one is akin to nature and the other alien : by means of these two choice and avoidance are determined. Of investigations some concern actual things, others mere words. This is a brief summary of the division of their philosophy and their views on the criterion of truth.

Now we must proceed to the letter.

83 Such was his letter on Physics : then follows his letter on Celestial Things.

116 Such was his teaching on things celestial. As regards
 117 the principles of living and the grounds on which we ought to choose some things and avoid others, he writes the following letter. But before considering it let us explain what he and his followers think about the wise man. Injuries are done by men either through hate or through envy or through contempt, all of which the wise man overcomes by reasoning. When once a man has attained wisdom, he no longer has any tendency contrary to it or willingly pretends that he has. He will be more deeply moved by feelings, but this will not prove an obstacle to wisdom. A man cannot become wise with every kind of physical constitution, nor in every nation.

118 And even if the wise man be put on the rack, he is happy. Only the wise man will show gratitude, and will constantly speak well of his friends alike in their presence and their absence. Yet when he is on the rack, then he will cry out and lament. The wise man will not have intercourse with any woman with whom the law forbids it, as Diogenes says in his summary of Epicurus' moral teaching. Nor will he punish his slaves, but will rather pity them and forgive any that are deserving. They do not think that the wise man will fall in love, or care about his burial. They hold that love is not sent from heaven, as Diogenes says in his . . . book, nor should the wise man make elegant speeches.

πιο μὲν οὐδέποτε, ἀγαπητὸν δὲ εἰ μὴ καὶ ἔβλαψε. | καὶ μὴν καὶ γαμήσειν καὶ τεκνοποίησειν τὸν σοφόν, ὡς Ἐπίκουρος ἐν ταῖς Διαιτορίαις καὶ ἐν ταῖς Περὶ φύσεως. κατὰ περίστασιν δέ ποτε βίου γαμήσειν. καὶ διαιτραπήσεσθαι τινας, οὐδὲ μὴν 5 ἐπηρεάσειν ἐν μέθῃ φῆσιν ὁ Ἐπίκουρος ἐν τῷ Συμποσίῳ. οὐδὲ πολιτεύσεται ὡς ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ Περὶ βίων οὐδὲ τυραννεύσειν οὐδὲ κυνιεῖν, ὡς ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ Περὶ βίων οὐδὲ πτωχεύσειν. ἀλλὰ καὶ πηρωθεὶς τὰς ὄψεις (οὐ) μετ(αλλ)άξει αὐτὸν τὸν βίον, ὡς ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ φῆσι. καὶ λυπήσεσθαι δὲ τὸν σοφόν, ὡς Διογένης ἐν τῇ ἐτῶν ἐπιλέκτων. | καὶ δικάστεσθαι. καὶ συγγράμματα καταλείψειν οὐ πανηγυριεῖν δέ. καὶ κτήσεως προνοήσεσθαι καὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος. φιλαγρήσειν. τύχῃ τε ἀντιτάξεσθαι, φίλους τε οὐδένα προήσεσθαι. εὐδοξίας ἐπὶ 5 τοσοῦτον προνοήσεσθαι, ἐφ' ὅσον μὴ καταφρονήσεσθαι. μᾶλλον τε εὐφρανθήσεσθαι τῶν ἀλλων ἐν ταῖς θεωρίαις. | 121^b εἰκόνας τε ἀναθήσειν εἰ ἔχοι, ἀδιαφόρως ἀν σχοίη. μόνον τε τὸν σοφὸν ὄρθως ἀν περὶ τε μουσικῆς καὶ ποιητικῆς διαλέξασθαι, ποιήματά τε ἐνεργείᾳ οὐκ ἀν ποιῆσαι. οὐκ εἴναι τε ἔτερον ἔτερον ποφώτερον. χρηματίσεσθαι τε, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ μόνης σοφίας, 5 ἀπορήσαντα. καὶ μόναρχον ἐν καιρῷ θεραπεύσειν. καὶ ἐπιχαρήσεσθαι τινι ἐπὶ τῷ διορθώματι. καὶ σχολὴν κατασκευάσειν, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὥστε ὀχλαγωγῆσαι· καὶ ἀναγνώσεσθαι ἐν πλήθει, ἀλλ' οὐχ ἐκόντα· δογματιεῦν καὶ οὐκ ἀπορήσειν. καὶ καθ' ὑπουργὸν δὲ δημοιον ἔσεσθαι, καὶ ὑπὲρ φίλου ποτὲ 10 τεθνήσεσθαι.

120^b [Τὸ ἔξῆς] δοκεῖ δ' αὐτοῖς | ἀμαρτήματα ἄνιστα εἶναι. καὶ τὴν

πιο 5 ἐπηρεάσειν scripsi: τηρήσειν libri (τήρησιν P¹). ληρήσεων C. F. Hermann: τήρησιν κοσμίου μεθήσειν ἐν μέθῃ Kochalsky 8 πηρωθεὶς PQF: πυρωθεὶς B: π. ρωθεὶς H (οὐ) supplevi: μεταλλάξει scripsi: μετάξει PQF. μετέξει B: μετέξει (sc. μετέξειν) H: μεθέξειν f: καταξοὶ Usener: μετ' (ἀταραβίας) ἔξαξει Kochalsky 9 αὐτὸν] αὐτὸν Usener, Kochalsky τὸν βίον scripsi: τοῦ βίου libri λυπήσεσθαι BP¹Q. λυπήσεσθαι FP¹H 120^a I δικάστεσθαι f. δικάστασθαι BFPQH¹ 4 ἀντιτάξεσθαι H²f: ἀντιτάξασθαι BFPQH¹ φίλοιν BPQH: φίλων F, φίλην Usener τε] γὰρ Usener οὐδένα BH: οὐδὲν P¹QF προήσεσθαι Bignone: κτήσεσθαι libri. (ἀπο)κτήσεσθαι Kochalsky 121^b εἰκόνας τε . . . δοκεῖ δ' αὐτοῖς totum hunc locum ex § 121 huc transferendum docuit Bignone I ante εἰ ἔχοι lacunam indicavit Usener: in notis πλούτον vel τέκνα supplevit; οὐκησιν Kochalsky σχοίη Kuhn: σχοίη libri 2 διαλέξασθαι FQH¹: διαλέξεσθαι BP¹H² 3 τε] δὲ Kochalsky ἐνεργείᾳ Usener: ἐνεργεῖν libri οὐκ εἶναι Sambucus: οὐκ ἔιναι τε B: οὐ κινήται

Sexual intercourse, they say, has never done a man good, and he is lucky if it has not harmed him.

- ¹¹⁹ Moreover, the wise man will marry and have children, as Epicurus says in the *Problems* and in the work on *Nature*. But he will marry according to the circumstances of his life. He will feel shame in the presence of some persons, and certainly will not insult them in his cups, so Epicurus says in the *Symposium*. Nor will he take part in public life, as he says in the first book *On Lives*. Nor will he act the tyrant, or live like the Cynics, as he writes in the second book *On Lives*. Nor will he beg. Moreover, even if he is deprived of his eyesight, he will not end his whole life, as he says in the same work. Also the wise man will feel grief, as Diogenes says in the fifth book of the *Miscellanies*.
- ^{120^a} He will engage in lawsuits and will leave writings behind him, but will not deliver speeches on public occasions. He will be careful of his possessions and will provide for the future. He will be fond of the country. He will face fortune and never desert a friend. He will be careful of his reputation in so far as to prevent himself from being despised. He will care more than other men for public spectacles. He will erect statues of others, but whether he had one himself or not, he would be indifferent. Only the wise man could discourse rightly on music and poetry, but in practice he would not compose poems. One wise man is not wiser than another. He will be ready to make money, but only when he is in straits and by means of his philosophy. He will pay court to a king, if occasion demands. He will rejoice at another's misfortunes, but only for his correction. And he will gather together a school, but never so as to become a popular leader. He will give lectures in public, but never unless asked; he will give definite teaching and not profess doubt. In his sleep he will be as he is awake, and on occasion he will even die for a friend.
- ^{120^b} They hold that faults are not all of equal gravity, that

FPQH: οὐ κινεῖσθαι Usener 7 δχλαγωγῆσαι BPQH: σχολαγωγῆσαι F 8 ἐκόντα FP²: ἐκών BP'QH 11 τὸ ἔξης ut indicium ad Librarium scriptum seclusit Bignone 120^b I ante δμαρτήματα Cobet τὰ supplevit, τά τε κατορθώματα καὶ τὰ Usener

νύγειαν τισὶ μὲν ἀγαθόν, τισὶ δὲ ἀδιάφορον. τὴν δὲ ἀνδρείαν φύσει μὴ γώεσθαι, λογισμῷ δὲ τοῦ συμφέροντος. καὶ τὴν φιλίαν διὰ τὰς χρείας· δεῖν μέντοι προκατάρχεσθαι (καὶ γὰρ 5 τὴν γῆν σπείρομεν), συνίστασθαι δὲ αὐτὴν κατὰ κοινωνίαν ἐν 121⁵ τοῖς ταῖς ἡδουναῖς ἐκπεπληρωμένοις). | τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν διχῇ νοεῖσθαι, τὴν τε ἀκροτάτην, οὐα ἔστι περὶ τὸν θεόν, ἐπίτασι 5 οὐκ ἔχουσαν καὶ τὴν (κατὰ τὴν) προσθήκην καὶ ἀφαίρεσιν ἡδουνῶν. μετιτέον δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐπιστολήν. |

Sequitur epistola ad Menoeceum.

- 135 7 Μαντικὴν δ' ἄπασαν ἐν ἄλλοις ἀναιρεῖ, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῇ μικρῷ ἐπιτομῇ. καὶ φησί· μαντικὴ οὖσα ἀνύπαρκτος, εἰ καὶ ὑπαρκτή, οὐδὲν παρ' ἡμᾶς ἔγινε τὰ γυνόμενα· τοσαῦτα καὶ περὶ τῶν βιωτικῶν· καὶ ἐπὶ πλείω διελεκταὶ ἀλλαχόθι |
- 136 Διαφέρεται δὲ πρὸς τοὺς Κυρηναϊκοὺς περὶ τῆς ἡδουνῆς. οἱ μὲν γὰρ τὴν καταστηματικὴν οὐκ ἐγκρίνουσι, μόνην δὲ τὴν ἐν κωῆσει. ὁ δὲ ἀμφότερα (τὰ γένη) ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος, ὡς φησιν ἐν τῷ Περὶ αἰρέσεως καὶ φυγῆς καὶ ἐν τῷ Περὶ τέλους 5 καὶ ἐν ἀ Περὶ βίων καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς τοὺς ἐν Μυτιλήνῃ φίλους ἐπιστολῇ. ὅμοιως δὲ καὶ Διογένης ἐν τῇ τέλει τῶν ἐπιλέκτων καὶ Μητρόδωρος ἐν τῷ Τιμοκράτει λέγουσιν οὕτω. Νοούμενης δὲ ἡδουνῆς τῆς τε κατὰ κλησιῶν καὶ τῆς καταστηματικῆς. ὁ δὲ 'Ἐπίκουρος' ἐν τῷ Περὶ αἰρέσεων οὕτω λέγει· 'Η μὲν γὰρ 10 ιο ἀταραξία καὶ ἀπονία καταστηματικαὶ εἰσιν ἡδουναὶ· ή δὲ χαρὰ καὶ ή ἐνφροσύνη κατὰ κλησιῶν ἐνεργείᾳ βλέπουσι. |
- 137 'Ετι πρὸς τοὺς Κυρηναϊκούς' οἱ μὲν γὰρ χείρους τὰς σωματικὰς ἀλγηδύνας τῶν ψυχικῶν, κολάζεσθαι γοῦν τοὺς ἀμαρτάνουντας σώματι· ὁ δὲ τὰς ψυχικάς τὴν γοῦν σάρκα τὸ παρὸν μόνον χειμάζειν, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν καὶ τὸ παρελθὸν καὶ τὸ παρὸν 5 καὶ τὸ μέλλον· οὕτως οὖν καὶ μείζονας ἡδουνὰς εἶναι τῆς

5 ἐν τοῖς ταῖς BP¹Q : ἐν ταῖς FP⁸H : μεγίσταις Usener 6 ἐκπεπληρωμένοις Bignone : ἐκπεπληρωμένην Usener 135 7 μικρά] μικρῷ Gassendi : ἐκπεπληρωμένην Usener 135 7 μικρά] μικρῷ Bignone 9 παρ' ἡμᾶς] πρὸς ἡμᾶς Meibom : παρ' ἀ τὸ παρ'] ἡμᾶς Bignone ἔγινε τὰ Usener : ἔγινε τὰ FPQH : ἔγινε τὰ Meibom : ἔγινε τὰ Cobet : ἔδη τὰ Gassendi 136 3 ἀμφότερα] ἀμφότερα Meibom : ἀμφότερα Gassendi τὰ γένη supplevit Bignone : σχήματα Kochalsky : lacunam indicavit Usener 5 φίλους] φιλοσόφους Gassendi 8 δὲ] διχῶς coniecit Usener 137 5 τῆς] (τὰς) τῆς Cobet

health is a blessing to some, but indifferent to others, that courage does not come by nature, but by a calculation of advantage. That friendship too has practical needs as its motive: one must indeed lay its foundations (for we sow the ground too for the sake of crops), but it is formed and maintained by means of community of life among those who have reached the fullness of pleasure. They say also that there are two ideas of happiness, complete happiness, such as belongs to a god, which admits of no increase, and the happiness which is concerned with the addition and subtraction of pleasures. Now we must proceed to the letter.

.

135 In several works he rejects all kinds of prophecy, and specially in the *Shorter Summary*. He says, 'Prophecy does not exist, and even if it did exist, things that come to pass must be counted nothing to us'. So much for his theory of morals, which he has discussed more fully elsewhere.

136 Epicurus differs from the Cyrenaics about pleasure. For they do not admit static pleasure, but only that which consists in motion. But Epicurus admits both kinds both in the soul and in the body, as he says in the work on *Choice and Avoidance* and in the book on *The End of Life* and in the first book *On Lives* and in the letter to his friends in Mytilene. Similarly, Diogenes in the 17th book of *Miscellanea* and Metrodorus in the *Timocrates* speak thus: 'Pleasure can be thought of both as consisting in motion and as static'. And Epicurus in the work on *Choice* speaks as follows: 'Freedom from trouble in the mind and from pain in the body are static pleasures, but joy and exultation are considered as active pleasures involving motion'.

137 A further difference from the Cyrenaics: they thought that bodily pains were worse than those of the soul, and pointed out that offences are visited by bodily punishment. But Epicurus held that the pains of the soul are worse: for the flesh is only troubled for the moment, but the soul for past, present, and future. In the same way the plea-

ψυχῆς. ἀποδείξει δὲ χρῆται τοῦ τέλος εἴναι τὴν ἡδονὴν τῷ τὰ
ἔφα ἄμα τῷ γεννηθῆναι τῇ μὲν εὐαρεστεῖσθαι, τῷ δὲ πόνῳ
προσκρούειν φυσικῶς καὶ χωρὶς λόγου. αὐτοπαθῶς οὖν
φεύγομεν τὴν ἀλγηδόνα· ίνα καὶ δὲ Ἡρακλῆς καταβιβρωσκό-
ιο μενος ὑπὸ τοῦ χιτῶνος βοᾷ

δακρύων ίύζων· ἀμφὶ δὲ ἔστενον πέτραι,

Λοκρῶν τ' ὅρειοι πρῶνες Εὐβοίας τ' ἄκραι. |

138 Διὰ δὲ τὴν ἡδονὴν καὶ τὰς ἀρετὰς αἰρεῖσθαι, οὐ δι' αὐτάς,
ὡσπερ τὴν ιατρικὴν διὰ τὴν ὑγείαν· καθά φησι καὶ Διογένης
ἐν τῇ κατων ἐπιλέκτων, ὃς καὶ διαγωγὴν λέγει τὴν ἀγωγὴν.
δὲ δὲ Ἐπίκουρος καὶ ἀχώριστόν φησι τῆς ἡδονῆς τὴν ἀρετὴν
μόνην· τὰ δὲ ἄλλα χωρίζεσθαι, οἷον βρωτά.

Καὶ φέρε οὖν δὴ νῦν τὸν κολοφῶνα, ὡς ἀνεπίποτες τις,
ἐπιθῶμεν καὶ τοῦ παντὸς συγγράμματος καὶ τοῦ βίου τοῦ
φιλοσόφου, τὰς Κυρίας αὐτοῦ δόξας παραθέμενοι καὶ ταύταις
τὸ πᾶν σύγγραμμα κατακλείσαντες, τέλει χρησάμενοι τὴν τῆς
εὐδαιμονίας ἀρχήν.

Sequuntur Sententiae.

10 χιτῶνος FP³H: χειμῶνος P¹: χειμόνος B βοᾷ Menagius:
βοῆ libri (βοΗ B) 11 δακρύων Casaubon δάκνων libri: βοῶν
Soph. Trach. 787: δεινῶς Menagius: λάσκων Dobree. δάκεων
Kochalsky ίύζων B²FQH: [Ι]υ[ζ]ων P¹: ήυξων B¹ [ἔστενον]
ἔκτυπουν Soph. Trach. 787 12 Λοκρῶν τ F P²QH: Λοκρῶν τε
BP¹: Λοκρῶν Soph. Trach. 788 ἄκραι BP³QH: ἄκρα F 138 Ι οὐ
δὲ αὐτάς FH: οὐδὲ ἑαυτάς ? P¹: οὐ δι' αὐτάς BP²Q 5 βρωτά
B³PQH: βρωτά B¹F: βρωτὰ (τινά) coniecit Usener

sures of the soul are greater. As proof that pleasure is the end he points out that all living creatures as soon as they are born take delight in pleasure, but resist pain by a natural impulse apart from reason. Therefore we avoid pain by instinct, just as Heracles, when he is being devoured by the shirt of Nessus, cries aloud

With tears and groans : the rocks re-echoed far
From Locris' mountain peaks, Euboea's hills.

- 138 He says that virtue is preferred for the sake of pleasure, and not for its own sake, just as the doctor's art is employed for the sake of health. So Diogenes says too in the 20th book of *Miscellanies*, and he adds that education is a 'way of life'. Epicurus says also that virtue alone is inseparable from pleasure, but that other things may be separated, such as things to eat.

Come, then, let us put the crown, as it were, to the whole work and to the life of our philosopher, in setting out his *Principal Doctrines* and closing the whole work with them, thus using as our conclusion the starting-point of happiness.

COMMENTARY

LETTER TO HERODOTUS

THE first letter, addressed to Herodotus, is an exposition of the main principles of Epicurus' system, intended, as he explains at once, not for the outside world or for novices, but for those who have already made some progress in acquiring the master's ideas. It accordingly assumes considerable knowledge on the part of the reader, especially of many of the technical terms and phrases used by him, and is often allusive and compendious. It is, moreover, carelessly written, and abounds in long sentences, which give the appearance of never having been thought out as a whole, but merely built up in the course of composition, as new thoughts and modifications occurred to the writer. It has no doubt suffered also in transmission, and consequently, as we have it, is one of the most difficult and obscure pieces of writing in the Greek language. Even in the sequence of the subjects treated it is dislocated and incoherent, but it seems useless to attempt to reconstitute a logical order of discussion.

The genuineness of the letter has never been contested, and it may be accepted as an example of Epicurus' esoteric and more crabbed style, just as the third letter is of the more lucid and polished style which he adopted when writing for a wider and less initiated audience. It is, with the exception of the poem of Lucretius, the most complete exposition of Epicurus' philosophy which we possess.

Of Herodotus, to whom the letter was written, we know nothing, except that he was of course a disciple and that he wrote a work *On the Youth of Epicurus* (*Vit. § 4*).

INTRODUCTION (§§ 35–37).

Epicurus explains his reasons for writing this new summary, which is intended as a reminder to those who have already made some advance in the comprehension of his system. It is to be a *résumé* of the chief points in the doctrine, to which they can refer and which they may commit to memory.

§ 35 2. τὰς μείζους . . . βιβλίους : i.e. Epicurus' more detailed works and in particular the *Περὶ φύσεως*, of which there were thirty-seven books (*Vit. 27*).

3. ἐπιτομή: i. e. the work known as the μεγάλη ἐπιτομή, which was intended, as he explains here, chiefly for beginners, and set out the main principles in the different departments of the system. It was probably on this work in the main that Lucretius based the *De Rerum Natura* (see Giussani, *Stud. Lucr.*, p. 10). The present letter was sometimes known as the μικρὰ ἐπιτομή.

πραγματίας, 'the system': so Aristotle speaks of *ἡ Πλάτωνος πραγματία*, *Metaph.* 1 6. I

4. κατασχεῖν, 'to grasp', 'get by heart'. Cf. § 83 οὐτος δ λόγος δυνατὸς κατασχεθῆναι μετ' ἀκριβείας.

τῶν διοσχερωτάτων γε δοξῶν, 'at least of the general principles covering the whole ground', sc. in the different departments. The variations in the MSS. strongly support Usener's suggestion of inserting *γε*, and it greatly improves the sense. It might not be possible for a beginner to retain the details of the system, but by the aid of the Greater Epitome he will at least comprehend the general ideas.

5. αὐτοῖς παρεσκεύασα. Usener quite unnecessarily alters to *ἄν τις παρεσκεύασαι*, probably because he did not realize that Epicurus is referring to the Greater Epitome, and took the reference to be to the present letter. *αὐτοῖς* picks up *τοῖς μὴ δυναμένοις*, a not infrequent habit in Epicurus (cf. K. Δ. xxx, xxxii, xxxix, though the instances there are not quite so clumsy).

6. αὐτοῖς. An obviously necessary correction for the MS. *αύτοῖς*.

7. καὶ τοὺς προβεβηκότας δὲ . . ., 'and those also who have made progress'. The more proficient disciples need reminding of the main principles, and for them the present letter is intended. It is certainly written in an 'esoteric' style. The point seems clear enough without reading *καὶ δὴ καί*, as Giussani suggests (*Stud. Lucr.*, p. 7, note 2)

8. τὸν τύπον . . . κατεστοιχειωμένον, 'the scheme of the whole system set out in its main principles'.

τὸν τῆς ἀθρόας ἐπιβολῆς. *ἐπιβολή* is one of the most difficult technical words in Epicurus. It is used without qualification here and in two other places in this paragraph, but it cannot be separated from *ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας* in §§ 38, 51, and K. Δ. xxiv. It means first a 'projection (of the mind or senses) towards an image', so an 'act of attention', and with the added idea of the result of the act 'view', 'apprehension'. So here 'we need the comprehensive grasp'. See also note on § 38, and a full discussion in Appendix, pp. 259 ff.

§ 38. 1. βαδιστέον ἐπ' ἔκεινα. *ἔκεινα* must be 'the general principles', τὰ δλα of § 35 8, though the reference is not very explicit. For the form of the phrase cf. § 83 ἔὰν μὴ καὶ πρὸς ἄπαντα βαδίσῃ τις. The MSS. have *καὶ ἐπ' ἔκεινα συνεχῶς ἐν τῇ μνήμῃ*, which is more easily and satisfactorily mended by Gassendi's transposition of *καὶ* after *ἐπ'* *ἔκεινα*, than by Usener's *ἐν τε μνήμῃ* or von der Muehll's *ἐν δὲ τῇ μνήμῃ*.

3. ή . . . κυριωτάτη ἐπιβολή: here again as in 6 ‘the most essential view, grasp, comprehension’ of the truth.

ἐπὶ τὰ πράγματα: not simply ‘over things’, but over things as Epicurus saw them, ‘the truth’. Cf. the use of *πραγματεῖα* above.

4. τὸ κατὰ μέρος ἀκριβώμα, ‘accurate knowledge in detail’. Cf § 83 τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἀκριβώματων.

6. τοῦ τετελεσιουργημένου, ‘of the man who is perfected in the system’, ‘fully initiated’. Cf. § 83 ὅσοι δὲ μὴ παντελῶς αὐτῶν τῶν ἀποτελουμένων. Giussani apparently takes it as a neuter participle with τοῦ παντὸς ἀκριβώματος, ‘of the perfect and complete knowledge of the whole system’, but both the order and the parallel of § 83 are against this. Bignone agrees in taking it as masculine. von der Muehll unnecessarily reads the dative τῷ τετελεσιουργημένῳ.

7. τὸ . . . χρῆσθαι, ‘to be able to make a rapid use of observation and mental apprehension’. ταῖς ἐπιβολαῖς is used here in a rather more technical sense, and for the plural we must compare § 38 ἐπιβολὰς εἴτε διανοίας εἴτε ὅτου δήποτε τῶν κριτηρίων: it means the ‘apprehensions either by the mind or by the senses’. The truly initiated man must be able to interpret quickly what he perceives and to apply rapidly his mental conclusions.

8. καὶ . . . συναγομένων. The MS. text will not construe as it stands. Usener drastically corrects it ἔκάστων . . . ἀναγομένων, ‘by referring everything to elementary principles and formulae’. But this is not quite the point, and the emendations are both considerable – it looks rather as if something were lost. Bignone supplies after χρῆσθαι (περὶ τῶν κατὰ μέρος καὶ περὶ τῶν δλων), but l. 3 shows that the preposition used after ἐπιβολή is ἐπί, not περί, and the correction ignores the καί of the MSS., nor again is the sense quite what is wanted. The initiate must be able to form his conclusions rapidly, and for this purpose he needs short mnemonic formulae. I therefore suggest that the words lost were something like (τούτῳ γίνοιτ’ ἄν ἀπάντων). Von der Muehll reads συναγομένους, which I do not understand.

φωνάς, probably ‘formulae’, made by the combination of φθόγγοι (§ 37. 6) and corresponding to προλήψεις in the mind.

9. τὸ πύκνωμα, ‘the condensation, abbreviation, abridgement’.

10. τῆς . . . περιοδείας. lit. ‘the continuous circuit of the whole system’, ‘circuit’ because it is all so closely linked that it is constantly coming back on itself.

§ 37. 2. φυσιολογία, ‘the investigation of nature’, but of course with the implication that it is the Epicurean method of investigation.

τῆς τοιωτῆς δδοῦ: i. e. the course he has just suggested of resuming important points for the benefit of the initiated like Herodotus.

5. παρεγγυῶν . . . δοξῶν. A difficult clause in which I have with some hesitation accepted Usener’s corrections. παρεγγυῶν τό is in effect the MS. text, ἐνέργημα has less authority than ἐνάργημα, but it is impossible to make sense of the latter here, τοιωτῶ is a not very serious correction for τὸ τούτων, and ἐγγαληνόων is as likely to be concealed by

the MS. variations as any other case of the participle. The most serious change is ἐποίησα σοι for ποιήσασθαι, but it seems required by the sense, and is the natural conclusion for this section. The whole sentence should be compared with the conclusion of the letter in § 83, where he comes back to the idea of the γαληνισμός, which results from the study of natural science.

παρεγγάνων, 'recommending', like an officer passing along the watchword.

3. τοιούτῳ. Bignone proposes an alternative correction, *τοιοῦτος ὡν*, which is not palaeographically much better, and is awkward in combination with the other two participles.

I. METHODS OF PROCEDURE (§§ 37, 38).

Epicurus starts with a brief summary of the important points in his *Canonica*, which is to be regarded not so much as a 'Logic' of the system, for he had no belief in logic, but as 'rules of procedure', or, as it presented itself to him metaphorically, the 'measures (*κανόνες*) and squares and plumb-lines' with which the builder keeps his building straight (Lucr. iv. 513 ff.) For further references to the *Canonica* see Usener, pp. 175–190.

The first principle is one of language. Every word must correspond to an exact concept on (*πρόληψις*) in the mind, and this conception must be the first and most obvious associated with the word.

6. τὰ ὑποτεταγμένα τοῖς φθογγοῖς, 'that which is attached to sounds' —i.e. the ideas or conceptions (*προλήψεις*) associated with words. *φθόγγοι* appear to be 'words' which in combination make *φωναί*.

7. τὰ δοκιζόμενα, 'matters of opinion'. According to Epicurean doctrine, the mind receives the data of sense-perception and makes its inferences from them. These inferences in themselves have no necessary validity, but must be tested by constant reference to sense-perception, and only accepted if they are confirmed (*ἐπιμαρτυρεῖται*) or not refuted (*οὐκ ἀντιμαρτυρεῖται*) by it (cf. § 50). But sense-impressions by frequent repetition form in the mind general conceptions (*προλήψεις*) —'composite photographs', as it were—and these *προλήψεις*, being derived from sense-impressions, have an equal validity with the sense-impressions as a criterion of truth (cf. *Vit.* 31, 33). The *φθογγοί* are the symbols of the *προλήψεις*.

ἴητούμενα are problems concerned with the investigation of external things; *ἀπορούμενα*, problems raised in the mind, apart from immediate sense-impression.

9. ἡμῖν (ἢ): the MSS. read simply ἡμῖν, G alone adding ἢ, of which ἢ seems a simpler and safer correction than ἦ.

διποθεικνύουσιν, 'explaining' rather than 'proving', as Bignone points out.

§ 38. 1. τὸ πρῶτον ἐννόημα: in Epicurus' idea all thought proceeds by means of visualization, or more exactly, the *προλήψεις* come before

the mind: an ἐννόημα then is a 'mental image', and Epicurus therefore uses the verb *βλέπεσθαι*. We are to make it the rule to consider the 'first' image, i.e. the most literal picture associated with a word. Epicurus no doubt meant this rule partly to be a protest against the use of metaphorical language in philosophy, but it can hardly be said that he carried it out very successfully himself.

4. έτι τε κατὰ τὰς αἰσθήσεις... 8. σημειωσόμεθα. An extremely difficult sentence involving several highly technical notions. Having dealt with the phraseology to be used in investigation, Epicurus passes now to the methods of investigation. The order is somewhat illogical because, as we have seen, the determination of the phraseology really involves the standards of judgement. He starts with the simple principle, which is the keystone of the whole metaphysic of Epicureanism *κατὰ τὰς αἰσθήσεις δὲ πάντα τηρεῖν*, 'all our investigations' (*πάντα* takes its content from the general tone of the context) 'must be controlled by sensations'. Sensations are infallible; their evidence must always be accepted at once, when it is available, and in cases where it is not (*ἄδηλα*), any hypothesis must be submitted to the test of sensation, and only accepted if it is not then contradicted (§ 50). Similarly, in the field of morality or conduct, the *ὑπάρχοντα πάθη*—the immediate feelings of pleasure and pain must be the supreme test: pleasure is good, pain is bad (cf. Ep. iii 129 ὡς κανόνι τῷ πάθει πᾶν ἀγαθὸν κρίνοντες). Thus far the idea is clear: we are left with the words *καὶ ἀπλῶς (κατὰ τὰς παρούσας ἐπιβολὰς εἴτε διανοίας εἴθ' ὅτου δίγοτε τῶν κριτηρίων*, which are fully discussed in the Appendix on *ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας*, pp. 259 ff. We may sum up the conclusions there reached thus: the *ἐπιβολαὶ τῆς διανοίας* are the 'apprehensions of mental images' of things imperceptible by the senses in two cases: (a) when certain images too subtle to be perceived by the senses, make their way directly into the mind and are 'apprehended' by it in a kind of secondary sense-perception, such especially are the images of the gods; (b) when the concepts of science are grasped by an act of attention on the part of the mind employing the process of verification which consists in their reference to the test of sensation and finding that they are not contradicted (*οὐκ ἀντιμαρτυρεῖται*). The *ἐπιβολαὶ τῶν κριτηρίων* are similar 'acts of apprehension' on the part of the senses (*κριτήριον* is here used in an active sense of the 'instrument of judgement'), which are not now content to receive a merely passive impression, but 'look' or 'listen' actively in order to obtain confirmatory evidence (*ἐπιμαρτύρησις*) with regard to the 'problem awaiting solution' (*προσμένον*) by means of the 'clear view' (*ἐναργές*). This process is exactly parallel to the second process of the *ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας*. For the whole idea of the *ἐπιβολαὶ* compare phrases in §§ 50, 51, 62, and K. Δ. xxiv, and for the processes of verification by the test of the senses § 50 *fin.* and notes there. έτι τε, Arndt, seems a more satisfactory correction of the MSS. *εἴτε* than Usener's *ἐπειτα*.

5. *ἀπλᾶς* probably means 'in particular': though Epicurus insisted that every *αἰσθησις* was true, i.e. the image formed in the sense-organ corresponded exactly to the 'idols' that fell upon it, he insisted no less strongly that before we allow opinion to pronounce upon the nature of the object (*στερέμνιον*) from which the 'idols' originally came, we must get the confirmation of the 'nearer view'. The 'nearer view' obtained by *ἐπιβολή* was thus in reality a surer indication of the truth of the image to the objective reality than the original passive *αἰσθησις*. This Epicurus never liked to admit, as it undermined the validity of *αἰσθησις* as a criterion of truth, but the letter is not without indications, such as this, that he preferred the clear view of *ἐπιβολή*, and indeed for purposes of scientific investigation demanded it.

τὰς παρούσας ἐπιβολάς means 'the immediate apprehensions' apart from any addition made to them by *δόξα*: cf. the exactly parallel phrase in Κ Δ. xxiv *τὸ παρὸν ἥδη κατὰ τὴν αἰσθησιν καὶ τὰ πάθη καὶ πάσαν φανταστικὴν ἐπιβολὴν τῆς διανοίας*.

6. *τῶν κριτηρίων* cannot be here used in its full technical sense of the 'standards of judgement', which are *αἰσθησις*, *πάθος*, and *πρόληψις* (and, according to later Epicureans, *ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας* (*Vit. Ep. § 31*)), because *αἰσθησις* and *πάθος* are separately mentioned, and you cannot have an *ἐπιβολὴ τῆς προλήψεως* (still less an *ἐπιβολὴ τῆς ἐπιβολῆς τῆς διανοίας*). I take the word both here and in § 51 *ἐπιβολάς τῆς διανοίας* ἡ *τῶν λοιπῶν κριτηρίων* to mean 'the individual senses' sight, hearing, smell, &c., regarded in their capacity as *κριτήρια*, 'instruments of judgement'. Giussani wrongly interprets the word in a general sense 'signs' or 'indications', and propounds a most improbable explanation.

If the general view here taken is correct, we must follow Gassendi in reading *κατά* before *τὰς παρούσας ἐπιβολάς* and Giussani in changing *καλ* before *τὰ ὑπάρχοντα πάθη* to *κατά*. Otherwise we get the statement that the *αἰσθήσεις* are to control the various *ἐπιβολαί* and the *πάθη*, which is impossible for Epicurus. Bignone reaches the same sense by omitting *κατά* after *ἔτι τε*, reading *πάντων* for *πάντα* and then preserving the MS. text. But this is palaeographically improbable, and the expression *τὰς αἰσθήσεις . . . πάντων* seems very unlike Epicurus. Von der Muehll reads here *τὰς αἰσθήσεις δεῖ πάντως τηρεῖν*, but *πάντως* is difficult, I doubt the phrase *τὰς αἰσθήσεις τηρεῖν* and the whole idea is not so Epicurean.

7. *ὅπως ἀν . . . σημειωσόμεθα*. Notice the implied parallelism of ideas: the *προσμένον*, the problem of sensation, is to be solved by an *ἐπιβολὴ* of one or other of the senses, the *ἀδηλον*, the problem of thought, by the *ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας*. Epicurus is also harking back to the beginning of the section: there the *ζητούμενα* are the problems of sense-investigation, the *ἀπορούμενα* the problems of thought.

II. THE UNIVERSE AND ITS CONSTITUENTS.

A. *Things imperceptible: the three principles.*

Epicurus plunges at once into the discussion of the ἀδηλά, the ultimate constituents of the universe, which never could fall within the ken of the senses. He here enunciates with brief proofs three fundamental principles: (1) that nothing is created out of nothing, (2) that nothing is destroyed into nothing; (3) a deduction from the two former principles—the universe is ever the same. The first two principles had already been enunciated by Empedocles and Anaxagoras and adopted by Democritus, whom Epicurus is here following.

The first principle that 'nothing is created out of nothing' really covers two important ideas: (1) in general, that the sum of matter is never increased by new additions, and (2) in reference to particulars, that every material object has a material cause. The proof seems at first sight irrelevant as it appears to deny fresh creation on the ground that there is not indiscriminate creation. But it is based as usual on the appeal to the evidence of sensation: every creation of which we have cognizance implies a previous 'seed': but if 'spontaneous creation' were possible, things would be created without 'seeds', which sensation denies. Lucretius elaborates the proof at great length in i 159-214.

9. Ταῦτα . . . διαλαβόντας lit 'having made these distinctions', i.e. between the right and wrong use of words and the true and false standards of judgement

θεῖ: either **θεῖ** must be read here for **δέ** or it must be inserted with Meibom after **ἡδη** or with von der Muehll after **διαλαβόντας**.

συνορᾶν, 'to consider', 'obtain a comprehensive view of': notice again the suggestion of thought as visualization

περὶ τῶν ἀδήλων, 'imperceptible things', such as never could come within the cognizance of the senses. Of these Epicurus distinguishes two classes: (1) certain atomic compounds too subtle to be perceived by the senses, which yet make themselves known directly to the mind by means of **εἴδωλα**. e.g. the gods (cf. Lucr. v. 148-149), (2) imperceptible things which cannot be perceived by **εἴδωλα** even by the mind, and can only be reached by ratiocination, e.g. the atoms and space, the ultimate constituents of the universe. He also sometimes applies the term **ἀδηλά** loosely to phenomena so distant that the near view of them cannot be obtained: e.g. **τὰ μετέωρα**.

11. **ἔγινεν**. Usener's suggestion in the notes that **ἔγινεν** should be read is contradicted by **ἔφθείρετο** in the next line, and is inconsistent with Epicurus' view of creation as a continual process: 'sporadic creation' would be going on now.

§ 39. The second principle that 'nothing is destroyed into the non-existent' is the complement of the first, and like it has two implications: (1) in general, that the sum of matter is never decreased by any

absolute loss—the principle of the ‘permanence of matter’; (2) that no individual thing is utterly destroyed, but only dissolved into its component particles (see *Lucr.* i. 215, 216). The proof is again succinctly put, but more obviously than that of the first principle. If everything which passed from our ken (*τὸ ἀφανιζόμενον*) utterly passed out of existence, then seeing that this process of ‘perishing’ is always going on all round us, the whole sum of nature would long ago have been destroyed. As it is, destruction is prevented by the ‘seeds’. Again Lucretius elaborates at great length (i. 217–264).

2. οὐκ ὅντων εἰς ἀ διελύσθη, ‘since the things into which they were dissolved did not exist’. This clause is the link between the two principles: it is the existence of the permanent *σπέρματα* which secures the permanence of the universe, and this existence is of course the ultimate basis of the atomic theory.

The third principle that ‘the universe is unchanging’ is in part a deduction from the other two if nothing is ever added by fresh creation from the non-existent, the universe cannot increase: if nothing is ever destroyed into nothing, the universe cannot decrease. The expression here is very compressed, and Epicurus only uses the latter of these two arguments explicitly in the last clause; the former is implied. Moreover the argument is expressed from the point of view of change, which is slightly different from that of the previous clauses. Change, in Epicurus’ view, is always destruction. see the constantly recurring and almost axiomatic lines in Lucretius (i. 670, &c.):

nam quocunque suis mutatum finibus exit,
continuo hoc mors est illius quod fuit ante

In the parallel passage of Lucretius ii. 304 ff., which was probably based on the Greater Epitome, it is implied that there are three possibilities by which the universe might change. (1) if there were anything outside it into which any part of it might escape; (2) if there were anywhere from which a new force might enter the universe and alter it. These two causes are those most prominent in this section. But there is another (3), the possibility of change by internal rearrangement, which might at first sight seem, in view of the constant dissolution and recombination of the atomic compounds, to be a cause actually at work in the universe. Epicurus’ answer lies in the conception of equilibrium (*ἴσονομία*): the atoms, not infinite but unlimited in number, have long ago entered into all possible combinations and nothing new can be created by their combinations. This Lucretius (ii. 297 ff.) puts vividly:

quapropter quo nunc in motu principiorum
corpora sunt, in eodem ante acta aetate fuere
et posthac semper simili ratione ferentur,
et quae consuerint gigni gignentur eadem
condicione et erunt et crescent vique valebunt,
quantum cuique datumst per foedera naturalia.

Bignone (Appendix, vi, p. 253) has rightly called attention to this

third point, and sees a reference to it in the words οὐθὲν γάρ ἔστιν εἰς ὁ μεταβαλεῖ. I think on the whole that it is more probable that this sentence refers to the first of the causes enumerated above, change due to dissolution into something else; but the idea of change by internal alteration seems to be lurking in Epicurus' mind, as is shown by his use of μεταβάλλει.

4. μεταβάλλει is the reading of all the MSS. and can, I think, be retained, although Usener's correction μεταβαλεῖ would produce a more normal construction. Brieger's omission of εἰς would make the clause a mere tautology of what follows, and is based on a misunderstanding. Still more so is Giussani's violent change παρὰ γάρ τὸ πᾶν οὐθέν ἔστιν εἰς ὁ μεταβαλεῖ ή ὃ ἀν εἰσελθὸν . .

5. οὐθέν ἔστιν, δ . . . Bignone thinking that there should be direct mention of the possibility of change by loss would amplify οὐθέν ἔστιν ὅποι ἀν τι ἐξέλθοι, η δ) ἀν εἰσελθὸν . . But this is unnecessary, if we can suppose that this cause of change is implied in the previous sentence.

6. ποιησαίτο . a curious use of the middle, but it is unnecessary to alter to ποιήσαι with Usener, or with Cröner to ποιῆσαι (δύνω)το. Epicurus not infrequently employs the middle unexpectedly.

B Bodies and space.

Epicurus proceeds at once to consider the constitution of the universe. It consists of bodies (matter) and space. That body exists is attested by the universal experience of mankind, and space must needs exist in order that bodies may exist and move in it. The line of argument is familiar in Epicurean writings (the Scholiast here notes that it recurred both in the Greater Epitome and in the Περὶ φύσεως) and is closely followed with some amplification by Lucr. i 419-448.

7. (σώματα καὶ τόπος) the addition made by Usener is amply justified by Ep. ii. 86 τὸ πᾶν σώματα καὶ ἀναφῆς φύσις, by quotations from Epicurus in Sext. *adv Dogm.* iii. 333 (Fr. 13) and Plut. *adv. Col.* ii, p 1112e (Fr. 14), and by Lucr. i 420. The omission is due to 'haplography'. Arndt and Kochalsky propose to read τὸ πᾶν ἔστι without any addition, but it is absurd that he should here state the existence of the universe after assuming it in the previous section, and the following sentence would then be left without connexion.

8. αὐτὴ η αἴσθησις . we are at every moment conscious of the existence of bodies and our consciousness cannot be denied. Reason must take its evidence from the senses in judging of ἄδηλα.

ἐπὶ πάντων: not neuter 'on all occasions' but 'before the eyes of', as often in legal phraseology (e.g. Dem. 781. 4 ἐλέγχεσθαι ἐπὶ πάντων). This is proved by Lucr. i. 422 'corpus enim per se communis dedicat esse sensus'.

9. ὁσπερ προεῖπον . sc. § 38.

10. τὸ πρόσθεν . Usener's τόπος δέ is an unnecessary emendation

of the MS. τὸ πρόσθεν: δέ must be inserted, as Gassendi saw, after εἰ.

§ 40. 1. δέ κερδὸν . . . Epicurus' list of synonyms is carefully reproduced by Lucretius: τόπος = *locus*, κειόν = *inane*, χώρα = *spatium*: διαφής φύσις is represented by the adjective *intactile* in l. 437 (cf. *intactus*, 'intangibility', l. 454). The words are used as absolute synonyms by Epicurus, but their interchangeable use suggests an uncertainty, and Epicurus seems to oscillate between the ideas of 'space' = extension in an almost mathematical sense, and the more concrete notion of the 'unoccupied space' between bodies. ὁ has the best MS. authority. Usener reads ὅν from the ὅν of some MSS., to agree with τόπος in his emendation.

2. διαφή φύσιν regards space from a slightly different point of view and leads up to the mention of properties. The one property of space, that by which alone it can be known, is that 'it cannot be touched': but it is a φύσις—an existence—just as matter is a φύσις. The idea really goes back to the controversies of Leucippus and Democritus with their opponents. 'The real' (τὸ ὄν), said Leucippus, meaning what his opponents called real, i.e. matter, 'exists not a whit more than the unreal, the void exists no less than matter'.

3. καθάπερ φάίνεται κινούμενα Notice again the appeal to sense, but in this case it cannot be so direct: sensation cannot tell us of the existence of the void, as it can of body. But it does tell us of the positions and motions of bodies: and neither position nor motion is possible without 'empty space'. Here then we have a case of the μαρτύρησις of phenomena.

παρὰ δὲ ταῦτα . . . Epicurus repeats his position from a slightly different point of view, stating it now negatively. Besides bodies and space there is nothing else which exists as a 'complete thing' (ὅλη φύσις), nothing, that is, which has an independent existence. Anything else we can conceive (e.g. a quality or a state) has an existence dependent on or relative to something else, is, as Epicurus says, a property (*συμβεβηκός*) or accident (*σύμπτωμα*) of body or space. Lucretius is again (l. 430–432, 445–448) following closely and goes on naturally enough to discuss properties and accidents, a subject relegated in the letter (possibly out of place) to § 68. Bignone notes that Epicurus' view is here stated in opposition to the Platonic theory of ideas and to any spiritual view of the φυχή.

4. οὔτε περιληπτικῶς οὔτε ἀναλόγως τοῖς περιληπτοῖς, 'neither by way of conception nor on the analogy of conceivable things'. Epicurus' idea of thought is always the grasping (*περιλαμβάνειν*) of a visual image (*εἴδωλον*)—sometimes this is the *πρόληψις*, which has been formed in the mind by a succession of *εἴδωλα* from outside (*περιληπτικῶς*), sometimes by a combination of images the mind forms an image of its own (*ἀναλόγως τοῖς περιληπτοῖς*).

Usener is probably right in regarding the form *περιληπτῶς* in the MSS. as impossible and emending to *περιληπτικῶς*.

5. ὡς . . . λαμβάνομεν . . . λεγόμενα. There seems no need to follow Usener in emending to *ὅσα . . . λαμβάνομεν . . . λέγομεν*: the construction is loose, but not too loose for Epicurus.

6. συμπτώματα ή συμβεβηκότα: cf § 68 and notes there.

7. καὶ μὴν καὶ . . . Having established matter and void as the sole existences, Epicurus proceeds to consider the form in which matter or body exists. ‘Body’ is an ambiguous term. We normally mean by it material things, such as we perceive: these are in reality compounds (*συγκρίσεις*) of matter and void. In its more technical sense it means ‘absolute matter’, matter apart from void. Once more Lucretius follows closely (1. 483, 484)

corpora sunt porro partim primordia rerum,
partim concilio quae constant principiorum.

§ 41. 1. ταῦτα δέ ἔστιν . . . This ‘absolute matter’ exists in the form of indivisible, unalterable particles, ‘atoms’. Epicurus’ very brief proof—that otherwise the dissolution of things would mean their absolute destruction—is elaborated by Lucretius into a long series of arguments to show that the ultimate particles are ‘solid, single, and eternal’ (1. 503-634, especially 540-550).

ἄτομα καὶ ἀμεταβλῆτα, ‘they cannot be separated into smaller particles, nor can there be any internal change by rearrangement of their parts’, both ideas come directly to Epicurus from Democritus, but the latter has greatly elaborated in the conception of the *πέρατα*, §§ 56, 57

3. ισχύον τι. The MSS. have *ἰσχύοντα*, but (a) it cannot be taken with *πάντα*, for Epicurus could not have said ‘all things remain strong’, meaning that their component particles so remained, (b) Bignone’s suggestion that it might refer to *ταῦτα* at the beginning of the sentence would involve a considerable stretch of grammatical probability. Usener emends to *ισχύειν τι*, but *ισχύειν* as a mere equivalent of *δύνασθαι* is unlikely. E Rohde in a MS note in his copy of Usener, now in my possession, suggested *ισχύοντά τινα*, which is on the right lines: the things are dissolved but ‘some permanent existences’ remain, i.e. the atoms survive. I suggest (and I now find that Bignone in his notes has the same proposal) *ισχόν τι*, ‘something with strength’, ‘something permanent’, which is nearer to the MS. text. The participle is strongly confirmed by § 54 ἐπειδήπερ δέ τι ὑπομένειν ἐν ταῖς διαλύσεσι τῶν συγκρίσεων καὶ ἀδιάλυτον, and by Lucretius’ recurrent description of the atoms in the corresponding passage as ‘solida pollutia simplicitate’ (1. 574, 612).

Cronert’s *ὑπομένειν* for *ὑπομένειν* is hardly necessary in Epicurus in spite of φθαρήσεσθαι.

4. πλήρη : i.e. each of the atoms is a solid corporeal *plenum* without any admixture of void.

ὄντα: the MS. *ὄταν* is clearly a mistake. Bignone’s correction *οἵα δή* is less satisfactory than Usener’s *ὄντα*, and Melbom’s *ὄντα καὶ* is hardly necessary.

δῆμος η δῆμος : quite literally, there is no part of themselves in which they could break up and no means by which they could do it—another anticipation of the idea of the *πέρατα*.

C. *Infinity of the universe.*

Epicurus proceeds to a new point. The universe, the sum-total that is of body + space (*τὸ πᾶν*), is infinite. This he proves characteristically by an appeal to sense-experience. In the case of any limited thing, you must come to the end of it, and you perceive its end ‘against something else’, i.e. as standing out against something which is not ‘it’. But in the case of the universe there is no such end and nothing outside it. The argument is brought out more clearly by Lucretius (i. 958–964).

omne quod est igitur nulla regione viarum
finitumst; namque extremum debebat habere
extremum porro nullius posse videtur
esse, nisi ultra sit quod finiat, ut videatur
quo non longius haec sensus natura sequatur
nunc extra summum quoniam nil esse fatendum,
non habet extremum, caret ergo fine modoque.

It is clearly illustrated by the famous problem of the throwing of the spear (968–983).

7. *παρ' ἔτερόν τι θεωρεῖται* Usener, thinking the argument is incomplete as it stands, suggests (Introd., p. xviii) that a clause has been lost by ‘homoeoteleuton’ ἀλλὰ μὴν τὸ πᾶν οὐ παρ' ἔτερόν τι θεωρεῖται, the equivalent of which is found in Cic. *de Div.* ii. 50. 103 ‘at quod omne est, id non cernitur ex alio extrinsecus’. But I agree with Bignone that in a brief epitome like this it is quite likely that one step in the argument was omitted.

9. καὶ μὴν καὶ . . . Not only is the universe infinite as a whole, but each of its two component parts is infinite, ‘the bodies’ in number, space in extent. For (if the whole is infinite, one or other or both of its constituents must be infinite—another omitted step conscientiously supplied in Lucr. i. 1008 ff.), and (a) a limited number of atoms in infinite void could never meet or remain in union to form things, (b) unlimited atoms in finite space would not have room to take up their place (an argument slightly varied by Lucretius in i. 988–1007).

§ 42. 3. οὐκ ἔχοντα τὰ ὑπερέιδοντα καὶ στέλλοντα κατὰ τὰς ἀνακοπάς. The idea involves the Epicurean kinetics. The atoms are continually falling in the void of their own weight, but they swerve from time to time owing to the *παρέγκλισις* (Lucr. ii. 216 ff.) and this causes them to collide. The result of constant collisions is that they are driven off in all directions, even upwards, and are so both prevented from falling and kept in their places within compounds. The *ἀνακοπή* is the single

blow which lies at the basis of the process of ἀντικοπή (see §§ 46 b, 47 b). Meibom's proposal to read ἀντικοπάς here is out of place.

4. οὐδὲ ἂν εἰχε . . . : i.e. there would not be room for infinite atoms in limited space. Lucretius (i. 988 ff.) argues rather differently that the particles would all collect in a mass at the bottom of limited space. The two ideas differ only in the relative extent attributed to a limited space.

D. Differences of shape in the atoms.

Epicurus' position on this point is a little unexpected and needs explanation. The varieties of shape in the atoms are caused by the number and arrangement of their πέρατα—their inseparable parts. In order to produce the great variety of perceptible things—συγκρίσεις—the variety of atomic shapes must be immensely large. But Epicurus is unwilling to say that it is infinite for a reason which becomes clear in § 56. Further variety of shape can only be produced by the increase in the number of πέρατα in the atoms, and if this increase were carried on to infinity, the atoms would become so large as to be perceptible to the senses. Democritus had indeed boldly said that some atoms are μέγιστα, but Epicurus, feeling that the evidence of sense-perception was against this conclusion, decided that the varieties of atomic shape were not infinite, but only inconceivably many. See *Lucr.* ii. 478 ff.

6. μεστά, 'compact', 'solid', one of the regular atomic words to denote the solidity and unbreakability of the atoms.

7. ἀπειληπτά, 'incomprehensible', 'not to be grasped by the mind': see the note on περιληπτικῶς (§ 40). The idea is again visual: you could not put the varieties of shape together and conceive them as a collection with a boundary round the outside.

9. τὰς τοσαύτας διαφοράς : i.e. in συγκρίσεις.

Ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν σχημάτων. i.e. in the atoms. One MS. (G) omits αὐτῶν, but there seems no reason to suspect it. 'by repeating the same shapes' we might say.

περιειλημμένων, 'limited'; so as to become comprehensible in number.

10. καθ' ἔκαστην δέ: though the number of shapes is only incomprehensible, the number of atoms of each shape is infinite. This idea greatly assists the possibility of the formation of compound bodies with so vast a variety of shape.

11 οὐχ ἀπλῶς ἄπειροι, 'not quite infinite': an almost colloquial use.

12. After ἀπειληπτοι the MSS have the words οὐδὲ γάρ φησιν ἐνδοτέρω ('further on', sc. § 56) εἰς ἄπειρον τὴν τομὴν τυγχάνειν, λέγει δέ, ἐπειδὴ αἱ ποιότητες μεταβάλλονται, εἰ μέλλει τις μὴ καὶ τοῖς μεγέθεσιν ἀπλῶς εἰς ἄπειρον αὐτὰς ἐκβάλλειν. This has generally been recognized by editors as a scholium, as is shown by its introductory words. Bignone (*Atti della Reale Acc. delle Scienze di Torino* xlvi, 1912, pp. 680 ff.)

has shown that Usener's emendation of λέγει to λύγειν is unnecessary, and that the general sense is that if you deny infinite division, as Epicurus did, and yet wish to account for variations in quality in things, you still need not suppose an infinite variety of atomic shapes, and if you do, some will become so large as to be visible. Von der Muehll would retain the words εἰ μέλλει . . . ἐκβάλλειν in the text, which is possibly right, as it completes the argument, but it makes the scholium leave off very abruptly at μεταβάλλονται.

E. Motion of the atoms

The never-ceasing motion of the atoms and the consequent internal vibration in compound bodies is a very important point in Epicurean physics and is treated at length by Lucretius (ii. 80-332). The present statement is very much abbreviated and entirely confined to the internal movement in compounds. It is however fairly certain, as modern editors assume, that something must have been lost in which Epicurus dealt with the two primary causes of atomic motion, their weight, which causes them to fall downwards at an equal rate in the void, and the swerve (*παρέγκλεσις, clinamen*) which produces their collisions and constant motion in all directions. The text resumes where he is describing the internal movement of the atoms inside compounds: there some atoms recoil at great distance, and thus constitute rarified bodies, such as air and fire, in which there is a large admixture of void, others are kept more closely together either by their own interlacings, as in hard solids, or by the interlacing of an outer atomic 'case' which confines them, as in the case of liquids. In such compounds there is a constant internal vibration of atoms, recoiling at short distances between their collisions with one another.

§ 43. 1. καὶ αἱ μὲν . . . Bignone places the lacuna here, and suggests as giving its general form the words (κατὰ στάθμην, αἱ δὲ κατὰ παρέγκλισιν, αἱ δὲ κατὰ παλμόν τούτων δὲ αἱ μὲν φέρονται). This will fit well with the context and is fairly clearly what a lost passage might have contained. Usener places the lacuna after τὸν αἰώνα, but does not indicate its exact contents. It is almost inconceivable that Epicurus should not have spoken of the two primary causes of atomic motion, and it is noticeable that in the letter as we have it there is no mention at all of the all-important doctrine of the παρέγκλισις, which would have come in naturally here.

2 αἱ δὲ αὐτὸν τὸν παλμόν is Usener's correction for the MS. reading αἱ δὲ αὐτὸν τὸν παλμόν. It is difficult to attach much meaning to αὐτὸν, though it would be easier if mention of the παλμός had been made in the lost passage. The correction to αὐτὸν is simple, αὐτὸν having resulted from the repetition of τὸν. Von der Muehll, following Brieger, reads αὐτοῦ, 'there', sc. in the compound. The παλμός is of course the internal vibration within close compounds resulting from the constant movement and recoil of the constituent atoms.

3. *τοχουσιν*, not merely ‘have’ but ‘keep up’. Usener suggests the correction *τοχονσαι*, but (a) if Bignone’s idea of the form of the lost passage is correct, the indicative would be natural; (b) even otherwise this abrupt breaking away from exact parallelism in clauses is very much in Epicurus’ manner.

τῇ περιπλοκῇ κεκλιμέναι . . . Epicurus assumes two varieties of these closer compounds. In one the atoms, those still moving in the *παλμός*, are actually interlaced with one another as in most solids, in the other there is as it were an outer case of interlaced atoms, which shuts in a number of other atoms moving freely within it (*στρεγάζομεναι παρὰ τῶν πλεκτικῶν*). It was in this latter form that he conceived the body of fluids. The MSS. have *τὴν περιπλοκήν*, but it is impossible to construe the accusative.

4. *παρὰ τῶν πλεκτικῶν*, G only, must be right as against the *περὶ* of the other MSS.

§ 44. 1. ἦ τε γὰρ . . . Epicurus’ explanation of the twofold cause of the internal vibration is rather obscure. When the atoms have entered a compound they are unable to stay still because they are even now individually surrounded by void, which offers no resistance to their movement; on the other hand, their constant collision with other perfectly hard and unyielding atoms makes them recoil in all directions.

2. *αὐτήν*: emphatically predicative, ‘each by itself’. The *αὐτῶν* of G seems pointless and Meibom’s correction *ἄτομον* needless, and not in Epicurus’ manner.

4. *κατὰ τὴν σύγκρουσιν*, ‘on their collision’, almost ‘as the result of their collision’.

ἔφ’ ὅποσον ἀν . . . This is clearly a greater distance in the case of atoms in the fluid body than in the solid

6. *τούτων*, ‘these motions’.

οὐκ ἔστιν Usener’s suggested addition *οὐδὲ τέλος* is quite unnecessary.

αἰτίων Usener adopted H Weil’s conjecture *ἀιδίων*, and it has been received by subsequent editors. But there seems no need for it. ‘there is no beginning to these motions, because their cause is the atoms and the void’, and they are the ultimate constituents of the universe which here existed for all eternity. Kochalsky would read *ἀναιτίων*, ‘uncaused’ (*ursachlos*), but such a meaning is surely doubtful.

§ 45 1. ‘Η τοσαύτη δὴ . . . : a short conclusion to this section, which would perhaps be better in place after the next paragraph. It is expressed in the material terms of the Epicurean phraseology. In order to have a visual image (*ἐπίνοια*) of unseen things, the mind must have an example (*τύπος*) on which to build. This example is given in the audible sounds (*φωνῆ*) of Epicurus’ words, the written text being regarded, as always in Greek, as a record of the spoken words *τοσαύτη δὴ* has better MS. authority than *τοσαύτη δὲ* and is more

natural. Bignone takes it to mean 'of so great importance', but it surely means 'so brief'.

2. τῆς . . . ἐπινοίας. The MSS have *ἐπινοίας* which Usener keeps, inserting (*ταῦς περὶ*) before *τῆς*. But Zf have *ἐπινοίας*, which Bignone adopts, and the correction is simpler. For the construction of *τύπου* with gen. he compares § 35 *τὸν τύπον τῆς δῆς πραγματείας*

F. *Infinite number of worlds.*

This section comes as a sort of afterthought. Other worlds than our own are in fact another kind of *ἀδηλα*, not because, like the atoms and space, they are in their nature imperceptible, but because we can never perceive them. It was a regular tenet of the atomic school that there is an infinite number of worlds, some like ours, some unlike, and differing too from one another. The proof given by Epicurus is also traditional, that with infinite atoms moving in space the sequence of their movements will cause the creation of other worlds just as it has of this world. no limited number of worlds could exhaust the supply of matter. Lucretius (ii 1023-1089) argues also from the typically Epicurean idea that nothing is unique, and that on the whole there is about an equal number of all things (*ἰσονομία*).

3. οἱ θ' has the support of the majority of the MSS.: the alternative εἰθ' would involve the change made by f of *καὶ οἱ τοιτέ*. *τούτῳ* is of course 'our world'.

4. αἱ τε γάρ. The *τε* suggests a complementary clause with reference to the infinite extent of space and something may have dropped out, as is suggested by the parallel passage of Lucretius ii. 1053-1055:

undique cum versum spatum vacet infinitum
seminaque in numero numero summaque profunda
multimodis volent aeterno percita motu

ὡς ἄρτι ἀπεδείχθη sc in § 42

6. ἐξ ὅν . . ποιηθεῖν. It is difficult to see the difference between the two clauses. Perhaps ἐξ ὅν ἀν γένοντο refers rather to the original creation of the world, ἦφ' ὅν ἀν ποιηθεῖν to its maintenance.

7. οὐθ' δοι . . . διάφοροι τούτοις. *τούτοις* is the reading of all the MSS. The parallel of οἱ θ' δοιοι τοιτέ would lead one to expect *τοιτέ* here, 'like or unlike our world', but there is no authority for the change. The idea then must be a new one, 'neither all those which are like one another nor all those which are different from these', i.e. from those which are alike.

III. SENSE-PERCEPTION.

A. *Sight by means of the 'images'.*

Epicurus now starts on a quite different topic. *αἴσθησις* is the foundation of the Epicurean theory of knowledge, and it is therefore

necessary to know how it is brought about. He starts directly on sight and enunciates the main theory that it is caused by 'images' which come off from things and travelling through the intervening air collide with the organs of sense and so cause perception. The theory was inherited from the Atomists and is described by Lucretius in a section which, though not closely following the present treatment, in many respects throws light on it (iv. 46-268).

(1) The 'images'. The first section gives a very careful description of the 'images'. They are in fact a film or framework, the outer atomic 'case' of things which comes off from the surface. It is thus hollow within and extremely thin. Here again we are dealing with something beyond the ken of the senses, and according to the *Canonica*, the theory may be accepted, if it is not contrary to our experience. This accounts for the strangely negative form of the proof οὐτε γὰρ ἀποστάσεις ἀδυνατοῦσιν . . .

§ 46^a. 1 τύποι δμοισχήμονες, 'images like in shape or outline' to the solid bodies from which they come. Cf. Lucr iv. 51-52:

quod speciem ac formam similem gerit eius imago
cumscumque cluet de corpore fusa vagari

2 τῶν φαινομένων, 'the objects of sense', a traditional philosophic term, rather oddly used by Epicurus, in whose theory external objects are never directly perceived except by touch. The 'subtlety' of the images far exceeds that of the objects, so that they can never be perceived by touch but only by the organs of sense.

3. ἐν τῷ περιέχοντι, 'in whatever surrounds the object', a perfectly vague phrase: in the case of the majority of things it is of course the air.

4. τῆς κατεργασίας. The MSS are divided between τούς, τάς, and ταῖς, which points to some case of the article, the variations may be due, as Kochalsky suggests, to a mistaking of the rare ἐπιτήδειότητες for some case of the superlative of ἐπιτήδεος τῆς therefore seems a simpler solution than Usener's πρός, the genitive being a perfectly natural construction after ἐπιτήδειότητες

τῶν κοιλωμάτων καὶ λεπτοτήτων. I take this to be a very careful description of the 'images', which are merely films or cases, hollow within and extremely thin in the outer crusts. Usener emended to λειοτήτων and took the whole phrase to mean, as Hicks translates, 'materials adapted for expressing the hollowness and smoothness of the surfaces', i.e. of reproducing those of the original object: so Bignone. This seems to be quite unnecessary and really to anticipate: Epicurus does not come to the relation of the image to the object till the next clause.

5. θέσιν καὶ βάσιν. θέσις is the position held by the atom in relation to itself (i.e. whether it is upside down or on its side), βάσις its place in the series with reference to its neighbours. The words correspond to the τροπή and διαθήση of Leucippus, which Aristotle

explains to mean *θέσις* and *τάξις*: Giussani wishes to emend *βάσις* to *τάξις*, but that is unnecessary. The importance of the preservation of these positions in the 'image' is that it enables it to reproduce not only the shape but also the colour of the object, colour being due to the arrangement and movements of the atoms. Cf. *θέσιν καὶ τάξιν* below, § 48.

§ 46. *καὶ μὴν καὶ . . . § 47. τοῦτο κατασχεῖν τὸ στοιχεῖον.* There follows a considerable section which interrupts the sequence of thought about the *εἶδωλα* and deals with the motion of atoms in the void and in compounds. Giussani suggested its transposition to §§ 61, 62, where he adjusted the two sentences naturally to the context, and with some hesitation I follow him. Bignone (*Epicuro*, Appendix I, II) has argued at length for the retention of the passage in its place, regarding it as a preliminary explanation of the general principles of atomic motion intended to lead up to the discussion of the motion of the *simulacra* at the end of § 47. But (1) it seriously interrupts the sequence here. Epicurus states at the outset of § 46 that there are 'images like in shape to the objects', and that 'they far surpass perceptible things in subtlety'. The first statement he immediately confirms in the sentence *οὐτε γὰρ ἀποστύσεις . . .*, the second is dealt with in the words *εἴδοτε δὲ τὰ εἶδωλα . . .*. It is most improbable that these clauses should be interrupted by a long discussion of atomic motion intended to explain the subsequent *ὅθεν καὶ τάχη ἀνυπέρβλητα ἔχειν*. Even if the explanation is required, it is not in place. (2) In order to obtain the reference to the *simulacra* Bignone has to adopt an improbable emendation in the text (*τάποφερόμενον σῶμα*). (3) The sentences fit admirably in the place to which Giussani transfers them in §§ 61, 62, and indeed seem necessary there to complete the argument. It is best therefore to regard these sentences as belonging to the later context and transferred here by a scribe in order to assist the understanding of what is undoubtedly an anticipation of the general ideas of the atomic kinetics at the end of § 47 such an anticipation Epicurus might well make in a letter intended for persons already acquainted with the system. Von der Muehll retains the sentences here and believes them to refer to the motion of the *εἶδωλα*, but they seem to me to contain many statements quite inapplicable to the 'images'.

§ 47^a. (2) The subtlety and speed of the images. Having said that nothing in sense-experience contradicts the possibility of the formation of images, Epicurus proceeds to state that there is similarly nothing to contradict the notion of their extreme subtlety. This is the normal Epicurean 'proof' with regard to *ἀδηλα*. He then proceeds to deduce from their subtlety an extreme speed in motion. The text here is uncertain and the argument difficult as it assumes a knowledge of the Epicurean kinetics (see §§ 61, 62). Briefly the idea is this: the unimpeded atom passes through space at 'inconceivable' (*ἀπερινοήτῳ*) speed: the only cause of delay is collision, which causes

arrest during the infinitely brief time of contact, and then the atom moves again at 'atomic' speed. In a compound body there are two causes of delay: firstly, it may collide with other bodies outside itself; secondly, the collisions and movements in all directions of the atoms which compose it delay the motion of the whole body, and it is only through this delay that its motion becomes perceptible (For both kinds of collision Epicurus uses the word ἀντικοπή) Now the 'images' are mainly fine in texture: they are shot off from the body by the impulse of atomic movement within it, which starts the whole complex film in movement in one direction, they can move through space without encountering any—or only a few—obstacles, and there is little or no internal vibration. For these reasons the images are able to move almost at atomic speed: they are imperceptible in their transit, and it is only when they touch our eyes that we then perceive them. Lucr. iv. 176-229 deals with the subject fully and in an independent manner, but he is, I think, of considerable value for the interpretation of the present passage.

ἱ λεπτότησιν ἀνυπερβλήτοις, 'unsurpassable fineness of texture', indefinitely greater than that of any compound perceptible by the senses. Cf. Lucr. iv. 110-128.

3. πάντα πόροι σύμμετρον ἔχοντα: a difficult expression which recurs in § 61. The analogy of § 53 ὅγκοι .. σύμμετροι πρὸς τὸ τοῦτο τὸ αἰσθητῆριον κινεῖν suggests that we should emend here πρὸς (τὸ) τῷ .., 'they have all their movement proportionate to the fact that.' This was the view taken by the Ambrosian version and recently by Tescari and Kochalsky. But in § 61 the expression is used absolutely, and the two passages must be taken together. Bignone would render it 'having all their movement in one direction', and Giussani explains that the component atoms of the 'image' are not impeded by any ἀντικοπή of their own owing to movements in many directions and consequent collisions. It is hard to see how even in the subtle complex of an 'image' there can be no ἀντικοπή at all, and Epicurus himself seems to suggest that there is some: it is therefore best to take the expression in a vaguer sense, 'having all their motion uniform', i.e. in speed and direction.

πρὸς (τῷ) τῷ δίλιγα ἀντικόπτειν. It is clear that an additional article must be inserted, and if we reject τὸ (see above), Meibom's τῷ is inevitable, 'besides the fact that'. The MSS. then have ἀπείρῳ. This Usener retains, and proposes to translate 'besides the fact that nothing . . . hinders their infinite subtlety', referring to Lucr. iv. 196-197:

deinde quod usque adeo textura praedita rara
mittuntur, facile ut quasvis penetrare queant res.

This Giussani adopts with some reluctance, and Hicks translates, 'owing to their infinitesimal fineness they meet with no resistance'. But this is a quite impossible sense for ἀπείρῳ, especially in view of

the occurrence of *ἀπέροις* immediately afterwards in a normal sense. Tescari, feeling that Usener's solution was impossible, supposed a lacuna after *ἀπέρω* in which the meaning required by Usener would be expressed. Bignone would read *τῷ (μὴ) ἀπέρω*, 'nothing hinders the limited number of atoms in the images', as opposed to *ἀπέροις* just afterwards. But though there is no difficulty in the neuter and genitive, for which he quotes parallels, the expression *τῷ μὴ ἀπέρω* *αὐτῶν* sounds very unlike Epicurus, who would surely have said *πεπερασμένοις*. In the parallel passage Lucretius (iv. 205) says:

cum iaciuntur et emissum res nulla moratur,

which suggests a word equivalent in sense to *emissum*. I therefore propose *ἀπόρρῳ*: it does not elsewhere occur in Epicurus though *ἀπόρροια* does in § 46, but it seems a quite probable word for him to use.

4. πολλαῖς δὲ καὶ ἀπέροις εύθὺς ἀντικόπτειν τι. The MS text is apparently *πολλαῖς*, though Usener in his notes quotes it as *πολλοῖς*. With the latter we should supply *εἰδώλοις*, and the meaning would be that though any one image would meet with but few obstacles, yet the continuous flow of them would be soon interrupted. This gives good sense, though it is surely possible to retain *πολλαῖς* (*sc. ἀπέροις*). 'The images with their subtle texture and few atoms meet with little opposition, whereas the many or infinite (in a loose sense) atoms which compose a normal compound body must at once be brought up against obstacles.'

(3) Epicurus proceeds to the question of the creation of the images. It must be that they not only move to us with incredible speed, but also that there is an immediate and unbroken flow. otherwise we should not have a steady vision of the object but a broken chain of images. It is also this constant and immediate flow which enables us to correct impressions which might be produced by the disturbance of individual images owing to collisions in transit, though occasionally (as in the familiar instance of the square tower seen at a distance) the whole series may be so affected. The images preserve 'for a long time' the order and position of the atoms on the original body, but cannot do so for an indefinite time or distance: hence we do not see distant objects so clearly or certainly as those near at hand. Epicurus adds further that images may be formed by the union of atoms in the air or in other ways, and finally, rather more elaborately than usual, states his 'proof': that nothing in his theory is contradicted by our experience of the clear view of things or of the details of colour, movement, &c. For the whole passage cf. Lucr. iv. 143-175

§ 48. 1. διτι: . . . sc. οὐθὲν ἀντιμαρτυρεῖ τῶν φαινομένων from above.

2. ἄμα νοῆματι, 'as quick as thought', almost a colloquial phrase Cf. § 61.

3. βεῦσις is here used generally not only for the flow of images, but for the constant efflux of individual atoms from compounds. Com-

pound bodies are always losing matter in this way and at the same time taking in fresh atoms from without

3. ἐπιπολῆς: the correction of Z^a and f for the MS. ἐπὶ πολῆς συνεχής from the margin of P for συνοχῆς. Both corrections are necessary and inevitable.

οὐκ ἐπίδηλος τῇ μειώσει. Usener's correction for σημειώσει of the MSS.: ἡ μειώσει in F and the margin of P points in this direction. This is an interesting point in the theory, which is not reproduced by Lucretius. The constant efflux of images does not diminish the size of the object, because the place of the atoms lost is immediately taken by other atoms joining the compound body from the surrounding atmosphere (διὰ τὴν ἀνταναπλήρωσιν). Cf especially Plut. *adv. Col.* 16 μυρίων μὲν εἰδώλων ἀπέρχομένων ἀεὶ καὶ ῥεόντων, μυρίων δ' ὡς εἰκὸς ἔτέρων ἐκ τοῦ περιέχοντος ἐπιφρεόντων καὶ ἀναπληρούντων τὸ ἄθροισμα, though he is of course wrong in supposing that it was by other images, not other atoms, that the place of the lost images is taken. Giussani wrongly interprets the ἀνταναπλήρωσις as of the images; Epicurus does not mean that what is rubbed off from them in transit is replaced by the influx of new atoms.

4. σῶζουσα: from this point the βενσίς, which is the subject, is definitely the flow of images.

5. θέσιν καὶ τάξιν: see note on § 46^a, 1 5.

6. συγχεομένη. Epicurus admits that the images may become blurred by collisions in transit; when this happens only to individual images the necessary correction is made by the 'cinematographic' effect of the whole series: but since, in the case of distant objects, the series may be thus affected we must be careful to regard what we see as a προσμένον. Usener adds ὑπάρχει after συγχεομένη from the margin of H, but the participle can well stand alone.

συστάσεις, 'compound idols', which correspond to no real object, but are formed by the spontaneous congregation of atoms in the air. Compare Lucr. iv. 129-142, where he illustrates the idea by the configurations formed by clouds in the air.

7. ὅξειαί διὰ τὸ μὴ δεῖν . . . Such idols can be formed quickly because it is only necessary for enough atoms to unite to form the external film, whereas in order to make a normal compound body, it would be necessary for all the interior to be filled up (*κατὰ βάθος*) as well. This is another interesting point which seems to have escaped Lucretius.

8. δόλλοι δὲ τρόποι τινὲς . . . Lucretius notes one other such possibility (iv 724 ff.), when images emitted from things unite in the air to form a new compound image. These are the cause of the belief in such monsters as Centaurs, Scylla, and Cerberus.

9. ἀντιμαρτυρεῖται, the passive, seems a necessary correction of Weil's for ἀντιμαρτυρεῖ. Epicurus could not say, 'none of these things witnesses against the senses'

10. ἀν βλέπῃ τις . . . δροῖσει. A difficult and obscure sentence

All editors agree with Gassendi's correction ἐναργεῖας for ἑνεργεῖας and that the ἀνοίσει of B is the origin of the strange variants ἀνοίση and ἀνεσι. Usener also altered the MS. ἵνα to τίνα; but with his accentuation ἀν βλέπη τίς τίνα τρόπον τὰς ἐναργεῖας, τίνα καὶ . . . ἀνοίσει I am unable to construe the sentence. It is surely probable that we have two parallel clauses, and should accentuate ἀν βλέπη τίς τίνα τρόπον τὰς ἐναργεῖας, τίνα καὶ . . . ἀνοίσει: the subject of ἀνοίσει will be αἰσθῆσις (derived from ταῖς αἰσθήσεσι) and we shall get the meaning 'if one looks to see in what way sensation will bring us the clear visions from outward things and in what way their qualities', i.e. if we try to investigate by means of our sense-perceptions how we get those sense-perceptions both of the near view of objects and of their qualities, we find nothing which contradicts the present theory.

Bignone keeps the MSS. ἵνα and translates, 'if one observes in a certain way the evidence of phenomena to which he must refer . . .', but τίνα τρόπον is then very weak, the use of ἵνα is unnatural and the whole idea out of place here.

τὰς συμπαθεῖας occurs again in § 50. It means the corresponding affections in the images to the atomic positions and movements in the original, to which are due the qualities of colour, &c., and any incidents of change. It is almost impossible to render it in a single word. Bignone says, 'the constant continuity of the sensible properties of the external objects': this seems to me to miss a little the idea of correspondence: we may perhaps say, 'the corresponding sequence of qualities and movements'.

(4) The letter passes from the consideration of the images and their character to that of the act of sight. Two points of some importance emerge in this section: (1) The idea that thought as well as sight is due to images; this was part of the material conception of the nature of the soul, and explains Epicurus' habit, already noticed, of regarding all thinking as a kind of visualization. (2) The refutation, very rare in the letters, of rival theories, namely that of Democritus of an impression made on the air and that of Empedocles and others of the effect of rays passing from the eye to the object. In contradiction to these Epicurus reasserts clearly and distinctly his own theory, and makes the new point that the emission of the images from objects is due to the internal vibration of the component atoms.

§ 49. 2 καὶ διανοεῖσθαι: an important addition. Thought too as well as sight is due to the influx of images directly into the mind: cf. Lucr. iv. 722 ff. He is thinking here, however, not so much of the ordinary processes of thought, which employ images or conceptions (*προληψεῖς*) already stored in the mind, as of those rarer processes by which we obtain a direct mental image of an external object by means of 'fine idols' which pass directly into the mind without stirring the senses. This is above all the means by which we obtain knowledge of the gods (cf. Lucr. v. 1169–1182).

οὐ γάρ ἀν διανοεῖσθαι . . . Epicurus dismisses two rival

theories. The first is that of Democritus, from whom his system was derived, but whose over-refinements he not infrequently rejected. Democritus held (*Theophr. de Sensu* 52) that the effluence from the object did not itself penetrate the eye, but that it formed in the air an impression (*ἀποτύπωσις*) in two dimensions, like the impression which an object makes in wax, and this impression being hard was able to enter the soft material (*ὑγρόν*) of the eye and appear there as the image in the pupil (*έμφασις*), which is what we actually see. This subtlety Epicurus rudely brushes aside, apparently because he did not believe that the air could receive and retain such an impression. Note that ἐναποσφραγίσατο recalls closely the Democratean idea of the *ἀποτύπωσις*.

4. οὐδὲ διὰ τῶν ἀκτίνων. The second theory is usually attributed to Empedocles and was certainly held by Parmenides, namely that rays came from the eyes of the percipient and acting on the effluence from the objects joined in forming the image. This theory, which was no doubt designed to emphasize the active element in perception, was adopted by Plato (*Theat.* 153 e, *Tim.* 45 c, &c.) τῶν ἀκτίνων is the MS. text, and Usener's alteration to τινῶν is unnecessary: Epicurus means 'the rays' of which Parmenides and Plato speak.

6. οὕτως ὡς with the whole sentence: 'the impression could not be produced so well by either of these two means as by my theory'.

τύπων, 'models' he wishes for the sake of argument to avoid his technical term εἰδώλων.

7 δημοχράων. the ἀπὸ χρωῶν of the MSS. appears to be a mere mistake derived from ἀπὸ τῶν πραγμάτων just before.

κατὰ τὸ ἑνάρμοντον μέγεθος, 'according to the appropriate size', i.e. the grosser images affect the sight, the more subtle pass directly into the mind and awake a mental image.

8. τὰς φορᾶς. the margin of H alone has preserved what must certainly be the right reading as against μορφᾶς—it is because of the celerity of their creation and the swiftness of their motion that the successive images are able to give a continuous and steady vision.

§ 50. 2. συνεχοῦς, 'continuous', that is in time, 'uninterrupted'.

συμπάθειαν. see note on § 48, l. 8.

3 κατὰ τὸν ἔκειθεν σύμμετρον ἐπερεισμόν—a careful phrase, 'owing to the uniform contact kept up from the object': the succession of images makes a continuous line of contact between the object and the percipient: for σύμμετρον see note on § 47, l. 3.

4. ἐκ τῆς . . . πάλσεως. This is a new point: it is the constant internal vibration of the atoms deep down within the object which forces off the outer film that comes to us as an image.

(5) Truth and falsehood in vision. After describing the genesis of the images and the method of their apprehension by the sight and the mind, Epicurus returns to the crux of the whole position, the nature of truth and falsehood in sight-perception. In the remainder of the section he distinguishes carefully between that which is seized by an

act of apprehension (*ἐπιβλητικῶς*) either by the mind or by the *senses*, which is true, and the additional inference made by the mind (*προσδοξάζομενον*), which must not be regarded as either true or false until it has received the confirmation of the near vision. The general idea is familiar, but it is very difficult to seize the exact meaning, and the reader is left with the impression that Epicurus did not very successfully get out of the difficulty caused by the possible alteration of the images in their transit from the object to the percipient.

5. καὶ ἦν ἀν λάβωμεν φαντασίαν . . τοῦ στερεμνίου. Another reference to the idea of the *ἐπιβολή* both of the mind and of the *senses*: see note on § 38 and Appendix, pp. 259 ff. Here, since Epicurus is speaking of the image of a concrete object (*στερέμνιον*), it is probable that *ἐπιβλητικῶς τῇ διανοίᾳ* refers only to the first of the two senses of *ἐπιβολή τῆς διανοίας*, the apprehension by the mind of subtle images too fine for sense-perception, and indeed mainly to the apprehension of images of the gods. The sense then is, 'When we have apprehended an image either by an act of attention on the part of the mind, undistracted as, for instance, in sleep, by other images, or by the active apprehension of the *senses* confirming the first passive impression by the near view, we may be certain that the image exactly represents the concrete object'. *φαντασία* is the image created in sense-perception by the rapid succession of 'idols', no one of which is perceptible in itself: in the mind the image may sometimes be produced by a single 'idol'.

ἐπιβλητικῶς must be taken both with *τῇ διανοίᾳ* and *τοῖς αἰσθητηρίοις* and the whole expression corresponds to § 38 *τὰς παρούσας ἐπιβολὰς εἴτε διανοίας εἴθε δότον δήποτε τῶν κριτηρίων* and § 51 below *ἐπιβολὰς τῆς διανοίας ή τῶν λοιπῶν κριτηρίων*.

6. εἴτε συμβεβηκότων this refers back to the *συμπάθεια* of §§ 48 and 50. It is the 'corresponding sequence' which gives us the 'accidents', colour, movement, &c., of the original object.

7. μορφή ἔστιν αὕτη τοῦ στερεμνίου. Epicurus states unhesitatingly the correspondence of image and actuality in the case of perceptions, sensible and mental, made *ἐπιβλητικῶς*, i.e. by an active act of apprehension, and not a mere passive reception of the image. This involves in the case of sight the clear vision of the *énárgyma*: he could not say that the first vision of the tower as round was 'the shape of the object': to be sure of that we must get the near vision obtained by looking (*ἐπιβλητικῶς*).

Included in *μορφή* we must understand καὶ τὰ συμβεβηκότα.

γνομένη : sc. *φαντασία* (not of course *μορφή*), which is picked up in *αὐτῇ*.

κατὰ τὸ ἔχῆς πύκνωμα ή ἁγκατάλειμμα τοῦ εἰδάλου: a very difficult and widely differently interpreted phrase. (1) Giussani would take it of the succession of images coming to the percipient, 'the successive fullness or failure of the images'. This is of course impossible with the singular *τοῦ εἰδάλου*. (2) Bignone takes it 'the complete integrity of the image or a remainder of it', and explains that it refers to the

image which arrives at the percipient without loss and that which has suffered detrition on the way. But (a) this omits ἔξης altogether, (b) it is surely impossible that Epicurus could say that the image produced by the 'idol' which has suffered detrition (e. g. that of a rounded tower) is the shape of the object. (Bignone does not, as I do, lay stress on ἐπιβλητικῶς) (3) It is tempting to translate 'according to the successive fullness and hollowness of the idol', i.e. its successive concave and convex parts represent those of the outline of the original—but I think this is an impossible sense for ἔγκατάλειμμα. (4) With some hesitation I believe that the two alternatives here correspond to τοῖς αἰσθητηρίοις and τῇ διανοίᾳ above. The image of sight-perception is produced by the 'successive repetitions' (τὸ ἔξης πύκνωμα) of the idol: the image in the mind is due to 'the impression left by' (ἔγκατάλειμμα) the idol which penetrated to it. ἔξης then goes only with πύκνωμα and not with the whole phrase.

9. τὸ δὲ ψεῦδος . . . The information given to the senses by the images is always true; they represent nothing which is not there in the original, even though it may need the 'near vision' to determine whether as they reach us they correspond exactly to the object. Where then does the possibility of error lie? Epicurus here recurs to the ideas already sketched in §§ 37, 38: it lies in the additions made by opinion to sensation (*ἐν τῷ προσδοξαζομένῳ*) The vision of an object at a distance should always be regarded as a problem awaiting the confirmation (*προσμένον*) of the nearer view, by which, if it is either confirmed or not contradicted, it is true.

10-12 (ἐπὶ τοῦ προσμένοντος) . (ἢ ἀντιμαρτυρουμένου) the additions made by Usener are in exact accord with Epicurean usage elsewhere and seem demanded by the context.

12. After ἐπιμαρτυρουμένου the MSS. have what is clearly a note on τὸ προσδοξαζόμενον derived from the material of the next section: κατά τινα κίνησιν ἐν ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς συνημμένην τῇ φανταστικῇ ἐπιβολῇ, διάληψιν δὲ ἔχουσαν, καθ' ὃν τὸ ψεῦδος γίνεται, 'by means of a movement in ourselves closely linked with the visual act of apprehension, but differing from it, by which falsehood is produced'.

§§ 51, 52. There follows a summing up of the doctrine about truth and falsehood in vision. On the one hand the exact correspondence of the image in sensation to the external object can only be brought about by the transit of the 'idols' from the object to the sense-organs—on the other error can only arise by the spontaneous movement of the mind (opinion) which is akin to the movement of apprehension (*ἐπιβολή*). It is essential to keep this in mind, if we are successfully to distinguish the true from the false.

§ 51. 2 οὐσιον εἶ, the reading of the MSS., is certainly right. The 'idols' are received by us as 'though they were a picture' of the thing, and the two processes by which this may occur are either (ἢ) when they visit the undisturbed mind directly in sleep or (ἢ) when they are grasped by an act of apprehension in waking life. Usener's

ολον ἢ would make three processes, but would establish a cross-division, as there is no distinct process by which the images are received ολον τὸν εἰκόνι.

τὸν εἰκόνι: Bignone translates ‘in a plastic representation’, and draws attention to the ‘solid’ three-dimension appearance even of the visions of sleep. But it is not easy to insist on this sense for εἰκών, nor does it seem necessary.

3. ἡ καθ' ὑπνους γνομένων: the images seen in sleep are true, i.e. they are produced by ‘idols’ which enter us from without and therefore originate from reality.

ἡ κατ' ἀλλας τινὰς ἐπιβολὰς τῆς διανοίας: i.e. mental apprehensions of an image, when awake—but he is still thinking of direct apprehensions and not those formed by a combination of προλήψεις: see Appendix, pp. 259 ff.

4. ἡ τῶν λοιπῶν κριτηρίων see note on § 38, l. 5. Here again it must mean ‘or of the other instruments of judgement’, i.e. the senses, and the whole phrase therefore corresponds closely to § 50 ἐπιβλητικῶς τῇ διανοίᾳ ἡ τοῖς αἰσθητηρίοις. The ἐπιβολὴ of the senses is the grasping by attention of the ‘clear vision’ (ἐναργεία). It is possible here that he includes πάθος, though it is doubtful whether it could have an ἐπιβολή, the nearest instance to such an idea would be Κ.Δ. xxiv τὸ παρὸν ἥδη κατὰ . . . τὰ πάθη. Note that here διάνοια is classed as a κριτήριον even more clearly than in § 38.

6. τοιαῦτα προσβαλλόμενα is a necessary correction of the MS. text ταῦτα πρὸς δὲ βάλλομεν. Von der Muehll retains ταῦτα (*sc.* the bodies which emit the images) πρὸς δὲ βάλλομεν, but it is not clear how he takes the last words.

τὸ δὲ διημαρτημένον. The δὲ of the MSS. is quite necessary: he is here opposing the source of error to the source of truth, and Usener’s τε really weakens the text.

7. ἀλλην τινὰ κίνησιν: i.e. opinion, which like the ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας is, in Epicurus’ view, ultimately a spontaneous movement of the atoms of the mind.

8. συνημμένην μὲν τῇ φανταστικῇ ἐπιβολῇ: the missing dative is supplied with certainty from the gloss on § 50 above. Opinion is closely linked with the ἐπιβολὴ because it combines images in σύνθεσις, but it differs in that it acts at random and does not check its conclusions by ἐπιμαρτύρησις and οὐκ ἀντιμαρτύρησις.

διάληψιν δὲ ἔχουσαν, ‘but having a difference’. This must certainly be the meaning, as Bignone agrees: earlier commentators took it to mean ‘having opinion’, but it is itself opinion, and both substantive and verb are used in the sense of ‘distinction’, ‘distinguish’, in § 58.

9. κατὰ δὲ ταῦτην . . . a recapitulation of the ideas of ἐπιμαρτύρησις and οὐκ ἀντιμαρτύρησις already familiar.

§ 52. 1. καὶ ταῦτην οὖν . . .: an emphatic warning. ‘We must have this doctrine constantly in mind’, for otherwise on the one hand

we shall annul the value of the clear view given by the ἐπιβολαί of the mind and the senses, and on the other by placing the false inference of opinion on a level with their information, we shall undermine all our standards of judgement and cause universal confusion. For the general idea compare K. Δ. xxiv.

B. Hearing

Epicurus passes from the sense of sight to that of hearing. Once again it was necessary to establish a material link between the object and the percipient, and this he finds in a stream of particles emitted by the object. But here there was a new difficulty. In the case of sight, since every object is constantly giving off 'idols' in every direction at once, it is clear that it may be seen simultaneously by many people. But in the case of sound we have a single emission of particles apparently in one direction: how then can many persons hear at once? Epicurus gets over this difficulty by supposing the material 'sound' after its emission to split up into a number of small particles, each preserving the same characteristics (*όγκοι δροιομερεῖς*), and stretching back in a continuous chain to the object. These particles radiate off in different directions, and reaching the ears of many persons, produce an apprehension of their meaning (*ἐπαισθῆσις*) or at least a recognition of the presence of an external object. Epicurus does not himself directly indicate the necessity for this rather elaborate supposition, but it is brought out clearly by Lucretius (iv. 563-567):

praeterea verbum saepe unum perciet auris
omnibus in populo, missum praeconis ab ore
in multas igitur voces vox una repente
diffugit, in privas quoniam se dividit auris
obsignans formam verbi clarumque sonorem.

As in his discussion on sight, so here he disposes briefly of rival theories.

5. *ρεύματος*: the MSS. have *πνεύματος*, which is not in itself impossible and is supported by *ρεύματος πνευματώδους* below (§ 53), but *τὸ δὲ ρεύμα τοῦτο* in the next sentence makes Gassendi's correction necessary.

6. *ἀπὸ τοῦ φωνοῦντος . . . παρασκευάζοντος* a most scrupulous expression of all the possible kinds of sound, showing that Epicurus is writing here with care.

8. *δροιομερεῖς ὄγκοις*, 'particles like, as parts, to the whole'—the adjective employed by Anaxagoras to express his famous theory that all things were composed of particles like in substance to the whole: likeness of shape, however, is what Epicurus would most wish to insist on here. The *όγκοι* will be small atomic compounds, of acute particles for shrill sounds, and rounder particles for lower sounds: Giussani is wrong in attempting to see a technical sense of 'molecules'.

συμπάθειαν, ‘correspondence’, as in §§ 48, 50. Here of general likeness of character.

9. ἐνότητα ἴδιότροπον: another careful expression, ‘a unity consisting in peculiarity of character’. The idea is of several chains of similar particles, stretching from the speaker to the hearer.

10. τὴν ἐπαισθήσιν, ‘comprehension’ as opposed to mere *αἰσθήσις*: we not only hear a person speaking but ‘catch his words’, i.e. understand what he is saying.

ἐπ’ ἀκείνου. in the percipient as opposed to τὸ ἀποστέλλαν.

ὅς τὰ πολλά is wrongly expunged by Usener as a gloss: we do not always comprehend what we hear.

11. ποιούσαν and 12. παρασκευάζουσαν, is the MS. reading and is probably right; Epicurus conceives of the ἐνότης ἴδιότροπος as a perfectly concrete ‘chain’ of particles, which actually causes the hearing. Usener alters unnecessarily to ποιῶντας . . . παρασκευάζοντας referring to δύκοις. But the δύκοι would not themselves cause ἐπαισθήσις if they were not connected by the ‘chain’ to the object which emits the sounds.

εἰ δὲ μή γε . . . : even if we do not hear distinctly enough to comprehend the meaning of the sounds, at least the particles which reach us make clear to us the presence of some object outside us

§ 53. 2. οὐκ αὐτὸν οὐν δεῖ ρωμίζειν . . . Epicurus is once again arguing against Democritus, whose explanation of hearing was given on just the same lines as his theory of vision (*Theophr. de Sensu* 55). He held that ‘the air is torn up (*θρύπτεσθαι*) into bodies of similar shape (*ὅμοιοσχήμονα*) and is assimilated to the particles which issue from the voice’ (*Aet. iv. 19. 13*): i.e. that the bodies of voice, which we emit, form ἀποντώσεις of themselves, just as do the idols of sight, and that it is these ‘impressions’ which come into contact with our sense-organs. Epicurus’ comment is again purely contemptuous, ‘this is very far from happening’.

4. τῶν δημογενῶν i.e. ‘similar sounds’, i.e. noises which are not significant: cf. ηχοῦντος ἡ ψοφοῦντος above

5. πάσχειν is a necessary correction of the variants πάσχων and πάσχον. Von der Muehll retains πάσχων, referring presumably to *ἀίρ-*.

