

LUCRETIVS
AND
HIS TIMES

DEPOSITED BY THE FACULTY OF
GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

Ixm



.IT14.1930



ACC. NO. **UNACC.** DATE **1930**

Lucretius and his Times.

by

Clarence Talpis

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate
Studies and Research of McGill University in
part fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Master of Arts in the Department
of Classics.

April, 1930.

Contents.

1. (a) Introduction and general remarks.---pps.1-10
(b) The Social and Political Picture----pps.10-17
2. Lucretius and contemporary Politics and Politicians.
(a) Lucretius and Politics-----pps.17-20
(b) Lucretius and Memmius-----pps.20-22
(c) Lucretius and Cicero-----pps.22-25
3. Lucretius and the Cultural background.
(a) Lucretius and Roman Literature-----pps.25-30
(b) Lucretius and Roman Science-----pps.30-38
(c) Lucretius and Roman Philosophy-----pps.36-43
4. Lucretius and the Roman Religion.
(a) The Roman Religion-----pps.44-50
(b) Lucretius' attack on Religion and
the Fear of Death-----pps.50-58
5. Lucretius and Contemporary Roman Society.
(a) Its 'ambition' and its 'luxury'~~the~~-----pps.58-64
(b) Its Immorality-----pps.64-68
(c) General-----pps.68-72
6. Conclusion-----pps.72-76
----- (a) Notes and References
(b) Bibliography

In any age, ancient or modern, the great majority are inclined to accept the doctrines, opinions and institutions current as the best possible, and if, perhaps, they are not in accord with them, they are nevertheless well-content to adopt a 'laissez-faire' attitude, considering as they do, the folly of the individual who seeks to oppose his frail strength and weak voice to the overwhelming weight of the things that are. Individuals there are, however, who are temperamentally and intellectually incapable of subscribing to opinions which are not based on fact and truth as they see it. Some of these non-conformists, moreover, are not satisfied with mere disbelief, but must, compelled by the intensity of their conviction, devote themselves wholeheartedly to an effort, to liberate their fellow-men from the yoke of fears superstitions and untruths. Rarely, one of these protestants or reformers seizes the popular fancy and becomes a determining factor in the formation of the thought of his age. Most of them are not so successful. Lucretius was not, we think, though he preached his gospel with

as great ~~an~~ zeal as man ever did. The fault, however, lies not in him but in his doctrine. It is not our purpose to examine that doctrine in detail, but rather to see if by a study of his background we may learn why Lucretius should have felt the need of such a doctrine both for himself and for his fellow-Romans. The Epicurean dogma is not one that is attuned completely to the average or even to the superior Roman mind. It teaches a recoil and a retreat from life. It is a doctrine which is on the whole rather apathetic and gloomy in its outlook. But we must remember that for many a Roman, Lucretius among them, no clear vistas extend, only, evil days await the Republic. There is no one purpose with which the Republic can forge ahead. Indeed, our poet feels, in a mood of dark despair, that not only is the Republic in decay but even that Earth itself is weary and dying:

"iamque adeo fracta est aetas affetaque tellus
vix animalia parva creat quae cuncta creavit
saecula deditque ferarum ingentia corpora partu."(1)

The strain of the long years of turmoil and bloodshed have left their mark upon the poet. His work

reflects the nervous tension of his generation, and we must not, with reference to his view of men and things, "forget amidst what men and in prospect of what things that view had its origin." (§)

To claim that a man and his work may be entirely explained by the effect upon him of the age in which he lives and writes is to allege too much. ^{A study} of a man's milieu, does, however, serve to cast light upon many points in his writings, which are not at first glance very clear. It may be reasonably asserted then, that Lucretius will be better understood, if and when we can see and understand his particular place in the general picture. We may then, perhaps, see more clearly how he expresses and ~~and~~ reflects the sense of bewilderment accompanying the change from the old orders to the new, the chaos of men of affairs and of opinions, in short, a time in which any system advocating withdrawal from this confusion would appear in a more than usually attractive light.