6. ἔκθλιψιν, ‘a squeezing out’. The MSS. here show traces of a serious corruption, most of them getting no farther than ἐκ. Usener emends ἔγκλισιν, ‘swerve’, a very improbable word for Epicurus to have used here, and one which would not account for the variants ἔκλιθην, ἔκλιθην of the only MSS. which produce a word at all. I have little doubt that ἔκθλιψιν is right. Brieger (*Epikurs Lehre von der Seele*, p. 6) has confidently made the same emendation. It would account well for the variants, and is a technical term of the atomists for the ‘squeezing out’ of particles between others surrounding them. It is then a very appropriate word for the emission of particles from the throat. For its use in Epicurean writings see Ep. II, § 109. 4.

δύκων τινῶν. the authority of the MSS. is distinctly in favour of

τυῶν, rather than *τύος*, which is preferred by Usener and Bignone, but would involve a very unnatural order of words.

7. *ἀποτελεστικῶν* again is the MS reading, and there is no reason to follow Usener in altering it to *ἀποτελεστικήν*. It is indeed more natural to conceive of the particles forming the stream of breath, than of their emission doing so. A favourite word in the second letter. see §§ 101, 102, 108.

C. Smell.

Continuing with the senses in order Epicurus proceeds to smell and decides that it too is due to the effluence of particles, which are of such a size as to enter into and stir the sense-organs. Lucretius has again (iv. 673-705) considerably elaborated the treatment of the subject, and explains (*a*) that it is owing to the accommodation or the reverse of the various shapes to the sense-organs of the percipients that smells which are good to some animals are bad to others, (*b*) that the particles of smell are much more easily destroyed in transit than those of sound or the idols of sight.

10. οὐκ ἀν ποτε . . . ἐρύδασθαι because no sensation (*πάθος*) can be produced without touch, and therefore contact must be produced between object and percipient by means of a concrete effluence.

11. σύμμετροι πρὸς τὸ . . . κινεῖν *σύμμετρος* is not here used in the technical sense in which it occurred in §§ 47, 50, but more generally 'fitly formed to . . .'

12. *τεταραγμένως καὶ δλλοτρίως* . . . *ἔχοντες* i.e. they are both disordered among themselves, they do not fit well together, and are alien in shape to the particles which compose the sense-organs of the percipient, and therefore produce the effect of a bad smell. Cf. Lucr. 11. 414-417.

neu simili penetrare putes primordia forma
in naris hominum, cum taetra cadavera torrent,
et cum scena croco Cilici perfusa recens est
araque Panchaeos exhalat propter odores.

It might have been expected that there would be sections on taste and touch: Lucretius deals fully with taste in iv. 615-672. But probably Epicurus would assume a knowledge of these in his more advanced disciples.

IV. THE ATOMS THEIR PROPERTIES, PARTS, AND MOTION.

Epicurus now returns to the atom and discusses at length its properties, constitution, and motion. The main conception of the nature of the atom he inherits from Leucippus and Democritus, but he has greatly elaborated it, especially in the conception of the *minimae partes*, and in some details as regards motion. This section would more naturally have preceded the discussion of the theory of sensation and ought possibly to be transposed, but the order of topics

in the letter is so irregular as compared with that in Lucretius, which may be taken to represent the normal Epicurean tradition, that it is best not to attempt transposition, except in certain small sections where it seems absolutely necessary (e.g. §§ 46, 47).

A. *Properties of the atom.*

These are, according to Epicurus, shape, size, and weight. The last was probably added by Democritus in order to explain the movement of the atoms.

(1) Epicurus argues that the atoms do not possess any of the qualities (or properties) which attach to compound bodies, except the primary properties of shape, size, and weight. For qualities are changeable and the atoms are *ex hypothesi* unchangeable, and it is their arrangement one with another, which is the cause of change in compounds. In elaborating the conception of shape he introduces the idea of the inseparable parts of the atom, which is dealt with at length in §§ 58, 59. The argument of this subsection is not explicitly stated in Lucretius, but is implied in i. 503–634 and again in ii. 478–521.

§ 54. 2 προσφέρεσθαι : lit. 'claim for themselves'.

3. ὅτα ἐξ ἀνάγκης σχήματι συμφυῇ ἔστι. the necessary accompaniments of shape in the Epicurean doctrine would be ἀντιτυπία, the capacity to strike against other atoms (cf. Sextus, *adv. Dogm.* iv. 257 κατὰ ἀθροισμὸν σχήματός τε καὶ μεγέθους καὶ ἀντιτυπίας καὶ βάρους τὸ σῶμα νενοήσθαι), and the possession of inseparable parts : cf. §§ 58, 59

4. οὐδέν : a necessary correction made by Z and f for οὐδέ.

5. ἐπειδὴπερ δεῖ . . . Epicurus here bases his argument on the fundamental principles of the system enunciated in §§ 38, 39 : 'nothing is created out of the non-existent' and 'nothing is destroyed into the non-existent'. In the dissolution of compound bodies, whose qualities are then lost, there must be something which remains constant, we must ultimately arrive at particles which are not dissolvable, but permanently retain their shape, size, and weight, i.e. at the atoms. It is they which cause the creation, alteration, and dissolution of compound bodies by their meetings, changes of position, and separations. For the general idea compare Sextus, *adv. Dogm.* iv. 42 (Us. fr. 291).

7. ἀλλὰ κατὰ μεταθέσεις . . . 8 ἀφόδους. The MSS. have ἀλλὰ κατὰ μεταθέσεις ἐν πολλοῖς τινῶν δὲ καὶ προσόδους καὶ ἀφόδους. (1) The traditional correction, adopted by Giussani (Lucr. i. 681 note) is ἀλλὰ κατὰ μεταθέσεις μὲν πολλῶν, τινῶν δὲ καὶ . . . But, apart from palaeographical difficulties, this represents 'rearrangement' and 'addition and subtraction' of atoms as concurrent causes needed to produce change, whereas they are in fact alternative causes : change may be due to atomic rearrangement, or it may be due to the addition or subtraction of atoms in the compound. (2) Usener would excise ἐν πολλοῖς . . . ἀφόδους as a *varia lectio* to explain μεταθέσεις, but the words τινῶν . . .

ἀφόδους are absolutely essential to the sense: **μεταθέσις** will not account for all changes in compounds, some (e.g. increase or decrease in size) must be due to the addition of new atoms or the departure of some hitherto included in the compound: cf. Lucr. i. 675 ff.:

certissima corpora quaedam

sunt quae conservant naturam semper eandem,
quorum abitu aut aditu mutatoque ordine mutant
naturam res et convertunt corpora sese.

(3) Bignone excises ἐν πολλοῖς (*sc. ἀπογράφοις*) as a lemma introducing the addition τινῶν δὲ καὶ . . . and supposes that *(τινῶν)* has fallen out by haplography. This gives the required sense, and seems on the whole the best solution of a rather uncertain passage.

9 τὰ μὲν μετατιθέμενα. The MSS. have τὰ μὴ μετατιθέμενα, which is impossible, and Usener's τὰ δὴ μετατιθέμενα is very improbable. τὰ μὲν might be justified either as used with an implied apodosis (cf. § 36 βαδιστέον μὲν οὖν and § 37 πρώτον μὲν οὖν, where μὲν does not go closely with οὖν), or as picked up rather irregularly by δύκος δὲ . .

10. δύκος δὲ καὶ σχηματισμούς ιδίους. The atoms have 'parts and arrangements of their own' which are constant and unchangeable. δύκος is here an anticipation of the discussion in §§ 56-58, and is used of the 'least inseparable parts' of the atom which Epicurus there calls *πέρατα*, and which are the measure of its extension. The σχηματισμός of an atom depends on the arrangement of its πέρατα. Bignone points out that Epicurus is here arguing against both the vague indeterminate matter (*ὕλη*) which Aristotle, following Plato, had assumed as the ultimate constituent, and also against Democritus, who had said that the atom has no parts. Epicurus holds that it has determinate parts, but these are inseparable.

11. ὑπομένειν, the reading of the MSS., must certainly be kept 'this much (*sc. the parts and the shape*) must remain as constant': the shape of the atoms, constituted by the arrangement of their *minimae partes*, is the ultimately permanent thing in all matter. τοῦτο is used loosely, but need not be emended to ταῦτα (cf. § 55 τούτου προσόντος) Usener, misunderstanding the passage, altered ὑπομένειν to ὑποτιθέναι, 'this we must assume', but the alteration is quite gratuitous. Kochalsky retaining ὑπομένειν cuts out τοῦτο . ἀναγκαῖον, 'the atoms must remain as particles and shapes', again a gratuitous alteration based on a misunderstanding. Bignone agrees with me in retaining the MS. text: ὑπομένειν is vouched for by τὰ ὑπολειπόμενα below.

§ 55 i. καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς . . . 5. ἀπολλύμεναι: a rather difficult and obscure sentence. Epicurus is as usual appealing to the experience of phenomena: when they change their shape by being reduced in size, we see that they lose their other qualities, but still retain the property of shape: much more must the atoms, which have no other qualities to lose, and cannot be diminished in size, retain their shape. Bignone aptly compares Lucr. ii. 826, where Lucr. explains that if you divide a piece of purple cloth into smaller and smaller particles, the

smaller the particle the fainter becomes the colour until it is finally lost: but the smallest particle will still have shape.

2. κατὰ τὴν περιάρσειν, 'by taking off bits all round', sc. by diminution in size.

5. ἵκανδ οὖν . . . : i.e. it has thus been shown that atoms, possessed only of size, shape, and weight, are sufficient, since they remain permanent, to account for all the varieties in sensible things

7. καὶ (μῆ). the MSS. have only καὶ, which Usener boldly emends to οὐκ. It is surely more natural to suppose that μῆ has dropped out owing to the succeeding εἰς τὸ μῆ οὖν. Bignone supplies μηδὲν as a reference to the fundamental axiom that nothing is destroyed into the non-existent.

(2) Epicurus now passes to a new consideration with regard to the size of the atoms. They vary in size, but are not of all sizes. A certain amount of variation in size is sufficient to account for the varieties in phenomena, and if the atoms were of all sizes, some would have to be so large as to be actually visible to us. Here again Epicurus is diverging from Democritus, who, apparently not perceiving this objection, stated that the atoms were 'unlimited in size' (*ἀπέλποντος κατὰ μέγεθος*, D. L. ix 44), and again that 'some atoms were very large μεγίστας. Lucretius apparently dealt with this subject in a passage which has been lost before n 478, for he speaks of the point as already proved in 499.

10. παραλλαγάς: not of course changes of size in individual atoms, which are unchangeable, but a series of variations of size.

11. τούτου i.e. the variation of size, used vaguely as *τοῦτο γάρ* in § 54 fin. Differences of size together with differences of shape in the atoms account for differences of sensation and qualities in phenomena.

§ 58. οἱ ὑπάρχοντες is the reading of the MSS. and will construe quite well. It is unnecessary to alter with Usener to ὑπάρχειν, which would moreover almost demand an article.

2. ἀμ' ἔδει (Usener) seems to be indicated by the ἀμέλει of the MSS., though H. Weil's suggestion ἀν' ἔδει might be right.

4. δρατὴ ἀτομος need not be excised from the text with Usener as a gloss. It is not absolutely required for the construction, but makes it clearer

B Parts of the atom.

Epicurus, having decided that there is an upward limit to the size of the atoms, proceeds to consider the downward limit: can the atoms be infinitely small? His decision is again in the negative: there is a limit also to the smallness of the atom. But his discussion of this point leads him necessarily to the wider consideration of the limit of divisibility in general, and so to the conception of the atom itself. He argues against infinite divisibility on two main grounds: (1) that unless you can reach a permanent existence, a point beyond which division is impossible, there is no substratum of strength and durability in the

universe · it is necessary, as he said in § 41, that there should be *τοχῦν τι*, which is permanent, (2) that on the analogy of sensible things, in which there is a *minimum visible*, there must also be a *minimum* of existence in the atom. The conception of the atom thus reached is that it is of a determinate size, has extension, and therefore must have parts; you could think of a top and bottom and right-hand and left-hand parts of it · but the atom could never be divided into these parts. These parts are the *minimum* of extension and can only exist as parts of the atom: the atom itself is the *minimum* of physical existence.

The argument is complicated and difficult. Considerable help is obtained from the parallel passage in Lucretius (I. 599-634) where the doctrine of the *minimae partes* of the atom is expounded. Giussani in his essay on the Lucretian *Atomia* (vol. I, pp. 39-84, and especially pp. 52, 56-75) has done great service in elucidating the general ideas, though his treatment of individual passages is sometimes arbitrary. Bignone in his notes and Appendix brings out many points clearly, especially as regards Epicurus' opposition to the Eleatics.

Epicurus first argues generally that in a limited body there cannot be an infinite number of parts nor can the parts be infinitely small · the two ideas are of course interdependent. If the parts were infinite in number, they must be infinitely small in size and vice versa. We must therefore in the first place reject the belief in *τομὴ εἰς ἀπειρον ἐπὶ τούλαττον*, in the possibility of an infinite physical subdivision of matter into smaller and smaller particles: for otherwise we shall 'make all things weak' and have no permanent substratum, and by constantly 'pounding' matter up into smaller and smaller particles we shall annihilate it. Secondly, we must not believe in the possibility of an ideal progress in thought to ever smaller and smaller particles, such as the Eleatics conceived. The argument against this idea is set out in the following sections

5. *ἐν τῷ δρισμένῳ σώματι* is here quite general 'in any limited body'. He proceeds to apply the idea to a perceptible body in § 58 and by analogy to the atom in § 59.

6. *ἀπείρους . . . ὅπηλίκους οὐν*, 'infinite in number' or 'of any size you will', i.e. as is obvious from the context 'of any smallness you will', 'infinitely small'. The ideas are complementary.

ῶστε οὐ μόνον . . . Of the two processes discussed in this clause the first is the physical process of infinite division (*τομὴ εἰς ἀπειρον ἐπὶ τούλαττον*) and corresponds to the notion of *ἀπειροι ὅγκοι*, the second a mental or ideal process of 'passing' in thought to ever smaller and smaller particles (*μετάβασις εἰς ἀπειρον ἐπὶ τούλαττον*) and corresponds to the notion of *ὅγκοι ὅπηλίκοι οὖν*.

7. *τὴν εἰς ἀπειρον τομήν* · the 'cutting up' of the limited body, first into halves, then into quarters, then into eighths, and so on to infinity. Lucretius argues against the possibility of such infinite division in I. 551 ff., in a subtle passage which has been well expounded by Giussani.

Ὥντα μὴ πάντα δισθενή ποιῶμεν: Epicurus states two reasons why infinite divisibility must be rejected. In the first place, if we could carry on the process of division without limit and cut things up into ever more and more minute particles, we should utterly deprive things of physical force. For any particle capable of further subdivision must have in it an admixture of void and would therefore be 'weak', i.e. subject to further dissolution from external blows: we should never arrive at anything which could be a source of permanent strength. The idea is that of § 41 *εἴπερ . . . μέλλει . . . ἴσχυόν τι ὑπομένειν.* Lucretius (i. 565 ff.) puts the same notion more simply. If there are hard permanent particles (the atoms) we can explain the creation of soft things by the admixture of void: but if the particles are 'soft', we cannot account for the creation of hard things.

8. καὶ ταῖς περιληψεσι . . . 9. καταναλίσκειν The second reason. We must follow Usener in writing *καὶ* for the MS. *καī*, but even so the clause is obscure. The meaning I take to be this. In the formation of actual compound bodies, the solid atoms are the source of strength, which enables the compound to have the powers of matter (cf. *Lucr.* i. 628–634). If there were a possibility of infinite subdivision, aggregate bodies would be built up of 'weak' particles they would not thus have the underlying strength, which is necessary to create material things, and to enable them to keep together: they would cease to be 'matter' or 'body' at all. In his own atomic world Epicurus denies the possibility of anything being dissolved into the *μὴ ὅν*: in a world without ultimate hard particles it would inevitably occur.

περιληψις means literally 'a marking off of a thing so as to be separate from others' (cf. *ἀπεριλήπτως* in i. 42): so 'the separating off of atoms to aggregate themselves into a compound body'. Bignone, following Kochalsky, would translate 'conception', but Epicurus is speaking here of actual things and not of our conceptions of them.

9. τὰ δύτα: Giussani insists that this means compound bodies, 'things'; Bignone that it must mean 'atoms', the only real existences. It is surely inclusive and implies both, just as does *τῷ ὡρισμένῳ* above. Through this section Epicurus' argument is general, and it is only in §§ 58 and 59 that he is thinking specially first of phenomena and then of the atoms.

Θλίψοντες καταναλίσκειν are more than usually picturesque words for Epicurus, 'by pounding things up to fritter them away into nothing'.

10. ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν μετάβασιν . . . 11. μηδὲ (ἐπὶ) τοῦλαττον. We pass to the second idea, which must be rejected. Not only is it possible to conceive of the physical division of things into smaller and smaller particles, but in imagination we may conceive a mental process by which we 'pass' from one part of a body to another. In perceptible things, as Epicurus explains below, we may look at one *ἄκρον* or extreme point after another: with the atoms we may conceive ourselves conducting the same process. Now it is clear that in a limited

body we cannot do this *eis ἀπειρον ἐπὶ τὸ οὐσιον*: if we conceive of these minute particles as all of one size and 'pass' from one to another successively, we shall sooner or later reach the sum total which constitutes the aggregate body. Still less can we have *μετάβασις eis ἀπειρον ἐπὶ τὸ μεῖζον*, in which we proceed from smaller to larger particles: for we shall reach the aggregate sooner. But we might suppose ourselves to continue the process *eis ἀπειρον ἐπὶ τοῦλαττον*, passing first in perception and then in thought to ever smaller and smaller particles. Such an idea is of course Eleatic, and we may compare the old problem of Achilles and the tortoise. But, says Epicurus, we must not even suppose such a process possible: for, if it were, we should similarly have a finite body composed of infinite particles, even though each were smaller than the last. The argument is leading up to the conception of the *minimae partes*.

τι. μηδ' *(ἐπὶ)* τοῦλαττον. Gassendi's addition *ἐπὶ* is necessary for the sense, and is of course vouched for by *τομὴν ἐπὶ τοῦλαττον* above The MSS. (reading *μηδέ* or *μὴ δέ*) clearly indicate *μηδ'*, though the passage might be easier without it: Giussani, who has interpreted the general notion very clearly, has ignored its effect: 'not only must we reject *μετάβασις eis ἀπειρον ἐπὶ τὸ οὐσιον* or *ἐπὶ τὸ μεῖζον*, but we cannot even admit it *ἐπὶ τοῦλαττον*'

§ 57. Epicurus proceeds to support his rejection of *τομή* and *μετάβασις eis ἀπειρον ἐπὶ τοῦλαττον* by two arguments. the first based on the idea of *τομή* shows that logically such a conception is impossible; the second examines the notion of *μετάβασις* and shows that it too in a finite body cannot be conducted *eis ἀπειρον ἐπὶ τοῦλαττον*. The text and the structure of the sentences is rather uncertain, the view I have adopted with some hesitation being that of Bignone

(a) The argument is a *reductio ad absurdum*. You cannot either conceive how infinite parts, however small, could be contained in a finite body, nor how, if the parts were infinite, the body could be finite. For the parts must be of some size, however small, and the sum of an infinite number of them must itself be infinite in size.

ι. οὐτε γὰρ ὅπως . . . ἔστι νοῆσαι is then parallel to the direct question *πῶς τ' ἀν . . . τὸ μέγεθος*, and with *ὅπως* must be supplied something like *τοῦτο γένοιτ' ἀν*; cf. § 56. 3 οὐδ' *ὅπως ἀν γένοιτο δρατὴ ἄτομος* *ἔστιν ἐπινοῆσαι*. The ellipse is awkward, but not, I think, impossible, especially in the near neighbourhood of the fuller expression. Giussani would follow F in omitting *ὅπως*, and then construct *οὐτε* *ἔστι νοῆσαι πῶς τ' ἀν . . . τὸ μέγεθος . . . , ἀκρον τε ἔχοντος . . . (οὐκ ἔστι . . . νοεῖν) μὴ οὐ . . .* But (a) *οὐτε* has then nothing to correspond to it, (b) the picking up of *οὐκ ἔστι νοῆσαι* by *οὐκ ἔστι νοεῖν* in the second member is awkward, (c) the MS. testimony is overwhelmingly in favour of the retention of *ὅπως*.

2 *ἀπειρον δύκοι . . . ή δημιλίκοι οὖν*: corresponding exactly to *ἀπείρους δύκους . . . οὐδ' ὁπηλίκους οὖν* in § 56. 6. Usener would read *οἱ δημιλίκοι οὖν*, constructing it after *νοῆσαι*, 'for, if you once say that

there are infinite parts in a body or parts of any degree of smallness, it is not possible to conceive of what size they would be', but (a) this is quite irrelevant to the argument, (b) the previous parallel makes *η* certain, (c) Usener appears to neglect *όπως* altogether.

4. πηλίκοι γάρ τινες . . . 6. καὶ τὸ μέγεθος. A parenthesis reinforcing the last argument. a body composed of infinite parts, however small, must itself be infinite: for the parts must have some size, and if they are infinite in number, their sum will be infinite in size.

5. After καὶ οὗτοι all the MSS. except B have ἐξ ὀντος, which must, as Usener points out, be intended as a variant for καὶ οὗτοι. but there is no reason to adopt it.

6. ἄκρον τε ἔχοντος . . . 10. τῇ ἐννοίᾳ. The second argument has been well explained by Giussani (*loc. cit.*, p. 67). Epicurus' opponent might admit that a μετάβασις εἰς τὸ ἵπον could not proceed to infinity, but he would say that a μετάβασις εἰς τὸ ἔλαττον could. Epicurus asks him to consider the process more closely: he might go on for a while 'passing' from a larger to a smaller part of a perceptible thing, but he would ultimately reach a part of it so small that though 'it was distinguishable, it was not perceptible by itself', i.e. could only be seen as part of the whole. On either side of this he could proceed to 'equal' parts, but not to smaller parts, as they would not be visible at all. Similarly, as he will show in § 59, in the atom itself we must reach a part which is 'distinguishable but not separable'. μετάβασις εἰς τοῦλαττον then cannot be continued to infinity, for after a while it becomes μετάβασις εἰς τὸ ἵπον, and that *ex hypothesi* is incapable in a finite body of prolongation to infinity.

ἄκρον, 'the extreme visible point' of the perceptible body, which is, as Epicurus very exactly explains, διαληπτόν, for it can in thought be separated from other component ἄκρα, but οὐ καθ' ἑαυτὸ θεωρητόν, perceptible only as a part of a whole: by itself it would pass out of the field of vision.

7. θεωρητόν is a necessary correction for the MS. θεωρητέον.

8. οὐκ ἔστι . . . 10. τῇ ἐννοίᾳ. The construction is οὐκ ἔστι νοεῖν (a) μὴ οὐ καὶ τὸ ἔξῆς τούτον τοιοῦτον (*εἴναι*) καὶ (b) οὐτω . . . βαδίζοντα . . . ὑπάρχειν εἰς τὸ ἄπειρον κατὰ τὸ τοιοῦτον ἀφικνεῖσθαι, 'it is not possible to conceive that the next ἄκρον should not be similar (in size), or that a person going on in this way to successive ἄκρα should be able to proceed to infinity'.

οὐτω with βαδίζοντα. Usener adopts τοῦτο from BF¹, taking it with ὑπάρχειν 'that this should occur, namely that he should arrive': the construction is unnatural. Giussani with less probability reads οὐ τῷ, constructing the sentence οὐκ ἔστι νοεῖν μὴ οὐ (a) καὶ τὸ ἔξῆς τούτον τοιοῦτον (b) καὶ οὐ τῷ . . . βαδίζοντα ὑπάρχειν: the sense is the same, but the accumulation of negatives unnecessary and almost unbearable.

10. (τῷ) is a necessary insertion made by Schneider.

§ 58. Epicurus proceeds to a more careful analysis of the 'least part in perception' in order to apply the analogy from αἰσθησίς to the

idea of the structure of the atom. The *ἄκρον* is *ἀμετάβατον*; you cannot within the limits of this 'smallest visible' part, pass to anything less than itself. It is like *μεταβατά* in that it has extension, but it is unlike them in that it has not itself distinguishable parts. If trying to look at an 'extreme point' we think that we are 'passing' within its own limits to something smaller, i.e. to a part of it, we are mistaken, and our eye has in reality only slipped on to the next extreme point. We may, however, pass from one *ἄκρον* to the next, which is like it and equal to it, and so in course of time our eye might travel over the whole surface of the object. In this way the *ἄκρον* becomes the measure of the object's size: for the larger the object the more *ἄκρα* it will contain.

1. τὸ . . ἐλάχιστον τὸ ἐν τῇ αἰσθήσει. 'The least part visible', 'the minimum for perception', which Epicurus refers to also as *ἄκρον* cf. Lucr. i. 599 'extremum . . . cacumen'.

2 οὐτέ τοιῦτόν ἔστιν . . . it is unlike in that it has itself no distinguishable parts.

3. τὸ τὰς μεταβάσεις ἔχον, 'that which does permit of passing from part to part'. Bignone notes rightly that the plural *τὰς μεταβάσεις* must include *μετάβασις* ἐπὶ τὸ *μεῖζον* and ἐπὶ *τούλαττον* as well as ἐπὶ τὸ *ἴσον*. We may take as an illustration a line, which we may divide either into equal parts, of which we may proceed from one to the other, or into a series of unequal parts, when we may either proceed ἐπὶ τὸ *μεῖζον* until we have reached the end of the line, or ἐπὶ *τούλαττον* until we come down to the *minimum visible*, when we still have to proceed ἐπὶ τὸ *ἴσον* until we reach the end. see notes on § 57.

οὐτέ . . . ἀνόμοιον it is 'not altogether unlike' *μεταβατά* in that it has extension

4 ἔχον . . . τινα κοινότητα, 'having some community' or 'affinity' with *μεταβατά*.

5 διάληψιν μερῶν, 'possibility of distinguishing parts': cf. *ἄκρον* . διαληπτόν, εἰ μὴ καθ' ἑαυτὸν θεωρητόν in § 57. 6 'The *ἄκρον* is itself the least distinguishable part of the whole and cannot itself have distinguishable parts.'

5. ἀλλ' ὅταν . . . δεῖ προσπίπτειν We may sometimes be misled by this affinity with *μεταβατά* and suppose that because the *ἄκρον* has extension, we shall be able to divide it too up into a right-hand and a left-hand part, i.e. to proceed farther in the process of *μετάβασις* εἰς *τούλαττον*. But if we try experimentally to do so, we shall find that each time we think we are looking at the right-hand or left-hand part of an *ἄκρον*, we have really passed in sight to the next *ἄκρον*, and from it are surveying the first.

ἀλλ' ὅταν. 'The MSS have ἀλλ' ὅτε or ἀλλοτε, but Cobet's correction ἀλλ' ὅταν is necessary.'

διὰ τὴν . . . προσεμφέρειαν, 'on account of the similarity of the common characteristic', i.e. extension.

7. τὸ *ἴσον*, sc. another *ἄκρον* like the first: προσπίπτειν, 'fall into our

ken', 'meet our sight', used no doubt with reference to the idea of the *εἶδωλα* of vision 'falling into' the eye.

ἔξης τε θεωροῦμεν . . . ἀλλὰ τὸ θάττον. As we move our sight over the object, we see a succession of such *ἄκρα*: and by reckoning up their number, thus successively perceived, we can reckon the size of the object. But the sentence contains some new and subtle points.

8. οὐκ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ: when on the analogy of the *μεταβατά* we tried to distinguish the parts of the *ἄκρον*, we imagined they would be 'inside the same' *ἄκρον*: but, as shown above, we found that we were really looking at fresh *ἄκρα* outside it. I have little doubt that with *ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ* we should supply *ἄκρῳ* (Giussani, Bignone) and not take it, as Hicks does, to mean 'in the same space', which is quite inconsistent with the argument. The argument is largely directed against Anaxagoras.

9. οὐδὲ μέρεσι μερῶν διπτόμενα Contact implies parts which touch. if I place two bodies in contact, it means that parts of each are in juxtaposition: but as the *ἄκρα* have no parts, this is with them impossible. They cannot touch but only succeed one another, you cannot see the edge or extreme point of an *ἄκρον*, but only look at it, as it were, from the next *ἄκρον*. As Giussani points out, Epicurus is here meeting a possible argument of the Eleatic School: a line, they might say for example, consists of a series of points, which touch each other. but each of these points again consists of smaller points in juxtaposition and so on to infinity. But Epicurus imposes a limit you reach in perceptible objects one so small that it has no parts which can touch, and beyond that you cannot go farther in the world of vision.

ἀλλ' οὐ . . . θάττον Though these *ἄκρα* have themselves no parts and cannot be in contact, yet because they have extension, they form a unit of size, and to say that a body is larger or smaller is in effect only to say that it contains a greater or smaller number of *ἄκρα*.

ἐν τῇ ἴδιότητι τῇ ἑαυτῶν, 'by virtue of their peculiar characteristics', i.e. of the possession of extension without distinguishable parts.

After this very careful examination of the *ἀμετάβατα* or 'least points' in sensible things, Epicurus turns to its application to the structure of the atom and maintains that the analogy is complete. The atom too has its least parts, which themselves have only extension and no parts, and never came together to form the atom, but have always existed in it; for indeed apart from it they could have no material existence at all. Having explained the character of the sensible points so elaborately, he is content now with a brief drawing of the parallel. The assumption of the analogy may appear arbitrary, but it is a characteristic application of the Epicurean principle that the *ἀδηλα* must be explained on the analogy of phenomena.

11. ἀναλογίᾳ. Giussani translates 'the same characteristics', Hicks 'follows the same analogy', Bignone 'such an analogy'. But the word in Greek means 'proportion', 'relation', and *ταύτη* must mean

'this which I have described' in relation to the sensible *minima*. I should then translate 'the same proportion' or 'relation' to the whole body. So again in § 59. 2 below.

§ 59. 3. κάχρηται. Gassendi's correction is necessary: the κεχρήσθαι of the MSS. is merely due to κεχρήσθαι above, § 58. 12.

4. κατὰ τὴν (τῶν) ἐνταῦθα ἀναλογίαν, 'in virtue of its relation to things here' (i.e. perceptible things) Usener's addition (τῶν) is necessary, and the MSS. are particularly liable to leave out one of two consecutive articles: cf. § 47 a. 3.

κατηγορήσαμεν. i.e. in § 54.

μικρόν τι μόνον μακράν ἐκβάλλοντες. Usener's correction, μακράν for μακρόν, seems necessary, but even so the form of expression is odd. lit. 'only as a small thing casting it (the atom) far away', i.e. 'only placing it far below perceptible things in smallness'. So apparently Giussani who paraphrases, 'only that its size is very much smaller'. Bignone takes it slightly differently, 'only removing to a distance (*protrarre lontano*) a determined degree of smallness', i.e. assuming that the *minimum* of perceptible things repeats itself far below in the scale as a minimum of extension, but this is putting rather too much into μικρόν τι. Hicks takes it, 'herein we have merely reproduced something small on a large scale' (reading presumably μακρόν), an unnatural sense for ἐκβάλλοντες and not what Epicurus wants to say.

5. ἔτι τε . . . τῶν δοράτων: a development of the analogy. just as the sensible least points act as a unit of the measurement of the size of concrete bodies, so do the least points act as the measurement of the size of the atom, i.e. the atoms vary in size according to the number of πέρατα which they contain. Epicurus conceived the normal atom as consisting of three or four πέρατα cf. Lucre ii. 485 ff.

There is some difficulty as to the construction of the sentence. The older editors took τὰ ἐλάχιστα καὶ ἀμιγῆ πέρατα together, in which case we must either translate *νομίζειν*, 'believe in', which is very improbable, or suppose that it is constructed with the participle παρασκευάζοντα, which is again irregular. Usener, perceiving this difficulty, supposed a small lacuna after παρασκευάζοντα, which would have contained an infinitive such as φainεσθαι or φανερὰ γίγνεσθαι. This is unnecessary, if with Giussani and Bignone we take τὰ . . . ἀμιγῆ as subject and πέρατα as predicative 'we must regard the least indivisible points as πέρατα'.

Most editors take τῶν μηκῶν with πέρατα, placing a comma after μηκῶν and another after παρασκευάζοντα. so Bignone, who translates, 'the extreme boundaries of extension'. This would surely require τὸν μηκοῦς, and I prefer to take τῶν μηκῶν, 'the sizes of individual atoms', with τὸ καταμέτρημα, placing the comma after νομίζειν.

6. ἀμιγῆ. i.e. themselves perfectly single and 'unmixed', sc. not consisting of parts. this idea Lucretius expresses by *solida simplicitate*, 1. 609 Von Arnim's correction ἀμερῆ is unnecessary

πέρατα: a new word specially introduced by Epicurus to denote the least parts of the atom, as *ἄκρα* above denotes the least perceptible parts of the sensible body. The 'least part' is at once the 'boundary' in that there can be nothing smaller, and the 'unit of measurement' an idea also contained in *πέρατα*.

Ἐξ αὐτῶν πρώτων, 'starting from themselves as units': sc. the size of the atom depends on the number of *πέρατα* which it contains. αὐτῶν is again a necessary emendation of Usener's for αὐτῶν. The MSS. are divided between *πρώτων* and *πρώτον*. Bignone prefers the latter, constructing it with τὸ καταμέτρημα, but *πρώτων* seems more in accordance with the general idea of the passage.

7. τοῖς μείζοις καὶ ἐλάττοις, 'to larger and smaller things', that is, in the first instance to the atoms and through them to the compound bodies which they form.

8. τῇ διὰ λόγου θεωρίᾳ ἐπὶ τῶν δοράτων, 'in our contemplation by thought of invisible things'. We have no direct perception of the atom, still less of its parts, but according to the Epicurean canons we must consider it in thought on the analogy of perceptible things. We may remember that to Epicurus thought itself was always a process of mental visualization, and in this we can, as it were, contemplate the atom and count its *πέρατα*.

ἢ γὰρ κοινότης ἡ ὑπάρχουσα . . . συντελέσαι. There is again difficulty as to the construction and meaning of the sentence.

(1) I agree with Bignone in taking αὐτοῖς to be the *πέρατα* of the atom, πρός to be constructed after κοινότης, τὰ ἀμετάβολα (leaving for the moment the question of the reading) to be the *ἄκρα* of the sensible body, and συντελέσαι to mean 'to form a conclusion', 'for the affinity which the least parts of the atom have to the least perceptible parts of the sensible body is sufficient to justify this conclusion', i.e. though the *πέρατα* in fact differ from the *ἄκρα* in that they are physically indivisible, whereas the *ἄκρα* are capable of further physical subdivision, yet the analogy between them as the minimum in their respective spheres is enough to justify the conclusion we have formed.

(2) I was formerly inclined, keeping the same idea of the construction, to take συντελέσαι to refer to the arrangement of the *πέρατα* in succession to one another in the atom, as opposed to συμφόρησιν which follows 'the affinity . . . is sufficient for them to be ranged alongside each other (just like the *ἄκρα*) to the extent we have described (i.e. in succession without contact of parts)'. συντελέσαι would then be a metaphorical extension of its usual constitutional sense, 'to belong to a class' (e.g. συντελεῖν εἰς ἄνδρας, Isocr. 277 b), and the whole would form a close parallel to Lucretius' description of the atom in the passage corresponding to this section (i. 609–612):

sunt igitur solida primordia simplicitate
quae minimis stipata cohaerent paribus arte,
non ex illarum conventu conciliata,
sed magis aeterna pollutia simplicitate.

But one can go too far in attempting to get an exact parallel with Lucretius, and I doubt this meaning for *συντελέσαι*.

(3) Giussani takes the clause in an entirely different way. *αὐτοῖς* is the atoms (he suggests that it might be better to read *αὐτᾶς*), *κοινότης* is their affinity with perceptible bodies, *πρός* means ‘in respect of’, and *συντελέσαι* is ‘the coming together of the atoms for creation’: ‘the common characteristics, which the atoms have with sensible things in respect to their smallest parts is what makes them fit for the composition, that is the creation, of things up to the point which we see’ This is surely a very unnatural sense to give both to *αὐτοῖς* (the *πέρατα* being the subject of the previous sentence), to *πρός*, and above all to *συντελέσαι*. Giussani is, I think, carried away by a desire to find in Epicurus a conclusion like that of *Lucr.* 1. 628–634.

9. *ἀμετάβολα* All modern scholars before Bignone adopted Usener’s obvious emendation *ἀμετάβατα* cf. § 58 τῶν μεταβατῶν. Bignone, however, quotes from *Sex. Empir. adv. Math* i 118 μονοεσθῆς καὶ ἀσύνθετος καὶ ἀμετάβολος, where it appears to have the sense ‘unchanging’, ‘homogeneous’. This is an admirable description of the *ἄκρα*, and would correspond exactly to *ἀμιγῆ* in l 6. There seems therefore no reason for departing from it.

10. *συμφόρησιν*, ‘a bringing together’ (*conventus*, *Lucr.*, *loc. cit.*) The atoms are ‘brought together’ to form things, but their least parts can never have been brought together to form the atoms, for the atom is *ex hypothesi* indivisible.

ἐκ τούτων κίνησιν ἔχοντων, ‘out of the store of first parts as bodies capable of movement’. If the *πέρατα* could have a separate existence, they could have movement · and if movement they might have been brought together, but all this is impossible. The expression is loose but not, I think, impossible for Epicurus. Brieger’s insertion of (*οὐκ*) before *ἔχοντων* is not only unnecessary, but mistaken, as it then makes *κίνησιν οὐκ ἔχοντων* the main reason why there is not a *συμφόρησις*, whereas it is only a secondary cause, derived from the primary cause, that the *πέρατα* have no independent existence. More probable is Bignone’s emendation *τοικτων ὡς τῶν*, and indeed *ὡς* is rather badly needed, but I think the passage can stand as it is.

§ 60. A detailed paragraph follows dealing with an important point: Can there be motion upwards and downwards in infinite space? The paragraph fits in badly where it stands, and Giussani would attach it to other sections concerning the universe (§ 42 and § 47). But it is almost more closely connected with the motion of the atoms, which Epicurus is about to consider. It seems best on the whole to leave it here in parenthesis, unless one is attempting to reconstruct the whole letter.

The argument is characteristically Epicurean. We cannot, says Epicurus, predicate upward and downward motion in infinite space with reference to a highest and lowest point, an absolute top and bottom, for such do not of course exist, but we can with reference to ourselves or to any point in space of which we choose to think. The

motion from our feet to our head, however prolonged, is to us motion upwards and the opposite motion downwards. From a mathematical point of view of infinity this is, of course, as Brieger says, *inepte excogitatum*, but, as Giussani points out (1, p. 169), the contradiction is inherent in the conception of space itself, at once infinite and relative. Moreover, the conclusion is reached in strict accordance with the Epicurean canons. We are bound to ask ourselves if *αἰσθῆσις* provides any evidence on the point, and the answer is that it does — we know what we mean by motion upward and downward in reference to ourselves, and we have only to prolong such motion to infinity, and we then have the conception we need.

1. καὶ μὴν . . . ἡ κάτω. A sentence of some difficulty. I take it to mean literally, 'moreover in the infinite we must not speak of the "up" and the "down" as though (measured by) the highest or a lowest'. τὸ ἄνω ἡ κάτω is, I think, 'up or down' in anticipation of the idea of the motion of the atoms, which is to follow in the new section: if so, we must read ἀνωτάτῳ . . . κατωτάτῳ with Usener Giussani and Bignone who take τὸ ἄνω . . . κάτω as 'the high' and 'the low', making it a merely special reference without consideration of motion, keep the MS. ἀνωτάτῳ . . . κατωτάτῳ, 'we must not speak of high or low as of a highest or lowest'. Neither the sense nor the reference seem to me so probable.

The MSS. are divided between ἀνωτάτῳ καὶ κατωτάτῳ and ἀνωτάτῳ ἡ κατωτάτῳ: the parallel of ἄνω ἡ κάτω below seems to decide for ἡ. After κατηγορεῖν Usener marks a lacuna, which presumably would contain something like τὴν φορὰν εἰς. But it is unnecessary he is here thinking simply of the directions 'up' and 'down', and the question of motion arises later.

2. εἰς μέντοι . . . ἡμῖν. With Bignone I regard this clause as a parenthesis strengthening the previous sentence. The general sense is, 'indeed, even if we were to prolong to infinity the line passing above our heads, we shall never reach the top (nor the bottom, if we prolong the line passing below our feet)'. τοῦτο is then τὸ ἀνωτάτῳ.

There is, however, difficulty in the text after εἰς ἀπειρον. The MSS. read ἄγειν ὅν (or ὅν). Palaeographically one would suppose this stood for ἄγειν (or sscr.), i.e. the correction of the infinitive into the neuter participle: but I cannot see any sense to be derived from this. Usener would read τέλον for ἄγειν ὅν, which I cannot construe. Hicks (in *Stoics and Epicureans*, presumably translating Usener's text) says, 'Still a line may be drawn vertically upward and stretch to infinity from the point, wherever it is, where we stand, and we must not say that this distinction of up and down will never be found in it'. This is good sense, but can hardly be extracted from the text. Bignone would read ἄγειν (νοοῦσι, δῆλον), 'even if we imagine ourselves proceeding to infinity above our head . . . it is manifest that we shall never find this extreme limit', but the insertion is too large. Giussani suggests ἄγειν (ἔξ)όι, 'if it were possible to go on'; this seems to me

far more probable, but I suggest *⟨εν⟩όν* as more likely to have produced the MS. text.

4. ή τὸ ὑποκάτω . . . πρὸς τὸ αὐτό. The construction runs on grammatically from οὐδὲ δεῖ κατηγορεῖν after the parenthesis, and η takes the place of the expected δέ corresponding to ως μὲν ἀνωτάτῳ. ‘While we cannot postulate a top and bottom in infinite space, we must not either say that that which stretches downwards to infinity below the point thought of can be at once up and down in reference to the same thing’, i.e. though ‘up’ and ‘down’ cannot be used in reference to a top or bottom, they can with reference to a point selected in space. In other words, the terms are not absolutely true, but they have a relative truth. As in the parenthesis, there is an implication, and the same is assumed with regard to the line upwards.

R. D. Hicks (*Class. Rev.* xxxvii, p. 108) has a different view of the whole sentence. He retains τοῦμεν and ἄγειν ὅν, takes τοῦτο, ‘this point or region’, as the subject of φανείσθαι, and places ή τὸ ὑποκάτω τοῦ νοηθέντος εἰς ἀπειρον in a parenthesis ‘As to the space overhead, however, if it be possible to draw a line to infinity from the point where we stand, we know that never will this space—or, for that matter, the space below the supposed standpoint if produced to infinity—appear to us to be at the same time “up” and “down” with reference to the same point, for this is inconceivable’. This is an ingenious interpretation and requires careful consideration—it certainly gets over the somewhat awkward want of parallelism between the two clauses.

6. ὥστε ξετί μίαν λαβεῖν φορὰν . . . So far he has spoken of direction—he now proceeds to what, in its effects on the general theory, is the more important question of motion. We may then in this conventional sense say that there is a motion upwards and a motion downwards in respect to us.

7. ἂν καὶ μυριάκις . . . even though there are thousands of worlds above and below us to whom this same motion passes from us. But the clause is not very satisfactory, because if motion upwards from us went on arriving at the feet of persons in worlds above us it would still be motion upwards to them too, and similarly with motion downwards—our ideas would be confirmed. I strongly suspect that πρὸς τοὺς πόδας and ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλήν ought to be interchanged. We then get very good sense: it is still motion upwards to us, even though persons in many other worlds are, in our view, upside down, so that to them it appears to be motion downwards. The two expressions might easily have been reversed by a scribe who did not properly understand the argument.

9. ⟨εἰς⟩ again seems a necessary addition.

10. ή γὰρ ὅλη φορὰ . . . a summing up: for in any case, whether you call them up and down or not, the two motions are diametrically opposed to one another. Of course once more, not a mathematical statement but a conclusion based on experience.

C. *Motions of the atoms.*

The two following sections together with portions of §§ 46, 47, which should be placed here, constitute an account of the motions of the atoms and their relation to the motion of compound bodies. The subject is very difficult, but both the general ideas and the phraseology have been very brilliantly elucidated by Giussani in his essay *Cinetica Epicurea* (Lucr., vol. I, pp. 97-124).

It will perhaps be well to begin by an attempt to state the main ideas. The free atoms in the void are borne downwards by their own weight at an incredible speed (*άμα νοήματι*). All move at an equal rate, differences of weight making no difference of speed in a vacuum for retardation is only due to the opposition of external bodies or, as we shall see, to internal vibration (*άντικοπή*), which cannot occur in the individual atoms. But owing in origin to the *παρέγκλισις* or spontaneous swerve of the atoms (which strangely enough is omitted in the letter, though it was an all-important point in the system and is treated at length by Lucretius II 216-293), the atoms collide. Then either they rebound in any direction, even upwards, and continue their movement at precisely the same speed but in a new direction, or they unite to form a compound body. But even in the compound their motion does not cease or slacken continually moving, meeting, and clashing, and starting off again at the same atomic speed, they keep the body in a constant state of internal vibration. When the body is at rest, this means that the sum total of internal movements balances and produces an equilibrium. When the body moves, for instance, as the result of an external blow, this means that to all the atoms is communicated over and above their natural motions a tendency towards movement in a certain direction. Yet even so their tiny trajects in all directions continue and act now as a retardation (*άντικοπή*) of the compound body. These main notions are refined by certain subtleties of thought, as Epicurus proceeds, but with them in mind, we can consider the passage

§ 61. 2. εἰσφέρωνται. The compound verb is undoubtedly difficult, and both Brieger and Giussani have noticed that one would expect the simple *φέρωνται*. The MSS however, in spite of variations, all point to the compound, and it should probably be regarded, with Giussani, as picture-que. Epicurus is thinking of the atoms plunging on into the void before the eyes of an imaginary spectator. It is consistent with his invariable conception of thought as visualization. It is unnecessary to follow Brieger in reading *εἰς* (ἐνα τόπον) *φέρωνται*.

μηθεύος ἀντικόπτοντος the Epicurean idea of *άντικοπή* must be carefully thought out and applied in each case, where it occurs. Its primary notion is of course the clash of atom with atom. In the case of the individual atom the sole cause of retardation is the collision with other atoms, nor indeed can any one collision do more than momentarily check its course before it starts off in a new direction. But

a series of such collisions may by constantly diverting its course in different directions, delay its advance in the original direction: such, for instance, would be the case, if the atom was moving not through the void, but through air. In the case of the compound body, however, the collision of the atoms which compose it translates itself into an internal vibration, which is a cause of delay and the slackening of speed. It is in this latter sense that ἀντικοπή becomes a technical term of Epicurean phraseology. Giussani wishes to interpret it in this technical sense all through, and even to take ἀπαντᾶ below in the same sense so here, 'when the atoms are moving through the void, without internal vibration' (which the atom cannot have, because it has not separable parts, §§ 58, 59). But this is surely mistaken here and leads to great difficulties in the next sentence. we must interpret the idea of ἀντικόπτειν according to its context as (1) external collision, (2) internal vibration, remembering of course that the latter is only the former looked at from the point of view of the compound body (Giussani is too apt to think of them as distinct things). Here, as Epicurus is speaking of the individual atoms, it is external collision alone. Bignone (Appendix, p 226) strongly supports this view.

οὐτέ γὰρ τὰ βαρέα . . . Epicurus now supports his previous statement about the atoms with a wider statement about bodies in general (τὰ βαρέα neut.), but he is still thinking of external collision. the technical notion of ἀντικοπή does not appear till later. The idea here then is quite simple. 'you might think that owing to their weight heavier bodies move faster than light. but provided the latter meet with no external collisions to deflect and delay them, this is not the case: the reason why, e.g. we see light bodies falling more slowly, is because the air offers to them a more successful resistance'. The idea is exactly parallel to Lucr. ii. 230-242. Giussani wishes to take even ἀπαντᾶ here of internal vibration—a manifest impossibility. The interpretation would be greatly simplified all through if we could take τὰ βαρέα, &c., merely of the atoms, but coming immediately after τὰς ἀτόμους the neuter must be intended to have a wider application.

3. τὰ βαρέα . . . τῶν μικρῶν καὶ κούφων. The antithesis is incomplete. Usener may well be right in suggesting τὰ (μεγάλα καὶ) βαρέα this is better than Gassendi's excision of μικρῶν καὶ

4. ὅταν γέ . . . an emphatic limitation, 'provided, that is, that . . .' αὐτοῖς. sc τοῖς μικροῖς

οὐτέ τὰ μικρά . . . ἀντικόπτη. It might be held by others that small bodies would naturally move faster than large bodies, because they meet with less opposition. Bignone points out that Epicurus is thinking not merely of the natural downward motion of the atoms, but also of the motion sideways and even upwards owing to blows, and as regards upward motion it might well be supposed that the small would move faster than the great. But this too, says Epicurus, is a mistake, provided always there is no collision of atom with atom: motion in all directions is at the uniform maximum speed. Usener's

insertion of *βραδύτερον* after τὰ μικρά is due to misunderstanding and produces a mere tautology: both Giussani and Bignone condemn it.

5. πάντα πάρον σύμμετρον ἔχοντα: the expression has already occurred in § 47^a with reference to the motion of the *αιδωλα*. I take it to mean here as there 'having their whole course uniform', i.e. they are always moving at the same rate and in the same direction, provided that there is no collision. Bignone takes it to mean only 'having their whole course in the same direction', but I think that the idea of uniform speed is also implied. Giussani here, as in § 47^a, with the idea of the internal *ἀντικοπή* in his mind, translates 'having a symmetrical course of all their parts', i.e. having all their component parts moving in the same direction so that there is no internal *ἀντικοπή*. Apart from the strain thus put upon *πάντα*, such a conception is only applicable to the atom, which has no separable parts, whereas here Epicurus' idea is intended to have a wider application.

Giussani's emendation *έχόντων* for *έχοντα* is tempting, as it would be more natural that Epicurus should apply this notion to the heavy bodies, as a reason why they should not be slower than the lighter bodies, but the notion is true of either, and it is best not to disturb the reading of all the MSS.

μηδὲ ἐκείνοις sc. τοῖς μεγάλοις as opposed to *αὐτοῖς* above.

6. οὕθ' ή ἄνω . . . Though the expression is still general in form Epicurus is thinking mainly now of the motion of the atoms in the void. They can move either sideways or even upwards owing to the blows received in collision with other atoms, but motion in these directions is still exactly equal in speed to that of their original motion downwards owing to their own weight—the blow deflects but does not diminish the pace—a very important point in the Epicurean kinetics.

The clause is loosely appended and we must carry on the general notion, 'quicker'. Usener would supply *θάττων* ή *βραδυτέρα*, but this is not necessary—either notion is sufficient for the general idea.

7. ἐφ' διπόσον γάρ . . . The summary of the preceding propositions Once started in any given direction the atom will continue to move in that direction at absolute speed until it is again deflected either by a new blow or by its own natural tendency to move downwards, which now counteracts the effect of the blow. In effect these two counteractions would work differently: a new collision will start an immediate change of direction, whereas the tendency to move downwards would assert itself gradually and cause a gradual deflexion.

8. κατίσχῃ, 'holds out', 'prevails'

ἐκατέρα αὐτῶν. The MSS. have *ἐκατέρων*, for which Usener proposed *ἐκατέρον* in the sense 'either of the two kinds of motion', and modern editors have followed him. But can *ἐκατέρον* have this sense? If it is retained, it must surely mean 'either the heavy or the light body', referring back to the opening clauses. I suggest *ἐκατέρα αὐτῶν* in the sense which Usener postulates.

ἄμα νοήματι, 'quick as thought', Epicurus' regular expression for the immeasurably swift motion of the unimpeded atom. Remember that thought was to him an atomic motion and the swiftest of all motions.

9. **Ἐώς** (**ὅτι τι**) **ἀντικόψῃ** a necessary insertion of Usener's: **ὅτι τι** would naturally fall out by 'haplography' before **ἀντικόψῃ**.

ἢ **ἔξωθεν** ἢ **ἐκ τοῦ ιδίου βάρους**. A new point: the atom moving along at absolute speed in any direction may be checked or deflected suddenly by a collision or gradually tend to its natural downward motion as the force of the blow is exhausted. **ἢ ἐκ τοῦ ιδίου βάρους** is used rather loosely with **ἀντικόψῃ**, for it is not of course strictly a case of **ἀντικοπή**, but **ἢ ᔁώθεν** leads up to it.

10. **πρὸς τὴν τοῦ πλήξαντος δύναμιν**, which Usener excludes as a gloss, is essential to the sense: the original downward motion asserts itself 'against the force of the blow'. Bignone (Appendix, p 228) would read **τὴν (ἐκ) τοῦ πλήξαντος**, pointing out that it is not strictly the force of the atom which delivered the blow that is in question, but the force of the blow received from it. He may be right, but the comparatively loose expression of the text is intelligible.

§ 46^b. 1. **καὶ μὴν καὶ . . . δροῖμα λαμβάνει**. With some hesitation I follow Giussani in inserting here the last two sentences of § 46 (see notes on § 46^a). They cannot be in place there for (a) together with the opening section of § 47 they interrupt a close consecutive argument, (b) the question of the rate of movement of the **εἶδωλα** is not raised till later. § 47 **οὐεν καὶ τάχη ἀντέρβλητα ἔχει . . .** On the other hand, they refer more naturally to the pace of the atoms and, like the beginning of § 47, may have been inserted there to explain the general notion of atomic movement as a preliminary to the description of the movement of the **εἶδωλα**. Here they are very much in point.

Epicurus proceeds then to a new point: the atoms, he has said, all move at an equal pace: he now passes to the question, What is that pace? It is true that he has to some extent anticipated the answer in the words **ἄμα νοήματι τὴν φορὰν σχῆσαι** above, but that is vague and general, and this is a careful and reasoned statement. The atoms moving uninterruptedly through the void can cover any comprehensible distance in an inconceivably short time: in fact, the speed of the atoms may be described with Giussani as 'absolute speed'.

κατὰ μηδεμίαν. . . **γινομένη**, 'if it takes place without a meeting of things which might collide'. As we have seen, such collision cannot diminish the speed of atomic motion, but only momentarily check it and deflect its direction. But it can therefore prevent its covering a certain **μῆκος**, i.e. the distance between two points in a certain time. If starting from *a* it only ultimately reaches *b* after a series of deflexions, it takes a longer time for the whole transit than if it passes uninterruptedly through the void.

2. **ἀντικοψόντων**. The MSS. have **ἀντικοψάντων**, which seems impossible. Usener emends to the future, Giussani more violently proposes

ἀντικόπτοντων: the future will surely stand as ἀπάντησιν does not strictly mean the clash but a ‘coming to meet’.

περιληπτόν, ‘comprehensible as a unit marked off from other periods of time’. Cf. §§ 40, 42, 56 for use of this and kindred forms.

3. **βράδος γὰρ καὶ τάχος** . . . i.e. the deflexion of the atom from one direction to another has the appearance of greater slowness of movement in its transit from one point to another. we think it has taken longer to pass from *a* to *b* (see note on l. 1). But of course Epicurus has also in his mind here the compound body, to which he is leading up there the internal collisions of the component atoms produce the appearance of greater slowness of movement of the whole compound body. Some MSS. have βραδύτητος, but βράδος goes more naturally with τάχος.

§ 62. Another very difficult paragraph, in which most editors seem to me to have gone strangely wrong. with three small alterations (θάττων for θάττον (2), τὸν ἐλάχιστον for τῶν ἐλαχίστων (4), and ἀντικόπτουσιν for ἀντικόπτωσιν (6)) the MS. reading seems to me to make perfect sense, which the editors, mainly owing to preconceived notions, have missed

Epicurus passes now from the motion of the free atoms in the void, to the motion of atoms in compounds, where the individual atoms are of course still moving in void, for even in the most compact bodies there is a διάστημα of void between atom and atom. Now here, just as in the case of the free atoms, hasty considerations might lead to the conclusion that some atoms move faster than others. Take the case of two compound bodies *A* and *B* moving in the same direction, of which *A* is moving at twice the pace of *B*. even if we narrow our observation to the least period of time which is continuous (*καὶ κατὰ τὸν ἐλάχιστον συνεχῆ χρόνον*), *A* still covers twice the distance that *B* covers. We are inclined then to infer (*προσδοξάζεσθαι*) that the atoms which compose *A* are moving twice as fast as those which compose *B*. But now let us try to pass beyond the region of sense-perception to what we might call ‘atomic’ time (note that the whole idea is exactly parallel to the notion of the *πέρατα* in the question of size, §§ 57, 58). take an instant of time, such as we can only conceive in thought (*λόγῳ θεωρητὸν χρόνον*), a division of time so small that it cannot be called continuous at all. Our inference from observation might again lead us to think that the atoms of *A* were moving at twice the speed of those of *B*. But let us now try the test of the mental vision (*ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας*) which we have obtained from our conception of the movements of the free atoms in the void. We see now at once that our inference was wrong. For we must think of the construction of the body, of atoms still, as we have seen, moving in void, but restricted by their collisions with one another. In this instant of time then, the individual atoms of both bodies are all moving at an equal rate, colliding and clashing momentarily, and striking off on their new little trajects in all directions. What then is the atomic difference

between the bodies *A* and *B* which causes the difference in the speed of motion of the aggregate body? It is simply that in *A* more atoms are moving in the direction of the whole body than in *B*: in *B* there is more *ἀντικοπή*, it is more retarded by adverse atomic motion and therefore as a whole body moves slower. Indeed it is this *ἀντικοπή* alone which renders the motion of bodies perceptible to us (*ἐπὸ τὴν αὐσθησιν τὸ συνεχὲς τῆς φορᾶς γίγνεται*) the atomic motion is far too fast for us to perceive: the union of atoms in compounds retards the motion by *ἀντικοπή* till at last, when the compounds are large enough, the motion is slow enough for us to perceive it. Once again the idea is exactly parallel to the notion of size, and the whole is wonderfully clearly brought out by Lucretius in his illustration from the motes in the sunbeam (ll. 114–141, but especially 132–141)

[The editors and commentators have curiously misunderstood the passage.

(1) Usener, not seeing the force of *μηθήσεται*, inserts (*οὐ*) before *θάττων*, reads *ἢ μὴ ἐφ' ἔνα*, and excises *κατὰ τοὺς λόγῳ θεωρητοὺς χρόνους* as a gloss. How he understands the clause from *τῷ ἐφ' ἔνα . . . ἢ μὴ ἐφ' ἔνα* I, like Giussani, fail to perceive. Hicks, who apparently follows Usener, except that he keeps *κατὰ τοὺς λόγῳ θεωρητούς χρόνους* (and ? reads *οὐ θάττον φορηθήσεται*), translates ‘Moreover, of the atoms in composite bodies, one will not travel faster than another, since all have equal velocity, and this whether we consider (*τῷ*!) the motion of the atoms in an aggregate in one direction during sensible and continuous time or their motions in different directions in times so short as to be apprehended only by the reason’. Apart from grammatical difficulties, I take this statement to be quite untrue: the ‘motion of atoms in an aggregate in one direction during sensible and continuous time’ is faster in some cases than others. see above.

(2) Brieger rightly keeps *θάττον* without *οὐ*, reads *φορηθήσεται*, and then proceeds to insert and suppose lacunae in his usual wild manner, with the general idea that the atom which makes a number of impacts in all directions moves slower than the atom which goes straight in one direction (cf. § 47). This idea seems to me quite inapplicable and inappropriate here.

(3) Giussani, to whom I owe a great deal for the explanation of the general meaning of the passage, has been misled by not observing the force of *μηθήσεται*. He therefore accepts Usener’s *οὐ*, understands ‘you cannot say even in compounds that one atom is faster than another’, and then, being driven to take the *τῷ ἐφ' ἔνα* clause as giving a reason, not for the apparent difference of pace, but for its real equality, emends *εἰ μή το εἴτα μή* and invents a quite gratuitous idea that at the first moment of the starting of a compound body after a blow for a very brief continuous period the atoms *do* all move in one direction, and then *ἀντικοπή* sets in—an idea surely quite foreign, as Giussani himself seems to feel, to the whole Epicurean kinetics.

(4) Bignone, who agrees very closely with me in the general sense

of the passage and has in his Appendix ably expounded the Epicurean conceptions of the minimum of time and the minimum of space, which correspond with the notion of the *minimae partes*, like Giussani, takes the clause *τῷ ἐφ' ἔνα . . . συνεχῆ χρόνον* as an explanation of *ἰσοταχῶν*: ‘they are equal in speed because they move in only one direction and in the least continuous time of their motion’. But this implies ‘each’ as the subject, takes *καὶ τὸν ἐλάχιστον συνεχῆ χρόνον* in an unnatural sense, and destroys the parallelism of *τῷ ἐφ' ἔνα τόπον . . . εἰ μὴ ἐφ' ἔνα.*]

2. *Θάττων*, the reading of f, must, I think, be accepted for *θάττον* of the MSS. The latter could only be kept if we supposed that *φέρεσθαι* had dropped out (or must be ‘understood’) after *ρηθήσεται*. I have shown above that there is no need to insert *οὐ* before it.

ρηθήσεται, ‘it will be said to be’, though as a matter of fact it is not. The inference from our experience of compound bodies would be exactly on a par with the supposition dealt with above that heavier atoms will move faster downwards than lighter ones.

3. *ἰσοταχῶν οὐσῶν* by itself, ‘though in fact they are all equal in speed’.

τῷ . . . χρόνον then gives the reason of this false assumption. The atoms in compound bodies are perceived in any continuous period of time, even the shortest (retain *καὶ*), to move as an aggregate in one direction. But it is wrong to infer from this that each individual atom is during that time moving *only* in this direction at the speed of the aggregate body.

5. *εἰ μὴ . . . γίνηται* is really Epicurus’ reply to the false objection, though in form he appends it rather oddly as an exception to the theory he is contradicting.

ἀλλὰ πυκνὸν ἀντικόπτουσιν . . .: again the statement of the fact: ‘but in truth they are constantly jostling and by their collisions gradually retard the motion of the whole until it becomes perceptible to us’. See above.

6. *Ἐως δὲ . . . γίνηται*: cf. *Lucr.* ii. 138–139:

sic a principiis ascendit motus et exit
paulatim nostros ad sensus.

7. *τὸ γὰρ προσδοξαζόμενον . . .* We see compound bodies moving at different rates in continuous perceptible periods, and we infer that the atoms which compose them are doing the same even in the ideal *minima* of time. But this is not the case. In matters of perception we must trust *αἰσθησις*, but in matters beyond its ken we must not make hasty inferences by analogy, but think out by an act of apprehension what the truth is. For the general idea of the *προσδοξαζόμενον* see §§ 50, 51.

9. *ἐπὶ τῶν τοιούτων*, ‘in the matters under discussion’, i.e. matters concerning the character and behaviour of imperceptible atoms.

10. *ἐπεὶ τό γε θεωρούμενον . . .* a return on the first principles of

inquiry. In dealing with phenomena *αἰσθητοῖς* will give us the truth, but with regard to *ἀδηλα* it cannot.

Ἐπεὶ . . . ἀληθές ἔστιν. See Appendix on *ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας*, pp. 259 ff. It is this passage which primarily demands the extension of the meaning of this difficult phrase beyond the immediate apprehension by the mind of images too subtle to be perceived by the senses : for that clearly cannot be his meaning here. I have argued in the Appendix that the meaning here is to be found in the parallelism of the sentence. *τὸ θεωρούμενον* is what Epicurus elsewhere (§ 56) calls *τὸ ἐπιβλητικῶς λαμβανόμενον τοῖς αἰσθητηρίοις*—the result of observation on the part of the senses as opposed to passive sensation : so *τὸ κατ' ἐπιβολὴν λαμβανόμενον* is the image apprehended as arising from a scientific deduction, each step of which has been referred to the test of the *αἰσθητοῖς* to make sure that there is no *ἀντιμαρτίρησις*. We have a passive sensation of a moving body by observation we see that each of its perceptible parts is moving in the same direction as the whole. *δόξα* by combining images applies this idea at random to the atomic parts but the mind apprehends true images of atoms in motion, which is derived from a chain of concepts—the atoms, their collisions, their resultant vibratory motion in all directions—each of which has been scientifically tested the conclusion of *ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας* is therefore true.

§ 47^b. i οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ ἄμα . I have here with more confidence followed Giussani in inserting this section from § 47. It could only with the greatest difficulty be forced into significance, where it stands, in connexion with the theory of ‘idols’, whereas here it follows on quite naturally with the preceding account of the movement of atoms. It is in fact a precaution against a misunderstanding of the theory just stated, and has been brilliantly expounded in most of its details by Giussani (pp. 14-118). The motion of the whole body is, it has been said, the sum of the motions of its component atoms· but these motions are an infinite series of tiny trajects in all directions : it might then be supposed that the whole body performs this entire series of motions, and arrives at the end of its journey after having followed a devious course in all directions. Such an idea is really inconceivable, and would moreover be a direct contradiction of *αἰσθητοῖς* for in that case the whole body will have come from any possible spot in any direction from which one of its atoms started and not from the place from which we saw it start The objection is put in a very exaggerated form, but it is not difficult to see the thought underlying it : if the motion of the compound body is only the sum of the motions of its component atoms, are not those imperceptible motions alone real and is not the motion of the compound a delusion? Epicurus replies with an emphatic negative. The motion of the compound is a reality, determined by the *ἀντικοπή* of the component atoms· or, if we may translate it more literally, the motion of the compound is the sensible likeness (*ὅμοιον*) of the sum of the component motions. As separate

identities the atoms perform their tiny trajects at infinite speed, but as parts of the new unity (*άθροισμα*, or *concilium*, as Lucretius calls it) they combine to perform a new motion. The compound is more than an aggregate, it is an entity : its motion is more than the sum of motions : it is a new reality.

Thus both the motions of the compound, sensible, continuous, taking place in perceptible time, and the motions of the atoms, imperceptible, constantly broken, occurring in time perceptible only in thought, are alike realities. ἐπεὶ τό γε θεωρούμενον πᾶν ἡ κατ' ἐπιβολὴν λαμβανόμενον τῇ διανοίᾳ ἀληθές ἔστιν (§ 62 *fin*). The idea is the very foundation of the Epicurean physics : both the sensible world and the imperceptible world comprehended by thought are real and true. Again, we have exact parallels in the theory of the secondary qualities the atoms, for instance, are colourless, but by their different shapes and collocations they produce colour in the compound body : and that colour is no delusion but a reality. This is the natural conclusion of the section on atomic motion, and I have little doubt that Giussani's transposition and general explanation of this passage are right, though I differ from him at one point.

οὐδὲ (*οὐδέ*) is the reading of the MSS. and may be kept : this idea or criticism is no more to be accepted than the fallacy with which he has dealt in § 62. Both Usener and Giussani alter it to *οὐθ'* to correspond to the *οὐτε* which they insert after *καὶ τοῦτο* below. Bignone, who keeps this passage in its original place, can find no reference for *οὐδὲ* and reads *οὐδαμῆ* for *οὐδέ ἀμα*. The MS. *οὐδέ* is indeed a small but strong argument for the transposition.

2. *καὶ τὸ φερόμενον σῶμα*. It is impossible to make sense of the MS. *κατὰ τὸ φερόμενον*, and *καὶ* and *κατά* are frequently confused in these MSS. (e.g. § 38). Bignone, supposing the passage to have special reference to the motion of the *εἰδώλα*, reads *καὶ τάποφερόμενον*.

ἐπὶ τοὺς πλείους τόπους : sc. the several places which each of the component atoms reaches in its trajects.

3. Usener, followed by Giussani, confines the parenthesis to the words *ἀδιανόητον γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο*. In that case it is necessary to insert a negative in the following clause, which must be *οὐτε* to correspond with the *οὐτε* which they read in l. 1. Usener reads *οὐτ' ἀφικνούμενον* (supposing *συν* a corruption, which is improbable), Giussani *οὐτε συναφικνούμενον*, keeping the significant compound to express the motion of the whole body together with its component atoms. Giussani then explains the sentence by a very subtle and improbable idea : he points out that all the atoms composing a compound must, before they entered the compound, have travelled in their course to far distant parts of space : the theory then which would identify the motion of the whole body with those of its atoms must suppose that with them it has arrived from all these distant parts of space and not from the spot from which we have watched its motion. He compares especially Lucretius' description of the formation of lightning,

vi. 340-345. But such an idea is very far-fetched and, as Bignone points out, there could be no reason to identify the motion of the body with those of its atoms *before they entered the compound*.

Bignone's own solution is far more satisfactory, and I have followed it without hesitation: he continues the parenthesis to *ἔσται ἀφιστάμενον*, and keeps the MS. text without the insertion of a negative. The clause then is an additional reason for rejecting the theory just enunciated: it is unthinkable, and moreover it involves the supposition that the compound might arrive not from where we saw it start, but from any spot in any direction, as it would if in devious course it followed the various trajects of its component atoms.

4. *ὅθεν δήποθεν τοῦ ἀπείρου* goes then with *συναφικούμενον*.

6. *ἀντικοπῆ γὰρ διοιον ἔσται* the motion of the whole body is the outward appearance (*διοιώμα* § 46 b 4) of the various internal motions of its component atoms.

μέχρι τοσούτου. Giussani, with his thoughts very much on the Lucretian account of the formation of the *fulmen*, takes this to mean 'up to the moment of departure', i.e. of the formation of the compound and the start of the compound motion up till that moment the motion of the free atoms was *οὐκ ἀντικοπτόν*. But it is very hard to extract this meaning from the context (*τούτου*, the reading of BG, would make it easier), and it is surely inconsistent, for Epicurus is apparently thinking just as much of compound bodies formed long ago and at rest before the moment of departure, when it could not be said that 'the speed of the motion was *οὐκ ἀντικοπτόν*'. The natural meaning to be extracted from the context is "*μέχρι τοῦ αἰσθητοῦ χρόνου*", and that I believe to be what Epicurus intends. In the *χρόνοι λόγῳ θεωρητοί* the motion is the independent motion of the individual atoms at atomic speed, *οὐκ ἀντικοπτόν*, but the moment we arrive at a *χρόνος αἰσθητός* we have the motion of the compound, the outward expression of the *ἀντικοπή*.

7. *ἀντικοπτὸν*: Usener corrected the MS. reading to *ἀντικόπτον*, but the active participle will not make sense, and I prefer to read *ἀντικοπτὸν*: 'the speed of its motion is not liable to retardation by collision'.

χρήσιμον δὴ . . . τὸ στοιχεῖον. Giussani demurs to transporting this clause with the rest of the passage on the ground that it sounds odd at the close of a section, and would be more natural in introducing a new section. But we may compare the parallel phrase at the close of the discussion of the nature of vision, § 52 *ι καὶ ταύτην οὖν σφόδρα γε δεῖ τὴν δόξαν κατέχειν.*

V. THE SOUL, ITS NATURE AND ACTIVITIES.

The next main section of the letter (§§ 63-68) deals with the nature of the soul, or vital principle (*ψυχή*). The main points in Epicurus' theory are (1) that it is material in character, a corporeal existence

(*σῶμα*), constructed like other material existences of atoms in composition; (2) that the component atoms are extremely subtle in nature; (3) that the soul particles are most like those of wind and heat, which he also conceives as material substances, (4) that added to these two elements is a third unnameable substance, far finer in structure than either of them; (5) that the soul is distributed over the body and is by it preserved from destruction, and in turn communicates sensation to the body; (6) that at the dissolution of the body the soul is dissolved too and perishes.

All this is in harmony with the general Epicurean account of the soul, but it is put very summarily, and when compared with other Epicurean sources would seem to have some omissions. In particular there are two notable divergencies from the account given by Lucretius in Book III.

(1) To the elements of breath or wind (*ventus*) and heat (*calor*, *vapor*) Lucretius adds the third element of air or mist (*aer*) (iii. 233). This account is supported by other Epicurean sources, e.g. Plut. *adv. Coloten* 20 (Usener 314) ἐκ τίνος θερμοῦ καὶ πνευματικοῦ καὶ ἀερώδους and Aet. iv. 3 (Usener 315) κράμα ἐκ τεττάρων, ἐκ ποιοῦ πυρώδους, ἐκ ποιοῦ πνευματικοῦ, ἐκ τετάρτου τίνος ἀκατονομάστον. Giussani (vol. i, pp. 184 ff.) has ingeniously explained that by this means the idea was obtained of atmosphere in three different temperatures, hot air (*θερμόν*), air at normal temperature (*ἀήρ*), and cold air (*πνεῦμα*). There is no reason to suppose a discrepancy on this point between Epicurus and his disciples, but we must regard the present passage as a rough statement, elsewhere elaborated. The 'unnameable' element thus becomes in Lucretius the *quarta natura* (iii. 241).

(2) Lucretius distinguishes (iii. 94-135) between the *anima*, the vital principle, distributed, as Epicurus says here, all over the body and thus the origin of sensation, and the *animus*, the mind, an aggregate of pure soul atoms situated in the breast. This distinction had already been made by Democritus, and is vouched for not only by the scholium on § 67, but by Aetius iv. 4 (Usener 312) and Plut. *adv. Coloten* 20 (Usener 314). It is indeed a fundamental idea in the system, and it seems strange that Epicurus should have omitted it here. Brieger has endeavoured to find a reference to it in § 65, but Giussani has, I think, shown conclusively that this is not the case. It may be that a passage has been lost in which Epicurus mentioned it, but here again it seems more probable that he is speaking summarily and does not refer to what was a cardinal point in the doctrine of the soul which would have been familiar to the advanced pupils for whom the letter to Herodotus was written.

(1) The first section (§ 63) deals with the nature and atomic composition of the soul.

§ 63. 1. *συνορᾶν*, 'to consider', lit. 'to obtain a comprehensive view': we may notice the verb: thought is always to Epicurus a kind of visualization.

διαφέροντα, ‘referring to’ the external and internal sensations, i.e. using them, as always in the Epicurean system, as standards or criteria of judgement.

3. **σῶμα**: this is a point of the greatest importance. The soul is purely material and corporeal, and the popular idea that it is *ἀσώματον* can have no place in a purely materialist system: see § 67.

λεπτομερές, ‘of fine particles’, i.e. as we learn from Lucr. iii 177 ff., of small round and smooth atoms put together in a subtle structure: cf. the scholium on § 67 ἐξ ἀτόμων αὐτήν συγκεῖσθαι λειοτάτων καὶ στρογγυλωτάτων, πολλῷ τινι διαφέρουσῶν τῶν τοῦ πυρός.

πάρ δὲ **τὸ ἀθροίσμα παρεσπαρμένον**, mingled in, that is, with the atoms which compose the body all over; but not necessarily, as Democritus held, arranged in alternate layers (see Lucr. iii. 370–395).

4. **προσεμφερέστατον**. Lucretius says straightforwardly that it is air and wind and heat: Epicurus more guardedly that it is ‘most like’ breath and heat.

πνεύματι: we ought perhaps to notice the strange variant of *F* *πτέρματι*, though it cannot of course be right. By *πνεῦμα* Epicurus probably means ‘wind’ rather than ‘breath’: it like heat was to him a corporeal body.

5. **ἔστι δὲ τὸ μέρος**, ‘there is also the part . . .’, is the reading of all the MSS. and should be kept, though it is rather abrupt. We should remember that Epicurus is writing to Herodotus, who is assumed to have considerable acquaintance with the system already. Woltjer, followed by Brieger, would prefer **ἔστι δέ τι μέρος**, which is unnecessary. Usener’s violent alteration **ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ μέρους** has little to commend it; he does not realize the introduction here of the ‘nameless’ element.

6. **πολλὴν παραλλαγήν**, ‘a large step in the scale’ of fineness of texture. For this idea of *παραλλαγή* as a series or sequence cf. § 55 10.

7. **συμπαθές δὲ τούτῳ μᾶλλον καὶ τῷ λοιπῷ ἀθροίσματι τούτῳ**, as Usener quite rightly insists, is a dative of cause, and **τῷ λοιπῷ ἀθροίσματι** is governed by *συμπαθές*. The third *μέρος* is most capable of acting in harmony with the rest of the body owing to its subtlety of structure, which enables it to interpenetrate the structure of the body more completely than can either of the other two elements. Brieger, who wishes to read **τούτοις μᾶλλον ἢ τῷ λοιπῷ ἀθροίσματι**, quite misunderstands both construction and meaning.

8. **τοῦτο δὲ πάντα . . .** The evidence of all our experience of the soul’s nature and actions, &c., makes it clear that the explanation just given is the right one. Cf. Lucretius’ arguments, amplifying this idea at great length, iii 417–829.

δῆλον (*ποιοῦντι*). Brieger’s addition, adopted by Giussani, is a far better correction of a meaningless text in the MSS. than Usener’s alteration to *δῆγον*. Bignone, following Giussani, reads *δηλοῦσι* the omission is more probable than the corruption.

10. **ῶν στερόμενοι θνήσκομεν**: lit. ‘the loss of what causes our death’,

i.e. what passes away when we die : if we can find out that we shall know what the soul is, and the evidence shows that it is particles of wind and heat and this other subtle element.

(2) The second section (§ 64) deals with the origin of sensation. This is produced by the movements of the soul-atoms, kept together by the body which encloses them, and to which the soul thus communicates sensation. Giussani has called attention here to Brieger's very useful distinction between two sorts of compound bodies in the Epicurean system : (1) *mixturae*, solid or liquid bodies which are capable of holding together by themselves ; (2) *texturae*, bodies of rarer formation, which cannot keep together unless they are enclosed (*στεγάζεσθαι*) in some more solid body. The soul is eminently an example of the latter kind : it could not hold together by itself (it is dissipated after death), but when protected by the body it has the capacity (*δύναμις*) of producing the 'accident' (*σύμπτωμα*) of sensation by the motion of its own component atoms (notice the purely materialist idea), and further of communicating that sensation to the body. Thus it is that, thanks to the presence of the soul, the body does itself feel, but that immediately the soul has departed it ceases to feel—for sensation was never a capacity of the body as such. The idea is subtle and of great importance for the Epicurean psychology, and is very clearly set out by Lucretius in iii. 323–416, some passages of which show a marked correspondence with the present text.

II. *τὴν πλείστην αἰτίαν* : notice this careful expression—the soul has the largest share in the causes of sensation, for it is the soul which starts the movement (*κίνησις*, see below) which produces it—but not all, for it could not produce sensation, unless through the protection of the body—that is a cause contributed by the body.

κατέχειν : compare §§ 52, 2, 47^b 8.

§ 64. 1. *ταύτην* : *sc. αἰσθησιν*, not *τὴν πλείστην αἰτίαν*.

2. *ἐστεγάζετο*, 'enclosed', 'protected', 'held together'. Cf. Lucr. iii. 323 :

haec igitur natura tenetur corpore ab omni.

παρασκευάσαν ἐκείνη τὴν αἰτίαν ταύτην : notice again the accuracy of the expression : the protection is a *cause* of sensation, afforded by the body to the soul.

3. *μετεῖληφε* : the body, as a consequence, has 'a share' in sensation.

συμπτώματος, 'contingent capacity', or in the logical sense, 'accident' : cf. §§ 68–73. Sensation is not a 'property' (*συμβέβηκός*), something essential to the existence of either soul or body, but it is an 'accident' or 'secondary quality' produced by the fact of their combination.

4. *οὐ μέντοι πάντων . . .*, 'it does not possess all the *συμπτώματα* which result from the combination', e.g. those of thought and visualization, which the mind in the body possesses. This clause

again suggests that a passage dealing with the mind has dropped out.

5. διό: and so, when the soul departs, as it has not in itself the right kind of movements to produce consciousness, the body loses sensation. Giussani wishes to refer διό not to the previous clause, but to the whole preceding description. But this is contrary to Epicurus' general practice in this section: he argues carefully clause by clause, and there is no real difficulty in the connexion if the body possessed all the συμπτώματα of the soul, it would be able to continue consciousness after its departure. but as it only has sensation, and that only owing to the presence of the soul, it cannot.

οὐ γάρ αὐτὸν ἐν ἑαυτῷ . . . for it does not have sensation independently, as a capacity of its own. The sequence of thought between this and the preceding clause is very exactly reproduced by Lucretius, iii 356, 357

at dimissa anima corpus caret undique sensu;
perdit enim quod non proprium sicut eius in aevo.

6. ἀλλ' ἔτέρω ἄμα συγγεγενημένῳ αὐτῷ παρεσκεύαζεν: the datives are strongly supported by the MSS ἔτέρω . . συγγεγενημένῳ, and I agree entirely with Brieger that it is quite impossible that Epicurus can have used παρεσκεύαζεν above (l. 2) of something afforded by the body to the soul, and later of something afforded by the soul to the body. Giussani, preferring Usener's ἔτερον. συγγεγενημένον, 'something else (*sc.* the soul) born with it supplied it with this faculty', argues against Brieger, that whereas above it was the opportunity (*airia*) for sensation which the body supplied, here it would have to be the sensation itself, and that Epicurus could not have said. But he forgets surely the meaning of παρεσκεύαζεν, which contains in itself the notion of 'affording an opportunity for'. I have little doubt that Brieger is right the difference does not, however, as Giussani notes, affect the main idea. Bignone also follows Brieger with confidence.

7 συντέλεσθείσῃς . . . δινάμεως: the latent capacity which the soul always had is now perfected or brought into action. an almost Aristotelian expression

8 περὶ αὐτόν, 'within itself', and not, as Giussani suggests, 'owing to its being within the body'. this is much more difficult to extract from the Greek, and down to the word ἀπεδίδον Epicurus is thinking of the creation of sensation in the soul, and nothing else

κατὰ τὴν κίνησιν: it is the atomic movement within the soul which gives rise to sensation.

9. εὐθύς, 'immediately', 'without external assistance', and so 'spontaneously'.

διμούρησιν: the 'juxtaposition' of the particles of soul and body.

10. συμπάθειαν : their correspondence of movement; compare §§ 48.
11, 50. 2, and Lucr. iii. 335-336 :

communibus inter eas conflatur utrumque
motibus accensus nobis per viscera sensus.

καὶ ἔκείνῳ, of course, 'to the body too'.

εἰπον: sc. ll. 2 and 3 above.

(3) This section (§§ 65, 66) contains deductions from the combination of the soul and body just explained. The soul, being the principal cause of sensation, can retain sensation even though portions of the body be lost: but the body, which only derives its sensation from the presence of the soul, must lose it the moment the soul is gone. Again, if the body is utterly broken up, the soul too must lose sensation, as it no longer has the body to hold it together. The passage is comparatively simple and straightforward, but has been considerably vexed by the editors. Brieger, who believes that the third *μέρος* of the soul is, in Epicurus' view, the *animus*, and is alone the cause of sensation, thinks that a passage has been lost before this section, in which Epicurus made a transition from the *anima* to the *animus*, and that this section itself deals with the latter. But his whole position has, I think, been shown to be untenable by Giussani (pp. 197-208), and his view involves, as Giussani has noticed, a very unnatural interpretation of this first sentence even the clause (*ὅσον ποτὲ ἐστὶ . . . ψυχῆς φύσις*) which might be thought to tell most in favour of this view has, as I shall have to show, been very seriously mistranslated by both Brieger and Giussani.

§ 65. 2. ἐνυπάρχουσα : quite literally, 'continuing to exist inside the body'.

ἄλλου τιὸς μέρους ἀπηλλαγμένου, 'if some other part (of the whole structure of soul and body) be lost'. Compare, for instance, Lucretius' description in iii. 642 ff. of the effect of the loss of limbs in battle. Brieger, taking ἡ ψυχή here to mean 'the mind' (*animus*), i.e. in his theory the third *μέρος*, interprets 'any other part of the soul', sc. the wind or the heat. But the expression would be, to say the least, extremely ambiguous, and the idea of either of these two elements being separately 'lost' is quite contrary to the general notion of Epicurus.

3. ἀναισθητήσει is probably the best restoration (suggested by Kühn) for the ἀναισθήσει or ἀναισθησία of the MSS.: but it is a curious corruption.

ἀλλ' ἡ ἄν καὶ ταύτης again seems to be demanded by the sense: ἀλλ' ἡ ἄν is given by FP^a (as against ἀλλὰ ἄν) and ταύτης is fairly guaranteed by the curious ταύτη of the MSS.

τοῦ στεγάζοντος λυθέντος εἴθ' ὅλου εἴτε καὶ μέρους τινός. I follow Bignone here in taking τοῦ στεγάζοντος to mean not 'the whole body which encloses the soul', but 'that which enclosed' the particular part

of the *ψυχή* which is lost, e.g. an arm or a leg suddenly cut off: *λυθέντος* will then be parallel in meaning to *διαλυνομένου*, used below (l. 9) of the whole body. Giussani takes *τοῦ στεγάζοντος* to refer to the whole body: *λυθέντος* cannot then mean 'shattered' because of *εἴθ οὐλον*: if the whole body is shattered, the soul, as Epicurus says below, must perish. He is therefore driven to take *λυθέντος* in the unusual sense of 'shaken' by a severe shock, and tries to find a contrast between it and the compound *διαλυνομένου*. But, as Bignone points out, this is mere juggling: the compound is appropriate to the whole body, the simple verb to a limb 'loosed' from the rest of the body.

4. ἐάν περ διαμένῃ, ξει: the subject is *ἡ λοιπὴ ψυχή*, the part of the soul which remains, when the portions of it in the lost limbs are removed. The construction is loose, but intelligible.

5. ξει: the MSS. all agree on *ξένι*, another queer mistake, of which *ξει* is a certain correction.

6. καὶ οὐλον καὶ κατὰ μέρος: a loosely tacked on apposition (cf. above): the body will not have sensation either in the whole or in any part (e.g. a leg or arm cut off), if certain atoms have departed.

7. ἔκείνου ἀπηλλαγμένου . . τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς φύσιν, 'if that sum of atoms, however small it be, is lost, which goes to make up (*συντεῖνον* . . . εἰς) the nature of the soul'. The body can by no means continue to have sensation, if the tiny collection of soul atoms be lost. Both the sense and the construction seem quite straightforward: for *συντεῖνον εἰς* cf. § 79 3 *πρὸς τὸ μακάριον τὰς γνώσεις συντείνειν* and § 80 2 *πρὸς τὸ ἀτάραχον καὶ μακάριον ἡμῶν συντείνειν*, and for the general idea Lucr. iii. 119-123:

principio fit uti detracto corpore multo
saepe tamen nobis in membris vita moretur,
atque eadem rursum, cum corpora pauca caloris
diffugere forasque per os est editus aer,
deserit exemplo venas atque ossa relinquit.

But the editors have made great havoc.

(a) Brieger, with his idea that the *ψυχή* all through this section is the *animus*, the pure third *μέρος*, would take it 'if that is lost, which, however small it be, is that which links together the vast mass of the atoms to the nature of the soul': i.e. the breath and heat again, which act as a link between 'pure soul' and body. But we have already seen the impossibility of this idea.

(b) Giussani, arguing against Brieger, adopts with some hesitation the rendering. 'if there is lost that *quantum* of matter, however small it be, which attunes the mass of the atoms into harmony with the animal life'. He then makes the very far-fetched supposition that Epicurus is arguing against Aristoxenus and those philosophers who

thought that the soul was a *harmonia*, and therefore ironically uses the musical metaphor *συντείνον*. The *quantum* of matter is of course the soul itself, which attunes the body into harmony with *τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς φύσιν*. The looseness of Giussani's translation obscures the difficulty that you would then have expected *ἔαντοῦ* instead of *τῆς ψυχῆς*, but this, he thinks, may be justified owing to the preceding neuter periphrasis.

But the fatal objection to both these renderings is that they translate as if the text were *τὸ συντείνον τὸ τῶν ἀτόμων πλῆθος*. It is not, and, unless *τὸ* be inserted, which is quite unnecessary, *τὸ συντείνον τῶν ἀτόμων πλῆθος* must go altogether as nominative.

I am glad to find that Bignone here agrees with me exactly.

9. διαλυομένου· of the dissolution of the body into its component parts, each of which *λύεται*. Though *διαλυομένου* is only read by F, it is supported by B's *δυνομένου* against the simply *λυομένου* of the other MSS., and I follow Giussani in adopting it.

10. κινέται. There is great probability in Brieger's conjecture, adopted by Giussani, that the words *τὰς αὐτὰς κινήσεις* have fallen out. Cf. Lucr. iii. 569 *moventur sensiferos motus*. Bignone, to obtain the same sense, would read *κινήσεις* for *κινέται*. But the clause will make good general sense without it, and on the whole it seems best not to 'restore'.

§ 68. 1 οὐ γάρ οἶν τε νοεῖν it is inconceivable that the soul can exist as a sentient being outside the protection of the body. This of course paves the way for the essential idea of the Epicurean philosophy that the soul is mortal.

αὐτὸν. a rough reference to *ἡ ψυχή*. Seeing the many changes from feminine to neuter in this passage, it may probably be retained: Usener's alteration to *τὸ* going with *αἰσθανόμενον* is of course easy, but unnecessary.

2. (*οὐ*), which Usener suggests in his note, is badly needed to complete the sense and may easily have fallen out before *ἐν*.

συστήματι, 'organism'. i.e. the *ἄθροισμα* of soul and body—another word with an Aristotelian flavour.

4. *ἐν οἷς* Usener suggests *ἐν οἷσις*, but it is not really necessary.

At the end of this section there is an interesting scholium in the MSS (see crit. app.).

This supplements the brief account of the letter in several important respects: (a) the shape and nature of the soul-atoms; (b) the division between the 'vital principle' (*τὸ ἀλογον*) distributed over the body and the 'mind' (*τὸ λογικόν*), situated, as Epicurus thought, in the breast; (c) the origin of sleep (cf. Lucr. iv. 907 ff.). It is also a conclusive proof against Brieger's view that the present section deals with *τὸ λογικόν* only.

(4) In the last section of this chapter Epicurus, having established his own view, proceeds to refute the popular belief that the soul is an incorporeal existence. The only incorporeal existence, he argues,

which can be conceived of as existing independently (i.e. not as a quality or relation or accident of some corporeal entity) is the void. Now the void, as it cannot touch or be touched, cannot act or be acted on by anything else. The soul then, which manifestly does act and is acted on, cannot be in nature like the void, cannot therefore be an independent incorporeal existence. It must be tangible and therefore corporeal.

The general sense of the passage is clear, but it has considerable difficulties in detail, which have been passed over rather summarily by the editors. Giussani, for instance, remarks that it is not even necessary to translate the section.

§ 67. 2 προσκατανοεῖν, 'to obtain a clear mental vision of this in addition to what we have already seen'. The MSS have ὅτι τὸ ἀσώματον λέγει γάρ κατὰ τὴν πλείστην ὄμηλίαν τοῦ ὄνόματος ἐπὶ τοῦ καθ' ἔαυτὸν νοηθέντος ἄν. Three lines of correction are possible, none of which is completely satisfactory (1) Usener noting that λέγει γάρ is the regular formula of introduction for a scholium, would remove λέγει γάρ κατὰ τὴν πλείστην ὄμηλίαν from the text as a gloss. He then writes ὁ τι τὸ ἀσώματον, sc. ἔστι, 'what the incorporeal is', and takes τοῦ ὄνόματος ἐπὶ τοῦ καθ' ἔαυτὸν νοηθέντος ἄν as a genitive absolute, and in this is followed by Giussani, but neither of them gives a hint how the words should be translated 'presumably 'if the name were to be thought of in reference to the independent existence'. But (a) the ἄν is unnecessary, (b) the next sentence shows clearly that τοῦ καθ' ἔαυτὸν νοηθέντος must be taken together. Moreover, as against Usener's view in general, the usual form of Epicurus' introduction of new topics demands ὅτι not ὁ τι, and, though λέγει γάρ often introduces scholia, the note 'he is speaking in the ordinary acceptance of words' would be a very strange one.

(2) We may then assume that ὅτι is right. Giussani then follows the suggestion of Lortzing, who adds after ἀσώματον (οὐ δεῖ κατηγορεῖν τῆς ψυχῆς), 'that we must not predicate incorporeality of the soul'. But there is no warrant for such an insertion, and the whole run of the section is against it. Epicurus speaks first of the incorporeal in general, and only applies the idea to the ψυχή in l. 7. Moreover it would necessitate καθ' ἔαυτὸν γάρ (not δέ) in the next sentence.

(3) Far better is the suggestion of Bignone, who retains ὅτι and κατὰ τὴν πλείστην ὄμηλίαν (with τοῦ ὄνόματος) and emends λέγει γάρ to λέγεται: 'that the incorporeal is applied in the general acceptation of the term to that which can be thought of independently'. I have with some hesitation followed him. The sense is far better, but (a) λέγεται for λέγει γάρ is not very probable (nor is von der Muehll's λέγομεν, which would give the same sense), (b) the use of ὄμηλία in this sense is unparalleled in classical Greek, and (c) one would expect the conclusion to be 'that which can be thought of independently as such', i.e. as incorporeal. For κατὰ τὴν πλείστην ὄμηλίαν compare § 70. 3 κατὰ τὴν πλείστην φοράν.

5. τὸ δὲ κενὸν . . . The void cannot act or be acted on because its only property is intangibility (*intactus*, *Lucr.* i. 454), and for all forms of action or suffering touch is a necessity.

6. κίνησιν . . . παρέχεται : cf. § 40.

7. ὥσθ' οἱ λέγοντες . . . : for the application of the idea to the soul compare *Lucretius* iii. 161–7, where the poet very clearly brings out the necessity of touch for action, which is rather implied in the present text.

8. οὐτε πάσχειν. Usener suggests in his notes that we should alter to οὐδέ. But the assumption of the first οὐτε of a pair is fairly common in Greek at all periods.

9. διαλαμβάνεται. The MSS agree here upon διαλαμβάνει, which will not make sense. Usener boldly alters to συμβαίνει, which is of course perfectly easy, and he is tacitly followed by Giussani. But the alteration is very serious. In § 69 in defining the nature of συμβεβηκότα Epicurus speaks of them as ἐπιβολὰς ἔχοντα ιδίας . . . καὶ διαλήψεις, sc. they can be perceived independently and distinguished. On the strength of that statement I suggest that διαλαμβάνεται is the right reading here: the occurrences of 'both action and suffering are separately perceived in reference to the soul', i.e. we are aware of both and distinguish between them. Though the sense is a little difficult, it is I think possible, and the change is not so unwarrantable as Usener's. Bignone suggests in the same sense διαλαμβάνεις, which is palaeographically easier, but the introduction of the second person is awkward: there would be less objection to von der Muehll's proposed διαλαμβάνομεν.

10. τὰ συμπτώματα : action and suffering are, of course, in Epicurus' technical sense 'accidents', cf. § 70.