The life of Lucretius falls during the crisis of Roman history, the period of the Roman revolution. It is during this epoch that the

Republic is finally overthrown and the foundations of the Empire established. It is a time of unrestrained, political passion, the worst in the world's history perhaps, approached only in intensity of political opinion by the period of the French Revolution. Shortly before the outbreak of the Social War his life begins, and ends a few years before the military chieftains dealt the death blow to the Republic.

For a few years there had been a lull in the hostilities following the quarrels of Marius and Saturninus. It was a lull of short duration. Drusus was assassinated in the year 90 B.C. His death was the signal for the outbreak of the mournful Social War, for the Italians, seeing their last hope of obtaining citizenship by peaceful methods vanish, took to the sword. The young Lucretius must often have heard terrible stories of the fighting. A boy of ten he may have with his own eyes seen the Forum after "Octavius' day" when ten thousand corpses covered it.(3) He was fifteen or sixteen years of age when Sulla returned from the east, and by the simple expedient of massacre and pros-

cription restoring a measure of quiet and peace to the city that had, in his absence, been at the mercy of the ruffians of Marius and Cinna.⁽¹⁾ He and many another who lived through such times must ever after have felt a shuddering horror at the very thought of their returning. On Italy, itself, the effects of the war were of the most disastrous. Whole districts, towns and villages were ravaged and left vacant of life and activity. In common with most Romans, Lucretius must have experienced the sense of impending calamity during the time that the Catilinarian conspiracy was formed and carried through to its unhappy end, a time when the rottenness of the whole State was only too apparent. The miserable antics of Clodius, the cynical manoeuvres of Pompey, Crassus and Caesar were unfolded before his eyes. Nowhere ~~xxx~~ did there appear any definite aim or object to this "political witches-revel." Let Cicero present to us, in his graphic manner, a typical scene of violence and turbulence:

"Scripsi ad te antea superiora; nunc cognosce postea quae sint acta. A Kal. Febr. legationes in

Idus Febr. reiciebantur. Eo die res confecta non est. A.d. llll Non. Febr. Milo adfuit. Ei Pompeius advocatus venit; dixit Marcellus a me rogatus; honeste discessimus; prodicta dies est in Vlll Idus Febr. Interim reiectis legationibus in Idus referebatur de provinciis quaestorum et de ornandis praetoribus; sed res multis querelis de re publica interponendis nulla transacta est. C.Cato legem promulgavit de imperio Lentulo abrogando. Vestitum filius mutavit. A.d. Vlll Id. Febr. Milo adfuit. Dixit Pompeius, sive voluit; nam ut serrexit, operae Clodianae clamorem sustulerunt, idque ei perpetua oratione contigit, non modo ut acclamatione, sed ut convicio et maledictis impediretur. Qui ut peroravit--nam in eo sane fortis fuit: non est deterritus; dixit omnia, atque interdum etiam silentio, cum auctoritate peregerat--sed ut peroravit, sarrexit Clodius. Ei tantus clamor a nostris (placuerat enim referre gratiam) ut neque mente nec lingua neque ore consisteret. Ea res acta est, cum hora sexta vix Pompeius perorasset, usque ad horam Vlll, cum omnia maledicta, versus denique obscenissimi in

Clodium et Clodiam dicerentur. Ille furens et exsanguis interrogabat suos in clamore ipso quis esset qui plebem fame necaret. Respondebant operæ: 'Pompeius.' Quis Alexandream ire cuperet. Respondebant: 'Pompeius.' Quem ire vellent. Respondebant: 'Crassum.' Is aderat tum Miloni animo non amico. Hora fere nona quasi signo dato Clodiani nostros consputare coeperunt. Exarsit dolor. Vrgere illi ut loco nos moverent. Factus est a nostris impetus; fuga operarum; eiectus de rostris Clodius, ac nos quoque tum fugimus, ne quid in turba. Senatus vocatus in curiam. Pompe^Fpius domum. Neque ego tamen in senatum, ne aut de tantis rebus tacerem aut in Pompeio defendendo (nam is carpebatur a Bibulo, Curione, Favonio, Servilio filio) animos honorum virorum offenderem..Res in posterum dilata est. Clodius in Quirinalia prodixit diem."(1)

The aristocracy gave up the unequal struggle in disgust. Before them, they could see nothing but anarchy. They felt that the fabric of the State and of the individual Roman was disintegrating and degenerating. The clouds, they saw, were gathering thick over the tottering Republic.