§ 68. 1. ταῦτα οὖν πάντα . . . the conclusion of the section: these general formulae will, by constant reference to the facts of internal and external sensation, give sufficient ground for the comprehension of the details.

διαλογίσματα, 'results of reasoning', i.e. results of ἐπιβολαὶ τῆς διανοίας as opposed to mere προσδοξάζόμενα from sensation: cf. § 62 fin.

2. (τὸ) is a necessary insertion of Usener's.

3. τῶν ἐν ἀρχῇ βηθέντων: sc. in §§ 37 and 38 as to the principles of procedure.

ἴκανῶς must go with ἐμπειριλημμένα, not, as Giussani apparently takes it, with κατόψεται. 'He will see the investigations of reason sufficiently embodied in these general formulae to make him . . .'. For τύπος in this sense cf. § 35.

4. (καὶ τὸ): again a necessary addition, and once more a confusion between καὶ and κατά, this time taking the form of 'haplography'.

VI. 'PROPERTIES' AND 'ACCIDENTS'.

Epicurus passes, with a more obvious link of connexion than usual after his discussion of τὸ ἀσώματον, to consider another class of things which might be regarded as ἀσώματα, namely qualities. Of these, including time, he treats in the next four sections (§§ 68-73) the text is difficult, and the general theory has been much discussed by the commentators. He divides qualities into συμβεβηκότα and συμπτώματα. We may roughly render these words by 'properties' and 'accidents', as Lucretius does by the corresponding terms in general use in Latin, *conuncta* and *eventa* (i. 449, 450), but we must attempt to get more closely at the underlying ideas.

(1) *Properties.* In the first section (to § 69 *fin.*) Epicurus deals with συμβεβηκότα: these he regards as the qualities, which are essential and inseparable physical constituents (though not of course material parts) of a corporeal existence. It is these qualities which are immediately perceptible by the senses, and the perception of a body is the aggregate perception of its properties. To the συμβεβηκότα then it owes its continued existence as body, and if any of them were to be removed from it, it would mean the break-up of its physical existence: cf. *Lucr.* i. 451-452 (a very careful statement).

coniunctum est id quod nusquam sine permisibili
discidio potis est seiungi seque gregarī.

Similarly, no συμβεβηκός can exist by itself apart from the aggregate body, which with other συμβεβηκότα it constitutes: but with them it has a corporeal existence as a constituent part of a σῶμα.

Much of the criticism which has been brought against Epicurus' theory of συμβεβηκότα, especially by Brieger and Munro (on *Lucr.* i. 449 ff.), takes the line of charging him with inconsistency. They argue that he has no definite line of cleavage between συμβεβηκότα and συμπτώματα, that, for instance, he sometimes classes colour as a συμβεβηκός, sometimes as a σύμπτωμα. Giussani, who has dealt carefully with this criticism (pp. 33-37), has, I think, completely absolved Epicurus from the charge. He points out that the terms are not absolute but relative, that what is a συμβεβηκός of one thing is the σύμπτωμα of another, or even of the same thing looked at from a different point of view. 'Slavery', for instance, which Lucretius (i. 455) takes as an example of an *eventum* (σύμπτωμα), is an *eventum* of 'man', but a συμβεβηκός of 'slave'. 'Colour' again, to deal with the example of the critics, is a σύμπτωμα of body, because in the dark a body has not colour, yet its physical existence is in no way impaired; but it is a συμβεβηκός of an ὅρατόν, for nothing can be seen except as coloured. It is strange that when Epicurus at the outset had, as we shall see, carefully guarded against this misconception, he should have been attacked on this very ground. Bignone, who would defend Epicurus on the same lines,

seems to me to go too far in regarding *συμβεβηκός* and *σύμπτωμα* not as technical terms at all, but almost interchangeable in their application: see note on ὅσανεὶ *συμβεβηκότα*, I. 7.

The three main points then to be remembered are (1) the essentially material conception of the *συμβεβηκότα* as physical constituents of body, (2) their immediate relation to the senses, (3) the impossibility of their existence except in relation to 'things'. Epicurus is throughout arguing both against the Platonic conception of the 'ideas' and against the Stoic view that qualities were in themselves *σώματα*.

6. τὰ χρώματα: we need not then be surprised at the presence of 'colours' in this list. The other qualities enumerated are the properties of all bodies (*πάσων* below), 'colours' belong to *τοῖς ὄρατοῖς*, which Epicurus has scrupulously added. Similarly sound and smell would be qualities belonging to bodies as recognizable (*γνωστοῖς*) by other senses.

7. ὅσανεὶ *συμβεβηκότα*. The MSS. have ὡς ἀν εἰς αὐτὰ βεβηκότα, of which the emendation attributed by Casaubon to Galesius has been almost universally adopted, 'as though they were the concomitant properties'. Bignone, however, believing *συμβεβηκότα* to be a general term and not sufficiently explicit in itself, prefers ὡς ἀν δεὶ *συμβεβηκότα*, 'as though permanent concomitants', distinguished from the occasional concomitants which Epicurus usually describes as *συμπτώματα*. If, however, we follow Giussani in his explanation of the relative character of the terms *συμβεβηκός* and *σύμπτωμα* (see the general note at the beginning of the section), this is unnecessary, as *συμβεβηκότα* in itself conveys the idea of permanence, and ὡς ἀν ἀεὶ *συμβεβηκότα* sounds an unnatural form of expression.

8. Ἡ πᾶσιν ἡ τοῖς ὄρατοῖς of the examples given by Epicurus above *σχῆμα μέγεθος* and *βάρος* are *συμβεβηκότα* of *πάντα* (all corporeal things) and *χρώματος* of τὰ ὄρατά

κατὰ τὴν αἰσθησιν αὐτῶν γνωστοῖς, 'recognizable by the sensation of these qualities', i.e. all concrete bodies are recognized by the perception of their qualities: shape, size, and weight apply to all, and beyond this some may be known by their colour through sight, others through their taste or smell. This is the reading of the third hand in P and seems the best solution. The MSS. however all have *αὐτοῖς γνωστοῖς*, and this would, I think, just construe, 'recognizable for what they are by perception', i.e. if we go into a dark room and smell a certain smell we recognize the object for what it is, a rose. There is certainly no need to follow Usener in the drastic emendation *σώματος γνωστά*, 'the *συμβεβηκότα* which are recognizable in the perception of the whole body', and it is unfortunate that much of Giussani's argument (pp. 36 ff.) should be based upon it.

9. οὐδὲ ὡς καθ' ἔατάς εἰσι φύσεις the properties are not 'physical existences by themselves', i.e. independent of other physical existences. He is thinking here specially of the Platonic conception of the 'ideas'.

10. οὐδὲ γὰρ δυνατὸν . . . : the usual Epicurean test. we cannot ‘visualize’ shape or weight, &c., existing by itself apart from a body of which it is a property.

§ 69. 1. οὐτέ δέλως ὡς οὐκ εἰσὶν, ‘nor can we say that they do not exist at all’, a seemingly rather futile addition, but not so, when we remember that to Epicurus existence, except in the case of the void, means corporeal existence. He has probably in mind here the sceptical attitude of Democritus

2 οὕθ' ὡς ἔτερ' ἄπτα . . . δούματα : they are not incorporeal existences, subsisting as accompaniments of body : we have seen (§ 67) that the only independent incorporeal existence is the void : it might be supposed that qualities were independent or relative incorporeal existences (practically the theory of Aristotle). But this Epicurus cannot accept because they are perceptible to the senses.

οὕθ' ὡς μέρια τούτου nor again are they separable parts of the body : something into which it might be physically divided up like the σύκοι mentioned below, l. 5. The argument here is directed against the Stoics, who spoke of properties and accidents alike as σώματα.

3. καθόλου: the body ‘in its entirety’ is constituted of an aggregate of qualities : there is no part of it of which this is not true : it owes its existence as a unity and as a ‘whole’ to its constituent properties.

(ἐκ) τούτων: a necessary insertion made by Meibom

4. δίδιον, ‘permanent’, lit ‘everlasting’, not, of course, with the implication that body is eternal, but only that, so long as it exists, its existence is continuously and always bound up with its constituent properties.

οὐχ οἷον δ' εἶναι (ἐκ) συμπεφορημένων, ‘yet not such as to owe its existence to things that have been brought together to form it’. The testimony of the MSS. is overwhelmingly in favour of συμπεφορημένων and ἐκ must be inserted as above before τούτων. Usener adopts συμπεφορημένον from F, but (a) the parallel of (ἐκ) τούτων above is strongly against this, (b) the compound body could not be said to be συμπεφορημένον, but only the particles which composed it (compare συμφόρησιν δὲ ἐκ τούτων κίνησιν ἔχόντων . . . , § 59. 10)

5. ὥσπερ δταν . . . The material parts of a body, the atoms and the larger molecules, are of course ‘brought together’ to form the compound body : with the properties it is not so : they are physical constituents, but not material parts.

σύκων. in a general sense ‘the parts’, great or small, of which a body may be composed, subsequently subdivided into (a) τῶν πρώτων . . . μεγεθῶν : the σύκων in the technical sense, ‘the first parts’ or ‘molecules’, the *minima* of sensation (cf §§ 57, 58), or (b) τῶν τοῦ δλον μεγεθῶν τοῦδε τινὸς ἐλαττόνων, larger ‘parts’ of the whole body, which are still fractions of it.

6. μεγεθῶν: the MSS. have μεγεθῶν, which may be kept (so Bignone) : both the order of words and the expression are a little

awkward and Schneider's *μερῶν* would make it much easier, but there seems no necessity for adopting it.

7. τοῦδε τινὸς ἐλαττόνων, 'smaller than the body, whatever it is', the idiomatic use of *tis* (cf. Soph. *Ant.* 252 ἀσημος οὐργάτης *tis* ήν).

8. ἐπιβολὰς . . . ἔχοντα ἴδιας, 'they have their own occasions of perception', *ἐπιβολάς* here *τῶν αἰσθητηρίων* (cf. § 50 and notes) i.e. they are capable of being looked at individually; we can pay attention to the colour of a thing apart from its weight or its size. Bignone translates 'intuitions', but here it is probably not used in the technical sense of *ἐπιβολὰς τῆς διανοίας*.

9. καὶ διαλήψεις, 'and they have their distinctions': we can make a distinction between the various properties; size, weight, &c.

συμπαρακολουθούντος δὲ τοῦ ἀθρόου: a limitation of the last clause, we can 'look at' or 'pay attention to' the colour of a body, apart from its weight or size, but only so long as the whole body is there too: it is not to be supposed that we could 'abstract' the colour and look at it.

10. ἀποσχιζομένου . . . εἰληφότος. Usener has again done violence to the text and meaning by altering both these participles to the neuter plural nom. 'if the properties are never separated from the whole, but thanks to the conception of the whole body acquire predication' (so Bignone). i.e. the properties are predicateable owing to their share in the complete comprehension of the body, constituted by the aggregate of qualities. This is quite good sense and not at all inconsistent with Epicurean doctrine, but it is an unnecessary change. The genitives need not be altered. 'the properties have their own *ἐπιβολαῖ* and *διαλήψεις*, provided the aggregate is always with them and is never torn from them, but derives its predication as body from the aggregate comprehension of the properties'. i.e. we call a thing body, because we are aware of size, shape, weight, &c., in combination Again, it is unfortunate that much of Giussani's elucidation should be built up on Usener's perversion of the text.

(2) § 70. *Accidents.* Epicurus' conception of 'accidents' is rather easier than that of 'properties'. The 'accident' in just the same way is not an independent corporeal existence, nor is it incorporeal, but has corporeal existence only in connexion with the body to which it is attached. But it differs from the property in that it is not a necessary physical constituent of body, but may or may not attach to it at any given time, and does not by its presence or absence alter the essential nature of the body. Lucretius (i. 456-458) has again put it clearly:

cetera quorum
adventu manet incolumis natura abituque,
haec soliti sumus, ut par est, eventa vocare.

Thus Socrates remains Socrates, whether he is free or slave, good or bad, speaking or being spoken to. Secondly, just as the *συμβεβηκότα* are immediately perceptible in sensation *ἐπιβολὰς* *ἔχοντα*, so the

συμπτώματα are an inference from sensation (*κατ' ἐπιβολάς τυπούς*). Roughly then the *συμπτώματα* are 'contingencies' or 'accidents', and under them we may class 'secondary' qualities, states, actions and occurrences, but we must again remember that the term is not absolute, but relative to the body with which it is connected and to the point of view from which it is considered · colour is a *σύμπτωμα* of body, but a *συμβεβηκός* of *τὸ δόρατον*.

The repetition in this section is almost more noticeable than in the last—a sure sign that Epicurus is dealing with a matter of importance.

§ 70. 1. καὶ οὐκ ἀίδιον . . . ἀσώματα. There is serious corruption here, but editors are not agreed as to where it lies. The MSS have καὶ οὐκ ἀίδιον παρακολουθεῖν (παρακολουθεῖ B) οὐτ' ἐν τοῖς ἀράτοις καὶ οὐτε ἀσώματα

(1) Usener keeps παρακολουθεῖν and marks a lacuna after it, adding in his note '*συμπτώματα* scriptor definit'. This is hardly explicit enough, and his change just after of *καὶ* to *ἔσται* is not convincing, a future is not wanted. Giussani follows Usener's text and is content to leave the lacuna vague.

(2) Bignone marks no lacuna but reads παρακολουθεῖ ἢ γ' (ΑΓ corrupted to N) οὐτ' ἐν τοῖς ἀράτοις καὶ ἀναισθήτοις δοξαστέον εἶναι οὐτε ἀσώματα. 'There frequently occur to bodies without permanently belonging to them contingencies which we must not suppose to be among things invisible and imperceptible nor incorporeal'. But the emendation *ἢ γ'* is not very probable, and the supplement is in itself gratuitous and does not cover what Epicurus would have been likely to say.

(3) If we take the words as they stand in the MSS (a) the infinitive παρακολουθεῖν may well have been explained by something in the lacuna, if it is necessary to suppose one. (b) οὐτ' ἐν τοῖς ἀράτοις εἶναι οὐτε ἀσώματα is clearly a reference to the two Epicurean categories of real existence, the atoms (*ἀδηλα* or *ἀόρατα*) and the void (*ἀσώματον*). The *συμπτώματα*, he says, do not come under either of these two heads. (c) Would Epicurus have been content to deny these two forms of existence to the *συμπτώματα* or would he have added more? Clearly, I think, there must have been a reference to the existence of compound things (*τὸ δόλον*) as above, and further he would most likely have denied, as he did of the *συμβεβηκότα*, the idea that they did not exist at all. (d) *εἶναι* is a more probable restoration of *καὶ* than *ἔσται*. I therefore read the passage as in the text, and should suppose that it originally ran something like *καὶ μὴν καὶ τοῖς σώμασι συμπίπτει πολλάκις καὶ οὐκ ἀίδιον παρακολουθεῖν* (*φαίνεται οὐαὶ οὐτε δλῶς ὡς οὐκ ἔστι δοξαστέον*, οὐτε τὴν τοῦ δόλου φύσιν ἔχειν) οὐτ' ἐν τοῖς ἀράτοις εἶναι οὐτε ἀσώματα

3. κατὰ τὴν πλείστην φοράν, 'according to common usage': compare § 67. 2 κατὰ τὴν πλείστην δμιλίαν, and remember that at the beginning of the letter Epicurus laid down the principle that ordinary words were

to be used in their ordinary sense. Lucretius (i. 458) faithfully reproduces this point :

haec soliti sumus, ut par est, eventa vocare.

4. οὗτε τὴν τοῦ ὅλου φύσιν ἔχειν : see above § 68. 9 : like the συμβεβηκότα they are not independent corporeal existences.

5. δι συλλαβόντες κατὰ τὸ ἀθρόον σῶμα προσαγορεύομεν, 'which we call body, comprehending it altogether in the aggregate', sc. of its properties , see the last clause of the last section

6. οὗτε τὴν τῶν ἀδίδιον παρακολουθούντων here the σύμπτωμα differs from the συμβεβηκός . it is not a permanent and essential constituent of body.

ῶν ἀνευ σῶμα οὐ δυνατὸν νοεῖσθαι : Giussani rightly points out (p. 30, note) that this must not be taken to mean 'without which it is impossible to conceive body as such', for in that case size, shape, and weight would be the only three συμβεβηκότα, but it must mean 'a body', 'any given body', thought of either as body simply, or as an ὄρατόν, ἀκοντόν, &c.

7. κατ' ἐπιβολὰς δ' ἂν τινας the συμβεβηκότα are directly perceived in acts of apprehension, but the σύμπτωμα only in relation to such acts : e.g. we see a man in a certain attitude, &c , and thus know that he is writing. ἐπιβολαὶ is again used here in the untechnical sense of 'acts of apprehension' on the part of the senses.

παρακολουθούντος τοῦ ἀθροῦ. the same important provision as in the case of the συμβεβηκότα . we cannot infer an 'accident' any more than we can perceive a property apart from the body to which it happens.

8. προσαγορευθεῖν, ἀλλ' ὅτε δήποτε . . . θεωρεῖται. Usener again supposes a lacuna after προσαγορευθεῖν and changes ἀλλ' ὅτε to ἀλλ' ὅτῳ, taking the clause presumably to have run, 'we can apply the name σύμπτωμα to them not as independent existences but in connexion with whatever body they are seen to be happening to on each occasion'. Bignone has however shown that if the MS. text ἀλλ' ὅτε is retained, it is unnecessary to suppose any loss : ἀλλ' ὅτε . . . then becomes a limiting clause, 'we can call them σύμπτωμα but only at the moment when each is seen to be happening'. We may notice, as showing the interchangeability of his terminology, that Epicurus here uses συμβαίνοντα of the σύμπτωμα—but there is an obvious difference of meaning between the present and the perfect.

§ 71. 2. ἀδίδιον : both here and in the several successive places where it occurs some or all of the MSS. have corrupted ἀδίδιον into ἀδίδιων owing to the surrounding genitives.

3. ταύτην τὴν ἐνεργείαν, 'the immediate vision', i.e. the perception of the σύμπτωμα as part of the direct data of sense . there is in the MSS. the usual corruption to ἐνεργείαν.

4. ὅτι, 'because' : the following clause gives the reasons which might

lead us to regard the *συμπτώματα* as not belonging to the real. Hicks translates 'this clear evidence that', but (a) this is an unusual construction in Epicurus, (b) it involves a tautology in the next sentence, which he avoids by translating *καθ' αὐτά*, 'permanent existences', which is not justifiable. The *συμπτώματα* are themselves an *ἴναργεία*, and we must not either deny them reality or think of them as independent existences.

The words *ὅ δὴ καὶ σῶμα προσαγορεύομεν* which occur in the MSS. after *συμβάνει* are rightly excluded by Usener as a gloss derived from several similar expressions in these sections. They are, however, retained by von der Muehll.

7. *ἄλλ' ὅπερ καὶ φαίνεται* we must accept as truth just what is presented to us in sensation—an emphatic declaration of the main Epicurean position, of which this notion of the *συμπτώματα* is the direct outcome.

8. *πάντα καὶ τὰ σώματα* (Bignone) is a better correction of the meaningless *πάντα τὰ σώματα* of the MSS than Usener's *πάντα σώματος* or von der Muehll's *πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα*.

9. *τάγμα*, 'a position in the ranks' of independent existences. a rather unusual word for Epicurus

ἄλλ' ὅν τρόπον . . . θεωρεῖται the construction breaks off into a main clause. Such abruptness is not unusual with Epicurus, and it is probably unnecessary to adopt either Bignone's suggestion *ἄλλ' (ὅν) ὅν τρόπον* or Usener's *θεωρεῖσθαι* or *θεωρητέον*, any of which would mend the construction grammatically.

10. *ἰδιότητα*, 'peculiar characteristics' (*proprietas* in Latin)

§ 72. (3) *The nature of time* As a kind of appendix to the explanation of the *συμβεβηκότα* and *συμπτώματα*, Epicurus deals with the special question of the nature of time. The general idea is clear, but the expression unusually obscure. Time differs from everything else in that we cannot have a general conception (*πρόληψις*) of it, i.e. a visual mental image resulting from a number of individual perceptions (see § 37 note). This we have of all classes of objects, and of their properties and accidents. We have, for instance, a conception of stone, with which is associated hardness and roughness, and we recognize an individual stone as such by reference (*ἀνάγοντος*) to this *πρόληψις*. But we have not a general conception (a mental image) of time, nor again is there anything else like it to which we might refer it (space was of course to Epicurus a real existence and not a relation). What then can we say about it? We must refer to the test of our experience, as usual: and we then perceive that it is something that we associate (*συμπλέκομεν*) with day and night, or again with our internal states, or with the external states of motion and rest. We decide then on the basis of this intuition (*ἐνάργημα*) without waiting for further discussion that time is a special kind of 'accident' associated with these states, &c., that are themselves accidents of body. In fact, time is not either a

συμβεβηκός or a *σύμπτωμα* of concrete things, but as Sextus Empiricus tells us that Epicurus stated (*adv. Math.* x. 219) time is a *σύμπτωμα συμπτωμάτων*. The conclusion is in absolute harmony with the Epicurean principles, and the whole idea is well brought out by Lucretius l. 459-463:

tempus item per se non est, sed rebus ab ipsis
consequitur sensus, transactum quid sit in aevo,
tum quae res insit, quid porro deinde sequatur,
nec per se quemquam tempus sentire fatendumst
semotum ab rerum motu placidaque quiete.

1. *προσκατανοήσαι*, used of an additional point connected with what has preceded, cf. § 67 *imil.*

2. οὐ *ἴητητον*, 'we must not look to find it'. When we use the word 'time' there does not come up in our minds any mental picture of an object with which we associate it, as there does, for instance, if we think of weight or redness

τὰ λοιπά is then 'all other *συμβεβηκότα* and *συμπτώματα*', which, as has been seen in the last two sections, are invariably connected with an *ἀθρόον*.

ἐν ὑποκείμενῳ, 'in an object'. The *ὑποκείμενον* is that which 'lies beneath', i.e. the actual thing, which is the cause of sensation and from which the *εἶδολα*, &c., which stir our senses are derived

4. *προλήψεις*, 'concepts', lit. 'anticipations', the 'composite photographs' formed in our mind by the combination of many individual impressions, by which we identify fresh objects of sensation. They are of course with the *αἰσθήσεις* and the *πάθη* (and possibly the *ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας*) the *κριτήρια* of truth compare K. Δ. xxiv. We may notice that the idea is so definitely that of mental visualization that Epicurus actually uses the participle *βλεπομένας*, 'which are seen': it is true, however, that it is not his usual word for the actual sensation of sight, though it comes near it in § 48 10

αὐτὸν τὸ ἐνάργημα, 'the actual intuition' or 'sense impression' which we get of time. The word is usually used by Epicurus of the 'clear vision' of an object which we get on the nearer view, but here in a slightly extended sense of the 'immediate perception' which we have of time without any associations of theory or analysis. This we must examine (*ἀναλογιστέον*) to see what it really is and how it arises

5. *συγγενικῶς τοῦτο ἐπιφέροντας*. The MSS. have *περιφέροντες*, which it is not easy to make sense of, and Usener's emendation to *ἐπιφέροντες* has been generally accepted. This can only be construed grammatically with *ἀναφωνοῦμεν*, 'we speak of a short time or a long time, applying this (sc. the idea of length or brevity) as we do to other things', i.e. using for duration the conception of measure, which we usually apply to spatial relations. This is not very satisfactory, and Bignone is probably right in taking the words with *ἀναλογιστέον*, only if so, it is essential to emend to the acc. *ἐπιφέροντας*. He then trans-

lates 'by keeping before us the specific determinate character of these modes of speaking'. I do not see how this is to be extracted from the Greek, and would rather take it to mean 'by applying our intuition to time as we do to other things', i.e just as in other cases we use the immediate data of sense to determine the nature of the thing perceived, so here we must use our direct intuition to determine the nature of time, and if we do so, we find, as he goes on to say, that it is really a *σύμπτωμα* associated with various *συμπτώματα* of things. But I feel very doubtful about the words.

6. *διαλέκτους*, 'expressions', almost 'descriptions' of time. Hicks notes that time had, for instance, been defined as 'number of motion' or 'measure of motion'.

7. *κατ' αὐτοῦ*: both times the phrase occurs the majority of the MSS. have *καθ' αὐτοῦ*, a mere error due to the occurrence of similar phrases in the previous sections

8. οὐτε ἄλλο τι ... We cannot predicate anything else about time - we cannot assign it to any special category of existences, for there is nothing else which is similar to it in nature. It is *sui generis*. He must of course here be thinking of some special efforts to class time with something else, but it is not clear what.

9. *ἔχοντος*, MSS *ἔχοντος*, a mistake due either to the neighbourhood of *κατ' αὐτοῦ* or possibly to a misunderstanding. Von der Muehll retains *ἔχοντος*, but in what sense is not clear.

ἰδιώματι, 'a peculiar' or 'unique existence'; cf. *ἰδίότητα*, § 71. 10.

10. *συμπλέκομεν*, 'associate it', in our ordinary thought or ways of speech

11. *ἐπιλογιστέον*, 'we must turn our thoughts to it', 'reflect on it', in a quite general sense so *ἐπιλογισμοῦ*, § 73. 2.

§ 73 1. *ἀποδείξεως*, 'logical proof' it is not a matter for reasoning, but simply of careful attention to our experience

2. *ταῖς ἡμέραις καὶ ταῖς νυξὶ συμπλέκομεν*. Our normal association of time is with the succession of day and night. Now they are themselves *συμπτώματα* of the earth, or the sky, or the sun, or generally of 'our world' time then is a *σύμπτωμα* of them, or a *σύμπτωμα συμπτωμάτων*

4. *τοῖς πάθεσι καὶ ταῖς ἀπαθείαις*. another association of time is with our own feelings or absence of feelings (e.g. in sleep), because we perceive these states as lasting for a longer or shorter period: so, too, with motion and rest

5. *ἴδιόν τι σύμπτωμα*, 'a special kind of accident': the duration of states, &c., is an *eventum* which is *sui generis*.

πάλιν. i.e. in the case of *πάθεσι*, &c., 'again', just as in the case of day and night. Usener, looking in this clause for a summary of the whole section, reads *πάντα* for *πάλιν*, referring *ταῦτα πάντα* to the whole list *ἡμέραις καὶ νυξὶ* as well as those mentioned in the second clause. But this is rewriting, and in fact the section is left without any summing up.

At the end of the section there is a scholium : 'this he says also is the second book of the *Περὶ φύσεως* and in the Greater Epitome'.

VII. WORLDS, THEIR CREATION, DESTRUCTION, SHAPES, AND CONTENTS.

Epicurus passes with a perfectly abrupt transition to the consideration of the various worlds contained in the universe. He had already dealt with this question in § 45, and shown that there is an infinite number of worlds : here he deals with their creation, their ultimate destruction, their shapes, and their contents. It is possible that one or other of the sections has been misplaced, and that they ought to be brought together, but the letter is so disjointed that to secure a logical order in it would require a very great readjustment, and it is better to leave the paragraphs where they are. The subject is dealt with again in the letter to Pythocles (§§ 88 ff.) and is treated fully in the fifth book of Lucretius.

The short paragraph, in which there is one considerable lacuna, divides itself into three sections :

(1) In the first section (§ 72) Epicurus states that worlds were created out of the infinite by the aggregation of certain nuclei (*συστροφαῖ*), out of which worlds 'separated out', i.e. the various parts of them went to their respective places, earth sinking down to the centre, water lying above it, and the lighter and more fiery elements rising to form air and the heavenly bodies. Just as they have been created, so they will ultimately be dissolved into their component atoms, whether owing to external blows or to internal disruption. For a fuller and very picturesque description of the process we may compare *Lucr v* 432-494, and for the general idea of growth, decay, and destruction *ii. 1048-1089*.

§ 73 7 τοὺς κόσμους. Epicurus' conception was of an infinite series of worlds in different parts of space, each an ordered system of earth, sky, and heavenly bodies.

πᾶσαν σύγκρισιν πεπερασμένην. 'every compound organism which has a limit'. Epicurus does not of course suggest that there are compound bodies without limit, but merely points the contrast - the limited comes out of the unlimited. It is not, however, quite clear what he is thinking of here, but probably some aggregation of atoms which was not definite enough to be called a *κόσμος*.

8 τὸ δροιοειδὲς τοῖς θεωρούμένοις πυκνῶς ἔχουσαν. Bignone translates 'like in kind to the things which we constantly see', but the order of words is strongly against this, and *πυκνῶς* must go with *ἔχουσαν*, not with *θεωρούμένοις*. It will mean then 'exhibiting continuously, i.e. throughout its extension, a likeness in appearance to the things we see'. The expression is a little obscure, and it is possible that Epicurus is intending to exclude from his statement the bodies of the gods, which, though of atomic structure, were not made 'like the things we see'.

10. συστροφῶν: vague masses of matter forced by the aggregation of atoms and void, *congressus materialis*, Lucr. II. 1065. There may be the added notion that they move round in a whirl (*δῆνος*), as in the old atomic motion. We may compare the modern conception of nebulae.

ἀποκεκριμένων, 'separated out', another early cosmogonical notion going right back to Anaximander's 'separating out of opposites'

11 καὶ πάλιν διαλύεσθαι πάντα an important point in the Epicurean physics: as all worlds (like all other compound bodies) have a beginning, so they are all ultimately dissolved compare Lucr. V. 235-379

τὰ μὲν . . πάσχοντα the main causes of dissolution would be external blows, such as the collision with another *κόσμος* and the gradual internal disruption due to the escape of atoms shooting off from the *κόσμος* into the surrounding void

13 πάσχοντα· there is considerable divergence of reading in the MSS. which seems to be due to a blot or erasure, but there is little doubt that πάσχοντα is right. It is, however, awkward standing by itself, and there is much to be said for the reading of the second hand in II τοῦτο πάσχοντα, of which a trace may also be found in BQ's τοῦτο σχά

At the end of the section follows an interesting scholium see crit app. Bignone takes *τῶν μερῶν* to be the four elements, but there seems no justification for this, and it is more natural to understand it of the local physical parts of a world which become dislocated after long internal atomic vibration. The reference in the last clause is to the idea set out in Lucr. V. 534 ff., that the earth is sustained in its place by a gradual thinning out of its structure underneath, which acts at once as a link with the surrounding air and as a kind of 'spring-mattress'. Von der Muchll may be right in retaining the words *δῆλον οὖν ὡς* as part of the text, supposing a lacuna after them.

§ 74 (2) *Shapes of the worlds*. The worlds are not all of the same shape. At this point there is a lacuna owing to the intrusion of a considerable scholium, see crit app. We may conclude that Epicurus stated that worlds were of different shapes, yet not of all possible shapes, and then enumerated some of the shapes.

2 ἔχοντας We can deduce the form of the text which was ousted by the scholium. There must have been a verb, probably *γεγονέναι*, after *νομίζειν*, then the second *οὗτε* clause, probably *οὗτε αὐτὸν σχῆμα ἔχοντας*. Then possibly a reason for this belief and a statement of the shapes that are found among *κόσμοι* as in the scholiast's quotation from the XIIth Book of the *Περὶ φύσεως*

(3) *Contents of the worlds*. A strange addition is made by Epicurus in the idea that other worlds than ours contain animals, plants, &c., such as we see here. The section must have begun in the lacuna, and Usener has suggested that it ran something as follows. ἀλλὰ μην καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς κόσμοις δεῖ νομίζειν ζῷα καὶ φυτά καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τὰ παρ' ἡμῖν θεωρούμενα ἐνεῖναι.

οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀν . . . οὐκ ἀν ἔδυνήθη. Usener has most acutely seen the meaning of this sentence, which at first sight might seem the reverse of what would be expected. The emphasis lies on *καὶ* before *οὐκ ἀν* ἐμπειρελήφθη. ‘No one could prove that in one kind of worlds these seeds might have been included (or might not, as chance dictated); and that in another they could not have been included’, i. e. there are two kinds of supposed worlds, one in which the inclusion or exclusion of such things was, so to say, ‘optional’ and due to chance, the other in which they were excluded, and both kinds are contrasted with our world, in which they are included. It is Epicurus’ general conception of *ἰσονομία* which makes him decide that such formations are in fact impossible.

3. *(ἐν)* is a necessary insertion, and may well have dropped out before *μέν*.

5. *(τὰ)* is again a necessary insertion; it dropped out after the last syllable of *πάντα*.

6. At the end of the section the MSS. have the not very illuminating scholium ὡσαύτως δέ καὶ ἐντραφῆναι. τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς νομιστέον. Von der Muchll would retain the words from *τὸν αὐτὸν δέ*, supposing them to be the beginning of a section dealing with animal and plant life.

VIII. THE DEVELOPMENT OF CIVILIZATION AND THE ORIGIN OF LANGUAGE.

Another rather sudden transition. From the consideration of the κόσμοι in general Epicurus passes to our earth and the development of civilization among men

§ 75. (1) In the first sentence he announces his general theory that surrounding circumstances first compelled men to certain actions or that nature gave them an example these actions they subsequently developed by deliberate reflection leading to improvements and new inventions. The whole idea is elaborated at great length and with many examples by Lucretius (v 925-1457): we may notice especially the passages in which he explains that lightning taught men the use of fire (1091-1104), and the action of the sun the melting and moulding of metals (1241-1280).

1. *ὑποληπτέον*. We may perhaps notice the less forcible word than the usual *νομιστέον* this is not a matter of ‘faith’, of immediate deduction from the main Epicurean principles, but a conjecture as to probable occurrence at the same time we may observe the regular Epicurean progress from *αἰσθησις* to *λογισμός*.

τὴν φύσιν. not here ‘nature’ in general, but ‘human nature’, and so throughout this section: perhaps ‘their nature’ would more exactly represent it. compare phrases like *ἡ τῆς ψυχῆς φύσις* and Lucretius’ usage of *natura* in such places as ii. 17

2. *διδαχθῆναι τε καὶ ἀναγκασθῆναι* · the distinction is clear. some

things, e.g. the clothing of their bodies to avoid cold they were compelled to do. others, like the lighting of fire, they learnt from the example of natural phenomena

3. *ἕτερον*: καὶ ὕτερον MSS., but it is not easy to make sense of καὶ (perhaps 'later again', like the καὶ ἐλάττους below), and we may follow Usener in excluding it.

5. ἐν μὲν τισὶ περιόδοις. ἐλάττους. A corrupt and very difficult clause, of which I do not think that the solution has yet been discovered.

(1) Usener emends ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀπείρου το ἀποτομὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀπείρου and then excludes it as a gloss, probably originally part of the scholium on § 74 2—a very arbitrary proceeding, such as Usener has taken in other places (cf. § 62). He then supposes a lacuna which would have contained something like μεῖζους λαμβάνειν ἐπιδόσεις, 'in certain epochs and at certain times it made greater progress at others again less'. This makes admirable sense, and is indeed what one would expect Epicurus to say, but the text can hardly be treated with such violence.

(2) Bignone would retain the words ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀπείρου, and with great ingenuity compares K. Δ xiii τῶν ἄνωθεν ὑπόπτων καθεστώτων καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ γῆς καὶ ἀπλῶς τῶν ἐν τῷ ἀπείρῳ τὰ ἐν τῷ ἀπείρῳ, he argues, were the chief cause of fear in the early history of man, and one of the main marks of progress would be liberation from them. He would therefore suppose the sentence to have run ἐν μὲν τισὶ περιόδοις καὶ χρόνοις ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀπείρου (φόβων μεῖζους παρασκευάζεσθαι λύσεις), ἐν δὲ τισὶ καὶ ἐλάττους, 'and that in certain epochs and at certain times it provided greater liberation from the fears resulting from the infinite, at others again less'. But (1) the suggestion is grammatically improbable: (a) K. Δ. xii τὸ φοβούμενον λύειν shows that Epicurus would have written τῶν φόβων λύσεις and not ἀπὸ τῶν φόβων, (b) it would surely have been τῶν ἐκ τοῦ ἀπείρου φόβων, (c) could one speak of a μεῖζων or ἐλάττων λύσις? (2) The early part of this section is meant to lead up to the discussion of language, and it is improbable that Epicurus would have introduced a reference to superstitious fears which, however important, are irrelevant.

I think the sense must have been something simple on Usener's lines, but I do not yet see how to deal with the words ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀπείρου, which seem to be quite genuine.

(2) *The origin of language* In the second part of the section Epicurus passes to the particular question of the origin of language. His theory is subtle and carefully worked out and should be noted particularly, as later Epicurean tradition, especially as represented in Lucretius (v. 1028-1090), only imperfectly preserved it. (Giussani's essay, vol. i, pp. 267-284, is very illuminating and important.) There was always a question in antiquity whether language originated φύσει or θέσει. Epicurus' answer is twofold. Approaching the question as a problem in the actual history of primitive man, he maintains that

language in its earliest stage was developed φύσις: it was a natural emission of sounds corresponding to emotions and impressions received. Later, in the stage that corresponds to that of λογισμός above, it was regulated, developed, and extended deliberately (θέσει). Lastly, as new things and new ideas were introduced, names were found for them partly by natural imitation or suggestion, partly by deliberate invention or analogy. His speculation is singularly acute and should be reckoned among his best contributions to anthropology—a subject on which Epicureanism was notably successful in its conjectures.

7. *δέ δρχῆς μὴ θέσει*. closely and emphatically together, ‘in origin names were not deliberately imposed’.

8. *καθ' ἔκαστα ἔθνη*. . . *φαντάσματα*: this curious idea that the emotions and impressions of different races were actually different is a weakness in Epicurus' theory, but is to be accounted for, as we have seen, by his conception of the brevity of the whole process

9. *τὸν δέρα ἐκπέμπειν*. for the physical process of the uttering of sounds, from which Epicurus derives this very literal expression, cf. §§ 52, 53.

10. *στελλόμενον*, ‘formed’, ‘shaped’, cf. *σχηματίζεσθαι* in the parallel context, § 53.

12. *εἴη* of the MSS may be retained, as it might be on each occasion, though Usener's *ἡ* would produce a more normal construction after *ώς ἄν*.

§ 76 1. *κοινῶς*, ‘by common action’, or almost ‘common consent’, a very strong expression of the deliberate nature of the process of the second stage.

3. *ἀλλήλοις, ἀλλήλαις* MSS : a very good correction of Meibom.

οὖσι συνορώμενα πράγματα, ‘things previously unseen’, i.e. those either introduced from foreign tribes or invented for the first time. Surely not ‘tried to introduce the notion of things not visible’ (Hicks).

5. *τοὺς (μὲν) ἀναγκασθέντας ἀναφωνῆσαι*, ‘being constrained by necessity to utter some of the sounds’. The MSS have *τοὺς* alone, which Usener omits taking *ἀναγκασθέντας ἀναφωνῆσαι* with the whole clause, and assuming that here again ἀνάγκη was always the cause. In that case it must apply also to the second clause *τοὺς δὲ τῷ λογισμῷ ἐλομένους*, and if so, it would be better, as Giussani points out, to adopt Schneider's conjecture *ἐπομένους*: there was a necessity even in obeying the dictates of reason. I greatly prefer, however, as does Bignone, to follow Schneider here in inserting *μέν*. In the introduction of new words at this stage both the causes ἀνάγκη (or φύσις) and θέσις work side by side e.g. when a foreign thing was brought in, ἀνάγκη would compel the imitation of its foreign name, when a new thing was invented, it would be given a new name θέσει.

6. *τοὺς δὲ . . . ἐλομένους*. . . *οὕτως ἐρμηνεῦσαι*: as so often in Epicurus (e.g. § 71. 9) the construction breaks off into a main clause, ‘and some names they chose by reasoning and thus expressed their

meaning'. Bignone, anxious to preserve the exact parallelism, would construct ἔρμηνεῦσαι after *aἰτίαν* this is doubtful Greek, and it would be better, if strict syntax is required, to read (*τοῦ*) οὐτῶς ἔρμηνεῦσαι but Epicurus' laxness in these matters makes it unnecessary.

κατὰ τὴν πλείστην αἰτίαν: cf. *κατὰ τὴν πλείστην δύματαν*, § 67. 2, and *κατὰ τὴν πλείστην φοράν*, § 70. 3, 'in accordance with the usual cause', i.e. the usual method of formation in such cases, sc. normally analogy. I agree with Giussani and Bignone that there is no reason to suppose with Usener that *aἰτίαν* is corrupt: the suggestion in his note, *φαντασίαν*, is quite unnecessary.

X CELESTIAL PHENOMENA

Epicurus passes from the earth and its inhabitants to a new department of inquiry. There is in this letter no full exposition of the nature or causes of celestial phenomena, as there is in the letter to Pythocles, but only a careful and elaborate precaution against the theological view of their creation and government, and a statement of the attitude which the true Epicurean should take up and the lines of study which he should pursue.

(1) In the first section (§§ 76, 77) he protests against two distinct forms of the belief in the divine character of celestial phenomena. We must not believe either that the motions of the heavenly bodies are controlled by any divine being (for that is inconsistent with our belief in the untroubled blessedness of the divine nature), nor again must we suppose that the heavenly bodies are themselves divine, for they are merely material atomic conglomerations. We must be careful not to derogate from our idea of the majesty of the divine nature. All is, on the contrary, due to regular atomic motion proceeding directly from the development of the original congeries into a world. For the general idea we may compare Lucretius v. 78-90.

8 (*καὶ τὴν*) a necessary addition of Usener's, vouched for by the opening of almost every section of the letter.

ἐν τοῖς μετεώροις· τὰ μετέωρα are for Epicurus celestial phenomena in general, including besides the action of the heavenly bodies also the phenomena of weather.

φοράν the normal course of the heavenly bodies in the sky compare Ep. II, § 92, and Lucr. v. 509-533.

τροπήν. regularly used of the 'turning' of the course of the sun at the tropics (*τροπαῖ*) compare Ep. II, § 93, and Lucr. v. 614-649. here also probably of other heavenly bodies as well.

9 *ἐκλειψίν* the 'eclipses' of sun and moon cf. Ep. II, § 96, and Lucr. v. 751-770.

ἀνατολὴν καὶ δύσιν cf. Ep. II, § 92, and Lucr. v. 650-655.

τὰ σύστοιχα τούτοις, 'questions in the same category as these', such, for instance, as the origin of the moon's light, the equinoxes, the size

of sun and moon, which are dealt with in the parallel passages of the second Epistle and Lucretius v.

10. **λειτουργοῦντος τίνος**: the first of the false explanations of popular mythology, that the movements of the heavenly bodies are controlled by some divine being, who either has ordered them once for all or continues to do so.

11. **διατάξαντος**: the majority of the MSS. read the fut. participle **διατάξοντος**, which Usener has placed in his text. But the distinction must be between the two ideas about the Supreme Being, (1) that he continues to control the revolutions, &c., of the heavenly bodies, (2) that at the Creation he set them once for all on a course which they then pursue automatically. We should therefore adopt the aorist participle from GHZ

§ 77. 1. οὐ γὰρ συμφωνοῦσι . . . the idea of such labours is inconsistent with the life of tranquillity which we attribute to the gods and regard as an essential in the conception of blessedness: compare Κύριαι Δόξαι i. Lucretius argues in the same way v. 82 ff.

3. μήτε αὖ πῦρ ἄμα ὄντα συνεστραμμένον . . . : the second of the false explanations, that the heavenly bodies are themselves divine beings, who voluntarily take upon themselves these recurrent motions. The MSS. here show signs of corruption, but there seems no reason for abandoning the text to which they point πῦρ ἄμα ὄντα συνεστραμμένον, 'as they are only aggregations of fire'. Usener, following up a suggestion of M. Casaubon, emends very ingeniously to πυρὸς ἀνάμμata συνεστραμμένουν, 'rekindlings of fire gathered together', in allusion to Herachitus' famous theory of the ἡλίου ἀνάμμα, that the sun was extinguished every night and rekindled in the morning by a fresh gathering of fire. This is quite gratuitous and indeed improbable, as Epicurus did not regard Herachitus' theory with much favour and is therefore not likely to have placed it here as his only statement of the nature of the heavenly bodies. Moreover, συνεστραμμένον is a clear reference to the συστροφαῖ at the creation of the world to which he refers below, l. 7

5. κατὰ βούλησιν, 'of their deliberate choice'

6. τὸ σέμνωμα. the idea of divine majesty (in perfect tranquillity and blessedness) which we attribute to the divine beings.

κατὰ πάντα δύναμata φερόμενa sc not only the titles and epithets which we apply to the divine beings, but also in all statements which we make about them. Both the ideas stated above are really a degradation of the idea of the divine majesty, because they attribute πραγματεία to the divine beings. The φερόμενa of the MSS. makes quite good sense, and there is no need to follow Usener in reading φερόμενον with σέμνωμa.

τὰς τοιαύτας ἐννοίας . i. e. the conceptions of tranquillity, peace, blessedness, absence of care, &c., which we attribute to the gods.

7. Ίνα μηδ'. it seems necessary to adopt this emendation of Usener's for the MS. έὰν μηδ'. It is true that Epicurus likes putting an important

point in a subordinate conditional clause (cf. § 62. 5 *εἰ μὴ ἐφ' ἔνα . . .*), but we can hardly take it so here: we must keep the idea of *σέμνωμα* pure, in order that our opinions may not be contradictory. *ἐὰν μηδὲν ὑπενάντιον . . . δόξῃ*, Meibom's conjecture, which is adopted by von der Muehll, seems an unnecessarily large departure from the tradition.

γένωνται another necessary addition; the clause must have a verb

8. *εἰ δὲ μή*, 'otherwise', 'if we do not preserve the *σέμνωμα*'.

τὸν μέγιστον τάραχον compare a striking parallel to the general idea in *Lucr. vi. 68-78*.

10. *κατὰ* once again has become *καί* in the MSS.

τὰς ἔξι ἀρχῆς ἐναπολήψεις τῶν συστροφῶν: a slightly different idea of the *συστροφαῖ* to that in § 73. 10. There they are the great agglomerations, each of which ultimately resolves itself into a world, here smaller agglomerations 'caught up' within the larger one, and ultimately forming into sun, moon, or star.

11. *τὴν ἀνάγκην ταύτην καὶ περίσσον* should be taken closely together, almost as a hendiadys, 'this necessary revolution', so 'the law of their revolution'.

§ 78 (2) Human knowledge and happiness Epicurus turns from the divine aspect to the human aspect. Just as it is an insult to the divine majesty of the gods to attribute to them the control of the affairs of the world, since it would be a disturbance to their eternal repose, so an accurate knowledge about the nature of these things is an essential for human happiness, as it removes those fears which arise as long as we believe celestial phenomena to be due to the arbitrary action of divine powers. Moreover, in the acquisition of this knowledge lies man's greatest happiness. But this is only true of the first essentials and the ultimate nature of things celestial. The details of celestial phenomena, the causes of risings and settings, eclipses, &c., cannot in themselves remove our fears nay, by the awe which they arouse, they may even increase them. Such knowledge in itself contributes nothing to human happiness, though in combination with the knowledge of the essentials it may go to increase it. In such particulars then we must not be disappointed if we are not able to fix on some one cause as the sole cause the phenomena may be produced in several ways, or we may not be able to say for certain which of several causes is the one which operates in our world. But as regards the ultimate nature of *τὰ μετέωρα* we must be certain. The introductory paragraphs of the second letter should be compared, and the whole of Lucretius' astronomical section (v. 509-770) affords constant illustrations of the principles.

1. (*τὸ*). again a necessary addition of Usener the article with the infinitive seems specially liable to be lost. cf. §§ 47^a 3, 57 10.

τῶν κυριωτάτων, 'the essential facts', i.e. the comprehension of the divine nature and the knowledge that celestial phenomena are not produced by it. Cf. § 35. 6, where the word is used in a broader sense

2. *φυσιολογίας*, 'the science of *φύσεις*', of the underlying structure

and character of things: compare Lucretius' *rerum natura*. It is contrasted here with *ἱστορία* (§ 79. 2), the inquiry into details of special phenomena.

τὸ μακάριον. of course here 'human happiness': compare below, § 80 2 τὸ . . μακάριον ἡμῶν. The peace of mind (*ἀραραξία*) which arises from the comprehension of the fundamental principles given to man, the nearest approach to the blessed life of the gods.

3. ἐν τῇ περὶ μετεώρων γνώσει: there seems no reason to follow Usener in excluding these words as a gloss.

ἐνταῦθα: Usener's suggestion that (τε) should be added seems unnecessary καὶ ἐν τῷ . . . is appended as an afterthought.

4 τίνες: the τινάς of the MSS. is a mere mistake.

5. συγγενῆ πρὸς τὴν εἰς τοῦτο ἀκρίβειαν, 'have an affinity to accurate knowledge for this purpose', i.e. to the knowledge requisite for human happiness (τοῦτο is τὸ μακάριον, as Usener points out in his note) συγγενῆ is quite natural and Usener's alteration to συντείνει gratuitous so Bignone.

τὸ πλεοναχῶς, 'that which may happen in several ways', e.g. as Epicurus believes, eclipses or the waxing and waning of the moon; see Lucr. v. 705 ff., 751 ff.

6. ἐν τοῖς τούτοις: sc. the knowledge of the ultimate nature of celestial things, in which alternative causes have no place: there is here one final certainty.

τὸ ἐνδεχόμενον καὶ ἄλλως πῶς ἔχειν, 'that which can happen sometimes in one way, sometimes in another', e.g. thunder and lightning, see Lucr. vi 96 ff. Bignone retains the reading of the majority of the MSS. τὸ ἐνδεχομένων as parallel to τὸ πλεοναχῶς, but it seems an almost impossible formation.

8. τῶν . . . ὑποβαλλόντων, 'things which suggest uncertainty as to their real cause, or alarm because we do not understand their cause', i.e. phenomena of which there may be several explanations.

9. καὶ τοῦτο ἀπλῶς εἶναι, 'of this (sc. the nature of the celestial bodies and their independence of the gods) we can know that it is absolutely', i.e. when we have worked on atomic principles to the right explanation we can be perfectly certain of it.

§ 79. Epicurus now turns to the other side of the picture. The knowledge of detailed causes is not necessary for happiness, and indeed it may even increase our fears, unless we are acquainted with the ultimate nature of the heavenly bodies and the true causes of their movements.

1. τὸ δ' ἐν τῇ ἱστορίᾳ πεπτωκός: *ἱστορία* is the detailed investigation of particular causes as contrasted with *φυσιολογία*, which is the knowledge of the ultimate principles. The genitives τῆς δύσεως, &c., are connected with *ἱστορίᾳ*.

3. πρὸς τὸ μακάριον τῆς γνώσεως, 'for the blessedness which knowledge confers', a possessive genitive, a favourite device of Epicurus', as Bignone points out. Usener unnecessarily alters to τὰς γνώσεις,

which he then takes with $\tauῆς δύσεως$, &c., leaving $\tauὸ ἐν τῇ ιστορίᾳ πεπτωκός$ in suspense.

4. **ἀλλ' δμοίως . . προσγένεσαν ταῦτα**: as Bignone notes, Epicurus is probably thinking here of astrologers and other superstitious persons who, although they have observed the detailed movements of the heavenly bodies and may know something of their immediate causes, yet postulate a divine agency behind all and regard celestial phenomena as an indication of the divine will.

δμοίως goes with **καὶ εἰ μὴ προσγένεσαν ταῦτα**, ‘just as much as if they had not learnt these things’.

5. **κατιδόντας**, ‘when they have perceived them’ · Epicurus regards the knowledge of the detailed causes of celestial phenomena as a matter of observation rather than of reasoning. It is quite unnecessary to alter with Usener to **κατειδότας**.

7. **πλείους sc. φόβους ἔχειν**

9. **οἰκονομίαν**, ‘ordering’, ‘regulation’ a curiously personal word for Epicurus to use, when he is so carefully disclaiming personal agency.

διὸ δὴ καὶ πλείους . εύρισκωμεν. we must accept Usener’s correction for the **καὶ . . εύρισκομεν** of the MSS. In many such cases of detail Epicurus propounds several causes which are not contradicted by the evidence of the senses without deciding between them (see the second letter and *Lucr. v. 509-770 passim*) We must here be content with such uncertain knowledge, and it is all that is required for our happiness.

10. **τῶν τοιούτοτρόπων** an ingenious correction of Meibom’s for **τῶν τοιούτων τρόπων** (or **τροπῶν**) of the MSS. **τρόπων** could hardly be used in the sense of ‘occurrences’, and the corruption is probably due to the neighbourhood of **τροπῶν**.

11. **ώστε καὶ ἐν τοῖς κατὰ μέρος γινομένοις ἦν** i.e. in such investigations as are contained in the letter to Pythocles, which would be familiar to the more advanced disciples for whom the present letter was written. **ἦν** again seems a necessary correction of the MS. **ἢ** or **ἢ**

§ 80 1. **χρείαν**, ‘investigation’, ‘inquiry’

3. **ώστε παραθεωρούντας**. A practical conclusion. The right method of procedure in inquiring into the details of celestial phenomena is by the analogy of things within our experience on earth. We must investigate kindred phenomena there, and consider in how many different ways they might be produced, and then apply our conclusions to the heavenly bodies, which owing to their distance from us we never can investigate closely. And even though we think that one explanation is the right one, we must be prepared to recognize that there may be others, and not allow the discovery to disturb our peace of mind. This is a typically Epicurean conclusion, and a good instance might be found in Epicurus’ theory of eclipses (*Ep. ad Pyth.*, § 96, *Lucr. v. 751 ff.*). We consider in how many different ways the light on earth may be obscured. Then, though we think that the cause of the sun’s

eclipse is the passing of the moon between earth and sun, we are yet prepared to admit that it may be that some other body intervenes or that the sun's fires are temporarily damped.

παραθεωροῦντας: probably 'considering in comparison with' celestial phenomena.

5. **παντὸς τοῦ ἀδήλου**: *ἀδηλα* to Epicurus fell under two categories, phenomena like the celestial which are too far off for us to investigate, and those like the atoms and the atomic structure of things, which are below the ken of our senses. In both these cases we should reason from our experience of earthly things

τῶν οὐτε . . ἀταρακτῆσαι : sc. ordinary unphilosophic persons who do not investigate at all or distinguish between different classes of knowledge or realize the importance of their distinction.

οὐτε (τὸ), Gassendi's correction of the MS. *οὐδέ*, which is practically demanded by the corresponding *οὐτε τό*.

7. **(ἐπὶ τῶν) τὴν . παραδιδόντων**. I have adopted with some hesitation Bignone's correction of the clause, 'in the case of things which provide an impression of themselves from a distance', i.e. the first class of *ἀδηλα*, the celestial phenomena to which we can never get near enough to obtain an *ἐνάργημα*. Usener reads *τὴν τ' . . παριδόντων*, 'but neglect the impression made on us by phenomena at a distance' (Hicks), i.e. presumably, base their belief on *προσδοξαζόμενα* instead of considering the evidence of sensation, but the expression is forced, and his main point here is that in considering the heavenly bodies we cannot get sufficient evidence from the senses. I think it would, as a third course, be just possible to accept Usener's *τὴν τ'* and retain *παραδιδόντων*, 'but are content to hand on the traditional account based on the appearance of phenomena from a distance'; a description of the ordinary conventional man who is content with the first-sight appearance of celestial phenomena without reasoning by analogy and would be satisfied, e.g. to say that the sun passes round the earth without considering Heraclitus' theory that it is lit up afresh every day. But Bignone's restoration seems to bring the sentence nearer to Epicurus' general phraseology and to the particular drift of this passage.

9. **καὶ ὅδι πως**, 'in some such way as this'. if, that is, we think that we have reached an approximate explanation which is right, we must still be prepared to admit that there may be several explanations and must not be upset by that conclusion.

καὶ ἐφ' οἷοις δομοῖς ἔστιν ἀταρακτῆσαι, 'and that in circumstances where we may be equally at peace in mind', even if there are several explanations, i.e. in the consideration of the detailed causes of celestial phenomena. Usener omits both *καὶ* and *ἔστιν*, which is only the reading of GH. *ἔστιν* seems necessary to the construction, and I think *καὶ* may be retained. Bignone would read *καὶ (ἔχειν)* on the analogy of *τὸ μοναχῶς ἔχον ἡ γινόμενον*, l. 5, which may be the right solution.

ΙΟ αὐτὸς τὸ διτι πλεοναχῶς . ἀταρακτήσομεν. sc. our recognition

of the possible plurality of causes will not disturb our peace any more than if we knew that there was one approximate cause.

(3) *The causes of men's fears* At the end of this long discussion of τὰ μετέρωπα Epicurus swings round to the practical moral conclusion. The two chief causes of mental disturbance, the opposite of the ideal ἀταραξία, are firstly this belief that the heavenly bodies are divine beings, performing actions quite contrary to the divine nature, and secondly the fear of death, whether it be of punishment in another life, or of the annihilation of sensation as something felt by 'us'. Peace of mind, on the other hand, consists in the release from these fears. The argument of the whole section is quite straightforward, and is repeated in many passages by Lucretius, compare especially i. 80-135, iii 41-93, v 1194-1240.

§ 81 2 τάραχος Usener suggests the insertion of μέν to balance η δὲ ἀταραξία below, § 82. 1, but that clause may well be an after-thought.

3. ταῦτα sc. the heavenly bodies, of which he has been speaking in the preceding sections Von der Muehll's ταῦτά is ingenious but hardly necessary.

δοξάζειν Usener's addition (*εἶναι*) seems unnecessary. It can be supplied in thought.

4 τούτοις sc. τὸ μακάριον καὶ ἀφθαρτον, easily extracted from the previous clause Usener's 'correction' τούτῳ is no improvement.

5 αἰτίας: here 'motives', i.e. anger and favour compare § 77. 1 ff. δέι for καὶ, a good correction of Usener's

6. εἴτε καὶ αὐτήν . κατ' αὐτούς a new point Some men do not fear punishment in another life, but fear the annihilation of sensation as though it were something that would affect 'them'. but, as Epicurus would say, when the soul has once left the body and dissolved, 'they', who are a combination of soul and body, no longer exist compare Lutr. iii 838-842 and 870-893 καὶ αὐτήν is a good correction of Casaubon's for κατὰ ταῦτην the constant confusion of κατά and καὶ occurs again in the MSS just below, l. 7

8. δόξαις as the result of an inference of opinion from phenomena: cf the constant use of δοξάζειν and προσδοξάζειν.

ἀλόγω γέ τινι παραστάσει, 'an unreasoning presentation of a picture to the mind', 'imagination' not even grounded on an inference, however false, from phenomena Hicks translates 'an irrational perversity', but is there evidence for παράστασις in this sense?

9. μὴ δρίζοντας, 'not limiting', i.e. not knowing the limits of pain, which in the Epicurean system are set by the right comprehension of what man needs and the limits of his suffering, and the knowledge that the gods do not intervene in the world and that death is nothing to us

10. ὡς εἰ καὶ ἐδόξασον ταῦτα constructed in sense after οὐτην. With some hesitation I propose the substitution of ὡς for MS. τῶ (or τῷ).

Usener, keeping $\tau\hat{\omega}$, proposes the much more violent change, $\tau\hat{\omega}$ εἰκαῖς δοξάζοντι ταῦτα : but Epicurus would not have admitted that any one held these opinions εἰκαῖς. Hicks's translation 'than if we held these beliefs' seems to imply ως or η $\tau\hat{\omega}$ would give this sense too, but is very harsh.

§ 82. 2. τό . I can see no reason for following Usener in his alteration to $\tau\hat{\omega}$, with which presumably ἐν is to be supplied from the construction of the previous sentence : 'peace of mind is freedom from these fears and the recollection of the main principles'

(4) *Trust in the senses.* As the conclusion of the whole discussion which started from the consideration of celestial phenomena, Epicurus comes back to the position which he enunciated at the beginning of the letter. The only safe principle in life is always to trust to the direct evidence of our external sensations and our internal feelings. Inference from them ($\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$) may be false, and may lead, as he has shown, to conclusions which greatly militate against our peace of mind ; but the sensations are always true This is the ultimate basis of the whole Epicurean system, physical and moral, and forms a fitting conclusion to the argument of the letter

4. πάθεσι : all the MSS. have the curious mistake πᾶσι.

τοῖς παροῦσι, 'those present to us', so 'immediate'. see § 38. 5 τὰς παρούσας ἐπιβολάς.

5. κατὰ μὲν τὸ κοινὸν . . ταῖς ιδίαις Bignone has shown the meaning of this. We must trust the common sensations of mankind (Lucretius' *communis sensus*) when we are considering common experiences or wish to correct individual experiences of our own, which are due to the particular state of our organism (e.g. when fever warps our taste). We must, on the other hand, trust our individual sensations when we are considering matters on which we can pronounce judgement, e.g. our own feelings of pleasure or pain. K. Δ. xxxvi affords an interesting example, where Epicurus distinguishes τὸ δίκαιον which is κοινόν to all mankind, from that which is ιδιον to particular nations or peoples.

6. καθ' ἔκαστον τῶν κριτηρίων : sc the senses and feelings, the πρόληψις or general concept, and possibly also the ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας, which combines perceptions and concepts into ideas which have validity in the region of the ἀδηλα.

7. ἐναργείᾳ . the 'clear vision' or 'intuition', as usual

9. ἀπολύσομεν probably goes not with τὸ δίκεν ὁ τάραχος . but with ὅσα φοβεῖ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀνθρώπους.

10. τῶν δεὶ παρεμπιπτόντων, 'things that occur casually from time to time', i.e. sporadic as opposed to normal recurring phenomena.

Conclusion. The last paragraph of the letter returns to the ideas of the exordium. The advanced student, absorbed in the examination of details, must have a careful statement of the general principles always in his mind, to which he may constantly refer. This was the primary purpose of the present treatise, but it will also, as Epicurus

adds at the end, enable even those who cannot enter into details to obtain a 'bird's-eye view', which will be sufficient to secure their peace of mind (*γαληνισμός*). The language of this section should all through be compared with that of the exordium. The general drift is clear, but the text in several places uncertain.

11. *κεφαλαιωδέστατα* is apparently an adverb going with ἐπιτεμημένα, but there is a strong temptation to read (*τὰ*) *κεφαλαιωδέστατα*, 'the most important heads', which would give a better sense.

12. *τῶν δλων*, 'the general principles' or 'the system as a whole'. Cf. § 36. 10 *τῆς συνεχοῦς τῶν δλων περιοδείας*.

§ 83 1. *ἄντε οὐ γένοιτο οὗτος δλόγος δυνατὸς κατασχεθῆναι*, 'so that this account would be able to be comprehended'. The MSS. have *κατεσχέθη*, except that H writes *κατασχέθη*, which suggests *κατασχεθῆναι* as the obvious correction with this change the MS text can be kept. Usener, followed apparently by Bignone, places a full stop at ἐπιτεμημένα, changes *άντε γένοιτο* to *έὰν γένηται*, adopts δυνατὸς οὗτος δλόγος from F, *κατασχεθεῖς* from Gassendi, and places a comma at ἀκριβείας, 'so that, if this account becomes effective, being grasped accurately, I think . . .' This seems quite unnecessary, and the participle is a much less likely emendation of *κατεσχέθη* than the infinitive.

2. *οἶμαι*: a lapse into a rather more colloquial style quite consistent with the turn to the personal address to Herodotus

3. *ἀκριβωμάτων*: compare § 36. 6 *τοῦ παντὸς ἀκριβώματος*

4. *ἀνύμβλητον*, 'incomparable', going closely with *πρὸς τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀνθρώπους*. The man who knows the main principles will be in a far superior position as regards the fears which attack men. There is, I think, no reference to the *ἀσφάλεια* ἔξ *ἀνθρώπων* of K. Δ *καὶ* and *κιν*

ἀδρότητα, 'ripeness', 'strength' a Homeric word which reappears in later Greek as a technical term of rhetoric

5. *καθαρά*, 'free from difficulties', 'clear', an unusual word for Epicurus

6. *κατὰ τὴν δλην πραγματείαν* compare *τὸν τύπον τῆς δλης πραγματείας*, § 35. 8.

7. *Βοηθήσει*. compare *βοηθεῖν αὐτοῖς δύνωνται*, § 35. 6.

8. *(καὶ τά)*. again lost by 'haplography' before *κατά*.

9. *ἴκανῶς ή καὶ τελείως*, 'sufficiently for practical purposes or even with scientific completeness'.

10. *ἐπιβολάς*. again in the semi-technical sense in which it appears in the exordium. 'acts of apprehension', so 'survey', almost 'principles'. Cf. § 36. 3 *ἡ κυριωτάτη ἐπιβολή*

τῶν περιοδειῶν. Cf. *τῆς συνεχοῦς τῶν δλων περιοδείας*, § 36. 10

11. *ὅσοι δέ*. Epicurus reverts to the thought of 1. 3 even those who are not intending to go into the full details of the system can use it as an epitome to give them the general ideas, and so to secure their peace of mind.

τῶν ἀποτελουμένων, 'those who are being perfected', i.e. those who

work through the whole Epicurean system and so attain perfection. A word which would suggest initiation.

12. *εἰσὶν οἱ*, 'some', picking up and limiting *ὅσοι*. This seems the obvious correction of the MS. *εἰσὶν ἡ*, though its sense is not very convincing. Usener conjectures *ἴκανήν* (*ι* = *ε*) taking it with *πρὸς γαληνισμόν*: the sense would be good, but it seems a rather violent correction. Bignone reads *ὅση δὴ ἡ*, 'a hasty view in so far as it can be obtained by the method without oral instruction': again a rather violent change.

κατὰ τὸν ἄνευ φθόγγων τρόπον apparently 'by instruction and not orally', for most of the disciples learnt the doctrine from the Master in person. But it is a curious phrase, and there may be some corruption: you would expect him to say 'by the method without details'.

13. *ἄμα νοήματι*, 'quick as thought', 'hasty'. Here in an even more untechnical sense than when he applies it to atomic movement in § 61. 8.

πρὸς γαληνισμόν, 'for peace of mind' (*ἀταραξία*), which was the aim of the Epicurean, and to which the knowledge of the principles of φυσιολογία contributed the greatest part: cf. § 37 3 μάλιστα ἐγγαληνίζων τῷ βίῳ.

APPENDIX

On the meaning of *ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας*.

OF all the technical terms of the Epicurean philosophy none is nearly so obscure and elusive as *ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας*. We are confronted with it or its equivalent five¹ times in the Letter to Herodotus and once² in the *Kύριαι Δόξαι*; Diogenes³ further tells us that the 'Epicureans' added it to Epicurus' three criteria of truth: yet each fresh context seems at first only to shed further obscurity on its meaning. Nor can it be said that modern critics and historians of philosophy have for the most part assisted much towards its elucidation finding it in a prominent place in the Epicurean philosophy they have felt bound to give some equivalent for it, but most of them have been content to make wild guesses⁴ without, as it seems, any careful consideration of the contexts in which it occurs: yet the very divergence of these guesses shows how little the phrase conveys a direct indication of its meaning. Only two⁵ scholars, so far as I know, have made a really critical study of the subject, Tohte⁶ and Giussani,⁷ and they again differ widely in their conclusions. I should be loth to enter the discussion, but that I feel bound to justify the views assumed in the translation and commentary, and also believe that something may yet be said, which may help towards a solution.

It will be convenient, before entering the details of the discussion, to give in full the passages of Epicurus dealing with the subject, which will frequently be required for reference, and to state summarily the conclusions at which this note will arrive.

¹ §§ 38, 50, 51 (twice), 62.

² xxiv.

³ x 31 (*Vit.*).

⁴ We may instance Zeller, 'sensible impression', Überweg, 'intuitive apprehension of the understanding' (which is nearer to part of the right idea than most conjectures), Ritter and Preller, 'a form of *πρόληψις* not differing from images seen in delirium or sleep'; Steinhart, 'the free activity of the imagination'.

⁵ Brieger's contribution (*Lehre von der Seele*, pp. 19, 20) is so vague and uncritical that it does not really come into question, though, as will be seen, he has grasped one essential part of the full meaning. F. Merbach (*De Epicure Canonica*, pp. 28-35) has some interesting pages on the subject, in which he agrees in the main with Tohte, but does not touch the crucial difficulty of § 62 of the Letter to Herodotus.

⁶ *Epikurs Kriterien der Wahrheit*, pp. 20-24.

⁷ Lucretius, vol. i, pp. 171-182.

I. Letter to Herodotus :

A. § 38 ἔτι τε¹ κατὰ τὰς αἰσθήσεις δεῖ πάντα τηρεῖν καὶ ἀπλῶς (κατὰ) τὰς παρούσας ἐπιβολὰς εἴτε διανοίας εἴθ' ὅτου δίποτε τῶν κριτῆριν, ὁμάφως δὲ κατὰ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα πάθη, ὥπερ ἂν καὶ τὸ προσμένον καὶ τὸ ἄδηλον ἔχωμεν οὐς σημειωσόμεθα.

B. § 50 καὶ ἦν ἀν λάβωμεν φαντασίαν ἐπιβλητικῶς τῇ διανοίᾳ ἡ τοῖς αἰσθητηρίοις εἴτε μορφῆς εἴτε συμβεβηκότων, μορφή ἐστιν αὐτὴ τοῦ στεφεμένου, γινομένη κατὰ τὸ ἔξης πύκνωμα ἡ ἐγκατάλευμα τοῦ εἰδώλου.

C. § 51 ἡ τε γάρ ὁμοιότης τῶν φαντασμῶν οἷον εἰ¹ ἐν εἰκόνι λαμβανομένων ἡ καθ' ὑπνους γινομένων ἡ κατ' ἄλλας τινὰς ἐπιβολὰς τῆς διανοίας ἡ τῶν λοιπῶν κριτηρίων οὐν ἂν ποτε ὑπῆρχε τοῖς οὖσί τε καὶ ἀληθεῖς προσταγορευομένοις, εἰ μὴ ἦν τινα καὶ τοιαῦτα προσβαλλόμενα.

D. § 51 (immediately following the preceding) τὸ δὲ διημαρτημένον οὐκ ἂν ὑπῆρχεν, εἰ μὴ ἐλαμβάνομεν καὶ ἄλλην τινὰ κίνησιν ἐν ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς συνημμένην μὲν (τῇ φανταστικῇ ἐπιβολῇ),¹ διάληψιν δὲ ἔχουσαν.

E. § 62 ἐπεὶ τό γε θεωρούμενον πᾶν ἡ κατ' ἐπιβολὴν λαμβανόμενον τῇ διανοίᾳ ἀληθές ἐστιν.

II. Κύριαι Δόξαι χχιν εἴ τω' ἐκβαλεῖς ἀπλῶς αἰσθησιν καὶ μὴ διαιρήσεις τὸ δοξαζόμενον κατὰ¹ τὸ προσμένον καὶ τὸ παρὸν ἥδη κατὰ τὴν αἰσθησιν καὶ τὰ πάθη καὶ πάσαν φανταστικὴν ἐπιβολὴν τῆς διανοίας, συνταράξεις καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς αἰσθήσεις τῇ ματαίῳ δόξῃ, ὥστε τὸ κριτήριον ἀπαν ἐκβαλεῖς.

To these passages of Epicurus must be added two others of great importance :

Diog. Laert. x. 31 ἐν τοίνυν τῷ Κανόνι λέγων ἐστὶν δὲ Ἐπίκουρος κριτήρια τῆς ἀληθείας εἶναι τὰς αἰσθήσεις καὶ προλήψεις καὶ τὰ πάθη· οἱ δὲ Ἐπικούρειοι καὶ τὰς φανταστικὰς ἐπιβολὰς τῆς διανοίας.

Clem. Alex. Strom ii. 4, p. 157 (Usener, fr 255) πρόληψιν δὲ ἀποδιδώσων ἐπιβολὴν ἐπὶ τι ἐναργὲς καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐναργῆ τοῦ πράγματος ἐπίνοιαν.

Briefly put, the line of argument which I propose to pursue is as follows : (1) The natural meaning of ἐπιβολή used of operations of the senses or the mind is a 'projection upon', and so 'attention to', and, with the added notion of the result, 'apprehension' and even 'view'. (2) Epicurus in several of the crucial passages implies an ἐπιβολή of the senses, as 'apprehension' by 'looking' as opposed to passive seeing. (3) ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας corresponds exactly to this and means firstly (a), the immediate apprehension by an act of mental attention of certain subtle 'images', too fine to be apprehended by the senses, and, in particular, of the 'images' of divine beings: secondly (b), the immediate, or 'intuitive' apprehension of concepts,

¹ For the text see the notes on the passages

and in particular of the 'clear', i.e. self-evident concepts of scientific thought. With this preface, which may be of assistance in the course of a rather intricate and necessarily controversial argument, we may proceed to full discussion.

1. It was one of the cardinal principles of the *Canonica*¹ (§ 38) that words must be used in their first and obvious meaning, and though it may well seem to us at times that Epicurus has hardly succeeded in carrying out his principles, yet his intention suggests that the best starting-point for inquiry is to ask what is the natural meaning of the word ἐπιβολή. Proceeding from such literal usages as ἐπιβάλλειν τὰς χεῖρας it is natural to conclude that ἐπιβάλλειν (τὸν νοῦν or the like) will mean, like the commoner ἐπέχειν, 'to project the mind towards', 'to turn the attention to' an object. so Diod. Sic. xx. 43 has πρὸς οὐδὲν ἐπέβαλλε τὴν διάνοιαν, 'he paid no attention to anything'. In an absolute sense without the accusative we find τοῖς κοινοῖς πράγμασιν ἐπιβάλλειν in Plut. *Cic.* 4 as an equivalent of *rem publicam capessere*, and in a famous passage of St Mark xiv. 72 καὶ ἐπέβαλλων ἔκλαιε. The verb is used in this way in an Epicurean passage of some importance, Aet iv 8 10, p. 395 (Usener *fr* 317) Λεύκιππος Δημόκριτος Ἐπίκουρος τὴν αἰσθησιν καὶ τὴν νόησιν γίνεσθαι εἰδώλων ἔξωθεν προσώντων μηδενὶ γὰρ ἐπιβάλλειν μηδετέραν χωρὶς τοῦ πρωτόπιπτοντος εἰδώλου, and again in Iambl. *Protr.* 4. 56 ἡ ὄψις τοῖς ὄρατοῖς ἐπιβάλλει for the moment we will suspend the question of the exact sense in these rather technical places

ἐπιβολή, the substantive, should then mean 'a projection towards', 'attention to', and so with the added notion of the result of such attention, 'view' or 'apprehension'. the substantive is thus used by Clem. Alex. 644 ἐπιβολὴ τῆς ἀληθείας, a 'grasp' or 'apprehension' of the truth. The simple ἐπιβολή without further qualification occurs six times in the Letter to Herodotus. (1) In § 35 Epicurus is speaking of the reason for writing an epitome, τῆς γὰρ ἀθρόας ἐπιβολῆς πνκνὸν δεόμεθα, τῆς δὲ κατὰ μέρος οὐχ ὅμοιως, 'for we have frequent need of the general view of the system, but not so often of the detailed exposition'. (2) In § 83 again, summing up the uses of the Letter, he says that even those who are working out the system in detail will be able εἰς τὰς τοιάντας ἀναλύοντας ἐπιβολὰς τὰς πλείστας τῶν περιοδειῶν ὑπὲρ τῆς ὅλης φύσεως ποιεῖσθαι, 'to carry out the greater part of their investigations into the nature of the whole by conducting their analysis with reference to such a survey as this'. (3) With these two passages goes the earlier of two instances in § 36 βαδιστέον μὲν οὖν ἐπ' ἔκεινα καὶ συνεχῶς ἐν τῇ μνήμῃ τὸ τοσοῦτον ποιητέον, ἀφ' οὗ ἡ τε κυριωτάτη ἐπιβολὴ ἐπὶ τὰ πράγματα ἔσται, 'it is necessary to go back on the main principles and constantly to fix in one's memory enough to give one the most essential comprehension of the truth'. The meaning in these three passages is direct and clear. Slightly more technical are

¹ Ep. 1, § 38.

(4) § 69, where he is speaking of the properties (*συμβεβηκότα*) of compound things καὶ ἐπιβολὰς μὲν ἔχοντα *ἰδίας πάντα ταῦτα ἔστι καὶ διαλήψεις*, 'all these properties have their own peculiar means of being perceived and distinguished', and (5) § 70 καὶ ἐπιβολὰς δ' ἄν τινας . . . ἔκαστα προσαγορευθεῖν, 'as the result of certain acts of apprehension . . . they might each be given this name'. Here we are clearly approaching a more esoteric use, though still on the same lines, and the last passage, (6) § 36 τὸ ταῦς ἐπιβολαῖς ὀξέως δύνασθαι χρῆσθαι must wait for the results of the general discussion. Similarly the passage in Clement of Alexandria quoted above, in which it is stated that *πρόληψις* is an ἐπιβολὴ towards an ἐναργές, must be kept over for the present. ἐπιβολὴ then would appear to mean an 'act of attention', and so 'view' or 'apprehension'. Both Tohte and Giussani, however, believe that it has also in Epicurus the 'passive' or 'objective'¹ meaning of the 'impression' resulting from such an act of apprehension. It is true that there are close parallels in Epicurus' technical phraseology for this derivative passive sense: *αἴσθησις* is certainly used both for the act of sensation or perception and also for the passive sensation or perception received, and *πρόληψις*, which should strictly mean the 'act of anticipation' is never, I think, used in this sense by Epicurus,² but always of the 'general concept' or 'compound image', which is the basis of such an 'act of anticipation'. But, although it is sometimes possible that the passive sense rather than the active may be intended, it is never³ necessary, and its indiscriminate introduction has, I believe, done a good deal to confuse issues.

2. We may get much light on the meaning of ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας if we ask first whether Epicurus contemplates any other kind of ἐπιβολὴ besides that of the mind. The answer is not far to seek, though its importance seems not to have been sufficiently noticed.⁴ Epicurus clearly recognizes an ἐπιβολὴ of the senses. They are not (at any rate, not always) the merely passive recipients of an impression, but by an 'act of attention' they apprehend the images which are flowing in upon them: they 'look' or 'listen' as opposed to merely 'seeing' or 'hearing'. In that case it is clear that ἐπιβολὴ⁵ will be connected with the process of ἐπιμαρτύρησις, the close view of the *διάρρηγμα*, which is to check the rash inferences of *δόξα*, and tell us with certainty the true nature of the object. The passages in the Letter to

¹ Giussani, loc cit., p. 180.

² It seems, however, to be so used in the Epicurean passage from Clem. Alex. quoted above.

³ Except possibly in § 38.

⁴ Tohte remarks it (p. 21) and points out that it is in distinction from the ἐπιβολὴ of the senses that Epicurus speaks explicitly of ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας. So also does Merbach (pp. 31, 32). Giussani seems not to realize it at all, and is consequently driven to a very unnatural interpretation of some of the passages in which it is referred to.

⁵ This connexion, which seems to me both necessary and extremely important, has escaped both Tohte and Giussani.

Herodotus which mention or imply this ἐπιβολὴ of the senses are four in number, and it will be convenient to consider them in the order of their increasing difficulty.

B. § 50. The clearest and easiest of the passages is that in which Epicurus most emphatically and directly sums up his doctrine as to the value of ἐπιβολὴ in general. The idea here seems exactly to bear out what has been said. ‘The image which we obtain by an act of attenuation or apprehension on the part of the senses (we must leave out the mind for the moment) of the shape or property (e.g. the colour) of an object, is in fact its shape (or property).’ This is exactly the idea of ἐπιμαρτύρησις which Epicurus has just been expounding in the preceding context. Our first passive sensation of a distant object is ‘true’, for the image is a faithful representation of the successive ‘idols’, but it is not until we have ‘looked at’ the close, clear view ($\tauὸ παρόν$, $\tauὸ ἐναργές$), that we can be sure that the image exactly reproduces the shape and colour of the object. ἐπιβολὴ is required for the confirmation (or non-confirmation) of the δόξα founded on the original passive perception.

E. § 62, though a very different passage from the point of view of the ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας, strongly confirms this notion of the ἐπιβολὴ of the senses. Epicurus is considering the motion of the atoms in a moving compound body: by ‘looking’ we perceive that the motion of a whole body is the sum of the motions of all its perceptible parts in the same direction as the whole (e.g. an army). δόξα applies this analogy to the motion of the atomic parts of a moving body and infers that it will be the same, whereas ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας shows that it is different. Here $\tauὸ θεωρούμενον$ (what is seen by ‘looking’ as opposed to $\tauὸ ὅρώμενον$) is clearly equivalent in sense to $\tauὸ ἐπιβλητικῶς λαμβανόμενον$, $\tauοῖς αἰσθητηρίοις$ in B, and the general idea is the same as in the previous passage. The ἐπιβολὴ of the senses gives us the certain image of a σύμπτωμα (in this case movement) of a στερέμυνον.

We are now in a position to deal with the other two passages, where the sense is slightly more obscure.

A. § 38 After speaking of the necessity for keeping the terminology of our investigations in exact correspondence with the ideas which it represents, Epicurus proceeds to consider the methods of investigation. For clearness’ sake we may extract the words which refer to the ἐπιβολὴ of the senses: κατὰ τὰς αἰσθήσεις δεῖ πάντα τηρεῖν καὶ ἀπλῶς (κατὰ) τὰς παρούσας ἐπιβολὰς . . . ὅτου δήποτε τῶν κριτηρίων, . . . ὅπως ἀν . . . τὸ προσμένον . . . ἔχωμεν οἷς σημειωσόμεθα: ‘in order that we may have certain indications by which to judge the image awaiting confirmation (i.e. the original image of the distant object), we must keep everything under the control of the senses (i.e. free from the additions of δόξα), and in particular of the close apprehension ($\tauὸ παρόν$ ἡδη κατὰ τὴν αἴσθησιν, cf. K. Δ. xxiv) of any of the standards of judgement’. The

*κριτήρια*¹ here are clearly the individual *senses*, sight, hearing, &c., the *αἰσθητήρια* of B, which are indeed *κριτήρια* because they are the instruments of *αἰσθησίς*: the expression is a little loose, but the meaning in view of the parallel passages quite unmistakable. The general notion of the passage is then exactly the same as that of the two preceding quotations, but it is much more clearly and elaborately stated. The *ἐπιβολή* of the senses, the *προσμένον* and the process of *ἐπιμαρτύρησις* are all brought into close connexion. The all-important matter for scientific investigation in the region of perception is the pure sensation, and in particular the observation of phenomena in the close view, which will give us the certainty that the sense-image corresponds to objective reality.

C. § 51. Epicurus is here arguing for the exact resemblance of the sense-images to the objects from which the 'idols' emanate. Extracting again the portions relating to the *ἐπιβολή* of the senses, we get: ἡ τε γάρ ὁμοιότης τῶν φαντασμῶν οἷον εἴ ἐν εἰκόνι λαμβανομένων . . . κατὰ τὰς ἐπιβολὰς τῶν λοιπῶν κριτηρίων οὐκ ἀν ποτε ὑπῆρχε τοῖς οὖσι τε καὶ ἀληθέσι προσαγορευομένοις, εἴ μὴ ἦν τινα καὶ τοιάτα προσβαλλόμενα, 'unless "idols" came to us, which are exact reproductions of the object, we could not be certain of the exact resemblance of the images obtained by the "apprehensions" of the senses', that is, the images seen by observation in the nearer view. The expression, as far as concerns the *ἐπιβολή* of the senses, is exactly parallel to what we have already met: the present passage adds no new ideas, but once more confirms our conclusion.

There is now no difficulty in interpreting the phrase of Iamblichus, which was noted on p. 261. ἡ ὄψις τοῖς ὄφασις *ἐπιβάλλει* expresses clearly enough the act of *ἐπιβολή* on the part of the sense of sight in immediate relation to its own peculiar object, visible things. Before leaving the *ἐπιβολή* of the senses, we may notice that the whole notion of the act of attention on the part of the senses and the resulting apprehension is clearly brought out by Lucretius iv. 807-810 (as an illustration of similar 'attention' on the part of the mind).

nonne vides oculos etiam, cum tenvia quae sunt
cernere coeperunt, contendere se atque parare,
nec sine eo fieri posse ut cernamus acute?

The ideas of the *ἐπιβολή* and the 'clear view' could hardly be expressed more accurately.

3 (a). It is now time to pass to the consideration of the *ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας*, and it is clear that the first question to be asked is whether

¹ Giussani (p. 177), not realizing the *ἐπιβολή* of the senses, takes *κριτήρια* here to be 'signs' (*σημεῖα* as Epicurus ordinarily calls them), and, since he naturally feels that 'signs' could not be standards of reference, does not insert *κατὰ*, but leaves the *ἐπιβολαῖ* both of the mind and of the *κριτήρια* subordinate to *αἰσθησίς* in general: but apart from all other objections (see notes on the passage) the parallel of § 51 makes this impossible.

there is any act performed by the mind in Epicurus' psychology which is analogous to the apprehension of an image by an act of attention on the part of the senses? We are at once reminded of course of the very subtle 'idols' which, being too fine to be perceived by the senses, pass on into the mind and are there immediately apprehended by it, the images seen in sleep, the visions of dead persons, above all the 'images' of the gods. In these cases there seems to be a very close parallel: the act of apprehension by the mind is, as it were, a kind of subtle sense-perception, and moreover we are informed by Lucretius¹ that such images are so fine, that, even when they have penetrated to the mind, they cannot be perceived by it except by a special act of attention, so that we see them most often in sleep, when the senses are dormant and the mind is undisturbed. This seems to be exactly what we should expect of the ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας, the perception of what is really a sense-image by an act of attention on the part of the mind. It is necessary to see how this notion tallies with the passages in Epicurus: it will again be convenient to take them in the order which will most naturally develop the idea.

D § 51, the passage in which Epicurus is arguing for the exact correspondence of the sense-images to the object from which they come. We are now concerned with the list of 'images' whose likeness is guaranteed by that of the idols. They are 'the images perceived as a kind of likeness (i.e. the normal images of sensation) or those occurring in sleep, or owing to any of the other apprehensions of the mind . . .' It would be impossible to have clearer confirmation than this: the images of sleep are perceived by one kind of ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας, and there are others (such as the images of the gods and the visions of the dead) perceived by other similar ἐπιβολαι. All of these, just like the sense-images perceived by the ἐπιβολαι τῶν αἰσθητηριῶν, require as the guarantee of their truth the correspondence of 'idols' to object.

B § 50. 'Any image which we obtain by an act of apprehension on the part of the mind . . . whether it is of shape or quality, is (i.e. exactly represents) the shape (or quality) of the object.' Is this true of our present notion of the ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας? It certainly is true of the images of the gods, for they are formed by a succession of 'idols' which come directly from the divine beings to the mind: the 'idol' is that which was once the 'body' of the god. It is equally true of visions of the dead, for again they are caused by 'idols' which came from their bodies when alive. But there are certain other kinds of images similarly perceived by the mind, which cannot here be passed over, for example, the συντάσσεις, the strange, grotesque, compound images which form themselves in the air, and the visions of delirium. In neither of these cases does the 'image' correspond to an external reality. Epicurus saved himself in such cases by arguing that

¹ Compare iv. 757-776 with 800-815.

the image is 'true', because it corresponds to the 'idols', and¹ it is a mistaken inference of δόξα to assume that the 'idols' in their turn represent actual realities. But it would perhaps be the truest account of the case to say that Epicurus is in the present passage thinking primarily of the other kinds of 'mental apprehensions', and in particular, as Tohte² believes he usually is, of the images of the gods. At any rate this passage again is a strong confirmation of the present view.

A. § 38 contains nothing which is inconsistent with this interpretation. The objects known to us by this mode of cognition, the immediate apprehension by the mind, are necessarily ἀδηλα, because they are imperceptible by the sense-organs. Selecting then the portion of the aphorism which concerns us, we get the principle 'in order that we may have standards by which to judge the imperceptible, we must keep all under the control of the senses, and in particular of the close apprehension of the mind'. This suits well enough with our present idea, but seems to suggest that it is not yet complete. for there seems nothing in the perception by the mind of the subtle images to correspond to 'a judgement on the imperceptible by means of the close view', or at any rate to get it we should have to press facts a little. Here then there is no contradiction of our present position, but a distinct hint for the first time that the ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας covers something more.

D. § 51 and E. § 62 must still be left aside for the present, but we are now in a position to consider the reference in Κύριαι Δόξαι xxiv, and it will be seen to sum up admirably the account at present given of the ἐπιβολαὶ both of the senses and of the mind. In xxiii, which is closely connected with it, Epicurus has said 'if you reject all sensations, you will have no standard by which to judge even those which you say are false'. In xxiv he pushes his argument still farther: 'if you reject any single sensation and fail to distinguish between the conclusion of opinion as to the appearance awaiting confirmation on the one hand, and on the other the close view made by sense-perception or feeling, or every kind of mental apprehension of an image, you will confound all other sensations as well by your groundless opinion, so that you will lose all standard of judgement'. This agrees excellently with what has been said: alike in cases of sense-perception and mental apprehension we must respect the validity of every sensation and attend to the close view, carefully distinguishing between the vague image of the indistinct view and the clear vision obtained by an act of apprehension. But here once again there is a suggestion of something more in the ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας than we have yet discovered: how does it obtain a clear vision in contrast to an image awaiting confirmation? and what is

¹ Sex. Emp. *adv. Math.* viii 63 (Usener 253) ή μὲν αἰσθησις ὑπ' εἰδώλων κινουμένη δηλητὴ τὸν (ὑπέκειτο γάρ τὸ εἰδῶλο), δὲ νοῦς οἴδηνος ὅτι στερέματοι εἰσιν Ἐρίνες (he is taking the case of Orestes) ἐψευδόδέει.

² Op. cit., p. 23.

meant by 'every ἐπιβολή of the mind'? Surely something more than the apprehension of the various kinds of subtle image.

So far we have concluded that the ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας is a 'mental apprehension of an image perceived directly by the mind without the intervention of the senses', and we might naturally suppose that Epicurus insisted on its truth and, even if he did not quite class it as a *κριτήριον*,¹ yet named it so frequently among the *κριτήρια*, mainly in order to support his theological contention that our mental vision of the forms of the gods is evidence of their existence. This is in effect the view of Tohte, except that he leans (unnecessarily, as I think) to the passive interpretation, and would speak of the ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας as an 'impression received by the apprehension of the mind'. And if this were all the evidence we had, we might be content with his explanation. But it has already been noted that this view does not seem to cover the full meaning required either in A. § 38 or in K. Δ. xxiv. we have, moreover, been compelled at present to leave over D. § 51, as there seems nothing in what has been said to explain it, and an examination of E. § 62 in its context will show at once that it can have nothing whatever to do with the mental apprehension of subtle images. If a complete explanation of ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας is to be discovered, it will be necessary to make further inquiry.

3 (b) We must ask then, can the ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας grasp or apprehend anything else besides these subtle images, exactly analogous to the images of normal sense-perception? At this point the passage quoted above² from Clement of Alexandria becomes of crucial importance 'Epicurus', he says, 'explains "anticipation" as an apprehension of something clear or of the clear thought-image of the thing.' Now from our knowledge of the nature of πρόληψις this is not difficult to explain the 'act of anticipation'—for πρόληψις³ is here used, contrary to Epicurus' usual custom, in an active sense—is the apprehension of the general or compound image, made up of many individual sense-images. This 'apprehension' must be mental—must be an ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας, for the general image can only be perceived by the mind and not by the senses, and what now is its object? Not a sense-image, nor anything analogous to it, but a concept. An ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας then can grasp a concept, and with this new notion in mind we may turn to the examination of the difficult passage in the Letter to Herodotus, which has been left over for consideration.

E. § 62. The particular question at issue in the context is What is the nature of the atomic motions in a compound body? 'We know', says Epicurus in effect, 'that the perceptible parts of a moving body are all moving in the same direction as the whole body: this is the truth guaranteed to us by an ἐπιβολὴ τῶν αἰσθητηρίων (*πὸ θεωρούμενον* is clearly that which is grasped by the senses when "looking" at the close view, i.e. by an ἐπιβολή). By analogy we apply the same idea in

¹ D. L. x. 31, quoted on p. 260

² p. 260.

³ See p. 262, n. 2

thought to be imperceptible atomic parts and suppose that they too are all moving in the same direction as the whole : this is the work of opinion (*δόξα*) combining images and forming what Epicurus would call technically an *ἐπίνοια κατ' ἀναλογίαν*. But we know as the result of scientific investigation that the atoms are really in a constant state of vibratory motion (*πάλσις*) in all directions, and this conclusion must be true as against our previous supposition, because it is obtained by an *ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας*. What does this mean ? how do we know this fact by an *ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας* and why is it therefore certainly true ? Giussani, largely on the strength of this passage, but influenced also by his general theories of the process of thought in Epicurus, has argued for a far wider sense of *ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας* than that proposed by Tohte. 'The *ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας* for Epicurus comprehends both what Tohte supposes, but not that alone, and *πρόληψις*, as Brieger wishes, but not it alone, and scientific concepts in general, including the concepts of those *ἄδηλα*—be they real or *conuncta* or *eventa*—which do not give off "idols". In fine the *ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας* is mental representation in general.'¹ The one fatal objection to this all-embracing view of the *ἐπιβολή* is to my mind just this passage (§ 62) on which it is based. Seeing that all mental operations, including *δόξα* itself, are carried on, according to Epicurus, by visualized images or 'mental representation', it is impossible that Epicurus could have said that 'everything that is grasped by mental representation is true'. Giussani went farther, I think, in this last clause than he really meant, and wished to distinguish the 'concepts of science' from the images formed by opinion, but that is just the crux of the whole matter.

Turn once more to the instance in § 62. We have a problem : What is the motion of the atoms in a moving compound body ? Two solutions are offered, one that they are all moving in the same direction as the whole, the other that they are moving in imperceptible little trajects in all directions. The former is the solution of opinion based on the analogy of the perceptible, and it is false : the latter is the solution of *ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας*, and it is true. Why ? What is the difference in process by which the two solutions are aimed at ? 'Opinion', Epicurus himself tells us—for we may now make use of D. § 51—'is a movement of the mind closely connected with the *ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας*, but distinct from it ?' What is the distinction ? Why is one liable to produce false results, while the other can only give us what is true ? If we could answer that question with certainty, we should have solved not merely the particular problem before us, but much of the difficulty of the Epicurean theory of knowledge. With some hesitation I venture to give an answer. So far what we know of *ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας* in the secondary sense is that it can apprehend concepts, as in *πρόληψις* (Clem. Alex.), and that its operation is in some way parallel to that of the *ἐπιβολὴ τῶν αἰσθητηρίων* in the

¹ Loc. cit., p. 179 *fin*

process of ἐπιμαρτύρησις (A. § 38 and K. Δ. xxiv). Let us attempt to apply these ideas to the problem of atomic motion. Δόξα frames the theory that the atoms in the moving compound all move in the direction of the whole body, as do the perceptible parts of the body. How is this theory to be tested? According to the ordinary rule of the *Canonica* in dealing with ἀδήλα by reference to the senses. But in this case, either the senses would give us no criterion of judgement, or, as in the case of celestial phenomena, several possible theories might meet with no ἀντιμαρτύρησις and be equally true. Scientific theory requires a greater accuracy than this, and as a matter of fact Epicurus does not test the δοξαζόμενον by reference to the senses, but by reference to an ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας. Scientific thought then about the ultimate realities is conducted on some different lines, and results in a 'one and only' truth. I suggest that in Epicurus' view the concepts of science are built up step by step by the juxtaposition (*σύνθεσις*) of previous concepts, each in their turn grasped as 'clear' or self-evident by the immediate apprehension of the mind (*ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας*). What is important here is to show that this conclusion is forced upon us by the passage in question. Epicurus refers the δοξαζόμενον not to the senses, but to 'that which is grasped by ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας'. What is it that is thus apprehended? Clearly the 'vision' or 'image' or 'concept' of the atoms still, even inside the moving compound body, themselves moving in every direction. And how is that vision (*ἐναργές*) formed? Clearly by the juxtaposition of the previous concept of the movement of free or uncompounded atoms (itself similarly formed by the apprehension of other 'clear visions' in juxtaposition) with the concept of atoms enclosed in a moving *άθροισμα*; such a juxtaposition can only make one new image or concept—only form one picture and not several alternative pictures—and that concept, because it is 'clear' or, as we might say, 'self-evident', is immediately or, as we should say, 'intuitively' apprehended by the attentive mind in an *ἐπιβολή*. And the moment that concept is apprehended, is seen to be true, we know that the previous δοξαζόμενον, founded on an arbitrary analogy, is false. Here then is an exact illustration of what I conceive to be Epicurus' idea of the process of scientific thought. Moreover, we now see that this process is in reality exactly parallel to the ἐπιμαρτύρησις. The δοξαζόμενον of thought is tested, just as is the δοξαζόμενον with regard to a sense-impression, by the apprehension—now mental—of a 'clear' image, seen, as it were, in the nearer view: that apprehension declares against the supposition of opinion, and at the same time, as the near view should, gives the one and only truth. Finally, it is now possible to say that the difference between opinion and mental apprehension is that whereas δόξα arbitrarily combines many kinds of concepts with each other or with the images of sense, ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας immediately apprehends a new concept as the necessary result of the combination of concepts, themselves similarly apprehended. ἐπιβολὴ τῆς

διανοίας then, as it plays its part in the highest mental operation of scientific thought, is the immediate 'apprehension by the mind of the concepts of scientific truth', which is conceived of as a chain of necessarily connected and self-evident visualizations.

It remains to test this idea by reference to the other passages in Epicurus.

B. § 50 deals solely with the form and qualities of *στερέμνια*. The secondary sense of *ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας* has no place here, and we may say confidently that Epicurus is thinking solely of the primary sense of the mental apprehension of 'subtle images'. C. § 51 is similarly concerned with the theory of 'idols'. Again the 'mental apprehension' involved there is solely the semi-sensational apprehension of the subtle images. But in A. § 38 the new conception supplies exactly the lack which was felt on the first examination of the passage. In it the parallel between the two kinds of *ἐπιβολή*, that of the senses and that of the mind, is very prominent, as also is the conception of the *προσμένον* and *ἐπιμαρτύρησις*. Including the second meaning of *ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας* it is possible to complete the parallel: *ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας* is a test by which to judge the *ἀδηλα*, not merely because some *ἀδηλα* give us direct mental impressions, but because by the process of the 'near view' of scientific concepts, hypotheses about the imperceptible may be tested and the truth 'clearly' perceived. The passage is given a fullness of meaning which was before notably lacking. Once again in K. Δ. xxiv the secondary sense is, though not perhaps so clearly, included. The *ἀπορούμενον* of scientific inquiry is, like the distant view, a *προσμένον* as opposed to it is the 'near view', *τὸ παρὸν ἥδη κατὰ τὴν ἐπιβολὴν τῆς διανοίας*. If these be not kept distinct, science, like everyday life, will be confounded with groundless opinion.

I do not of course wish to substitute this new conception of the *ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας* for that of Tohte, but to add it to it: 'mental apprehension' is of course concerned with the subtle images, but also with the concepts of science. If we now turn back to Giussani's summary, and exclude the rash generalization of the final clause, we shall see that it precisely represents the conclusion we have reached, only that we now know the reason for the inclusion of all its parts 'The *ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας* comprehends both what Tohte supposes (for there it is the immediate apprehension of an image perceptible only by the mind), but not that alone, and *πρόληψις*, as Brieger wishes (for the act of *πρόληψις* is again an immediate apprehension by the mind of an image that can exist only in the mind and is itself a criterion of truth), and (what Giussani wishes, but does not clearly express or explain) scientific concepts (for in their case *ἐπιβολή* is the act of apprehension in the nearer view of clear and self-evident concepts).' But *ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας* is not 'mental apprehension in general', for that would include also the operations of *δόξα*, which are liable to error. The result then of this long investigation is to confirm what

I believe Giussani really meant, only I hope that the process of investigation has put his theory on a firmer basis for parts of my argument I cannot, I fear, claim complete ἐπιμαρτύρησις in the authorities, but I fully believe there is no ἀντιμαρτύρησις; and as I may certainly claim that the whole subject is ἄδηλον, that is as much as can be demanded.

There remain over certain additional problems which are closely connected with the main question.

1. It is not difficult now to see that ἐπιβολαὶ in § 36 is used in a technical sense, but also in the widest possible meaning, including all ἐπιβολαὶ both of the *αἰσθητήρια* and of the *διάνοια*. ‘The most essential thing’, for a scientific inquirer, ‘is to be able to conduct acutely his acts of observation or apprehension, both with the senses and in the mind’. Similarly we can now say that the passage from Aetius quoted on p. 261 is technical, and concerns ἐπιβολαὶ both of the senses and of the mind.

2. It will be noticed that in some of the extracts¹ there is prefixed to ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας the epithet *φανταστική*. The question has often been raised whether the *φανταστικὴ ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας* differs from any other form of ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας, and if so, what the difference is. Both Tohte and Giussani, though for different reasons, deny the difference, Tohte because it is obvious that the only ἐπιβολὴ he conceives—the direct apprehension of the subtle images—is always necessarily *φανταστική*, Giussani because, since all thought is conducted by visual images, it is impossible to imagine an ἐπιβολὴ (or even a *δάξα*) which is not *φανταστική*. I should be inclined to agree in denying the difference, of course for Giussani’s reason, but I also think that in the passages where the epithet is used, Epicurus is thinking primarily of the ἐπιβολὴ of the subtle *φαντασία* of the gods, &c., and not of that of scientific concepts, for it is more obviously and immediately *φανταστική*.

3. A more difficult and important problem is the question why ‘the Epicureans’² made the *φανταστικὴ ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας* a criterion of truth, with its almost equally difficult corollary, why Epicurus, after his constant coupling of it with the other criteria, did not. I hope that the previous discussion has thrown some light on this point. In justice to ‘the Epicureans’ we must in the first place notice how exceedingly close Epicurus himself comes to calling it a criterion. In E. § 62 he affirms that the conclusions reached (or, as we should rather say, the images grasped) by ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας are always true: in B. § 50 he states similarly that the image of the form of a concrete object apprehended by ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας is in fact its form: in A. § 38 he speaks of the ἐπιβολαὶ ‘of the mind or of any of the *κριτήρια*’ (used here, as we have seen, in an active sense, of the *senses* which make the ἐπιβολαὶ, = *αἰσθητήρια*), and in C § 51 even

¹ §§ 31, 57 *fin.*, K. Δ xxiv.

² D. L. x. 31.

more explicitly of 'the ἐπιβολαι' of the mind or of the rest of the κριτήρια': finally in Κύριαι Δόξαι xxiv the φανταστικὴ ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας is ranked alongside with αἰσθησις and the πάθη. The cumulative impression of these passages is certainly that of a tacit acceptance of ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας as a κριτήριον, and one feels that 'the Epicureans' had but a very small step to take. Yet Epicurus never in so many words states that the ἐπιβολὴ is a κριτήριον of truth and his authoritative list of the κριτήρια does not contain it. Can we explain his reluctance to make this identification as contrasted with the Epicureans' apparent insistence upon it? I think I can give an answer. Epicurus did not include the ἐπιβολὴ¹ mainly, I believe, for two closely allied reasons · (1) that he felt uneasy about the 'truth' of certain of the images directly apprehended by the mind, about the visions, that is, of delirium, the συντάσσεις and some of the images of sleep, (2) that in spite of all his insistence on the truth of αἰσθησις, he felt similarly uneasy about the passive sensation, and in particular about the 'distant view'. In other words, to put these two difficulties together, Epicurus did not wish to raise in any form the question of 'truth' involved in the relation of the image, the 'idol' and the real object, for any such 'stirring of the mind' might have imperilled his whole system. There are plenty of similar indications of the same hesitation at different points in his psychology. On the other hand, where their Master feared to tread, the Epicureans rushed in and included the ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας² in the criteria. Their reasons were, I believe, somewhat as follows · (1) They strongly maintained the truth of the 'image' on the ground of its correspondence to the 'idols': it was then necessary to admit that the 'idol' of the 'distant view' (e.g. the small round tower) was untrue as a representation of the concrete object ἐπιμαρτύρησις and the 'near view' obtained by ἐπιβολὴ is then the only method of securing full truth, i.e. complete correspondence of object, 'idol' and image (2) Similarly in the region of thought the only method of distinguishing the certain concepts of science from the false hypotheses of δόξα, was by insistence on the truth of ideas obtained by ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας. (3) They were anxious (as Tohte has suggested) to maintain the certainty of the knowledge of the gods as obtained by the immediate mental apprehension of their images. The Epicureans had already been denounced on the ground of atheism, and it was necessary to rebut the charge.

4. In conclusion we must consider certain expressions in Latin

¹ Notice that all the passages in the Letter to Herodotus give us just as much justification for the inclusion of the ἐπιβολὴ of the senses as a criterion, as they do for that of the ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας: the passage in the Κύριαι Δόξαι alone places the φανταστικὴ ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας on a different footing.

² It seems odd at first sight that they did not also put in ἐπιβολὴ τῶν αἰσθητηρίων, but the reason clearly is that it was already included under αἰσθησις, whereas in Epicurus' list there was no mental κριτήριον at all, under which ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας might be subsumed.

authors, which appear to have a connexion with the ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας. In one passage of Cicero and two (possibly three) in Lucretius such an echo seems clear: we must ask whether it is the result of mere coincidence or of translation, and if the latter, what is the exact relation of the Latin passages to Epicurus' theory.

(a) *Cic. de Nat. Deor.* i. 54 'si immensam et interminatam in omnis partis magnitudinem regionum videretis, in quam se intencens animus et intendens ita late longeque peregrinatur, ut nullam tamen oram ultimam videat, in qua possit insistere' The mind is here 'projecting and straining itself towards (or into)' the infinity of space

(b) *Lucr.* ii. 1044-1047:

quaerit enim rationem animus, cum summa loci sit
infinita foris haec extra moenia mundi,
quid sit ibi porro quo prospicere usque velit mens
atque animi tactus liber quo pervolet ipse.

The mind is here similarly 'projecting itself freely' into infinite space to ask what there is outside our world.

(c) *Lucr.* ii. 739-744. The poet has stated that the atoms are colourless, and wishes to forestall the objection that we can have no mental pictures which can give us knowledge of such atoms.

in quae corpora si nullus tibi forte videtur
posse animi insectus fieri, procul avius erras.

scire licet nostrae quoque menti corpora posse
verti in notitiam nullo circumlita fuco.

We can 'project our mind' to bodies without colour: they can form a concept in our mind.

(d) *Lucr.* ii. 1080 would, if Winckelmann's conjecture

in primis animalibus inice mentem

be right, offer us another example of the similar idea, 'turn your attention to the animals', but (a) *in* with the ablative *animalibus* as compared with *in* with the accusative *in* the other passages is not satisfactory, or indeed natural, (b) I doubt if the sense is right, as we may see subsequently. The MS. text *indice mente* should probably be kept

(e) To these passages we must add, though the expression is different, another already quoted in connexion with the ἐπιβολή (iv. 802-817), and note especially:

et quia tenvia sunt, nisi quae contendit,¹ acute
cernere non potis est animus; proinde omnia quae sunt
praeterea pereunt, nisi si ad quae se ipse paravit. (802-804)

¹ Compare Cicero's 'animus . . . se intendens' in (a) above.

and

et tamen in rebus quoque apertis noscere possis,
si non advertas animum, proinde esse quasi omni
 tempore semotum fuerit longeque remotum. (811-813)

It is clear in the first place that none of these passages (except the last, which has no phrase which can be a direct translation of ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας) is concerned with the direct mental apprehension of subtle images. Tohte¹ therefore, who restricts ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας to this sense, though he admits that the Latin *animi insectus*, &c., is a translation of Epicurus' term, yet concludes that 'Lucretius and Cicero have used these expressions in another sense from that in which Epicurus used the corresponding Greek'. But Giussani² has rightly insisted that the very oddness of the Latin phrases, the coincidence between the expressions of Cicero and Lucretius, and the occurrence of Cicero's term in a passage where he is obviously following his Epicurean text carefully, will make it certain that the Latin expressions were an intentional and careful translation of Epicurus' technical term. Giussani, who of course approached the whole problem from the point of view of Lucretius, was in fact largely influenced by the apparent width of ideas embraced in these Latin passages to conclude that ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας is a wide term for 'mental representation in general'. As we have seen, that contention will not hold and must be limited. Is there anything in these Latin passages which is inconsistent with our general conclusion about the ἐπιβολή?

In (a) and (b) the idea is the same, the 'projection of the mind' into the infinity of space: here we have exactly the notion of the ἐπιβολή, as we have explained it: it is the mental examination of a scientific concept. The Epicurean parallel is E. § 62. In (c) we have a particularly interesting instance of the same idea: we can have an ἐπιβολή of the colourless atoms, for again it is an image based on πρόληψις (*nolitiam*, n. 745, is always Lucretius' technical translation of πρόληψις). In (d) I think Winckelmann's emendation cannot be right, for we should not have an ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας of 'animals' either as a direct mental apprehension of a subtle image, or as a scientific concept (though we might of course have an ordinary πρόληψις of 'animal'). Lucretius would more naturally have said simply, 'look at animals', as he practically does in n. 342 ff. If *inice mentem* is right, it is a loose use of the phrase. Finally, in (e) we have an instance without a technical term of the general idea of the ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας in the primary sense of the apprehension of subtle (*tenuia*) images.

It may fairly be said then that the Latin passages, so far from creating any difficulty or being in any way inconsistent with Epicurus' phraseology, strongly confirm the general view we have taken, and especially the second sense of ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας as the apprehension of a scientifically verified concept.

¹ p. 24.² p. 171.

LETTER TO PYTHOCLES

THE authenticity of the Epistle to Pythocles appears to have been a matter of doubt even in antiquity, as we learn from a note¹ of Philodemus, the Epicurean, found among the rolls of Herculaneum. The work itself, as Usener has clearly shown,² strongly confirms this suspicion. The sections dealing with different topics are not united, as are those in the other epistles, by any link of thought or even by the familiar introductory phrases καὶ μήν, ἀλλὰ μήν καί, &c.: their order is unsystematic, and the stars are dealt with twice in §§ 90–98 and §§ 111–115, the latter passage being added as an afterthought. We may add that the style is neither the highly technical and crabbed writing of the first letter, nor the polished and more elaborate diction of the third, but a slipshod composition suggestive of abridgement. It might perhaps be answered to Usener's objections that the subjects with which the letter deals do not admit of much co-ordination, and are always put together in Epicurean documents in a rather haphazard manner, as in the sixth book of Lucretius; the double treatment of the stars, too, is not a greater dislocation than we find in the text of the first letter, as we now have it. But in fact the letter throughout bears the clearest marks of being an abridged compilation from some larger work, the gist of Epicurus' teaching being put down rather hastily into a small compass. Yet, as Usener has himself shown, this very fact allows us to place complete confidence in the authority, if not the authenticity, of the letter – we may be confident that, with the exception of the introduction, we have the exact teaching and in many cases probably the exact words of the Master himself. The letter is not of such great interest as the other two, either in the subjects treated or the manner of treatment, but it helps greatly, when compared with the sixth book of Lucretius, to fill in the details of the Epicurean system.

Pythocles, to whom the letter is addressed, was a young disciple of great beauty, of whom Epicurus was very fond. He thought him, we are told,³ a sort of Alcibiades, and a fragment of a letter addressed to him speaks of Epicurus waiting for 'the coming of his lovely and godlike presence'.⁴ In another place⁵ we find

¹ Voll Hercul coll. alt., 1. 1, f. 152 ἐποψ[ία]ν τιν[ά λα]μβάν[ει]ν, ὡς περὶ τινῶν ἀπιστού[ῶν] καὶ τῆς [πρὸς Πυθ]οκλέα π[ε]ρὶ [με]τέωρων ἐπιτομῆς.

² pp. xxxvii–xli.

³ Alciphron, Ep. II 3 'Αλκιβιαδην τινὰ Πυθοκλέα νομίζει.

⁴ Fr. 34 καθεδοῦμα προσδοκῶν τὴν ἱμερτὴν καὶ λούθεον σον εἴσοδον.

⁵ Fr. 33 παιδείαν δὲ πᾶσαν, μακάριε, φεῦγε τάκτιον ἀράμενος.

Epicurus adjuring him to 'unmoor his bark and flee from all culture', in the idea doubtless that he should give himself up to the study of Epicurean philosophy. A letter to Idomeneus¹ addresses him apparently as a sort of guardian of Pythocles, and suggests that his conduct needed control. It was then natural that he should be selected by the compiler as the recipient of this letter.

INTRODUCTION (§§ 84–88).

The introduction is, no doubt, the work of the compiler, and is closely modelled in thought and diction on the introductions to the other letters, but by an occasional strange word or phrase seems to show that it is not by Epicurus himself. §§ 84, 85 are the usual epistolary opening, the request from Pythocles for a treatment of τὰ μετέωρα and Epicurus' consent, together with the hope that it will be of value to other disciples as well: all this might be suggested by the opening of the letter to Herodotus.

§ 84. 1. Κλέων is otherwise unknown, and is possibly a quite imaginary person.

2. διετέλεις . . . ἀπειρῶ: of course epistolary imperfects.

3. εἰς μακάριον βίον, 'to a life of happiness', which results from the knowledge of, and obedience to, the Epicurean philosophy: cf. τὸ μακαρίως ζῆν, Ep. iii, § 128, &c.

4. διαλογισμῶν: cf. διαλογισμόν and διαλογίσματα below, but otherwise not an Epicurean word, and suggestive rather of other schools of philosophy in which discussion and dialectic played a larger part.

5. περὶ τῶν μετεώρων 'the phenomena of the sky': a regular term in Epicurus of wide connotation, including not merely what we should now call meteorology, but astronomy and, indeed, all the phenomena of the sky, and certain subterranean phenomena as well: cf. e.g. K. Δ. x, xi.

εὐπερίγραφον, 'easy to be drawn in outline' or 'sketched'. Again otherwise unknown in Epicurus.

8. βαστάζεις: the MSS. have βαστάζειν, which would, of course, continue the construction of εἶναι, but is made impossible by the parenthetical ὡς ἔφη. The choice lies between Casaubon's βαστάζεις and Usener's βαστάζονται, and in spite of the prevalence of epistolary imperfects, the simpler emendation is the better; it is adopted by Bignone and von der Muehll. The literal meaning 'you have in your hands', for purposes of study, is more probable than the derivative 'you carry in your mind', which would hardly be possible without some addition. Crönert proposes the more violent change to καδύνατον . . . βαστάζειν.

9. συνεσχέθημεν: i. e. 'I am constrained' by the great hopes I have of your future to accede to your request.

¹ Fr. 28 εἰ βούλει πλούσιον Πυθοκλέα ποιῆσαι, μὴ χρημάτων προστίθει, τῆς δὲ ἐπιθυμίας ἀφαρεῖ.

§ 85. 1. τὰ λοιπὰ πάντα, 'all my other writings', a slightly odd expression, which would not however be improved by Usener's suggestion τὰ λείποντα.

4. φυσιολογίας: Epicurus' regular technical term for the knowledge of nature and natural laws: cf. Ep. 1, § 37, l. 2; K. Δ. xi.

γηγότου, 'genuine', i.e. the Epicurean science as opposed to any other.

τοῖς εἰς δοχοδίας . . . ἐμπεπλεγμένοις, 'for those involved too deeply (sc. to have time for full philosophical study) in one of the routine occupations'. For ἔγκυκλια in this sense cf. Fr. Iviii τοῦ περὶ τὰ ἔγκυκλια καὶ πολιτικὰ δεσμωτηρίου.

6 περιόδειε, 'go through from point to point'. A good Epicurean word: cf. Ep. 1, § 36, l. 10 τῆς συνεχοῦς τῶν ὅλων περιοδείας.

7. ἐν τῇ μικρᾷ ἐπιτομῇ πρὸς Ἡρόδοτον ἀπεστείλαμεν. an attempt to link on this letter with the first that suggests doubts as to its genuineness. It is interesting to find that as early as the composition of this letter—in the first or second generation of Epicurus' pupils—the letter to Herodotus was known as the μικρὰ ἐπιτομή in distinction to the μεγάλη ἐπιτομή, which was probably a more complete but less elaborate exposition of the whole system, intended for novices. Bignone notes, however, that in the *Vita Epicuri*, § 135, a passage is quoted as from the μικρὰ ἐπιτομή which does not occur in the letter to Herodotus. this throws some doubt on the identification. It was the μεγάλη ἐπιτομή in all probability which was used by Lucretius see Giussani, vol. I, p. 10.

§§ 85-87 are concerned with the purpose of this investigation of the phenomena of the sky and the principles of its conduct. The sections are entirely based on two main ideas and their interconnexion, and are modelled both in diction and subject on §§ 78-80 of the letter to Herodotus (1) The purpose of this branch of inquiry, as of all others in the Epicurean philosophy, is to prepare the way for the tranquil life so long as we have any disquieting suspicion that the movements of the stars or phases of the weather are due to divine action and portend or express the attitude of divine beings to men, we cannot live undisturbed: we must learn that they are all caused by the action of natural law (2) In the method of inquiry we shall find a difference from the procedure employed in ethics and in the explanation of earthly phenomena. In both those spheres it is possible to trace any given effect to us one single cause, but in dealing with τὰ μετέωρα we shall often have to suggest several causes for the same phenomenon—and this for two reasons firstly, that in these greater phenomena of nature there often is more than one cause which can produce the same effect, secondly, that, as we are not able to observe them as closely as earthly phenomena, we cannot be sure of the exact cause in any given case. We must then be ready to accept any probable explanation, provided it does not conflict with the data of sense-perception. But this plurality of causes need not cause us any

disturbance—and here the two ideas draw together—for it is not due to any arbitrariness or uncertainty in the sequence of occurrences, or to any breach in the laws of nature, but merely to the natural difference of the phenomena themselves and our relation to them. These two notions are repeated *ad nauseam* throughout the letter.

At the end of § 87 Epicurus proceeds more closely to the question of method, and says that we must use the analogy of earthly phenomena to explain the heavenly, but never in doing so lose sight of the exact sense-impression which the phenomena in question makes upon us.

9. μὴ . . . νομίζειν this direct general prohibition with μὴ and the infinitive is not characteristic of Epicurus' own style: he would usually say οὐ δεῖ νομίζειν or οὐ νομιστέον. For this reason Kochalsky proposed to alter ἐκ, which Usener regards as *suspectum*, to εἰκός. But μὴ (not οὐ) makes this impossible, and also invalidates Bignone's explanation that we should understand δεῖ or δυνατόν or ἔνδεχεται.

10. κατὰ συναφήν, 'in connexion' with the other doctrines of the system, physical or moral: see below for the distinction which Epicurus makes. For the expression cf. § 88, l. 2 τὰ συναπτόμενα τούτω.

αὐτοτελῶς, 'independently', as a department by themselves. For the general idea of the ultimate moral purpose of all physical investigation cf. Ep. 1, § 82, l. 1 ἡ δὲ ἀτραπεία τὸ τούτων πάντων ἀπολελύσθαι κτλ. and Κ. Δ. xi. Bignone notes the supremacy of the moral interest in philosophy after the time of Aristotle.

§ 88. 1. μήτε: notice the very slight connexion. As Usener remarks, Epicurus himself would have written ἔπειτα μήτε Kochalsky would transfer καὶ from after δδύνατον before μήτε.

τὸ δδύνατον καὶ παραβιάζεσθαι, 'to try actually to force that which is impossible', i.e. to force on phenomena an explanation derived from prejudice, but inconsistent with the evidence of the senses. An expression quite in Epicurus' manner, the sense of which is resumed in ἀξιώματα κενὰ καὶ νομοθεσίας below, l. 9.

καὶ is a little forced, and is omitted in several of the MSS. Crönert would expunge it, and Bignone thinks that it attached a second adjective which has fallen out, and would read καὶ (ἀπρακτον), 'and would not lead to practical results'. I think καὶ may be retained as emphasizing παραβιάζεσθαι.

2. τοῖς περὶ βίων λόγοις, 'the theories on various types of lives', i.e. on ethics. The expression is odd, but doubtless intended as a link with Epicurus' treatise, Περὶ βίων (cf. D. L. x. 27 30). This again seems to point to a compiler.

3. τῶν ἄλλων φυσικῶν προβλημάτων: i.e. the problems of earthly phenomena and the problems of the ἄδηλα concerning the ultimate composition of the universe, in both of which there is only one right explanation.

3. κάθαρις, 'explanation', 'clearing up', a very unusual use, but paralleled just below, § 87. 4, by ἐκκαθαίρομένων.

4. ὅτι τὸ πᾶν . . . : a quotation from Ep. 1, § 39, l. 7.

σώματα the MSS. have σῶμα, and the passage in Ep. 1 is not decisive owing to a lacuna, but Epicurus elsewhere always uses σώματα in the plural. The atomic theory does not conceive of matter as one body, but an infinite number of bodies. We should, therefore, accept Usener's correction.

ἀναφῆς φύσις: sc the void. Cf. Ep. 1, § 40, l. 2, and note there.

ὅτι ἄπορα (τὸ) στοιχεῖα: cf. Ep. 1, § 41, l. 1. Usener's insertion of the article is necessary.

5. τὰ τοιῶντα δὴ ὅσα is Bignone's correction for the MS τὰ τοιῶντα ἡ ὅσα: this seems better than Usener's omission of ἡ, which it is hard to account for.

ὅσα μοναχὴν ἔχει . . . , 'all things that have only one method of harmony with phenomena', i.e. can only be explained in one way which is consistent with the evidence of the senses.

7. πλεοναχήν ἔχει καὶ τῆς γενέσεως αἰτίαν not 'have a complex cause of birth', but 'several possible causes of birth'; see introductory note above, and compare Ep. 1, § 80, l. 10 πλεοναχῶς γίνεται.

8. τῆς οὐρίας . . . κατηγορίαν, 'an account of its existence'. κατηγορία is again not a normal word in Epicurus, though he uses the verb.

9. ἀξιώματα κενά, 'propositions assumed without ground', i.e. *a priori* statements not founded on the evidence of the senses: so κενός always in Epicurus; e.g. κενῆς δόξης, § 87, l. 2, below, and K. Δ. xv, xxix.

νομοθεσίας: similarly the 'laying down of principles' before inquiry.

§ 87. 1 ἡδη ἀλογίας has the best MS authority, but B and other MSS. read ἴδιαλογίας, which may conceal ἴδιολογίας in the sense of 'personal prejudice', which would not be unlike Epicurean language. With the text as it stands ἡδη means 'now that we have learnt the right method'.

2. τοῦ ἀθορύβως . . . ξῆν is of course the Epicurean ideal of life. So in the corresponding passage, Ep. 1, § 80 ἀταρακτήσαι, ἀταρακτήσομεν.

3. πάντα . . . γίνεται δοείστως corresponds to τὸ ἀθορύβως . . . ξῆν: the ideal is fulfilled, and all life runs without disturbance.

κατὰ πάντων (τῶν) . . . ἐκκαθαίρομένων with some hesitation I have adopted the emendation of Bignone, 'all goes without disturbance in regard to all of the phenomena explained in several ways in harmony with our experience, when one admits convincing explanations of them': i.e. if you once accept the principle that all convincing explanations must be admitted, then you can have the same ἀταρακτία with regard to the celestial phenomena as you can have in morals and earthly phenomena. HP¹Q have πᾶν τῶν and the other MSS. have κατὰ πάντων without the article, which will not stand. Bignone's reading involves an unusual meaning of κατά with the genitive, but

is better than the alternative *κατὰ πάν τῶν*. Usener alters *κατά* to *καὶ*, ‘even when all things are explained in several ways’, but that is against Epicurus’ teaching, for he only admits such plural explanations in regard to celestial phenomena. Cronert would omit *κατά*, making the construction an awkward genitive absolute.

6. *καταλίπῃ*, ‘leaves undisturbed’, does not try to get rid of it: so *ἀπολίπῃ* in the next clause as opposed to *ἐκβάλῃ*.

8. *ἐπὶ . . . τὸν μῆθον*, ‘to superstition’, for the characteristic of the religious explanation of phenomena is that it asserts one theory to the exclusion of all others, and claims certainty where it cannot be attained by reason.

σημεῖα, ‘indications’ earthly phenomena cannot give us certain explanations of heavenly phenomena, but they can afford hints and analogies, which we can follow up.

9. §⁸ *ἐπὶ*: Usener’s text, which, on the whole, seems the best solution. The MSS. are divided between *δέ τι*, from which Usener’s conjecture is derived, and *δέ τινα*, which would just construe, though the repetition of *τινα* just below would be very awkward. Bignone conjectures *δὲ πι(θα)ρά*, carrying on the idea of *τὸ πιθανολογούμενον* in l. 5, but this is going very far away from the text.

10. §. a brilliant correction of Woltjer’s for the meaningless *ἢ* of the MSS.

καὶ οὐ τὰ . . . φαινόμενα. almost concessive in effect, ‘though we cannot observe celestial phenomena’. The clause would certainly be made easier by Cronert’s *οὐχ ὡς* (based on F’s *οὐτως*), but the change is not necessary.

§ 88. 1. *τὸ . . . φάντασμα*: the actual appearance of the phenomena in sense-perception.

ἐκάστου: there seems no reason for accepting the conjecture in Usener’s note *ἐκαστον*, which is derived from the *ἐκάστων* of Froben’s edition.

τηρητέον, ‘must be kept to’, a favourite word of Epicurus’ in this sense: cf. Ep. i, § 38, l. 4 *κατὰ τὰς αἰσθήσεις δεῖ πάντα τηρεῖν*. A good instance of this principle is Epicurus’ theory that sun and moon are actually the size we see them; *αἴσθησις* here gives us information and we must not try to get behind it.

καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ συναπτόμενα . . . πλεοναχῶς συντελεῖσθαι: lit. ‘and as regards what is associated with the actual appearance we must distinguish those things of which there is no evidence in our experience against several causes’. *τὰ συναπτόμενα* are the opinions (*προσδοξαζόμενα*) which we associate with the actual perception of sensation. In dealing with celestial phenomena we must distinguish those opinions, which may all simultaneously be true, from those which are certainly true or certainly false. This is Bignone’s explanation of the passage, and I have little doubt that it is right. Usener reads *ἐτι* for *ἐπὶ* and puts a comma at *διαιρετέον*, ‘we must distinguish from the actual appearance that which is associated with it, and of which there is no

evidence against several causes'. But this is not so satisfactory, since among the *συναπτόμενα* of an appearance there may be some where there is no question of several opinions.

2. *& οὐκ ἀντιμαρτυρεῖται*: another technical expression of Epicurus': we must bring our several explanations to the test of our experience and reject any which are refuted by it: there may still be several left uncontradicted.

I. WORLDS.

The compiler of the letter plunges at once into the physical theory of Epicurus, and deals first with the nature and formation of worlds. As he is obviously putting together his account from different sources (sometimes apparently from the letter to Herodotus), the result is a little disjointed and here and there obscure. But we are not justified in rejecting as glosses statements, for which there is good evidence elsewhere, on the ground that they do not fit in very well with the context (see notes on lines 5 and 6). A world is first defined as a circumscribed portion of sky: then its boundaries and shape are discussed. We are next told that there are infinite worlds, and their creation and growth are described with comments on certain false theories. All these are well-known Epicurean topics, and the details will be better discussed in the individual notes. §§ 45, 73, and 74 of the letter to Herodotus should be compared together with Lucr. II. 1048-1174 and v. 416-508, 534-563.

4. *κόσμος*: Epicurus' conception of a 'world', like that of all ancient philosophers, was of a system in which the earth was the centre, and around it moved in orbits ever more distant, moon, sun, planets, and stars, the circumference of heaven forming the outer boundary. He differed from most of his predecessors in conceiving that there was an infinite number of such *κόσμοι* besides our own.

περιοχή τις οὐρανοῦ: i.e. a certain portion of sky circumscribed by a boundary (*πέρας*)

ἄστρα: including sun and moon as well as stars: cf. § 90, l. 6 *ἡλιός τε καὶ σελήνη καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἄστρα*. Lucretius similarly uses *astra* in an inclusive sense, v. 509.

γῆ, 'an earth', a body like our earth to be the centre of the system.

5. *πάντα τὰ φαινόμενα*: both astronomical and meteorological; in fact, those with which he deals in the rest of this letter.

5, 6. From this point the rest of the sentence is very confused in the MSS. It runs *ἀποτομὴν ἔχονσα ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀπέρον καὶ καταλήγονσα ἐν πέρατι ἡ ἀραιῶ ἡ πυκνῷ καὶ οὐ λνομένον πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ σύγχρονα λήψεται καὶ λήγουσα ἡ ἐν περιαγομένῳ . . . περιγραφήν*. It is, I think, clear that this has been put together from various sources, but we are not justified in assuming with Usener (who expunges *καὶ καταλήγονσα . . . ἡ πυκνῷ* and *καὶ οὐ λνομένον . . . λήψεται* as two separate glosses) that the composition was affected by any one other than the original compiler of the letter. It is surely more reasonable to suppose some

dislocation. οὐ λυομένου . . . λήψεται is clearly part of the definition and should come first: then follow certain descriptive participial clauses, (1) of its nature ἀποτομὴν . . . ἀπέρου, (2) of its boundary καὶ καταλήγουσα . . . στάσιν ἔχοντι, (3) of its shape καὶ στρογγύλην . . . περιγραφήν. καὶ λήγουσα then, which occurs in the MSS. after λήψεται, should be omitted as a mere repetition of καὶ καταλήγουσα above caused by the misplacement of the clause οὐ λυομένου . . . λήψεται, and a participle (*ἔχουσα*) must be supplied with the last clause. We thus obtain a consistent and reasonable statement, and are not excluding phrases which add much force to the description. Bignone follows Usener in excluding the two clauses, but notes that they hang closely together. it is because the worlds have a definite boundary that their dissolution implies the destruction of all within them.

5. οὐ λυομένου . . . λήψεται i.e. the περιοχή is not any casual piece of sky 'cut off', but an organized whole, the dissolution of which implies disturbance in all its parts. The masculine οὐ goes back, slightly irregularly, to κόσμος in spite of the intervening περιοχή.

6. ἀποτομὴν ἔχουσα . . . : i.e. it is a portion cut off from the infinite universe. This idea had been already stated by Leucippus. D. L. ix. 31 γίνεσθαι δὲ τὸν κόσμον οὕτω φέρεσθαι καὶ ἀποτομὴν ἐκ τῆς ἀπέρου (sc. φύσεως) πολλὰ σώματα, παντοῖα τῶν σχήμασιν εἰς μέγα κενόν. For ἀποτομὴν ἔχουσα equivalent practically to ἀποτμηθεῖσα cf. στάσιν ἔχοντι, l. 8

7. καὶ καταλήγουσα ἐν πέρατι: i.e. a world has a quite definite boundary: cf. Ep. 1, § 73, l. 7 τὸν κόσμον . . . καὶ πᾶσαν σύγκρισιν πεπερασμένην.

ἢ ἀραιῷ ἢ πυκνῷ this boundary may in its composition be either dense or rare: that of our world, the 'flammantia moenia mundi' (Lucr. 1. 73), is rare: cf. Aetius ii 7 3, p. 336 d (Usener, *fr* 303) Ἐπίκουρος ἐνίων μὲν κόσμων ἀραιὸν τὸ πέρας, ἐνίων δὲ πυκνόν, καὶ τούτων τὰ μέν τυνα κινούμενα τὰ δὲ ἀκίνητα.

ἢ ἐν περιγομένῳ ἢ ἐν στάσιν ἔχοντι. the outer circumference may either move round, as most probably, according to Epicurus, does that of our world (§ 92), or be stationary. cf. the passage from Aetius just quoted. Gassendi corrected the MS. error ἐντασσιν to ἐν στάσιν.

8. καὶ στρογγύλην . . . περιγραφήν: for this possibility of variation in the shape of worlds cf. Ep 1, § 74, l. 1 ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὸν κόσμον οὔτε ἐξ ἀνάγκης δεῖ νομίζειν ἓνα σχηματισμὸν ἔχοντας . . . : and the scholion on that passage, οὐδὲ μὲν γὰρ σφαιροειδῆς, καὶ φρεσιδῆς ἄλλους, καὶ ἀλλοιοσχήμονας ἐτέρους. Bignone notes that the Pythagoreans conceived of a triangular world and Empedocles of an egg-shaped world.

9. (*ἔχουσα*): the only alternative to inserting a participle here seems to be to read κατὰ στρογγύλην for καὶ στρογγύλην as does the Tauchnitz text. But though the confusion of καὶ and κατὰ is very frequent in these MSS., the sense is unnatural, and the sentence becomes still more incoherent. Usener and Bignone follow the MSS. with no alteration,

constructing *περιγραφήν* presumably after *ἔχοντι*, but this is very awkward and hardly sense : a *πέρας* cannot have a *περιγραφή*

πανταχός : including, I think, all the previously mentioned alternatives, the density or rareness and movement or stationary character of eth *πέρας*, as well as the varieties of shape. The variant *πανταχοῦ* is a mere error.

10. τῶν γὰρ φαινομένων . . . an application of the principle above, 1. 2 ἂ οὐκ ἀντιμαρτυρεῖται τοῖς παρ' ἡμῖν φαινομένοις πλεονάχως συντελεῖσθαι. Though our world has a *πέρας* which is ἀραιόν and *περιαγόμενον*, and is in shape *σφαιροειδῆς*, there is no evidence that there are not elsewhere worlds in which these details differ.

(εν) τῷδε a necessary correction of Usener's for the MS. τῶδε.

11. λήγον οὐκ ἔστι καταλαβεῖν. we cannot advance to the end of the world and ourselves perceive its nature : *καταλαβεῖν* here of sense-perception.

§ 89. 2. εἰσὶν ἄπειροι τὸ πλῆθος : so Ep. 1, § 45, l. 3 ἀλλὰ μὴν κὶ κόσμοι ἄπειροι εἰσὶν, which may be the source on which the compiler draws. but the idea is an Epicurean commonplace. cf. Lucret. II. 1084-1089.

καταλαβεῖν. here of mental perception we can quite well picture it in our mind, and, as Lucretius shows (loc. cit.), can adduce many reasons to prove it must be so.

3. ἐν κόσμῳ a curious idea, which I do not know elsewhere : a new world might form itself within an existing world, presumably as the old world dissolved.

4. καὶ (εν) : the addition seems necessary, and Usener had already suggested καί in his notes

μετακοσμίω : a famous technical word of Epicurus'. There being in the universe all these κόσμοι of various shapes, there must be intervals between them, in which new worlds might be formed. It was in the *μετακόσμια* that Epicurus placed the abodes of the gods. Cicero, *de Nat. Deor.* i 8 18, translates the word by *intermundia*.

ἐν πολυκέντῳ τόπῳ : it would be a place in which there was much void, but not entire void, for there is no large space of that character in the universe : Leucippus then (*τινὲς*) was wrong in believing it to be a 'great space of pure void' cf. *μέγα κενόν* in the passage quoted above on § 88, l. 6

5. εν μεγάλῳ εἰλικρινεῖ, sc. τόπῳ. There is no need with Zeller to write ἐν μεγάλῳ καὶ εἰλικρινεῖ κενῷ. Bignone notes the difficulties which arose because the atomists did not sufficiently distinguish between space = extension and empty space. The phrase *μεγάλῳ εἰλικρινεῖ καὶ κενῷ* is an attempt to express the latter, like Lucretius' 'locus intactus, inane, vacansque', l. 334.

6. τινὲς Casaubon's correction for *τινά*, an obvious error

ἐπιτηδείων τινῶν . . . The Epicurean theory of the formation of a world many conditions are requisite besides the mere aggregation of atoms in a void: (a) they must be atoms of the right kind to form

combinations, &c.; (δ) they must be capable of uniting (*προσθέσεις*) and forming organized bodies (*διαρθρώσεις*) and causing changes of position; (ε) they must be able to supply the right material to the right places.

8. *προσθέσεις*: the juxtapositions of matter which are creative of things.

διαρθρώσεις, 'articulations', i.e. they must be able to form bodies which are organized: Bignone takes it to mean more definitely 'connexions', but it implies the notion of separation as well as that of union.

μεταστάσεις: the moving of portions of matter to their appropriate places, e.g. of the fiery materials to the sky, where they can form the heavenly bodies and ether.

9. *ἐπαρθεύσεις*, 'irrigations', not merely of liquid material, but of the constant supply of appropriate material to the appropriate quarter. The whole description should be compared with Lucr. v. 449-494, and especially with ii. 1112-1119, where the diction is very like that here:

nam sua cuique locis ex omnibus omnia plagis
corpora distribuuntur et ad sua saecla recedunt,
umor ad umorem, terreno corpore terra
crescit et ignem ignes procudunt aetheraque aether,
donec ad extreum crescendi perfica finem
omnia perduxit rerum natura creatrix,
ut fit ubi nilo iam plus est quod datur intra
vitalis venas quam quod fluit atque recedit.

10. *ἕως τελειώσεως*, 'until the period of completion'. Epicurus held that with worlds so with bodies there was a process of gradual growth, new material being always absorbed, until a limit of completion was reached, and from that time began the process of decay, in which more was given off than taken in: cf. Lucr. ii. 1105-1174.

καὶ διαμονής, 'and stability': Epicurus recognized such a period between those of growth and decay. It is unnecessary to follow Usener in altering to *διαμονήν* (*sc. ποιούντων*), which is very awkward in construction.

11. *τὰ ὑποβληθέντα θεμέλια*: the atomic foundations on which the world is built: i.e. the original nuclei which uniting in their turn formed 'things'.

τὴν προσδοχὴν δύναται ποιεῖσθαι: i.e. as long as they are capable of assimilating new material. See Lucr. ii. loc cit., and particularly ii. 1122-1130.

§ 90. 1. οὐ γὰρ ἀθροισμὸν δεῖ μόνον. a mere aggregation of atoms in a void, such as Leucippus had supposed, is not sufficient to make a world: the atoms must have these other characteristics, which will produce the proper unions, and enable the process of assimilation to take place.

οὐδὲ δίνον: he passes from Leucippus to Democritus, *τῶν φυσικῶν*

καλουμένων τις, who thought that a world was produced mechanically by an atomic whirl, caused in its turn by his convenient 'maid-of-all-work' ἀνάγκη, acting thus in a purely arbitrary manner: Epicurus thus asserts his independence of both his predecessors in the atomic theory.

2. κατὰ τὸ δοξαζόμενον, 'according to the mere fancy of the imagination'. Democritus' supposition of the whirl created by ἀνάγκη rests on no evidence of the senses, and it is directly opposed to φαινόμενα (see below). It was an ἀξίωμα κενὸν καὶ νομοθεσίᾳ. Epicurus had of course another quarrel with Democritus' notion of ἀνάγκη in the region of morals.

3 αὐξεσθαι τε: we must supply τὸν κόσμον. Democritus' notion apparently was that the whirl went on gradually increasing in size by the assimilation of external particles, until it grew so big as to come into collision with another world, and then followed destruction: cf. Hippol. 55. 13 a φθείρεσθαι δὲ αὐτὸν ὥπ' ἀλλήλων προσπίπτοντας

τῶν φυσικῶν: said contemptuously. οἱ φυσικοί, for Epicurus, are the earlier cosmologists, whom he associates with the unbending application of ἀνάγκη, and therefore with determinism. cf. Ep. ii, § 134. Ι ἐπεὶ κρείττον ἦν τῷ περὶ θεῶν μύθῳ κατακολουθεῖν ἢ τῇ τῶν φυσικῶν εἰμαρμένῃ δουλεύειν: but he is always thinking principally of Democritus.

4. τοῦτο γάρ . . . τοῖς φαινομένοις: this might be very difficult to explain, if we had not got the illuminating passage at the end of Lucr. ii, for of course we have no sense-evidence of the creation and destruction of worlds. Epicurus clearly refers to the analogy of the growth of bodies, where we see the process of assimilation up to a point, after which decay sets in owing to the excess of matter lost over that taken in.

II. THE HEAVENLY BODIES.

The second main section of the letter, which extends to § 99, deals with the heavenly bodies as constituent parts of their respective worlds. A variety of points is dealt with in the order traditional in Epicurean works. The epitome is very brief, but can be supplemented from other Epicurean sources, and especially from the fifth book of Lucretius. The general ideas are founded on the notions of Epicurus' predecessors, and particularly of Democritus, but there are many characteristic additions and alterations. It is hardly necessary to add that the whole conception is geocentric.

(a) (b) § 90. 6-11 deal with the creation and constitution of the heavenly bodies. They were not independently formed and then included in a world, but were gradually fashioned inside the world, as appropriate bodies were linked on to them. These bodies were rare in texture, and of the nature of wind or fire. All these are doctrines of the Atomic School.

6. τὰ λοιπά ἄστρα : the sun and moon being themselves included as ἄστρα, as in § 88, l. 4, above.

(οὐ) is an old and necessary addition: the sentence must have been negative, as is shown by δλλ. (l. 7), and proved by our general knowledge of Epicurus' theories. Bignone has pointed out that there is no real contradiction between this passage and *De Placitis*, i. 4 (Usener, fr. 308), in which the air is said συμπεριλαμβάνει τὰ ἄστρα in its rotation: this does not necessarily imply that they were originally outside the κόσμος.

καθ' ἑαυτά, 'independently', outside the κόσμος.

7. For the gloss after τοῦ κόσμου see note below

8. εὐθύς, 'from the start', i.e from the origin of their own existence and that of the κόσμος: as soon as a world was formed, the heavenly bodies began to be created in it. cf. Lucr. v. 443-454.

προσκρίσεις: a technical term of Anaxagoras, here used exactly in his sense, and possibly with intentional reminiscence. From the original chaos bodies of like texture were separated out (*κρίσις*) and joined one another (*πρός*). cf. Lucr. v. 443 sq.

diffugere inde loci partes coepere paresque
cum paribus iungit res et discludere mundum
membraque dividere et magnas disponere partis.

9. δινήσεις, 'vortices', referring to the independent rotation of the revolving nuclei, and not to the δίνος which causes the movement of the heavenly bodies through the sky

λεπτομερῶν, 'of light parts' the idea being that the lighter bodies were 'squeezed out' between the heavier, which formed the earth, and so lifted into the sky to form sun, moon, &c. cf. Lucr. v. 453.

expressere ea quae mare sidera solem
lunamque efficerent et magni moenia mundi.

πνευματικῶν, 'of the nature of wind', and therefore volatile, and capable of rising and subsequently performing the revolution. Bignone translates 'gaseous', but that seems to introduce too modern an idea.

10. πυροειδῶν, 'of the nature of fire', and therefore capable of giving out heat and light.

ἡ αἰσθησις: perception cannot of course give us any information as to the creation of the heavenly bodies nor directly as to their composition: but it does show them to us moving through the sky and giving out light, and we must therefore infer their nature on the analogy of similar phenomena on earth.

In the course of the sentence at different places in different MSS, but in most after τοῦ κόσμου and αἴχνους ἐλάμβανεν, are found the words καὶ ὅσα γε δὴ σώζει and ὅμοιως δὲ καὶ γῆ καὶ θάλαττα. The variation of their position in the MSS. would alone justify us in

following Usener and excluding them as glosses, but the internal evidence is also strong. *καὶ ὅσα γε δὴ σώζει* was an ill-expressed note to include, e.g. comets, falling-stars, and other heavenly phenomena, which hardly come under the head of *τὰ λοιπὰ ἀστρά*, but *σώζει* is a word Epicurus would not have used in this sense. Gassendi's proposal to attach the words to the other gloss, 'the earth and the sea and all that in them is', does not help, nor is it improved by Usener's suggestion *συζῆ*, and the Tauchnitz reading *ὅσα γε δὴ ζῶν* is very irrelevant. Bignone regards them as continuing the construction of *ὑπὸ τοῦ κόσμου*, 'by the world and those parts of it which serve as its defence', i.e. the *flammantia moenia mundi*, but this seems very far-fetched. Similarly *ὅμοιώς δὲ καὶ γῆ καὶ θάλασσα* was meant to note that earth and sea too were not an independent creation: this is of course quite good Epicurean doctrine, but it cannot have been in the text here, as sea and earth are certainly not composed of *λεπτομερεῖς φύσεις*, *ἥτοι πνευματικαὶ ἡ πυροειδεῖς*.

(c) § 91. The size of the heavenly bodies is in reality either the same or slightly larger or smaller than we see them. This is one of the most characteristic of Epicurus' doctrines both in its boldness and its childishness. It was of course based primarily on his complete trust in the evidence of sense-perception. We see sun, moon, and stars as of a certain size; we have no right to attempt to go behind the evidence of our senses therefore they are that size. But he based it also on terrestrial analogies in the case of earthly fires, we notice that we cease to feel their heat before they appear through distance to diminish in size (Lucr. v 566-573): but we are very conscious of the sun's heat, therefore it has not diminished in apparent size. Again, the outline of a light becomes blurred before it decreases in size, but the moon's outline is not blurred: therefore it again has not diminished (Lucr. v 579-584). This argument the compiler merely alludes to in l. 5, but it is clearer in the scholiast's reference to the eleventh book of the *Περὶ φύσεως*. see app. crit., 'if its size had been lost through the distance much more would its colour have been: for there is no distance better adapted for such loss than that of the sun', i.e. no earthly fire is ever so far away and therefore so likely to lose both in size and splendour.

1. (*καὶ σελήνης*). an almost certain addition of Usener's. 'Epicurus' would hardly have written *ἥλιον τε καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀστρων*'. cf. § 90, l. 6, above.

2. *κατὰ μὲν τὸ πρὸς ἡμᾶς . . . κατὰ δὲ τὸ καθ' αὐτό*. At once an indication of the line of thought in Epicurus' remarkable decision, and an interesting illustration of the whole idea of *ἐπιμαρτύρησις* (see notes on Ep. 1, §§ 50, 51, and K Δ. xxiv). We see the sun a certain size: that is its size *πρὸς ἡμᾶς*: i.e. that is what the sun looks like at the distance we are from it, just as a distant tower looks round. Are we then to conclude at once that is its size *καθ' αὐτό*? No, it is a *προσμένον*: we must try for *ἐπιμαρτύρησις*. In the case of the tower we can go nearer

to it and see: we cannot do this with the sun, but we can use the analogy of terrestrial lights (see introductory note to this section), and shall then have confirmatory evidence that καθ' αὐτό it is about the size we can see it. Bignone takes κατὰ . . . τὸ πρὸς ἡμᾶς to mean 'as far as concerns us', i.e. as far as it is necessary for our happiness to know, but that does not make a natural contrast with τὸ . . . καθ' αὐτό.

μὲν τὸ . Schneider's correction of μέντοι.

3. φάνεται: the reference to the eleventh book of the *Περὶ φύσεως*, which comes in at this point in the MSS., is a very obvious scholium. The illustration, which is important, is quoted in the introductory note.

ἢτοι μεῖζον . . . : the idea of μικρῷ is certainly to be supplied with μεῖζον as well as ἔλαττον: cf. Lucr. v. 564, 565:

nec nimio solis maior rota nec minor ardor
esse potest, nostris quam sensibus esse videtur.

And again 590, 591

After τηλικοῦτον the MSS. have οὐχ ἄμα, which I take to be merely a note on μεῖζον . . . ἢ . . . ἔλαττον ἢ τηλικοῦτον, i.e. 'it can't be all these three at the same time'. Lachmann, believing it to be a corruption of a true reading, proposed τυχόν, Usener with more probability τυγχάνει. But no verb is needed, and I believe the words are simply a ridiculous comment: so Kochalsky.

οὐτῶ γάρ καὶ τὰ παρ' ἡμῖν πυρὰ . . . would be almost intelligible in itself, but is explained by the scholiast's quotation from the *Περὶ φύσεως* and the parallel passage in Lucr. (see introductory note).

6. καὶ πῶν δὲ . . . As usual, what we must do is to look at the clear evidence of the senses and not confuse it with προσδοξαζόμενα: cf. Ep. i, § 50, &c.

ἴνστημα, 'an objection': apparently from its occurrence in Sextus Empiricus an Epicurean word for the more usual ἐντασίς.

7. ἐναργήμασι, 'the clear visions' uncontaminated with opinion: a technical Epicurean word: cf. § 93, l. 9.

8. ἐν τοῖς περὶ φύσεως βιβλίοις: i.e. presumably in Book XI, from which the passage quoted by the scholiast is taken.

(d) § 92. 1-8. The rising and setting of the heavenly bodies Two possible explanations are given: (1) that of Heraclitus, that these bodies of light are extinguished at their setting and kindled again each day at their rising; (2) that of Anaximenes, that they appeared from behind the earth and then were hidden again by the land. Against neither of these explanations do phenomena afford any objection, and they must therefore be regarded as equally true: the phenomenon is one of those which may πλεοναχώς γενέσθαι. The alternatives are put with almost equal brevity by Lucr. v. 650-655, though in speaking of the nature of dawn in the following paragraph he somewhat enlarges the ideas.

2. ἀναψιν : cf. Aet. II. 20 16 'Ηράκλειτος ἀναψιν νοερὸν τὸ δὲ θαλάττης εἶναι τὸν ἥλιον. Xenophanes appears to have held the same view (cf. Hippol. Ref. i. 14). Herachitus' own word is here intentionally recalled.

Usener, thinking that ἀναψιν and σβέσιν ought to be closely linked, inserts τε after ἀναψιν and omits κατά before σβέσιν : but they correspond exactly to ἀνατολὰς καὶ δύσεις above. The rising is caused by the ἀναψιν and the setting by the σβέσις, and a too close connexion would upset the correspondence.

3. δύνασθαι : an or. obl. infinitive, or else prolate after ἐνδέχεται understood : cf. γίνεσθαι, § 106. 2. It is not necessary to alter to δύνατόν with Usener.

περιστάσεως, 'the composition of the surrounding matter', a favourite word of the writers cf. § 102. 7, § 104 9. Bignone translates 'conditions', but the two passages cited seem to show that the word has a more concrete meaning. The idea is explained more clearly by Lucretius, v. 660-668. The 'seeds of fire' gather together in the east towards dawn and make themselves into a compact body, which is the new sun. It is perhaps worth while noting that this theory of Herachitus is quite incompatible with the idea of the gradual composition of the heavenly bodies in the growing κόσμος enunciated in § 90.

4. καὶ καθ' ἐκατέρους τοὺς τόπους, 'especially in regard to the two places on each occasion', i.e. the places of the daily composition and extinction of sun (or moon): there must in the east be an atmosphere conducive to its kindling and in the west to its extinction. Meibom early emended to τρόπους, which makes the clause meaningless, and Usener, adopting his reading, excluded the words as a gloss. Bignone shows that the inclusion of the words is essential: one of the objections made in antiquity to the theory of Herachitus was that though it was easy to conceive of the extinction of the sun in the western sea, it was by no means easy to imagine its kindling in the east, and Lucretius (v 660 ff.) lays special stress on this. There must therefore be the requisite atmospheric composition 'in both places'.

5. (καὶ) a necessary addition made by Usener to correspond with καὶ κατὰ ἀναψιν, l. 2. As so often, it was lost before κατά by 'haplography'.

6. ἐκφύειαν... . . . ἐπιπροσθέτησιν. We must remember that the early philosophers did not think of the earth as a sphere, and the sun's nightly course did not present itself to them as a passing *under* the earth, so much as a passing round behind the lofty ground in the north, corresponding to a journey round the southern sky during the day-time. The earth was tilted up to the north and the sun went behind it. So Aristotle (*Meteor.* B. I. 354 a 28) referring to Anaximenes, πολλοὺς πέισθην τῶν ἀρχαίων μετεωρολόγων τὸν ἥλιον μὴ φέρεσθαι ὑπὸ γῆν, ἀλλὰ περὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὸν τόπον τοῦτον, ἀφανίζεσθαι δὲ καὶ ποιεῖν νύκτα διὰ τὸ ὑψηλὴν εἶναι πρὸς ἄρκτον τὴν γῆν.

ἐκφάνεια and *ἐπιπροσθέτησις* are again probably technical terms borrowed from one of those who held this theory. Some editors have doubted the form *ἐπιπροσθέτησιν* and wished to 'restore' *ἐπιπρόσθησιν*: but it is exactly the kind of form that one would expect to find in one of the older philosophers, from whom it is probably quoted.

(e) §§ 92. 8–93. 3. The motions of the heavenly bodies are next dealt with and various possible causes suggested. There is an unfortunate lacuna, which almost certainly contained other explanations than the two given we can restore them from the closely parallel passage in Lucr. v 509–533

8. τὰς . . . κινήσεις· including both the daily revolution and the orbit of the heavenly bodies, their apparent path round the heavens, as indicated by the successive points of their daily rising.

οὐκ ἀδύνατον. a rather more tentative statement than usual

9. κατὰ τὴν τοῦ δόλου οὐρανοῦ δίνην : sc the whole heaven moves round in a whirl and takes the heavenly bodies with it This was the theory of Anaximenes, who thought (Aet. ii. 2. 4) that the motion of the heaven was 'like a mill-stone' and not 'like a wheel', i.e. horizontal and not perpendicular: this of course corresponds with his notion of the daily revolution of the sun (see note on 1 1, above): cf. Lucr. v. 510–516, where the possible mechanism of this revolution is more fully explained.

ἡ τούτου μὲν . . . δίνην sc the heaven as a whole remains stationary, and the individual heavenly bodies perform their circuits (cf. Lucr. v. 517–533). This individual motion may again be due to various causes, of which the text, as we have it, refers to two.

10. κατὰ τὴν . . . ἀνάγκην. i.e a 'natural law', initiated at the beginning of the world, causes all the bodies to move in one direction This of course, with its characteristic assertion of *ἀνάγκη*, was the theory of Democritus, which is explained at greater length by Lucr. v. 621–636.

11. ἐπ' ἀνατολῆ, 'towards the east' as Lucretius explains, the orbit of the heavenly bodies is in reality in the reverse direction to what it appears to us: for the nearer a body is to the earth the slower it moves, the moon slower than the sun, the sun than the planets. But when we observe this motion against the background of the fixed stars, it seems to us by a familiar optical delusion that they are moving in the reverse direction, the moon quicker than the sun, the sun than the planets It is possible that this notion was explained in the passage lost in the lacuna. Bignone translates *ἐπ' ἀνατολῆ*, 'for their origin', but it is surely impossible that the word could be used for the original creation of sun and moon. in reference to them it could only mean their daily rising.

§ 93. There is undoubtedly something, probably several lines, lost at this point. Lucretius in the parallel passage mentions two other possible causes of the individual revolution of the heavenly bodies, (1) 519–521, that they were impelled by an internal fire trying to

escape: this appears to have been the theory of Anaximander, (2) 522-523, that they were driven on by an external current of air: this was the theory of Anaxagoras (*Aet.* 11. 23. 2). Then we pass on to the fourth explanation, which is here left us in a fragmentary condition. In Lucretius this appears in the form that the bodies move on to places where they can find food, i.e. are naturally attracted to a fresh supply of fuel: this appears to have been the theory of the Stoics. The letter has it in a slightly different form, which seems more consistent with the theory of the constant rekindling of the heavenly bodies: the apparent progress of the stars is really the constant spread (*ἐπινέμησις*) of fire moving on to fresh fuel (we may perhaps compare the advance of a spark along a train of gunpowder). In this form the theory may certainly be attributed to Heraclitus, who held the *ἄναψις* (§ 92, 2, note).

1. * * τάτη θερμασίᾳ: the mutilated word must have been a superlative possibly, as Usener suggests, *σφοδρότατη*

2. ἐπινέμησιν, 'spread', the verb, too, is so used of fire, e.g. πῦρ ἐπινέμετο τὸ ἀστυ, *Hdt.* 5 101. Bignone would take the words after the lacuna in more direct correspondence with Lucretius' statement. He would complete the missing word *ἐπιτηδειοτάτη* (*εἰ* in the MSS.) and translates, '(it is possible that the heavenly body moves through the sky in search of the heat) most appropriate to it, and proceeds, as though feeding on the fire, successively from place to place'. But apart from the questionable meaning assigned to *ἐπινέμησις*, the rendering at the end is surely impossible with *λόγος*, which must go with *τοῦ πυρός*.

(f) § 93 ll. 3-8 deal with the question of the tropics of sun and moon. Besides appearing to perform a revolution, they seem also to go up and down in the sky, standing higher in the heavens at one part of their orbit than another. The highest and lowest points were known as the *τροπαὶ* or turning-places, and the problem now discussed is really the whole nature of this 'ecliptic', which ranges between the tropics. Again, various alternatives are presented, which correspond closely to the ideas of the causes of motion in the previous section.

4. λόξωσιν οὐρανοῦ: this theory goes closely with the first theory in the previous section. If the motions of the heavenly bodies are caused by the revolution of the whole heaven, then their 'obliquity' must be due to an 'obliquity' of the entire sky: i.e. it is set at an angle to the plane of the earth. This does not however appear, as one would expect (see note on § 92 9), to have been the theory of Anaximenes, but of Empedocles: it is implied in *Lucr.* v. 691-693.

propter signiferi posituram totius orbis,
annua sol in quo concludit tempora serpens,
obliquo terras et caelum lumine lustrans.

τοῖς χρόνοις κατηγακασμένου, 'constrained by', or 'in respect to the

times', probably refers to the obvious connexion between the ecliptic and the succession of the seasons.

5. *ἀέρος ἀντέξων*, 'the contrary thrusting of a current': this theory goes with that of a stationary heaven and independent orbits: the revolution of sun and moon would be in the same plane as the earth, but that they are thrust out of their course towards the tropics by cross-currents of air. This was the theory of Anaxagoras. cf. Aet. II. 23. 2 ἀνταπώσει τοῦ πρὸς τὰς ἀρκτοῖς ἀέρος, and is fully explained by Lucr. v. 637-649.

ἢ καὶ ὅλης . . . ἐκλειπούσης must be taken in connexion with the last theory of the movements: the train of fuel along which the fire moves lies along this oblique orbit. This then was the theory of the Stoics and almost certainly, though we have no authority for it, of Herachitus.

6. *ἐχομένως*, 'successively', Usener's correction of *ἐχομένοις* or *ἐχομένης* in the MSS.

τῆς δ' ἐκλειπούσης, 'when the other', sc. the former fuel, 'fails'. I have with hesitation adopted Usener's correction of the MS *τῆς δὲ καταλειπούσης*. There is no trace of an intransitive use of *καταλείπειν*, and it is not likely that *καταλειπομένης* (von der Muehll), which is the sense required ('being left behind'), should have been altered into the active, as might be the case if there were a neighbouring active participle.

7. *ἢ καὶ ξεδρῆς . . . κινεῖσθαι*: corresponds to the theory that the heavenly bodies were originally set in *δίοι* by *ἄνάγκη* (see note on I. 5 above). It is the theory of Democritus, and is in part set out as such, though in a paragraph where he has not quite understood his own argument, by Lucr. v. 621-636.

ἀστροῖς: a good instance of its use for sun and moon.

8. *οἱόν τιν' ἔλικα* the combination of the daily revolution of sun and moon with the gradual mounting or descent to the tropics would of course produce a spiral movement *οἱόν τιν'*, Usener, for *οἱόν τε*

8-13. The section ends with the usual appeal to the principles of argument, here with greater elaboration than usual.

9. *οὐθενί*, Usener, for *οὐθέν*, a necessary correction as there is no evidence for *διαφωνεῖν* with the genitive.

ἐναργημάτων: cf. § 91. 7.

10. *μερῶν*, 'subjects', lit. 'departments of inquiry'; cf. § 91. 6 *εἰς τοῦτο τὸ μέρος*.

12. *ἀνάγειν* is, I think, a slightly more probable correction of the *ἀπάγειν* of most MSS than B's *ἐπάγειν* adopted by Usener. *ἀνάγειν* or *ἐπανάγειν* is Epicurus' technical word in this sense: cf. K. Δ. xxii, xxvi. Von der Muehll prefers the double compound *ἐπανάγειν*.

τὰς ἀνθραποδάδεις . . . τεχνιτείας, 'slavish', because they are wedded to one explanation instead of having an open mind for many possibilities, like the true Epicureans.

ἀστρολόγων: not 'astrologers' in our sense, but professional astronomers: a subdivision of the *φυσικοί* (§ 90. 3).

(g) *The moon.* (1) Its phases. § 94 The letter now passes to the consideration of certain problems with regard to the moon, which are, as usual, traditional among the physical philosophers. It deals first with the phases, and again reports several traditional explanations without the expression of any preference. The sentence should be compared with *Lucr.* v. 705-750, which shows the connexion of the explanations given here with the theories concerning the moon's light which are discussed in the following sentence

1. Κενώσεις . . πληρώσεις: all the MSS. agree on the plural in both cases, and it seems simpler to alter δύναται' ἄν (l. 2) to the plural with Meibom rather than 'restore' the singular here. The plural would be quite natural: each separate phase of the moon is a κένωσις or a πλήρωσις, and the whole process of waxing and waning is rightly described by the plural.

2. στροφὴν τοῦ σώματος τούτου, 'the turning round of the moon's own body'. If this idea is combined with the theory that the moon has its own light, then the moon, as Lucretius explains (v. 720-730), is thought of as a ball light on one side and dark on the other, and its gradual turning round causes the appearance of the phases. This was approximately the theory of Heraclitus, who (Aet. II 24 3) thought that both sun and moon were 'bowl-shaped' (*σκαφειδεῖς*), and that the turning of the concave side to us caused both the phases of the moon and also eclipses. Lucretius (v. 727) attributes the theory to the Chaldeans, from whom possibly Heraclitus took it. On the other hand, if the action of 'turning' be combined with that of the moon's reflected light, we get approximately the right explanation of the phases, as described by *Lucr.* v. 705-714.

3. σχηματισμὸς ἀέρος, 'the conformation of the atmosphere'. This theory, which is not mentioned by Lucretius, goes naturally with the notion of the rekindling of the heavenly bodies at times the 'fuel-track' of the moon runs through dense and moist tracts of atmosphere, so that portions or the whole of the light was extinguished. We may therefore compare the theory Lucretius puts forward (v. 696-700) of the unequal length of nights and days. This notion seems to have been held by Xenophanes (Aet. II. 29 5).

κατὰ προσθετήσεις, 'by the interposition', as Lucretius explains (v. 715-719), of another opaque body which is itself invisible to us, so that the moon's own light is partially or completely hidden. This was the theory of Anaximenes (Aet. II 13 10) and Anaxagoras (Hippol. I. 8 6). Though ἐπιπροσθέτησις is more usual in this sense, e.g. § 92 6, it seems unnecessary to alter with Usener to κατ' ἐπιπροσθετήσεις.

5. τούτου τοῦ εἴδους, 'of this appearance', almost 'of these phases'. ἀποδόσεις, 'accounts', 'explanations'

7 ἀποδοκιμάζῃ: an intentional use of a legal technical term.

οὐ τεθεωρηκώς: Cobet's restoration of οὐτε θεωρητικῶς

(2) Its light. § 94. 9-§ 95. 7. The next section deals with the

origin of the moon's light and with the two explanations that it is her own, or is reflected from the sun. Lucretius does not deal separately with this problem, but refers to it, as we have seen, in the discussion of the phases of the moon, and again in his discussion of its size (v. 575–576).

9. ἐξ ἀντῆς: this view was held by Anaximander (*Aet.* ii. 25. 1) and Xenophanes (*id.* ii. 28. 1).

10. ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου: the belief of Thales, Empedocles, and Anaxagoras

§ 95. 1. καὶ γὰρ παρ' ἡμῖν: the analogy of things on earth is in favour of the double possibility.

2. καὶ οὐθὲν ἐμπαροστατεῖ . . . and nothing in the phenomena of the sky is against either explanation.

3. έάν τις . . .: another long exposition of the principles, but an unusually clear statement. The two mistakes we have to avoid are admitting explanations which are inconsistent with phenomena, and arbitrarily confining ourselves to a single explanation.

6. ταῦτ' δύκοι ματαιώς: a good instance of the superiority of B, which alone preserves the text, which is dreadfully mangled in the other MSS.

(3) Its face. § 95. 7–§ 96. 4. The face in the moon is a subject not touched on by Lucretius, but dealt with by some of the early philosophers. Two causes are suggested for its appearance.

7. ἐμφασις, 'impression', the word ordinarily used to represent the image on the retina of the eye

8. κατὰ παραλλαγὴν μερῶν, 'by the succession of varying parts', i.e. the contour of its surface changes in successive places and so causes the appearance. Anaxagoras had so explained the face in the moon (*Aet.* ii. 30. 2).

9. κατ' ἐπιπροσθέτησιν, 'by the interposition of other bodies' shutting out the moon's light, and so causing the shadows which produced the appearance. This may have been the theory of Anaximenes, who gave a similar account of the moon's phases; see on § 94. 3 above.

ποτ' the MSS. have πάντα, which must be a mere mistake

Θεωροῦντο, 'might be observed', i.e. in terrestrial phenomena, so as to suggest an explanation by analogy.

§ 96. 2. τὴν τοιαύτην (*sc.* ὁδὸν) ἵχνεύειν: it is unnecessary to emend with Usener to ἵχνευσιν. Bignone compares § 114. 3 παρὰ τὸ τὴν ἐναντίαν κινεῖσθαι.

3. τις οὐ μαχόμενος: the MSS. have τισὶ μαχομένοις (or βαλλομένοις): again this seems a necessary correction

(h) *Eclipses*. § 96. 5–10. The letter proceeds to deal very briefly with the problem of the eclipses of sun and moon, and suggests two possible causes corresponding to the general theories of sun and moon already enunciated; either the temporary extinction of the luminaries or their obscuration by the interposition of some other body. The latter explanation is then subdivided according to the nature of the

interposed body. The text is rather uncertain and the whole passage made obscure by its brevity, but much light is thrown upon it by the longer discussion in Lucr. v. 751-770.

6. κατὰ σφέσιν: i.e. just as we have seen the cause of the daily setting and rising may be the extinction and rekindling of sun and moon, their eclipses may be due to the same cause, when the 'fuel-track' passes through damp regions. So Lucr. v. 758-761 (cf. 768-770).

solque suos etiam dimittere languidus ignis
tempore cur certo nequeat recreareque lumen,
cum loca praeterit flammis infesta per auras,
quaes faciunt ignis interstingui atque perire?

This was probably the theory of Xenophanes (cf. Aet. II 24. 4)

7. κατ' ἐπιπροσθέτησιν, 'by the interposition of another body', e.g. as, in point of fact, the eclipse of the sun is due to the interposition of the moon between earth and sun and that of the moon to the interposition of the earth between sun and moon. The writer is not satisfied with these possibilities, but must add others.

ἢ γῆς this of course accounts for the eclipse of the moon, as Lucretius clearly explains v. 762-764

et cur terra queat lunam spoliare vicissim
lumine et oppressum solem super ipsa tenere,
menstrua dum rigidas coni perlabitur umbras

This explanation was given by Anaxagoras, Aet. II. 29. 6, 7 τὰς δύ¹
ἐκλείψεις [τὴν σελήνην ποιεῖσθαι] εἰς τὸ σκίασμα τῆς γῆς ἐμπίπουσαν,
μεταξὺ μὲν ἀμφοτέρων τῶν ἀστέρων γενομένης, μᾶλλον δὲ τῆς σελήνης
ἀντιφράττομένης.

ἢ ἀδράτου τινὸς ἢ ἔτερου τοιούτου The MSS. at this point have
ἢ οὐρανοῦ ἢ τινος ἔτερου τοιούτου. οὐρανοῦ can hardly be kept, though
von der Muehll retains it. Woltjer (*de Lucr. Philos.*, p. 135) proposed
to read ἢ σελήνης ἢ τινος ἔτερου τοιούτου. ἢ γῆς ἢ σελήνης would
then give the right explanations of the eclipses of moon and sun
respectively, and ἢ τινος ἔτερου τοιούτου would allude to the theory of
the interposition of some other opaque body mentioned by Lucr. v.
756-757, 765-767. Usener's objection (Preface, p. xviii) that this
will not do because 'the writer is anxious to explain the eclipse of
both sun and moon by the same cause', does not hold: for it applies
equally well to ἢ γῆς, which can only explain an eclipse of the moon.
The real objection to Woltjer's suggestion is surely palaeographical,
that it does not at all account for the MS. οὐρανοῦ. Usener himself,
thinking of the theory of the interposition of the opaque body,
and comparing the passage in Aet. II. 13 10, where it is attributed to
Anaximenes (τεριέχειν δέ [sc. τὰ ἀστρα] τινα καὶ γεώδη σώματα συμπερι-
φερόμενα τούτοις ἀόρατα) together with Lucr. v. 753-767, made the
brilliant restoration ἀδράτου for οὐρανοῦ, which may be considered

certain. He then proposes to omit η , and suggests that it may possibly conceal $\eta\mu\nu$. I prefer to transpose η and $\tauω\sigma$ and take $\eta\ \acute{e}t\acute{e}ron\ tōiōtōn$ to refer, not to the possibility of the sun-eclipse by the interposition of the moon (which is now not mentioned, $\eta\ \gamma\eta\varsigma$ being taken as typical of this line of explanation), but rather to the interposition of 'any other such body'—one of those vague phrases by which the writer wishes to leave the way open to other possible explanations: cf. § 95. 9 $\kappa\alpha\ i\ddot{o}\sigma\ i\pi\tau\ \grave{\alpha}\nu\ t\rho\sigma\pi\iota\ k\tau\lambda$. I do not however feel sure that we should not combine both Woltjer's and Usener's suggestions, and restore the passage $\eta\ \gamma\eta\varsigma\ (\eta\ \sigma\acute{e}l\acute{e}n\eta\varsigma)\ \eta\ \grave{\alpha}\sigma\acute{r}\acute{a}tōn\ t\iota\varsigma\ \eta\ \acute{e}t\acute{e}ron\ tōiōtōn$, when we should have a fuller account and a closer correspondence with Lucretius. Homoeoteleuton would account for the omission of $\eta\ \sigma\acute{e}l\acute{e}n\eta\varsigma$.

8. $\kappa\alpha\ \grave{\omega}\delta\epsilon$. . . : the writer adds two cautions with regard to such explanations

$t\iota\omega\varsigma\ o\acute{i}k\acute{e}i\varsigma\ .\ .\ .\ s\iota\pi\theta\omega\pi\eta\pi\tau\acute{e}\varsigma\cdot$ (1) we must be careful that the explanations of eclipses are properly combined with the other theories adopted about the heavenly bodies. e.g. as Lucretius suggests v. 768, the idea that eclipse is due to extinction can only be applied to the moon, if it be held that she shines with her own light, or again, moon-eclipse can only be explained by interposition of the earth, if we suppose her light to be reflected from the sun.

9. $t\grave{\alpha}\varsigma\ \grave{\Delta}\mu\alpha\ s\iota\gamma\kappa\pi\eta\pi\sigma\iota\varsigma\ .\ .\ .\cdot$ (2) we must remember that several of these causes may be at work at once: e.g. it might be that the moon is extinguished at the same moment as an opaque body comes in front of it, or that the sun is shut off by both the moon and some other body at once. It is an additional argument for the $\pi\acute{l}\acute{e}\o\pi\chi\grave{\alpha}\varsigma\ t\rho\sigma\pi\iota\varsigma$. $s\iota\gamma\kappa\pi\eta\pi\sigma\iota\varsigma$, which is undoubtedly right, is preserved in BQCo and the second hand in H and P: the other MSS. have the corruption $s\iota\gamma\kappa\pi\iota\varsigma$.

10. $\gamma\iota\pi\pi\sigma\theta\varsigma\iota\varsigma$: at this point the MSS. have a reference to the eleventh book of the $\Pi\acute{e}\pi\iota\varsigma\ f\acute{u}\sigma\pi\omega\varsigma$, which is important as showing that Epicurus had there the full theory of eclipses 'by interposition': see app. crit. The word $\sigma\iota\kappa\acute{a}\pi\mathtt{m}\athtt{a}\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ connects the theory directly with Anaxagoras: see note on l. 7 above. The compiler of the letter probably had this passage of the $\Pi\acute{e}\pi\iota\varsigma\ f\acute{u}\sigma\pi\omega\varsigma$ before him.

(i) *Periods.* § 97. A brief sentence on the 'periods' of the heavenly bodies, with another elaborate warning against the falseness of the theological view and the mistake of the dogmatic assertion of one theory against all others.

i. $\tau\acute{a}\xi\varsigma\ \pi\acute{e}\pi\iota\delta\o\varsigma\iota\varsigma$, 'the regularity of the period', i.e. the mechanical regularity with which the orbits ($\pi\acute{e}\pi\iota\delta\o\varsigma\iota\varsigma$) of the heavenly bodies are performed, the moon in a month, the sun in a year, &c.

2. $\xi\iota\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\ \pi\ar\ \eta\mu\nu$. we can infer the kind of analogies of which the writer was thinking from the similar passage in which Lucretius (v. 737-750) adduces the succession of the seasons as a parallel to the regularity of the successive phases of the moon.

3. ἡ θεία φύσις . . . : such things must not be attributed to the gods, for such work would be inconsistent with their existence of perfect tranquillity. The argument is familiar. cf. Ep. i, § 77; iii, §§ 123, 124.

4. ἀλειτούργητος, 'not oppressed with burdens'. cf. Ep. i, § 76. 10
μήτε λειτουργοῦντος τινός

μακαριότητι. cf. Ep. iii, § 123. 5.

5 αἰτιολογία, 'the discussion of causes'. Stob. *Ecl.* i. 724 αἰτιολογίαι . . . ἐν φυσιολογίᾳ and Sext Emp. i. 181 πάσαν δογματικὴν αἰτιολογίαν.

6. οὐ δυνατοῦ τρόπου ἔφαψαμένοις, 'not clinging to the possible method', i.e. the method of accepting only such explanations as are consistent with possibility as revealed by phenomena.

7. τὸ καθ' ἓν τρόπον . . . οἰσθαι it seems quite possible to retain the accusative τό, in apposition to τὸ μάταιον, instead of emending with Usener to τῷ.

9. τὸ ἀδιανόητον, 'that which cannot be thought': that which is inconsistent with the προλήψεις which exist in the mind

10 σημεῖα· as 'hints' or 'indications' of the facts of celestial phenomena, cf. § 87. 6

11. συνθεωρεῖν, 'to consider them with' celestial occurrences, i.e. to compare and so infer cf. τοὺς οἰκείους ἀλλήλοις τρόπους συνθεωρητέον, § 96. 8 The strange reading of the MSS. σὺν θεῷ (*sic*) χαίρειν looks almost like a 'pious' emendation.

(j) *Length of nights and days.* § 98. 1-8. Another brief paragraph on the alternations in the length of days and nights at different times of the year. It is obscure and undoubtedly corrupt, but we may, I think, recover the sense and in part the text from the parallel section in *Lucr.* v. 680-704. I do not, however, at all agree with Usener as to the relation of the two passages or the state of the text.

1. παραλλάγοντα cf. κατὰ παραλλαγὴν μερῶν, § 95. 8.

καὶ παρὰ τὸ ταχεῖας . . . θεωρεῖται: these clauses must all be considered together. The MS text runs καὶ παρὰ τὸ ταχεῖας ἥδιον κυήσεις γίνεσθαι καὶ πάλιν βραδεῖας ὑπὲρ γῆς παρὰ τὸ μήκη τόπων παραλλάγοντα καὶ τόπους τινὰς περαιοῦντα τάχιον ὡς καὶ παρ' ἥμιν ἡ βραδύτερον τινὰ θεωρεῖται, an obvious muddle which the earlier editors practically gave up, though Meibom by inserting ἡ before παρὰ τὸ μήκη τόπων tried to distinguish a separate explanation from that in the beginning of the clause. This is merely unintelligent patchwork.

Usener, after emending the participles παραλλάγοντα and περαιοῦντα to the infinitives παραλλάττειν and περαιοῦν, and making the obvious transference of ἡ βραδύτερον to its place between τάχιον and ὡς καὶ παρ' ἥμιν, then cuts out the whole clause from παρὰ τὸ μήκη τόπων . . . ἡ βραδύτερον as an explanatory gloss on the previous explanation and marks a lacuna. He thus leaves the passage with one explanation, the difference of pace in the sun's movements, which does not occur in Lucretius, and supposes all the three reasons which Lucretius

mentions to have been dealt with in clauses now lost. But seeing the close correspondence of the letter and Lucretius all through this astronomical section, this is not a probable nor, I think, a necessary supposition, and, further, the clause which Usener excludes is by no means a 'formula paullo accurior' for what he has already said.

If we analyse the passage in Lucretius we see that the three explanations he gives fall naturally under two heads, corresponding to the two main theories about the sun. (1) If we suppose that the same sun performs a daily orbit round the earth, then the variation is due to the fact that he spends more time above the earth in summer than in winter. This may be caused (*a*) by an unequal division of the arcs of the orbit owing to the relation of ecliptic, equator, and horizon (682–695), or (*b*) by the presence of a *crassior aer* at some parts of his journey, which causes a delay in his rising (696–700). (2) If we suppose a new sun is kindled every day, then the variation is due to the slowness or quickness of the gathering of the flames which create the sun (701–704).

It is probable that the writer of the letter had the same explanations in the same order, and with but slight alteration of the text one can obtain this. I should keep *παραλλάττοντα*, suppose that a verb of motion, say διέναι, was lost after it, after καὶ insert *(παρὰ τὸ)*, adopt Usener's *περαιῶν* for *περαιῶντα* (the change may either be due to the neighbouring *παραλλάττοντα* or to dittography of the first syllable of *τάχιον*), and accept the transference of ἡ βραδύτερον after *τάχιον*: it is also possible that there is a considerable lacuna after ἡ βραδύτερον.

The clause καὶ παρὰ τὸ ταχεῖας . . . ὑπὲρ γῆς then expresses the general view (1) that the sun in his daily orbit spends less time (*ταχεῖας*) above the earth at certain periods of the year than at others. This explanation is then subdivided into two possible causes. (*a*) corresponding to Lucr. v. 682–695 παρὰ τὸ μήκη τόπων παραλλάττοντα (διέναι), 'because he traverses regions differing in length (above earth)', or (*b*) corresponding to Lucr. v. 696–700 καὶ *(παρὰ τὸ)* τόπους τιὰς περαιῶν τάχιον ἡ βραδύτερον, 'because he gets through certain regions' (i.e. those which have a thinner atmosphere) 'more quickly than others'. Then in all probability there was another clause beginning with καὶ παρά corresponding to καὶ παρὰ τὸ ταχεῖας . . . setting out (2) the explanation on the theory of the ἀνάψις. In this way with small alteration we can get a complete correspondence to Lucretius. μήκη νυκτῶν καὶ ἡμερῶν παραλλάττοντα is left without any definite construction, but the looseness is not greater than in many places of the letter: 'the variation in length of nights and days (is) due to . . .'

Bignone, who agrees with me as to the general run of the passage, but wishes to mend the construction and refrain from any MS. alteration, except the transference of ἡ βραδύτερον (and possibly the substitution of *περιόδους* for *κυήσεις*—surely gratuitous), would suppose

a more considerable loss and restore as follows καὶ παρὰ τὸ ταχεῖας ἡλίου κινήσεις (? περιόδους) γίνεσθαι καὶ πάλιν βραδεῖας ὑπὲρ γῆς, παρὰ τὸ μήκη τόπων παραλλάττοντα (περαιῶν, ἐνδέχεται ὑπάρχειν, καὶ παρὰ τὸ τάχιον ἢ βραδύτερον κινεῖσθαι, παρεκτάσεις δέρος) καὶ τόπους τιὰς περαιῶντα τάχιον ἢ βραδύτερον. This appears to me a rather clumsy and unnecessarily elaborate change.

6. οἱ δὲ τὸ εὐ λαμβάνοντες; the usual caution against the 'single' method.

7. εἰ: Usener's alteration to ἢ is unnecessary: the persons who dogmatically assert the single explanation, have surely failed to ask if it is possible for man to attain such accuracy in observation

(k) *Weather-signs.* § 98. 9-§ 99. 2. Another brief sentence on signs of the weather as given by the heavenly bodies. The text is again corrupt, but in its most difficult place has been set right by a brilliant conjecture

9. ἔπισημασίαι, 'weather-signs'. The writer is thinking here solely of such signs as are given by the heavenly bodies, e.g. the rising of Sirius, the red sunset, the blushing of the moon (*Virg. G. i 431*), &c

κατὰ συγκυρήσεις καιρῶν. It may be that such signs are due mainly to coincidence of occasion, e.g. the presence of Sirius and hot weather. For συγκυρήσεις cf. § 96. 9 above.

10. καθάπερ ἐν τοῖς . . . ζώοις i.e. in the case of weather-signs given by animals, e.g. the low-flying swallow, the croaking crow, &c. With these the writer deals in § 115, and explains there that they are due to coincidence.

παρ' ἑτεροιώσεις δέρος καὶ μεταβολάς: a brilliant restoration of Usener's for the MS. text παρ' ἑτέροις ὥστε δέρος καὶ μεταβολῆς (μεταβολᾶς is due to Kühn). In some cases the signs are really due to the same changes in the atmosphere, which produce the change of weather: e.g. the flushing of the moon.

§ 99. 1. ἐπὶ δὲ ποίοις . . . it is not possible for us to distinguish which of these two possible causes is at work on any given occasion. The writer seems to have been almost excessively cautious here, but consistent with his own principles. There is some authority in the MSS. for the reading ἤδη δὲ ποίοις adopted by Kochalsky.

III. METEOROLOGY: CLOUDS, RAIN, THUNDER, LIGHTNING. §§ 99-104

The discussion of signs of the weather leads naturally to the third main section of the letter, which deals with what we know more strictly as meteorology: it corresponds to the earlier portion of *Lucr. vi. 96-607*. The same principles are of course observed as in the section on Astronomy.

(a) *Clouds.* § 99. 3-8 The writer deals first with clouds and explains three methods of their formation, which correspond with those set out by *Lucr. vi 451-482* the fourth cause suggested by Lucretius,

the pouring in of moist elements from outside the κόσμος, is not noticed in the letter.

3. πιλήσεις δέρος, 'the packing of the atmosphere': the ἄηρ is regarded always as being moist in character, and its condensation would form the masses of moist matter which we call clouds.

4. (κατὰ) πνευμάτων συνώσεις: the two last words are excluded by Usener as a gloss, συνώσεις being Meibom's correction of συνώσεως. But they are certainly not an interpretation of πιλήσεις δέρος, but are required to explain the origin of the phenomenon: cf. Lucr. vi. 462–466, who describes the operation as taking place on a mountain-top:

propterea quia, cum consistunt nubila primum,
ante videre oculi quam possint, tenvia, venti
portantes cogunt ad summa cacumina montis.
hic demum fit uti turba maiore coorta
et condensa queant apparere.

The words should then certainly be retained. Meibom connected them with ἢ—but they do not express an alternative cause, Kuhn with καὶ—but they do not give a parallel cause. rather the remoter cause of the πιλήσεις δέρος; the air is condensed owing to the compression of the winds. I think, therefore, that it is a preposition which has dropped out, and have inserted κατά. Bignone, who takes the same view, inserts διὰ: Usener in his preface suggests πνευμάτων συνώσει, which is simpler, but a little abrupt. The theory was that of Anaximenes. cf. Aet. iii. 4 Ι νέφη μὲν γίνεσθαι παχυνθέντος ἐπὶ πλειον τοῦ δέρος.

παρὰ περιπλοκὰς . . . τοῦτο τελέσαι. atoms likely to form moisture come together and become interlaced, making the nucleus of a cloud which gradually grows. The process is described by Lucr. 451–458. The explanation, as one might expect from its atomic character, was that of Democritus: cf. Aet. iv. 1. 4 Giussani translates ἀλληλούχων, 'of every kind', but this is clearly wrong.

5. κατὰ δρεμάτων . . . καὶ ὑδάτων· paricles of moisture came off from sea, rivers, and even the earth itself, and streamed together into the air to form clouds: cf. Lucr. vi. 470–482, and especially 476–477.

praeterea fluvii ex omnibus et simul ipsa
surgere de terra nebulas aestumque videmus.

This was the theory of Xenophanes: cf. Aet. iii. 4. 4, and the fragment of Xenophanes himself which is there preserved:

μέγας πόντος γενέτωρ νεφέων ἀνέμων τε
καὶ ποταμῶν.

6. καὶ καὶ' ἄλλους δὲ . . . the usual supposition that there may be other equally good explanations.

(b) *Rain.* § 99. 8-§ 100. 4. A short explanation is given of the way in which rain may be produced, corresponding to the origin of clouds above, and roughly with the account given by Lucr. vi. 495-526.

8. ηδη : i.e. when the clouds are thus formed.

ἢ μέν θλιβομένων, ἢ δὲ μεταβαλλόντων : the ideas are not at once clear, but are explained by Lucretius (1) The clouds are piled up on one another: those underneath are 'squeezed' on their upper side by the clouds above them, and so the rain is pressed out cf. Lucr. vi. 510-512 :

ipsa
copia nimborum turba maiore coacta
urget et e supero premit ac facit effluere imbris.

This idea is found in Anaximenes : cf. Aet. iii. 4. 1 μᾶλλον δ' ἐπισυναχθέντος [τοῦ δέρος] ἐκθλίβεσθαι τοὺς ὅμβρους and corresponds to the first notion of the formation of clouds given above. (2) The clouds are 'altered' when they are struck by the sun's rays and so changed from solid to liquid, falling in the form of rain cf. Lucr. vi. 513-516

praeterea cum rarescant quoque nubila ventis
aut dissolvuntur, solis super icta calore,
mittunt umorem pluvium stillantque, quasi igni
cera super calido tabescens multa liquecat.

§ 100. 1. πνευμάτων καταφορᾶ : the MSS. have πνεύματα κατ' ἀποφοράν, the alteration is Usener's. The genitive πνευμάτων is required by the participle κινούμενων, and καταφορᾶ expresses the swooping down of the wind on the clouds better than κατ' ἀποφοράν. The first cause of the rain is internal—in the clouds themselves; the second is external—the advent of the wind which disturbs them: this corresponds exactly to Lucr. vi. 510 'nam vis venti contrudit'

Bignone, who apparently overlooked these words in Lucretius, complains that Usener's text does not give satisfactory sense, and reads ρευμάτων κατ' ἀποφοράν, in reference to the gathering of moist particles into the clouds described later on by Lucretius in vi. 520 ff.:

multa carent semina aquarum
atque alius aliae nubes nimbiique rigantes
omni . . . de parte feruntur.

This change seems to me gratuitous, and ἀπὸ ἐπιτηδείων τόπων is much more forcible in reference to the wind: it would not matter from what places the moist particles came.

2. ἀπὸ ἐπιτηδείων τόπων. the wind must be blowing from the right quarter to affect the conformation of the clouds in the right way.

καὶ δι' δέρος : Usener omits καὶ, unnecessarily. The wind must not

only blow from the right quarter, but pass through the misty atmosphere, and so gather in its course more of the material of clouds.

3. **βιαιοτέρας . . . ἐπιπέψεις.** Usener apparently (from his analysis) takes this clause solely with the second explanation *ἐπι τε*, regarding it as the true atomic and probably Democritean explanation as opposed to Anaximenes. But this is surely not right. Both the internal pressure of clouds and the external force of wind are causes of rain which would be recognized on any theory, atomic or otherwise, nor is there any good reason for the comparative *βιαιοτέρας* Lucretius, too, vi. 517-518, after giving the two causes above as exactly parallel to one another, proceeds to consider the cause of a *vemens imber*, and though his explanation differs from that given here, it shows, I think, the purpose of the clause. I understand the writer to mean: 'there are two causes of rain, and with either cause the violence of the shower is increased, if the atomic conformation of the cloud is suitable'.

ἀθροισμάτων: the regular technical word for the combination of atoms in a thing: cf. K. Δ ix, Lucretius' *glomeramina* Bignone, reading *ρευμάτων* in l. 1, takes it of the accumulation of moist emanations, but it is very common in Epicurus in the atomic sense.

4. **ἐπιτηδείων** it is interesting to note this reference to the main theory. to produce a given effect, a thing must be composed of the right atoms in the right formation

(c) *Thunder.* § 100 5-11. From clouds and rain the writer naturally proceeds to thunder, lightning, and thunderbolts, and suggests an unusually large number of causes for these phenomena. Lucretius similarly treats these subjects at great length (vi. 96-422), and as usual the letter corresponds closely with his explanations.

5. **πνεύματος . . . δνείλησιν:** the wind shut up in the hollows of the clouds and by its whirl always thickening their sides, reverberates loudly. The idea is clearly explained by Lucr. vi. 121-131.

7. **άγγειοις, 'vessels'.** the ordinary Greek jar with a narrow mouth would, as Bignone points out, make a noise when one blew into it. Lucretius' illustration from a bladder is really more appropriate.

nec mirum, cum plena animae vesicula parva
saepe ita dat parvum sonitum displosa repente.

πυρὸς πεπνευματωμένου βόμβον: an explanation not mentioned by Lucretius. The idea is no doubt of the flame excited by wind, which seems to get inside it and drive it about with a great roar, as in a forge. I do not think Usener is right in translating (in his analysis) *ignis in spiritum soluti*. it is not the natural meaning, nor required by the context. Bignone agrees with my view.