Lucretius as one of the "optimates" must have joined in with Cicero's weary sigh, "Nos hic in re publica infirma misera commutabilique versamur".(1) The ablest men among them regarded the political life with a jaundiced eye. They 'despaired of the Republic'. Their attitude is exemplified by the acts of men like Sulla, who at the height of his power suddenly abdicated his dictatorship, Lucullus who deserted his legions for his library and garden, Atticus, friend of Cicero, who held completely aloof from the public life of his time.(2) The younger nobles did not for the most part make any attempt to enter into the life of the Forum but turned to the ways of ease and pleasure, "energetic only in the pursuit of their own interest, pleasure-loving, luxurious, trifling, they played at hazard, delicately perfumed, and surrounded by their mistresses". (3)

Accompanying the political decay we find no less a marked breakdown of the national character. The sudden influx of wealth following the conquest or annexation of new provinces gave rise to a class of Romans with the leisure and the means to gratify their whims and frivolities. Perhaps in this

economic cause one may find the source of all Rome's troubles in the century preceding the Christian era. Economic disturbance in a nation so very often leads to loss of political equilibrium, and from the latter can result the moral decay of a people. To return, the sumptuary laws were of no avail against a senseless extravagance of table and dress.(1) Lucretius contrasts the nightly banquets in houses gleaming with silver and gold, with the calm pleasures to be derived from moderation and good health.(2) Sallust, in his description of the state of Rome in the years leading up to the conspiracy of Catiline gives us a vivid picture of society:

"Igitur ex divitiis iuventutem luxuria
atque avaritia cum superbia invasere:
rapere consumere, sua parvi pendere,
aliena cupere,...nihil pensi neque
moderati habere...vescendi causa terra
marique omnia exquirere...omnia luxu
antecapere, haec iuventutem, ubi fam-
iliares opes defecerant, ad facinora
incendebant:" (3)

It is hardly to be wondered at, if a young

man of the time, in the midst of this general crash of political and moral institutions should begin to doubt the existence of the Gods, or allowing them to exist, whether they made any distinction between the good and the bad. The doctrine of Epicurus that tucked the Gods away in some far off interspace of the world and proclaimed them to be indifferent to, and to have no effect upon man here below, and that offered a haven from the restless fever of politics gained many converts at this time among the younger and wealthy class of Romans. Among these Roman Epicureans, we find one who claims he has found this so desired peace and is ardent with eagerness to preach the philosophy which has given it to him. One who seems to have gone his way almost unnoticed by his contemporaries, and who even to-day remains a person of mystery.

The poet Titus Lucretius Carus was born about the year 98 B.C. and died in the year 55 B.C. These two facts seem fairly well established, but no more. The rest is conjecture. Unfortunately his personal history is a sealed book to us. Unfortunately, for it would furnish us with the answers to the many questions we should like to ask. What

experience caused him to break so utterly with the orthodoxy of his day? What mental disturbance is there behind that rushing torrent of words, that nervous strained atmosphere ~~immanent~~ in the poem? What event brought the poem to its abrupt end? To all these questions no certain answer comes to us over the long span of years. Peculiar too. The age is well known to us by the evidence of his contemporaries, yet Lucretius lives, works and dies in their midst, and no one of them mentions his name, except the orator who does so once. At a later date St. Jerome states that the poet was driven mad by a love-philtre, that in the intervals of insanity he composed his poem, which Cicero afterwards corrected, and that he perished by his own hand in the forty-fourth year of his life.(1) Jerome, however, gives no contemporary authority, and his statement, coming 500 years after the event must go for what it is worth. Though the poet keeps every fact about himself excluded from his poem, we may nevertheless find in it some traces of his personality. He does not speak as one who has always lived a sober and settled Epicurean, but rather as one who has ex-

perienced the vanities of life, and now has an after taste of bitterness in his mouth. We may guess that his life was spent in some such fashion as this: as a youth living the life of the average young noble, with its ambitions, luxuries and extravagances, then a later period of violent reaction.(1)

At this time he probably came into contact with the doctrine of Epicurus. Whether the precepts of this doctrine ~~of~~ some great disillusionment is the cause of his retirement from his fellow-men we do not, and cannot, know. He seems never to have purged himself entirely of this bitterness of spirit. He must have been, a man, aloof and lonely, but he does not proclaim this aloofness and loneliness of his, though ^{to} those who can hear the sadness of it cries aloud in his poem!(2) We may here state with a fair amount of certainty some general conclusions as to the man's outlook on, and opinions of, his time, opinions into which we will later go in greater detail. He was not indifferent to the civil strife of his generation, and not altogether free from that pessimism and despair of the Republic which is apparent in his contem-

poraries.(1) His bitter attack on the folly of lovers, and his numerous references to the immorality and luxury of Roman society make it probable that he was not unacquainted with the society whose vices he attacks. He also appears to have been affected by the "lugubres images de ^{la} ~~la~~ religion païenne"(2) and to have experienced, in his pre-Epicurean days at least, some of that fear which the current superstition and mysticism instilled into men's minds, for though he may have freed himself from the embrace of Superstition yet fragments of her claws remained buried deep, ever and anon to cause a pang.(3) There is another more apparent and more striking characteristic of the poet's temperament, a moral malady variously called 'Taedium Vitae', 'Ennui', 'Weltschmerz'. Whatever be its name, it manifests itself in a deep-seated depression of the spirit. A disgust for the world followed by a disgust for self, resulting in an aimless, nervous, restlessness. It is a vivid picture he gives us of the Roman who:

"ut nunc plerumque videmus
quid sibi quisque velit nescire et quaerere semper

commutare locum quasi onus deponere possit.
exit saepe foras magnis ex aedibus ille,
esse domi quem pertaes umst, subitoque (revertit),
quippe foris nilo melius qui sentiat esse.
Currit agens mannos ad villam praecipitanter,
auxilium tectis quasi ferre ardentibus instans;
oscitat extemplo, tetigit cum limina villae,
aut abit in somnum gravis atque oblivia quaerit,
aut etiam properans urbem petit atque revisit.
hoc se quisque modo fugit, at quem scilicet, ut fit,
effugere haud potis est, ingratis haeret et odit
propterea, morbi quia causam non tenet aeger;"(1)

Not that, as far as Lucretius, in our opinion, is concerned, the fact that he caught hold of the system of Epicurus proves a disgust for the world. His own unsettled temperament would rather have been a source of such 'malaise'. It is interesting to note that Lucretius is one of the first Romans to give evidence of this mental malady, that as Imperial Rome decayed, manifested itself more and more, as indeed, it manifests itself in most tired civilizations. "Lucretius in the last days of the Republic has discovered its deep significance for human nature."⁽²⁾

Conditions were favourable in his day for its development. Political and public life being well-nigh closed to these Romans, there results an enforced leisure for minds which normally active in the affairs of state, must now turn in on themselves in useless and melancholy brooding, to experience what Mr. Fowler terms "the sense of weariness almost of sin that comes from neglected duty." (1)

Horace some years later notes the same phenomenon:

mutant
"caelum non animum ~~mutant~~ qui trans mare currunt.
strenua nos exercet inertia: navibus atque
quadrigis petimus bene vivere." (2)

The two men, however, differ in the remedies they propose. Horace urges us to live for and to enjoy the moment. Lucretius, says:

"temporis aeterni quoniam, non unius horae,
ambigitur status," (3)

and that being so man must leave all else and turn to the study of eternal nature. Now, if by the study of nature Lucretius meant the study of, and the attempt to increase, human knowledge, then, he struck the right answer and remedy for such a disease.