8. **ρήγεις . . . διαστάσεις:** the clouds themselves are actually torn asunder, and make a noise, like the rending of awnings in a theatre or the tearing of paper, as Lucretius aptly says, vi. 108-115.

διαστάσεις. Usener unnecessarily corrects to **διασπάσεις παρατρίψεις**. . . **κρυσταλλοειδῆ**: a more difficult idea. The clouds, congealed to a kind of rigidity, scrape along one another and burst with a report cf. *Lucr.* vi. 116-120:

fit quoque enim interdum ut non tam concurrere nubes
frontibus adversis possint quam de latere ire
diverso motu radentes corpora tractim,
aridus unde auris terget sonus ille diuque
ducitur, exierunt donec regiomibus artis

9. **κατάξεις**, ‘breaking’, ‘bursting’ doubtfully I follow Bignone in adopting this reading from Froben’s *editio princeps*. The majority of the MSS. have **τάξεις**, which is impossible. If it has **διαστάσεις**, whence Usener conjectured **τάσεις**, ‘tension’, the idea being that the clouds being stretched emit a sound like the string of a lyre but this is very far-fetched.

κρυσταλλοειδῆ surely not ‘like glass’, as Usener renders in his analysis, but ‘like ice’, it is a less violent form of the process which produces hail: see § 106

καὶ τὸ ὄλον. . . the usual appeal to the ‘plural’ method. **τὸ ὄλον** here apparently the whole subject of meteorology: **τοῦτο τὸ μέρος**, the special question of thunder

II έκκαλεῖται cf. § 86. 10

τὰ φαινόμενα both the phenomena of thunder itself and phenomena on earth, which supply analogies

(d) *Lightning*. § 101 1-§ 102. 6 The causes of lightning are set out in a rather confusing profusion. The explanations may be analyzed thus

- (1) fire-atoms contained in the clouds are driven out of them—
 - (a) by collision or friction with other clouds (1-3);
 - (b) by wind (4, 5);
 - (c) by compression (6, 7).
- (2) fire atoms are driven out, which came originally
 - (a) from the heavenly bodies (8-10),
 - (b) from a filtration of light-particles through the atmosphere (10-12)
- (3) the cause is wind—
 - (a) itself ignited in the cloud (13, 14),
 - (b) bursting the clouds and driving out fire-atoms (101. 1-3).

The last cause (3b) is hardly distinguishable from (1b), but it is now regarded from the point of view of the wind as cause. Nearly all the explanations can be paralleled in *Lucr* vi 160-218, and many can be discovered in the earlier philosophers.

2. **παράτριψιν καὶ σύγκρουσιν**. **παράτριψις**, the side-friction of clouds rubbing against each other (cf. 100 8); **σύγκρουσις**, the collision of clouds charging against one another. The two operations are of

course distinct, but are classed together : it is unnecessary to alter καὶ to ἡ, as Usener suggests in his notes. This cause Lucretius also places first (vi. 160–163). It was the theory of Democritus, and Aetius in his account (iii. 3. 11) has just the same combination of σύγκρουσις and παράτριψις : ἀστραπὴν δὲ σύγκρουσιν νεφῶν, ὑφ' ἣς τὰ γεννητικὰ τοῦ πυρὸς διὰ τῶν πολυκένων ὀραιωμάτων ταῖς παρατριψέσιν εἰς τὸ αὐτὸν συναλιξόμενα διηθεῖται.

δ πυρὸς ἀποτελεστικὸς σχηματισμός : a splendidly atomic expression : the right conformation of the right kind of atoms to produce fire.

4. ἔκρισισμὸν . . . παρασκευής : the second means of ejection ; a violent casting out by winds. This is treated by Lucr. vi. 185–203, and may be traced in Anaximander and later in Metrodorus of Lampsacus (Aet. iii. 3. 3).

τῶν τοιούτων σωμάτων & . . . again characteristic. the right sort of atoms for the purpose.

6. κατ' ἔκπισισμὸν . the third possibility, the atoms are squeezed out by the presence of other clouds or of wind, a cause similar to the two preceding, but less violent. Lucretius does not deal with it separately. It was the theory of Anaxagoras.

7. κατ' ἐμπεριῆληψιν . . . διὰ τῶν νεφῶν the writer now passes to the second class of causes in which the fire is not supposed to be originally contained in the clouds, but to enter them from without, and first from the heavenly bodies. This curious idea is explained by Lucr. vi. 204–213 : it was apparently the theory of Empedocles. κατεσπαρρένον seems a very necessary correction of the MS. κατεσπειραμένον, which Usener strangely keeps.

10. κατὰ διήθησιν . . . τοῦ λεπτομερεστάτου φωτός . the light-particles are now regarded as collected in the clouds from the air in which they previously floated. This is not mentioned by Lucretius, but seems to have been a notion of Anaxagoras, who regarded the αἴθήρ as fire and said that it was κατενεχθὲν ἀνώθεν κάτω, and that the lightning was διάλαμψιν . . . τούτου τοῦ πυρός (Arist. Meteor. 369 b 15) : cf. also Seneca, Nat. Quaest. ii. 12. 3, who uses the word *distillare*, which is clearly a translation of διηθεῖν.

(διὰ). a necessary addition of Usener's.

11. λεπτομερεστάτου : particles of heat or light are always in the atomic theory extremely light and subtle, so that they can both rise and penetrate cf § 90. 9 λεπτομερῶν τινῶν φύσεων.

After φωτός the MSS. have ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ πυρὸς νέφη συνειλέχθαι καὶ τὰς βροντὰς ἀποτελεῖσθαι καὶ κατὰ τὴν τούτου κίνησιν. The words from ἡ ἀπὸ . . . ἀποτελεῖσθαι are excluded as a gloss by Usener, who then omits κατὰ and takes καὶ τὴν τούτου κίνησιν parallel to κατὰ διήθησιν. This is arbitrary, and Bignone has shown that the words can be preserved in the text with the slight changes of ἡ to ἥ and συνειλέχθαι to συνεφλέχθαι (Usener), and the omission of καὶ before κατὰ τὴν τούτου κίνησιν. The clause will then constitute a parenthesis connecting the phenomenon of lightning with that of thunder, which has already been discussed : it is

this penetration of the light particles from the ether which causes the kindling of the clouds and so the occurrence of thunder through the movement of the enclosed fire. He discovers the same connexion in Lucr. vi. 150 f., where he says :

andior porro si nubes accipit ignem,
uritur ingenti somitu succensa repente.

The infinitives συνεφλέχθαι and ἀποτελεῖσθαι will be dependent on a suppressed ἐνδέχεται, as in § 92. 3 γενέσθαι δύνασθαι.

In a later note Bignone is inclined to keep both καὶ and κατὰ and to suppose a lacuna : he would then write καὶ κατὰ τὴν σῆξιν καὶ κατὰ τὴν τούτου κίνησιν. σῆξις occurs in Arist. *Meteor.* ii. 9. 369 a in the sense of ‘a hissing noise’, such as would be produced by the fire-particles in contact with the moisture of the clouds and might cause thunder. He then quotes as parallel Lucr. vi. 145 ff. where two causes are adduced : (1) the noise of the fire in contact with the wet clouds ; (2) the onward rush of the increasing fire. An exact parallel would then be produced, but I think this is going too far in the way of imaginative restoration.

13. κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἐκπύρωσιν this is the third class of causes, namely wind. Here the wind inside the clouds catches fire owing to the severity of its motion. Lucretius explains this cause in vi. 175-182.

§ 102. 1 κατὰ βήξεις . . . ἀποτελουσῶν : wind is here the active cause which drives out the fire-atoms. This explanation is found in Lucr. vi. 214-218, and corresponds nearly to the theory of Democritus, given in § 101. 4, but is here represented from the point of view of wind as the main cause.

2. ἐκπτωσίν τε for ἐκπτωσιν τῶν. the particle is essential.

3. φάντασμα the ‘appearance’ which we perceive, not said of course with any sense of its unreality.

5. δεῖ · for the MS. κατ.

τὸ τούτοις δόμοιον · i.e. that which in earthly phenomena resembles what we see in the sky.

6 συνθεωρεῖν . cf. § 96. 9, § 97. 11

(c) *Why lightning precedes thunder.* § 102. 6-§ 103. 2. The writer now deals with the question why the lightning precedes the thunder in our experience : he offers two solutions, one with the general idea that the lightning actually takes place first, the other that the two are simultaneous, but the lightning travels more quickly to us than the sound. The latter reason alone is asserted by Lucr. vi. 164-172, who for once seems to abandon his Epicurean suspense of judgement.

7. περιστάσει : lit. ‘gathering of matter to form the clouds’ : so practically ‘atomic conformation’ · cf. § 92. 3, § 111. 8. Bignone again takes it less concretely, ‘in the case of such phenomena in the clouds’.

καὶ διὰ τὸ δμα . . . : this explanation goes with those of lightning and thunder above which attributed them to wind: the wind enters the cloud and at once expels the fire-particles, and then is itself caught in the cloud and rushing about causes the sound of thunder, so that the lightning does in fact occur first. A description of the idea will be found in a different context in *Lucr.* vi. 194–203.

8. ἀποτελεστικὸν σχηματισμόν. cf. § 101. l. 3 above.

ὕστερον δὲ . . . ἀποτελεῖν τοῦτον: cf. § 100. 5 above.

10. κατ' ἔκπτωσιν, ‘owing to the falling out’ both of the light and sound from the cloud at once. The MSS. are here much corrupted, B’s κατέρπτωσιν being the nearest approach to sense. Usener keeps κατ’ ἔμπτωσιν, but it is not a question of the light and sound entering the cloud (which the sound does not do on any theory), but of their being driven out of it simultaneously. Usener shows this clearly in his analysis, where he renders ‘posse etiam simul utrumque nubibus emitti’: ἔμπτωσιν cannot possibly mean this, and it seems to me necessary to correct to ἔκπτωσιν. Bignone apparently retains ἔμπτωσιν in the sense of ‘occurrence’.

τῷ τάχει . . . τὴν βροντήν: involving of course the general idea that light travels quicker than sound. We must remember that on the Epicurean theory both sight and sound are caused by actual particles of matter, which move from the objects in all directions, and when they impinge on our sense-organs, cause sensation: cf. *Ep.* i §§ 49–53.

§ 103. 1. καθάπερ ἐπ' ἐνίων: *Lucr.* vi. 167–170 illustrates from the case of a woodman felling a tree ‘we see the blow of the axe before we hear it.

πληγάς τινας ποιουμένων: a quite correct atomic expression, referring of course to the blows on the pupil of the eye and the drum of the ear, made by the impinging particles of the εἴδωλον and the φωνή.

(f) *Thunderbolts*. § 103. 3–§ 104. 4. The origin of thunderbolts is explained on the lines of the previous sections. Either they are portions of wind, fanned into flame by movement inside the clouds, or portions of the fire contained in the cloud, driven by the wind: in either case the outburst is due to the condensation of the cloud, which impedes further motion inside itself. The description is more detailed than usual, and from the fact that Lucretius devotes a long section (vi. 219–422) to the origin of the thunderbolt and its behaviour, we may gather that it was an important point in Epicurean meteorology.

3. κατὰ πλείονας πνευμάτων συλλογάς, ‘many gatherings of winds’, i.e. the conjunction of several of those whirls of wind pent in the clouds, which are described in § 100. 5 above. The emphatic word is πνευμάτων as opposed to πυρός, l. 7 below: this is the distinction between the two theories, which in effect come to much the same. Lucretius (vi. 246–284) has a long description in which the ideas of wind and fire are not kept distinct, though it on the whole inclines to the present notion of ignited wind.

4. ἐκπύρωσιν καὶ κατάρρηξιν μέρους: the whole is ignited, and then, as it comes into collision with denser and denser masses of cloud, a part breaks off and falls as a thunderbolt. There is no doubt that the sentence is continuous, and that *καὶ κατάρρηξιν, &c.*, forms part of the first explanation: cf. *Lucr. vi. 281-284*, where he exactly describes this portion of the process. Usener in his text followed the authority of the better MSS. and printed ἐκπύρωσιν καὶ κατὰ ρῆξιν μέρους, starting an independent explanation: but, as he sees in his preface (p xx), that leaves the first explanation incomplete (and *μέρους* in the second would be strangely vague) Bignone agrees in reading *καὶ κατάρρηξιν*.

6. διὰ τὸ τοὺς ἔξης τόπους. . . the violent rush of wind condenses the cloud more and more, and so it offers an ever increasing resistance to the wind itself as it advances, until it is compact enough to cause a portion of the wind to break off and fall out of the cloud.

7. καὶ κατ' αὐτὴν δὲ In the second explanation it is the fire-particles which produce the thunderbolt, being driven violently by the wind, and then owing to the same opposition of the increasing density of the cloud, breaking through it and falling. The MSS. have *κατὰ ταύτην*, on which Usener's *κατ' αὐτήν* is certainly an improvement, though even that is not very easily intelligible: it probably refers back to the theory of thunder in § 100. 5 ff.

8. καθὰ καὶ βροτὴν. . . certainly a reference to the theory of § 100. 5. One would have expected a reference to one of the theories of lightning here rather than thunder.

9. πνευματωθέντος. cf. πεπνευματωμένου, § 100. 7.

10. διὰ τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι ὑποχωρεῖν just in the same way as the ignited wind above, 1 4

11. τῷ πέλησιν γίνεσθαι After these words the MSS. have τὸ μὲν πολὺν πρὸς ὄρος τι ὑψηλον, ἐν ὦ μάλιστα κεραυνοὶ πίπτουσιν. The words interrupt the sense badly and μέν has nothing to correspond with it, so I have followed Usener in rejecting them as a note. But the high mountain is a prominent feature in the Epicurean theory of clouds, as we may see from *Lucr. vi. 459 ff.*, and the note is at any rate on quite correct Epicurean lines.

§ 104. 1. καὶ κατ' ἄλλους δὲ τρόπους. . . Lucretius suggests several in vi. 295 ff., 300 ff., 309 ff.

3. δὲ μῦθος of course the idea that the thunderbolt is the direct instrument of divine vengeance, which Lucretius combats at length *vi. 379-422*

4. τῶν ἀφανῶν. It is of course the causes of celestial phenomena which are ἀφανῆ and not the phenomena themselves. We are to get hints (*σημειοῦσθαι*) from causes we know about causes beyond our ken.

IV. ATMOSPHERIC AND TERRESTRIAL PHENOMENA.

(a) *Cyclones*. § 104. 5–§ 105. 4. The writer deals first with cyclones and suggests three explanations: in the first cloud is the main constituent, which is forced down by wind: in the other two wind, which either forms itself into a spiral, or is impeded by the mass of cloud and so driven downwards. Lucr. vi. 423–450 deals with the same topic and, though he only suggests the first explanation, sets it out with much picturesque detail. The section owes much to the restorations of Usener, who has, however, gone a little too far in ‘correcting’ it.

5. κατὰ κάθεσιν νέφους, &c. The cloud is forced down by wind, which also causes its rotation, and its advance sideways is caused by an external wind: cf. Lucr. vi. 431–442.

6. στυλοειδῶς, ‘like a pillar’: a brilliant restoration of Usener’s for the MS. ἀλλοειδῶς: Lucr. vi. 433 ‘tamquam demissa columna’ makes it almost certain.

7. πολλοῦ, ‘by the violence of the wind’, which in its whirling efforts to escape drives on the cloud. Usener reads κύκλῳ, comparing l. 9 κατὰ περίστασιν δὲ πνεύματος εἰς κύκλον, but the sense is already sufficiently given by στυλοειδῶς, and a change here is unnecessary.

8. εἰς τὸ πλάγιον. another emendation of Usener’s for εἰς τὸ πλήσιον. again, l. 11 εἰς τὰ πλάγια διαρρυῆται gives it strong support

9. κατὰ περίστασιν . . . In this explanation wind is the main constituent, which forms itself into a rotating spiral. For περίστασις of § 92. 3, § 102. 7.

ἀέρος τινὸς ἐπισυναθουμένου ἄνωθεν: Usener, who analyses this clause ‘vento in gyrum acto et desuper pulso’, apparently takes ἐπισυναθουμένον as a middle in an active sense, ‘atmosphere thrusting it down simultaneously from above’. But (a) such a middle use is very improbable, (b) ἀέρι could not have this thrusting power. The participle is surely passive: wind in a spiral formation could not in itself account for the phenomenon of the spout. it needs also some ‘body’: this is supplied in a portion of misty atmosphere (*ἀέρος τινός*) which is thrust down from above into the wind-spiral.

10. βύσεως πολλῆς. . . : the third explanation, which also takes wind as the chief constituent, follows the lines of the explanations of the thunderbolt given above. The wind in the cloud, being impeded by the condensed mass of cloud in its endeavours to move sideways, is driven to find an exit in a downward direction: cf. § 103. 3–7.

§ 105. 1. καὶ ἡσ μὲν . . . : the same distinction of the whirlwinds on land and the waterspouts at sea produced by the cyclones is implied by Lucretius, who, after his description of the phenomenon at sea, appends a picture of what occurs on land (vi. 443–447).

2. ὡς δὲ . . . γίνηται: Usener having emended ὡς ἀν to ὡς ἀναγκαῖς, κίνησιν to δίνησιν, and γίνηται to γίνεται, then excludes the clause as a gloss on δινοι. This is exceedingly arbitrary, and Bignone points out

that the words will make good sense as they stand if ὡς ἀν be taken in the sense of 'in whatever way', 'in all the various ways in which the creation of such whirlwinds may occur owing to the movement of the wind'. He would however himself prefer to suppose a brief lacuna, γίνονται, ἴδιως δὲ καὶ ὀνομάζονται, ὡς ἀν... This would, no doubt, give further point to the clause, but once again it seems to be unduly imaginative restoration, and I should prefer to keep the words as they stand as a reference to the various kinds of whirlwinds which may occur.

(b) *Earthquakes*. § 105 5-§ 106 2. The writer suggests two main causes for earthquakes. (1) The dislocation and shaking of the earth by wind, which either (a) penetrates from outside, or (b) is produced by the falling in of large masses of ground into subterranean caverns. Or (2) this falling may itself circulate a shock underground, which is ultimately arrested and returned by compact tracts of earth. We must remember that the earth is conceived of as flat and of no great depth. The explanations are for the most part like those suggested by Lucr. vi. 535-607, and may be traced to their authors among the early philosophers, from whom too comes the tradition of reckoning certain subterranean phenomena among τὰ μετέωρα.

5 κατὰ πνεύματος... The causing of the earthquake by subterranean winds is described by Lucr. vi. 577 ff.

6. παράθεσιν. presumably 'dislocation', lit 'the putting aside' of the earth in small masses by the force of the wind, which ultimately by cumulative effect causes a great motion.

7 οὐ τὴν... παρασκεύαζει. Usener for ὅταν... παρασκευάζῃ (sic).

τὴν κράδανσιν, 'the swaying of the earth'. so τὸ περιέχον κραδαίνοντος, Aet. iii 15.4, in his account of Anaxagoras' theory of earthquakes. The reading of the majority of the MSS points to κραδαῖμόν, which Casaubon adopted, but the second hand in B supports Hermann's restoration κράδανσιν

καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦτο... the writer deals with the question of the origin of this wind. It may come from outside. This was apparently the theory of Anaxagoras. cf. Aet. loc. cit., and Arist. *Meteor*. ii. 7 365 a so Lucr. vi 578:

ventus ubi atque animae subito vis maxima quaedam
... : extrinsecus . . . coorta.

8. (ἢ). a necessary addition of Meibom. he must proceed now to the alternative cause of the wind.

ἐκ τοῦ πέπτειν...: the second cause: the earth is cavernous beneath, and from time to time masses of earth fall in which stir the air and so create a wind. This idea is explained in Lucr. vi. 535-556 and was the notion of Anaximenes: Arist. *Meteor*. ii. 7. 365 b βρεχομένην τὴν γῆν καὶ ἐγρανομένην ῥήγνοθαι καὶ ὑπὸ τούτων τῶν ἀπορρηγμένων κολωνῶν ἐμπιπτόντων στείσθαι. So too Seneca, *Nat. Quæst.* vi 20, in explaining Epicurus' theories of earthquake says: 'fortasse

enim aere extrinsecus alio intrante agitatur, fortasse aliqua parte subito cadente percutitur et inde motum capit'.

There can be no doubt as to the meaning, but the text is uncertain. The MSS. have ἐκ τοῦ πίπτεν εἰς ἔδαφη εἰς ἀντροειδεῖς τόπους. Usener obliterates the first *eis* and suggests in his notes that it may represent something like ἔκοντα or ἐκλελυμένα, but Hermann's simple emendation *εἰσω*, mentioned by Usener in the preface, seems to set the passage right.

9. ἐκπνευματοῦντα is again a correction of Usener's for ἐκ πνευμάτων. A participle is badly wanted, and this gives just the sense required: we may compare πεπνευματωμένου, § 100. 7, and πνευματωθέντος, § 103. 9.

10. ἐπειλημμένον of Q is probably right: πεπιλημένον of the majority of the MSS. is certainly wrong: there is no question here of the condensation of air.

(καὶ) κατ' αὐτὴν δὲ . . . the second main cause: the communication of a shock owing to the fall of ἔδαφη. There seems to be nothing quite like this notion elsewhere. Lucret. vi. 557-576 has the idea of the fall, but regards it as due to wind and causing wind, as above, 1 b, and Democritus too (Seneca, *Nat. Quaest* vi 20) connects it with the motion of a subterranean stream. The MSS. have κατὰ ταύτην: the sense demands Usener's restoration: cf. § 103. 7

διάδοσιν, 'the distribution' of the shock.

12. ἀνταπόδοσιν, 'the return' of the shock: the movement reaches a firm, rocky piece of earth and is repelled: so, with his general notion of wind, Lucret. vi. 568 ff.

ἀπαντήσῃ. sc. ἡ κίνησις.

§ 108. 2. γίνεσθαι. Usener, who puts a full stop at ἀποτελεῖσθαι, suggests in his notes that δυνατόν is missing: it is probably another instance in which ἐνδέχεται or the like must be supplied: cf. § 92. 3, § 101. 4.

(c) (²) Volcanoes. § 108. 3-7 There follows a short passage dealing with the genesis of wind, which is palpably fragmentary. It does not seem to be part of a general theory of wind, though Bignone appears to take it as such, but rather of its origin in connexion with some other phenomenon. Usener is inclined to attach it to the section dealing with cyclones (§ 104 above), but it does not seem to fit well. Comparing it with Lucretius' description (vi. 680-702 and especially 694-700), I am inclined to believe that it formed part of a section on the cause of volcanoes. Lucretius explains that there are subterranean tunnels from the sea underneath Aetna, and the water which thus enters causes the wind which drives out the flames, &c. The passage in Lucretius has also been unfortunately mutilated, but we may notice the lines:

et penetrare mari penitus res cogit aperto
atque efflare foras ideoque extollere flammarum
saxaque subiectare et harenæ tollere nimbos,

which correspond well enough to the second half of the first sentence of this section. If this theory be right, a considerable passage must have fallen out.

3. τὰ δὲ πνεύματα: Usener suggests that we should read τὰ δὲ πνεύματα (*ταῦτα*), and whether the reference be to the cyclones or to volcanoes, or any other phenomena, it is a very probable addition: something is wanted to distinguish τὰ πνεύματα here from τὰ λοιπὰ πνεύματα below.

ἀλλοφυλίας τινός: probably the alien matter of wind as opposed to the earth of the volcanoes. I do not understand how Usener takes it on his theory of the context.

4. καθ' ἡδατος ἀφθόνου συλλογήν will, on my view, be a second cause, namely, that described by Lucretius—the entrance of the sea-water, which forces the air in the caverns up as wind.

5. τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πνεύματα, ‘other winds’ concerned in the eruption apart from the special ones with which he has been dealing: these are produced when a few wind-particles or currents fall into the hollows beneath the mountain, and setting the interior air in motion cause a spreading of wind. Bignone would read τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν.

6. δλίγων: sc. πνευμάτων, as opposed to the πολλὰ κοιλάματα into which they enter. The word does not seem to me, as Usener thinks, to require emendation. Bignone would translate ‘few bodies of matter’, holding that the writer is arguing against Democritus, who said that when many bodies were in an empty space, wind followed: this seems very far-fetched.

διαδόσσεως, ‘spreading’ as the currents set in motion the air which they meet and that in its turn stirs more distant air: cf. κατ’ αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν διάδοσιν τῆς κινήσεως, § 105. 10.

(d) *Hail* § 106. 6-§ 107 4 The writer now returns from terrestrial phenomena to more strictly meteorological occurrences, and deals with the formation and shape of hail. The text is uncertain and the meaning obscure: unfortunately Lucretius passes by the subject of this and the next few sections with the general statement that it will be easy to account for the formation of such things when we have once grasped the nature and powers of the atoms (vi 527-534), nor can we derive much assistance from the accounts of the theories of early philosophers. The general idea, however, seems clear. Hail is formed either (1) by the powerful congelation of particles of wind, or (2) by the milder congelation of particles of water: in either case together with the process of congelation there is a (?) simultaneous process of division which causes the formation of small masses of ice instead of the freezing of the whole cloud. With regard to details both of text and interpretation I am inclined to differ considerably from Usener.

8. κατὰ πῆξιν ἴσχυροτέραν: because it requires a stronger congelation to solidify the subtler and more elusive particles of wind than the already more compact particles of water.

9. πνευματωδῶν: the emphatic word in this first explanation as opposed to the ὑδατοειδῶν of the second.

περιστασίς, 'conformation', the coming together from different quarters to form a whole: cf. περιστασί . . . πνεύματος εἰς κύκλον, § 104. 9 above, for the word; also § 92. 3, § 102. 7.

καὶ καταφέρισιν: so the MSS., except that κατὰ μέρισιν is written as two words. Simultaneous with the process of conformation is one of division, which causes the formation of separate nodules of hail instead of one solid mass. Usener reads κατὰ μέρισιν, 'and a subsequent division'. but (a) it is extremely improbable that any one held the notion that the whole congealed in a mass, 'and then' was divided: surely τὰ φαινόμενα ἀντιφαρτυρεῖ, (b) the lengthier explanation of the process in the second theory shows that this was not the case. Bignone tacitly follows Usener.

καὶ (κατὰ) πῆξιν μετριωτέραν . . . : the second theory: it is watery particles which congeal, and for this purpose a less severe freezing is required. (κατά) is a necessary insertion made by Meibom.

10. (καὶ) δμοῦ ρῆξιν, 'and at the same time a breaking': i.e. just as in the case of the πνευματωδῆ particles, there must be a concurrent process of division: the idea is then doubly explained: this causes a simultaneous 'thrusting together' (*σύνωσις*) of the particles, and a splitting up (*διάρρηξιν*) into separate nodules; the former process makes the individual parts of the hailstones cling together (κατὰ μέρη), the latter makes them cling together as separate wholes (κατὰ ἀθροότητα). I believe then that with the single insertion of καὶ the MS. text gives a perfectly intelligible and consistent account of this double process and that no further emendation is required. Usener, however, adopts the correction ὁμούρησιν (cf. Ep. *ad Hdt* § 64. 9) for δμοῦ ρῆξιν, and to account for it inserts before it (πνευματωδῶν δέ τινων). But (a) the alteration is very considerable; (b) the 'neighbourhood of certain windy particles' is not required to account for the double process, (c) it destroys the triple parallelism of the whole clause (πῆξιν . . . ρῆξιν, σύνωσιν . . . διάρρηξιν, κατὰ μέρη . . . κατὰ ἀθροότητα); (d) it introduces a confusion between the two explanations: all that is required in the second is ὑδατοειδῆ particles (this is made clear again by § 107. 3 εἴτε ὑδατοειδῶν εἴτε πνευματωδῶν). The correction is very ingenious, but to my mind quite wrong. Bignone's translation again follows Usener's text without comment.

11. σύνωσιν: the process of union of the parts in a whole as opposed to διάρρηξιν the breaking up into separate nodules: the particles congeal, but in single nuclei.

ποιουμένην agrees grammatically with ρῆξιν, but in sense, of course, also with πῆξιν.

12. κατὰ μέρη, as far as regards the parts of the nodules as opposed to κατὰ ἀθροότητα, as far as regards the individual nodules as separate wholes. With the general idea of the second theory we may compare the notions of Anaximenes, χάλαζαν δὲ (ἐκθλίβεσθαι), ἐπειδὰν τὸ καταφερό-

μενον ὑδωρ παγῆ (Aet. iii. 4. 1) and Anaxagoras χάλαζαν δ' ὅταν ἀπὸ τῶν παγέντων νεφῶν προσῳθῇ τινα πρὸς τὴν γῆν, & δὴ ταῖς καταφοραῖς ἀποψυχρούμενα στρογγυλοῦται (Aet. iii. 4. 2)

§ 107. 1. ή δὲ περιφέρεια . . . : the writer proceeds to consider the cause of the round shape of the hailstones and suggests (1) that the corners are rounded off as they fall; (2) that as all the composing particles come together in exactly even quantities and at even rate from all sides, the round shape is naturally formed: this is true whether the particles are of wind or water.

2. τῶν ἄκρων ἀποτηκομένων this is stated as Epicurus' theory by Aet. iii. 4. 5 στρογγυλάνεοθα δὲ τὴν χάλαζαν καὶ τὸν ὑετὸν ἀπὸ τῆς μακρᾶς καταφορᾶς ὑποτεπλασμένον.

καὶ ἐν τῇ συντάξει . . . this most ingenious idea is again implied in Seneca, *Nat. Quaest* iv. 12

πάντοθεν . . . κατὰ μέρη δμαλῶς περισταμένων notice the extreme carefulness of the description it seems to be taken direct from some philosopher's theory.

ῶς λέγεται. but unfortunately we cannot attribute it to its author.

3. ὑδατοειδῶν: Usener for some reason adopts the reading of F, ὑδατοποιῶν, against that of all the other MSS., which preserves the parallelism and is strongly supported by ὑδατοειδῶν in § 106. 10.

(e) *Snow* § 107. 5-§ 108. 4 A section naturally follows on snow. The text is again corrupt, but the general sense is clear, and a series of brilliant emendations have greatly improved the MS. reading. There are three theories (1) that water is driven out of the clouds, which subsequently congeals in cold regions below; (2) that the pressure of clouds on one another congeals the water into snow inside, so that it falls out in that form, (3) that the friction of congealed clouds causes bits of snow to break off along the edges. The last is perhaps the most typically Epicurean explanation. Lucretius again passes over the question without comment (vi. 529).

5. ὑδατος λεπτοῦ . . . : the first theory. fine particles of water exude from clouds of the right atomic formation provided with pores to fit them, and entering cold regions below become congealed into snow flakes. This was the theory of Anaximenes and Anaxagoras.

6. διὰ πόρων a striking correction of Kühn's for διαφορῶν (variously accented) of the MSS.

Θίψεις, Usener. Θλίψεως MSS. - the writer uses διά with acc. rather than gen. in this sense, e.g. διά τινα ἵσχυρὰν . . . ψυχρασίαν just below, and the accumulation of genitives would be almost intolerable.

7. νεφῶν δεὶ ὑπὸ πνευμάτων σφοδράς a series of corrections for the MSS. νεφῶν καὶ ὑπομνήματος σπορᾶς, which is clearly nonsense. Usener excludes καὶ, but I have accepted Bignone's correction δεὶ (cf. § 102. 5).

8. ἐν τῇ φορᾷ: i.e. in its descent.

9. κατωτέρω, Cobet, for κατώτερον

περιστασιν. see §§ 92. 3, 102. 7, 104. 9, 106. 9.

καὶ κατὰ πῆξιν δ...: the second explanation: the congelation of the snowflakes may take place inside clouds of sufficiently fine texture, and their exudation caused by the pressure of clouds in juxtaposition.

10. δμαλῆ δραιόγητα: the clouds must be fine in texture to produce such fine particles as those which compose snow: they must be of the same texture all over (δμαλῆ) to cause the evenness of the formation of the snowflakes. cf. of the formation of hailstones, § 107. 2, πάντοθεν . . . κατὰ μέρη δμαλῶς περισταμένων.

ἔχουσιν, Meibom, for ἔχουσαν οτ ἔχουσα.

τοιαύτη, Froben, for τοιαύτην

12. Before ὑδατοειδῶν Usener inserts (τῶν) unnecessarily, ὑδατοειδῶν καὶ συμπαρακειμένων are conditions which must be fulfilled by the clouds. Bignone translates 'when the watery elements are pressed by those near them': I do not see how this can be got out of the Greek σύνωσιν in the technical sense: the driving together of particles to form the flake: see § 106. 11.

13. δ μάλιστα γίνεται ἐν τῷ δέρι: i.e. this process of σύνωσις, the driving together of particles by an external agency to form things is especially frequent in the atmosphere, where there is greater freedom of movement. We have seen it in the case of hail in § 106. 11. The clause is curious, but not, I think, unnatural. There seems no necessity for Usener's ἐν τῷ ἔστι, though Arist. *Meteor.* I. 12. 347 b says αἱ δὲ χάλαζαι γίνονται ἔστι μὲν καὶ ὀπωρίνον μάλιστα.

§ 108. 1. καὶ κατὰ τρῆψιν δὲ νεφῶν. a third possibility: the clouds themselves may be congealed, and by their friction cause the flakes of snow to spring off by a kind of trituration: a specially Epicurean idea.

2. ἀπόπαλσιν. a technical word: the particles which form the congealed clouds are always in a state of vibratory movement, and the friction enables them to 'leap away' from the cloud.

Δν λαμβάνοι τὸ, Schneider, for ἀναλαμβάνοτο or ἀναλαμβάνοι τὸ.

3. ἀθροισμα: again technical, the right conformation of atoms to make snowflakes. cf. 100. 3

(f) *Dew and Frost.* § 108. 5–§ 109. 8. Dew is next dealt with in a section which presents no great difficulty. There are two theories of its formation: (1) that particles which form it unite in the atmosphere and fall; (2) that particles rise from damp places, unite and form moist drops, which fall again as dew. To this account is appended a brief statement that frost is formed in the same ways, when the moist particles are congealed by cold air. Lucretius does not even mention dew in his list of phenomena passed over: vi. 527–534.

5. ἐκ τοῦ δέρος is emphatic: in the first theory the origin of the moisture is in the air: moist particles gather together there till they form a drop big enough to fall as dew.

7. καὶ κατὰ φορᾶν δὲ . . .: the second theory differs in that the

origin of the moisture is the earth: moist particles are exhaled from damp places which then gather together and fall once more as dew-drops. Bignone would read *κατ' ἀναφοράν*, unnecessarily. cf. *φοράν* for the fall in 1.7.

ἀπὸ νοτερῶν τόπων: sc. marshes, η ὕδατα κεκτημένων, sc. places with ponds or streams.

8. οἶσις · Usener's correction for *τοῖς*, better than Kühn's *οῖς*, which is too abrupt.

9. εἰς τὸ αὐτὸν with *σύνοδον* only: cf. *σύνοδον πρὸς ἀλληλα*, 1.5 above.

10. *ὑγρασίας* · Bignone would insert *παχυρέας*: if anything is to be added I would rather insert *τοιαύτης*.

καθάπερ δροίως . . . the appeal to familiar phenomena is not so obvious as usual: perhaps the writer is thinking of such things as the formation of steam into water on an intervening solid

II. *τοιαῦτά τινα* there is obviously a lacuna after these words which must have contained (a) the conclusion of the sentence, (b) the beginning of a sentence about hoar-frost, as Gassendi long ago inferred from the context. I should differ slightly from Usener's tentative filling up, (a) because I think *συντελούμενα* is unnecessary and not quite in accordance with the writer's usual phraseology (cf. § 95. 9, &c.), (b) because *οὐ διαφερόντως συντελεῖται τῶν δρόσων* seems an unnatural expression I suspect a participle, *μεταβαλλομένων* or *ἀλλοιούμενών* is lost.

§ 109. 2 *τοιούτων τινῶν*, Usener, for the *τούτων* of the MSS · the correction is not absolutely necessary, but makes the construction less abrupt, and is hinted at by B's *τούτων τινά*.

(g) *Ice*. § 109. 4-8 A short section on the formation of ice follows Two theories are advanced both hold that ice is produced by the elimination of particles of round formation and the gathering together of those of angular shape, but they differ in that the first, which is probably that of Democritus, describes the process as taking place entirely in the water, the second holds that it is an external formation which then comes and causes congelation in the water. The ideas seem rather grotesque to us, but we may remember (1) that to Epicurus the alteration of the *σχηματισμός* of component particles is always the cause of change, (2) that round smooth particles are always characteristic of water (cf. *Lucret. II. 451-452*), and that consequently their elimination would be the natural preliminary to the change of water into a solid; (3) that the observation of the formation of ice-crystals might well lead to some such idea. Lucretius (vi. 530) again passes over the problem with a mention.

4. *ἐκθλιψιν*, 'the squeezing out', a technical word of the atomists for the process by which a particle (or an atom) between two others gets driven out usually in an upward direction (cf. probably *Ep. I. § 53. 6*).

5. *σχηματισμόν*: the formation of atoms into a nucleus of matter: Lucretius' *glomeramen*: cf. §§ 101, 102.

σύρωσιν, as in § 107. 12.

σκαληρῶν καὶ δέγυωντιν: it is a little difficult to realize the difference, but probably by σκαληρῶν he means particles of triangular shape, by δέγυωντιν other angular formations.

6. τῶν . . . ὑπαρχόντων: this is emphatic as it is the point in which the first theory differs from the second.

καὶ κατὰ ἔξωθεν: again the emphatic point: the nuclei are formed outside, and attaching themselves to the water cause the change in shape and texture. We ought perhaps, with Schneider, to read κατὰ τὴν.

7. πρόσκρισιν: the use of this word leads one naturally to suspect that this was the theory of Anaxagoras, though I can find no trace of it elsewhere: cf. § 90. 8.

8. ποσά, 'a certain number': the use is odd, but seems vouched for by the MSS.

(h) *The rainbow.* § 109. 9–§ 110. 6. The writer proceeds to deal with the rainbow. Two theories again are advanced: (1) that it is due to the shining of the sun's rays on a watery atmosphere; (2) that it is caused by a mixture of light and air which produces these colours, which are then reflected by the surrounding air. The former theory alone is mentioned by Lucr. vi. 524–526, and seems to have been the notion of Anaximenes (Aet. iii. 5. 10).

9. ἀπὸ τοῦ ἥλιου: the MSS. have ὑπό, which can hardly be right. Usener, following F, omits the preposition: I think it is more likely that it is a mistake for ἀπό.

10. κατὰ πρόσκρισιν: the MSS. have κατ' ἀέρος φύσιν, a palpable error. Usener reads κατὰ κράσιν, which is excellent in sense, but hardly accounts for the MS text. I suggest κατὰ πρόσκρισιν (κατ' ἀέρος = κατὰ πρός.); cf. § 109. 7 above. If the suggestion be right, one would expect this to be the theory of Anaxagoras, though Aetius (iii. 5. 11) states that he supported the reflection theory: it may be that the writer adopted Anaxagoras' technical term without intending to imply his authorship of the theory. Bignone, feeling the same objection to Usener's emendation, reads κατὰ σύμφυσιν.

11. ἴδιωματα, 'the special characteristics': cf. πρόσκρισιν ἴδιαν above.

εἴτε . . . μονοειδῶς: i.e. the peculiar combination of light and air may produce all the colours at once, or separate combinations may cause the separate colours.

13. τοιαύτην, Usener, for ταύτην: cf. § 109. 2.

14. κατὰ πρόσλαμψιν πρὸς τὰ μέρη: i.e. the shining of the same light on different parts of the surrounding atmosphere may cause the production of different colours: a suggestion to explain μονοειδῶς above.

§ 110. 1–6. As a secondary point the writer discusses the shape of the rainbow. Here we have two quite different theories corresponding, though not at first obviously, to the two theories of the formation of

the rainbow above: (1) if the rainbow is merely the reflection of the sun's light, then it is round because all points of the reflection are equidistant from our sight; (2) if it is caused by the mixture of elements of light from the sun and air in the atmosphere, then its roundness is due to the fact that one or other of these two component elements is actually arranged in round form and impresses its shape on the combination.

2. *διὰ τὸ . . . θεωρεῖσθαι*: the conformation of our *κόσμος* being spherical, the junction of points equidistant from the earth will assume a round appearance.

3. *ἢ σύνωσιν . . .*: this explanation clearly goes with the second of the two theories as to the general nature of the rainbow.

4. *τῶν ἐν τῷ ἀέρι . . . ἀποφερομένων*: corresponding exactly, though with a more careful statement, to *τοῦ τε φωτὸς καὶ τοῦ ἀέρος*, § 109. 10.

ἀτόμων · all the MSS. have *τομῶν*, a palpable mistake, which, as Usener has seen, was corrected by the insertion of *ἀτομῶν* after the participle *ἀποφερομένων*.

ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀέρος · after these words the MSS. have *προσφερομένου πρὸς τὴν σελήνην* · Usener insists, following C. F Hermann, that the words from *ἀέρος* to *σελήνην* are only a meaningless repetition of a phrase from the following section · Usener also excludes *αὐτοῦ*, which I am inclined to keep as emphasizing the contrast between the light atoms derived from the sun and the air atoms already in the atmosphere: all that need be excluded is *προσφερομένου πρὸς τὴν σελήνην*.

5. *περιφέρειαν . ταύτην*. This combination (*sc.* of light and air atoms) stretches downwards, a kind of round shape i.e spreads out in the round shape which it assumes from one of its elements. But the expression is odd and the text rather uncertain, all the MSS. having *καθίσθαι* instead of *καθίεσθαι*, which is Meibom's correction.

(1) *The moon's halo*. § 110. 7-111 2. Three easily distinguishable theories are propounded (1) that the halo is formed by air advancing from outside towards the moon; (2) that it is formed by effluences from the moon itself, which are checked equally all round by the air; (3) that it is formed by the surrounding air, which is piled up in a thick circle either by an external current, or by heat which blocks up the channels for its movement. The text is rather corrupt, though it has been greatly improved by Meibom and Usener. Lucretius does not deal with this problem, nor does it seem possible to obtain any light from the accounts of the earlier philosophers, from whom no doubt these theories are derived.

7 *καὶ* the MSS. have *καὶ κατὰ*, their most frequent mistake, due to dittography.

9. *ἀναστέλλοντος*, 'blocking', 'banking up'. Meibom's correction for *ἀναστέλλοντα*, a mere mistake due to the neighbourhood of *ῥεύματα* and *ἀποφερόμενα*.

10. περιστήσαι εἰς: Usener's most ingenious correction of *περὶ τῆς εἰς*, based on Meibom's previous suggestion *περιστήσῃ*.

καὶ μὴ τὸ παράπαν διακρίναται, 'without any distinction all along', i.e. the process of the banking up of the cloudy circle takes place equally at all parts, an elaboration of ὁμαλῶς in l. 9.

11. ἀναστέλλοντος: sc. τοῦ ἀέρος, as before: the expression is loose, 'the air checks the air round the moon'. Possibly it was the consciousness of this carelessness which led the writer to add the clause δ γίνεται . . . ἀπεργάσασθαι, which explains the real causes of the check.

12. περιφερές, like παχυμερές, is predicative.

παχυμερές, 'thick in parts', i.e. with its parts closely compressed, so dense.

§ 111 1. δ γίνεται . . . ἀπεργάσασθαι. I take this sentence to refer only to the last explanation: the 'banking' of the air may be due either to an external effluence or to the effect of heat. Bignone would refer it to the whole paragraph, taking ἦτοι . . . βεύματος as the cause of the advance of air from outside (first explanation) and ἡ . . . ἀπεργάσασθαι as the cause of the 'banking' of the air (third explanation). The singular δ seems to me against this.

κατὰ μέρη τινά, sc. in different parts of the sky during the moon's course one or other of these causes is at work.

2. ἡ τῆς θερμασίας . . . ἀπεργάσασθαι is not very explicit. Bignone takes this to mean that heat seizes on the pores through which the air would naturally move and blocks them up, so as to produce the phenomenon of the halo. I feel sure that this is the meaning, but do not see how it can be extracted from the MS. text, with which it must be that the πόροι are ἐπιτήδειοι εἰς τὸ τοῦτο ἀπεργάσασθαι. I therefore propose the small change to ἐπιτηδεῖως

V FURTHER CELESTIAL PHENOMENA.

The writer now, with a certain irregularity of procedure, returns to celestial phenomena, and deals with certain problems which he had hitherto left untouched. It would not be right to transfer this and the following sections to their logical position at the beginning of § 99, because the whole letter is so obviously a patchwork compilation without systematic treatment. Usener suggests that this paragraph on comets ought to come after the two sections on the planets and fixed stars and immediately before that on falling stars. Again we may agree that this would be more logical, but there seems little reason for supposing that the writer was careful enough to put his subjects in the rational order.

(a) Comets. § 111. 4-11. For the occurrence of comets the writer suggests two possible causes, the latter being subdivided. (1) It may be that they are casual collocations of fire in the sky due to a special atomic conformation; (2) it may be that they are real permanent stars,

and that either (*a*) some special movement of the sky reveals them to us when they were previously hidden, or (*b*) they move independently so that they come into our vision. I cannot at all agree with Usener that (*2 b*) is a mere repetition of (*1*) and should therefore be excluded: see notes. Bignone agrees with me both in keeping the text and in the explanation of it.

5. *περιστάσεως*, 'a gathering of matter all round' to form some new object one of the writer's favourite technical terms cf. §§ 92, 102, 104, &c

6. *ἡ ιδίαν . . . ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς*. the second cause· the whole heaven moves so as to bring the comets into view. compare the account given of the motion of sun and moon, § 92. 9.

7. *τὰ τοιαῦτα ἀστρα* is emphatic· the comets are actual *ἀστρα*, permanent heavenly bodies, which through the movement of the whole sky now become visible.

ἢ αὐτὰ. *ἐκφανῆ γενέσθαι*. the third cause· the comets may be permanent celestial bodies, which though the whole heaven remains stationary, come into view from time to time by their own movement. The construction of the clause, as Bignone points out, is again infinitive depending on a suppressed *δινάτον* or *ἐνδέχεται*. cf. § 92. 3, § 101. 11, § 106, 2. Usener excludes the whole clause on the ground that it is a mere repetition of (*1*), but it differs from it in that (*1*) regards the comets as occasional temporary aggregations of fire, and (*2 a* and *b*) as permanent bodies. It is essential to the passage to retain the clause, which is then parallel to the second possibility with regard to sun and moon given in § 92. 9.

8. *διά τινα περιστασιῶν* i.e. some conformation of the atmosphere which presses on these normally stationary bodies and stirs them into action. Bignone again translates 'for some reason' see § 102. 7.

9. *τὴν τε ἀφάνισιν*. *αἴτιας*. There can surely be no reason why Usener should exclude this clause. the explanation of the disappearance of the comets is not only natural but almost necessary.

(*b*) *Fixed stars*. § 112 1-8. The writer now proceeds to consider the problems of the various kinds of motions of the stars, and deals first with the fixed stars. His explanations correspond exactly to the theories of the motions of the stars given in § 92, with which passage this is closely connected. (*1*) If the whole heaven moves round and the stars with it, then the fixed stars are at the points which do not revolve (i.e. the poles), (*2*) if the heaven is stationary and the stars move independently then, (*a*) if the stars are driven by their own whirl (*δινῆ*), the fixed stars are prevented from moving by a circular current all round them which keeps them in their place, (*b*) if the stars advance to the regions where they can successively find fuel for their flame, then the fixed stars are kept in one place as it is the only source of their proper fuel. We may therefore fairly attribute the first theory to Anaximenes, the second to Democritus, and the third to Herachitus. The reference is to the polar stars, i.e. as Bignone

explains, those whose distance from the pole is less than the height of the pole above the horizon, so that they are visible all the year round.

§ 112 1. τινὰ ἀστρα στρέφεται αὐτοῦ δ συμβαίνει: the MSS. have *τινὰ* ἀναστρέφεται αὐτοῦ δ συμβαίνει. Usener's restoration *ἀστρα* for *ἀνα-* is certain, and he rightly sees that the expression is a reminiscence of the Homeric ἄρκτον... η τ' αὐτοῦ στρέφεται (*Il.* 18. 487). That being so, it seems more likely that the writer should have made the quotation exact and followed it with δ συμβαίνει, as the MSS. have it, than that he should have brought the phrase into line with his usual form of expression by writing, as Usener emends, στρέφεσθαι αὐτοῦ συμβαίνει.

στρέφεται αὐτοῦ. not merely *versatur ibidem*, but literally 'revolve in their place'.

οὐ μάνον . . . στρέφεται. the first cause: these stars are in a stationary part of the heaven.

2. τὸ λοιπόν: sc. 'the rest of the heaven': there is no reason to adopt Schneider's τὰ λοιπά, 'the remaining stars'.

3. τινὲς we may take to be Anaximenes and his followers. Usener thinks the reference is not to the polar stars, but to the theory of the Pythagoreans that the 'middle and end' of the world were fixed. But the parallel of § 92 seems to demand the polar theory.

ἄλλα καὶ . . . καὶ τὰ ἄλλα. the second theory: the other stars perform an orbit, but these are kept in their place by a revolving ring of air around them.

4. περιεστάναι: with the full technical force of περίστασις the encircling whirl is formed all round the star

5. η καὶ διὰ . . .: the third theory, which is really so different in general idea from the other two, is carefully marked off from them

6. κείμενα: emphatic, 'fixed'

καὶ κατ' ἄλλους . . : the usual caution: the parallel of earthly phenomena may suggest several other ways in which the occurrence may take place.

(c) *Planets and regular stars.* § 112. 9-§ 113. 12. From the fixed stars the writer passes to the moving stars, and first suggests explanations for the difference between the (apparently) erratic course of the planets and the regular orbits of the other stars. The two explanations given again correspond, but not so completely, to the theories of § 92. The notion of the movement of the whole sky now drops out, and the two theories of the independent motion of the individual stars are considered (1) if they move according to orbits determined by necessity from the beginning, then some of these were regular circles and some are interrupted by aberrations, (2) if the stars move towards the regions which supply their fuel, then some pass always through regions equally open and prolific in fuel, others through irregular tracts with an unequal supply, so that their movements are erratic. For the latter notion we may compare, in a slightly different context, Lucr. v. 696-700. The wording of the passage is a little obscure and

the text in places uncertain, though I incline, as usual, to think Usener's corrections rash.

9. εἰ οὖτω... συμβαίνει: a parenthesis 'if indeed it is the case that their movements are erratic', suggesting the possibility that in such distant phenomena even our observations may be doubtful.

§ 113. 1. τινὰ δὲ μὴ {οὗτω} κινέσθαι. The MSS. have *τινὰ δὲ μὴ κινέσθαι*, which cannot be right, as the question of the fixed stars has already been disposed of in the previous paragraph, and the contrast now is between the aberrations of the planets and the regularity of the stars. Usener boldly emends, on the analogy of the terminology elsewhere in this paragraph, to *τινὰ δὲ ὄμαλῶς κινέσθαι*. But this seems too violent, and I am inclined to think that *δὲ μὴ* is right and some word has dropped out—possibly *ἄνωμαλῶς*, but more probably simply *οὗτω*, referring back to *οὗτω... συμβαίνει*. Bignone would exclude *κινέσθαι* as a gloss—not a very probable one.

2. παρὰ τὸ κύκλῳ...: the first explanation—in this idea of the whirl and *άνάγκη* we seem again to recognize the theory of Democritus.

3. ὄμαλήν... 6. ὄμαλός... 7. ἀνώμαλεῖς There is considerable doubt as to the form of the adjectives. Elsewhere the forms *ὄμαλός* and *ἀνώμαλος* alone are known—the MSS. here are doubtful, they are unanimous for *ὄμαλήν* in 1. 3, divided between *ὄμαλός* and *όμαλεῖς* in 1. 6, and distinctly in favour of *ἀνώμαλεῖς* in 1. 7. Usener prefers the 3rd declension forms throughout. I incline to think that MS evidence combined with the invariable practice elsewhere is against it. Possibly the right solution is, as the MSS. suggest, that the writer used *ὄμαλός* but *ἀνώμαλής*, a slightly more probable form than *όμαλής*.

4. κατὰ τὴν (sc. δίνην) ἄμα τοῖν ἀνωμαλίαις χρωμένην is the MS. text and seems to me quite reasonable. the course of the planets is an orbit, but at the same time (*ἄμα*) it has some irregularities. Usener emends quite unnecessarily to *κατά τινα δίνησιν*, Bignone less violently but, I think, gratuitously to *κατά τιν' ἀλλην*.

ἐνδέχεται δὲ...: the second theory, that the fuel track of the planets is irregular, seems to bear the mark of Heraclitus.

5. παρεκτάσεις, 'tracts' of air surely not 'currents', as Bignone renders

6. ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συναθούσας κατὰ τὸ ἔξης, 'urging them on (by the attraction of appropriate fuel) continuously in the same direction', i.e. in the direction of a regular orbit.

7. παραλλαγές, 'alternations', so 'aberrations'—for the word cf § 95. 8.

8. τὸ δὲ μίαν αἰρίαν...: the usual attack on the 'theological' view, which adopts one certain theory: cf § 87.

10. ἀστρολογία: here clearly 'theological astronomy', the view which wishes to see in the movements of the stars an indication of the divine will. cf. *ἀστρολόγων τεχνιτείας*, § 93. 12

11. αἰρίας τινῶν is the MS. text, and again there seems no reason

to follow Usener in altering to *αἱρίας ἀστρων*—if indeed that is a possible expression. Bignone's *πάντων* is more probable, but possibly the writer's expression here was more mild.

ὅταν . . . ἀπολύωσι: again a familiar point. The primary object of Epicurean astronomy is to show that the divine nature *πράγματα οὐκ ἔχει*, K. Δ. i.

(d) *Difference of speed in the stars' orbits.* § 114. 1-7. The writer next deals with the apparent variety of pace in the orbits of the stars. His explanations here cannot be attached closely to preceding theories, nor are they exactly parallel to Lucretius' treatment of the same subject (v. 614-649), but they are within the same range of general ideas. Either (1) all stars are going on the same orbit, but some faster than others, or (2) some are really moving in the opposite direction, but are caught back by the whirl of the others and so seem to follow them more slowly, or (3) all move in the same direction, but some being at a greater distance from the centre have a larger distance to travel. The only difficulty of the passage lies in the text and interpretation of the second explanation.

3. *περιόντα* of course nom. plur., *τὸν αὐτὸν κύκλον* being an internal acc. *περιόντα* is the correction in Froben's text for the MS. *περιόντα*

καὶ παρὰ τὸ. *ὑπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς δίνης*. with this, the MS. text, the idea seems to be that the 'slower' stars are actually moving in an orbit in the opposite direction to that of the 'faster' stars, but they are, as it were, caught up by the whirl of the others and dragged back, so that they seem to move in the same direction as the others, but less fast. The idea is not quite clearly thought out, but sufficiently clear to be maintained in the text. Usener alters *τῆς αὐτῆς* to *τοιαύτης*, and in his analysis renders *causam posse esse vertiginem illa ex orbita detrahentem*, the idea being apparently that of a whirl 'of the requisite nature' (*τοιαύτης*) dragging the stars out of their course. But (a) this entirely neglects *τὴν ἐναντίαν κινεῖσθαι*, (b) *ἀντιστρώμενα* could only mean 'dragged in the opposite direction' and not 'dragged out of the course'; (c) the facts of the case are against such an idea, which is more appropriate to a planet. Bignone apparently accepts *τοιαύτης*, but agrees with me in the general idea of the passage.

4. *τῆς αὐτῆς δίνης* then is the whirl which moves the other stars as opposed to *τὴν ἐναντίαν*: cf. *τὸν αὐτὸν κύκλον* above. To me the expression seems quite clear and natural.

καὶ παρὰ τὸ περιφέρεσθαι. . . : this idea approaches nearly to the theory of Democritus as explained by Lucr. v. 621-636, but is without the elaborate notion of optical delusion which was a cardinal point in Democritus' explanation. We may compare the expressive phrase in the Epicurean Diogenes of Oenoanda, *fr. viii. 1. 11 οἱ μὲν ὑψηλὴν ζῶντι φέρονται, οἱ δὲ αὖτεινήν*.

6. **τὸ δὲ ἀπλῶς . . .** the same caution as above, § 113. 8. To insist on the single explanation is to lay claim to miraculous knowledge

(τερατείσθαι). Compare again Diog. Oen. fr. viii. 3 7 μάρτεως γὰρ μᾶλλον ἔστιν τὸ τοιοῦτον η ἀνδρὸς σοφοῦ

(e) *Falling stars* § 114. 8-§ 115 8. The letter proceeds to deal with falling or shooting stars, a sequence which would be quite natural if we were to follow Usener's suggestion and transfer the section on comets to a place immediately before it. Three explanations are offered, as to the first of which there is great divergence of opinion. As I understand the passage they are. (1) the falling stars may actually be fragments of stars, rubbed off in collision of star with star and driven down towards earth by an outburst of wind; (2) they may be formed by a gathering of fire-producing atoms, caused to fall in the direction of the impulse started by their meeting, (3) they may be formed by a gathering of wind in dense clouds, which is ignited when it cannot find an outlet, and then bursts out and falls in the direction of its original impulse. Usener interprets the first theory quite differently and alters the text, but in any case the paragraph must be carefully compared with that dealing with comets (§ 111) and those which treat of lightning (§§ 101-102) and thunderbolts (§ 103).

8 παρὰ μέρος, 'in part', almost 'in individual cases', as Bignone translates it. It may possibly be used in a more strictly local sense, 'in places' cf. κατὰ μέρη, § 111 1.

κατὰ παράτριψιν Usener's correction for καὶ παρὰ τρίψιν. The repetition of παρὰ is not, I think, impossible, and the uncompounded τρίψις might be used here (see, however, § 101. 2), but καὶ is unintelligible after καὶ παρὰ μέρος, and the confusion of καὶ and κατὰ is the commonest mistake in the MSS.

8-11. κατὰ παράτριψιν. . . ἐλέγομεν I take this whole clause together as constituting the first cause and, with some hesitation, retain the MS. ἑαυτῶν. The idea is that stars rub together and fragments break off, which fall through the atmosphere. compare, as the writer tells us, the description of the first cause of the creation of lightning (§ 101 2 ff.). The explanation will then be parallel to the second and third explanations of comets, namely, that shooting stars are in point of fact stars, or in this case, fragments of stars, whereas the other two explanations regard them as occasional formations.

If this view be correct, (1) παράτριψιν ἑαυτῶν is a loose expression, for it is of course the collision of stars which causes the fragments to be rubbed off, and not the collision of the 'falling stars' themselves. Bignone, agreeing with me in the general view of the phrase, would read ἀστρῶν for ἑαυτῶν, which would certainly make the expression much clearer, but this I do not consider necessary, as ἀστρῶν can so easily be derived as the equivalent of ἑαυτῶν from οἱ λεγόμενοι ἀστέρες ἔκπτυπτειν in l. 8, (2) καὶ παρὰ ἔκπτωσιν will denote a further step in the same cause. the fragments of stars are first rubbed off and then caused to fall by the action of wind. Bignone takes the words as introducing the second cause. but (a) the introductory phrase for a new cause in this section is καὶ κατὰ, not καὶ παρὰ, and (b) in the

parallel account of lightning in § 101 the 'falling out' of the fragments rubbed off is denoted by *ἔξολισθαίνων*; (3) the parallel to the explanation of the lightning flashes will not be exact, for they are created by the friction of clouds: but I take it that the reference is intended to suggest the kind of *παράγρυψις* and *ἐκπτώσις* which the writer has in mind and not to insist on an exact parallelism of occurrence. Usener however, desiring an exact parallel, reads *νεφῶν* for *ἴαντῶν* and *πυρὸς ἐκπτώσιν* for *παρὰ ἐκπτώσιν*. But the changes seem to me (as to Bignone) unjustifiably violent; they are not really required by the reference to the section on lightning, and they destroy the parallel to the section on comets which we should certainly expect to find. Bignone notices further that they would make the first cause very little different from the third. I prefer, therefore, to retain the MS. text and explain it as above, though admitting that it is a rather careless piece of writing.

9. καὶ παρὰ ἐκπτώσιν, 'and then by the falling out of the fragments'. Bignone, as already noted, takes this of an alternative cause.

10. ἡ ἐκπνευμάτωσις, 'the blowing of them out by wind'. Bignone renders 'the combination of fire and air, of which we have spoken in treating of lightning'. But (1) it is surely impossible that *ἐκπνευμάτωσις* could imply as much as this; (2) *καθάπερ* ought to refer to the whole clause and not to one word only.

§ 115. 1. καὶ κατὰ σύνδος δὲ . . . γένηται. 'The second cause, the casual gathering of fire-particles, which then fall in the direction originally given them by their meeting. Compare the first explanation of comets in § 111. 4.'

2. συμφυλίας, 'a kinship', i.e. a gathering of kindred matter, the *περιστασίς* of § 111. 8: an unusual but quite natural term for the writer, which seems to be corroborated by the MS. variations.

καὶ κίνησιν: the MSS. have *καὶ κατὰ κίνησιν*, which might perhaps be kept to express a subordinate cause like *καὶ παρὰ ἐκπτώσιν* in § 114. 9: but the writer's usual practice is only to insert the preposition again when he is introducing a new cause, and the confusion and dittography of *καὶ* and *κατὰ* is so common that we should probably follow Usener in excluding *κατὰ* here.

οὐδὲ . . .: 'wherever' is a little awkward in expression, and we should perhaps adopt the suggestion made by Usener in his notes of *ἄν . . .*, 'in whatever direction'.

3. καὶ κατὰ πνεύματος . . .: the third suggestion is that the falling stars are really ignited wind: cf. the sections on lightning and the thunderbolt.

5. τούτου, Usener: the *τούτων* of the MSS. is a mere mistake: von der Muehll prefers the plural all through, *πνεύματων . . . τούτων . . . φερομένων*.

κατεῖλησιν, 'the whirl' of a pent up body: cf. § 101. 14, &c.

ἐπέκρηψιν seems to be what is intended by the MS. variants (three MSS. have it), though the force of *ἐπ-* is not easy to see, and Usener

suggests that we ought to read the simple *ἐκρηξιν*. Von der Muehll's *ἐκρηξιν* (*ἐκ*) is attractive.

6. τῶν περιεχόντων, 'from the surrounding matter', i.e. the πυκνώματα δύμχλοιειδῆ. Bignone translates 'the bursting asunder of the parts on the outside', but this seems to miss the force of *ἐπέκρηξιν*.

7. φερομένου, Usener rightly, with πνεύματος, l. 4: φερομένης (MSS) is again a mistake due to the neighbourhood of φορᾶς.

8. ἀμύθητοι, MSS. . the word, when it occurs (e.g. Dem. 520 20), usually means 'unspeakably large, or many', a sense which is obviously out of place here, though Cronert would retain it in that sense. I do not think, seeing the writer's many references to μῦθος, that it is impossible that he should use the word meaning 'uncontaminated by myth' . cf. especially the conclusion of the parallel section on thunderbolts (§ 104 2) μόνον δὲ μῦθος ἀπέστω. Usener, presumably regarding this as impossible, reads ἀνίσιμοι, 'effective', another very violent and, I think, unnecessary change. Bignone retains ἀμύθητοι, noting that Lortzing proposed ἀμυθοι, which is the more usual word in this sense

(f) *Weather-signs from animals* § 115 9-§ 116 3. A concluding ironical paragraph follows on the supposed signs of the weather given by the appearance of certain animals—e.g the swallow as the herald of spring. Such 'signs' are, the writer says, merely due to coincidence: the animals cannot exert any influence on the course of the seasons, and no animal of any sort, let alone a divine being, could be so enamoured of trifles as to play the game of watching for the animals and thus bringing the prediction to pass. The irony of the passage is in rather marked distinction to the general matter-of-fact style of the letter, and reminds us of passages in Lucretius. In his amused scorn the writer seems to have forgotten the explanation that it is the approach of a new season which causes the animals to appear.

9. ἐπισημασίαι, 'signs of the weather' cf. § 98, where in dealing with the signs given by the stars, the writer says that some of them are due to chance coincidence, καθάπερ ἐν τοῖς ἐμφανέσι παρ' ἡμῖν ζῷοις.

κατὰ συγκύρημα τοῦ καιροῦ. cf. § 98 9 κατὰ συγκυρήσεις καιρῶν.

§ 116. 2 κἀν (εἰ). the addition of Usener seems necessary, as is Cobet's ἀν just before

μικρὸν χαρίστερον εἶη. obviously an allusion to a proverb, 'the smaller the trifle, the greater the joy'.

3. ἀμπέσοι: another certain correction for the MS. ἐκπέση.

Conclusion. § 116. 4-12. The letter ends with a conclusion based more or less closely on the corresponding conclusion of the first letter. These main principles, and especially the doctrine of the origin of things and the infinity of the atoms and space, must be thoroughly grasped, together with the fundamental reason for their knowledge, the true pleasure of life: from them an understanding of the details will naturally follow.

5. τοῦ μύθου ἐκβῆσῃ, the avowed object all through this second letter, and one of the chief sources of *ἀταραξία*.

6. τῶν δρχῶν, 'the origins' of things, i.e. the atoms and space.

7. ἀπειρίας: i.e. the infinity of the two *ἀρχαί* and of the *κόσμοι*.

8. κριτηρίων here must be the criteria of truth on the intellectual side, i.e. *αἰσθησις* and *πρόληψις*.

παθῶν. the criteria of rightness on the moral side: they are usually included with the other two under the general head of *κριτήρια* (e.g. *D. L.* x. 31), but the separation here is quite natural, and there is no reason, with Kochalsky, to suspect the text.

οὐδὲ ἔνεκεν i.e. the *ἀταραξία*, freedom for the disturbance of theological beliefs, which is the greater part of the true philosopher's *ἡδονή*.

9. τῶν κατὰ μέρος the detailed phenomena of nature and their explanation

10. καταγαπήσαντες: not merely understood but accepted them as a creed. Bignone renders 'studied with the utmost care', which is hardly strong enough

11. ῑ: Kuhn's necessary correction for *ἢ*

(ἢ) an inevitable addition of Usener's.

12. περιεποιήσαντο, 'made it their own' they have not otherwise attained *ἀταραξία*.

LETTER TO MENOECUS

THE third letter, written to Epicurus' disciple Menoeceus, is a brief exposition of the philosopher's moral theory. It starts with a reiteration of the two fundamental conditions of the moral life, the right understanding of the nature of the gods and the freedom from the fear of death, after which the rest of the letter is devoted to a clear and logical statement of Epicurus' view that pleasure is the end of life and of the sense in which this is to be understood.

The letter is not intended, like that to Herodotus, for the use of advanced students, but is a simple and straightforward exposition for the general reader. It is in fact an 'exoteric' work, as Aristotle might have called it, and as such, contains far more references than the other letters to rival theories and popular views. The common ideas as to the nature and activities of the gods are passed in review (§ 123) and their weakness is exposed, popular notions as to the terrible nature of death are condemned (§§ 125, 126), and vulgar conceptions of the character of true pleasure are refuted (§ 131). References are made, implicitly or explicitly, to ideas of Plato (§ 132), of the Cyrenaics (§ 127), of the Stoics (§ 130), of Theognis (§ 126), and possibly of Epicharmus (§ 125) and Mennermus (§ 126). It is clear that however devoted a disciple Menoeceus may have been, the letter was intended to reach a wider public who might still be under the influence of an erroneous philosophy or of the unsupported maxims and opinions of popular thought.

For this reason the letter is written in a very different style from that of the letter to Herodotus. The expression is almost invariably smooth and artistic, free from the crabbed obscurities of the first letter and the hasty carelessness of the second. It is in the Attic mood, in a mellow and straightforward Greek, with far fewer idiosyncrasies of vocabulary and idiom, and less technical diction than either of the other two letters or the *Kύπιαι Δόξαι*. Epicurus employs such deliberate artifices as antithesis and assonance, one can almost trace an intentional rhythm, and certainly (though Usener has probably pressed the point too far) there is in general a deliberate avoidance of hiatus. As a consequence no doubt of its greater ease and fluency, the text of the letter has been far better preserved in the MSS. of Diogenes and, except in the last three sections, presents few serious difficulties.

The genuineness of the third letter has not been disputed, and in it we see Epicurus at his best. He is still the dogmatic teacher, certain

of the truth of his own position and contemptuous of all who differ from him, he preserves his characteristic gravity and seriousness, and has, for instance, no trace of the playfulness and irony of Plato or of the humour of Aristotle, but the reader cannot fail to find a certain attractiveness in this cold, severe style, which seems to bring before us a vivid picture of the aged philosopher discoursing to his young friends in the Garden.

INTRODUCTION (§ 122).

The introductory paragraph presents no serious difficulties. Philosophy is for all alike: no one is too young or too old for it, and to refuse to study it is at any age to throw away one's chance of happiness. This is an emphatic declaration of Epicurus' essentially democratic view: he had no desire to form a new esoteric sect, but wished to place his philosophy at the service of any who would hear it.

§ 122. 3. *πάρωρος*, 'past the age': the word is not quoted elsewhere in this sense, but the neighbouring *ἄρωρ* makes its meaning clear.

4. *ἢ μήτω* is the reading of the MSS. (*εὶς B*), and there seems no reason for excluding *ἢ* which anticipates *ἢ* before *παρεληλυθένται*: indeed it makes it easier to take *τὴν ὥραν* with *ὑπάρχειν*.

ὑπάρχειν *ἢ*. the MSS. have *ὑπάρχειν ὥραν* *ἢ*, which must be emended either by the insertion of the article before *ὥραν*, as Cobet proposed, or by omitting *ὥραν* as a gloss. The latter seems the better course, as the repetition of *τὴν ὥραν* would be both unnecessary and harsh, and Epicurus in this letter shows much greater attention to such points of style.

5. *πρὸς εὐδαιμονίαν* is of course emphatic: a man might just as well say that he is too young as too old to be happy.

μήτω is a necessary correction for the MSS. *μὴ F* makes a similar mistake immediately afterwards in reading *μὴ* for *μηκέτι*.

7. *νεάνῃ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς*, 'may be young in blessings', a rather unusual expression: *νεάζειν τῷ τρόπῳ* is quoted from a fragment of Menander, but is not quite so harsh.

8. *διὰ τὴν χάριν τῶν γεγονότων*, 'by the grateful recollection of the past', i.e. of the philosophic truths which he learnt in earlier life. The phrase has almost a New Testament ring: there are other indications of an approximation of Epicurus' language to the Hellenistic, e.g. the use of *σάρξ*, K. Δ. iv. There is no need to follow Ritter in altering to *χαρὰν*. For this idea of the value of recollection Bignone refers to K. Δ. ix and *Sent. Val.* xvii.

9. *διὰ τὴν ἀφοβίαν τῶν μελλόντων* because he will know the truth about the government of the world and the dissolution of the soul at death.

μελετᾶν: probably 'meditate on', not 'practise': so at the end of the letter, § 135. 5. Note its combination with *πράττε* in § 123. 1.

THE FIRST PRINCIPLES OF THE GOOD LIFE (§§ 123-127).

§ 123. In a brief sentence Epicurus recommends his disciple to keep in mind the first principles, which are the guarantee of a happy and good life.

1. παρήγελλον: the imperfect seems to refer to verbal instructions given while Epicurus and Menoeceus were together. Oral teaching was always the basis of Epicurus' instruction. cf. *Ep. ad Hdt.*, § 83. 12 note

2. στοιχεῖα, 'first principles'. cf. κατεστοιχειωμένον, *Ep. ad Hdt.*, § 35. 9. There he was dealing with physical and metaphysical principles; here he is speaking of the moral principles, the στοιχεῖα τοῦ καλῶς ζῆν

διαλαμβάνων. more than 'receiving' or 'accepting': 'distinguishing' these moral principles from other στοιχεῖα as the ground of the good life. So frequently in *Ep. ad Hdt.*, e.g. § 58 6

The two great principles, which Epicurus now enunciates, that the gods need not be feared, and that death is nothing to us, were part of the Epicurean *τετραφάρμακος*, and form the subject of K. Δ. i and ii.

1. *The nature of the gods (§§ 123-124)*

The Epicurean theology is here viewed in its moral aspect, as it affects human beings. That the gods exist is certain, for the knowledge of them is due to immediate (mental) perceptions, which are common to all men. They are also, as is commonly supposed, blessed and immortal, but popular religion errs in attributing to them the government of the world, and feelings of anger and love towards men, which are inconsistent with their blessedness. They live apart from the world and are not concerned with its changes and chances. Yet by the visitation of their images man can be brought to have a share in their ἀταραξίᾳ, so that a place is still left for religion. The removal of fear and the communication of tranquillity thus both contribute to the good life

3. Ιών: God is a living being, though the peculiar formation of his person distinguishes him from all other creatures.

ἀφθαρτον καὶ μακάριον, 'imperishable and blessed in happiness': cf. K. Δ. i τὸ μακάριον καὶ ἀφθαρτον.

4. ἡ κοινὴ . . . νόησις, 'the universal conception' the idea which is in the mind of every man. This idea was created, as we learn from Luctr. v. 1161 ff., by the constant influx into the mind of subtle images (*εἰδώλα*) passing from the persons of the divine beings and thus creating in the mind a 'concept' (*πρόληψις*): the process is exactly described by the verb ὑπεγράφῃ.

μηθὲν . . . προσάπτε, i.e. we must not attribute to the gods any care or anxiety, such as would be implied in the government of the world, or any feelings of anger or favour towards men, which would

disturb or diminish their complete happiness : this is where popular religion makes its mistake. Note how the non-interference of the gods in the world is presented as a deduction not from the workings of phenomena, but from the nature of the gods themselves cf. *Ep. ad Hdt.*, § 77

7. *θεοὶ μὲν γὰρ εἰσίν* an emphatic declaration of Epicurus' position : he was not an atheist. As he explains in the next sentence, the conception of the gods is universal in the minds of men and cannot therefore be denied.

8. *ἐναργῆς* . *γνῶσις*. the knowledge of the gods is a matter of immediate perception, not in this case by the senses, but directly by the mind. It was the result of an *ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας* (see Appendix, pp. 259 ff) *ἐναργῆς* is a technical term used of the immediate perception of a near object.

9. *οἱ πολλοί*. Gassendi's insertion of the article is essential for the meaning and is amply justified by *τῶν πολλῶν* below, ll. 10 and 11.

οὐ γὰρ φυλάττουσιν αὐτοὺς οἷous νομίζουσιν, 'for they do not preserve them as they think them to be', i.e. they do not consistently keep up the idea of their blessedness and tranquillity, but attribute disturbing passions, &c., to them. But *νομίζουσιν* in this sense is certainly very awkward coming immediately after its use in reference to the erroneous opinions of men, and there is a strong temptation to adopt Usener's conjecture *νοοῦσιν*, which would refer back to *ἡ κοινὴ τοῦ θεοῦ νόησις* in l. 4 'they do not represent them consistently as they originally conceive them' (so too Bignone). There is, however, no warrant for the conjecture, and it is perhaps safer to retain *νομίζουσιν*.

10. *ἀσεβῆς δὲ . . προσάπτων* for the general thought cf. *Lucr.* v. 1198 ff and vi. 68 ff.

§ 124 1 οὐ γὰρ ἀποφάσεις a very technical clause the popular representations of the gods (as taking a part in the affairs of the world) are not 'concepts' formed in the mind by the constant repetition of the *ἐναργῆς* vision of the image, but 'suppositions' or additions of the mind (*προσδοξαζόμενα*), inferences, as Lucretius tells us in v. 1183 ff., from their observation of the regular sequence of phenomena on the earth and in the sky. For *πρόληψις* see note on *νόησις*, § 123 4 above. *ὑπόληψις* is defined in *Vita Epicuri*, § 34, as the equivalent of *δόξα*, an inference from phenomena, which may or may not be true.

2 *ἔνθεν αἱ μέγισται βλάβαι . . 5 ὡς ἀλλότριον νομίζοντες* a difficult and obscure piece of writing. I take *ἔνθεν* to refer to the *ἀποφάσεις*, and to be used in the slightly forced sense 'according to which' · the subject of *οἰκειούμενοι* in the next sentence then is 'men', or rather *οἱ πολλοί*. The majority of men judge others according to their own accepted standard of ethics. They are in the habit of welcoming those they see to be like themselves and rejecting those whom they find alien. They therefore falsely attach to the gods a similar habit, and suppose that they do harm to the wicked and benefits to the good.

In spite of the slight difficulty attaching to the meaning of *ἐνθεού*, this seems to me the natural interpretation.

Bignone takes *ἐνθεού* to mean 'from the gods' and believes the subject of *οἰκειούμενοι* to be *οἱ ἀγαθοί*. He translates 'Yet from the gods the foolish and wicked obtain the greatest evils and the good and *τελεῖ* the greatest benefits, for they, accustomed to their own virtues, embrace and make dear to themselves those who are like them, and consider alien what is discordant with them'. He thus believes the *ἐνθεού* clause not to be a statement of false popular belief, but of the actual facts. the good do derive benefit from the visitation of the images of the gods, because they can appropriate what is like themselves. This is good Epicureanism, but I doubt if it can be derived from the Greek (1) *ἐνθεού* and *ἐκ θεῶν* will be an awkward tautology, which Bignone glosses over in his translation; (2) his argument largely depends on the words 'foolish' and 'wise' which he introduces without any warrant into the translation, (3) this Epicurean subtlety is alien to the rest of the section, (4) his objection that popular opinion does not represent the gods as doing kindness to the good and injury to the evil is not sound in a certain stage of religious opinion (e.g. the Psalms) this opinion is very commonly found, (5) is there any evidence in Epicureanism for the idea that the images of the gods do harm to the evil?

3. *βλέψαι τε* the MSS. have *βλέψαι αἴτια*, for which Usener's correction *βλάψαι τε* is not altogether satisfactory. Is it possible that Epicurus wrote *βλάψαι τοῖς αἰτίοις* on which *κακοῖς* was a gloss? Von der Muehll would write *αἱ μέγισται βλαβῶν αἴτια τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. . . καὶ ὠφελεῖν.*

3. *(τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς)* seems a necessary addition the antithesis can hardly have been left understood.

5. *ὡς ἀλλότριον νομίζοντες* Usener parallels the construction from Plat. *Legg.* ix. 879 c *νομίζων ὡς πατέρα ἢ μητέρα*, but adds 'exspectes verbum spēnendi'. A more direct opposition to *ἀποδέχονται* would indeed be natural, but is not essential.

2. Death (§§ 124-127).

The second great principle, that death is nothing to us, is also viewed in its moral aspect. As the true understanding of the nature of the gods relieves us from fear in this life, so the knowledge that consciousness ceases at death relieves us from fear with regard to a subsequent life. Moreover, since death will not be terrible when it comes, there is no reason why its anticipation should disturb us. The whole thought is worked out clearly, and as in the previous section the Epicurean view is set in contrast with popular notions.

7. *μηδὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἶναι τὸν θάνατον* the simple and emphatic expression which recurs frequently in Epicurean documents cf. § 125, K Δ. ii, and *Lucr.* iii. 830.

8. πᾶν δυαδὸν . . . ἐν αἰσθήσει : as in the physical world, so too in the moral world, *αἰσθήσις* is the final criterion, but here it takes the form of *πάθος*, the internal feeling of pleasure or pain, which is the measure of good and bad. *πάθος* then, like *αἰσθήσις*, has its place among the *κριτήρια*.

10. τὸ τῆς ζωῆς θητόν, 'the mortality of life', sc. the life which is bounded by a mortal period.

11. ἀπειρον. the MSS. have *ἀπορον*, but the correction of Aldobrandinus and Menagius is inevitable: the false notion about death, which is popularly current, adds 'an infinite period' of conscious existence after death. Bignone accepting *ἀπειρον* here, but wishing to account for the MS. text and noticing Epicurus' conscious habit of parallelism in this letter, would insert *ἀπορον* after *ἄλλὰ τὸν*.

§ 125. 1. οὐθὲν γάρ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ ζῆν δεινόν. a rather startling deduction at first sight, but we must remember that to Epicurus the fear of death was not only the greatest of all fears in life, but was also the cause of other evils (cf. *Lucr.* iii. 59 ff.).

2. γνησίως, 'genuinely', 'whole-heartedly', a rather odd use which recurs in § 130 7.

3. ὥστε μάταιος ὁ λέγων. Bignone thinks the reference may be to Epicharmus (*fr. 11 Diels*), but it seems more likely to be an attempt to get over what is in reality the popular feeling about death, not that it will be painful when it comes, but that the present thought of it is painful. Epicurus argues that the two are identical. we do not dread the coming of what will not be unpleasant when it comes. We might reply that death is painful in thought because it will mean the cessation of many present pleasures; to which Epicurus would answer that 'we' shall not be there to feel the loss (cf. *Lucr.* iii. 900).

5. παρὸν. the reading of some MSS. *παρὼν* is due to the neighbourhood of *παρών* in l. 4.

6. ἐπειδὴπερ: a fuller explanation of the way in which 'death is nothing to us'. so long as we live, death is not there, and when death comes, 'we' shall be no more, for consciousness will be gone.

10. οὐκέτι εἰσίν: the hiatus (*οὐκέτι εἰσίν* MSS.) should be avoided as in *μηκέτι εἶναι*, § 122. 6.

11. ἀλλ' οἱ πολλοὶ . . . § 127. 4. οὐκ ἐπιδεχομένοις. Having stated his own position Epicurus turns to the popular views of death. In the first place men are inconsistent. they sometimes dread death as the worst of evils, at other times they long for it as a respite from suffering. The wise man neither wishes to escape from life nor fears death: he does not ask for the longest but for the most pleasant life.

12. ἐν τῷ ζῆν . . . : a line has clearly been lost here, and Usener's suggestion (in which however I prefer Casaubon's *ποθοῦσιν* to his own *αιροῦσται*) successfully gives the sense. The loss may have been due to the repetition *τῷ ζῆν . . . τῷ ζῆν* (note that B originally had *τὸ* for *τῷ*).

§ 126. 2. προσίσταται, 'comes across his path', 'offends' him. For the general sense of this sentence cf. K. Δ. xx, xl.

4. ηδιστον is the reading of the MSS. and there seems no sufficient cause to follow Usener in his change to ηδιον: Epicurus writes τὸ πλεῖστον because τὸ πλεῖστον would be a palpable exaggeration, but τὸ ηδιστον is not.

οὐτω καὶ . . . καρπίζεται, cf. K. Δ. xix.

6. The second error; to advise the young to live well and the old to die well is foolish. the art of both is the same, and life may be just as pleasant for the old, while it lasts.

δ δὲ παραγγέλλων: Epicurus may, as Bignone suggests, have Mimnermus in mind

7. καταστρέφειν, 'to end his life'; so K. Δ. xx. 11 κατάστρεφεν.

τὸ τῆς ζωῆς ἀσπαστόν, 'the desirability of life', the pleasure which it really has for all.

9. The third error, which is much worse, that it is best not to be born, or if born to die as soon as possible. If a man really believes this, why does he not end his life? otherwise, he is talking idly to a world that will not believe him χείρων has better authority than χείρον, which Usener adopts, and should be kept the direct masculine is natural after εὐήθης.

ιο δ λέγων. sc. Theognis

§ 127. 1. ἀπέρχεται ἐκ τοῦ ζῆν. the MS text is a quite natural construction, and there is no need to drop ἐκ with Usener it adds emphasis and force.

4. ἐν τοῖς οὐκ ἐπιδεχομένοις i.e. among the majority of men, to whom such a paradox seems absurd

5. μημονευτέον δὲ . . . οὐκ ἔσθμενον. The section ends with a short aphorism as to the right view of the future: we must not either reckon it as certainly ours, or certainly not ours. The true Epicurean has it in his hands to obtain the true pleasures of life, and can be almost independent of what fortune brings him or when it will terminate his life. Bignone notes well that Epicurus is arguing against the Cyrenaics, whose motto was μόνον ἡμέτερον τὸ παρόν.

THE MORAL THEORY.

Having considered the two conditions of a good life, a right knowledge of the nature of the gods and a true understanding of death, Epicurus devotes the rest of the letter to the exposition of his moral theory. He states that the end of action is pleasure, and then develops the implications of this view. The argument may conveniently be divided into subsections as the various points arise.

1. Pleasure as the motive and end of action (§§ 127-129)

In considering the purpose of life and the standard of good action Epicurus does not pursue the line of thought which he has already suggested in § 124. 8 (ἐπεὶ πᾶν ἀγαθὸν καὶ κακὸν ἐν αἰσθήσει) of deducing pleasure as the end from its fundamental nature as the only feeling in the field of morals. This is a popular treatise, and he prefers therefore

to reach his conclusion on more traditional and less strictly Epicurean lines. The motive of all action is desire · the classification of desires leaves as the 'necessary' residue, the health of the body and the repose of the mind · this means the absence of pain, bodily and spiritual, and the absence of pain is pleasure. Pleasure then is at once the mainspring and the purpose of life. We must note however how from the outset pleasure to Epicurus is not the positive enjoyment, which it was, for instance, to the Cyrenaics, but the negative release from pain, which some philosophers regarded not as pleasure, but as a neutral or indifferent state. This distinction is of vital importance for the whole ethical theory: the right life for Epicurus depends essentially on a due comprehension of limits.

§ 127 8. τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν . . . φυσικὰ μόνον. the main division of pleasures here follows traditional lines (cf. Plat. *Rep.* II. 357 and Ar. *Eth.* 1118 b), and the general idea is clearly brought out with examples by the scholiast on A1. *Eth.* loc. cit. ή μὲν οὖν τῆς τροφῆς ἐπιθυμία καὶ τῆς ἐσθῆτος ἀναγκαῖα ή δὲ τῶν ἀφροδισίων φυσικὴ μὲν οὐκ ἀναγκαῖα δέ η δὲ τῶν τοιῶνδε σιτίων η τοιῶνδε ἐσθῆτος η τοιῶνδε ἀφροδισίων οὗτε φυσικὴ οὗτε ἀναγκαῖα.

9. κενάι, 'vain', 'idle', οὐκ ἀναγκαῖαι

10. τῶν δ' ἀναγκαίων . . . πρὸς αὐτὸν τὸ ξῆν in the subdivision of the necessary desires Epicurus follows his own line of thought and leads up directly to his main point. Some desires are necessary for the preservation of life, e.g. those of food and shelter, some to the repose of the body (freedom from pain), some to happiness of mind (freedom from fear). From these he passes at once to health of the body and peace of mind—the two foundations of the true Epicurean conceptions of pleasure.

II. δοχλησίαι: a typical Epicurean formation. cf. K. Δ. xi εἰ μηδὲν ήμᾶς αἱ τῶν μετεώρων ὑποψίαι ηνώχλουν, and viii πολλαπλασίους ἐπιφέρει τὰς ὁχλήσεις

§ 128. 1. ἀπλανῆς θεωρία, 'the unerring contemplation' to form a right choice and avoidance, we must always have our eye on the true end.

3. (τῆς ψυχῆς) · a necessary addition made by the second hand in B.

4. τούτου γάρ χάριν . . . for the idea of true pleasure or the absence of pain cf. K. Δ. xxvi, xxx, and especially iii.

7. τοῦ ζώου Epicurus characteristically implies that animals as well as men feel the desire for pleasure.

8. καὶ τὸ τοῦ σώματος ἀγαθὸν: Usener following BF omits the article, which is however surely required. the good of the body is not identical with the good of the soul.

συμπληρώσεται: the testimony of the MSS is uncertain, but seems to point to **συμπληρώσεται**, which must be taken as a fut. middle with **τὸ ζῶον** as the subject. The parallel of K. Δ. xxvi. 2 (**ἐὰν μὴ συμπληρώθωσιν**) however suggests that the **συμπληρωθήσεται** of F may be right. For the idea cf. Lucr. ii. 16 ff.

nonne videre

nil aliud sibi naturam latrare nisi ut qui
corpore seiunctus dolor absit, mente fruatur
iucundo sensu cura semota metueque?

10. (**ὅταν δὲ μὴ ἀλγῶμεν**) was the original insertion of Gassendi, and there seems no need to 'improve' it with Usener by the substitution of **μηδέν** for **μή**. the addition is of course demanded by the sense. The limit of pleasure is in Epicurus' idea the removal of pain, and beyond that point pleasure can only be varied see especially K. Δ. xviii

11. **τὴν ἡδονὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος** pleasure is the beginning because it is the motive which leads to action, it is the end because its attainment is the completion of action

§ 129 2. συγγενικὸν the desire to reach pleasure is innate in us a strengthening from the Epicurean point of view of its adoption as the end. cf D L. x, § 137, which Bignone incorporates with the *Life*.

4. **ὡς κανόνι . . . κρίνοντες** we are thus brought back to the most simple and fundamental Epicurean point of view the feeling of pleasure, the immediate sensation, is in the moral sphere the standard of good and bad, just as in the physical sphere, sense-perception is the standard of true and false πάθος takes its place with αἰσθῆσις among the **κριτήρια** see on § 124 8.

2. *Pleasure and pains choice and avoidance (§§ 129, 130)*

Having established pleasure as the end of action, it is necessary next to inquire what precisely this means in effect. It will mean, Epicurus argues, that though all pleasure is in itself good, because it is natural to us, yet there are some pleasures which we shall have to avoid because of their concomitant pain, and similarly some pains which we shall choose, because of the pleasure arising out of release from them. It is ultimately a matter of calculation, we must balance pleasures and pains against one another, and then choose the course which in the end brings the maximum of pleasure and the least pain. Two points are of interest in this section (1) that we have arrived at something very like the Utilitarian calculus of pleasure, (2) that although Epicurus here amply refutes the calumnies attaching to the popular idea of Epicureanism and implicitly rejects all the pleasures of excess, yet he does not at all abandon the main position that in itself pleasure is always good indeed, it is just for that reason that we must avoid pleasures which entail pain

5. **σύμφυτον**, 'natural to us', like **συγγενικόν** above and **οὐκείαν** below.

6. **οὐ πᾶσαν ἡδονὴν αἴρούμεθα** for this and the following clause compare the striking fragment (62) preserved by Aristocles apud Euseb., *Praep. Evang.* xiv. 21 (442) ἄμεινόν ἔστιν ὑπομέναι τούσδε τινὰς τοὺς πόνους, ὅπως ἡσθῶμεν ἡδονὰς μείζους συμφέρει τῶνδε τινῶν

ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν ἡδονῶν, ἵνα μὴ δλγῶμεν δλγηδόνας χαλεπωτέρας, where the idea of the calculus is clearly brought out.

7. τὸ δυσχερές, 'discomfort', another typical Epicurean word cf. the fragment (37) in Ioannes Stob. *Flor.* xvii. 34 (Usener 181) προσπτών ταῖς ἐκ πολυτελείας ἡδοναῖς οὐ δι' αὐτάς, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὰ ἔξακολονθοῦντα αὐταῖς δυσχερῆ.

10. διὰ τὸ φύσιν ἔχειν οἰκείαν, 'because it has a nature akin to ours', i.e. because it is that towards which we naturally move: an elaboration of the idea expressed in συγγενικόν and σύμφυτον above. Cf. K. Δ. vii. 4 οὐ ἔνεκα ἐξ ἀρχῆς κατὰ τὸ τῆς φύσεως οἰκείου ὥρεχθησαν. Bignone translates 'because of their own proper nature', but this cannot be right.

11. After μέντοι Usener inserts γ' to avoid the hiatus. But μέντοι γε would be an unusual combination, and though this letter is undoubtedly written with care, we are hardly justified in correcting the MSS. on purely euphonic grounds, unless as in § 122. 6 and § 125. 10 the correction involves no change.

§ 130. 1. τῇ μέντοι συμμετρήσει: quite literally 'the measuring of one against the other'—just the word for a calculus of pleasures.

2. βλέψει: the simple substantive reads oddly, and Usener may be right in suggesting ἐπιβλέψει.

3. τοῦμπαλιν or τὸ ἔμπαλιν is the reading of all MSS. except B, and we are hardly justified in believing with Usener that B's eccentric ὅτι ἀν πάλιν indicates an original τᾶμπαλιν.

3. Independence of desires (§§ 130, 131).

Epicurus proceeds to a practical application of his principle of choosing only the pleasures that involve no pain. αὐτάρκεια, 'self-sufficiency', is a virtue praised by all (remember that it was the moral aim of the Stoics), and in its application with regard to pleasures it means 'independence of desires' (Bignone). It leads us to be content with simple pleasures which involve no reaction. Indeed, since pleasure is but the removal of pain, simple food and drink can give us as complete pleasure as the most elaborate banquet. Finally, as Epicurus adds, almost cynically, if we accustom ourselves to simple fare, we are put into a better frame to enjoy luxury, if ever we meet it. The thought all through is typically Epicurean and may be paralleled from many other Epicurean sources.

5. οὐδὲ ἵνα πάντως τοῖς δλγίοις χρώμεθα: it was not necessarily the Epicurean's ideal to have but a little to enjoy all his life, but rather that he should be content with what he has. So in a letter to a friend (fr. 39, Usener 182) we find him asking for a gift of cheese, so that he may make merry.

7. χρώμεθα is given by all the MSS., and though it may possibly be a dittography of χρώμεθα in l. 6, and ἀρκώμεθα, suggested by Cobet and adopted by Usener, gives more the sense which we should expect, we are hardly justified in introducing it into the text.

7. γνησίως: see § 125, 2 note.

8. ἡδιστα. ἡκιστα: Bignone notes that this assonance is employed by Epicurus again in a quotation given by Plutarch, *de Tranquillitate Animi* 16 δ τῆς αὐριον ἡκιστα δεόμενος ἡδιστα πρόσεισι πρὸς τὴν αὔριον (fr. 78, Usener 490), and had already been used in Xen. *Mem.* 1. 6 5. It is another sign of conscious style in this letter.

9. τὸ μὲν φυσικὸν πᾶν εὐπόριστον: all that is required for the satisfaction of the natural desires is easy to obtain: cf. K. Δ. xv and xxi, and Lucr. v. 1119 'neque enim est unquam penuria parvi'

τὸ δὲ κενὸν: what is required to satisfy the κενὰ ἐπιθυμίαι, § 127. 9

10. οἱ τε λιτοὶ χυλοὶ . . . an amplification of the satisfactory results of αὐτάρκεια. plain tastes can fully satisfy the pangs of hunger, and when once the 'pain due to want' has been removed, pleasure cannot be increased but only varied: cf. K. Δ. xviii. Usener alters τε to γὰρ in order to get a better logical sequence, but the transition is again from class to species, as in καὶ τὴν αὐτάρκειαν δὲ in l. 5.

ἰσηγ. . ἡδονή: after the πέρας has been reached and the pain removed, pleasure cannot be quantitatively increased, but only qualitatively changed: therefore the pleasure to be obtained from plain and luxurious food is equal in amount (ἰσηγν). Usener most unjustifiably changes ἡδονή to ἀηδίαν, believing presumably that the reference is to the cloying of the appetite after satiety. But not only is this inconsistent with Epicurean doctrine, but, as Bignone has shown, the MS. text is made certain by Cicero's translation of the passage, *de Fin.* n. 28 90 'negat enim tenuissimo victu . . . minorem voluptatem percipi quam rebus exquisitissimis ad epulandum'

11. τὸ ἀλγοῦν κατ' ἔνδειαν, 'that which is painful by way of defect', i.e. the pain arising from an unsatisfied want, as in the case of hunger. Another characteristic phrase repeated in K. Δ. xxi

§ 131 i καὶ μᾶζα καὶ ὕδωρ . . . a still further limitation of the general principles to a particular instance

τὴν ἀκροτάτην. ἡδονή. i.e. the pleasure of ἀπονία, freedom from the pain of hunger

2. τὸ συνεθίζειν οὖν. : a summing up, referring the conclusions just reached to the general principles of the earlier part of the paragraph: simple living is the best for the health of the body and the purposes of life.

4. συμπληρώτικὸν: one more characteristic word: cf. εὐσυμπλήρωτον, § 133. 4

5. καὶ τοῖς πολυτελέσιν . . . a new and almost ironical consideration plain living puts us into better condition (both physically and mentally) for the enjoyment of luxury, if we do at long intervals come across it.

6. προσερχομένους. though it has inferior MS. authority is better than προσερχομένοις with τοῖς πολυτελέσιν.

καὶ πρὸς τὴν τύχην . . . a more serious reason. if we are accustomed to simple living, the attacks of fortune cannot hurt us, for we are used to being content with a little.

4. *The character of true pleasure (§§ 131, 132).*

Having now explained clearly what in effect is meant by making pleasure the end of life, Epicurus is able to refute false conceptions. He is not encouraging gluttony or sensuality, which bring with them greater pains, but the higher pleasure of a simple life, which satisfies the needs of the body and keeps the mind free from trouble and therefore able to devote itself to the study of philosophy. It is interesting to see that even apparently among contemporaries there were calumnies abroad concerning the nature of 'Epicureanism'.

9. καὶ τὰς ἐν ἀπολαύσει κευμένας. The MSS. have καὶ τὰς τῶν : τῶν is rightly excluded by Usener and must have come from τὰς τῶν διστάτων just before.

ὡς τίνες . . . νομίζουσιν. notice the three classes of persons who make misrepresentations (1) those who do not know the true doctrine ; (2) those who know it, but do not agree with it, philosophical opponents ; (3) those who cannot comprehend it—another piece of careful writing. Bignone points out that under (2) Epicurus is thinking primarily of the Cyrenaics who regarded ἀπορία as a purely neutral state ('the condition of the dead') and only the starting-point of true pleasure. The doctrine of the 'limit of pleasure' is the really essential feature of Epicurus' own theory.

§ 132. 1. ἀπολαύσεις : there seems no reason for Usener's change to the singular ἀπόλαυσις it means individual acts of ἀπόλαυσις.

4. νήφων λογισμός, 'sober reasoning', a rather strong metaphorical use cf Arist., *Metaph.* 984 b 17 οἷον νήφων παρ' εἰκῇ λέγοντας. Notice that Epicurus is here surreptitiously introducing a new point. The characteristic pleasure of the mind, freed from fear, is philosophical study.

5. τὰς δόξας, 'opinions', are in particular of course mistaken opinions about the gods and about death. Epicurus is here working back to the two fundamental principles laid down at the outset of the letter.

εἴς ὅν : preserved only by B its omission in the other MSS. has led to the filling out of the construction by ἀφ' οὐ or ἀφ' ὥν in the earlier printed texts.

5. *Prudence (§§ 132-135).*

After establishing the general character of his ideal, Epicurus proceeds to consider the method of attaining it. It is clear that the right course of action will not be discovered by instinct, as it might be supposing all pleasures were not merely ἀγαθά but αἰρέα. It is necessary in order to live the truly pleasant life to have 'a right judgement in all things', based upon a calculation of the less and more of pleasure and pain. This right judgement Epicurus characterizes by the old word φρόνησις, always with philosophers the practical as opposed to the speculative wisdom. It is at once the ἀρχή, the beginning of any step in the right direction, and the μέγιστον ἀγαθόν, the best thing

a man can attain. It is indeed more valuable than purely speculative wisdom, *σοφία*, which cannot issue in any action, but can only lay the foundation of action in a true knowledge of circumstances. And what will be the instruction given by *φρόνησις*? It will be the recommendation of the accepted virtues, for it will show that the pleasant life is really that in which honour and justice are practised. Thus by a strict train of reasoning Epicurus, starting from his first principle of the pursuit of pleasure as the ideal, reaches the acceptance of the recognized standards of morality—the answer to his detractors is now complete. He concludes with a panegyric of the prudent man, the details of which must be considered as we come to them.

9. *διδάσκουσα* is Usener's necessary correction of the MS. reading *διδάσκουσαι* which must merely be due to the neighbourhood of the plural *ἀρεταῖ*.

10. καὶ *δικαίως*. notice how Epicurus includes the central word of Platonic ethics and ordinary morality—not without intention (*οὐδὲ . . . καὶ δικαίως*): Stephanus made this essential addition cf. K. Δ. v. The omission must be due to homoeoteleuton.

§ 133. 1. ἐπεὶ τίνα ρομίζεις. . . a panegyric of the *φρόνιμος*, in which he incidentally returns on much that he has said before—it is the *φρόνιμος* who knows the conduits of life, namely the true understanding of the nature of the gods and of death (§§ 123-127), who realizes the government of the world and the responsibility of free-willed man, who sees in chance not a determinant of action but an opportunity, and prefers to suffer with wisdom, rather than to prosper through folly. The section, largely through the corruption of the MSS., is undoubtedly the most difficult in this letter.

2. *ὅσια*, 'holy' or 'reverent' opinions, such as a truly religious man may hold—a singularly bold word seeing his direct opposition to ordinary religious beliefs. But, as has been seen already (§§ 123, 124), religion had a very real place in Epicurus' system.

3. τὸ τῆς φύσεως. *τέλος* sc. pleasure: cf § 129, where pleasure is described as *συγγενικόν* and *συμφυτον* and is said *φύσιν ἔχειν οἰκείαν*.

4. τὸ μὲν τῶν ἀγαθῶν πέρας sc. *ἀπονία*, the freedom from pain, which can easily be secured by simple means. cf. § 130

εὐσυμπληρωτών cf. § 131 3. *ὑγείας . . . συμπληρωτικόν*, and for *εὐπόριστον*, § 130. 9. τὸ μὲν φυσικὸν πᾶν *εὐπόριστον ἔστι*

5. τὸ δὲ τῶν κακῶν, 'the limit of evils' in a slightly different sense, 'the possible extent' of evils. For this idea that all pain is either slight or of short duration compare K. Δ. iv. The sentence so far has resumed the ideas of the Epicurean *τετραφάρμακος* cf. K. Δ. i-iv notes

6. τὴν δὲ ὑπό τινων δεσπότων *εἰσαγομένην πάντων* sc. *εἰμαρρένην*, 'destiny', or 'necessity' as viewed in the moral sphere. The earlier thinkers, and especially Democritus, having insisted in their physical theories on an all-controlling *ἀνάγκη*, were compelled to admit determinism in human actions. From this necessity Epicurus only escaped

(as we know from *Lucr.* ii. 216 ff.) by the device of the *παρέγκλωσις*, the original spontaneous swerve of the atoms in their downward fall, which in the conscious aggregate of the *ψυχή* was the cause of free will.

7. ἐγγελῶντος: with some hesitation I propose this correction for the varieties of reading found in the MSS., ἀγγέλωντος, ἀγγελῶντος, ἀγγέλλοντος. Usener had already suggested this sense in his reading διαγελῶντος, but the correction is more violent. It is true that ἐγγελῶν is elsewhere only found with the dat., but καταγελᾶν similarly takes acc. in *Eur. Bacch.* 286. Bignone prefers to ‘keep the MS. text’ ἀγγέλλοντος, and to follow on in the lacuna with εἰμαρμένην κενὸν ὄνομα εἶναι. But (a) ἀγέλλοντος is not the universal reading in the MSS., and the variation strongly points to a compound of γελᾶν, (b) the verb ἀγγέλλειν in the context seems to me very unnatural. Kühn’s ἀνελόντος is too far from the MS. text, and does not give the right sense: the ‘prudent’ Epicurean does not entirely annihilate destiny, as is seen by what follows.

After ἐγγελῶντος there must be a lacuna of some considerable extent. All are agreed on εἰμαρμένην. Epicurus could not have left τὴν . . . δεσπότιν alone without explanation, and that εἰμαρμένην must be the word is shown by τῇ τῶν φυσικῶν εἰμαρμένῃ, § 134. 2. It is also clear that towards the end of the lacuna there must have been the words ἀ μὲν κατ’ ἀνάγκην, corresponding to ἀ δὲ ἀπὸ τύχης. So far there is agreement, but as to what the lacuna exactly contained and its relation to the rest of the sentence opinions differ.

(1) Usener, who believes that the whole section down to § 135. 4 δρθωθῆναι διὰ ταῦτην is one monstrous sentence, would write the lacuna (εἰμαρμένην καὶ μᾶλλον ἀ μὲν κατ’ ἀνάγκην γίγνεσθαι λέγοντος). But (a) in a letter so carefully written as this, so clumsy a sentence is highly improbable, and moreover the supposition involves the alteration of ὑπολαμβάνων, § 134. 5, and νομίζων, § 135. 2, to ὑπολαμβάνοντος and νομίζοντος, it is far more probable that the sentence τίνα νομίζεις εἶναι κρείττονα ended in the lacuna; (b) as Bignone shows, the resulting argument is most illogical. Epicurus could not have written that the φρόνιμος says that ‘some things happen by necessity, others by chance, &c., . . . because necessity cannot be called to account, &c.’ On the other hand the clause διὰ τὸ τὴν μὲν ἀνάγκην κτλ. would give a good reason for the belief that most things are within our control.

(2) Bignone himself would therefore place a mark of interrogation after κενὸν ὄνομα εἶναι, which he supplies after εἰμαρμένην, and would then proceed σόφος γὰρ ὁ τὴν μὲν τῶν γνομένων κυριωτάτην αἵτιαν παρ’ ἡμᾶς τιθέμενος, ὃν ἀ μὲν κατ’ ἀνάγκην γίνονται (presumably a slip for γίνεται), ἀ δὲ κτλ. &c. ‘For the wise man is he who places in our hands the chief control for the things that happen, of which some occur by necessity, others by chance, &c.’ This is much more likely to have been the sense of the passage, and

(3) I should only differ from it in putting the mark of interrogation immediately after εἰμαρμένην (reading ἐγγελῶντος) and supposing that

the rest was a little simpler, e.g. οὗτος γὰρ τὴν τῶν γνωμένων κυριωτάτην αἰρίαν παρ' ἡμᾶς τίθεται, ὃν ἂ μὲν κατ' ἀνάγκην γίνεται ἂ δὲ κτλ.

In any case note that the emphasis falls on τὴν . . δεσπότιν . . πάτων Epicurus does not deny that ἀνάγκη causes many things, but not all, and the greater part of our lives is under our own control

8. ἂ δὲ ἀπὸ τύχης: Epicurus' conception of 'chance' seems to be of a force co-ordinate with necessity. Natural law causes the inevitable sequence of events, but it is chance that rules the production of particular causes. e.g. ἀνάγκη causes the motions and meetings of atoms, but chance causes them to fall into the positions which create our world. Such a notion is of course unscientific, but is very prominent in the Epicurean philosophy, e.g. Lucr. vi 30 'quod fieret naturali . . seu casu seu vi' Guyau (*La Morale d'Épicure*) has seen in this idea the working of the παρέγκλισις in inanimate nature, just as in the soul it produces free will, but there is no evidence for this, and most probably Epicurus had not fully thought out the relation of his notion of chance to the rest of the system.

παρ' ἡμᾶς, 'in our control'

ἢ ἀνυπεύθυνον εἶναι, 'cannot be called to account'; i.e. if ἀνάγκη were universal, as the determinists hold, neither could there be responsibility in the moral sphere, nor the occasional 'lapse' in the physical sphere, which we call chance. It means more than 'destroys responsibility' (Wallace) for it is opposed not only to the ἀδέσποτον of our actions, but also to the ἀστατον character of τύχη

10. ἀδέσποτον, 'not subject to the tyranny' of determinism - we are morally our own masters

§ 134. 1. ἐπεὶ κρείττον τὸν the most emphatic and famous declamation of Epicurus' greater hatred of physical determinism than even of popular religion

τῷ περὶ θεῶν μύθῳ. i.e. the popular story of the gods' interference in the affairs of men, and of their assignment of rewards and punishments

3. παρατήσεως by worship of the gods we may, according to popular religion, hope to escape from the destiny which is our due.

ὑπογράφει, 'lightly sketches', 'hints at'.

4. τὴν δὲ τύχην . . finally the prudent man understands the nature of chance - it is not a divine force, nor a direct cause of good or evil, but it does afford occasions for good and evil. There is considerable doubt as to the punctuation and text of this section.

(1) Usener continues the construction of the main sentence, placing a comma after the parenthesis and reading ὑπολαμβάνοντος 5 . . νομίζοντος § 135 2. But apart from the improbability of the immense unbroken question, there is no authority for the genitives and the MSS. have ὑπολαμβάνων (*ὑπολάμβανον H*) . . νομίζων (*νομίζειν F*)

(2) The variants just quoted might suggest ὑπολαμβάνοντ' . . νομίζειν constructed after διὰ τό in § 133. 9. but, as Usener points out, the sense makes this impossible.

(3) With Bignone's view of the lacuna in § 133. 7, it is possible to retain the two nominative participles ὑπολαμβάνων, νομίζων, placing a comma after the parenthesis and referring them right back to the subject of the main sentence which begins in the parenthesis.

(4) But this too makes a very clumsy piece of writing, and I prefer, while retaining ὑπολαμβάνων, to read νομίζει (to which F's νομίζειν seems to point) in § 135. 2. A fresh sentence will then start at τὴν δὲ τύχην of which νομίζει is the main verb.

6. οὐτε ἀβέβαιον αἰτίαν (MSS), 'nor an uncertain cause', but (a) this is exactly what Epicurus did think chance to be (cf. τὴν δὲ τύχην ἀστατον, § 133. 9), and (b) as Bignone points out, the statement would not be at all borne out by the explanatory parenthesis. Bignone comparing Democritus' aphorism τύχη μεγαλόδωρος, ἀλλ' ἀβέβαιος would read οὐτε ἀβέβαιον αἰτίαν (μεγαλόδωρον), or to put it more in Epicurus' phraseology οὐτε ἀβέβαιον αἰτίαν (μεγιστῶν ἀγαθῶν ή κακῶν); chance, that is, is not to be regarded as the cause, however uncertain, of the greatest blessings or ends—it can only confer the opportunities for good and evil and not the lasting blessings or evils themselves, which are παρ' ἡμᾶς. I think his suggestion is on the right lines, but too obscure in phraseology, and prefer to think that πάντων has dropped out before ἀβέβαιον αἰτίαν (cf. τὴν . δεσπότιν πάντων . . εἰμαρρένην in § 133. 6 above). chance is not the cause, even the uncertain cause of *everything*, for it cannot give the vital good or evil, but only the opportunities for them.

7. (οὐκ) οἶται μὲν γάρ . . . δίδοσθαι. It is clear that a negative must have dropped out somewhere, and Usener's οὐκ at the beginning seems a better correction than Gassendi's μή (why not οὐ?) before δίδοσθαι. The position of μέν is strongly in favour of a preceding negative.

8. ἀρχὰς μέντοι . . . ὑπὸ ταύτης χορηγεῖσθαι. i.e. chance may start good or evil, but it still rests with us to use the occasions furnished by chance rightly.

§ 135. 2 νομίζει · see note on l. 4 above.

βέλτιον γάρ . . . δρθωθῆναι διὰ ταύτην as the sentence stands in the MSS. it does not make sense. Usener reads βέλτιστον. 'for it is best of all that a well-judged action should succeed through chance', but (a) there is no authority for βέλτιστον; (b) γάρ, as Bignone points out, is unsuitable; the parenthesis would not then give a reason for the previous opinion; (c) it is doubtful whether Epicurus would have said that this is best; (d) the idea is at any rate alien to the context. Bignone retains βέλτιον but would substitute δ' αὖ for γάρ, 'but it is still better that . . .' I believe that once again homoeoteleuton has caused a loss of some words and that Epicurus wrote something like βέλτιον γάρ ἐν ταῖς πράξεσι τὸ καλῶς κριθὲν σφαλῆναι μᾶλλον ή τὸ κακῶς κριθὲν ὁρθωθῆναι διὰ ταύτην, a restatement of the previous idea from a new point of view. Madvig's insertion (μὴ ὁρθωθῆναι ή τὸ μὴ καλῶς κριθέν) adopted by von der Muehll would give the same sense.

5. *ταῦτα οὖν . . ἀθανάτοις ἀγαθοῖς.* The peroration of the letter. The disciple must meditate on (cf. § 123. 1) these precepts alone and with his fellow-disciples, and such practice will enable him to attain so complete an *ἀταραξία* that he will be a god on earth.

σεαυτόν Gassendi's correction for *ἴαυτόν* perhaps not quite necessary as *ἴαυτόν* is not infrequently used for other persons besides the third. In the neighbourhood of *τὸν δόμον* *σεαυτῷ* it would however be very improbable.

6. (*τε*) after *πρός* is a necessary insertion.

7. *ὡς θεὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποις* is not a mere rhetorical exaggeration. The gods in their perfectly untroubled life are the ideal of what human life might become, and the man who has come near to this ideal might justly be said to have become a god on earth (cf. Lucr. iii. 322 'dignam dis degere vitam'). Thus explains how, again not metaphorically or in mere adulation, his later disciples could speak of Epicurus himself as a god, e.g. Lucr. v. 8 'deus ille fuit, deus'.

KYPIAI ΔΟΞΑΙ

THE *Kύριαι Δόξαι* are a series of brief aphorisms dealing with Epicurus' ethical theory, and in particular with the conditions requisite for the tranquil life of the Epicurean philosopher. They are introduced by Diogenes Laertius¹ as 'the crown (*κολοφώνα*) of all Epicurus' writings and of the philosophic life', and are quoted by name and with unmistakable references by Philodemus² and the Epicurean writers³ in the Herculaneum rolls, who speak of 'those who write against the *Kύριαι Δόξαι*'. Plutarch,⁴ Diodorus,⁵ and Lucian⁶ refer to them under the same title. Cicero in one passage⁷ appears to translate the title as 'Authoritative Sayings', in another⁸ as 'Selected Sayings', but undoubtedly regards them as the work of Epicurus.

There can then be no doubt that in antiquity the *Kύριαι Δόξαι* were looked upon as an authentic work of the Master deserving very special esteem and consideration. Modern critics have, however, been inclined to treat them with less respect. Gassendi,⁹ although he gave them the title of *Ratae Sententiae*, yet stated dogmatically that they were 'a Florilegium culled from various writings of Epicurus', and Usener,¹⁰ fastening upon Cicero's alternative title *Sententiae Selectae*, is at pains to prove that they are a compilation from various sources put together by some faithful but not very intelligent Epicurean disciple. His contentions were resisted by Giussani¹¹ and have recently been fully dealt with by E. Bignone,¹² but, as the question is one on which every reader is bound to form his own judgement, it is worth while to give a brief summary of the position.

Usener's chief lines of attack are: (1) important points in the Epicurean doctrine are omitted and points of secondary importance included. There is no mention of the cardinal principles of the physical theory or of the *Canonica*, nor is even the nature of the soul explained: on the other hand the points included about politics (e.g. in

¹ D. L. x 138.

² Phil. de Ira, col. xliii.

³ Vol. Herc col. xv ibid, col xxvii

⁴ Plut. adv. Colotem, 31, p. 1125 e

⁵ Diod. I xxv, fr. 1, Dind

⁶ Luc. Alexandri, c. 47.

⁷ Cic. de Fin. II 7. 20 'Epicuri Kupias Δόξας, id est quasi maxime ratas'.

⁸ Cic. de Nat. Deor. I 30. 85 'in illis selectis eius brevibusque sententius, quas appellatis Kupias Δόξας'.

⁹ Animadversiones, p. 1693

¹⁰ Usener, Epicurea, xliii ff

¹¹ Giussani, Stud. Lucr., p. xxvi, note 1

¹² Rendiconti del R. Istit. Lombardo di sc. e lettere, 1908, pp. 792 ff, and in an abridged form in Epicuro, Introd., pp. 8-26.

XXXII and XXXVII) are not the basis of Epicurus' position, which was that politics should be altogether excluded (2) Some of the maxims read like extracts from personal letters and are quite inappropriate in a summary of doctrines (e.g. X, XX, XXIV) some are even left in the second person, as they were in their original context. (3) Many of the maxims are mere duplicates of one another (e.g. III and XVIII, XI, XII, and XIII, XXXVII and XXXVIII). (4) There is the greatest possible disorder : all kinds of subjects are jumbled together and there is no sign of any fundamental scheme.

Of these points the second is easily dealt with : the use of the second person singular¹ in such maxims is common not only in Epicurus and is no necessary indication of an extract from a more colloquial work. The other three are more serious and can only be properly appreciated after a careful study of the aphorisms as a whole and in detail, and an attempt to gather the purpose and character of the work. As regards the supposed omissions Usener has certainly mistaken the character of the whole work, if he imagines that it was intended as a complete summary of the whole Epicurean system. Its purpose is essentially ethical, and there is therefore no attempt to explain the physical doctrine or the principles of the *Canonica* (XXIII and XXIV come in incidentally as an elaboration of the idea in XXII of the necessity for a well-ordered life of the understanding of the external world) such knowledge was contained in other Epicurean summaries (e.g. Ep. i) and is assumed in the *Kύριαι Δόξαι*. Nor indeed are the maxims meant to cover the whole range even of the moral theory their content might, as Giussani has suggested, be described as 'Man in his own consciousness and the external world', and they constitute in fact a kind of practical handbook for the professed Epicurean, by which he may attain the life of *ἀταράξια*. This will explain not only the omissions, but the insertion of certain precepts which Usener regards as of secondary importance, e.g. the stress laid on the Epicurean view of justice (XXXII, XXXVII, &c.) is necessary because the Epicurean, essentially an individualist, must be instructed as to the attitude which he should take up to the society in which he lives and to its laws and customs. Bignone² has also pointed out that some of these apparently unimportant points are in reality replies to rival schools of thought, but the main guiding principle of their choice is the scope of the work itself.

As regards Usener's 'doublets', Bignone has dealt in detail with each individual case. It may be said in general that whereas no doubt the same ideas do recur from time to time in the aphorisms, they are put from a different point of view and gain a new significance in their context. If the framework of the *Δόξαι* is understood,³ it is seen that the repetition is always valuable and significant. Thus, for instance,

¹ Giussani, loc. cit. Bignone, p. 10.

² p. 11.

³ See p. 346

in III the idea of the quantitative limit of pleasure is stated as one of the four fundamental principles of the ethical system, in XVIII it is introduced and amplified by the notion of the 'variation' of pleasures as the foundation of a discussion of the 'pleasures of the flesh'. In XI the value of physical science is maintained as conducive to mental *drapæcia*, in XII it is asserted as saving man from the falsehoods of myth, in XIII it is regarded as a necessary supplement to 'protection from men'. The one instance in which we may with some probability assume a 'doublet' is XXXVII and XXXVIII, though even there the former seems to lay stress on the universality of the fundamental character of the 'just' action, the latter on the variability of the particular actions which in different circumstances may be just or unjust.

The accusation of 'disorder' may also, I think, be met. It may be that some transpositions should be made. Gassendi had proposed a rearrangement of XXVI–XXX, and Guissani, with his usual passion for transposition, would apparently be prepared to carry this further, though he does not specify the changes which he would propose. The charge is, however, very considerably minimized, if the true character of the 'Maxims' is realized. They are clearly not intended to be a consecutive logical whole, and any attempt to twist them into such will necessarily fail. Rather they are to be regarded as a series of groups of aphorisms, each group being internally consistent, but often only loosely connected with that which precedes or follows. The various points on which the faithful Epicurean may need instruction or guidance are dealt with as they occur, and he is left at the end with a whole which is complete but not continuously consecutive. To establish this point, it is necessary to suggest a brief analysis of these groups¹:

(1) I–IV The *τετραφύρμακος*—the four fundamental principles necessary for the tranquil life, (2) V. The relation of pleasure and virtue, (3) VI, VII Protection from external disturbance, (4) VIII–X. The selection of pleasures; (5) XI–XIII The ethical value of physical science; (6) XIV–XXI. The wise man's life in relation to nature, his fellow-men, and to true pleasure (this group can be subdivided), (7) XXII–XXVI The tests and standards of moral (i.e. truly pleasant) action, (8) XXVII, XXVIII Friendship; (9) XXIX–XXX The classification of desires, (10) XXXI–XXXVIII Justice and Injustice, (11) XXXIX, XL. The wise man's life in the Epicurean community. This analysis might no doubt be varied, and there is often an interrelation between group and group, so that some aphorisms might be more justly regarded as links between groups rather than as belonging exclusively to one rather than the other. The question of the amount of disorder in the aphorisms must be judged by every reader for himself, but the criterion must not be a general framework, such as Usener would postulate, but a satisfactory distribution in groups.

We may take it then that the *Κύριαι Δόξαι* is a practical manual of

¹ The individual links of connexion between aphorism and aphorism will be dealt with more fully in the notes.

guidance for life intended for the professed Epicurean, that it does not claim to be a consecutive treatise on ethics, but deals successively with the various topics of importance for its own practical end. With all the ancient testimony which we have in its favour, there seems no sound reason for doubting that it is the work of Epicurus himself, nor, if its character be rightly understood, does its working out seem unworthy of him or more appropriate to an unintelligent compiler. The picture of the 'true Epicurean' which it represents is consistent with what we learn from other sources, and in particular from the third letter, to Menoeceus. It is based on a relentless working out of the idea of pleasure as the end of life (which is characteristically never stated in the aphorisms), and though in some details, such as the conceptions of justice and friendship, its individualism strikes the reader as almost incredibly cynical, yet the image of the tranquil life has its strong attractions, and the vision of the Epicurean community with which the series concludes has a considerable beauty of its own. We may safely regard the 'Principal Doctrines' as *Ratae*, the authentic dicta of their Master, and also as *Selectae* in the sense that they do not attempt to cover the whole field of ethics, but only to lay down the conditions for the true Epicurean life.

The first four aphorisms hang closely together and form the basis of the Epicurean moral system. The principles which they enunciate were known to the school as the 'quadruple remedy' (*τετραφάρμακος*), and are found summed up under this title in the Herculanean Rolls 1005, col. 4 καὶ πανταχῆ παρεπόμενον (Cronert παρέστω μόνον Us) ἡ τετραφάρμακος ἄφοβον ὁ θεός, ἀνύποπτον (Cronert. ἀναισθῆτον Us) ὁ θάνατος, καὶ τάγαθὸν μὲν εὔκτητον, τὸ δὲ δεινὸν εὐεκκαρτέρητον. The four principles are again summed up as the full equipment for the moral life in Ep. iii, § 133, and are dealt with fully and in order in the earlier part of that letter. The right belief about the gods and about death, and the true understanding of pleasure and pain, secure ἀταραξία for the mind and enable us to aim at ἀπονία for the body.

§ 139 I Sums up the teaching with regard to the nature of the gods and corresponds to Ep. iii, §§ 123, 124.

1. μακάριον καὶ ἄφθαρτον so ἄφθαρτον καὶ μακάριον, Ep. iii, § 123 3 ἄφθαρτον, 'indestructible', is a typically Epicurean word, based of course on the purely material conception of atomic structure

οὐτε αὐτὸ . παρέχει. The divine beings themselves enjoy perfect ἀταραξία and do not disturb that of others cf. Ep. i, § 77. 1 οὐ γὰρ συμφωνοῦσιν πραγματεῖαι καὶ φροντίδες καὶ ὄργαι καὶ χάριτες μακαριώτητι

3 ἐν δυσθενεῖ exist only 'in a weak nature', almost 'are a sign of weakness' so Ep. i, § 77. 2 ἀλλ' ἐν δυσθενείᾳ καὶ φόβῳ καὶ προσδεήσει τῶν πλησίον ταῦτα γίνεται, which brings out the meaning here. Anger and favour are characteristics of a weak nature dependent on others, and not of the perfect strength and independence of the divine.

Sent. Val. i has ἀνθρωπεία, which would correspond with the passage in Ep. i, but it seems unnecessary to alter the neuter.

After the first aphorism there is a very important scholium; see app. crit. This obviously bears very closely on the Epicurean conception of the nature of the gods. We may notice certain points in the scholium here. (1) λόγω θεωρητούς is not likely to be Epicurus' own expression, but its meaning will be that the εἴδωλα of the gods are not perceptible by αἰσθησις but only by the mind (cf. *Lucr.* v. 1170
egregias animo facies vigilante videbant
et magis in somnis mirando corporis auctu.)

(2) The following clause obviously corresponds very nearly to the passage in *Cic. N. D.* i. 49 'nec . . ad numerum, . . sed imaginibus similitudine et transitione perceptis, cum infinita simillimarum imaginum species ex innumerabilibus individuis existat'. It may therefore be taken as certain that οὐς μὲν . . οὐς δέ cannot be right. There is no trace elsewhere that Epicurus conceived of two categories of gods, and it is inconsistent with such evidence as we have. Gassendi's conjecture οὐ μέν for οὐς μέν, accepted by Giussani (*Stud. Lucr.*, p. 234) and Bignone, may be taken as fairly certain, and for οὐς δέ we should read either ως δέ with Gassendi, or more probably οῖους δέ suggested by Bignone. On the other hand, I regard Kuhn's change of ἀποτελεσμένων to ἀποτελεσμένους (followed by Usener and Giussani) as unnecessary. οὐφεστώτας can be continued into the second clause, and ἀποτελεσμένων refers to the formation of the εἴδωλα by the atoms. The gods 'do not exist as numerable material bodies, like other atomic compounds, but by identity of form, owing to the constant afflux of similar images which are completed at the same spot'. The expression is very condensed, but is, I think, intelligible. The form of the divine body remains always the same: its material constitution is a succession of atomic formations, the individual atoms coming together within the limits of the form to constitute the divine body for a moment and then coming off together in the combination of an 'image' to pass into the mind of man. The use of εἴδωλων is therefore proleptic, and there is some confusion, as in the passage of Cicero, between the formation of the divine body and its cognition by men through the medium of the εἴδωλον. (3) ἀνθρωποειδῆς. The divine body was always conceived by Epicurus as anthropomorphic in form (cf. *Cic. N. D.* i. 46 'a natura habemus omnes omnium gentium speciem nullam aliam nisi humanam deorum').

II. The second aphorism states the second condition of ἀταραξία, the true knowledge with regard to death, and corresponds therefore to Ep. iii, § 124. 7

4. δ θάνατος οὐδὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς. The regular Epicurean formula, as in Ep. iii, § 124. 7, and *Lucr.* iii. 830 'nil igitur mors est ad nos'. It is here enforced by a brief and interesting syllogistic argument.

τὸ γὰρ διαλυθὲν διαισθῆται: death means the atomic dissolution of the living being and atomic dissolution means the loss of sensation, for

sensation is due to the juxtaposition and movement of the soul and body atoms. So more briefly Ep. iii, § 124, 8 στέρησις δέ ἐστιν αἰσθήσεως ὁ θάνατος. Lucr. iii. 558–614 explains the theory carefully and at length.

5. τὸ δ' ἀναισθῆτον οὐδὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς for we are sentient beings, and a non-sentient existence, whatever it might be, is not us. Lucr. iii. 847–869 again gives a useful commentary.

III The first two principles concerned external things, the gods and death, with regard to which a right understanding is necessary to avoid fear. The third and fourth concern the internal feelings of pleasure and pain and the attitude to be taken up towards them. Bignone (p. 56 note 1) has pointed out that the third aphorism consists of two parts and must be considered in relation to the doctrines which Epicurus is combating. In the first he states that the quantitative limit of pleasure is the complete removal of pain if all pain is eliminated, then perfect pleasure has been secured. Here he is attacking the doctrine of the Cyrenaics, who regarded the removal of pain as a merely negative state of calm, while pleasure was the addition beyond that of a κίνησις. In the second part he is attacking the Platonic idea of the μικτὰί ἡδονάι, pleasures in which there is an element of pain where you find something in a state of pleasure (*τὸ ἡδόμενον*), there is no element of pain either bodily or mental. In other words, pain and pleasure are mutually exclusive, and Plato's μικτὰί ἡδονάι are not genuine pleasures. The practical inference was of great importance for the Epicurean ethic—pain can be removed by simple means, but it requires elaboration to produce the Cyrenaic pleasure hunger is satisfied by bread, but the Cyrenaic needs an elaborate banquet. Moreover, these elaborate pleasures involve pains and are therefore to Epicurus' mind not true pleasures. We come then to the 'simple life' as the foundation of Epicurean morality—Epicurus was no 'epicure'—and this third aphorism does in fact correspond, though at first sight it seems remote, to the third article of the τετραφάρμακος, τάγαθὸν εὔκτητον. The point is brought out in the more elaborate treatment in Ep. iii, §§ 129–130, and is the underlying notion of Lucr. ii. 20 ff.

6. δρός, 'limit', beyond which greater pleasure cannot be produced, but as he points out in XVIII, pleasure can only be varied. Here he is in direct and immediate contrast to the Cyrenaic view.

παντὸς τοῦ ἀλγοῦντος Usener quotes an interesting note from Voll. Herc. Coll. II. t. vii, f. 14, which shows that even in antiquity there was a division of authorities as to whether παντὸς should or should not be read here. Its exclusion would not weaken the main position, but rather limit it to a particular case, the removal of what on each occasion causes pain. *τὸ ἀλγοῦν* is strictly 'bodily pain', as it is used just below, as opposed to *τὸ λυπούμενον*, 'mental pain', but it appears here to be used in a comprehensive sense, covering both.

7. ὑπεξαιρεσίς. Voll. Herc., *ibid.* assures us that 'all the good copies' have ἔξαιρεσίς, but the compound seems more probable and

the meaning is not affected. We may compare the parallel passage in Ep. iii, § 130. 11, ὅταν ἄπαν τὸ ἀλγοῦν κατ' ἔνδειαν ἔξαιρεθῇ (so again in K. Δ XVIII)

ὅπου δ' ἀν.. : the second point, which really follows from the first ; if pleasure is the complete absence of pain, then if pleasure is present there can be no pain. We cannot then have the μικτὰ ἡδοναί, and all pleasures which involve pain must be eschewed

8. ή τὸ συναμφότερον. Logically the addition is superfluous ; if there is neither bodily nor mental pain there cannot be the combination. But the idea of the close connexion of the two and their interaction is constantly present to Epicurus.

§ 140. IV The fourth aphorism deals with bodily pain, and is an expansion of the last clause of the *τετραφύρμακος*, τὸ δὲ δεινὸν εὐεκαρτέητον. Acute pain does not last long and chronic pain permits of an excess of pleasure. So that there is nothing in our physical constitution to make a life of pleasure as described in III impossible. The general idea is repeated epigrammatically in Ep. iii, § 133. 5 τὸ δὲ τῶν κακῶν (πέρας) ὡς ἡ χρόνος ἡ πόνος ἔχει βραχεῖς, and is echoed by Diogenes of Oenoanda, fr. lviii. We may also compare another saying of Epicurus¹, quoted by Plutarch, *de Poetis Audiendis*, 14, p. 36^b οἱ μεγάλοι πόνοι συτόμως ἔξαγοντιν, οἱ δὲ χρόνοι μέγεθος οὐκ ἔχοντιν, with which he compares a line of Aeschylus Θάρσει πόνον γὰρ ἀκρον οὐκ ἔχει χρόνον. It seems doubtful whether sufferers from pain would accept Epicurus' position, but Cicero (*de Offic. III* 33 117) acutely observes, 'non id spectandum est quid dicat, sed quid consentaneum sit ei dicere, qui bona voluptate terminaverit, mala dolore'. It was essential for Epicurus to maintain that there is open to every one at least a preponderance of bodily pleasure over pain. Two points in the aphorism may be noted. (1) Epicurus apparently speaks here of a coexistence of pleasure and pain, which at first sight seems inconsistent with III. But he is now considering pain in the body as a whole some part may be in pain while other parts are free, but there cannot be pleasure and pain in the same part at the same time — ὅπου δ' ἀν τὸ ἡδόμενον ἐνῃ, καθ' δν ἀν χρόνον η, οὐκ ἔστι τὸ ἀλγοῦν (2) He is speaking here solely of bodily pain he held of course that even the severest bodily pain might be exceeded and overcome by mental pleasure, and it was the function of the philosopher to secure this.

1. συνεχῶς goes of course with χρονίζει R. D. Hicks takes τὸ ἀλγοῦν συνεχῶς together, 'continuous pain does not last long' this seems a paradox which even in this paradoxical aphorism Epicurus did not contemplate.

ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ, 'in the flesh', a favourite use of Epicurus' where most writers would have said ἐν τῷ σώματι so again in XVIII and XX. Remember that σῶμα in Epicurus' vocabulary includes the corporeal ψυχή, so that he was forced to look for another word to express the body without the soul. It is also one of the signs of the approach of Epicurus' diction to Hellenistic Greek : cf. the use of αἰών in XX.

2. τὸ μὲν ἄκρον, 'the crisis' of acute pain. The use of ἀκέραιος τὰς ήδονάς in XII makes it tempting to conjecture ἀκέρατον here, but the point of the aphorism is that bodily pain is never absolutely without alleviation, and the line of Aeschylus strongly supports ἄκρον: Epicurus may possibly have had it in mind. So in Diog. Oen. fr. lviii τῶν ἀλγηδόνων αἱ ἄκραι χρονίζειν οὐ δύνανται.

3. Bywater's συμμένει for συμβαίνει would improve the sense, but it has no authority.

V. After the exposition of the *τετραφάρμακος* Epicurus proceeds to the conditions required for the pleasant life, and maintains that it must have the three qualities of prudence, honourable action, and justice a life which is based on these three will of necessity be pleasant. The first half of the aphorism is repeated verbally in Ep. iii, § 132, 9 and in Diog. Oen. fr. lv, who confirms Gassendi's addition. As regards the second sentence there are divergent views, but with the text adopted Epicurus enforces his statement with a reiteration from another point of view.

7. *οὐδὲ . . δικαίως* Gassendi's addition must be accepted as in the corresponding place in Ep. iii, § 132, 10. It is now confirmed by Diog. Oen. fr. lv.

8. δέτω δὲ τοῦτο . τοῦτον ήδεως ζῆν As this sentence stands in the MSS. (see critical notes) it cannot construe, and some correction is necessary. Usener emends ὅτῳ δ' ἐν τούτων μὴ ὑπάρχει οἷον ζῆν φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως ὑπάρχει, οὐκ ἔστι τοῦτον ήδεως ζῆν, 'but if a man lacks any one of these, as for instance prudence in life, even though he has honour and justice, it is not possible for him to live pleasantly'. The sense is at first sight good, not only cannot a man live pleasantly who lacks all these qualities, but the want of one of them is fatal. But there are several objections to the restoration. (a) the alterations δέτω δὲ τοῦτο for δὲ τοῦτο and οἷον ζῆν for οὐ ζῆν are too violent, (b) the grammar of καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως ὑπάρχει in the sense of 'and yet possesses an honourable and just life' is surely impossible, (c) the most important objection lies in the resulting sense. The language of Ep. iii, § 132 shows that Epicurus thought that φρόνησις was the controlling force in life, and itself produced the subordinate virtues it is, therefore, surely impossible to suppose that he could have imagined that a man could live καλῶς καὶ δικαίως, if he did not live φρονίμως. Bignone takes this point strongly.

Bignone himself reads *ἢ οὐ ζῆν* . . , 'but the man who is without that from which a prudent, honourable, and just life is derived, cannot possibly live happily'; he explains that τοῦτο ἢ οὐ is φρόνησις, and refers to the emphasis laid on it in Ep. iii, § 132. Palaeographically the correction is simple, but the expression is surely too vague to be probable and the explanation is unnatural, as it would of course be impossible to live φρονίμως without φρόνησις.

Von der Muehll follows *Sent. Vat.* v. in omitting the words from οὐ ζῆν to ὑπάρχει.

I suggest that the MS. text is right as far as it goes (with the obvious correction ξῆ for ξῆ), but that here again there has been a loss owing to parallelism of expression. τοῦτο then refers to ἡδῶς ζῆν, the nearest subject in the previous sentence, and ἔκεινο to φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαῖως ζῆν. The sentence then becomes a reinforcement of the maxim by the appeal to experience: ‘if in fact we see a man’s life is not pleasant, then we may be sure that he is not living virtuously: if we see that he is not living virtuously, we may know that he cannot be living pleasantly’. It does not greatly add to the previous maxim, but Epicurus is fond of such repetitions to enforce important points (he uses one in the corresponding place in Ep. iii, § 132), and the correction involves very little textual change.

VI and VII go closely together. If, as is stated in V, the pleasant life involves prudence, honourable living, and justice, how is this to be secured? The first necessity is ἀταραξία from without: for a man to live his own life well, he must be protected from molestation by others. It is therefore necessary to seek for such protection, and any means which can provide it is a ‘natural good’ (VI). In VII he goes on to consider certain false attempts to secure protection. The general idea of these two aphorisms is referred to in XIV, XXVIII, XXXI, and XXXIX, and is implicit in much of Lucretius’ description of early civilization in v. 1011 ff and 1105 ff.

II. θαρρεῖν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, ‘to have immunity from the attacks of men’, a condensed form of expression which Epicurus affects: cf VII τὴν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀσφάλειαν and XIV τῆς ἀσφαλείας τῆς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων γενομένης, and the corresponding use of θαρρεῖν in XXVIII and XXXIX.

ἢν· the inferential imperfect used often in the Κύριαι Δόξαι· cf XII οὐκ ἢν.

κατὰ φύσιν ἀγαθόν, ‘a good in accordance with nature’: cf VII τὸ τῆς φύσεως ἀγαθόν ἀγαθὸν ἐξ ὅν is certainly an odd construction, though not impossible for Epicurus. Usener suggests ἀγαθά, which would be easier, but possibly something like ταῦτα ζητεῖν has dropped out.

After κατὰ φύσιν the MSS. have ἀρχῆς καὶ βασιλείας, which Usener excludes as a gloss on ἐξ ὅν. I had at one time thought the words might be retained and (*όρεγεσθαι*) added after them (cf VII *ad fin* ὠρέχθησαν). The aphorism would then become an anticipation of the first part of VII ‘in order to obtain ἀσφάλεια men sought rule and kingship as the means by which they might attain their end’. The sense would be quite in accordance with Epicurus’ thought, but I do not think he could speak of this mistaken idea as κατὰ φύσιν ἀγαθόν, and it is better to regard the words as an anticipatory gloss. VI is the general statement and VII gives the detail. Von der Muehll retains ἀρχῆς καὶ βασιλείας, translating ‘presumably “the advantage of rule and kingship is a natural blessing”, but apart from the grammatical difficulty, this is open to the same objection that Epicurus could not have spoken of such things as a κατὰ φύσιν ἀγαθόν.

12. After τοῦτο Meibom inserted τις, which would again make the construction easier, but in Epicurus it is hardly necessary.

§ 141 VII deals with a false attempt to obtain this necessary protection from other men: persons have thought that they could do it by winning fame and high position which would place them above molestation. But in fact the struggle to obtain and maintain high position is itself a serious obstacle to ἀταράξια, nor, as Epicurus points out here, is the result attained one of real security. Lucretius has a remarkably close parallel v. 1120-1126

at claros homines voluerunt se atque potentis,
ut fundamento stabili fortuna maneret
et placidam possent opulentu degere vitam,
nequicquam, quoniam ad summum succedere honorem
certantes iter infestum fecere vias,
et tamen e summo, quasi fulmen, deicit ictos
invidia interdum contemptum in Tartara taetra

3 ἀπέλαθον, 'they obtained to the full' cf. ἀπολαμβάνειν in XII
τὸ τῆς φύσεως ἀγαθόν, 'the good according to nature' as in VI

5 κατὰ τὸ τῆς φύσεως οἰκεῖον, 'in accordance with that which is akin to nature', i.e. the instinct for pleasure Cf. Ep. iii, § 129 το πᾶσα οὖν ἡδονὴ διὰ τὸ φίστιν ἔχειν οἰκεῖαν ἀγαθόν.

VIII passes to a slightly different topic, yet not unconnected with the last two aphorisms. If men can be so deceived about 'natural goods', what criterion can we have in the choice of pleasures? This aphorism lays down the general principle all pleasures are good in themselves, but in some the concomitant pain outweighs the pleasure, and these must be avoided. The idea is elaborated in IX and X and is dealt with fully in Ep. iii, § 129

6. καθ' ἐαυτὸν κακόν the neuter is quite natural, and the reading καθ' ἐαυτὴν κακή of FP³ looks like the commendation of a grammatical purist. But possibly von der Muehll's καθ' ἐαυτὴν κακόν is the most natural construction.

7 ὄχλησις, 'disturbances' cf. XI ἡτοχλοῦν and Ep. iii, § 127 οὐ αὐχλητίαν.

§ 142 IX is a unique statement in Epicurus but very important, as it gives the ground for the differentiation of pleasures. Gassendi observed that it was directed against the Cyrenaics, who held (D. L. n. 87) that 'no pleasure differs from any other nor is it more pleasant': they believed also that pleasure was merely momentary and could not be prolonged, so that the object of life was to accumulate as many pleasurable moments as possible, and it did not matter from what source they were derived life for them was simply and solely apolaustic. Epicurus' view, on the other hand, was that although pleasure could not be increased quantitatively beyond the limit of the complete absence of pain (III), yet pleasures could be

varied, and had qualitative differences. Here he also implies that they can differ in 'density' in three ways, either by lasting longer or by affecting the whole organism or by affecting its more important parts (in particular, the mind). If all pleasures were alike in these respects, then there would be no difference at all between them, but as it is, a 'calculus of pleasures' becomes possible we can select our pleasures, either according as they are more pure, i.e. more completely exclude pain (VIII and XI), or as they are more lasting or affect the whole organism or its more important parts. The theory is an integral part of the ethical scheme and is needed to complete the argument of Ep. III, § 129.

1. *κατεπικυρώτο*, 'could be intensified' or 'condensed'.

After *ἡδονή* Bignone would insert *καὶ μνήμη*. There is no doubt that memory played a part in Epicurus' conception of pleasure (compare the general idea of Ep. III, § 122, and XVII of the Vatican aphorisms) and would be a means of *καταπίκνωσις*, but it seems hardly justifiable to introduce it into the text here. Similarly Cronert's insertion (*καὶ τόνω*) is superfluous.

2. *ἄθροισμα* is used quite literally of the 'aggregate' of atoms of soul and body which composes the man. 'Organism' seems the nearest word in English, though it includes ideas foreign to the Greek word cf. Ep. I, § 63 3 ἡ ψυχὴ σῶμά ἔστι λεπτομερὲς παρ' ὅλον τὸ ἄθροισμα παρεσταρμένον

τὰ κυριώτατα μέρη, 'the most important parts', i.e. especially the mind rather than the body. cf. Ep. I, §§ 35 6, 36. 6.

X-XIII may be regarded as going together and are naturally approached from IX. Epicurus is applying the test of the *κυριώτατα μέρη*, and in particular of the mind. For its pleasure the necessary conditions are, as has been learnt from the *τετραφάρμακος*, a true knowledge of the nature of the gods and of death, and an understanding of the bounds to be set to desire and of the limits of pain. Now the pleasures of sensuality cannot help us here; if they could, we might (apart from their accompanying pain) regard them as perfect pleasures. But for this purpose we must turn rather to philosophy, which gives us the sure knowledge of the nature of the world and the principles of our own conduct.

X is a straightforward statement. if the pleasures of the body could give us what we need, we could find nothing to censure in them.

4. *τῶν περὶ τοὺς ἀσώτους ἡδονῶν*. the regular Greek periphrasis with *περὶ* to avoid one genitive dependent on another *ἀσωμάτους* F is a strange variant, but does not point to any real alternative.

5. *μετέωρων*: the movements of the heavenly bodies and the other phenomena of the sky, the subject in fact of the second letter. The fear about the *μετέωρα* is of course the idea that they are arbitrary acts on the part of divine beings, which, according to the Epicureans, was one of the causes of the origin of religion: cf. XI and Lucr. v. 1183-1240.

6. καὶ ἀλγηδόνων, 'and its pains', not 'pain' simply (as Hicks), for 'the fear of pain' would be an idea not found elsewhere in Epicurus.

τὸ πέρας τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν, 'the limits set to our desires', i.e. that we cannot desire greater pleasure than the complete absence of pain (III).

It is clear that we require here the mention also of the limit set to pain (IV), and the insertion of (καὶ τῶν ἀλγηδόνων) would be sufficiently justified by XI. But, as Bignone has pointed out, it is now guaranteed by the text of Diogenes of Oenoanda, *fr. xlvi*, where this aphorism is quoted.

7. μεμφάιμεθα The reading of B μεμφάιμεθα is hardly enough authority for altering the otherwise universal μεμφάιμεθα to the more grammatically correct ἐμεμφάιμεθα

8 ἐκπληρουμένοις a necessary correction of the εἰσπληρουμένοις of the MSS a common error (K = ic)

9 δπερ sc. τὸ ἀλγοῦν καὶ τὸ λυπούμενον

XI If we had no need of such knowledge, we could well lead a pleasant life without physiology, but as this knowledge is the essential condition of pleasure, we cannot dispense with our understanding of nature. The general idea of this direct value of scientific knowledge is dealt with in Ep. 1, § 78

11 ἡνώχλουν cf VIII ὀχλήσεις

12. μή ποτε. ή τι the form of the expression strongly recalls ὁ θάνατος οὐδὲν πρὸς ἥμᾶς in II and elsewhere.

τε τὸ μὴ κατανοεῖν is a brilliant restoration for the MSS τετόλμηκα νοεῖν B accentuates τετόλμηκά and P has τ τό μηκα, which point to a corruption, and a marginal note in B describes the reading of the text as σφά(λμα)

§ 143 XII makes one step farther in advance. There are two possible sources of information about the heavenly phenomena and death, religion and science. The ordinary man derives his conceptions from the myths of religion, but they are peculiarly calculated to inspire fear and so to destroy pleasure if pleasure is to be based on complete ἀταραξία, and so to be absolutely pure, we must learn the truth about the universe from physical science. Again Ep. 1, § 78, puts the point fully

1. οὐκ ἦν, 'it is not possible' the inferential imperfect again. cf. VI ἦν κατὰ φύσιν

ὑπὲρ τῶν κυριωτάτων, 'about the most important matters', i.e. the μετέωρα and death cf. Ep. 1, § 78 1 τὸ τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν κυριωτάτων αἴτιαν ἔξακριβώσαι φυσιολογίας ἔργον εἶναι δεῖ νομίζειν also §§ 35, 36.

2 τοῦ σύμπαντος: nothing short of a knowledge of the universe will really suffice, or at least of the general principles of its working

ὑποπτεύμενον the fear of the arbitrary action of the gods in phenomena gives us a 'suspicion' cf. ὑποψία in XI. Normal Attic uses the verb only in the active, and Usener proposes to read ὑποπτεύοντα, but this may be accepted as a later usage.

4 ἀκεραίος, 'unalloyed', entirely free from pain, and in this case from the mental pain of fear Lucretius puts the point well in ill. 37 ff.

et metus ille foras praeceps Acheruntis agendum,
funditus humanam qui vitam turbat ab imo
omnia suffundens mortis nigrore neque ullam
esse voluptatem liquidam puramque relinquit

ἀπολαμβάνειν· cf VII ἀπέλαβον τὸ τῆς φύσεως ἀγαθόν

XIII is a connecting link between the immediately preceding topic and that of VI and VII, to which Epicurus returns in XIV. It is no good to secure freedom from molestation by other men, unless we combine that with the greater freedom of mind, which is due to the true knowledge of the universe. Our ἀταραξία must be complete both on the physical and mental sides, if we are to have true pleasure cf Lucr ill. 37 ff and ii 16 ff

5. τὴν κατ' ἀνθρώπους ἀσφάλειαν. cf VI θαρρεῖν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, VII τὴν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀσφάλειαν κατ' ἀνθρώπους is here a natural variation

6. ὑπόπτων cf XI ὑποψίαι, XII ὑποπτευόμενον, the word which links these three aphorisms together the root idea is fear arising from uncertainty

τῶν ὑπὸ γῆς always coupled by the physiologists with τὰ με-έωρα, as Ep. ii and Lucr vi

7. τῶν ἐν τῷ ἀπείρῳ things outside our κόσμος, sc other worlds and the gods So Lucr. i 74 of Epicurus, 'omne immensum peragrat ments animoque'

XIV A most difficult and obscure aphorism in which both text and meaning are uncertain. It returns to the topic of the ἀσφάλεια ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, which had been broached in VI and VII and referred to again in XIII. VI showed its necessity for the ideal life, and VII that the effort to gain it by fame and position is mistaken. Epicurus now considers the question how it is to be attained: the aphorism must be considered in close connexion with XXXIX where he recurs again to this question. Our view as to his answer must be determined by the text adopted both here and in XXXIX. According to the text here given Epicurus holds that there must as a preliminary be some force (*δύναμις*)—even though it were only personal influence—which can banish from one's life the elements which are likely to cause disturbance (*ἐξοριστική*, cf *ἐξωρίσατο* in XXXIX). But besides this force, by far the purest source (*εὐπορία εἰλικρινεστάτη*) of ἀσφάλεια is that which arises from one's own quiet life and retirement from the world. Here then we have the answer to the question raised in VII. The men who aim at political power think to secure their ἀσφάλεια wholly by force. They are wrong: it is true that some force is necessary to banish certain molestations, but the true solution is to eschew politics altogether and live one's own life in peace. This was, of

course, the regular Epicurean view, characteristic of its general individualistic attitude compare *Lucr.* v. 1127-1128

ut satius multo iam sit parere quietum

quam regere imperio res velle et regna tenere

For other views of the aphorism see notes below.

8 γενομένης μέχρι τινός the start towards ἀσφάλεια must be made by an exercise of force or power which can secure it to a certain degree

9. δυνάμει τινὶ ἔξοριστικῇ, 'by a certain force of expulsion', i.e. of getting rid of certain elements of interference and placing them beyond the borders of one's life. The text is very uncertain. I accept with some hesitation Usener's correction *τινί* for *τε*. among the many MS variations of the next word, the almost universal *perispomenon* accent points to a dative rather than a nominative. *ἔξοριστικῃ* would be strongly supported by *ἔξωρίσατο* in XXIX, which in my view is based on the same general idea 'The man who secures ἀσφάλεια makes all things he can akin to him (*ὅμοφυλα*) or at least not alien (*ἀλλόφυλα*) for the rest, he either does not mix with them (*ἀνεπίμικτος ἐγένετο*), or else banishes them from his life (*ἔξωρίσατο*)' There is, however, an exactly similar doubt as to the text there

Usener takes δυνάμει *τινί* by itself and reads *ἔξερειστική* 'the ἀσφάλεια arising from ἴστυχία and ἔλαχώρησις is a support to and the purest source of the ἀσφάλεια from men which has been obtained to a certain extent by a certain force'. But (1) δυνάμει *τινί* is very weak and does little but repeat *μέχρι τινός*, (2) *ἔξερειστική* is feeble in sense and grammatically awkward in combination with the substantive *εὐπορία* this Usener feels himself and suggests in his notes *ἔξερειστις η*, (3) the general sense is unsatisfactory the life of retirement cannot well be described as 'a support' to ἀσφάλεια

R. D. Hicks, accepting Usener's text, translates 'then on a basis of power arises most genuine bliss' this is surely an impossible sense for *ἔξερειστική*, which cannot be passive in meaning, and *εὐπορία* must go with the genitive *τῆς ἀσφαλείας*

Bignone retains the *τε* of the MSS and reads δυνάμει *τε* *ἔξερειστική καὶ εὐπορίᾳ εἰδικρινεστάτη* *έπεξεργαστικῶν* *τάτη γίνεται*, 'both by its power of offering support and by its unalloyed gifts of goods is most productive of' the ἀσφάλεια ἐξ ἀνθρώπων. But δυνάμει *ἔξερειστική* is an odd expression, and the addition to the text is very considerable *εἰδικρινεστάτη*, 'most pure', because it is not tainted by the element of *ὄχλησις*, which is involved in the use of force to banish molestations.

10 ἔκχωρήσεως the bulk of the MS authority is for *ἔγχωρήσεως*, but that must be a mere mistake

§ 144. XV deals with the topic of Ep. iii § 130 to satisfy the desires of nature (the *ἀναγκαῖαι ήδοναι*) very little is wanted, and that can easily be obtained. But to satisfy the empty cravings of those who are not philosophers is an almost endless task. The idea is familiar and the expression straightforward Besides Ep. iii, § 130 Τὸ μὲν φυσι-

κὸν τὰν εὐπόριστόν δοττί, τὸ δὲ κενὸν δυσπόριστον, we may compare an aphorism preserved by Stobaeus, *Floril.* xvii. 23 (*fr. 67*, Usener 469) χάρις τῇ μακαρίᾳ Φύσει, ὅτι τὰ διαγκαῖα ἐποίησεν εὐπόριστα, τὰ δὲ δυσπόριστα σύν διαγκαῖα, and *Lucr.* v. 1117-1119.

quod si quis vera vitam ratione gubernet,
divitiae grandes homini sunt vivere parce
aequo animo; neque enim est umquam penuria parvi.

1. δῆτης φύσεως πλοῦτος: cf. the epigram in *Athenaeus* (Usener *fr. 471*).

τᾶς φύσιος δ' ὁ πλοῦτος δρον τινὰ βαιδὸν ἐπίσχει,
αἱ δὲ κεναὶ κρίσιες τὰν ἀπέραντον δόδον.

2. τῶν κενῶν δόξων, 'the wealth demanded by idle imaginings', i.e. suggested by the baseless mental images of persons who have not learned the true wisdom. So Epicurus, as quoted by Porphyrius, *ad Marcellam*, 27, p. 208. 2 (*fr. 68*, Usener 471) οὐ σπάνιον γε εὑρεῖν ἄνθρωπον (πένητα) πρὸς τὸ τῆς φύσεως τέλος καὶ πλούσιον πρὸς τὰς κενὰς δόξας Cf. also XXIX παρὰ κενὴν δόξαν γινόμεναι.

XVI. A new topic, the comparative importance of chance and reason in life. Chance can at times hinder the wise man, but only to a small extent. It must be reason that throughout his life decides his action and therefore his fate. The idea is reproduced in several Epicurean passages and is foreshadowed in Ep. iii, § 134.

3. βραχέα: the neuter plural (internal acc.) has the better MS. authority as against βραχῖα, and, as Usener points out, is supported by Cicero's rendering (*de Fin.* i. 19. 63) 'exiguum (*not* exiguum) fortunam intervenire sapienti'. Epicurus, too, is almost certainly adapting Democritus' aphorism βαῖα γάρ φρονήσι τύχη μάχεται, τὰ δὲ πλεῦστα ἐν βίῳ εὐεύνετος διεδερκίᾳ κατιθύνει, where we have the same neuter plural. τὰ δὲ μέγιστα just afterwards confirms it.

The same parallels are conclusive against Cobet's τύχῃ for τύχη.

4. διώκηκε is clearly intended by the MS. διώκηκε and is read by Stobaeus, when he quotes this passage. Usener, who quite arbitrarily excises διοικεῖ καὶ διοικήσει at the end of the sentence as a gloss, reads διώκησε as a gnomic aorist and cuts out the καὶ which follows it in the MSS. Epicurus wishes to emphasize the continuance of the process by the use of all three tenses. Bignone also takes this view of the text.

XVII gives us the direct connexion between justice and the Epicurean ideal. Justice, as we shall see (XXXIII), has in itself no immediate value, but indirectly it is useful because it most contributes to the inward and outward peace (*ἀταραξία*) of the life of ideal pleasure: injustice, on the other hand, is the source of the greatest possible disturbance. The idea is strictly Epicurean, and besides V we may compare the fragment δικαιοσύνης καρπὸς μέγιστος ἀταραξία (*fr. 80*, Usener 519), and particularly K. Δ. XXXV, which explains the cause of the *ταραχή*.

6. ὁ δίκαιος βίος is the form in which the aphorism appears in Diodorus and *Sent. Vat.* xii: the meaning is of course not different.

In XVIII Epicurus passes back to the limitation of pleasures, originally laid down in III, and speaks now more fully as regards both the body and the mind. The amount (*μέγεθος*) of pleasure is limited in both cases: both for body and for mind there is a point beyond which pleasure cannot be increased in quantity (*τὸ πέρας*), but only varied in kind. For the body this point is reached when there is *ἀνονία*, when all pain due to want is removed by the satisfaction of the want (e.g. in hunger). For the mind the limit is the establishment of *ἀταραχία* by the reasoned comprehension of the limits of pleasure and the right understanding of emotions like them, i.e. the desires and fears connected with the conceptions of immortality and death. Beyond these limiting points we can only get variation in our pleasures, and though for the mind such variation is good, for the body it means the introduction of means of pleasure which involve pain. The ideal of 'plain living and high thinking' is thus shown to be the life of the fullest and purest pleasure' cf. X and Ep. iii, §§ 130-132.

9. τὸ κατ' ἐνδειαν ἀλγοῦν, 'the pain due to want': cf. III and Ep. iii, § 130.

ποικιλλεῖται, 'is varied', in the means by which it is satisfied. This is a new point in addition to the *πέρας* doctrine of III. The luxurious life, which as was seen in X does not produce *ἀταραχία*, cannot increase the quantity of pleasure, but only vary its means of satisfaction.

10. *ἀπεγέννησεν* a curious word, meant perhaps to suggest the reaching of the limit in the process.

11. ἡ . τούτων αὐτῶν ἐκλόγησις, 'the thinking out of these very pleasures', i.e. the comprehension by reason of their limits. The understanding of the limits of pleasure of body and mind will not only give a rule of conduct but will itself be one of the means of securing *ἀταραχία*.

τῶν ὄμογενῶν τούτοις is probably rightly explained by Bignone to mean 'the emotions like them', i.e. the desires associated with immortality and the fears connected with death which (before the Epicurean philosophy) used to be the greatest cause of mental fear.

Hicks translates the clause, 'The limit of pleasure in the mind is obtained by calculating the pleasures themselves and the contrary pains'. But (a) this is not at all an Epicurean idea: he does not weigh pleasures against pains, but only admits 'pure pleasure', (b) it is a possible, but not the natural sense of *ἐκλόγησις*, (c) *τῶν ὄμογενῶν τούτοις* cannot be strained to mean 'the contrary pains'.

12. *παρεσκεύαζε*: a real imperfect 'used to cause' before the Epicurean philosophy was grasped

§ 145. XIX. A point of great importance is introduced as a deduction from the previous aphorism. If there is a limit of greatness to the

pleasure both of body and mind, and no pleasure can be greater than the complete absence of bodily pain and mental trouble, then complete pleasure can be attained in a limited time, and infinite time could not produce greater pleasure. The conception is of great importance for Epicurus because it enables him to maintain that there is no reason why men should long for immortality, which could not give them greater pleasure than they can know in this life. It is elaborated in XX.

1. *τοντν*: sc. not greater.

2. *τὰ πέρατα*: as in XVIII, the limits of bodily and mental pleasure, i.e. the complete absence of pain and anxiety.

XX. A difficult aphorism in which the editors have been inclined to tamper with the text, but it can, I think, be maintained as it stands. It is a contrast in the attitudes of 'the flesh' and 'the mind' towards pleasure, and is clearly intended to bring out further the point of XIX that infinite time is not required to obtain the greatest pleasure. Epicurus has also in mind, as usual, the view of the Cyrenaics. 'The flesh' is the body apart from the mind (IV). it can perceive individual sensations owing to the admixture of soul and body atoms, but cannot correlate sensations or reason about them. Any individual sensation of pleasure is perceived by it as something which might be indefinitely increased or prolonged: if this were really the case the longer the time, the greater would be the pleasure, and infinite time would produce infinite pleasure. It is on this purely sensational basis that the sensual man (*δσωτρος*, X) acts, and it is also the root of the Cyrenaic theory which advocated the accumulation of the individual moments of pleasure (*μονόχρονος ήδονή*). But the mind, Epicurus holds, knows well that this is not so, but that there is a quantitative limit to pleasure both of body and mind. complete pleasure is therefore attainable in this life and there is no need of immortality. The man who holds this conviction will be content to cease to exist, when his time comes, without feeling that he has missed anything. The difficulties lie chiefly in the first sentence.

4. *πειλαθε*, 'perceives', as in VII and XII, with no added implication of reflection on the sensation.

5. *καὶ ἀπειρος αὐτὴν χρόνος παρεσκεύασεν*, 'and infinite time is (in that case) required to supply pleasure'. I think the sentence may be so translated without unduly straining the Greek. *παρεσκεύασεν* is the reading of all the MSS. and is exactly paralleled by *τὸν παντελῆ βίον παρεσκεύασεν* below. If the text is altered at all, it should be to *παρεσκεύασος ἄν*, or with Diels to *καὶ . . . παρεσκεύασεν*. Usener reads *ἀρέσκοι ἄν, αὐτὴν* being then *τὴν σάρκα*, 'infinite time would satisfy it'. But not only is this a violent alteration of a word which is almost certainly authentic, but, as Bignone points out in his admirable discussion of this aphorism (Introd., pp. 26-32), it implies in the *σάρκη* something more than mere perception, and is therefore contrary to Epicurus' doctrine. Bignone himself would read *καὶ ἀπειρος οὐκ*

ἀπειρος, 'and limited time can produce unlimited pleasure'. But (1) the phrase below οὐθὲν ἔτι τοῦ ἀπείρου χρόνου προσδεήθημεν shows that there must have been a contrast between the σάρκē which does require infinite time and the διάνοια which does not; (2) though Epicurus says that the flesh perceives pleasures *as ἀπειρα*, he surely would not go so far as to say that limited time gives it pleasure which *is ἀπειρον*, for his whole doctrine is that there is always a πέρας. The expression is very obscure, but can, I think, stand as we have it,

τοῦ τῆς σαρκὸς τέλους, 'its ultimate purpose', or as Bignone translates it, 'its summum bonum', i.e. to get rid of all pain and so secure ἀπονία: the τέλος is also the πέρας of pleasure.

6. τὸν ἐπιλογισμὸν, 'the reasoned understanding': cf. XVIII ἡ . . . τούτων αὐτῶν ἐκλόγισας.

7. τοῦ αἰώνος, 'the age to come', the eternal life after death which religion assumes. The word is another of the signs of the approximation of Epicurus' language to the Hellenistic: cf. αἰώνιον XXVIII.

τὸν παντελῆ βίον, 'the complete life', which has attained its τέλος of ἀπονία and ἀταραξία. The analogy of XXI τὸ τὸν δόλον βίον παντελῆ καθιστάν suggests the transposition παντελῆ τὸν βίον. But the present order perhaps accords better with Epicurus' use of παρασκευάζειν, to 'afford' rather than 'to make'.

8. προσδεήθημεν is the reading of F and H and is clearly indicated by the reading of P and Q. The change of subject is quite natural and Usener's προσδεήθη· (οἵ) μήν is unnecessary.

9 οὐτε ἔφυγε τὴν ἡδονήν, an interesting point. Epicureanism is not ascetic. It does not avoid pleasure, but only realizes its true limits.

11. κατέστρεψεν, 'draws to its close'. cf. Ep. iii, § 126 6 τὸν δὲ γέροντα καλῶς καταστρέψειν and XL προκαταστροφήν. The aorist κατέστρεψεν, gnomic as all through the aphorism, would be more natural and was suggested by Bywater, and the imperfect may be due to the neighbouring παρεσκεύαζεν, which is a genuine imperfect in relation to the other aorists.

§ 146 XXI An ingenious connexion between the argument of the last aphorisms and the earlier practical considerations of VII and XV. If we are really convinced of the limits of pleasure, we shall know that but little is needed to secure ἀπονία and ἀταραξία, and shall avoid, as unnecessary, the struggles for political power and position. We may compare Lucr. ii. 16-53 and v. 1105-1135.

1. ὡς εὐτόριστοι ἔστι: cf. XV.

2 (τὸ) the addition of the second article is necessary.

τὸ ἀλγοῦν κατ' ἔνδειαν: cf. XVIII.

4. ἀγῶνας: a metaphor from the games: the struggles for success and the prizes which they bring. We may perhaps translate 'competition'.

XXII. An interesting and important link of connexion between the ethical theory and the general theory of knowledge. If we are to be

sure that our actions are right, we must, as has been seen from the preceding aphorisms, always refer them to the 'real end' of life, namely *ἀπονία* and *ἀπαραξία* (cf. XXV). But it is equally important to refer them also to the direct evidence of the senses, which is the ultimate basis of all knowledge (see Ep. i, § 82). It is a cardinal rule in the field of *φυσιολογία* that all conclusions of opinion (*δοξαζόμενα*) must be tested by such reference to immediate sensation. In the ethical field there is a double reason for doing this. firstly, in order to act rightly, we must have a right understanding of the world around us and must therefore refer to our external perceptions (*αισθήσεις*), and secondly, we must refer to our internal sensations (*πάθη*), the immediate perceptions of pleasure and pain, to be sure that any action we choose is really productive of pleasure and not of pain. Unless we keep these rules, we are liable in the moral sphere, as in the physical, to be misled by *προσδοξαζόμενα*, unauthorized additions of the mind.

5. τὸ ὑφεστηκός . . τέλος, 'the real end' of life, sc. *ἀπονία* and *ἀπαραξία*. For this meaning of *ὑφεστηκός* Bignone refers to the Life of Epicurus, § 32, 6 ὑφεστηκε δὲ τὸ ὄραν ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀκούειν, 'our sight and hearing are realities'. Schneider's proposal to expunge *τέλος* would make the aphorism refer solely to the theory of knowledge without any connexion with the ethical theory—a very abrupt jump. Hicks translates 'We must take into account as the end all that really exists'; this seems unmeaning, and is certainly not Epicurean.

πᾶσαν τὴν ἐνάργειαν, 'all the immediate evidence of sensation', i.e. both of the *πάθη* and the *αισθήσεις*. For the meaning of *ἐνάργεια* see Ep. i, § 52 3. Merbach (*de Epic Canon.*, p. 19) notes that *ἐπιλογίζεσθαι* is definitely associated in Epicurus with *ἐνάργεια*.

6. ἐφ' ἣν. a general statement, applicable both in the physical and the moral fields.

7. *ἀκρισίας*: because, unless we bear in mind the fundamental criterion of *πάθος*, we shall lose the power of discriminating between really pleasurable actions and the reverse.

ταραχῆς: because, unless we attend to the evidence of the senses, *αισθήσεις*, in the physical world, we shall admit the fears which are primarily destructive of the pleasures of life. Ep. i, § 82, provides a close parallel.

XXIII. The last aphorism took us back to the fundamental acceptance of *αισθήσεις* as the final test, and the next two deal with this subject. Objection to the Epicurean principle might be taken on two grounds: either that some of our sensations were trustworthy, but others not, or that they are all untrustworthy. Epicurus deals with these two positions separately, and in this aphorism with the extreme sceptic position. If, he says, you reject all sensations you are left without any standard of judgement at all, by which even to condemn the senses: for, as Lucretius explains in an interesting parallel

passage, reason, the only other possible standard, is itself founded on the senses and owes to them its validity :

quid maiore fide porro quam sensus haberi
debet? an ab sensu falso ratio orta valebit
dicere eos contra, quae tota ab sensibus orta est?
qui nisi sunt veri, ratio quoque falsa fit omnis.

(Lucr. iv. 482-485.)

There is no difficulty in text or expression.

9. *ἀναγωγήν*, 'reference': cf. *ἀνάγομεν* in XXII.

§ 147. XXIV. Epicurus now proceeds to consider the more modified scepticism which does not reject all sensation as untrue, but maintains that this or that sensation is false. He answers in effect, 'If you reject any single sensation, you will produce confusion in them all, and so destroy the possibility of a standard of judgement'. The expression of the aphorism is, however, obscure because it is highly technical. It should be read in conjunction with Ep. 1, § 50. Both Giussani (who has a valuable comment on this aphorism in *Stud. Lucr.*, pp. 181-182) and Bignone in his note explain the passage with reference to the familiar Epicurean instance of the man who sees a tower at a distance. He has a sensation of a round tower. If he is a good Epicurean he will say to himself, 'this sensation is true: it represents the image which has come to me'. But he will not go on to affirm that the tower itself is round, this he will regard as a problem awaiting (*προσμένον*) confirmation (*ἐπιμαρτύρησιν*) or contradiction (*ἀντιμαρτύρησιν*) on a nearer view (*ἐνάργυμα*). But the man who is not an Epicurean, when he comes up to the tower and finds it square, will say, 'my sense-perception was false', not realizing that the judgement that the tower was round was something added by his mind (*προσδοξάζομενον*) to the actual sensation—he ought to distinguish the two. If, says Epicurus, we reject any single sense-perception in this way we are really undermining them all by our groundless opinion, because the next time that we have a similar sensation, we shall at once be inclined to doubt its truth and so on till we shake our belief in sensation altogether—for we may take up a similar attitude to immediate feelings (*πάθη*) or images perceived by the mind (*ἐπιβολαι τῆς διανοίας*).

If, on the other hand, he continues, we blindly accept these opinions based on sensation—including both the actual sensation and the addition of thought—then, so far from escaping error, we shall introduce doubt into every judgement that we make. If, for instance, we decide in the example given above that the tower is round, we are simply wrong.

Many difficulties are involved in this Epicurean principle, some of which were more clearly perceived by his successors than by himself.

1. *Ἐκβάλλεις*: the MSS. both here and in l. 5 support *ἐκβάλλεις*: the

parallel of XXIII *εἰ μάχη . . . οὐχ ἔξεις* might support its retention, but διαιρήσεις following immediately in the protasis, makes the future necessary.

απλῶς, 'singly', 'by itself', as opposed to *πάσαις ταῖς αἰσθήσεσιν* in XXIII. Hicks' translation 'absolutely' does not make sense.

2. κατὰ τὸ προσμένον. κατὰ has better MS. authority than καὶ, which Usener adopts, and very greatly improves the sense: the 'opinion based on the idea awaiting confirmation' (that the tower is round) is contrasted with 'that which is actually present in sensation' (the image of a round tower), and we thus get a natural division of the two things to be 'distinguished', whereas with καὶ the point at which the second part of the contrast begins is not grammatically obvious. κατά and καὶ are frequently confused in the MSS. of Diog. Laert. Bignone also reads κατά, and Merbach (*de Epic. Canon.*, p. 39).

3. καὶ τὰ πάθη: a similar error may be made in the region of feeling. Giussani (l.c.) suggests as an example, that we may have a sensation of pricking: opinion at once assumes an external body pricking us, and when we find there is none, we may be similarly led to conclude that the sensation itself was false, whereas, it was, in fact, due to some internal cause.

καὶ πᾶσαν φανταστικὴν ἐπιβολὴν τῆς διανοίας For a discussion of the very difficult expression ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας see note on Ep. i, § 38, and Appendix, pp. 259 f. I do not believe that the epithet φανταστικήν here is intended to modify its sense, seeing that for Epicurus all thought was conducted by means of images. It seems likely, however, that he is thinking primarily of those mental images which are caused by the attention of the mind to εἴδωλα, not perceptible to the senses, but visiting the mind directly. The kind of mistake then would be, as Giussani again suggests, if seeing in sleep the vision of a dead friend, and realizing on waking that he was dead, we therefore assumed that the dream-vision was false, whereas as a dream-vision it was true, and Epicurus on his theory of the persistence of the εἴδωλα, can explain its occurrence.

4. τῇ ματαίῳ δόξῃ: by the same kind of 'groundless opinion' as caused confusion in the case of the single sensation, e.g. of the tower. The MSS. point to ματαίῳ rather than ματαίᾳ.

5. ὅτε . . . ἐκβαλεῖς because, when you are similarly led to reject other perceptions, you will then be in the position of the objector of aphorism XXIII.

εἰ δὲ βεβαιώσεις . . . The exactly opposite process, the acceptance of all appearances (i.e. sense-perception plus the inference of opinion), will lead to exactly the same confusion. The only sure ground of procedure is the distinction of the two.

6. τὸ προσμένον . . . τὴν ἐπιμαρτύρησιν: together. The addition of the accusative here is a valuable explanation of the real sense of τὸ προσμένον in passages where it is used absolutely as above, e.g. Ep. i, § 50. 10 Here τὸ προσμένον . . . τὴν ἐπιμαρτύρησιν is of course, in our

example, the idea that the tower is round, τὸ μῆ is the simple sense-perception of a round tower.

7. οὐκ ἐκλείψεις is the MS. reading. Bonnet's ἐκλείψει, adopted by Usener, would make the construction more normal, 'the error will not disappear', but it is probably possible to retain ἐκλείψει in a transitive sense, either 'you will not escape' (so Bignone) or possibly 'you will not leave out', 'eliminate' the falsehood.

8. ὡς τεττηρκῶς . . . ή μὴ δρθῶς, 'since you will have preserved the whole ground of doubt in every judgement of right or wrong': the 'ground of doubt' is always the προσδοξάζομενον, and if we accept that in all cases, we make all our conclusions dubious. I have followed Bignone in reading κατὰ for the MSS καὶ · cf. the similar confusion in l. 2.

Usener boldly alters to ωστ' ἀνηρηκῶς, 'so that you will have annulled all distinction and every judgement of right and wrong'. But apart from the very violent character of the change, it involves, as Giussani points out, the very unnatural sense of 'distinction' for διμοισβήτησι, which should certainly mean 'doubt', 'uncertainty'. (Hicks with Usener's text translates 'you will be taking sides in every question involving truth or error' I can make nothing of this)

Giussani himself reads ωστε τεττηρκῶς and καὶ (ἀνηρωκῶς), 'so that you will have preserved every cause of doubt and destroyed every judgement of right or wrong'. This gives good sense, but Bignone's correction is far simpler

§ 148. XXV After this excursion into metaphysics in the two previous aphorisms, Epicurus now returns to ethics. Every action must be tested by direct reference to the ultimate end of nature, i.e. perfect pleasure, consisting of ἀπορία and ἀταραξία. If we stop short of that and try to test our actions by any intermediate standard, such as that of prudence or honour or justice, we shall find that our actions are deviating from the true ideal of pleasure and we shall no longer be practising as we preach

2 τὸ τέλος τῆς φύσεως, 'the end which our nature seeks'. cf. XX τὸ τῆς σαρκὸς τέλος and XV ὁ τῆς φύσεως πλοῦτος.

προκαταστρέψεις . . . εἰς ἄλλο τι, 'you stop short before reaching the τέλος and turn to some other standard': the picture is of proceeding upwards through a series of correlated ideals, all dependent on the ultimate end of pleasure and stopping before we reach the end of the series. For this intransitive sense cf. XL προκαταστροφήν from the derivative sense of καταστρέψειν, 'to depart from life', XX.

4. τοῖς λόγοις . not merely 'your words' but 'the principles you profess'.

XXVI-XXX. Considerable doubt has been raised as to the correct order of these aphorisms. It would appear at first sight that XXVI, which deals with the classification of desires, must have a close connexion with XXIX and XXX, while XXVII and XXVIII, which deal with friendship, appear to interrupt that connexion. Gassendi

accordingly arranged them in the order XXIX, XXX, XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, and Meibom following him inserted XXVI between XXIX and XXX. Bignone (Introd., pp. 21 ff) who is concerned to defend the sequence of the aphorisms against the attacks of Usener, expresses some doubt at this point, and thinks it possible that a sentence has been lost linking up XXVI and XXVII. He has, however, made a good case for preserving the order of the MSS., and it seems better to retain it, bearing in mind, however, the possibility of a slight dislocation.

XXVI. Bignone (Introd., p. 21) has pointed out that there is an essential link of connexion between this aphorism and XXV. We must always refer our desires to the ultimate test of *ἀπονία* and *ἀράπαγία*, and the practical application of that test is that physical pain or mental disturbance results if the desires are not satisfied. If then we find that no such result would follow, we may be sure that the desire in question is unnecessary. This is confirmed when we find that the craving passes away, if it is found that the object of desire is unattainable or likely to cause harm.

5. *δοσι μὴ ἐπ' ἀλγοῦντι ἀπανάγουσιν*. Pleasure being the removal of *τὸ ἀλγοῦντι κατ' ἔνδειαν* (III, XXI), if no such pain results, when desires are unfulfilled, they cannot be necessary.

6. *εὐδιάχυτον*, 'dissolvable': cf. XXX οὐ διαχέονται.

7. *ἢ (ἢ)*: the variation in the MSS. points to the duplication which is required by the sense. Possibly *δυσπόριστοι* *ἢ*, adopted by von der Muehll, is a simpler correction.

XXVII. The connexion of thought is here much less obvious, and as Bignone suggests (Introd., p. 22), it is possible that an aphorism has dropped out, of which we may obtain the sense from Ep. iii, § 127. 10 τῶν δὲ ἀναγκαίων (*ἐπιθυμιῶν*) αἱ μὲν πρὸς εὐδαιμονιὰν εἰσὶν ἀναγκαῖαι, αἱ δὲ πρὸς τὴν τοῦ σώματος ἀολησίαν, αἱ δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν τὸ ζῆν. On the other hand, a good Epicurean could supply the links. Some pleasures are unnecessary, some are necessary. Of the necessary some are requisite for happiness, and of all those friendship is easily the most important. Friendship always played a large part both in the teaching and the practice of Epicurus. Just as love was condemned by Epicurean ethics as being an 'unnecessary' pleasure involving pain, so friendship is always extolled as helping to fill a want, but not causing excessive feeling. We may notice that there is no altruistic element in it at all: it is only to complete one's own pleasure that one acquires a friend. So Cicero (*de Fin.* ii. 26. 82) quotes Epicurus as saying that 'friendship cannot be divorced from pleasure and is to be cultivated for pleasure's sake'.

9. *ὅστις*. As Cicero in translating this aphorism (*de Fin.* i. 20 65) says *omnium rerum quas . . .* Usener suggests that we should read *ὅστιν*: but the rendering is natural in Latin as in English.

παρασκευήσεται probably in a real middle sense: 'provides for itself', 'acquires'.

ὅλου, 'the whole course of life', or possibly in the technical sense of παντελῆς in XX and XXI.

XXVIII continues the subject of friendship but is obscure, as it introduces an unexpected connexion of thought. It takes us right back to the ideas of the *tetrapharmakos*. The thought that 'death is nothing to us' (II) assures us that there is no everlasting pain in a future life, and the knowledge that acute pain is of short duration (IV) gives us confidence as regards the pains of this life. Now this conviction has an importance for our view of friendship. Friendship is both a requisite for happiness and also one of the best means of securing ἀσφάλεια ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, for our friends will protect us against attack. Now if they had a fear of death or of the long duration of pains which they might suffer as the result of their efforts on our behalf, they might be unwilling to risk danger on our behalf—as it is, having nothing to fear, they will not refuse. The thought is a little far-fetched and almost cynical in its selfishness, but not inconsistent with the general Epicurean position about friendship, and is an interesting instance of the way in which Epicurus endeavours to link together different parts of his theory. The aphorism must be compared with the free translation of it in Cic. *de Fin.* i. 20. 68 'eadem sententia confirmavit animum, ne quod aut sempiternum aut diuturnum timeret malum, quae perspexit in hoc ipso vita spatio amicitiae praesidium esse firmissimum'.

12. αἰώνιον, 'everlasting', in the Hellenistic sense. cf. τὸν αἰώνος (XX) ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς ὥρισμένοις probably, as Bignone takes it, 'in the limited evils of this life', as opposed to αἰώνιον δεινόν. It may perhaps be more general 'in the present limited existence'.

13. ἀσφάλειαν φίλιας cf. Cic. (loc. cit.) *praesidium amicitiae*, 'the protection which is secured by friendship'. The expression is a little odd, but not impossible for Epicurus, and it is clear that Cicero read φίλιας. Usener would emend to φίλιατ, which might make the construction easier, 'sees the protection... perfected by means of friendship', but the plural is strange. So Madvig's 'vir doctus' read φίλη, which is adopted by von der Muehl, but the alteration is unnecessary.

κατεῖδε: the MSS. agree on κατεῖναι, but it is impossible to construe it, and Cicero's *perspexit* seems to make Madvig's correction certain.

§ 149. XXIX. After the digression on friendship Epicurus returns to the classification of desires which was started in XXVI. There he had taken the broad division of necessary and unnecessary desires. Here he makes a more elaborate division into three classes. The division is closely supported in Ep. ii, § 127, and by *Sent. Vat.* xx (from which Bignone corrects the text) and Diog. Oen. fr. 11. Compare also Cic. *de Fin.* i. 13. 45.

The meaning is best illustrated by the scholium on this aphorism (see app. crit.): 'Epicurus regards as natural and necessary desires those which put an end to pain, as for instance drink in the case of thirst: natural and not necessary are those which merely vary the pleasure but do not remove pain, as for instance expensive foods:

neither natural nor necessary are for instance crowns and the setting up of statues'.

i. It is obvious that there is a lacuna in the MSS. caused by the repetition of *φυσικά*, and the correction of Stephanus, adopted by Usener, would give the required sense satisfactorily. But the quotations of the aphorism in *Sent. Vat. xx* and *Diog. Oen. fr. li.*, have enabled Bignone to make a slightly more elaborate correction, which may now however be regarded as certain.

3. παρὰ κενῆν δόξαν : cf XV ὁ δὲ τῶν κενῶν δοξῶν (*πλοῦτος*) εἰς ἀπειρον ἀκπίπτει. He means not merely 'false opinion' but, having as usual the image-notion of thought, 'idle fancies'. A mental picture of some object, which does not really contribute to pleasure, causes us to desire it.

XXX This aphorism seems at first sight to be almost a duplicate of XXVI, but there are two points which distinguish it. In the first place, as Bignone has pointed out (Introd., p. 23), whereas XXVI dealt with all unnecessary desires, this deals only with those that are physical and unnecessary, the second class in XXIX. Secondly, Epicurus is here dealing with a special class of desires. In XXVI he pointed out that all unnecessary desires are due to idle imaginings, which fade away when the object is found to be unobtainable or harmful. But here he has in mind the case where the effect is violent and prolonged : there is little doubt, I think, that he is thinking of the passion of love. Nevertheless, even here the same explanation is true : the desire arises from a baseless mental image, and it is prolonged owing to the maintenance of that image in the man's mind and not owing to anything in the nature of the desire.

4. τῶν φυσικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν. Usener suggests the insertion of *μέν* : it would be an improvement but is not essential

6. σύντονος, 'intense', used of *ἐπιθυμία* also in Plat. *Zegg.* 734 a.

7. οὐ διαχέονται, 'are not dissolved'. cf. XXVI *εὐδιάχυτον*. This clause adds to the notion of intensity that of prolongation.

§ 150. From XXXI-XXXVIII follow a series of aphorisms on the subject of justice, and of the Epicurean philosopher's relation to the laws of the community.

XXXI lays down clearly Epicurus' position. There is a kind of justice, which is in accordance with nature, that is, contributes directly to pleasure. To obtain pleasure we need 'protection from men' : and this we may partly attain by making a compact between ourselves and other men that if they will refrain from hurting us, we will not hurt them. Justice then is 'a pledge of mutual advantage'. The idea is developed in the following aphorisms and is reproduced in *Lucr. v. 1019-1020*.

tunc et amicitiem coeperunt jungere aventes
finitimi inter se nec laedere nec violari.

Critics have always seen in this theory of Epicurus an anticipation of Hobbes' idea of the 'social contract'.

i. τὸ τῆς φύσεως δίκαιον, 'the justice which arises from nature', i.e. contributes to the natural end of pleasure. For the form of the

phrase cf. XXV τὸ τέλος τῆς φύσεως and more particularly XV δὲ τῆς φύσεως πλοῦτος. Epicurus implies of course that any kind of justice which does not contribute to δισφάλεια and so to δραματία and so to pleasure is not natural and may be rejected.

σύμβολον τοῦ συμφέροντος, 'a pledge of mutual advantage': the compact to act justly guarantees the advantage of both parties. Cf. συνθήκας in XXXII and in XXXVI again συμφέρον γάρ τι ἦν. Bignone following Philippson (*Arch. f. Gesch. der Philosophie*, 1910, pp. 291 ff.) would translate 'symbol', 'expression (*Ausdruck*)', pointing out that Epicurus held that there was actually such a thing as natural justice, and that it was the 'outward sign' of mutual advantage. But συνθήκας in XXXII and Lucretius' phraseology seem to be against this, and the passages which Bignone adduces are not decisive for either version.

XXXII is a deduction from the general idea of justice expounded in XXXI. Apart from the compact to refrain from mutual molestation, justice does not exist at all: no action, save in this sense, is 'naturally' just or unjust. Justice and injustice therefore do not exist for the animals, who from the nature of the case cannot make such a compact, nor (as against the Pythagorean view, as Bignone points out) between men and animals, nor for such nations as either from their weakness are unable or from their savagery are unwilling to make it.

3. δσα τῶν ζώων μὴ ἐδύνατο. . . that is, all animals except men.

4. ἀλληλα. With some hesitation I accept Gassendi's emendation. The majority of the MSS. have ἀλλὰ, which Usener emends to ἀλλα, but the variation of the other MSS. and especially the indication of some letters lost in P point to some other word, and ἀλληλα is strongly demanded by the parallel of ἀλλήλους in XXXI.

5. ἦν· the imperfect as Philippson suggests (*Archiv für Gesch. der Phil.* xvi, p. 298) looks to the time of the formation of primitive communities

6. οὐ μὴ ἐβούλετο in the case of nations is of course a necessary addition.

XXXIII at first sight seems to add little to what has already been said, except that its statement that justice does not exist in itself might be taken on a superficial view to be a contradiction of the statement in XXXI as to 'natural' justice. Its importance lies, as Bignone points out, in its polemical significance: it is directed against those who regarded justice as a 'metaphysical entity' (*καθ' αὑτό*) independent of the social relations of men, such as the Pythagoreans, Plato with his conception of the 'idea' of justice, and the Stoics who regarded the moral qualities as having a corporeal existence. For Epicurus justice like the other virtues was a συμβεβηκός, 'an accident', relative to the actions of men: see Ep. i, §§ 40, 68-73 and *Lucr.* i. 455 ff. Therefore, although it is a 'natural' good, it can only be realized in social relations and has no existence 'in itself'. There is no difficulty in text or expression.

9. καθ' ἑτηλίκους δῆ τοτε δεῖ τόπους is important. There is no universal justice, but it arises naturally as a *συμφέρον* in different places, and may thus vary in its content.

§ 151. XXXIV is the complement of the preceding proposition, and one of Epicurus' most relentless logical deductions from his premises. If justice has no meaning apart from the contract for *ἀσφάλεια*, neither has injustice. Each man is concerned only with his own pleasure, and that may often be promoted by an act of injustice: but for the preservation of the contract society has appointed certain officials to punish acts of encroachment, and the fear that he may be caught and punished by them may be so disquieting to the offender as to make his action—purely from the point of view of his own pleasure—a bad thing for him. The theory is completely cynical and perfectly consistent with the whole Epicurean theory, but it must not be understood to mean that fear is the *only* motive for just action in Epicurus' eyes: he is here stressing one side.

2. εἰ μὴ λήσει after *ὑποφύιαν*, almost dependent in sense.

XXXV is an amplification of the latter part of XXXIV. The fear of detection must always be disquieting even to the most ingenious wrongdoer, for no man can have perfect confidence that he will not be detected. A thousand escapes give a man no security that he will not be taken before his death. The general idea is vouched for in many Epicurean references, e.g. XVII ὁ δ' ἀδικος πλείστης ταραχῆς γέμων, Clem. Alex. Strom. iv. 22 (Usener fr. 582) πίστιν γὰρ λαβεῖν περὶ τοῦ λαθεῖν οὐ δύνασθαι, Lucr. iii. 1014 ff.

4. ποιῶντα: the reading of the MSS. can well be kept, ὃν being constructed directly after λάθρη, lit. 'doing anything in secret from what they contracted'. Usener's alteration to *κινοῦντα* is gratuitous.

5. πιστεύειν has of course the emphasis of the sentence: 'he may escape detection, but he can't trust to doing so'. Cf. Seneca, Ep. 97. 13 'latendi etiam si felicitatem habent, fiduciam non habent'.

6. ίδι seems a necessary correction of the MSS. ἀνώ or ὑπό, and the divergence points to some uncertainty.

7. καταστροφῆς, 'death': cf. κατέστρεψεν, XX, &c. μέχρι . . . καταστροφῆς goes with ἀδηλον and not, as Bignone apparently takes it, with λήσει. You cannot tell until the moment of death whether he will finally escape. It is like Solon's 'Call no man happy, until he is dead'.

XXXVI introduces a new point. Though justice in its definition and general character is universally the same, the advantage gained by this mutual compact, yet if we consider individual actions, we see that the same action may be just in one country, or at one time or under certain circumstances, and not in others: no particular action is universally and always just.

The varieties of the codes of justice and its variability in character according to circumstance was of course a commonplace of Greek philosophers, and a fruitful cause of moral scepticism. Epicurus here states it from his own point of view.

8. *(τὸ)*: a necessary addition made by Gassendi.

9. κατὰ τὸ τὸν χώραν: a strange expression; 'in reference to the individuality of country'.

10. διαφέρει τῷ ποτὲ ἄλλῳ: e.g. at different times, in relation to different persons, &c.

§ 152. XXXVII is a considerable amplification of the idea of the variability of justice expressed in the last aphorism. The first clause insists emphatically that the supreme test of a just action is that it should contribute to 'advantage' in the sense in which Epicurus understands it of the Social Contract: that it should be just in some circumstances and not in others is of no moment. In the second clause he explains that mere ordinance by law does not make actions just: indeed, an enactment is unjust, if it does not contribute to 'advantage'. Lastly, he asserts that the justice or injustice of a particular action may change, but the action is just so long as it is sincerely held to contribute to 'advantage', even though subsequently it becomes unjust. The sense is clear, but the text in several places is uncertain.