Mr. Sellar sees in the poem unmistakable evidence of this 'taedium vitae' which, in combination with excessive nervous strain might have compelled the poet to suicide.(1) Certainly the philosophy that Lucretius turns to is in itself not one well conducive to a cheerful frame of mind. It is one of the Epicurean tenets that all organisms must decay, and that the world being an organism must also suffer its inevitable end.(2) To the gloomy imagination of the poet this end is not far away, and he notes with apprehension how Italy is growing increasingly barren:

"iamque caput quassans grandis suspirat arator
crebrius, incassum magnos cecidisse labores,
et cum tempora temporibus praesentia confert
praeteritis, laudat fortunas saepe parentis.
tristis item vetulae vitis sator atque (vietae)
temporis incusat momen caelumque fatigat,
et crepat, antiquum genus ut pietate repletum
perfacile angustis tolerarit finibus aevum,
cum minor esset agri multo modus ante viritim.
nec tenet omnia paulatim tabescere et ire
ad scepulum spatio aetatis defessa vetusto."(3)

We have before mentioned the disastrous effect of the long years of war, civil and foreign, upon the agriculture of Italy and upon the yeomen class.(1) For the most part the small-farmer class had ceased to exist. Large estates owned mainly by absentee landlords and worked by slave gangs formed the new agricultural units. Lucretius notes the effects accurately enough but fails to see the true causes. To return, it is possible to imagine the poet taking his own life in the hope of attaining to peace and quiet at last. It is possible to imagine it, but not quite probable. Lucullus is said to have gone out of his mind, and died due to the effect of a love-philtre administered by one of his slaves.(2) Sulla is reputed to have died from a foul disease.(3) It seems, therefore, to have been the correct thing for the Roman mob to attach fearful legends to the names of those who dared to retire from their sight. Lucretius ~~was not~~ Sulla and Lucullus are reputed to have met unhappy ends. Two of them, Lucretius and Lucullus were rumoured mad.

In the politics of the period leading up to the downfall of the Republic and to the ult-

imate domination by Caesar, Lucretius took no part but was nevertheless a deeply anxious and watchful observer.(1) He must have noted Caesar's relentless march to power from its beginning; the formation of the first Triumvirate in 60 B.C.; the election to the consulship in the following year; the brilliant pro-consulship in Gaul; the renewal of the Triumvirate in 56 B.C. As Cicero did, he also must have appreciated the irresistible power of the regents, of the men who in their hands held the state as a mere toy, who formed the centre of all other men's hopes and fears:

"de re publica nihil habeo ad te scribere, nisi

summum odium omnium hominum in eos qui tenent omnia."

says Cicero, writing to Atticus in the year 59 B.C.(2)

As one of the optimates Lucretius must have viewed Caesar with hatred and dismay, as a man of evil ambition bent only on the destruction of the republic to satisfy his own lust for power. Had he lived he would doubtless have joined with Cicero in the latter's glad congratulations to one of the murderers of Caesar: "Tibi gratulor, mihi gaudeo, to amo, tua tueor."(3) There is hardly any doubt but that Luc-

retius was one of the conservative party. The man to whom he addresses himself throughout, Memmius was one of the 'die-hard' Tories.(1) The 'gens Lucretia' was moreover one of the most ancient and noble in Rome.

Having regard to the above facts, we may find the task of interpreting many passages in the poem to be much simplified. It is sweet, he says, from the ~~serenex~~ towers of philosophy to watch others

"certare ingenio, contendere nobilitate,
noctes atque dies niti praestante labore
ad summas emergere opes rerumque potiri."

not knowing that all that nature requires is freedom from pain care and fear. Neither wealth nor power avail to furnish us this freedom~~ne~~ of body and mind; "unless perhaps you find relief when:"

"tuas legiones per loca campi
fervere cum videas belli simulacra cientis,
subsidiis magnis epicuri constabilitas,
ornatas armis vastuas pariterque animatas,
fervere cum videas classem lateque vagari,
his tibi tum rebus timefactae religiones

effugiunt animo pavidae;"

but no, these things are food for laughter, and;

"re veraque metus hominum curaeque seguaces
nec metuunt sonitus armorum nec fera tela
audacterque inter reges rerumque potentis
versantur neque fulgorem reverentur ab auro
nec clarum vestis splendorem ~~xxx~~ purpureai."(1)

In the above passage his contemporaries could not fail to see a reference to the Regents; nor again when he later speaks of co-partners in crime compelled by ambition to transcend the bounds of law;(2) nor again when he warns them that:

"circumretit enim vis atque iniuria quemque
atque, unde exortast, ad eum plerumque revertit,
nec facilest placidam ac pacatam degere vitam
qui violat factis communia foedera pacis."(3)