I τὸ . . . ἐπιμαρτυρούμενον, 'that which on examination is proved to be . . .', the regular Epicurean notion cf. XXIV, and for a fuller exposition Ep. i, § 50. We must not be content with a first impression that an action is just, for our belief may be due to false opinion, but must try it by the test of 'advantage', and if it stands that, we can know that it is just.

2. τῶν νομοθέτων εἶναι δικαίων is excised by Usener as a title for the aphorism which has by mistake crept into the text. But there is no parallel case of a title, the words will make good sense as a partitive genitive, they are strongly supported by XXXVIII τὰ νομοθέτα δίκαια, and greatly help the general idea. There are many actions 'customarily regarded as just' or 'sanctioned as just by law' (*νόμος*), but to each of these must be applied the test of 'advantage'. The order is unusual, but it is difficult to see at what other point the genitive could be inserted. Bignone retains the words and Hicks implies their retention in his translation.

3. τὸ τοῦ δικαίου ἐνέχυρον. The text here is very uncertain: the MSS. vary between τὸ and τὸν and between εἶναι alone and χώραν εἶναι. Usener conjectured τὸν . . . χαρακτῆρα, 'it bears the stamp of justice', which would give good sense, but is palaeographically very remote. If we can suppose that the two words χώραν εἶναι have been transposed, then εἶναι χώραν is not far from ἐνέχυρον and τὸ is vouched for by F. The sense will then be 'it has the guarantee of a just action', and for the expression we may compare XL βεβαιώτατον πίστωμα.

4. νόμον: a certain correction of the MSS. μόνον.

6. καὶ μετανίστηται . . ., 'even if the "advantage" in the matter of justice shifts', i.e. it is at one time advantageous and so 'just' to do a certain action, at another not.

8. πρόληψις, 'general concept' of justice: i.e. the idea which has

been formed in our minds by a series of apprehensions of acts which are just : cf. Ep. i, § 37, and notes there. We may remark the materialistic form of the phrase *εἰς τὴν πρόληψιν ἐναρμόττῃ*, as a coin might 'fit in' to the mould from which it was impressed.

9. *φωναὶς κεναῖς*, 'sounds without content', i.e. words which have no real meaning, as would the word 'just' if applied by mere association to an action which had seemed to lead to 'advantage': cf. Ep. i, § 37. 10 *κενοὺς φθόγγους*.

ἄλλας εἰς τὰ is Usener's correction for the MSS. *ἄλλὰ πλεῖστα, ἀ πλ* being regarded as a dittography of *ἄλλα*: it may be however that the letters really represent *ἄπλως* as Kochalsky has conjectured.

§ 153. XXXVIII is an elaboration of the idea of the two last clauses of the preceding aphorism and adds little that is new. Actions regarded as just are not just, if in practice they turn out not to be of advantage. actions which are really just may, by a change of circumstance, become unjust. Even Bignone, who is concerned to maintain the genuineness of all the aphorisms and the correctness of their order, is ready to agree with Usener that this is a 'duplicate' of XXXVII, and suggests that it was either written as an alternative by Epicurus or inserted here from some other work as an illustration, which subsequently became incorporated in the text.

1. *καινῶν*, both here and in l. 4, is a certain restoration for the MSS. *κενῶν*: f's *καινῶν* here, and still more B's *καὶ τῶν* in l. 4, strongly support the change.

2. *ἐναρμόττοντα*: the MSS. have only *ἀρμόττοντα*, but *ἐναρμόττῃ* in XXXVII makes Usener's correction almost necessary.

3. *ἐπ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἔργων*, 'in actual practice', as opposed to the theoretic assumptions of the makers of laws or originators of customs.

5. *ἐνταῦθα δέ*: a rather curious case of 'δέ in apodosi': it has, however, considerably better MS. authority than *δῆ*.

τότε μὲν ήν . . . ὕστερον δ' οὐκ ήν. In the first clause the imperfects seem to be real past tenses, in the second inferential as usual in the aphorisms.

§ 154. XXXIX. An obscure aphorism with a very uncertain text. It returns from the special topic of justice to the wider subjects of immunity from external interference and friendship (cf. VI, VII, XXVII, XXVIII, XXXI, and in particular XIV). The general idea is not very difficult: the wise man must first grapple with the element in external things which militates against *ἀράραξία*, then he must win over to his side (*όμοφυλα*) things which are akin to him (cf. Ep. iii, § 124. 4 *ταῖς γὰρ ιδίαις οἰκειούμενοι διὰ παντὸς ἀρετᾶς τοὺς δμοῖους ἀποδέχονται*): others, if he cannot have with him, he must at any rate not allow to be alien to him (*οὐκ ἀλλόφυλά γε*). But supposing it is impossible with some things to secure even this, then he must keep clear of them altogether either by refusing to have dealings with them himself (*ἀνερίμπτος*), or by driving them beyond the borders of his life (*ἐξωρίσατο*). All through the neuter really implies persons: cf. I *τὸ μακάριον καὶ ἄθεατον*.

For the general idea which is implied of a sort of league of Epicurean wise men against the world we may compare XL and Cic. *de Fin.* i. 20. 70 'sunt autem qui dicant foedus esse quoddam sapientium, ut ne minus amicos quam se ipsos diligant'.

1. τὸ μὴ θαρροῦν . . . συστημένος is the reading of the MSS. Usener despairs of it, and suggests in his notes that we must either read συστελάμενος (presumably 'the man who best contracts (or 'narrows') the element of disquiet'), or τὸ μὲν θαρροῦν . . . συστημένος ('the man who has best organized immunity'), supposing that a corresponding δέ clause has dropped out. But it is, I think, possible to retain the MS. text not, as Bignone takes it, 'the man who is best able to confront' (*affrontare*), but rather 'the man who is best able to order (or control) the element of disquiet'. For this use of *συνίστασθαι* we may compare its military use with such words as πόλεμον, κίνδυνον, ἐπιβολήν, &c., while the participial τὸ μὴ θαρροῦν will be like τὸ ἀλγοῦν in IV and τὸ φοβούμενον in XII.

2. δμόφυλα κατεσκευάσατο, 'made akin to himself', lit. 'made members of his own tribe': the metaphor is political, though the reference of the aphorism is not political, but quite general. Hicks translates 'made into one nation all the folk capable of uniting together', an incredible action on the part of an Epicurean philosopher!

4. ἀνεπίμικτος, 'without intercourse with' - so βίος ἀνεπίμικτος ὄμιλίας, Plut. 2. 438 c.

καὶ ἔξωρίσατο . . . πράττειν a very doubtful and difficult clause. All MSS. except one give ἔξηρίσατο, and the majority ὅσα τοῦτ' ἐλυστέλει πράττειν. Usener, basing his text on ἔξηρίσατο, B's τούτω and F's λυστελῆ, reads ἔξηρέσατο ὅσα τούτων λυστελῆ πράττειν, 'he wins over all of them which it is profitable to treat thus (for ἔξηρέσατο with acc. in this sense cf. Dem. 1396 26 ἀν τὸς κυρίους ή δάροις ή δί' ἀλλης ἥστινοσοῦν ὄμιλίας ἔξαρέσηται). But (1) πράττειν by itself will not construe; (2) the sense is not what is wanted: this idea has already been expressed in δμόφυλα κατεσκευάσατο, and it is absurd to say that he 'wins over' those whom he cannot even persuade to remain neutral! The only possible meaning for this last clause is 'when he cannot even make them neutral, he either withdraws himself from them or expels them from his life'. This sense can be obtained if we follow Stephanus in reading ἔξωρίσατο, which is practically the reading of H. The exact parallel to the meaning will then be found in XIV if we read there δινάμει ταῖς ἔξοριστικῇ, and the idea is also implied in ἐκ τῶν ὄμορούντων in XL. Bignone agrees in reading ἔξωρίσατο.

ὅσα τοῦτ' ἐλυστέλει πράττειν is the text best supported by the MSS., 'all whom it was an advantage to treat thus', τοῦτο πράττειν governing the acc. like εὐ ποιεῖ, &c. Bignone reads ὅσα τοῦτο λυστελὲς πράττειν, and translates 'in so far as it is profitable', but this appears to me to be an impossible sense for ὅσα.

XL. A summing up of the best kind of life in a community of true Epicureans. Men must first procure immunity from their neighbours:

then, as it were in a protected sphere, they may live in perfect security and close intimacy with their friends ; and if a friend dies first, they may mourn their own loss, but not pity him, as they know that death is nothing to him. This is a fitting conclusion to the Κύριαι Δόξαι, as it puts together many ideas which have previously occurred singly and leaves a very attractive picture of an Epicurean society such as must have lived in Epicurus' own 'garden'.

The text is uncertain in some details.

6. *τὴν δύναμιν ἔσχον* : because a certain power is requisite to establish this security from neighbours : cf XIV δυνάμει τινὶ ἔξοριστικῇ τοῦ τό is a simple and inevitable correction.

7. *τῶν διορούντων*, 'those on the borders of their life'. this is the same idea of a circumscribed field of life as is implied in *ἔξωρίσταρι* in XXXIX.

οὐτοι only F, but the *οὐτῶ* of the other MSS., which Usener keeps, can hardly be anything but a mistake. *οὐτοι* is implied in *ὅσοι*.

8. *ἥδιστα τὸ* : Usener's correction for *ἥδιστον τὸν* B and other variations ; it is again required by the sense.

9. *ὡς πρὸς θλεον* : the Epicurean may lament his own loss of a friend, but must not pity him : cf. Lucr. iii. 894-911, a famous passage which brings out the idea very clearly.

10. *προκαταστροφῆν* : cf. *καταστροφῆς* XXXV and *κατέστρεψεν* XX. It means surely 'the decease of a friend before oneself', and not, as Hicks and Bignone take it, 'before his time', 'premature'.

FRAGMENTS

THE fragments here given are derived from two sources. The first is a collection of eighty aphorisms discovered in 1888 by C. Wotke in a Vatican MS. (Cod. Vat. gr. 1950) and published by him in *Wiener Studien*, 1888, pp. 191 ff., with a critical apparatus containing emendations by Usener and Hartel, and supplemented by observations by Usener himself and by Gomperz. The MS., which is of the fourteenth century, is a miscellany containing works of Xenophon, the *Thoughts* of Marcus Aurelius, Epictetus' *Manual*, and other works. The present collection is headed Ἐπικούρου Προσφώνησις (? *Προσφωνήσεις*, as suggested by Weil). Some of the sayings, denoted in the text by square brackets, came not from Epicurus but from his disciples, in several instances from Metrodorus. About twenty of them were already known, several being quotations from the *Κύριαι Δόξαι*. The rest were probably selected from various works of Epicurus, not a few of them seeming to be quotations from private letters. Usener conjectured that the collection was derived from a florilegium made from the letters of Epicurus and his disciples which was used by Seneca, the sentences from the *Κύριαι Δόξαι* being added by the compiler, but Bignone is probably right in thinking that there is not sufficient ground for any such definite statement.

The collection deals almost wholly with the moral theory of Epicurus and adds on many points to our knowledge of the system. The sentences containing new matter have been marked, as they were in Wotke's publication, by an asterisk. The text is fairly sound and in most places can easily be corrected, but there remain certain doubtful passages.

The fragments which follow are almost all derived from the great collection of *Epicurea* made by Usener, who gathered from writers both Greek and Latin all quotations from Epicurus' words and references to his doctrines. Here will only be found passages in Greek, which there is good reason to believe are actual quotations of the philosopher's words, though possibly in some cases (notably the extracts from Porphyrius, *ad Marcellam*) slightly paraphrased. I have not included fragments in Latin (mainly quotations in Cicero and Seneca), even though they are probably often literal translations. These fragments have naturally not even so much coherence as those in the Vatican collection: they deal with all kinds of subjects, and were preserved for all kinds of reasons. Nearly half are extracts from personal letters of Epicurus to his disciples, which do not as a rule throw much light on his philosophy, but add greatly to the

picture of the man: we understand more clearly what the 'Life' means by his 'unsurpassed kindness to all' (§ 9). But from the rest we can glean much confirmation of his doctrines, mainly on the ethical side, and often interesting additions to our knowledge.

To Usener's collection have been added a few further fragments from the Herculanean rolls and the inscription of Diogenes of Oenoanda, incorporated in his translation by Bignone.

IV. This sentence is a brief epitome of K. Δ. iv, which is quoted in Sentence III. It is couched in epigrammatic form and probably intended to be committed to memory.

1. σύντομον: Usener's emendation is certain, *σύντομον* of the MS. being an anticipation of *σύντομον* immediately following.

3. ἀβληχρόν. cf Hom. *Il.* v. 337. A good instance of Epicurus' use of a poetic word in a short maxim. perhaps it was easier to bear in mind.

VII. This sentence again is an epigrammatic *résumé* of K. Δ. xxxv, which has just preceded it. It occurs again in part in Plut. *Contr. Epic. Beat.* 6. 1090 c (fr. 82) and is quoted in a pregnant Latin form by Seneca, *Ep.* 97. 13 'potest nocenti contingere ut lateat, latendi fides non potest.'

IX. Quoted by Seneca, *Ep.* 12. 10 (Usener fr. 487) 'malum est in necessitate vivere, sed in necessitate vivere necessitas nulla est'. Hartel on the ground of Seneca's form of the maxim would read κακὸν ξῆν ἐν διάγκῃ, but this is unnecessary, and Usener points out that Epicurus' model was probably the famous lines κακὸν γυναικεῖς, ἀλλ' ὅμως, ὁ δημόραι, οὐκ ἔστιν οἰκεῖν οἰκίαν ἀνευ κακοῦ. The epigrammatic form is again prominent. For the idea compare K. Δ. xvi: the wise man can so regulate his life that he is little affected by circumstance, and at the worst he can put an end to his life. Bignone notes that this sentence by implication contradicts the popular notion that Epicurus forbade suicide.

X. This sentence is quoted with some variations as from Metrodorus by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* v. 138), and is included in the collections of Metrodorus' fragments (3, p. 43, Duen.: 37 Korte). Bignone notes that the most interesting variation is the inclusion of the vocative Μενέστρατε, which shows that the quotation comes from a private letter. For the general idea we may compare Lucretius' description (i. 62 ff.) of the life and work of Epicurus. The quotation is from Hom. *Il.* i. 70.

XI. There is no close parallel to this sentence, but it is obviously a striking contrast with the life of the Epicurean philosopher, for whom both rest and activity are a part of his *drapæcia*.

XIV. This aphorism occurs also in the collection of Stobaeus (*Floril.* xi. 28) and is quoted by Plutarch (*Contr. Epic. Beat.* 27, p. 1104 a). It would appear to come from a private letter addressed to some one

who was delaying to make a full study of Epicureanism. The idea, as Bignone notes, occurs in Hor. *Od.* i. 11.8 'carpe diem quam minimum credula posterō'.

2. κύριος may be supplied with certainty from Stobaeus.

3. τὸ χαῖρον: Stobaeus has τὸν καιρόν. The variation is suspicious, but our text here may well be right, as Epicurus is particularly fond of these participial substantives and the sense is good. Epicurus' correspondent is postponing the true pleasure of philosophy.

XV. Both the text and the exact meaning of the aphorism are doubtful. Wotke on Usener's suggestion read it thus: ἡθη ὥσπερ τὰ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν ἔδια τιμώμενα· ἀν τε χρηστὰ ἔχωμεν, καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ζηλούμεθα· ἀν τε μή, οὐτω χρῆταις καὶ τῶν πέλας, ἀν ἐπιεικεῖς ὅστιν, which he would presumably render, 'Our characters are esteemed as our own possessions. if they are good, then we are envied by men ; if not, we shall find our neighbours ill-disposed as well, if they are just', i.e. men will judge us and behave to us, as they find us. This was objected to by subsequent critics: the expression is jerky and the sentiment not particularly Epicurean: moreover, the participle *τιμώμενα* is awkward, and still more so Usener's *χρῆσταις* for the MS. *χρῆται*.

I have followed the restoration of Bignone, based on conjectures of Wilamowitz and Weil. He notes that the idea is then closely parallel to the argument in Hor. *Sat.* i. 3. 'among friends allowances must be made for idiosyncrasies of character', and points out that it bears clear marks of Epicurean origin. The notion that certain characteristics remain particular to individuals in spite of philosophic teaching is brought out in *Lucr.* iii. 310 ff., and the general conception of mutual indulgence among friends frequently recurs.

1. *τιμῶμεν* of the MS. should certainly be retained: indeed *τιμώμενα* can hardly be construed unless the fragment is regarded as part of a longer sentence.

ἀν τε χρηστά . ἀν τε μή go more naturally together with Bignone's punctuation than as Wotke arranged them with ἀν τε μή introducing a new clause.

2. ζηλώμεθα is a slight change for ζηλούμεθα, a second subjunctive frequently becoming corrupted in a dependent clause. Weil's ζηλούμενα is a less satisfactory correction.

3. (τὸ) is an easy addition.

ἐπιεικεῖς 'must be taken in the sense of 'indulgent', 'well-disposed', which it has not infrequently, e.g. Thuc. iii. 40. 3 καὶ ἡ ἐπιεικεία πρὸς τοὺς μέλλοντας ἐπιτηδείους . . . ἔστεθαι . . . δίδοται.'

If our friends are indulgent to us, we must behave similarly to them.

XVI. Another rather doubtful aphorism in which I have again followed the reading of Bignone, which involves only two slight changes, βλέπων (Wotke) for βλέπτων (an obvious error) and ἀγαθῷ for ἀγαθῷ. The reference then is to the ordinary man, and the idea is a commonplace of Greek philosophy after Socrates: no man deliberately chooses evil, but only when he is allured to it as good

compared with what seems a greater evil. It is not easy to find an exact parallel to the idea in Epicurus, though Bignone compares K. Δ. xxv and *fr.* 38, but the commonplace may well have been introduced in a letter and selected rather injudiciously by the compiler.

Usener quite unnecessarily altered the second part of the clause, *ἄλλὰ δελεασθεῖς ὡς ἀγαθὸν προσὸν μεῖζον ἢν τοῦ κακοῦ ἐθηρεύθη*, and took it to refer to the deliberate choice by the Epicurean philosopher of a good which involves evil but surpasses it. This is good Epicureanism, but as Bignone points out, both *δελεασθεῖς* and *ἐθηρεύθη* are against it: to this may be added that *οὐδὲς* makes the general reference clear.

Crönert's *πρός τι μεῖζον* for *πρὸς τὸ μεῖζον* is unnecessary: it is *the* evil which seems greater on each occasion.

XVII. A characteristic aphorism on the blessings of old age, for which Bignone well compares the exordium of the letter to Menoeceus (§ 122). The young man is still tossed about by uncertainty and constantly changes his course, but the old man has reached harbour and, if he has lived well, can look back in thankful memory on the blessings he has received.

2. *νέος* (*ἐν*) *ἀκμῆ*: the MS has *νέος ἀκμῆ* which Usener altered to *ἐντος ἀκμῆς*, but there is an elaborate parallelism between the two clauses and *ὅ δὲ γέρων* demands *ὅ νέος*. Similarly *ἐν λιμένι τῷ γήρᾳ* suggests *ἐν ἀκμῇ* which gives a natural construction. Bignone, seeing the parallelism, wrote *νέος ἀκμῆ*, but the dative alone is unnatural, as is Crönert's *νέος ἀκμήν*.

πολὺς: Hartel unnecessarily altered to *πολλά*. Not only the construction, but the metaphors are parallel: the young man is a wandering stream, the old man has reached harbour. *πολὺς πλάξεται* is therefore like the familiar *πολὺς ρέι*. For *πλάξεται*, used in this sense of a stream, cf. Hom. *Il.* xvi. 750 *ρόον πεδίονδε τίθησι | πλάξων*.

5. *χάριτι* of the MS. is certainly right and is used in Epicurus' sense of 'grateful recollection': cf. *Ep. ad Men.* § 122. 7 *δῶς γηράσκων νεάλη τοῦς ἀγαθοῖς διὰ τὴν χάριν τῶν γεγονότων* and LV *τῇ τῶν ἀπολλυμένων χάριτι*. Hartel's *χάρακι* is a clumsy completion of the metaphor which really loses the point of the aphorism. Memory plays a considerable part in the Epicurean conception of pleasure: cf. K. Δ. ix.

XVIII. This is probably not a general maxim, but, as Usener thought, an extract from a personal letter to a friend, who had fallen in love. For the general attitude of Epicurus towards love, which he regarded as a violent disturbance of *ἀράραξία*, see *Lucr.* iv. 1058 ff.

XIX. Bignone has rightly seen that this aphorism refers again to the importance of memory in the Epicurean conception of happiness. The philosopher, remembering the joys of the past, can renew his youth daily (cf. *Ep. ad Men.* § 122), or rather remains continually young: but the man who is ever seeking new pleasures and is disappointed is plunged at once into the gloom of old age.

1. τήμερον may therefore probably be retained in an emphatic and picturesque sense, though Usener's αὐθημερόν would be the more conventional way of expressing the meaning. Gomperz's τὴν (τὴμ) φρόνησιν misses the point.

XX is important as it restores the right text of K. Δ. xxix see notes there.

XXI. For the idea see *Ep. ad Men.* §§ 127 ff. and K. Δ. xxvi, xxix.

1. πεισόμεθα: the MS. has πείσομεν, which Wotke accepts and Bignone translates 'we shall obey'. But this meaning is impossible except in the middle, and we cannot render 'we shall persuade'. It therefore seems necessary to read πεισόμεθα.

2. τὰς (τ'), Wotke's addition, seems inevitable

XXIII. The notion is exactly that of *Vit. Ep.* § 120 καὶ τὴν φιλίαν διὰ τὰς χρείας . . . συνιστάσθαι δὲ αὐτὴν κατὰ κοινωνίαν ἐν τοῖς ταῖς ἡδοναῖς ἐκπεπληρωμένοις. Compare also K. Δ. xxvii. Friendship starts from need, but it becomes a good in itself.

1 αἰρετή, Usener, is a necessary correction of ἀρετή

XXIV. This aphorism is interesting as being the only one in the collection which is not strictly ethical. For the doctrine of the εἴδωλα see *Ep. ad Hdt.* §§ 46, 49, and for the simulacra as the origin of dreams *Lucr.* iv 962 ff. For Epicurus' opposition to divination see *Vit. Ep.* § 135.

XXV. This aphorism appears in Seneca, *Ep.* 4 10 (Usener 477) 'magnae divitiae sunt lege naturae composita paupertas', and is echoed in *Lucr.* v. 1117-1119:

quod si quis vera vitam ratione gubernet,
divitiae grandes homini sunt vivere parce
aequo animo; neque enim est umquam penuria parvi.

Compare also K. Δ. xv and *fr.* 45 (Usener 202).

XXVI. This is probably an extract from a private letter and refers to the philosopher's own works.

XXVII. An ingenious claim for the superiority of philosophy over other pursuits, which brings out its close connexion with the Epicurean ideal of pleasure. Bignone compares Diog. Oen. *fr.* xxvi for the general idea of pleasures, in which the action and enjoyment are simultaneous.

3 δῆμα: μετά (V) must be a mere mistake, a repetition of μετά above.

XXVIII. Friendship is not always acquired in the same way it is sometimes fast sometimes slow in the making, but we must risk much for it. A characteristic saying, to which we have no close parallel. At the end the MS. has παρακανδυεῖσαι χάριν χάριν φιλίας, which von der Muehll retains. 'We must risk acts of kindness for the sake of friendship' but the repetition is probably a mistake.

XXIX. Epicurus' claim to originality and his scorn for popular acclamation.

I. φυσιολογῶν χρησμωθεῖν is an ingenious correction of Usener's for an obvious corruption and may be taken as certain. For the idea of the philosopher as an oracle compare *Lucr.* v. 110 ff.:

qua prius aggrediar quam de re fundere fata
sanctius et multo certa ratione magis quam
Pythia quae tripode a Phoebi lauroque profatur.

Bignone also refers to Cicero's ironical allusion in *N. D.* i. 66 'haec ego nunc physicorum oracula fundo' Von der Muehll adopts Crönert's correction φυσιολόγω, which I do not understand: is it to be taken with παρρησίᾳ?

XXX This fragment is attributed to Metrodorus by Stobaeus, *Flor.* xvi. 20. As quoted by him in a fuller form, with the words ὡς βιωσόμενοι μετὰ τὸ λεγόμενον ζῆν after τὰ πρὸς τὸν βίον, it clearly refers to the preparations for a continued life after death, and Bignone therefore believes that it is directed against the Orphics. In that case τὸ τῆς γενέσεως φάρμακον will be an ironic reference to the draught of the waters of Lethe taken by souls before they enter this life. As the fragment stands here it might equally well be taken to mean that men act as though this life would continue for ever.

XXXI. This aphorism is attributed to Epicurus by the Paris Gnomologium (Usener, *fr.* 339), but to Metrodorus by Stobaeus, *Floril.* cxviii. 33. Usener in his notes on the Vatican collection is inclined to give it to Metrodorus, as does Bignone on the ground of its metaphorical expression. For the Epicurean idea of ἀσφάλεια see K. Δ. vii, xiii, xiv.

XXXII. The text of this sentence is corrupted in the MS. Usener's ἀγαθῶν μέγα for ἀγαθῶν μετά may be accepted, and similarly in all probability his correction σεβασμός for σεβαστός. Bignone, comparing *fr.* 31, where Epicurus, addressing Colotes who had fallen down and worshipped him, says ὡς σεβομένῳ γάρ σου τὰ τότε ὑφ' ήμῶν λεγόμενα, would read σεβαστὸς λόγος, but the parallel is not very close, and the present quotation is clearly more of a general aphorism. Usener would also change τῶν σεβομένων to τῷ σεβομένῳ, but though the dative would be more usual, the alteration is not imperative. The idea is interesting, that the veneration of a sage is really a blessing to his worshippers rather than to himself.

XXXIII. Protection from hunger, thirst, and cold are the necessary physical desires, and a man who satisfies these may have perfect happiness equal to that of the gods. The first part of the aphorism is quoted again by Porphyrius (*fr.* 44) and may be compared with *Lucr.* ii. 16 ff. The second part reappears in several forms, the closest of which is that in Aelian, *Var. Hist.* iv. 13 (Usener, *fr.* 602) ὁ αὐτὸς Ἀλεγεν ἐτοίμως ἔχειν καὶ τῷ Διὶ ὑπὲρ εὐδαιμονίας διαγνωζέοθαι μᾶλισταν ἔχειν καὶ ὄντα. From this quotation we may with certainty restore Διὶ to the text. We may also compare the conclusion of the letter to Menoeceus (§ 135).

XXXIV. A subtle observation on friendship to which there is no exact parallel, though the idea in K. Δ. xxvii, that friendship provides *ἀσφάλεια* comes near to it. I cannot think of any very satisfactory way of retaining in English the double meaning of *χρείαν . . . χρέας*; Usener ingeniously translates 'Nicht, dass wir sie brauchen, brauchen wir von den Freunden'.

XXXV. An ingenious argument for Epicurean contentment. We may compare *Ep. ad Men* § 127. 5 μνημονευτέον δὲ ὡς τὸ μέλλον οὕτε ἡμέτερον οὔτε πάντως οὐχ ἡμέτερον, ἵνα μήτε πάντως προσμένωμεν ὡς ἐσόμενον μήτε ἀπελπίζωμεν ὡς πάντως οὐχ ἐσόμενον. Seneca, *Ep.* 15. 10 also suggests it, and Bignone traces the same idea in Hor. *Sat.* ii. 6, *init.* Compare also Lucretius' phrase of the discontented man (iii. 957) 'semper aves quod abest, praesentia temnis'.

2. *τῶν εὐκταίων*, 'among the things to be prayed for', not of course that Epicurus believed in prayer for blessings: the word is conventional, and to Epicurus would mean 'to be hoped for'.

XXXVI. This fragment clearly cannot be attributed to Epicurus himself. Usener would assign it to Hermarchus, his successor as head of the school.

2. *αὐταρκείας*: Bignone notices the two sides of this word 'internal contentment' arising from self-sufficiency, and also 'self-control', 'independence of desires'. It is perhaps significant that it is the word chosen by the Stoics to express their moral ideal: Epicurus fully satisfied the Stoic standard.

XXXVII. An Epicurean paradox. If pleasure is the end of life, then the natural inclination to it is a source of strength.

XXXVIII. Though Epicurus did not forbid suicide (cf. fr. IX), he had some contempt for it: cf. Seneca, *Ep.* 24. 23 (Usener 498) and *Vit. Ep.* § 119; also *Lucr.* iii. 79 ff.

I *μικρός* is probably right, and Usener's emendation to *οἰκτρός* really weakens the sense. Bignone suggests that if any correction is needed, we should read *μικρόλυχος*.

XXXIX. Another subtle observation on friendship which we may compare with XXIII, XXVIII, and XXXIV. The expression is a little obscure.

2. *συνάπτων* sc. *τὴν χρείαν τῇ φιλίᾳ*. To Epicurus (cf. XXIV) *χρεία* is an essential element in friendship.

καπηλεύει τῇ χάριτι τὴν ἀμοιβήν, 'takes the return of favours in the place of kindly feeling'.

3. *τὴν περὶ τοῦ μελλοντος εὐελπισίαν*: what is described in XXXIV as *ἡ πίστις ἡ περὶ τῆς χρείας*.

XL. A clever argument of Epicurus, who stoutly maintained free will, against Democritus, who held that necessity was supreme. Bignone compares a fragment of the *περὶ φύσεως* published by Gomperz in *Wiener Studien*, 1879, where it is argued that you cannot persuade any one else of error, unless free will is admitted: for if necessity is supreme, you cannot be sure that you have always the necessity of

reasoning right and your opponent of reasoning wrongly. We may compare the parallel argument as to scepticism in *Lucr.* iv. 469 f.:

denique nil sciri si quis putat, id quoque nescit
an sciri possit, quoniam nil scire fatetur.

2. Usener quite arbitrarily added the word γέλων to the end of this aphorism, deriving it from γέλαν at the beginning of the next sentence (XLII). It completely destroys the argument and is required where it stands.

XLII. An interesting injunction: philosophy is not to be divorced from ordinary life but associated with it at all times.

1. γέλαν was arbitrarily excluded by Usener and attached (as γέλων) to the previous aphorism. But it is clearly in place here and Bignone finds a parallel for it in the fragments of Philodemus (*περὶ Ἐπικούρου ΙΧ*), ἐν μέρει δὲ θέλειν εὐχαῖσθαι αὐτὸς γελανῶς (cf. *Riv. di Fil.* 1915, pp. 538 ff.).

So too Plut. *de Defectu Oraculorum*, 19 (Usener, *fr.* 394) εἰ δὲ χρὴ γελάν ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ. Crönert's μελετᾶν is therefore unnecessary.

3. φωνάς: cf. *Ἐρ. ad Hdt.* § 36. οἱ διὰ βραχεῶν φωνῶν and XXXIII σαρκὸς φωνῆ.

XLII. A rather obscure fragment, which it is impossible to interpret with certainty without its context. τὸ μέγιστον ἀγαθόν must be 'pleasure', and the general sense will then be that pleasure is enjoyed at the moment when it is brought into being: the two processes are simultaneous. Bignone believes it to be an argument against the Platonic doctrine that pleasure is a γένεσις ποιητική οὐσία, and compares it with K. Δ. iii, where Epicurus denies that pleasure and pain can coexist. But it seems difficult to take the present fragment as a representation of the Epicurean point of view, as it can hardly be reconciled with the importance attached to the pleasures of memory, and it looks more like a statement of the Cyrenaic view of the μονόχρονος ἡδονῆ. But compare XXVII, which suggests that the reference here may be to the pleasure of philosophic study.

2. ἀπολαύσεως, Usener, seems a certain correction of ἀπολύσεως.

XLIII. An interesting aphorism on avarice, which Greek thought ranked among sensual vices.

2. μετὰ τοῦ δικαίου: Bignone translates 'even in a just man', but it must surely be neuter.

XLIV. A continuation of the same subject. The text has got corrupted: Usener's ἔπισταται is certain and συγκαθεῖς may be right in the sense of 'having accommodated himself to', but possibly we should prefer Gomperz's correction συγκλεισθεῖς. For the meaning of αὐτάρκεια see note on XXXVI. Usener is inclined to refer this maxim to the period when Athens was besieged by Demetrius in 294 B.C.

XLV. An interesting description of what Epicurus takes to be the physical effect of the study of natural philosophy. Note that the contrast is not between pride and humility, but between an outward boastfulness and an inner confidence.

1. φωτῆς can, I think, stand by itself without Usener's addition of κενῆς.

3. σοθαρός: I agree with Bignone that this can be retained: the philosopher has a pride and disdain, but it is not expressed in idle vaunting.

XLVI. A rather commonplace sentence which Usener thinks comes from a private letter: von der Muehll reads ἐκδιώκομεν but without critical comment: the subjunctive is more natural.

XLVII. The first part of this fragment was already known as Metrodorus' (Duen 26 · Korte 49); for the second Bignone compares Diog. Oen. fr. 11, col. 2.

2. σήν: it is hardly necessary to insert the article, as Usener suggested.

3. περιστάσει: a favourite Epicurean word for 'surroundings', 'environment', used sometimes in a concrete, sometimes in an abstract sense.

4. προσπτύσαντες: a violent expression, which Usener notes was often used by Metrodorus, but not often by Epicurus himself (see however frs. 37 and 79).

τοῖς . . . περιπλαττομένοις Bignone has, I think, shown that the MS. text may be kept, περιπλάττεσθαι being used of shell-fish holding on to rocks; Usener emended it unnecessarily to περιπλεκομένοις.

6. παῶνος a brilliant emendation of Usener's for the MS. πλείονος. The metaphor here may be, as Usener suggests, from the comic chorus leaving the stage with a τίγνελλα καλλίνικος at the end of the play, cf. Aristoph. *Ach.* 1232.

XLVIII. Another rather commonplace aphorism, which in the topic of life and death has a connexion with that which precedes.

1. πειρᾶσθαι the regular infinitive in such aphorisms, δεῖ or χρή being 'supplied'.

τὴν ὑστέραν τῆς προτέρας may well be retained, as Bignone has shown, if ὁδόν be understood. Usener preferred to change to τὴν ὑστεραίαν (sc. ἡμέραν) τῆς προτεραίας.

2. ἐν δδῷ: the MS. has ἐν ὁ δδῷ, which is probably a mere dittography. Bignone corrects to ἐν προόδῳ, which is more likely to be right than Crönert's ἐν εὐόδῳ.

3. διμολῶς, 'equably', 'contentedly'.

L1 is clearly an extract from a private letter to a disciple who had asked for advice. The form of the answer, stating the conditions of permission and then denying the possibility of their fulfilment, shows a certain touch of humour uncommon in Epicurus. There is a certain number of small corruptions in the MS. text which the editors have put right: οὐθεὶς for οὐθῆ might possibly be retained with von der Muehli. The general aphorism at the end recurs in *Vit. Epic.* § 118. 10.

L11. A more than usually picturesque and metaphorical aphorism: the chain of Epicurean friends is imagined as extending round the

world, every man exhorting his acquaintances to embrace the true life of happiness.

1. ἡ φιλία : Bignone defends the MS. text, and for the personification compares the address to Venus in *Lucr. i init.* The expression is certainly unusual, but not extravagant. Of the corrections Hartel's ἡ φιλοσοφία might possibly be right, but Usener's Ἡλίου σφάῖρα is palaeographically improbable and gives a picture which seems strangely unlike Epicurus.

τεριχορεύει : with an idea of joyful motion, not merely 'runs round', as Bignone translates it.

2. ἐπὶ τὸν μακαρισμόν, 'to the felicitations given to one who enjoys true happiness': the Epicurean sage is felicitated both by Epicureans and by others who see his happiness. Bignone notes the frequency with which Epicurus and his disciples congratulated one another on their lives, and quotes in support a saying about Epicurus from Dionys. Episc. Περὶ φύσεως in Eus. *Præp. Ev.* xiv. 27 8 οὐτα πάντας ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ μακαρισμοῦ τούτου μετουσίαν ἔξομοιωθησομένους ἐκείνους τοῖς θεοῖς παρακαλεῖ. The expression is again strange, and Weil may be right in conjecturing ἐπὶ τὸν μακάριον βίον which is simpler.

LIII. A straightforward argument against envy.

LIV. This aphorism was already contained in various *florilegia* (fr. 53).

LV. 2. χάριτι, 'grateful recollection': cf. *Ep. ad Men.* § 122 and *Vat. Sent.* xvii above.

LVI-LVII are given in the MS as one sentence, though imperfect. Wotke separates the two parts, supposing ὁ βίος . . . ἔσται to refer to some different subject, and adopting Usener's completion of the first half στρεβλούμενος (αὐτὸς ἡ ὄρων στρεβλούμενον) τὸν φίλον. Bignone however, following Thomas, thinks that the two parts ought to be related: he notes that after the publication of the *Vatican Sentences*, the first part of the maxim was found in a gnomologium in a MS. at Heidelberg, the last words running ἡ στρεβλούμενον τοῦ φίλον. Adopting this he would then proceed (καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ τεθνήξεται εἰ γὰρ προήσται) τὸν φίλον, ὁ βίος αὐτοῦ πᾶς κτλ. But there are, I think, two objections to this restoration: (a) it neglects μὲν at the beginning of the sentence, which should be followed by a contrasted δὲ clause; (b) it neglects the technical Epicurean sense of ἀπιστία: friendship gives a πίστις (cf. *Sent. Vat.* xxxiv, xxxix), a trust that your friend will serve you if need comes, and what destroys this πίστις is an injury done to you by your friend, which shows that you can no longer trust him. I should therefore accept Usener's restoration of the first half (the text of the Heidelberg anthology is probably a mere variation), and if one is to conjecture the words lost in the second half, would propose εἰ δὲ ἀδικήσει αὐτὸν ὁ φίλος: 'The wise man will be as distressed for his friend's suffering, as for his own, but if his friend proves unfaithful, then his whole life will be confounded.'

1. στρεβλούμενος: for the idea cf. *Vit. Ep.* § 118, 3.

LVIII. For ἐγκύλια in the sense of 'affairs', 'routine', cf. *Ep. ad Pyth.* § 85, 4 τοῖς εἰς δάσκαλίας βαθύτερας τῶν ἐγκυκλίων τυὸς ἀπτεγμένοις, and for the Epicurean notion of the importance of the withdrawal from politics compare also K. Δ. vii and *Vit. Ep.* § 119.

LIX. A straightforward attack on greed. Usener's insertion of the article before γαστρὶ is hardly necessary.

LX. This fragment is quoted by Seneca, *Ep.* 22, 13 'nemo non ita exit e vita, tamquam modo intraverit'. There is considerable doubt about its interpretation and reference. Seneca interprets it in a moral sense, 'a man leaves life no better than he entered it', and comments 'falsum est, peiores morimur quam nascimur'. Usener compares *Lucr.* iii. 972, 973:

respicere item quam nil ad nos anteacta vetustas
temporis aeterni fuerit, quam nascimur ante,

and takes it to mean that our condition after death will be as it was before birth, i.e. we shall feel and know nothing—but it is very difficult to extract this from the Greek. Bignone takes it to refer to the accompaniments of this life, 'We brought nothing into this world and it is certain that we shall take nothing out'. If one looks simply at the Greek text it surely refers to the brevity of life and the little that any man accomplishes in it. 'every man at his death is like a new-born child'; his life is gone as it were in a few hours.

LXI. Another fragment where both text and interpretation are difficult. Bignone has rightly seen that it must be an extract (as is shown by καὶ) from a longer passage on friendship: Epicurus has probably been speaking of the advantages of friendship in mutual service and protection, and has instanced first the friendship of true Epicureans, which he regards as the highest. Then he passes to the friendship of members of a family, where kinship forms a natural basis for such mutual confidence.

1. ὄψις is the actual bodily presence of those who live together: Usener's σύναψις is quite unnecessary.

2. η . . . ποιουμένη: I would retain the nominative of the MS., regarding εἰς which follows η as a dittography of εἰς before πολλήν. It is the actual ὄψις which is a spur to mutual confidence, just as in XVIII he said that πρόσοψις was the great incitement to love. The editors wish to refer this clause to συγγενείας and agree in changing ποιουμένη τοποιουμένης: Wotke accepted Hartel's καὶ for η εἰς, and Bignone would read κεῖται η—*a* strange exaggeration. But I think the nominative is right and makes better sense.

εἰς τοῦτο is then the general purpose of mutual confidence, which is the subject of the whole section from which this sentence is taken. The saying is interesting as showing Epicurus' belief in family life.

LXII. Again the text is difficult and uncertain, but the general meaning is clear. It is never of any use for children to be angry with parents who are angry with them if the parents' anger is justified, then retaliation is futile, if it is irrational, resentment only increases their passion, but 'a soft answer turneth away wrath'.

4. γελοῖον πάντα τὸ προσεκκαίειν τὴν ἀλογίαν θυμοκατοχοῦντα : I have with hesitation adopted the text put together by Bignone from suggestions by Weil and Crönert. I feel considerable doubt about προσεκκαίειν in the sense of 'increasing' the irrational passion, but θυμοκατοχοῦντα appears to be supported by the usage of θυμοκάτοχον of a magic medicine in passages quoted by Crönert (*Rhein. Mus.* lxi, p. 421), *Dict. Abrax.* 118. 17 θυμοκάτοχον πρὸς βασιλεῖς καὶ μεγιστᾶς, *Pap. Lond.* 1. 114. 941 θυμοκάτοχον καὶ ὑποτακτικόν. The MS. has πᾶν τὸ πρὸς ἐκκλησιν τὴν ἀλογίαν θυμωκατοχοῦντα, for which Usener read σγάν τὸ πρὸς ἐκκλισιν τὴν ἀλογίαν (ἄγον) θυμῷ κατασχόντα, a large correction, which does not give satisfactory sense.

6. εὐγνωμοῦντας V. it is unnatural to take this with *τρόπους*, and it is probably better to read the singular *εὐγνωμοῦντα* to correspond with *θυμοκατοχοῦντα*.

LXIII is interesting as showing that Epicurus did not wish to push his idea of the simple life to excess : the ascetic will suffer bodily distress like the glutton and so fail to attain *ἀποτία*. The text of the first few words is corrupt but has been set right by Usener. Bignone compares Hor. *Sat.* I. i. 102 ff. Von der Muehll reads ἐν λεπτότητι καθαριότης, but I do not understand the meaning of *λεπτότης* here.

LXIV. The true Epicurean is glad to receive praise (cf. LII) but he must not seek for it. his care is for his own bodily and spiritual welfare.

LXV is clearly part of an argument against the current practice of prayer. The gods cannot ever answer it, and often a man could get for himself what he prays for.

LXVI. Usener is probably right in holding that this fragment cannot refer to sympathy with living friends (*θρηνοῦντες* is against that), but to feeling for friends who are dead. The true Epicurean will not idly lament their death, but meditate on their lives. Compare K. Δ. xi οὐκ ὠδύραντο ὡς πρὸς ἔλεον τὴν τοῦ τελευτήσαντος προκαταστροφήν

LXVII Great possessions cannot be obtained by the true Epicurean, and if he has them by chance he can distribute them, and so win the good-feeling of friends which is the true wealth.

1. ἐλευθέρος. Usener suggests ἐλευθέριος but ἐλεύθερος is better. The philosopher's life is 'free' because it is not encumbered by the necessity of courting others.

2. (μῆ) must be added.

3. συνεχεῖ διψιλεῖ can hardly stand alone and σὺν is a more probable insertion than ἐν. πάντα κέκτηται can well stand by itself in the sense of Bignone's amplification πάντα τὰ συμφέροντα κέκτηται.

LXVIII. In the form in which it stands here, the aphorism appears to mean that a fastidious man is never satisfied. But the sense is a little feeble, and as it is quoted by Aelian, *Var. Hist.* iv. 13 (fr. 69) φὶ δλίγον οὐχ ἰκανόν, δλλὰ τούτῳ γε οὐδὲν ἰκανόν, 'the man who is not satisfied with little, is satisfied with nothing', it is far more pointed. We should however perhaps hardly be justified in reading here φὶ δλίγον οὐχ ἰκανόν.

LXIX. The point is truly Epicurean : it is not bodily hunger which makes one desire dainty foods, but a greed of the mind which imagines and then desires new varieties. After the satisfaction of the need there can be only variety in pleasure. *λίχνος* with the gen. is quoted from the fragments of Menander (*Incert.* i. 10 *λίχνος τοῦ κεκρυμμένου*).

LXX. A common Epicurean theme which recurs in K. Δ. xxxiv, xxxv and *Sent. Vat.* vii.

LXXI. Another straightforward aphorism, which suggests the Epicurean 'hedonistic calculus'. In the presence of every desire we must ask what amount of pleasure and what amount of pain does it involve and decide accordingly. Compare *Ep. ad. Men.* § 129. 5 ff.

LXXIII. A rather interesting statement of the value of experience in the case of physical health.

LXXIV. A paradox of dialectic

LXXV. This is of course a reference to the story of Solon's saying to Croesus (Hdt. i. 30 ff.). The quotation is the end of an iambic line and is attributed to Solon in Scholion on Dio Chrys. *Or.* 72. 13 and on Lucian, iv, p. 137. To the Epicurean on the other hand the memory of past pleasures was one of the chief sources of present happiness cf. XVII, XIX.

LXXVI. There is some doubt as to the authorship of this fragment, which evidently comes from a personal letter. Usener attributes it to Epicurus and thinks that it is addressed to one of the earlier disciples, who was older than Epicurus himself possibly to Leonteus of Lampsacus. Bignone comparing it with a fragment of Metrodorus (Korte 41, Plut. *adv. Col.* 31), which is somewhat similar in tone, prefers to attribute it to him.

Bignone in his translation does not sufficiently bring out διέγνωκας . . . ὄποιόν ἔστι . . . καὶ οἷον : this must imply a distinction between two methods of philosophizing, exoteric and esoteric. Epicurus' philosophy was to be proclaimed to the world (cf. XXIX, LII), and the contrast here must be with some other sect who kept their philosophy to themselves.

LXXVII may be compared with XLIV and LXVII. αὐτάρκεια must be taken in the same wide sense as in XLIV which cannot be fully translated in English.

LXXVIII is perhaps the most remarkable of all the exaltations of friendship in Epicurus. It is called immortal because it gives a man happiness equivalent to that of the gods : compare *Ep. ad. Men.* § 135. 7 ζῆτες δὲ ὡς θεὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποις. οὐθὲν γὰρ ἔοικε θητῷ ζῷῳ οὐν άνθρωπος ἐν ἀβανάτοις ἀγαθοῖς

LXXIX. With this saying we may compare what is said of the nature of the gods in K. Δ. i τὸ μακάριον καὶ ἄφθαρτον οὐτε αὐτὸ πράγματα ἔχει οὐτε ἀλλω παρέχει.

LXXX. A well-spent youth will have put a man on the safe path for the rest of his life.

The opening of the sentence is blurred in the MS.: von der Muehll conjectures γενναύει.

3. οἰστραζεῖς: lit. 'gad-fly like', a typically picturesque word.

LXXXI. The first part of the sentence is alluded to in Porph. *de Abstin.* i. 51 (Usener, *fr.* 470).

1. οὐδὲ τὴν need not be altered with Usener to οὐδέ τιν'.

3. περίβλεψις: cf. K. Δ. vii ἔνδοξοι καὶ περίβλεπτοί τινες ἐβουλήθησαν γένεσθαι.

4. τῶν παρὰ τὰς ἀδιορίστους αἴτιας: lit. 'things connected with unlimited causes', i.e. causes of unlimited desire, such as there is for wealth, honour, power, &c. Bignone takes it to mean 'causes not proportional to the natural end', but this seems less natural.

OTHER FRAGMENTS

1 (Usener 2). This sentence is quoted in the *Life of Epicurus* by Diog. Laert. (x. 136) in a passage where he is contrasting the Epicurean idea of pleasure as the absence of pain with that of the Cyrenaics. See notes there.

2 (Usener 18). The fragment is quoted by Plutarch in a work (*adv. Colotem*), which is a violent attack on Epicureanism. He interprets the reply to mean, 'Yes, I will act so, but I do not wish to admit it', and Cicero, in a passage (*de Fin.* ii. 9. 28) which seems to allude to this book, says that Epicurus 'sometimes gets into great difficulties, and when the general conscience of mankind is removed, seems ready to do anything, however disgraceful, for pleasure's sake'. But it is obvious from its occurrence in a book of 'Problems' (or we might say 'Casuistry') that Epicurus regarded this as an open question, and the reply given here is therefore to be taken quite seriously. *Sent. Vat.* li suggests that conflict with the laws is likely to mean ultimately conflict with Epicurean principles. At the same time K. Δ. xxxvii and fragments 81, 83 suggest that the laws were made for man and not man for the laws, and there might have been cases in which Epicurus would have answered this question affirmatively.

3 (Usener 27). This sentence is again quoted in the *Life of Epicurus* (§ 135) in a passage where he is summing up various characteristics of the Epicurean philosophy. The expression is not very easy: see notes there.

4 (Usener 29). Epicurus held that the atoms had no colour, but that colours were produced in things by the arrangements and movements of the component atoms (cf. *Ep. ad Hdt.* §§ 54, 55. *Lucr.* ii. 730 ff.). One of his arguments is here recorded, that even in our experience things have no colour in the dark (cf. *Lucr.* ii. 746, 747).

5, 6, 7 (Usener 58, 59, 60). These three passages, all cited from Plutarch's attack on Colotes, must be extracts from a discussion in the *Symposium* on the results of differences of atomic arrangement in compounds, illustrated by the effects of wine on the human body. Sometimes it is felt to be cool, sometimes it produces heat. How can this be? Not according to Epicurus, because wine is absolutely either hot or cold, but because it contains in itself particles which may be productive of heat and others which may be productive of cold. If then the 'heat-particles' come together, the effect is warming, if the cold, then cooling. But the atomic conformation of the body which it enters is also of importance: for heat or cold particles in it may come and join those in the wine and so increase the one effect or the other. The whole explanation is, in fact, closely parallel to that of the differences of taste which the same thing will have for different persons given by Lucretius in iv. 633 ff.

The general sense is clear, but there are difficulties of text and of the detailed interpretation of the passages.

5 This is part of a dialogue between Polyaenus, Epicurus, and others, and it is quoted piecemeal by Plutarch. The first question is definitely assigned to Polyaenus, the second remark it seems most natural to take as an interruption by one of the other characters, and the third (quoted as occurring 'a little later') will be part of Epicurus' reply.

2. ὅπελαβέ τις οὐ . . . ἀποφαίνεσθαι: we may with Bignone retain the MS. text and interpret 'some one interrupted saying that it did not appear'. the 'some one' will be a supporter of Epicurus. Usener, wishing to assign this remark to Epicurus himself, would read ὅπελαβε Τίς οὐ . . . ἀποφαίνεται, but this is not only unnecessary but does not really give good sense.

4. τοῦθε δέ τινος. I take this genitive, like τῆς δὲ τοιάντης φύσεως κτλ. in fr. 6, to be objective after θερμαντικός, 'capable of warming a body of a certain kind', i.e. that you must not only have the right amount of wine, but the right atomic structure in the body of the drinker to assist the warming process as described in fr. 6. Bignone in all these places takes the genitive apparently as descriptive, 'a certain quantity of wine at a certain temperature'. This seems to me very doubtful Greek, and moreover it neglects the essential point of the conformation of the body of the recipient.

6. 2. τῆς δὲ τοιάντης . . . θερμαντικόν, 'capable of warming a certain body which is in a certain disposition', i.e. a body containing the right kind of particles in the right arrangement - see note on fr. 5. Bignone again takes it as descriptive, 'a certain quantity of wine at a certain temperature and arranged in a specific manner'.

4. φύσεις, here, 'atoms': it was Democritus' technical term, and Epicurus himself spoke of *ai atomoi physis*.

5. εἰ, δέον γε: this is the MS. text, and I think it may just be retained: 'in the compound there are certain particles out of which

cold might be produced, if, when occasion requires, united with other particles they could form a structure which would cause cold'. The particles are always there, and it requires only the combination with other particles in the body to form the right atomic structure to produce the effect of cold. But the sense of δέον γέ is rather strained, and we should perhaps accept Bignone's suggestion εἰ (εἰς) δέον γέ ἐρέπει παραλύγεισαι, 'if appropriately united with other particles'. The same sense would be obtained by Wyttenbach's εἰς δέον τε, but Usener's alteration ή αἱ γέ is both violent and unsatisfactory.

7 is more straightforward and reinforces the general argument with the statement that wine is frequently drunk without any perceptible effect of heat or cold, which shows that it is neither hot nor cold absolutely.

8 (Usener 62) occurs in *Vit. Ep.* § 118, and recurs at the end of *Sent. Vat* li with the substitution of ἀφροδίσια for συνουστή. In *Vit. Ep.* it is quoted as a common saying of the Epicureans, but Plut *Quaest. Conviv.* iii. 6. 1 makes the attribution to the *Symposium* certain.

9 is not included in Usener's collection, but was included by Bignone from the Herculanean Rolls on rhetoric. The text is corrupt in the papyrus and was first put in order by Gomperz: I have noted the points in which Sudhaus, from whom I here take the text (*Philodem Voll. Rhet. Suppl.*, p. 50), differs from him. The fragment is clearly a double version of a saying and may, though not with certainty, be attributed to Epicurus himself. It is of course very ironical in tone and is fully in accordance with Epicurus' usual contempt for rhetoric.

10 (Usener 67). This fragment is quoted as from the *περὶ τέλους* by Athenaeus, and also, with abbreviations at the end, in *Vit. Ep.* § 6 (see notes there). It was maliciously used against Epicurus by his detractors, but is in fact an extremely emphatic statement that bodily pleasure must be regarded as just as essential for complete happiness as mental pleasure. It should, however, be read in conjunction with such passages as *Ep. ad Men.* § 129, where Epicurus says that all pleasures are good, but not all *aiperaί*.

11 (Usener 68). An interesting fragment for Epicurus' idea of bodily pleasure. *ἀνονία* becomes a permanent stable condition of body and this produces *χαρά*, which is a strong and positive feeling of pleasure.

12 (Usener 70). A clear statement of the doctrine that pleasure is the supreme test: beauty and virtue have no validity in themselves. Compare *fr. 79*.

13 (Usener 75). This of course is the fundamental doctrine of Epicurean physics and may be compared with *Ep. ad Hdt.* § 39 and *Lucr. Bk. I.*

14 (Usener 76). A slight variation of the preceding statement, but there is no reason to doubt that they both occurred in the first book of

the *περὶ φύσεως*. *τόπος* was one of Epicurus' regular terms for 'empty space': cf. *Lucr.* i. 426 'locus ac spatiū quod inane vocamus'.

15 (Usener 81). This fragment is quoted as from the eleventh book of the *περὶ φύσεως* by the scholiast on *Ep. ad Pyth.* § 91 (see note there). It is clearly an argument for the Epicurean view that the size of the sun is as we see it. It must be compared with *Lucr.* v. 564 ff., where it is argued that terrestrial lights become confused in outline before they appear to diminish in size. Much more so would this happen with the sun whose great distance from the earth would be very likely to cause such blurring. But the outline of the sun is not blurred: therefore we must suppose that his size is not diminished. Bignone in his note on *Ep. ad Pyth.* § 91, has, I think, shown clearly that this is the meaning and that there is no reason for any alteration in the text.

Other fragments of the *περὶ φύσεως* have been found in the Herculanean Rolls (see *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature*, Powell and Barber, 1921, p. 40, note by J. L. Stocks). Some of these have been published with conjectural restorations, but the text is so fragmentary and uncertain and the restorations at present so far from satisfactory that I have not included any in the present collection. It may, however, be well to give some account of the extent of these fragments and their contents with references to the sources where they may be found.

A. Fragments definitely assigned to certain Books:

1. *Book II.* Eleven fragments from *VH*¹ vol. ii, edited by Rosini and Orelli (*Epicuri Fragmenta*, Leipzig, 1818). These deal with the theory of sense-perception by means of effluences, and in particular with the *εἴδωλα* which are the cause of vision. Col. iii gives an indication of Epicurus' theory of the atomic construction of the *εἴδωλα*, and col. vii appears to point out that the *εἴδωλον* preserves the same shape and the same space intervals as the original, but that its content (*βάθος*) is not solid (*σῶμα*) but void (*κενόν*). Further references to these fragments will be found in an article by Gomperz ('Neue Bruchstücke Epikurs', *Sitzungsberichte der kais. Akad. der Wissenschaften*, lxxxii, 1876, p. 87), which contains a summary of the *περὶ φύσεως* fragments then known.

2. *Book XI.* Thirteen fragments from *VH*¹ vol. ii, edited by Rosini and Orelli (op. cit.); corrections and additions from the Oxford copies of cols. ix to xii, published by Gomperz (*Zeitschrift für die Öesterreichischen Gymnasien*, xviii, 1867, pp. 207 ff.). See also *Sitzungsberichte der kais. Akad.* lxxxii, p. 87). This book deals with cosmogony and is largely occupied with a discussion of the earth's position at rest in the middle of the *κόσμος*. The idea expounded by Lucretius (v. 534 ff.) is elaborated, and the earth is said to owe its freedom from motion to its position in the centre, so that there is equal pressure of air on it from all sides. There is incidentally a

discussion of the means by which we can obtain information as to τὰ μετέωρα. [An alternative version of these fragments (except 2, 3, and 4) was published by Mancini (*Atti del Congresso Internazionale di scienze storiche*, vol. ii, 1905, pp. 249 ff.) based on a MS. in the University Library of Messina (Fondo Monastico 37). This MS. is a transcript made by one Foti, who assisted Rosini in the deciphering of the Herculanean Rolls, and was apparently taken from an earlier facsimile than that from which *VH* was published: its readings may therefore have occasional value, though Foti's own restorations are for the most part very poor.]

3. *Book XIV.* Ten fragments published by Gomperz (*Zeitschr. für Oest. Gymn.*, loc. cit., pp. 211–213), which are part of a polemic on the question of the original φύσις, and are directed, as Gomperz thinks, against the theory of Plato in the *Timaeus*.

4. *Book XV.* A fragment of the title of the book giving an indication of the date of its writing. Discussed by Gomperz (*ibid.*, pp. 669–670).

5. *Book XXVIII.* Thirteen fragments from the *Apographa Oxoniensia*, each composed of two halves taken from different parts of the reproduction, the pages of the roll having been torn in half and copied separately: published by Cosattini (*Hermes*, xxix, 1894, pp. 1–15). These represent the latter portion of the book and look like the records of a conversation, Metrodorus being frequently addressed by name. They deal with the principles of the *Canonice*, and in particular with the truth of *ἀλθητική* and the importance of the use of words in their primary sense (see *Ep. ad Hdt.* § 37). Cosattini thinks that they show a greater interest in questions of logic than is usually attributed to Epicurus.

B. Unassigned Fragments:

1. *On the Will.* Six fragments and one fairly continuous passage of some length published by Gomperz (*Sitzungsberichte der kais. Akad. für Wiss.* lxxxii, 1876, pp. 92 to 95, and *Wiener Studien*, i. 1879–1880, pp. 27–31). The fragments appear to discuss from an atomic point of view the reaction of the mind to the εἰδῶλα coming from without, and tend in Gomperz's view, to show that Epicurus, though the opponent of fatalism, was not opposed to determinism. These fragments, if they could be satisfactorily restored, would throw a great deal of light on Epicurus' psychology, and so illuminate his moral theory.

2. *On generation.* Seven fragments published by Cosattini (*Rivista di Filologia*, xx, 1892, pp. 510–515) and attributed by him to Epicurus himself on the ground that no other Epicurean work *περὶ φύσεως* is known in the Herculanean collection and the writing resembles that of the fragments of Book II. The passage appears to deal with the process of generation from the atomic point of view.

3. *On error.* A short fragment from the conclusion of a book published by Gomperz (*Sitzungsb. kais. Akad.*, *ibid.*, p. 96) dealing with the origin of erroneous ideas in the mind.

4. *On the 'myth' of a future life.* A few scraps published by

Gomperz (*ibid.*, pp. 96, 97), which appear to be part of a polemic against the popular religious ideas of punishment after death (cf. *Ep. ad Men.* §§ 124 ff.).

18 (Usener 92). These definitions may well be included among the genuine fragments, though Usener does not admit them. They are entirely in agreement with Epicurean doctrine and are expressed in the language of Epicurus.

17 (Usener 93). This quotation occurs in the *Vit. Ep.* § 7, 11, and is directed against Nausiphanes, a pupil of Democritus, from whom Epicurus undoubtedly learned much, though he heaped scorn and abuse on him. For the text and interpretation see notes there.

18 (Usener 97). This and the following two fragments (19) come from the Herculanean Rolls. Their restoration is naturally very tentative.

i. 3: sc. that pleasure has a limit cf. K. Δ. iii.

19 (Usener 99) These two much corrupted fragments from Philodemus' *περὶ εὐσέβειας* must have been quoted by him for the sake of the pious expression θεῶν εἰλεων ὄντων. This is strictly inconsistent with Epicurus' view of the gods, but it is notable that both he and his disciples occasionally used such conventional phrases: cf. Lucr. ii. 434, v 1156.

20 (Usener 105). The fragment is quoted by Theo as an example of a bad order of words, and is placed by Usener among 'Spurious Letters'. But there seems no particular reason to doubt it. It is almost impossible to guess the context.

i. οἰσθ' ἀπερ τῆμν is a brilliant restoration of Crönert's (*Rhein. Mus.*, 1906, p. 422) for the manifest corruption of the MSS. Usener's ἔστιν & πρὶν μέν is much less probable.

2. γεγένηται. Cronert's obvious correction for γάγηται.

21 (Usener 113). This fragment, which is about Nausiphanes, is quoted in *Vit. Ep.* § 8, 2.: see notes there. Bignone has, I think, clearly shown that the MS text διδάσκαλον may be retained without alteration or addition.

22 (Usener 114). These quotations are again about Nausiphanes and are given by Sextus Empiricus. There is little doubt that Epicurus did derive some of his knowledge of atomism from Nausiphanes, but he is always very violent in proclaiming his independence.

i. βαρυτόνος is given by Plutarch (*contr. Ep. Beat.* 2, p. 1086 e) among a list of abusive epithets which Epicurus liked to hurl at other philosophers.

2. τοῦ πλεύρονος, 'the Mollusc': Sextus explains that Epicurus gave him this nickname, ως ἀναίσθητον.

23 (Usener 116). Epicurus is here clearly contrasting the motive of his moral philosophy with that of others. They invite men to a laborious round of virtues, which may or may not profit them, he invites them to continuous pleasure.

24 (Usener 117). The fragment is preserved in Athenaeus, but the name Apelles is restored from a reference in Plutarch. Athenaeus quotes it in connexion with Epicurus' claim to have been free himself from all traditional education, and notes his congratulations to disciples in the same condition : cf *fr.* 33.

1. *αἰκίας* is an ingenious emendation of Bignone for the meaningless *αἴριας* of the MSS. It would be quite in Epicurus' manner to refer to education on traditional lines as 'contamination'. It is therefore better in sense, as well as palaeographically, than Wachsmuth's *παιδείας* which is accepted by Usener.

25 (Usener 125). Another fragment from *Vit. Ep.* § 5. 6, addressed to Themista, Leontes' wife. It shows Epicurus in a playful mood.

26 (Usener 130). A considerable number of fragments survive addressed to Idomeneus, who was one of the leading disciples. This fragment refers to the voluntary contributions (cf *frs.* 40, 41) made by the disciples for the support of their master. The phraseology used is religious and playful in tone, but the Epicureans began quite early to give the founder a form of religious veneration.

27 (Usener 131). This invocation, like *fr.* 20, was quoted by Theo as an example of bad prose rhythm, the fault here being that the rhythm is too close to that of verse. Rohde in his copy of Usener, now in my possession, has noted that if the word *κυνήματα* be removed, the remainder is a rough iambic verse.

28 (Usener 135) is rightly referred to by Seneca (*Ep.* 21. 7) as a *nobilis sententia*.

1. *χρημάτων* is the reading of the MSS. and should be retained as a partitive genitive. One MS. corrects to *χρήματα*. Seneca translates *non pecuniae adiciendum*, from which Meineke restored *χρήμασι*, but there seems no authority for the construction.

2. *τῆς . . . ἐπιθυμίας* : probably specifically 'the desire for money', and not 'desires' in general, as Bignone takes it. Seneca has *cupiditati detrahendum est*.

29 (Usener 135 a, p. 345). This is quoted by Stobaeus with the heading 'Απολλώνιος Εἰδομένη'. It is certainly Epicurean in expression and Usener is probably right in recognizing 'Ιδομενεῖ' in *Εἰδομένη*. 'Απολλώνιος may, as he suggests, come from the next heading in Stobaeus, 'Απολλώνιος τοῦ γνωρίμοις, or, as Hense thinks, it may be that Stobaeus took the saying from Apollonius quoting Epicurus.

1. *τὴν αὐτάρκειαν* must be taken here in its narrower sense of the control of desires.

2. *Θαρρῶμεν*, 'may be content', and so free from any disturbing desires for luxurious food.

30 (Usener 138). A dying letter to Idomeneus quoted in *Vit. Ep.* § 22. 2 (see notes there). An almost identical letter to Hermarchus is translated by Cicero, *de Fin.* ii. 30. 96. It is probable that Epicurus sent slight variations of the letter to different disciples.

31 (Usener 140). The tone of this fragment is probably ironical:

Epicurus wished to discourage Colotes' extravagant signs of devotion and so paid them back to him and addressed him in the excessive reverence of the second sentence.

2. **ἀφυιστόλογητος**, 'not to be accounted for by scientific method', 'unaccountable', obviously a semi-ironical expression: cf. the use of the word in *fr. 44*.

3. **πάσης . . . ἐπιλήψεως**, after **ἐπιθύμημα**, **γίνεσθαι** after **εἰθισμένης**

4. **τινῶν**: the MSS. have **τιμῶν**, for which Wytténbach conjectured **θεῶν**, but the nearer correction **τινῶν**, though a little feeble, is probably safer.

32 (Usener 143). Another playful extract quoted in the *Vit. Ep.* § 5. 3.

33 (Usener 163). For the text see note on *Vit. Ep.* § 6. 6.

34 (Usener 165) Quoted in *Vit. Ep.* § 5. 8 as a phrase which brought censure on Epicurus for his excessive flattery of a young man

35 (Usener 176). A charming letter to a child written on one of Epicurus' visits to see his disciples in Asia Minor, where he had lived and taught before coming to Athens: see *Vit. Ep.* § 10.

36 (Usener 177). Another portion of a letter obtained from the works of Philodemus in the Herculaneum Rolls. It may be compared with *fr. 30*.

37 (Usener 181) A clear statement of the argument for the 'simple life'. it satisfies bodily needs and does not involve consequent pains, as luxury does.

2. **προσπτύω**: a violent word, for which see its use by Metrodorus in *Sent. Vat.* xlvi, and by Epicurus again in *fr. 79*.

38. This fragment, which is not in Usener's collection, was recovered from the Herculaneum papyri by Cronert (*Rhein. Mus.* lxi, p. 426). It is like in character to 30 and 36.

39 (Usener 182). Another fragment on the simple life from *Vit. Ep.* § 11. 6: see note there on **κυθριδίου**.

40 (Usener 183). A reference to the contributions made by the disciples for the support of Epicurus: see *fr. 26*

1. **δαιμονίως** seems a safer correction of the MS **δαιώς** than Cobet's **δαιφίλως**. It is also more in accord with the phraseology of the fragment.

2. **οὐρανομηκῆ**. an intentionally poetic word.

41 (Usener 184). Another reference to the **σύνταξις**, which shows that it was a well-organized subscription of a substantial amount levied on all disciples. It would presumably be required for the upkeep of the house and gardens in Athens and for the sustenance of Epicurus and the disciples who lived there. The opening of the fragment looks as though some official of the community was authorized to assess the amount.

42 (Usener 185) Another fragment from Philodemus said to be in reference to a boy who had brought the philosopher a present of a sheep (the preceding words in the papyrus should surely be read **καὶ**

δάστος πρόβατον παιδίον των δύ] πλε[κ]τῶν ἐργ[έ]ιοι], and not as they were edited, παιδίῳ των): Epicurus paid him by teaching. Bignone for some reason omits this fragment.

1. *ἀπτίδοσιν*: the papyrus has *αἴνοῦσαν*, out of which Usener admits that it is practically impossible to extract any sense. *ἀπτίδοσιν* would give what is required and is not palaeographically a very large alteration.

43 (Usener 187). Epicurus was always contemptuous of the 'man in the street', and did not wish or expect to be understood by him. Compare *Sent. Vat.* xxix.

44 (Usener 200). The quotation is not assigned by Porphyrius to any author, but apart from its language the coincidence of part of it with *Sent. Vat.* xxxiii makes it certain that this is Epicurus. Bignone enters a caution about Porphyrius' quotations, and in particular points out that it is not easy to determine where the quotation stops and Porphyrius' comment begins. But the whole of this extract may safely be assigned to Epicurus.

i. *ἀφυσιολόγητον*: cf. fr. 31.

45 (Usener 202) We may compare *Sent. Vat.* xxv, and for the general idea K Δ xviii.

4. *ἐστιν* (*οὐ πλούτος ἀλλὰ πενία*). In the MS. of Porphyrius the fragment ends with *ἐστιν*, the next sentence (fr. 68) beginning with the words *οὐ σπάνιον*. Usener wrote *ἐστι πενία*, thinking presumably that *οὐ* should be excluded and that *πενία* had dropped out owing to confusion with *σπάνιον*. Bignone, who retains *οὐ*, suspects the larger omission due to the reputed *οὐ*.

46 (Usener 203). Fears arise because we forget the laws of nature, desires because we forget the natural limits of pleasure.

48 (Usener 207) is very close in expression to Lucr. II. 34-36:

nec calidae citius decedunt corpore febres,
textilibus si in picturis ostroque rubenti
iacteris, quam si in plebeia veste cubandum est.

i. *κατακειμένη* and *ἔχουση* are changed by Usener to the masculine, presumably on the ground that Porphyrius, citing the quotation in his address to Marcella, would have adapted the participles to the feminine. But Epicurus' correspondent may also have been a woman and nothing is gained by the change.

49 (Usener 212). A more than usually fragmentary extract from a letter to a disciple who had written to the master on the relation of phenomena to the unseen (atoms and space). See *Ep. ad Hdt.* § 51 and elsewhere. The text given is that of Crönert (*Rhein. Mus.* lxi, p. 425), who re-examined the papyrus.

i. Before *φέρων*, *ἐν μνήμῃ* or the like must have preceded.

50 (Usener 213) Bignone quotes interesting passages from Plutarch (*contr. Ep. Beat.* 1097 e) and from Metrodorus showing that Epicurus and his disciples recognized a peculiar joy in the tears of

grief shed for a dead friend. Memory is here, as always, an important factor in Epicurean happiness.

51 (Usener 214) sounds a little cynical in expression, but Epicurus was probably thinking of the formation of habit.

52 (Usener 215) is a half-hearted precept to do good to an enemy, but remarkable even as it stands.

54 (Usener 221) is another unassigned quotation in Porphyrius. Stobaeus refers it to Pythagoras, but its likeness to *Sent. Vat.* liv and other Epicurean sentiments seems to justify Usener's attribution to Epicurus.

55 (Usener 266). It is not certain that these are the actual words of Epicurus, but the idea of revolving cycles or periods of time is certainly his: cf. *Lucr.* iii. 856 ff.

56 (Usener 356). This fragment deals with the gods to whom Epicurus himself attributed speech and supposed them to converse with one another, like Epicurean sages, the nearest approach on earth to the gods. Philodemus goes on to argue that the gods speak in Greek, or in some language like it, for in no other language is philosophy discussed.

57 (Usener 387). An unusually interesting fragment preserved by Philodemus about religious observances. Though Epicurus denied the interference of the gods in the direction of the world, he was yet scrupulous in the performance of religious functions (cf. *Vit. Ep.* § 10. 5) and here recommends such piety to his disciples. He held no doubt that such performance of ceremonial did not involve any belief in the action of the gods in the world, but it is also clear from *Lucr.* vi. 68 ff. that he conceived that the *simulacra* of the gods entering the mind of the worshipper could communicate something of the divine *árapaçía*: prayer for the Epicurean becomes communion.

1. καὶ καλῶς is perhaps a closer emendation of the defective κα . . . αλω than Gomperz's καὶ τάλλα.

3. περὶ τῶν ἀρίστων καὶ σεμνοτάτων: sc. τῶν θεῶν.

4. ἐπι . δὲ . . . δόξης: the meaning is here obscure. It may be that Epicureans should be careful not to incur any charge of impiety.

5. φυσικῶς ξῆν: a few words after this can be made out, but sense can hardly be made of them.

58 (Usener 388). A rather cynical argument for the general Epicurean view that the gods do not listen to prayer.

59 (Usener 409). A relentless and startling exposition of the doctrine of pleasure which caused great scandal in antiquity. Compare the saying attributed to Metrodorus (*fr. vi*, p. 47, Duen. *fr. 39*, Körte) περὶ γαστέρα γάρ, ὡ φυσιολόγε Τιμόκρατε, τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ καλόν. If the mind is to have *árapaçía* in order to pursue philosophy, the first condition is *átoria* of the body, and for that the first need is *átoria* = *ἡδονή* of the stomach. It is a fearless piece of logic which was falsely interpreted as though Epicurus had made the pleasure of the stomach the first object of life.

2. τὰ περιττά, 'the things over and above', mere *drapætía*, those 'variations' of mental pleasure which may be summed up as 'culture'.

60 (Usener 422). An emphatic statement of the Epicurean doctrine of pleasure: the removal of pain constitutes pleasure, and if it has been accomplished no further pleasure is needed. The satisfaction of the natural desire for the removal of pain does not incite to evil-doing, but only the striving for the fulfilment of unnatural desires.

2. ἐν αἰσθήσει καθεστῶτες. sc. as long as we are alive and awake.

3. ή τῆς φύσεως ἡδονή is the MS. text and may be kept. Bignone objects that the contrast between ἡδονή and ὅρεξ is inappropriate, but the contrast is between the natural pleasure fulfilled and the unnatural desires unfulfilled. Bignone himself would read ῥοπὴ in the sense of 'impulse': this seems to me unnecessary, but is better than Crönert's φωνὴ or Usener's ἔνδεια.

4. ἔξωθεν, presumably 'outside' the person who conceives it: 'puts ἀδικία into action'.

61 (Usener 423). As pleasure is the removal of pain, so the height of pleasure is the removal of a great pain. If we grasp and hold to this, we need not engage in Peripatetic subtleties.

1. παρ' αὐτῷ it seems impossible to retain, but none of the suggestions are satisfactory. Reiske's παρ' αὐτοῦ, 'from the person himself', is odd Greek and poor sense, Usener's πάραυρα = παραυρίκα is not very good sense and introduces an odd word. Bignone would read κατ' αὐτὸν, 'in itself', and translates 'the simple liberation from great pain', supporting it by Plutarch's words in the context τὴν τάχαθον φύσιν ἔξ αὐτῆς τῆς φυγῆς τοῦ κακοῦ, but the expression is still strange.

3. ἐπιβάλῃ, 'grasps it in mind', a reference to the Epicurean conception of ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας. The aorist seems essential as against the MS. ἐπιβάλλῃ.

περιπατῆ: Bignone is undoubtedly right in seeing an ironical allusion to the 'Peripatetics', whose Aristotelian doctrine of pleasure involved subtle analysis.

62 (Usener 442). This is good Epicurean doctrine (see *Ep. ad Men.* §§ 129, 130), but, as Usener admits, we cannot be certain that these are actually Epicurus' words.

63 (Usener 445). As usual with these citations from Porphyrius we cannot feel certain of the actual words. Porphyrius goes on to explain that it is the mind which is to blame because of its vain desires and hopes: compare Diog. Oen. fr. i.

64 (Usener 447). For this Epicurean commonplace see K. Δ. iv and *Sent. Vat* iv.

65 (Usener 448). An echo of the first part of the preceding fragment.

66 (Usener 457). For the idea see Seneca, *Ep.* 8. 7 'philosophiae servias oportet, ut tibi contingat vera libertas': the expression here is, as Usener points out, not quite like that of Epicurus himself.

67 (Usener 469). So in a less picturesque manner, *Ep. ad Men.* § 130. 9 τὸ μὲν φυσικὸν πᾶν εὐπόριστόν ἔστι, τὸ δὲ κενὸν δυσπόριστον.

68 (Usener 471). An elaboration of a commonplace dictum of Epicurus. The fool is poor in respect of ἀραραξία, the true end of life, and rich in fancies which lead to extravagant desires.

i. οὐ σπάντος: Usener in connexion with his emendation of the previous sentence (see *fr. 45*) omitted οὐ, but it is not easy to see how he then interpreted the remark.

πένητα seems a necessary addition, as is νόσοι in l. 5.

69 (Usener 473). A strange variant of this aphorism occurs in *Sent. Vat.* Ixvii.

70 (Usener 476). αἰτάρκεια is here used in the narrower sense of self-control', 'control of desires'. almost, as Bignone translates it, 'frugality'.

71 (Usener 478). This looks more like a long-winded paraphrase of some brief saying of Epicurus than an exact quotation of his words: cf. *Sent. Vat.* Ixiii.

72 (Usener 479). Riches involve a greater complication of life and therefore greater ταραχή.

i. τὴν ἀπαλλαγὴν, 'the escape' which they desire. Usener's change to τιν' is unnecessary.

73 (Usener 480) A strange aphorism which again may be a little distorted in Porphyrius' quotation.

i. θηριώδους is Nauck's emendation for the MS. θρηνώδους: one might hesitate to accept it but for a close parallel in Philod. *VH*² vii. 179, *fr. xxiv* ἀπὸ γὰρ ἀνημ[έρου καὶ] θηριώδους ἐργασίας κτλ. Epicurus is probably comparing the rapacious acquisition of riches with the ravening of a wild beast.

74 (Usener 485) Fear and desire are the two great obstacles to ἀραραξία, which is the necessary prelude to philosophical study.

75 (Usener 486). On the same theme again. It is not the poor man who is without luxuries who suffers, but the rich man tormented by his desires.

i. τούτων is explained by τὸ τῶν πολλῶν ἀγαθόν, which has preceded.

πόνος is a little strange in view of φέρειν . . . πόνον, and Usener may be right in suggesting κακὸν.

76 (Usener 488). Fluctuation between extremes of feeling is the reverse of ἀραραξία.

77 (Usener 489). For the Epicurean attitude to fortune see especially *Ep. ad Men.* § 134 and K. Δ. xvi. The text is uncertain in places, but in the latter half can be corrected from a quotation in the Byzantine gnomologion.

4. παρατετάχθαι: cf. *Vit. Ep.* § 120. 3 τύχη τε ἀντιτάξεσθαι.

78 (Usener 490). Usener aptly quotes Hor. *Ep.* i. 4. 13:

omnem crede diem tibi diluxisse supremum:

grata superveniet quae non sperabitur hora. *

For the play on ἡκιστα . . . ἡδιστα cf. *Ep. ad Men.* § 130. 8.

79 (Usener 512). Epicurus had but little place in his system for aesthetic appreciation, as such: cf. *fr.* 12. *τὸ καλὸν* has probably also a moral sense in reference e.g. to Plato's use of it.

1. προσπτύω: cf. *Sent. Vat.* xlvii, *fr.* 37.

80 (Usener 519). Virtue was not in Epicurus' view of value in itself, but only in so far as it produced *ἀταραξία*. Compare K. Δ. xvii δίκαιος ἀταρακτότατος.

81 (Usener 530). The wise man, as is explained in *fr.* 83, will act justly without the compulsion of law, but the law protects him against those who have not such wisdom.

82 (Usener 532). For the ideas compare K. Δ. xxxiv and xxxv; esp. xxxv *mit.* οὐκ ὅτι τὸν λάθρῳ τι ποιοῦντα . . . πιστεύειν ὅτι λήγει: also *Sent. Vat.* vii. Bignone omits this fragment, possibly because Plutarch introduces it with φασί, suggesting a general Epicurean source, but the words sound like Epicurus himself.

83 (Usener 533). The fragment is not specifically quoted as from Epicurus, but as it comes among a number of others definitely assigned to him, Usener is probably justified in his attribution. Epicurus may have in mind the story of Gyges and its use by Plato in *Rep.* ii. 359 d.

1. *τὸ τοῦ γένους τέλος* is certainly a rather strange expression for Epicurus, but Bignone supports it by *τὸ συγγενικὸν τέλος*, Philod. *Voll. Rhet.* ii. 17. 15. It is of course equivalent to the more usual *τὸ τῆς φύσεως τέλος*, i.e. ἡδονὴ.

84 (Usener 537). An interesting fragment, as it shows the basis on which, according to Epicurus, the 'social contract' was built. The man who causes fear in others may incite them to revenge, and so is full of fear himself. Compare K. Δ. vi, xxxi, *Lucr.* v. 1019, 1020. Usener notes that the saying appears in a positive form in Maximus Abb. *gnomol* 9, p. 174 ὁ πολλοῖς φοβερὸς ὁν πολλοῖς φοβεῖται.

85 (Usener 548). For the general idea see K. Δ. vii.

86 (Usener 551). This is the famous Epicurean motto against which Plutarch wrote the treatise from which it is quoted. The idea is that of the preceding fragment, that it is in the life which abstains from public affairs that *ἀταραξία* can most easily be attained. Usener notes echoes of the idea in Hor. *Ep.* i. 17. 10 'nec vixit, male qui natus moriensque sefellit' and in Ovid, *Trist.* iii. 4. 25 'crede mihi, bene qui latuit, bene vixit'.

87 (Usener 554). A curious fragment which may not contain Epicurus' own words. The general sense of the passage is familiar.

2. ἐξ ἀρχῆς: because, as is seen from K. Δ. vii, men originally seek for high position as a means of securing *ἀσφάλεια* and only later come to regard it as an end in itself.

LIFE OF EPICURUS

THE 'Life of Epicurus' is in fact the tenth book of Diogenes Laertius' *History of the Philosophers*, in which are embodied the three *Letters* and the *Main Principles*. It is, as we possess it, a curious medley of statements concerning Epicurus' life and his disciples, of attacks made upon him and the replies which might be given to them, of summaries of his doctrines, and of discussions of his differences with other schools, and especially with the Cyrenaics. And not only are these sections thrown together anyhow, but within the individual sections there is confusion, facts and opinions being foisted in at inappropriate places and consequently dislocating the sequence. The most conspicuous example occurs in §§ 120, 121, but there are others in §§ 6, 10, 22 (see notes on these passages), and the exceedingly disjointed style which pervades the whole work can only be accounted for by the supposition of constant additions and interruptions.

The recent work of scholars, and in particular of Diels, on the Greek Doxographers, has made us familiar with the way in which works of this kind were constructed. They were in fact 'traditional books': round the text would grow a collection of marginal notes, and each successive editor, incorporating almost at haphazard what he found, and adding perhaps further material of his own, would then publish his own 'edition'. Into this succession came Diogenes Laertius, who proceeded on the usual plan, or rather, engaged copyists to do it for him, for, as Usener warns us (p. xxii), *ne scripsit quidem sed scribenda librarius commisit*. Round the *vetustissimum illud opus, quod Laertius librarius exemplar fuit* (p. xxxv), itself a conglomeration, there had gathered marginal incrustations: sometimes, as in §§ 120, 121, we can peel these off: more often we are left with an inextricable confusion. The book is in fact not an intelligent compilation, but a growth.

It might reasonably be asked, What in that case is its value? When it has grown from so many sources, unknown to us, whose validity cannot now be estimated, what importance can be attached to its statements? The answer seems to be that it is of value, if used with discretion. In the first place there is no reason to doubt the main statements about Epicurus' life. with the exception of one or two minor discrepancies as to dates, they tally well. In the second, the 'Life' embodies a very considerable number of quotations from Epicurus' writings, which, couched as they are in language very similar

to that of the *Letters*, we may fairly accept: they are in many instances confirmed from other sources. Thirdly, the disjointed expositions of his doctrines, which again agree well on the whole with the *Letters*, may be regarded as giving us an occasional addition to our knowledge. Lastly, though this is less important, the long section on the abuse hurled at Epicurus and the replies (§§ 3-12), together with his sporadic criticisms on other philosophers, give us an interesting, though unpleasant picture, of the methods of philosophic controversy in antiquity. In short, though the process of its construction has made the book almost intolerable as literature, it has not impaired the value of its contents, if duly sifted and compared with what is otherwise known.

The text of the book, as might be expected from its origin, is seriously corrupted, but the acumen of Usener did much to restore it, and it has been in my opinion greatly improved, often in the direction of a return to the MS. tradition, by the work of Bignone.

§ 1 i. The date of Epicurus' birth is placed in 341 or the end of
342 B.C.

2. Γαργυττιος : Gargettus was one of the Attic demes.

3. Μητρόδωρος : one of the principal personal disciples of Epicurus, for the celebration of whose memory Epicurus provides in his will. Certain fragments of his works remain (ed. Korte)

4. Ἡρακλείδης : sc. Heraclides Lembos, who wrote an epitome of the διαδοχὴ τῶν φιλοσόφων of Sotion of Alexandria.

κληρουχησάντων . . . Σάμον : the colonization of Samos by Athens took place in 352 or 351 B.C. Epicurus' father had therefore probably been settled there about ten years before Epicurus was born.

5. δικτωκαιδεκέτη : sc. in 323 B.C.

6. Ξενοκράτους : Xenocrates of Chalcedon (396-314 B.C.) was a personal friend of Plato and head of the Academy for twenty-five years.

8. ἐκπεσόντων : sc. from Samos, whence the Athenians were driven out by Perdiccas in 322 B.C.

§ 2. 2. μαθητὰς ἀθροίσαντα : both in Colophon and also, as we learn from § 15, in Lampsacus and Mitylene.

ἐπανελθεῖν : in 307-306 B.C.

3. κατ' ἐπιμιξίαν τοῖς ἄλλοις : this is interesting, as Epicurus always professed his complete independence of all other philosophers.

4. ἀποφαίνεσθαι, 'expounded his doctrines', 'taught': the MSS. are obviously corrupt here, but Usener's emendation is highly probable: Kochalsky ingeniously reads ἀποστατᾶν, 'separated from them' αἵρεσιν, 'sect', 'school'.

10. τὰ περὶ τοῦ παρ' Ἡσιόδῳ χάρους : the notion is that Epicurus came on Hesiod's description of the original Chaos in the course of his school reading, and finding that the schoolmasters could not explain it to him, determined to go to the philosophers.

11. γραμματοδιδάσκαλον : the natural interpretation of the words is

that Epicurus himself was at some time or other a schoolmaster, possibly during the period at Colophon. Usener, however, on the ground of γραμμαδιδασκαλίδης in Timon's verses below, believes that the reference is to Neocles, Epicurus' father: if so, the statement has got misplaced.

12. Δημοκρίτου: there can be no doubt, in spite of Epicurus' denials, that he obtained his physical philosophy from the Atomists, and in particular from Democritus.

§ 8. 3 γραμμαδιδασκαλίδης: probably the word is not to be taken as a patronymic, but, as Bignone points out, in the generally contemptuous sense in which these terminations are employed by the comedians. 'teacher of infants'.

διαγωγότατος, 'stubborn', 'unmanageable', a word frequently applied to ill-trained domestic animals.

6. Φιλέθηρος: the Epicurean teacher of the last century of the Roman Republic, contemporary of Cicero and instructor of L. Piso, whose writings have been partly recovered from Herculaneum. Cicero draws a most unfavourable and probably unfair picture of him in the *In Pisonem*, c. 28.

8. ἐν Ὀμοίοις: a very probable restoration for ἐν νόμοις. The work would have been a collection of historical parallels and coincidences.

9. Διότιμος: Athenaeus xiii. 611 b speaks of a Theotimus who wrote a slanderous treatise against Epicurus, who may be the same person as this Diotimus.

§ 4. 1. Ποσειδώνιος: the philosopher who succeeded Panaetius as the popular exponent of Stoicism at Rome and was Cicero's chief authority for the Stoic position. Bignone points out that *οἱ περὶ* in philosophic phraseology often denotes the original authority for a statement and the intermediate sources of information. so here it may mean 'Posidonius and his successors'.

2. ἐν τοῖς δώδεκα . . . τῆς εἰκάδος: a very vexed clause. The MSS. have ἐν τοῖς δώδεκα . . . ἡ ἔστι περὶ τοῦ κδ. Usener, whom I follow, keeps the MS. text at the beginning and adopts at the end Hübner's emendation περὶ τῆς εἰκάδος. 'in the twelve books of the work entitled "The Arguments of Diocles", which are about the Twentieth', i.e. the Epicurean festival held on the twentieth of each month in commemoration of the Founder. This is a rather bold conjecture, but not improbable. Bignone objects that it is improbable that any author would devote twelve books to the Epicurean festival, and accepting Gassendi's emendation ἐν τῷ δωδεκάτῳ (B reads δωδεκάτῳ), proposes at the end ἡ ἔστι δὲ πρὸς τοῦ κ, 'which runs to twenty-four books'. But (1) περὶ τῆς εἰκάδος might well be taken as the title given to the portion of Sotion's work dealing with Epicureanism, which would be not unlikely to occupy twelve books; (2) the comment which Bignone restores, that the Arguments of Diocles consisted of twenty-four books is wholly irrelevant and surely a most improbable parenthesis.

4. καὶ γὰρ σὺν τῇ μητρὶ. **ἀραγητώσκειν**: seeing that this is the

precise charge made by Demosthenes (*de Cor.* 258) against Aeschines, it may well be discounted as a commonplace of abuse.

7. Λεοντία: one of the most prominent of Epicurus' disciples, the recognized companion of Metrodorus (see § 23). She appears to have been a woman of ability and learning.

8. τὸ δὲ Δημοκρίτου: though no doubt Democritus' work was the basis of Epicurus' physics, he made many great changes in the theory of the atomists, in particular in his insistence on the truth of *αισθήσις* as the basis of all inquiry.

καὶ Ἀριστίππου: still less is it true that Epicurus adopted the pleasure-theory of Aristippus, the founder of the Cyrenaics. Epicurus regarded the absence of pain as complete pleasure, while the Cyrenaic theory took absence of pain to be itself indifferent, and regarded as the end the accumulation of moments of intense pleasure (*μονόχρονος ηδονή*), such as Epicurus strongly deprecated as involving *ταραχή*.

10. Τιμοκράτης, brother of Metrodorus, was a disciple who subsequently deserted the school (see § 23); Ήρόθοτος, the disciple to whom the first letter is addressed.

12. Παιᾶνα, the title of Apollo, the Healer: see below § 5. 3.

§ 5. 1. Ἰδομενέα: fragments of several letters to him from Epicurus are preserved (*frs.* 26–30).

ἴκτυστα . . . ποιήσαντας. it is not known what secrets they divulged, but it would be in accordance with Epicurus' views of the value of friendship to forgive them.

2. αὐτὸν τοῦτο can hardly mean here 'for this very reason', but more likely idiomatically 'all the same'.

3. Παιάν ἄναξ (*fr. 32*): here an exclamation, not a vocative. One wonders whether the use of the same exclamation gave rise to the idea of Epicurus' flattery of Mithres mentioned above § 4. 12.

4. κροτοθορύβου: a facetious and playful word.

ἐνέπλησα is quoted by Suidas in his note on *κροτοθόρυβος* and is probably right as against the ἐνέπλησεν of the MSS. '

5. Θέρμωτα (*fr. 25*) was the wife of Leonteus of Lampsacus, to whom Epicurus dedicated one of his works: see § 28.

7. τρικύλιστος. again colloquial, 'with a hop, skip, and a jump', or 'in my seven-leagued boots'.

8. Πιθοκλέα (*fr. 34*), to whom the second letter is addressed.

10. νομίζει αὐτῇ παραίνει is the reading of the MSS., 'he thinks that he is giving her advice'. This cannot be right, but no emendation yet proposed seems satisfactory. Usener's suggestions ὀνομάζει αὐτῇ ἔταιραν or Ἀριάγνην are too far from the text, as is Kochalsky's νομίζει αὐτῇ παρενέναι. Bignone following the suggestion of the *editio princeps* would read νομίζει αὐτῇ περαίνει in an obscene sense, and explains that Epicurus' expressions of tender affection were so exaggerated that they might be so described by a malicious critic. But this does not seem convincing. What is required is some exaggerated expression of flattery like those in the other quotations:

θεομάζει αὐτήν is likely to be right, and the missing word should be a proper name implying a flattering comparison.

§ 6. 3. οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε . . . (*fr. 10*). There is no reason to doubt the genuineness of the quotation, but its citation without context and the interpretation put on it are malicious and quite misleading. Epicurus must not be supposed to have recommended all these pleasures; the sentence should be read in connexion with such passages as *Ep. ad Men* § 129, where he says that all pleasures are good, but not all to be chosen (*aiperaί*), or expressly goes on in § 130 to exclude the pleasures of the table because they are not pure, but bring pain with them.

4. *ἀφαιρῶν δὲ τὰς . . .* Possibly Meibom's insertion of *καὶ* before *τὰς* would make it a little clearer and more in Epicurus' manner, but it is not necessary.

5. *τὰς διὰ μορφῆς*, 'the pleasures arising from shape', that is to say, all the pleasures of sight: it need not be confined, as Kochalsky supposes, to the appreciation of artistic work any more than *τὰς δι᾽ ἀκροαμάτων* refers only to the pleasures of music. *μορφῆς* is rightly restored from Athenaeus, the gen. sing. being corrupted in the MSS. to other cases.

6. *Παιδείαν δὲ πᾶσαν . . .* (*fr. 33*). Again the meaning of the quotation is slightly distorted. Epicurus always claimed independence of all the other philosophical schools, but is probably thinking here rather of the normal Athenian education in literature and music, 'culture'.

τάκατιον δράμετος is a brilliant restoration of Gassendi of hopeless corruptions in the MSS.

7. *Ἐπίκτητος*, who would naturally attack Epicurus as part of the Stoic polemic.

10. *διὸς αὐτὸν . . . ἀπὸ τρυφῆς*: this is probably pure slander, and if it has any foundation, may be explained by Epicurus' weak health.

12. *τὴν μωστικὴν ἐκείνην συνδιαγωγὴν*: this is interesting as probably indicating that there was an element of an initiate community in Epicurus' school.

§ 7. 1. *πολλὰ . . . ἡγνοκένται*: once again, Epicurus' detachment from other schools of thought. His ignorance was probably less than he would have liked it to be thought.

2. *τὸ τε σῶμα ἔλειψιν διακεῖθαί*: Bignone quotes evidence from the Herculanean writings of Epicurus' bodily infirmities, which is also supported by Plutarch, *contr. Epic. Beat.* 16.

4. *μνᾶν . . . ἡμερησίαν*: possibly this was for the support of the whole community.

6. *ἐν ταῖς πρὸς τοὺς ἐν Μυτιλήνῃ φιλοσόφους*. Crönert thinks that this is the ἐπιστολὴ περὶ ἐπιτηδευμάτων (Usener 171, 172): if so, we ought perhaps to accept the correction of Menagius *ἐν τῇ*.

7. *Μαρμάριον*: the name has been restored from Philodemus in the Herculanean Rolls: *VH* i. 149.

9. *ταῦτα λέγειν*, 'he repeats himself': Kühn's *ταῦτα* for the *ταῦτα* of

the MSS. may certainly be accepted, but it is hardly necessary with Usener to insert *τε* after *ταῦτα* and cut out *τὰ πλεῖστα* after *Ναυσιφάνει*. The inelegant repetition of *τὰ πλεῖστα* is not inconsistent with Diogenes' usual style.

10. *Ναυσιφάνει*: Nausiphanes of Teos was a pupil of Democritus, who continued the tradition of the atomic school. It is tolerably certain that Epicurus learnt much from him, but he always professes his independence and treats Nausiphanes with scorn.

11. *ἀλλ’ ἵτωσαν* (*fr. 17*) is a brilliant restoration of Usener's for *ἀλλ’ εἴτης ἀλλ'* (B) and other hopeless corruptions in the MSS. It is certainly better than Stephanus' correction *ἀλλ’ εἰ τις ἄλλος εἶχε κάκεῖνος*. Kochalsky, believing the MSS. *εἴτης* to be composed of the two final syllables of *λέξει* and *οὐτῶς*, accidentally omitted and written in the margin, would read the whole passage *καὶ αὐτῷ λέξει φάσκειν οὐτῶς, Ἀλλ’ εἶχε κάκεῖνος*.

εἶχε . . . ὥδινων τὴν . . . καύχησιν: Usener compares Julian. *Ep. 59* *νῦν δὲ ὥσπερ ὥδινων τὴν καθ’ ἡμῶν λοιδοραν ἀθρόαν ἔξεχεας*.

§ 8. 3. *διδάσκαλον* (*fr. 21*) is the reading in all the MSS., and Bignone has shown, I think, that it may be kept: 'he called me sarcastically, "The Master".' There would be considerable point in such a sarcasm from a master to a very obstinate and independent pupil, and there is the same kind of irony in Epicurus' use of the epithet *χρυσοῦς* below for Plato. Kochalsky would read *ἀποκαλεῖν διδάσκαλόν* (*μου ἑαυτόν*), but this would be feeble, and further *ἀποκαλεῖν* which always has an abusive sense would be inappropriate. Usener's conjecture is also unnecessary.

πλεύμονα, 'mollusc', the *pulmo marinus*. Bignone compares Plat. *Phileb* 21 c *ζῆν δὲ οὐκ ἀνθρώπου βίον, ἀλλά τινος πλεύμονος ἢ τῶν ὅσα θαλάττια μετ’ ὅστρεινον ἔμφυχά ἔστι σωμάτων*.

Sext. Emp. *adv. Math.* 1. 3, quotes Epicurus' application of the epithet to Nausiphanes and adds *ὡς ἀναισθητον*, which gives the point, and makes impossible the interpretation 'lung', i.e. 'braggart'.

5. *Διονυσοκόλακας*, because of Plato's relations to Dionysius of Syracuse.

χρυσοῦν, obviously a sarcastic epithet, like *διδάσκαλον* above. Bignone believes that there is a reference to the golden age and would take it to mean 'simpleton': he adds that it applies to Plato's use of myths and belief in immortality. Is it not more probable that it refers to the division of the classes in *Rep. 415 a?* Epicurus speaks of Plato ironically as the 'golden philosopher', who himself of course belonged to the highest class.

6. *(δν)*, a necessary insertion by Hermann.

7. *οπρατεύεσθαι*: contemptuously. There seems no need to accept Usener's suggestion *τερατεύεσθαι*, 'he dealt in magic', though no doubt it would go better with *φαρμακοπωλεῖν*.

8. *γράμματα διδάσκειν*: just as in § 3 Epicurus is called *γράμμαδιδασκαλίθης*.

9. κυκητήν, 'the muddler' in reference to Heraclitus' well-known obscurity, which an opponent might regard as confusion of thought. Compare his nickname ὁ σκοτεινός and Lucr. i. 639 'clarus ob obscuram linguam'.

Αηράκριτον: of course a feeble pun. Bignone notes however that elsewhere Epicurus speaks with respect of Democritus, from whom he certainly learnt his atomic theories.

10. Σαννίδωρον: cf. σάννας, 'zany', in Cratinus, *Incert.* 33 and σαννίων in a similar sense in Arr. Epictet. iii. 22. 83.

Κυνικός is probably the right restoration of the Κυζηνικούς of the MSS. Gassendi suggested Κυρηγνακούς, but the epithet would be very inapplicable to them.

11. τοὺς διαλεκτικούς, 'the logicians', those who believed, as Epicurus did not, in the value of logic and dialectic. Possibly more definitely 'the Academics' as the inheritors of Plato's διαλεκτική.

πολυφθόρος seems a safe correction of πολυφθονερός, of which it is difficult to make any satisfactory sense.

Πύρρων: Pyrrhus of Elis (c. 365-275 B.C.), who after some acquaintance with atomism, took up the attitude of a sceptic and was the founder of the sceptic tradition. His moral ideal of ἀπαθία was closely akin to Epicurus' ἀραραξία and may have influenced him.

§ 9. 1. τῷ γὰρ ἀνδρί: Gassendi's correction of the MSS, reading τῶν γὰρ ἀνδρῶν seems necessary, and is supported by the note in the margin of B γρ. τοῦ γὰρ ἀνδρός.

2. ἦ . . . πατρίς: sc. Athens, where he was born.

5. ταῖς δογματικαῖς αὐτοῦ σειρῆσι προσκατασχεθέντες: a strong phrase. The faithfulness of the Epicurean school to the exact doctrines of the master was notorious and comes out strongly in Lucretius.

6. Μητροδώρου τοῦ Στρατονικέως. This Metrodorus was of course not Metrodorus of Lampsacus, Epicurus' most faithful disciple, but apparently a pupil of Apollodorus who is mentioned in § 25.

πρὸς Καρνεάδην ἀποχωρήσαντος: i.e. the famous Carneades of a century later, who was head of the New Academy.

8. ἦ τε διαδοχὴ . . . ἐς δεῖ διαμένουσα. The continuity of the Epicurean school right through the classical period is notorious, though an even greater claim might be made in the Roman era for the Stoics.

9. ῥηρίθμος. the authority of the MSS. seems to be in favour of this spelling as against the more normal ἀνηρίθμος.

ἀπολύνοσα, 'producing', a rather unexpected word, which is however used in medical writings of child-birth.

§ 10. 1. πρὸς τοὺς γονέας, and especially towards his mother Chaerestrata. The letter in the fragment (ixiii) of Diogenes of Oenoanda, which was originally supposed to be one of Epicurus' to his mother, is more probably, as William thinks, a letter of Diogenes' own.

5. τῆς . . . πρὸς θεοὺς δοκίμητος. For Epicurus' piety see *Ep. ad Men.* § 124 and *fr.* 57. It was probably a quite genuine religious feeling that the ἀράραξία of the gods could communicate itself to men in their devotions.

7. ὑπερβολὴ γὰρ ἐπικείας . . . ἥψατο. The true reason for Epicurus' abstention from political life was probably not his own 'excessive modesty', but his strong conviction that politics were destructive of ἀράραξία and therefore to be avoided: cf. K. Δ. vii.

χαλεπωτάτων . . . τὴν Ἑλλάδα: this refers no doubt to the state of Athens during the blockade by Demetrius of Phalerum in 295 B.C., when Athens was reduced almost to starvation. Plutarch, *Vit. Demetr.* 34, says that Epicurus rationed his disciples on a few beans daily.

9. εἰς τὸν: there seems no reason to follow Usener in omitting *eis* which is read by all the MSS. Part of a letter to a child written apparently on one of these visits is preserved (*fr.* 35).

12. [δν . . . φησιν]. Usener was probably right in excluding these words as a note by a Scholiast: it is impossible to fit them into the text satisfactorily.

§ 11. 6. οὐδαὶ μόνοι . . .: cf. *fr.* 37.

Πέμψον μοι . . .: *fr.* 39.

7. κυθρίδιον is the Ionic form of χυτρίδιον. In the genitive it must be adjectival 'potted cheese', but there is much to be said for the reading κυθρίδιον, 'a small pot of cheese'.

§ 12. 2. ἀπληστοι seems a necessary correction of Usener's; ἀπληστον is hardly possible, either with κέρδος or adverbially with ἀρχετε.

3. 4. This is Epicurus' doctrine that pleasure has a πέρας, namely the removal of pain: cf. K. Δ. iii and *Ep. ad Men.* § 131.

8. βητῶν has the better MS. authority, but possibly βημάτων is the more natural word to use.

10. Ἀναξαγόραν: Epicurus would be in agreement with Anaxagoras in holding that the original φύσις was not one continuous substance, but innumerable 'seeds', but violently opposed to his supposition that there were heterogeneous 'seeds' corresponding to every individual thing.

Ἀρχελαον: Archelaus is said to have been a pupil of Anaxagoras and the teacher of Socrates, and may have had a special attraction for Epicurus in that he combined the study of ethics with that of physics.

11. ἔγγυματε δέ . . .: compare, for instance, his instruction to Herodotus to learn the doctrines by heart, *Ep.* i, § 36.

§ 13. 3. Προβιφάντος, a Peripatetic and pupil of Theophrastus.

4. Λεύκιππον, the undoubted founder of the atomic school, and teacher of Democritus, who took over and greatly elaborated the theory. Epicurus' denial of his existence was probably a playful form of his assertion of independence.

7. Ξενοκρέτους: see § 1 note.

9. λέξει κυρίᾳ must surely mean 'ordinary, current speech', and not, as Bignone interprets it 'proprietà di vocaboli'. It was one of the

points of the Canon that the 'first word', i.e. the most obvious term should always be used (*Ep. ad Hdt.* § 38), but in carrying out his principle Epicurus, though he avoided the technical phraseology of other philosophers, certainly created a terminology which may well be described as *ἰδιωτάτη* and was not always *σαφής*.

10. *ἰδιωτάτη*, 'most special or peculiar' to himself. It seems unnecessary to emend to *ἰδιωτική* or *ἰδιωτικωτάτη*.

11. *ἀρχοί . . . δικαιεῖν*, 'he claims to demand', i.e. requires of orators. He urged that the orator should aim at the same *σαφήνεια* which he practised himself. This seems quite good sense and would not be improved by Usener's suggestion *δικαιών*, 'he claims for himself when he demands of others', or by Cobet's *ἀσκεῖν*, 'he claims to practise'. It is far more probable that the *περὶ Ρητορικῆς* contained 'a demand for clearness from orators than any claim to clearness in his own writings.

§ 14 1. *ἀντὶ τοῦ Χαίρειν*: this may have been a mere idiosyncrasy, but more likely that Epicurus on his own view of pleasure regarded 'rejoicing' as excessive and inconsistent with true pleasure, and therefore substituted expressions more consistent with his own ideal. It is hardly necessary to insert *γράφει* after *χαίρειν* with Usener or *γράφειν* after *πράττειν* with Kochalsky, constructing it with the previous sentence.

3. *Ἀρίστων*: the MSS. have *ἀριστον* *οι*, for which Cobet, seeing that this must stand for the name of some writer proposed *Ἀρίστων*; Bignone wishing further to account for *οι* in the MSS. would read *Ἀρίστων ὁ περιπατητικός*. In vii. 164 Diog. Laert. speaks of *ἐπερός* *Ἀρίστων* *Ἀλεξανδρεὺς περιπατητικός* and it is very probable that a Peripatetic philosopher, who is otherwise known to have written philosophy and history, should have made this charge of plagiarism against Epicurus. There seems no reason to go so far from the MSS. as Usener's *Ἀντίγονος* or his other proposal *Καρύστιος*.

τὸν Κανόνα. see *Ep. ad Hdt.* §§ 35, 36.

5. *Παμφίλου*: Pamphilus is also mentioned by Suidas as one of the teachers of Epicurus.

7. *δύο πρὸς τοῖς τριάκοντα*: it would appear from other sources that Epicurus was thirty-five when he set up his school in Athens, but he had previously taught in Lampsacus and Mitylene. See the next paragraph.

8. *τὸ τρίτον . . . δλυμπιάδος*: i.e. the end of 342 or the beginning of 341 B.C.

§ 15. 2. *δύο καὶ τριάκοντα*, i.e. 310 B.C., but if he was five years teaching in Lampsacus and Mitylene, this would put his coming to Athens in 305, whereas on other grounds (see § 2) it seems best to date this in 307-306. Possibly he began his teaching in Asia earlier or did not continue it for so long, but the point is not of much importance.

3. *οὕτως*, 'after that'.

4. *τὸ δεύτερον . . . δλυμπιάδος*, i.e. 270 B.C.

7. Ἐρμάρχον: for his succession to the headship of the school see Epicurus' will (§ 17).

§ 16. 4. Χαίρετε . . . This poem has been included in the *Palatine Anthology*, vii. 106, though it seems hardly worthy of a place there: it is poor doggerel and may therefore be rendered by such.

5. τοῦτος: Usener's conjecture, is much better than *οὗτοι* found in f and the *Anthology*, a substantive is badly needed. It is not easy to account for the πρῶτος or πρώτον of the MSS., of which no sense can be made.

6. ἐληλύθειν is the rather odd form preferred by Usener. The MSS. point to ἐσήλυθε and the metre might then be put straight by καὶ τόν, as in f and the *Anthology*: but the article is not needed and would be strange.

8. (ἢ), a necessary addition to answer μέν.

9. The will of Epicurus is an interesting document, showing his care for the preservation of the garden and for the continuance of the school, and his interest in his friends and disciples. It is said to be drawn up in better form than most of the philosophers' wills which have been preserved, but behind the legal phraseology one may detect the rather loose rambling style which we associate with Epicurus, and which may be taken as evidence of its genuineness.

12. ἐν τῷ Μητρώφῳ: the Metroum was the office of the state-archives.

§ 17. 2. Ἐρμάρχω this provision practically appoints Hermarchus as head of the school.

3. Ἀγεμάρτου, the MS. reading ἀγεμάρχον is merely due to the neighbouring Ἐρμάρχω and the name may be restored with certainty from other places in the *Life*.

8. αὐτῶν: sc. of Amynomachus and Timocrates: the legal heirs are to act with the successors in the school.

ἐν φᾶν ποτε τρόπῳ is an almost certain restoration for the MS. text ἐν φᾶν ἀποτρέπω: f has ἐν φᾶν τρόπῳ which points to it

9. διατηρῶσιν: the subjunctive seems necessary in spite of the unanimous optative of the MSS.

10. παραδίδωσιν seems to be the word indicated by the MS. variations: Usener on the ground of the accent in most of the copies, prefers the aorist παραδῶσιν.

§ 18. 3. ἀναγίσματα · the customary offerings at the tomb of the dead: cf. the Roman festival of the Parentalia.

5. τῇ προτέρᾳ δεκάτῃ: sc. δεκάτῃ ιοταμένου as opposed to δεκάτῃ φθίνοντος Cic. *de Fin.* ii. 31. 101 ff makes a severe attack on Epicurus for these provisions for the celebration of his memory: *id testimonio cavebit is qui nobis quasi oraculum ediderit nihil ad nos pertinere post mortem?* The answer would probably be that Epicurus did not suppose that such celebrations would affect him, but thought it would be valuable to the coming generations of his disciples to keep his memory fresh. From the festival on the 20th Athenaeus says that the Epicureans were known as the εἰκαδισταί.

8. μιήμην was restored by Aldobrandinus from the corresponding words of Cic, loc. cit., *ut et sui et Metrodori memoria colatur*. I agree with Bignone that it is unnecessary to go farther with Usener and change κατατεταγμένην to κατὰ τὰ τεταγμένα.

§ 19. 4. τῆς θυγατρὸς τῆς Μητροδώρου: the daughter of Metrodorus and Leontion, whose name was apparently Danae

§ 20. 2. μετά τοῦ: some of the MSS. read μετ' αὐτοῦ. Possibly μετ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ may be the origin of both readings.

τοῦ συγκαταγεγηρακότος ἡμῖν ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ: this expression is very characteristic of Epicurus. Cf *Ep. ad Men.* § 122 μήτε γέρων ὑπάρχων κοπάτω φιλοσοφῶν and farther on ὥστε φιλοσοφητέον καὶ νέω καὶ γέροντι, τῷ μὲν ὅπως γηράσκων νεάζῃ . . .

6. ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων: i.e. from the capital as opposed to the interest (*πρόσοδοι*)

8. χρείαν ἐν τοῖς ιδίοις παρεσχημένοι: for an example of an appeal by Epicurus for such assistance see *fr. 26* πέμπε οὖν ἀπαρχὰς ἡμῖν εἰς τὴν τοῦ ἱεροῦ σώματος θεραπείαν ὑπέρ τε αὐτοῦ καὶ τέκνων.

11. παρά, Usener, is a rather violent correction for the MS. ἐπί, but it seems necessary.

§ 21. 2. Εἳν δέ τι τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων . . . γένηται, the regular Greek periphrasis to avoid the mention of death (cf. *fr. 36*). γένηται is only read by F, but is more natural than the pres. subj. which is given in the other MSS.

6. ὁν has more MS. support than ὁς, adopted by Usener, and as it will make good sense, should be preferred.

7. ὅπως ὁν is Usener's correction of the MS. ὅπως δῆ. ὁν seems necessary according to Epicurus' usage, but the change is violent.

9. ἐλευθέραν is the natural word and has considerable MS. authority, but there is strange variation. Usener reads ἐλευθερίᾳ, but the strangeness of the expression and its position immediately after the straightforward ἐλεύθερον make it improbable.

§ 22. 1. The extract from the letter to Idomeneus is a manifest insertion: in an earlier form of the 'Life' καὶ διέθετο μὲν ὁδε must have immediately followed the will.

πρὸς Ἰδομενέα (*fr. 30*): the letter is also quoted with some variations by Cic. *de Fin.* ii. 30. 96, but as addressed to Hermarchus.

2. καὶ ὅμα τελευτῶντες, 'even though dying at the same time', but the expression is a little strange, especially coming inside τὴν μακαρίαν ἀγοντες . . . ἡμέραν. Cicero has *cum ageremus vita beatum et eundem supremum diem*, whence Davis has conjectured τελευταίαν for τελευτῶντες, which would certainly make the construction easier.

3. ἔγραφομεν: a normal epistolary imperfect.

παρηκολούθει, imperf. seems more probable than the MS. pluperf. παρηκολούνθηκε.

8. διέθετο, a necessary correction of ἔθετο: see § 16. 9.

11. Μητρόδωρον . . . Λαμψακηνόν. The text is uncertain here: the MSS. seem to point to Μητρόδωρον Ἀθηναῖον ἡ Τιμοκράτην καὶ Σάνδην

Λαμψακτρόν. The researches of Duening (*de Metrodori Epicurei vita et scriptis*) seem to show that Metrodorus' father's name was either Athenaeus or Timocrates: we should then emend as in the text and take Sande to be the name of his mother. But (a) ἐλλογίμους points to the mention of more than one person here; (b) the sentence οὐχεὶ δὲ καὶ . . . Τιμοκράτην, § 23 7, implies a previous mention of Timocrates; (c) there is some authority (f) for καὶ instead of η. It is therefore possible that the sentence originally ran Μητρόδωρον καὶ Τιμοκράτην Αθηναίον καὶ Σάνδης Λαμψακτρόν· (καὶ Μητρόδωρος ἀφ' οὗ . . .).

Σάνδης seems a strange name and possibly we should accept Gomperz's conjecture Κασσάνδρας.

13. εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν: sc. to Lampsacus. Cobet's restoration of οἰκίαν of the MSS. may be taken to be certain.

§ 23. 1. ἀγαθὸς πάντα is a quite natural construction and the insertion of κατά with P³H is unnecessary.

2. ἐν προηγουμέναις γραφαῖς is rightly interpreted by Bignone to mean 'in prologues or prefaces to his writings', where he might well mention Metrodorus. It appears, for instance, that the 28th book of the περὶ φύσεως was dedicated to Metrodorus (*Vol. Herc. vi, fr. 45*).

γραφαῖς again a necessary correction by Usener of γράφει.

5. ἀκατάπληκτος: the majority of the MSS. have the curious error ἀκατάληπτος, perhaps because it was a familiar technical word in the writings of Epicurus.

11. οὐχεὶ δὲ . . . Τιμοκράτην: if we adopt Usener's text in § 22. 11, we should also follow his suggestion (*Introd. xxvi*) that this sentence should be put in brackets as interrupting the account of Metrodorus. If on the other hand we suppose that Timocrates was mentioned in the first sentence of the paragraph, we must find room for this sentence somewhere, perhaps after the list of Metrodorus' writings.

§ 24. 6. Πολύαινος, whose memory Epicurus in his will (§ 18) enjoined on his disciples to preserve.

7. φιλικός, 'friendly, amiable': there seems no reason to adopt Cobet's φιληκός.

Φιλόδημον: see note on § 3.

§ 25. 1. ἐπιστολικὰ, probably 'treatises in the form of letters'.

2. μαθημάτων, 'science', is a brilliant and fairly certain emendation of Casaubon's for μαθητῶν.

6. Κωλώτης was a devoted disciple of Epicurus, to whom is addressed an extant fragment of a letter of the master (*fr. 31*). He wrote a treatise to show that it was impossible to live according to the precepts of any of the other philosophers, to which Plutarch wrote in reply the *adversus Coloten*, which is one of our sources for knowledge of the Epicurean morals.

7. Πολύστρατος: a work of his entitled περὶ ἀλόγου καταφρονήσεως was discovered at Herculaneum.

9. Κηποτύραννος: probably a name given him by his opponents.

11. Ζήνων was the master of Philodemus.

§ 26. 1. Διογένης of Tarsus wrote an abridgement of Epicurus' ethics and also the ἐπίλεκται σχολαὶ here mentioned, probably a collection of philosophical dissertations.

5. τέταρτος is a little odd (it includes Epicurus himself), but it is unnecessary to change the text to τρίτος.

7. κύλινθροι are the rolls made by fastening the papyrus pages together, and, though there was some variation, the average length in Pliny's time was twenty sheets, but earlier the rolls were larger.

9. αὐτοῦ: a good emendation of Cobet's for the almost meaningless αὐται.

11. εἰ γάρ πτ . . . Usener is of opinion that the following quotation comes from Clitomachus, not from Carneades.

12. φιλονεκεῖ: the present is unusual after εἰ and opt., and Casaubon's ἐφιλονεκεῖ is attractive. But there are historic presents or perfects all round, so that it is best to retain the present here.

§ 27. 3. εἴλακε: a very brilliant restoration of Cobet's for the meaningless εἴλκε.

10. φυγῶν is Gassendi's certain correction of the MS. φύτων.

§ 28. 3. περὶ τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀτόμῳ γνώσις: this work must have dealt with the doctrine of the 'least parts' or πέρατα in the atom: see *Ep. ad Hdt.* §§ 56 ff.; *Lucr.* i. 599.

5. περὶ εἰδώλων sc. the 'images' by which sight took place. cf. *Ep. ad Hdt.* §§ 49 ff.; *Lucr.* Bk. IV

9. νόσων is Gassendi's emendation for νότων which Usener retains. But 'maxims about south-winds' are very improbable, and one of the Herculanean papyri refers to an Epicurean work, περὶ νόσων καὶ θανάτου.

11. & must be right: the MSS. have the extraordinary reading μίαν, which it is hard to account for.

§ 29. 3. κάν: Usener's restoration for κάμε, which cannot be right.

4. η̄ τις . . . Πιθοκλέα . there must be an omission owing to the clauses of similar form and the loss can be supplied with certainty.

§ 30. 2. ἐφόδους: probably not 'introduction', as Bignone translates it, but rather the 'method of approach' to the Epicurean philosophy. It is in the *Canonicon*, for example, that we should find the insistence on the supremacy of αἰσθήσις.

5. κατὰ στοιχεῖον, 'in an abridged form'. The expression is not unnatural, and Usener's suggestion κατεστοιχειώμενον, though it would express it better, is unnecessary. The reference is surely to such letters as the three which Diogenes has given us, and not, as Crónert supposed, to any regular series of letters containing epitomes.

§ 31. 1. οτὴν διαλεκτικὴν . . . διποδοκιμάζουσιν. The Epicureans rejected both the Platonic dialectic and the Aristotelian logic on the ground that they both implied argument based on words and led away from the true basis of αἰσθήσις.

ταρελκουσαν, 'misleading'. Both Bignone and Kochalsky translate 'superfluous', a sense which the word has in later Greek. They

are no doubt influenced by the following δρκεῶ γάρ, but the more original meaning of the word is here stronger and better. Logic to the Epicurean is not only unnecessary : it is actively deceptive.

2. κατὰ τοὺς τῷν πράγματων φθόγγους, 'in accordance with the voices of things', i.e. with what things tell us themselves by immediate perception without the interpretation of δόξα. Bignone compares K. Δ. xxxvii τοῖς μὴ φωνᾶσι κενᾶς ἔαντοὺς συνταράπτουσιν ἀλλ' εἰς τὰ πράγματα βλέπουσιν, and Lucr. iii. 931 'denique si vocem rerum natura repente mittat' (which is rather far from the notion here). The idea is akin to that in *Ep. ad Hdt.* § 37. 6 τὰ ὑποτεταγμένα τοῖς φθόγγοις... δεῖ εἰληφέναι.

3. ἐν . . . τῷ Κανόνι : in the extant works of Epicurus the nearest passages are *Ep. ad Hdt.* §§ 38 (which comes closest to an exposition of the Canon), 51, 82, and K. Δ. xxiv : see notes there, and Appendix to the letter to Herodotus, p. 259. In the first and last of these passages Epicurus comes at any rate very near including the ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας among the κριτήρια of truth.

4. καὶ προλήψεις, 'the general concepts' formed by a combination of αἰσθήσεις : cf. *Ep. ad Hdt.* § 72, and note there. Gassendi would insert τὰς before προλήψεις, but it is possible that αἰσθήσεις and προλήψεις are grouped closely together as the κριτήρια of knowledge and τὰ πάθη added separately as the κριτήριον in the moral sphere.

5. καὶ τὰς φανταστικὰς ἐπιβολὰς τῆς διανοίας, 'the intuitive apprehensions of the mind', the apprehensions which consist in grasping an image. For fuller discussion see K. Δ. xxiv note and Appendix, p. 259.

6. (αὐτὸς) : an addition suggested by Giussani in his notes, seems necessary to bring out the sense. Besides the Epicureans Epicurus himself gives some countenance for the inclusion of ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας among the κριτήρια of truth. The reference is probably to *Ep. ad Hdt.* § 38 and K. Δ. xxiv. Possibly, as Bignone suggests, Epicurus did not include ἐπιβολὴ in the Canon, but later on put it in with the other κριτήρια.

8. ἀλογος. i.e. αἰσθησις carries its own conviction of truth without reasoning or calculation, it is immediate. Nor is it μνήμης δεκτική : one sensation gains nothing in truth, though it may in interpretation, from the recollection of another. It cannot be started by itself, but only by an outside object, and when it is so started it cannot of itself add to or remove anything from the data of the sensation.

9. ὑψ' αὐτῆς is only read by F, but seems obviously right.

δύναται, Gassendi, is a necessary correction of ἀδύνατεῖ of the MSS.

10. οὐδὲ ζητεῖ τὸ δυνάμενον αὐτὰς διελέγεται, κτλ. This idea recurs in K. Δ. xxiii and xxiv, and is elaborated by Lucretius in iv. 482 ff.

§ 32. 1. δμογενής : the MSS. have δμογένεια, which is improbable as an adjectival form, and may well have arisen from the neighbouring ἀνομογένεια. Seeing that just below they are divided between δμογενῆ and δμογένεια, it seems safe to restore the natural adjectival form here. By δμογενῆς αἰσθησις he means e.g. two acts of sight, by ἀνομογένεια

e.g. sight and hearing. cf. *Lucr.* iv. 486 ‘an poterunt oculos aures reprehendere, an auris tactus?’

4. ηρηται is a considerable change from the MS. ειρηται, but seems required to make sense.

5. τὰ ἐπαισθήματα, ‘the apperceptions’, e.g. the understanding in addition to the hearing of what is said by some one else. Σο ἐπαισθήσας is used in *Ep. ad Hdt.* §§ 52, 10, 53, 2 in the sense of ‘comprehension’. The fact that we do so understand confirms the truth or necessity of what we hear.

6. ὑφίστηκε, ‘is a fact’, is part of our experience.

7. δθεν καὶ . . . σημειωσθαι: this is of course the regular Epicurean rule of procedure with regard to things of which we cannot have immediate perception.

9. ἐπίνοιαι, ‘ideas’, framed by the mind and based ultimately on sensation: e.g. the Epicurean conception of infinite space is formed by the combination of προλήψεις of space, themselves based on sensation.

κατά τε περίπτωσιν is not easy. I take it to mean ‘by coincidence’, by the fitting in of one experience with another. This is I take it what Bignone means by ‘secondo l’incidenza’. Kochalsky appears to take it to mean ‘by throwing themselves on such perceptions’, but that does not suit well with the rest of the sentence.

10. ἀναλογίαν, the conscious ‘comparison’ of one experience with another. δημοσίητα, the ‘resemblance’ that is noticed between them, σύνθεσιν, the ‘combination’ of experiences into a new idea.

11. συμβαλλόμενον τι καὶ τοῦ λογισμοῦ: Epicurus would have to admit that here reasoning played some part.

τά τε . . . οὐ κινεῖ: a characteristic Epicurean doctrine. The vision seen in dreams or by madmen must be real, i.e. must be caused by actual εἶδωλα inasmuch as they do ‘move’ the mind, but they need not be evidence of an external reality, for they may be caused, e.g. by εἶδωλα from things which meet and combine in the air. cf. *Lucr.* iv. 732 ff.

§ 33. 1. τὴν . . . πρόληψιν: the ‘general concept’ formed in the mind by repeated sense-perceptions, and therefore acting as an ‘anticipation’ by which fresh perceptions are identified: see *Ep. ad Hdt.* § 72.

κατάληψις, ‘apprehension’ by the mind. Kochalsky appears to take ὄρθην with this word as well as with δόξαν, but not rightly, ὄρθη δόξα being so well-recognized a philosophical term.

3. οἷον τὸ . . . ἀνθρώπος: the πρόληψις gives us the conception of ‘man’ as such and such in form and behaviour and enables us thus to recognize a man. Kochalsky wrongly writes: οἷον τὸ τοιοῦτον ἔστιν ‘Ανθρώπος, ‘such for instance, as “Man”, a very unnatural form of expression.

5. προηγουμένων τῶν αἰσθήσεων: the αἰσθήσεις ‘lead the way’ inasmuch as they have formed the πρόληψις.

6. τὸ πρώτως ὑποτεταγμένων, 'the first significance', that which the word immediately suggests apart from metaphorical and other extensions. The participle is Gassendi's necessary correction for ὑποτεταγμένων of the MSS.

ἐναργές, 'clear evidence' of truth, a favourite word of Epicurus usually used of the 'clear vision' of an object close at hand: cf. ἐνάργημα, *Ep. ad Hdt.* § 72. 4, and ἐνάργεια, *ibid.* § 48. 10.

12. καὶ τὸ δοξαστὸν . . .: for the Epicurean view of opinion see *Ep. ad Hdt.* §§ 50–52 and K. Δ. xxiv. Opinion is an inference made by the mind, but based, as is said here, on sense-perception. In the case of terrestrial phenomena, we can approach and get the 'clear vision' (*ἐνάργημα*) which will confirm or contradict it: in the case of the distant phenomena of the sky we cannot have confirmation, the utmost is non-contradiction.

13. οἷον Πόθεν . . . Here the ἐναργές on which our answer will depend is the πρόληψις of 'man'.

34. 4. (τὸ) προσμένον . . ., 'the problem awaiting solution': the distant view of any object should be so regarded until we can get near and reach a decision by means of the near view: cf. *Ep. ad Hdt.* §§ 38, 50 and K. Δ. xxiv. The article is a necessary addition.

5. ἔγγυς γενέσθαι τῷ πύργῳ: the square tower which in the distance looks round was a favourite Epicurean example of the προσμένον: cf. *Locr.* iv. 353 ff., 501 ff.

7. πάθη . the criterion of the moral field, the 'feelings' or 'internal sensations': cf. *Ep. ad Hdt.* § 38, &c.; *Ep. ad Men.* § 129.

10. τὰς δὲ περὶ ψιλὴν τὴν φωνήν: unless we keep to τὸ πρώτως ὑποτεταγμένων τοῦς φθόγγους our inquiries will be into mere words: cf. *Ep. ad Hdt.* § 37. 7 ὅπως ἀν . . . μὴ ἄκριτα πάντα ημῖν γ . . . η κενοὺς φθόγγους ἔχωμεν.

§ 83. Between the first and second letters there is only this brief sentence.

§ 116. Between the second and third letters there is a longer discussion, which has the appearance of being foisted in.

§ 117. 1. περὶ δὲ τῶν βιωτικῶν, 'concerning matters touching different kinds of lives', practically 'concerning morals' or 'ethics': cf. *βίοι*, as a title of a work of Epicurus, in § 119.

3. πρότερον δέ: it looks almost as if the third letter originally followed here, but the discussion of the 'wise man' was put in subsequently. The section is rather difficult and loose in its construction.

ἢ τε αὐτῷ: Usener justly observes that one would expect ἢ αὐτῷ τε: it is a very loose piece of writing as it stands.

4. περὶ τοῦ σόφου: the Stoics spoke particularly of the σοφός or *sapiens*, and a good deal in the section has the appearance of polemic against the Stoics.

βλέψας δὲ ἀνθρώπων . . . γίνεσθαι: the sentence has the appearance of a philosophic commonplace: hatred is between equals, envy for superiors, and contempt for inferiors: cf. Quintilian xii. 8 'nam pluri-

mum refert, invidia reus an odio an contemptu laboret, quorum fere pars prima superiores, proxima pares, tertia humiliores premit'.

8. πάθεσι μᾶλλον . . πρὸς τὴν σοφίαν: a difficult passage, which has been very variously treated and understood. Usener would prefer to read μῆν for μᾶλλον (p. xxviii) and suggests (p. 334) that before οὐκ ἀνέμποδίσαι something like τὰς τοῦ βίου περιστάσεις has fallen out: 'It is true that he will be constrained by passions, but the circumstances of life would be no impediment to wisdom'. This is a little inconsequent. Kochalsky, following Usener's hint, reads μῆν ὡς ἄλλον συνοχεθήσεται, (ἢ) οὐκ ἀνέμποδίσαι . . . , 'He will be subject to emotions, like any other man, but this would be no obstacle'. Bignone points out that the Epicurean sage will not let himself be carried away by intense passions, but that there are certain affections, such as friendship and the grief for departed friends, to which he is peculiarly liable, and would therefore read πάθεσι (τοῖς) μᾶλλον. It is difficult to be certain, but I am inclined to think πάθεσι is used here in the technical Epicurean sense: 'the wise man will feel pleasure and pain more acutely', because of his education and consequent susceptibility. In that case the MS. text may be kept, but Kochalsky's connecting (ἢ) seems necessary to give the passage some kind of coherence.

§ 118 1. καὶ στρεβλωθῆ . . εὑδαίμονα. Bignone notices that this paradox was common to the Stoics and Epicureans. Usener has collected evidence for it among the latter (p. 338).

3. διατελεῖν εὐλογοῦντα, the emendation of Kochalsky, seems to me to get nearest to the required sense. But it is not palaeographically a satisfactory correction of διά τε ὁδὸς οὐχ, which with variations in the division of the words is the MS. text. Usener proposed διά τε λόγον (καὶ διὰ πράξεως λέναι), apparently meaning 'he will act similarly both in word and deed towards friends present or absent': but it is a very strange expression, and is not, I think, improved by Bignone's suggestion εἶναι or γίνεσθαι for λέναι. The true solution has not yet been found and it looks as if the corruption were extensive.

ὅτε μέντοι . . οἰμώξει a return to the subject of the first sentence of the section: the arrangement all through this passage is very scrappy and incoherent.

4. μύξει καὶ οἰμώξει: as the MSS. are fairly evenly divided between μύξει and μύξει but show a great preponderance for οἰμώξει over the present, it seems better to read the future in both cases. Present and future are used indifferently all through this section.

5. Διογένης: sc. of Tarsus: cf. § 26. 1.

7. τῶν σπουδαίων must be right as against τὸν σπουδαῖον of the majority of MSS., but the expression is not natural.

9. οὐδὲ θεόπεμπτον εἶναι τὸν ἔρωτα: cf. Lucr. iv. 1278.

nec divinitus interdum Venerisque sagittis
deteriore fit ut forma muliercula ametur.

ἐν τῷ . . . Aldobrandinus supplies the number 'the twelfth book', but on what authority is not known.

10. οὐδὲ μητροπεστιν καλῶς: Epicurus had a strong dislike for rhetoric, which he no doubt thought tended to deal with φωναὶ κεναῖ.

συνουσίᾳ . . . ὄνησις (*fr. 8*), with φωνω̄ parenthetical, seems to be indicated by the MS. text. Usener having introduced συνουσίῃ then reports that the MSS. unanimously read ὄνησις, ‘solita negligentia’, for ὄνησαι: this is surely uncritical.

§ 119. 4. θιατραπήσεσθαι τίνας, ‘will feel shame in the presence of some’, i.e. the respect due to distinguished persons.

οὐδὲ μὴν ἐπηρέασειν, ‘and certainly will not insult them in his cups’. The MSS. have τηρήσειν, which Usener retains and Bignone translates ‘will not continue in drunkenness’, but he admits in his note that there is no evidence for such a meaning of τηρήσειν. Hermann suggested ληρήσειν, ‘he will not talk nonsense in his cups’, which is poor sense. Kochalsky’s amplification is not convincing, τήρησιν κοσμίου being a most unnatural expression. I incline to connect the clause with the preceding and to read ἐπηρέασειν, a rather unusual word which might be corrupted to τηρήσειν: the verb is constructed with acc. in Arist. *Pol.* v. 10. 15.

6. οὐδὲ πολιτεύσεται: Epicurus both recommended and practised abstention from public life on the ground that it was destructive of ἀταραξία.

8. (οὐδὲ) μεταλλάξει αὐτὸν τὸν βίον, ‘he will not put an end to his life altogether’. This is perhaps a rather hazardous conjecture for μετάξει αὐτὸν τὸν βίον, but the corruption is deep-seated. For the expression cf. Isocr. 119 B, 192 A. Usener reads καταξίοι αὐτὸν τὸν βίον, ‘he still thinks himself fit to live’, Bignone prefers the text of f μεθέξειν αὐτὸν τὸν βίον, ‘he will retain a part in life’, which presumably carries with it the change of πηρωθεῖς to πηρωθέντα. Kochalsky has a characteristic amplification μετ’ ἀταραξίας ἔξαξει αὐτὸν τὸν βίον, ‘he will quietly remove himself from life’, but this is surely the opposite of the sense required: the true Epicurean will endure, though blinded.

§ 120^a. 2. οὐ πανηγυρεῖν δέ: another instance of Epicurus’ distrust of rhetoric: see § 118.

καὶ κτήσεως . . . τοῦ μελλοντος: the Epicurean sage must be a practical man. Cf. *Sens. Vat.* xli ἀμα δεῖν καὶ φιλοσοφεῖν καὶ οἰκονομεῖν καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς οἰκειώμασι χρῆσθαι

3. φιλαγρήσειν: a pleasant and rather modern touch in the sage.

4. φίλον τε οὐδένα προσεσθαι is Bignone’s correction ‘for the MS. κτήσεοθαι’: cf. § 118. 2. Usener made the violent change φίλην γὰρ οὐδένα κτήσεθαι, ‘for no one will find fortune a constant friend’. Kochalsky reads ἀποκτήσεοθαι in the same sense as Bignone’s text, but the word is unnatural and apparently otherwise unknown except in ecclesiastical Greek.

εὐδοξίας . . . καταφρονήσεοθαι: for the Epicurean view of worldly reputation see K. Δ. vii.

6. ἐν ταῖς θεωρίαις, ‘at public festivals’, and especially religious ceremonies. That this is the meaning Bignone has shown by reference

to Plut. *contr. Epic. Beat.* 13. 1095c, where it is said that the sage will take special pleasure in recitations and the Dionysiac festivals: we may compare what is said of Epicurus' own 'devotion to the gods' in § 10 Kochalsky perversely translates, 'he will specially have friends in his philosophical speculations'.

§ 121^b. Bignone has, I think, quite conclusively shown that this passage and that which precedes it in the MSS. ἀμαρτήματα . . . ἐπὶ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν should be transposed. As the section stands in the MSS. a passage on the general moral tenets of the Epicureans is interposed without introduction between two passages descriptive of the 'wise men'. By the transposition the sequence is restored. This is strongly confirmed by the words which come at the end of the two passages respectively. (1) μετέπεον δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν in the MSS. is out of place and is followed by the further description of the σοφός, εἰκόνας τε ἀναθήσειν κτλ. with the transposition it is brought to its natural place just before the third letter. (2) τὸ ἔξῆς δοκεῖ δ' αὐτοῖς is almost meaningless as it stands: with the transposition τὸ ἔξῆς is the direction to the scribe to include the passage about the moral tenets, which, as Bignone supposes, was written, probably by Laertius himself, as an adscript, δοκεῖ δ' αὐτοῖς are the first words of the passage which give both meaning and construction to ἀμαρτήματα ἀντα οὐναι.

Usener perceived that there was dislocation but wrongly referred the note τὸ ἔξῆς δοκεῖ δ' αὐτοῖς to the third letter, which followed, and regarded the second passage on the σοφός, εἰκόνας τε ἀναθήσειν, as the adscript: he then had to suppose a lengthy lacuna before ἀμαρτήματα containing a summary of the whole Epicurean position.

1. εἰ ἔχοι, ἀδιαφόρως ἀν σχοίη the MSS. have σχοίης, of which Kühn's σχοίη is a certain correction. Bignone has shown that no further correction is necessary: 'he will set up statues (of others), but whether he has one himself, he will be indifferent'. This is confirmed by the scholium to K. Δ. xxix, when in giving examples of the division of pleasures it is said οὗτε δὲ φυσικὰς οὐτ' ἀναγκαῖς, ὡς στεφάνους καὶ ἀνδριάντων ἀναθέσεις. Usener taking the words to refer to some other trait of the σοφός, supposed something lost before εἰ ἔχοι and suggested πλοῦτον οτ τέκνα: Kochalsky would prefer οἰκησιν. But no addition is necessary.

2. διαλέξασθαι: as the aorist infinitive is read by three of the MSS., there seems no need with Usener to accept the solecism δρθῶς ἀν . . . διαλέξεσθαι: Cobet bracketed ἀν, but it seems simpler to read the aorist.

3. ἐνεργείᾳ is Usener's correction of the MS. ἐνεργεῖν: he will not 'in practice' make poems. We ought perhaps to accept Kochalsky's δὲ for τε, as a contrast with the previous clause is wanted.

οὐκ εἶναι τε ἔτερον ἔτερου σοφώτερον. Bignone explains that, as the aim of Epicureanism was purely practical and the doctrine was laid down once for all by the founder, any idea of progress or superiority of one Epicurean thinker over another is impossible. οὐκ εἶναι was

accepted by the old editors from the οὐκ ἔναι τε of B. The majority of the MSS. have οὐ κινέται, whence Usener reads οὐ κινάσθαι, of which I cannot make any satisfactory sense.

9. καὶ καθ' ὑπονοῦ δὲ δμοιον ἔστεσθαι : cf. *Ep. ad Men.* § 135. 5 ταῦτα οὖν καὶ τὰ τούτοις συγγενῆ μελέτα πρὸς σεαυτὸν ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς πρὸς τε τὸν δμοιον σεαυτῷ, καὶ οὐδέποτε οὐθ' ὑπάρ οὐτ' ὅντα διαταραχθήσῃ.

11. τὸ ἐξῆς, on Bignone's theory, which I follow is a direction to the scribe, to add in the text the section 120. 5-10 which was originally written in the margin, and was wrongly inserted above.

δοκεῖ δ' αὐτοῖς are similarly the opening words of this short section on Epicurean tenets and are to be read continuously with ἀμαρτήματα κτλ.

§ 120^b. 1. ἀμαρτήματα ἀνίσα εἶναι if δοκεῖ δ' αὐτοῖς be read in connexion with these words it is not necessary to suppose any loss, though the transition is a little abrupt. Editors before Bignone taking them in their place in the MSS. after ἐν ταῖς θεωρίαις were compelled to think that something had dropped out. Cobet read (*rā*) ἀμαρτήματα and Usener would supply (*rā κατορθώματα καὶ τὰ*) ἀμαρτήματα which Kochalsky adopts in his translation. But Bignone has shown (1) that the article is not required, because the Epicureans did not maintain that *all* faults were unequal: some may be equal; (2) that the addition of *τὰ κατορθώματα* is unnecessary, as in other passages (e.g. D. L. vii. 120; Hor. Sat. i. 3 95) it is the equality or inequality of sins alone which is in question, and indeed Epicurus, holding that no sage could be wiser than another, would not mind recognizing equality in good deeds. The argument is of course directed against the Stoic doctrine of the equality of all ἀμαρτήματα

5. ουνίστασθαι .. ἐκπεπληρωμένοις the words in the MSS. are clearly corrupt, but it is unnecessary to do more than emend ἐκπεπληρων with Bignone to ἐκπεπληρωμένοις Those who are 'complete in their pleasures' are the wise, and they alone, according to Epicurus (§ 118, cf. K. Δ. xl), are capable of having the fullest friendship. Usener unnecessarily read ουνίστασθαι δὲ αὐτὴν κατὰ κοινωνίαν μεγάτας ἥδονας ἐκπεπληρωμένην, 'in a community of interests which is made complete by the greatest pleasures'.

§ 121^a. 1. τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν . . . δφάρεσιν ἥδονῶν one would naturally take this contrast to be between the perfect happiness of the gods which knows no increase or diminution and human happiness, which is a balance between pleasures added and lost. This was the view of Meibom who emended καὶ τὴν (*ἀνθρωπίνην*), ἔχουσαν προσθήκην . . . But this is not good Epicureanism: for Epicurus the perfect human happiness, the complete removal of pain, was equal to that of the gods (cf. e.g. Lucr. iii. 322 'ut nil impedit dignam dis degere vitam'). Bignone is therefore right in supposing the contrast to be between the Epicurean ideal of happiness and that commonly held by men.

4. μετιτέον δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐπιστολήν: these words now fall into their natural place.

§ 185. 7. *λv τῇ μικρῷ ἀπιτομῇ*: the 'Lesser Summary' is usually taken to be the letter to Herodotus in which there is no reference to prophecy or divination. Gassendi therefore proposed to emend to *μικρῷ*, but it is possible either that a passage on the subject has dropped out of the letter, or that the compilers have here given a wrong reference.

8. *μαντικὴ . . . γινόμενα* (*fr. 3*): the phrase is difficult and in any case very compendious. The thought appears to be: since events are regulated by natural laws there can be no supernatural revelation; even if there were, the events which occur do not concern the true Epicurean, for he has the regulation of his life in his own hands: cf. *Ep. ad Men.* § 133 *τὸ παρ’ ἡμᾶς ἀδέσποτον*.

9. οὐδὲν *παρ’ ἡμᾶς*, 'nothing to us' appears to be the sense. But this is a very unusual meaning of *παρά*, which after οὐδέν, &c., usually means 'in comparison with'. Meibom accordingly read *πρός*, which would be normal. Bignone, comparing *τὸ παρ’ ἡμᾶς ἀδέσποτον*, cited above, would read οὐδὲν *παρὰ τὸ παρ’ ἡμᾶς*, 'nothing in comparison with that which is in our control', which is attractive, but probably unnecessary.

§ 186. 1. *διαφέρεται δὲ . . . ἡδονῆς* The Cyrenaics, like Epicurus, selected pleasure as the 'end', but attached a quite different meaning. Epicurus held that there were two kinds of pleasures, the 'static' (*καταστηματική*), which consisted in the calm resulting from the complete removal of pain, and the 'kinetic', which could not increase pleasure but only give it variation. The Cyrenaics, on the other hand, regarded 'static' pleasure as purely indifferent, and 'kinetic' pleasure was their aim: thus they approached more nearly to the popular conception of Epicureanism.

3. *ἀμφότερα* cannot be right by itself: the older editors altered it so as to refer to the two *ἡδοναί* mentioned above, Meibom to *ἀμφοτέραν* and Gassendi to *ἀμφοτέρας*. Usener suggested more probably that a neuter word had been lost, and Bignone's supplement *γένη* is more likely than Kochalsky's *σχήματα*.

5. *φίλους*: there seems no reason to take Gassendi's correction *φίλοσόφους*

8. *δέ* again Usener's suggestion *διχῶς* is gratuitous.

11. *εὐφροσύνη* must here denote some violent form of pleasurable experience, and Bignone may be right in supposing a reference to its use of the feelings of banqueters in Hom. *Od.* ix 5 ff.:

οὐ γάρ ἔγώ γέ τί φημι τέλος χαριέστερον εἶναι
ἢ ὅτ' ἀνέ εὐφροσύνη μὲν ἔχη κατὰ δῆμον ἀπαντά,
δαιτυμόνες δ' ἀνὰ δώματ' . . . κτλ.

§ 187. 4. *τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν . . . τὸ μελλον*: for this idea that pleasures can be varied, though not increased, by duration, compare K. A. ix and the opening (§ 122) of the letter to Menoeceus. The Cyrenaics did not 'look before and after', but regarded only the intensity of the pleasure at the moment of its occurrence (*μονόχρονος ἡδονή*).

5. τῆς ψυχῆς : Casaubon's insertion of τὰς is not necessary in the very loose writing of these notes.

6. τῷ τὰ ζῆα . . . χωρὶς λόγου : an interesting appeal to experience to support the central moral doctrine of Epicureanism.

9. ίνα καὶ δὲ 'Ηρακλῆς . . . : the reference is to Soph. *Trach.* 787, 788 :

βοῶν, ίνέων ἀμφὶ δ' ἐκτύπουν πέτραι,
Δοκρῶν τ' ὄρεσι πρώνες Εὐβοίας τ' ἄκρα.

10. χιτῶνος must be right, and the χειμῶνος of P¹ a mere error. Diogenes is clearly making the quotation from memory, and having used βοᾷ as the introductory verb, substitutes something for the participle βοῶν at the beginning of the line. But the MS. δάκνων can hardly be right, nor are the older conjectures δεινῶς and λάσκων probable. Kochalsky would read δάκεων, going after ὥτο, 'when he is being devoured by the biting of the shirt', βοᾷ then being part of the quotation : but the arrangement of the words is very awkward, and δάκεων in this sense improbable. Casaubon's δακρύων seems an obvious and simple correction.

11. ἔστενον : again by memory for Sophocles' ἐκτύπουν.

§ 188. 1. οὐδὲ αὐτὰς must be the right reading, though it has been corrupted in some of the MSS.

3. διαγωγὴν . . . διαγήν, 'education is a way of life', a means διάγειν τὸν βίον, a process that must be continued from age to youth. So Kochalsky, who translates 'education continues over the whole of life'. This is the natural meaning derived from the ordinary sense of διάγειν. Bignone, connecting it apparently with a transitive sense of the verb, translates 'direction'.

4. διχωριστον . . . μόνην . cf. K. Δ. v and *Ep. ad Men.* § 132.

5. βρωτά, 'things to eat', is the reading of the majority of the MSS. and might well be taken as a typical example of χωριστὰ ἀγαθά : food is a necessity to life, but βρωτά, particular foods, may be done without. Usener suggests βρωτά τινα, but in the very rough style of Diogenes' notes this is hardly necessary. B¹F read βροτά, 'mortal things', which Bignone prefers, pointing out that these two MSS. are the chief representatives of the two classes. He translates 'mortal goods', and for the idea refers to K. Δ. v and *Ep. ad Men.* § 132 and § 135 : but the support is slight and, in spite of Bignone's argument that in his maxims Epicurus is apt to use words of poetic colouring, the expression would be very strange.

6–10 are an introduction to the Κύριαι Δόξαι, which Diogenes regards as the 'crown' of all Epicurus' work.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(This list does not pretend to be complete, but contains the main works, which deal directly with the constitution or interpretation of the text, published in the last fifty years)

I. EDITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS:

- H. Usener, *Epicurea*, 1887 (Teubner).
- O. Tescari (translation of letter to Herodotus in Latin, with brief critical notes), 1907 (in *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica*).
- A. Kochalsky (translation in German and critical notes), 1914 (Teubner).
- E. Bignone (translation in Italian, with critical and explanatory notes and appendices), 1920 (Laterza, Bari).
- P. von der Muehll (text and apparatus criticus), 1922 (Teubner).
- A. Ernout (translation in French in ed. of Lucr. I, II) 1925 (Société d'Édition—*Les Belles-Lettres*).
- R. D. Hicks (translation and brief notes) 1925 (Heinemann, Loeb Series, *Diogenes Laertius*).

II BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS:

- T. Tohte, *Epikurs Kriterien der Wahrheit*, 1874 (Clausthal).
- J. Wolter, *Lucretii philosophia cum fontibus comparata*, 1877 (Groningen).
- A. Brieger, *Epikurs Brief an Herodot*, 1882 (Halle), and *Epikurs Lehre von der Seele*, 1893 (Halle).
- W. Scott, *Fragmenta Herculaneana*, 1885 (Oxford).
- P.-F. Thomas, *De Epicuri Canonica*, 1889 (Alcan, Paris).
- C. Giussani, *Studi Lucretiani* (vol. 1 of edition of Lucretius), 1896 (Turin).
- C. Pascal, *Studi critici sul poema di Lucrezio*, 1903.
- W. Crónert, *Kolotes und Menedemos*, 1906 (Leipzig).
- F. Merbach, *De Epicuri Canonica*, 1909 (Weida).
- R. D. Hicks, *Stoic and Epicurean*, 1910 (Longmans).
- W. Arndt, *Emendationes Epicureae*, 1913 (Berlin).

III. ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS:

- I. Bywater, *Classical Review*, ii. 1888.
- F. Lortzing, *Berlin. Philolog. Wochenschrift*, 1888.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- H. Weil, *Journal des Savants*, 1888.
- C. Wotke (Gnomologium Vaticanum), *Wiener Studien*, 1888 (with notes by Usener and Gomperz).
- J. von Arnim, *Almanach der kbn. Akad. der Wissenschaften zu Wien*, lxvii. 1907.
- E. Bignone, *Rendiconti del R. Istit. Lombard. delle Scienze e Lettere*, 1908, 1917.
- *Atti della R. Accad. delle Scienze di Torino*, 1910, 1912.
- *Rivista di Filologia*, 1915, 1917.
- *Nuova Rivista Storica*, 1917.
- R. D. Hicks, *Proceedings of Cambridge Phil. Society*, 1910; *Classical Review*, xxxvii 1923.
- R. Philippson, *Archiv für Gesch. der Philosophie*, xxiv. 1910; *Hermes*, hii. 1918.
- H. Leopold, *Mnemosyne*, xliii. 1915.

INDEX OF THE PRINCIPAL TERMS

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>ἀβέβαιος Ep. III. 134.
 ἀβληχρός Fr. iv.
 ἀδέσποτος Ep. III. 133.
 ἀδηλον Ep. I. 38, 39, 80. Vit. 32.
 ἀδιάλυτος Ep. I. 54. Fr. 56
 ἀδιανότος Ep. I. 47 b; II. 97.
 ἀδιάφορος Vit. 120 b.
 ἀδίκια K. Δ. xxix.
 ἀδιώριστος Fr. Ixxxii.
 ἀδρότης Ep. I. 83.
 ἀδανασία Ep. III. 124.
 ἀδωρίθως Ep. II. 87. Fr. 77.
 ἀδρούσμα Ep. I. 62, 63, 64, 65, 69;
 II. 100, 108. K. Δ. ix. Fr. 6.
 ἀδρούσμός Ep. II. 90.
 ἀδρόος Ep. I. 56.
 ἀθροότης Ep. II. 106.
 αἰκία Fr. 24
 αἴρεσις Ep. III. 128, 129, 132. Vit.
 27, 30, 34, 136.
 αἱρετός Ep. III. 129. Fr. xxiii
 Vit. 30.
 αἰσθησίς Ep. I. 38, 39, 48, 55, 58,
 59, 62, 63, 64, 65, 68, 82; II. 90,
 91; III. 124. K. Δ. xxiii, xxiv.
 Fr. 43, 49, 60. Vit. 31, 32, 33.
 αἰσθητήμου Ep. I. 50, 53.
 αἰσθητικός Ep. I. 64.
 αἰτιολογεῖν Ep. I. 80, 82.
 αἰτιολογία Ep. II. 97.
 ἀκατάπληκτος Vit. 23.
 ἀκέραιος K. Δ. xii.
 ἀκοή Ep. I. 53.
 ἀκουστικός Ep. I. 52, 53
 ἀκρίβεια Ep. I. 78, 80, 83
 ἀκρίβωμα Ep. I. 36, 83.
 ἀκρισία K. Δ. xxii
 ἀκρόαμα Fr. 10.
 ἀκρον Ep. I. 41, 57; II. 107. K. Δ. iv.
 ἀλγηδών Ep. III. 129. K. Δ. x, xi.
 Fr. iv, xxxvii, lxxiii, 36, 62. Vit.
 34, 137.
 ἀλειτούργητος Ep. II. 97.
 ἀλληλούχος Ep. II. 99.
 ἀλλοφυλία Ep. II. 106.</p> | <p>ἀλλόφυλος K. Δ. xxix.
 ἀλογία Ep. II. 87. Fr. lxii.
 ἀλογίστως Ep. III. 134.
 ἀλυπία Fr. 85.
 ἀλως Ep. II. 110.
 ἀμετάβλητος Ep. I. 41.
 ἀμετάβολος Ep. I. 59.
 ἀμέτοχος Fr. 16.
 ἀμυγῆς Ep. I. 59.
 ἀμύθητος Ep. II. 115.
 ἀμφισβήτησις K. Δ. xxiv
 ἀνάγκη Ep. I. 74, 77, II. 115.
 Fr. xl.
 ἀναγωγή K. Δ. xxii.
 ἀναισθηστα Ep. I. 81.
 ἀναισθητεῖν Ep. I. 65. K. Δ. ii.
 ἀνακοπή Ep. I. 42
 ἀναλογία Ep. I. 58, 59. Fr. 49.
 Vit. 32.
 ἀναλόγως Ep. I. 40.
 ἀνάπανσις Ep. III. 125.
 ἀνατολή Ep. I. 76, 79; II. 92.
 ἀναφής Ep. I. 40; II. 86. Fr. 16.
 ἀναφορά Fr. 59.
 ἀναψύτις Ep. II. 92.
 ἀνεληστις Ep. II. 100.
 ἀνεπιλόγιστος Fr. lxxiii.
 ἀνεπέμπτος K. Δ. xxix.
 ἀνομογένειος Vit. 32.
 ἀντανατλήρωσις Ep. I. 48.
 ἀνταπόδοσις Ep. II. 105.
 ἀντέξωσις Ep. II. 93.
 ἀντικοπή Ep. I. 46 b, 47 b.
 ἀντικόπτειν Ep. I. 47 a, 61, 46 b, 62.
 ἀντικοπός Ep. I. 47 b.
 ἀντιμαρτυρεῖν Ep. I. 47 a, 48, 50, 51,
 55; II. 88, 92. Vit. 34.
 ἀντιμαρτύρησις Fr. 49.
 ἀντροειδής Ep. II. 105.
 ἀνύπαρκτος Fr. 3 Vit. 135.
 ἀνυπέρθλητος Ep. I. 47 a.
 ἀνιπτεύθυνος Ep. III. 133.
 ἀνωμαλής Ep. II. 113.
 ἀνωμαλία Ep. II. 113.
 ἀξίωμα Ep. II. 86.</p> |
|--|--|

- δομιστία** Fr. lxiii.
δόχλησία Ep. III. 127.
δόχλητος Fr. lxxix.
ἀπάθεια Ep. I. 73.
ἀπάντηροις Ep. I. 46 b.
ἀπειρία Ep. I. 45; II. 116. Fr. x.
ἀπειρού (τό) Ep. I. 60, 47 b, 73, 75; II. 88. K. Δ. xiii.
ἀπεργαστικός K. Δ. xxvi.
ἀπερίληπτος Ep. I. 42.
ἀπερινόητος Ep. I. 46 b.
ἀπογέννησις Ep. II. 105.
ἀπόδοσις Ep. II. 94.
ἀποκατάστασις Ep. I. 44.
ἀπόλαυσις Ep. III. 131, 132. Fr. xxvii, xlii.
ἀπολαυστός Ep. III. 124.
ἀπόληψις Ep. II. 105.
ἀπονία Fr. I. Vit. 136.
ἀποπαλμός Ep. I. 44.
ἀπόπαλσις Ep. II. 108.
ἀπόρροια Ep. I. 46 a.
ἀπορροής Ep. I. 47 a.
ἀπόστασις Ep. I. 46 a.
ἀπόστημα Ep. I. 80; II. 91, 103.
ἀποτέλεσμα Ep. II. 108.
ἀποτελεστικός Ep. I. 53; II. 101, 102, 108, 115.
ἀπογοή Ep. II. 88.
ἀπόφασις Ep. III. 124.
ἀραιότης Ep. II. 107.
ἀρετή Ep. III. 132. Fr. 12, 23. Vit. 28.
ἀρρωστία K. Δ. iv.
ἀρχή Ep. I. 41, 44; II. 116; III. 128, 132, 134. Fr. xxiii, 59, 85, 87. Vit. 30, 138.
ἀσείστως Ep. II. 87.
ἀσθένεια Ep. I. 77.
ἀστατος Ep. III. 133.
ἀστραπή Ep. II. 101, 102, 114.
ἀστρολογία Ep. II. 113.
ἀστρολογος Ep. II. 93.
ἀσύμβλητος Ep. I. 83.
ἀσφάλεια K. Δ. vii, xii, xiv, xxvii. Fr. xxxi.
ἀσχολία Ep. II. 85.
ἀσωματος Ep. I. 67, 69, 70.
ἀστωτος Ep. III. 131. K. Δ. x.
ἀταρακτεῖν Ep. I. 80.
ἀτάρακτος K. Δ. xvii.
ἀταραξία Ep. I. 82; II. 85, 96; III. 128. Fr. 1, 80. Vit. 136.
ἀτάραχος Ep. I. 80. Fr. lxxix..
- ἀτομον** Ep. I. 41, 48, 50; II. 86, 99, 102, 110. Fr. 16. Vit. 4, 27.
ἀτομος Ep. I. 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 61, 62, 65. Fr. 7. Vit. 28.
ἀθησις Ep. II. 90.
ἀντάρκεια Ep. III. 130. Fr. xxvii, xlii, lxxvii, 29, 44, 70.
ἀντάρκη Fr. xlvi, 45.
ἀντοτελώς Ep. II. 85.
ἀφαιρεσις Vit. 120 b.
ἀφανής Ep. II. 104.
ἀφάνισις Ep. II. 111.
ἀφθαρσία Ep. I. 76; III. 123.
ἀφθαρτος Ep. I. 54, 78, 81; III. 123. K. Δ. i. Fr. 31.
ἀφοβία Ep. III. 122.
ἀφοδος Ep. I. 54.
ἀφυσιολόγητος Fr. 31, 44.
ἀχάριστος Fr. lxxix, lxxxv.

βάρος Ep. I. 54, 61, 68.
βάσις Ep. I. 46 a.
βίοι Ep. II. 86. Vit. 28, 30, 136.
βιωτικά Vit. 117, 135.
βλέψις Ep. III. 130.
βούλησις Ep. I. 77, 81.
βράδος Ep. I. 46 b.
βροντή Ep. II. 100, 101, 102, 103.

γαληνισμός Ep. I. 83.
γένεσις Ep. I. 77; II. 86, 92. Fr. xxx, xli. Vit. 30.
γνῶσις Ep. I. 78, 79; II. 85; III. 123, 124. Fr. xxvii.

δαψιλεια Fr. lxxvii.
δελεάζεσθαι Fr. xvi.
δήλωσις Ep. I. 76.
διάδοσις Ep. II. 105, 106.
διάθεσις Vit. 117.
διαθερμασία Fr. 5.
διαίρεσις Vit. 34.
δίαιτα Ep. III. 131.
διάκρισις Ep. I. 78.
διαλαμβάνει Ep. I. 38, 58, 67; II. 85; III. 123, 133.
διαλέμμα Ep. III. 131.
διαληπτός Ep. I. 57.
διάληψις Ep. I. 51, 58, 69.
διαλόγισμα Ep. I. 68; II. 85.
διαλογισμός Ep. II. 84. Fr. x, 30, 49. Vit. 22.
διαλύειν Ep. I. 41, 42.

διάδυσις Ep. I. 41, 54.
 διαμονή Ep. II. 89.
 διανοεῖσθαι Ep. I. 49.
 διανησίς Ep. I. 63.
 διάνοια Ep. I. 38, 49, 50, 51, 62, 78.
 K. Δ. x, xviii, xx, xxiv. Vit. 31.
 διαπίπτειν Ep. II. 98.
 διαπορία Vit. 27, 119.
 διάρρωσις Ep. II. 89.
 διάρρηξις Ep. II. 106.
 διάστασις Ep. II. 100.
 διάστασις Ep. II. 89, 110. Fr. 15.
 διαφορά Ep. I. 42, 55, 56.
 διαχείν K. Δ. xxx.
 διηθῆσις Ep. II. 101.
 δικαιοπραγία Vit. 28.
 δίκαιος K. Δ. xvii, xxxi, xxxii, xxxvi,
 xxxvii, xxxviii Fr. xlvi, 57.
 δικαιοσύνη K. Δ. xxxiii. Fr. 80.
 Vit. 28.
 δίνη Ep. II. 92, 93, 112, 113, 114.
 δίνησις Ep. II. 90.
 δίνος Ep. II. 90, 105.
 δόξα Ep. I. 35, 37, 52, 77, 81; II
 87; III. 123, 132. K. Δ. xv, xxiv,
 xxix, xxx. Fr. xxix, lix, 45, 57,
 60, 68, 75. Vit. 27, 28, 31.
 δοξαζόμενον (τό) Ep. I. 37, 38, II.
 90 K. Δ. xxii, xxiv.
 δοξαστικός K. Δ. xxiv.
 δρόσος Ep. II. 108, 109.
 δυσελπιστεῖν Fr. xvii.
 δύσις Ep. I. 76, 79; II. 92.
 δυσπόριστος Ep. III. 130. K. Δ.
 xxvi. Fr. 67.
 δυσφορία Fr. 63.
 δυσχερές (τό) Ep. III. 129.

 ἔγγαληνίζειν Ep. I. 37.
 ἔγκαταδειμμα Ep. I. 50.
 ἔγκυλος Ep. II. 85. Fr. lviii.
 εἰδώλον Ep. I. 46 a, 47 a, 48, 50. Fr.
 xxiv. Vit. 28.
 εἰκὼν Ep. I. 51.
 εἴλεκρηνής Ep. II. 89. K. Δ. xiv.
 εἰμαρμένη Ep. III. (133), 134. Vit.
 28.
 ἔκθληψις Ep. I. 53; II. 109.
 ἔκλεψις Ep. I. 76, 79; II. 96.
 ἔκλογχος K. Δ. xviii.
 ἐκπιασμός Ep. II. 101.
 ἐκπνευματοῦ Ep. II. 105.
 ἐκπνευμάτωσις Ep. II. 114.
 ἐκπτωσις Ep. II. 102, 103, 114.

ἐκπύρωσις Ep. II. 101, 103, 115.
 ἐκριτισμός Ep. II. 101.
 ἐκστασίς Fr. 21.
 ἐκφάνται Ep. II. 92.
 ἐκχώρησις K. Δ. xiv.
 ἐλάχιστον (τό) Ep. I. 58.
 ἐλευθερία Fr. lxxvii.
 ἐλέξ Ep. II. 93.
 ἐμπειριαλιμθάνειν Ep. II. 90, 105.
 ἐμπειρίληψις Ep. II. 101.
 ἐμποδοστατεῖν Ep. II. 95.
 ἐμπτωσις Fr. xxiv.
 ἐμφασίς Ep. II. 95.
 ἐναπόληψις Ep. I. 77.
 ἐνπιοσφραγίζεσθαι Ep. I. 49.
 ἐνάργεια Ep. I. 48, 52, 71, 82. K. Δ.
 xxii.
 ἐνάργυμα Ep. I. 72; II. 91, 93, 96.
 ἐναργής Ep. III. 123. Vit. 33.
 ἐναργῶς Ep. I. 67.
 ἐνδεια Ep. III. 130. K. Δ. xviii, xxii.
 Fr. 18.
 ἐνδέχεσθαι Ep. I. 78, 80; II. 87, 88,
 90, 93, 94, 97, 103, 104, 105, 107,
 108, 113.
 ἐνδοξός K. Δ. vii. Fr. 9.
 ἐνεργεία Fr. 1. Vit. 121 b.
 ἐνέργημα Ep. I. 37.
 ἐννόημα Ep. I. 38.
 ἐννοία Ep. I. 69. K. Δ. xxiv. Vit.
 33.
 ἐνστήσις Ep. I. 52.
 ἐνοχλεῖν K. Δ. xi.
 ἐνοτημα Ep. II. 91.
 ἐξαγωγή K. Δ. xx. Fr. xxxviii.
 ἐξαιτιολογεῖν Ep. I. 82.
 ἐξακριβοῦν Ep. I. 35, 36, 68, 75, 78,
 83.
 ἔξις Vit. 117.
 ἐξορίζεσθαι K. Δ. xxxix.
 ἐξοριστικός K. Δ. xiv.
 ἐπαίσθημα Vit. 32.
 ἐπιαίσθησις Ep. I. 52, 53.
 ἐπάρδενσις Ep. II. 89, 100.
 ἐπέκρηξις Ep. II. 115.
 ἐπερεισμός Ep. I. 50.
 ἐπιβλεψίς Ep. I. 35.
 ἐπιβλητικός Ep. I. 50.
 ἐπιβολή Ep. I. 35, 36, 38, 51, 62, 69,
 70, 83. K. Δ. xxiv. Vit. 31.
 ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας I. 38, 51. K. Δ.
 xxiv. Vit. 31.
 ἐπιεικής Fr. xv.
 ἐπιθύμημα Fr. 31.

ἐπιθυμία Ep. III. 127. K. Δ. x, xi,
 xxvi, xxix, xxx. Fr. xxi, xxxv,
 lxxi, lxxx, 28, 46, 66, 68, 74.
 ἐπικρίνειν Ep. I. 37.
 ἐπίληψις Fr. 31.
 ἐπιλογίζεσθαι Ep. I. 72. K. Δ. xxii.
 Fr. xxv.
 ἐπιλογισμός Ep. I. 73. K. Δ. xx
 ἐπιμαρτυρέιν Ep. I. 50, 51. K. Δ.
 xxxvii. Vit. 34.
 ἐπιμαρτύρησις K. Δ. xxiv.
 ἐπιμέμοσις Ep. II. 93.
 ἐπινοέσθαι Ep. I. 40.
 ἐπίνοια I. 45. Vit. 32.
 ἐπίπεμψις Ep. II. 100.
 ἐπιπολῆς Ep. I. 48.
 ἐπίπονος Fr. 66.
 ἐπιπροσθέτσις Ep. II. 92.
 ἐπιστημασία Ep. II. 98, 115.
 ἐπιστήμη Fr. 9.
 ἐπισυνωθεῖν Ep. II. 104.
 ἐπίτασις Vit. 121 a.
 ἐπιτομή Ep. I. 35, 37, II. 85. Vit.
 27, 31, 135.
 ἐργαστικός Fr. xlvi
 ἐτεροίωσις Ep. II. 98.
 ἐτεροφρονεῖν Fr. xvii.
 εὐγνωμονεῖν Fr. lxii
 εὐδαιμονία Ep. III. 122, 127. Fr.
 xxxiii. Vit. 121 a.
 εὐδιάχυτος K. Δ. xxvi.
 εὐελπιστία Fr. xxxix
 εὐημέρημα Fr. 76.
 εὐκαταφρόνητος Fr. iv.
 εὐκυνησία Ep. I. 63.
 εὐκταῖος Fr. xxxv.
 εὐλογίστως Ep. III. 134.
 εὐπορία K. Δ. xiv.
 εὐπόριστος Ep. III. 130, 133. K. Δ.
 xv, xx. Fr. 67.
 εὐσταθής Fr. II.
 εὐσυμμετήρωτος Ep. III. 133.
 εὐφροσύνη Fr. I.

 ἥδονή Ep. III. 128, 129, 130, 131.
 K. Δ. iii, viii, ix, x, xviii, xix, xx.
 Fr. xxxvii, io, 12, 23, 37, 59, 60,
 62, 79. Vit. 4, 6, 11, 34, 121 a,
 136, 137, 138.
 ἥμερότης Fr. xxxvi.
 ἥσυχία K. Δ. xiv.

 θάνατος Ep. III. 124, 125, 133. K. Δ.
 ii, x, xi. Vit. 23.

θαρρεῖν K. Δ. vi, xxviii, xxxix, xl.
 Fr. 29, 48.
 θερμαντικός Fr. 5, 6, 7.
 θερμασία Ep. II. 93, 111.
 θερμότης Fr. 7.
 θεσίς Ep. I. 46 a, 48, 75.
 θεωρητός Ep. I. 57, 62, 47 b.
 θεωρία Ep. I. 35, 59; II. 86; III.
 128. Vit. 30, 120 a.
 θητεία Fr. lxvii.
 θιλίψις Ep. II. 101, 107.
 θύρυβος Ep. III. 132.
 θυμοκατοχεῖν Fr. lxii.

 λατρεία Fr. lxiv.
 λατρική Vit. 138.
 ίδιοτης Ep. I. 58, 71.
 ίδιοτροπος Ep. I. 52.
 ίδιωμα Ep. I. 72; II. 109.
 Ἱρις Ep. II. 109.
 λοσοθένεια Vit. 32.
 λοσταχής Ep. I. 61, 62.
 λοστορία Ep. I. 79.

 καθαρός Ep. I. 83. Fr. 19, 24.
 κάθαρος Ep. II. 86.
 κάθεσις Ep. II. 104.
 κανονικόν Vit. 30.
 κανών Ep. III. 129. Vit. 27, 30, 31.
 κατάληψις Vit. 33.
 καταμέρισις Ep. II. 106.
 καταμετρεῖν K. Δ. xix.
 καταμέτρημα Ep. I. 59.
 κάταξις Ep. II. 100.
 καταπυκνούσθαι K. Δ. ix.
 κατάρρηξις Ep. II. 103.
 κατάστημα Fr. 11.
 καταστηματικός Fr. I. Vit. 136.
 καταστοχειώδην Ep. I. 35.
 καταστρέφειν Ep. III. 126. K. Δ. xx.
 καταστροφή K. Δ. xxxv.
 καταφορά Ep. II. 100.
 κατελλήσις Ep. II. 101, 103, 115.
 κατεργασία Ep. I. 46 a.
 κατηγόρημα Fr. 2.
 κατηγορία Ep. I. 69; II. 86.
 κενοδοξία K. Δ. xxx.
 κενόν (τό) Ep. I. 40, 41, 42, 44, 46 b,
 67; II. 89, 90. Fr. 13, 16. Vit.
 27.
 κένωσις Ep. II. 94.
 κεραυνός Ep. II. 103, 104.
 κίνημα Fr. 27.
 κίνησις Ep. I. 51, 59, 64, 66, 67, 73,

- 77 ; II. 92, 98, 101, 105, 106, III. 112, 115. Fr. i, 1, 10 Vit. I. 36.
 κοιλωμα Ep. I. 46 a, II. 100, 106.
 κουνωνία K. Δ. xxxvi, xxxvii, xxxviii.
 Vit. 120 b.
 κομήτης Ep. II. 111.
 κόσμος Ep. I. 45, 73, 74, 77 ; II. 88, 89, 90, 112.
 κράδανσις Ep. II. 105.
 κρίσις K. Δ. xxiv.
 κριτήριον Ep. I. 38, 51, 52, 82 ; II. 116. K. Δ. xxiv. Vit. 27, 30, 31, 34.
 κροποθόρυβος Fr. 32. Vit. 5.
 κρούσις Ep. I. 61.
 κρυσταλλοειδής Ep. II. 100.
 κρύσταλλος Ep. II. 109.
 κυριώτατος Ep. I. 35, 36, 78, 79, 81, 82, 83. K. Δ. ix, xii, xvi.
 λαμπηδών Ep. II. 101
 λειτουργείν Ep. I. 76.
 λειτουργία Ep. II. 113.
 λεπτομέρεια Ep. I. 63.
 λεπτομερής Ep. I. 63, II. 90, 101.
 λεπτότης Ep. I. 46 a, 47 a
 λιτότης Fr. lxiii.
 λογισμός Ep. I. 39, 75, 76 ; III. 132. K. Δ. xvi, xix. Fr. 74. Vit. 32, 117, 120 b.
 λόξωσις Ep. II. 93.
 λύσις Ep. I. 79.
 μακάριον (τό) Ep. I. 78, 79, 80 K. Δ. i. Fr. 85.
 μακαριότης Ep. I. 76, 77 ; II. 97 ; III. 123. K. Δ. xxvii.
 μακαρισμός Fr. lxi.
 μακαριστός Fr. xviii.
 μαντική Fr. xxiv, 3. Vit. 135
 μέγεθος Ep. I. 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 68 ; II. 91. K. Δ. iii. Fr. 64. Vit. 22. *
 μεστός Ep. I. 42.
 μετάβασις Ep. I. 56, 58
 μεταβατός Ep. I. 58.
 μεταβολή Ep. I. 39, 54 ; II. 98 Fr. 72
 μετάθεσις Ep. I. 54.
 μετακόσμον Ep. II. 89.
 μετάρσιος Vit. 29.
 μετάστασις Ep. II. 89. Fr. 7.
 μετασχηματίζειν Ep. I. 55.
 μετέωρα Ep. I. 78, 80, 82 ; II. 84,
 85, 86, 87, 95, 96, 97, 98, III. K. Δ. x, xi. Vit. 83, 117.
 μῆκος Ep. II. 98.
 μήμη Ep. I. 82, 83 ; II. 85, 95. Fr. 30. Vit. 22, 31, 33.
 μοναχή Ep. II. 94.
 μοναχός Ep. II. 86, 95.
 μοναχώς Ep. I. 80.
 μονοειδῶς Ep. II. 109
 μορφή Ep. I. 49, 50. Fr. 10 Vit. 6, 33.
 μύθος Ep. I. 81, II. 87, 104, 116 ; III. 134. K. Δ. xii. Fr. xxxvi.
 νεφοειδής Ep. II. 110.
 νέφος Ep. II. 99, 100, 101, 102, 104, 107, 108, 110.
 νόημα Ep. I. 48, 61, 83
 νόητις Ep. III. 123 Vit. 33.
 νομοθεσία Ep. II. 86.
 νύμος K. Δ. xxxvii Fr. li, 2, 57, 81.
 δύκος Ep. I. 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 69 ; II. 105. Fr. 7, 85.
 οἰκειότης K. Δ. xl.
 οἰκείωμα Fr. xli
 οἰκονομεῖν Fr. xli.
 οἰκονομία Ep. I. 79.
 δλοσχερής Ep. I. 35, 36.
 δμαλός Ep. II. 113.
 δμαλῶς Ep. II. 110. Fr. xlvi.
 δμιχλοειδής Ep. II. 115
 δμογενής Ep. I. 53 K. Δ. xviii. Vit. 32
 δμοιομερής Ep. I. 52.
 δμοιόμορφος Ep. I. 49.
 δμοιοσχήμων Ep. I. 46 a.
 δμοιότης Vit. 32.
 δμοίωμα Ep. I. 46 b
 δμούρησις Ep. I. 64.
 δμόσφυλος K. Δ. xxxix.
 δμόχροος Ep. I. 49.
 δηγώνιος Ep. II. 109
 δπτλίκος Ep. I. 56, 57.
 δρεξις K. Δ. xxvi Fr. 45, 60
 δρίζειν K. Δ. xv, xxviii. Fr. x
 δρμή Ep. II. 115
 δρος K. Δ. iii, xi.
 δσμή Ep. I. 53
 δνστα Ep. I. 72 ; II. 86.
 δχλησις K. Δ. viii. Vit. 23.
 πάθος Ep. I. 38, 52, 53, 55, 63, 68, 73, 75, 82 ; II. 116 ; III. 129.

- Κ. Δ. xxiv. Fr. 54, 85. Vit. 28,
 31, 34, 117.
 παιδεία Fr. 33. Vit. 6.
 παλμός Ep. I. 43.
 πάλσις Ep. I. 50.
 παντελής K. Δ. xx, xxi.
 παράθεσις Ep. II. 105.
 παραλλαγή Ep. I. 55, 63; II. 95,
 113.
 παραλλάττειν Ep. II. 98.
 παράστασις Ep. I. 81. Fr. 30. Vit.
 22.
 παράτριψις Ep. II. 100, 101, 114.
 παρέκτασις Ep. II. 113.
 παρεμπλοκή Fr. 16.
 πάχη Ep. II. 109.
 παχυμερής Ep. II. 110.
 πέρας Ep. I. 41, 59; II. 88; III.
 133. K. Δ. x, xviii, xix, xx,
 Fr. xlvi.
 περιαίρεσις Ep. I. 55.
 περιβλεπτός K. Δ. vii.
 περίβλεψις Fr. lxxxii.
 περιγραφή Ep. II. 88.
 περιέχον (τό) Ep. I. 46 a, 48
 περιληπτικώς Ep. I. 40.
 περιληπτός Ep. I. 40, 46 b.
 περιληψις Ep. I. 56.
 περιόδεια Ep. I. 36, 83.
 περιοδεύειν Ep. II. 85.
 περίοδος Ep. I. 77, 83; II. 97.
 περιοχή Ep. II. 88.
 περιπλοκή Ep. I. 43, 44; II. 99.
 περιπολεῖν Ep. II. 112.
 περίπτωσις Vit. 32.
 περίστασις Ep. II. 92, 102, 104, 106,
 107, 109, III. Fr. xvii. Vit.
 119.
 περιφέρεια Ep. II. 107, 110.
 περιφερής Ep. II. 109.
 πηλίκος Ep. I. 57.
 πήξις Ep. II. 100, 106, 107, 108, 109.
 πλησίος Ep. II. 99, 103, 104.
 πλωτώμα K. Δ. xl.
 πλανάσθαι Ep. II. 112.
 πλεκτικός Ep. I. 43.
 πλευραχός Ep. II. 86, 87, 95.
 πλευραχώς Ep. I. 78, 80; II. 87, 88,
 100, 113.
 πλεύμων Fr. 22. Vit. 8.
 πλήρωμα Fr. lix.
 πληρωσις Ep. II. 94.
 πνεῦμα Ep. I. 63; II. 100, 101, 102,
 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 115.
 πνευματικός Ep. II. 90.
 πνευματοῦσθαι Ep. II. 100, 103.
 πνευματωδής Ep. I. 53; II. 106, 107.
 ποιητικός K. Δ. viii, x.
 ποικίλλειν K. Δ. xviii.
 ποικίλμα Fr. lxix.
 ποιότης Ep. I. 54, 55, 56.
 πολιτικός Fr. lviii.
 πολύκενος Ep. II. 89.
 πολυτέλεια Ep. III. 130. Fr. 37.
 πόρος Ep. I. 47 a, 61; II. 107, 111.
 πραγμάτεια Ep. I. 35, 83. Vit. 30.
 πρᾶξις Ep. III. 135. K. Δ. xxv.
 Fr. 71.
 πρηστηρ Ep. II. 104, 105.
 προαιρεσις Fr. li.
 πρόβλημα Ep. II. 86.
 πρόεσσις Ep. II. 107.
 προκαταστρέφειν K. Δ. xxv.
 προκαταστροφή K. Δ. xl.
 πρόληψις Ep. I. 72; III. 124. K. Δ.
 xxviii, xxix. Vit. 31, 33.
 προσδοξαζόμενον Ep. I. 50, 62.
 προσδοχή Ep. II. 89.
 πρόσθεσις Ep. II. 89.
 προσθέτης Ep. II. 94.
 προσθήκη Vit. 121 a.
 προσκατανόησις Ep. I. 79.
 πρόσκρισις Ep. II. 90, 109.
 πρόσλαμψις Ep. II. 109.
 προσμένον (τύ) Ep. I. 38, 50. K. Δ.
 xxiv. Vit. 34.
 πρόσοδος Ep. I. 54.
 πύκνωμα Ep. I. 36, 50; II. 105,
 115.
 πυροειδής Ep. II. 90.
 πύρωσις Fr. 7.
 ρέῦμα Ep. I. 49, 52, 53; II. 111.
 ρένσις Ep. I. 48.
 ρήξις Ep. II. 100, 102, 103, 106.
 ρήτορική Fr. 9. Vit. 43.
 ρύσις Ep. II. 104
 "
 σάρξ K. Δ. iv, xviii, xx. Fr. iv,
 xxxi, li, II, 44, 63. Vit. 137.
 σβέσις Ep. II. 92, 96.
 σέβασις Fr. 31.
 σεβασμός Fr. xxii.
 σεισμός Ep. II. 105.
 σέμινωμα Ep. I. 77.
 σημεῖον Ep. II. 87, 97. Fr. 40.
 σημειοῦσθαι Ep. I. 38; II. 104.
 σκαληνός Ep. II. 109.

- σοθαρός** Fr. xlvi.
- σπέρμα** Ep. I. 38, 74; II. 89.
- στάσις** Ep. I. 73; II. 92.
- στεγάζειν** Ep. I. 43, 64, 65, 66.
- στερέμικον** Ep. I. 46 a, 48, 50.
- στερεότης** Ep. I. 44.
- στωχείον** Ep. I. 47 b; II. 86; III. 123. Vit. 30.
- στοιχείωμα** Ep. I. 36.
- στοιχείωσις** Ep. I. 37.
- στράβιλος** Ep. II. 105.
- στροφή** Ep. II. 94.
- στυλοειδώς** Ep. II. 104.
- συγγενικός** Ep. III. 129.
- σύγκρισις** Ep. I. 40, 41, 42, 54, 55, 62, 73; II. 110.
- σύγκρουσις** Ep. I. 44; II. 101.
- συγκύρημα** Ep. II. 115.
- συγκύρημης** Ep. II. 96, 98.
- σύγχνασις** Ep. II. 88.
- συλλογή** Ep. II. 99, 103, 106, 115.
- συζῆτησις** Fr. lxxiv.
- συμβεβηκός** Ep. I. 40, 50, 68, 71.
- σύμβολον** K. Δ. xxxi.
- συμμέτρησις** Ep. III. 130.
- συμμετρία** Ep. II. 107.
- συμμετρός** Ep. I. 47 a, 50, 53, 61. Fr. 15.
- συμμετρώς** Ep. II. 110
- συμπάθεια** Ep. I. 48, 50, 52, 53, 64.
- συμπαθής** Ep. I. 63.
- συμπληρωμα** Ep. I. 48.
- συμπληρωτικός** Ep. III. 131
- συμπτωμα** Ep. I. 40, 64, 67, 70, 71, 73.
- συμφορεῖν** Ep. I. 69.
- συμφόρησις** Ep. I. 59.
- συμφυλία** Ep. II. 115.
- συμφωνία** Ep. II. 86. Fr. 49.
- συμφώνια** Ep. II. 98.
- συναναστροφή** Fr. xviii.
- συναφή** Ep. II. 85.
- συνήθεια** Fr. xlvi, 9.
- σύνθεσις** Vit. 32.
- συνθεωρεῖν** Ep. II. 96, 102, 116.
- συνθήκη** K. Δ. xxxii, xxxiii.
- σύνδοσις** Ep. II. 108, 115.
- συντίθεσις** K. Δ. xxxv.
- σύντομος** Fr. iv.
- συντονία** Ep. II. 101.
- σύντονος** Ep. II. 102. K. Δ. xxx. Fr. (v.)
- σύνωσις** Ep. II. 99, 106, 107, 109, 110.
- σύντασις** Ep. I. 48; II. 99, 107.
- σύντημα** Ep. I. 66
- σύντοιχος** Ep. I. 76.
- συντροφή** Ep. I. 73, 77. K. Δ. xxix.
- σχῆμα** Ep. I. 42, 54, 55, 68.
- σχηματίζειν** Ep. I. 53.
- σχημάτισις** Ep. I. 42.
- σχηματισμός** Ep. I. 54, 74; II. 94, 101, 102, 109.
- σῶμα** Ep. I. 39, 40, 41, 42, 55, 56.
- σωτηρία** Fr. lxxx.
- τάγμα** Ep. I. 71.
- τάξις** Ep. I. 48, II. 97.
- ταραχή** Ep. I. 81. K. Δ. xvii, xxii. Fr. lxxxii.
- τάραχος** Ep. I. 78, 81, 82.
- ταραχώδης** Fr. 23, 66
- τάχος** Ep. I. 47 a, 46 b.
- τεκμαίρεσθαι** Ep. I. 39.
- τελείωσις** Ep. II. 89.
- τελεσιουργεῖν** Ep. I. 36.
- τέλος** K. Δ. xx, xxii, xxv. Fr. 68, 83, 87. Vit. 6, 11, 27, 30, 136, 137.
- τερατεύεσθαι** Ep. II. 114.
- τεχνιτεία** Ep. II. 93.
- τομή** Ep. I. 56.
- τόπος** (Ep. I. 39); II. 98, 103, 105, 108, 111, 112, 113, 115. K. Δ. xxxiii. Fr. 14.
- τριβή** Fr. 9.
- τριψίς** Ep. II. 108.
- τύπος** Ep. I. 45, 46 a, 49, 68. Vit. 33.
- τύχη** Ep. III. 131, 133, 134. Fr. 77.
- ὑγιαίνειν** Fr. iiv.
- ὑγίεια** Ep. III. 128, 131. Vit. 120 b, 138.
- ὑγρασία** Ep. II. 108.
- ὑδατοειδής** Ep. II. 106, 107, 109.
- ὑπεναντίος** Ep. I. 81.
- ὑπεναντιότης** Ep. I. 77.
- ὑπεξαίρεσις** K. Δ. iii.
- ὑπερείδειν** Ep. I. 42.
- ὑπέρεισις** Ep. I. 44.
- ὑπόθεσις** Ep. II. 95.
- ὑπόληψις** Ep. III. 124. Vit. 34.
- φαινόμενα** (*rá*) Ep. I. 46 a, 54, 55; II. 86, 87, 88, 90, 92, 93, 95, 97, 98, 100, 102, 104. Fr. 49. Vit. 32.
- φαντασία** Ep. I. 50, 80. Vit. 28.

- φάντασμα** Ep. I. 75; II. 88, 102, 110. Vit. 32.
- φάντασμός** Ep. I. 51.
- φάνταστική** (Ep. I. 51.) K. Δ. xxiv. Vit. 31.
- φευκτός** Ep. III. 129. Vit. 30.
- φθόγγος** Ep. I. 37, 38, 76, 83. Vit. 31.
- φέλτα** K. Δ. xxvii, xxviii. Fr. xxvii, xxviii, iii, lxxviii. Vit. 120 b.
- φελοσοφία** Ep. III. 132. Fr. xxvii, xli, 24, 30, 54, 66. Vit. 17, 22.
- φιλοσοφεῖν** Fr. xli, liv.
- φορά** Ep. I. 49, 60, 61, 62, 47 b, 70 (= 'usage'), 76; II. 101, 107, 108, 115.
- φρόνησις** Ep. III. 132
- φυγή** Ep. III. 128, 129, 132. K. Δ. xxv. Vit. 27, 30, 34, 136.
- φυσικός** Ep. II. 86, 90; III. 127, 130, 134. K. Δ. xxix, xxx Fr. xxii. Vit. 27, 29, 30.
- φυσικώς** Fr. 57. Vit. 137.
- φυσιολογεῖν** Ep. II. 86. Fr. xxix
- φυσιολόγημα** Ep. II. 87
- φυσιολογία** Ep. I. 37, 78, II. 85. K. Δ. xi, xii. Fr. xiv.
- φύσις** Ep. I. 35, 40, 41, 44, 45, 49, 65, 68, 69, 71, 75, 78, 79, 82, 83; II. 86, 91, 97; III. 129. K. Δ. vi, vii, xii, xv, xxv, xxx, xxxi, xxxvii. Fr. xxi, 6, 13, 14, 16, 44, 45, 46, 60, 61, 67, 68, 77, 85, 87. Vit. 7, 27, 30, 119, 120 b.
- φωνή** Ep. I. 36, 45, 53. K. Δ. xxxvii. Fr. xxxiii, xli, xlvi, lxxv, 44. Vit. 26, 34.
- χάλαζα** Ep. II. 106, 107.
- χαρά** Fr. lxxxii, i, ii, 20. Vit. 136.
- χάρις** Ep. III. 122. K. Δ. i. Fr. xvii, xxxix, iv, 67. Vit. 28, 118.
- χιών** Ep. II. 107, 108.
- χρεία** Ep. I. 80; II. 87; III. 128. K. Δ. xxxvii. Fr. xxxiv, xxxix, 60. Vit. 120 b.
- χρῆσις** Ep. III. 131.
- χρόνα** Fr. 15.
- χρόνος** Ep. I. 72.
- χρόμα** Ep. I. 49, 68; II. 109. Fr. 4.
- χρώσις** Ep. II. 109.
- χυλός** Ep. III. 130. Fr. 10 Vit. 6.
- χώρα** Ep. I. 40.
- ψυκτικός** Fr. 6, 7.
- ψυχή** Ep. I. 63, 64, 65, 67, 68, 77, 81, III. 122, 128, 131, 132. Fr. lxxxii, 30, 44, 54, 68, 76, 85. Vit. 22, 136, 137.
- ψυχικός** Vit. 137.
- ψυχρασία** Ep. II. 107. Fr. 6
- ώφελεια** Fr. xxiii.