There is only one politician of his time whom he mentions by name and that is the man to whom the poem is dedicated, Gaius Memmius Gemellus.(4) Memmius, of a noble and conservative family had been very active in politics on the side of the 'optimates'. He had been praetor in 58 B.C., and in the following year had gone out to Bithynia as

pro-praetor.(1) Later he had allied himself [^]the popular party, and supported by Caesar was a candidate for the consulship for the year 54 B.C.(2) Lucretius must have considered that Memmius was allying himself with men of utterly abandoned scruples, of boundless and reckless ambition. He never comes out with it directly, but surely he must have intended Memmius to take heed of the fate of the over-ambitious and to refrain from a similar way of life. However the chances are that Memmius never read the poem at all, or if he did, not thoroughly enough to derive benefit from the admonitions therein. Indeed he apparently professed great contempt for the Epicurean sect, as we may gather from a letter written to him by Cicero.(3) Memmius at this time is living in exile at Athens, and is preparing to pull down the ruins of the house which had belonged to Epicurus in order to erect a residence of his own on the same site. The Epicureans apply to Cicero, through Atticus, to intercede with Memmius on their behalf, and Cicero does so in this letter. The result is not known. In all probability the house was pulled down. Memmius appeared to have been a

surly fellow of the sort that opposition only annoys the more and makes more obstinate; add to this the fact that the disgraceful circumstances under which he left Rome were not calculated to increase the geniality of his disposition.

Whether or not Lucretius was familiar with, or a friend of, any other prominent man of his day we do not know for certain. Probably he knew the Ciceros, Atticus, Catullus, and other conservatives and Epicureans at Rome. If friendship did exist between the poet and any one of these men its basis was certainly not one of similarity of temperament, but rather of common political and philosophic opinions. One cannot help wondering what the relations were, if any, between the man who has given his name to the age, and the poet, his almost unknown contemporary. St. Jerome states that the poet wrote six books: "Quos postea Cicero emendavit;"(1) and Cicero writes to his brother Quintus; "Lucreti poemata, ut scribis, ita sunt: multis luminibus ingeni, multae tamen artis;"(2) and there we have the source of apparently endless discussion and controversy. Did Cicero really edit the poem? Which

Cicero, Marcus or Quintus? Did Lucretius regard Cicero as one of his technical masters? Was Cicero in any way influenced by the Epicurean philosophy as set forth by the poet? The more generally accepted opinion seems to be that Marcus did edit the poem, or at least criticised it to the poet, and that Lucretius was greatly influenced by an earlier hexameter work of the orator, a Latin version of the 'Phaenomena' of Aratus, indeed that Lucretius "looked upon this translation as one of his poetical models." (1) Moreover, it is asserted, Lucretius knew that Cicero was friendly with many of the leading Epicureans (2) and would no doubt avail himself of the opportunity to have the orator criticise and advise him. On the other hand Cicero is regarded as having been influenced by Lucretius' precepts as many passages in his philosophical writings show. (3) But why, the question is asked is the orator so silent when he has so many opportunities for direct reference to Lucretius? "Ce silence n'aurait-il pas été commandé par certaines bienséances morales ou politiques? Ou bien faut-

il penser que Cicéron connaissait peu le Poème de la Nature?"(1) M. Martha is inclined to accept the first and more flattering view, namely, that certain official necessities brought about this silence. No less strong is Mr. W.A. Merrill in support of the alternative view.(2) For one thing, on the technical side, that "Lucretius studied and imitated the youthful Cicero's poetry is fundamentally improbable...additional evidence is necessary to prove that Lucretius regarded Cicero as his master and model", and for the contrariwise influence "we should infer Lucretius' poem as a source only when other sources are improbable... The two men had little in common in character, in literary sympathy, or in valuation of life. I doubt very much whether Cicero ever read the poem." Mr. Merrill then goes on to support his case with a detailed study of all Cicero's philosophical works. His argument is a strong one and seems to be conclusive. One would like to think, however, that Mr. Merrill is not altogether correct. The statesman was one to whom nothing human was alien. Surely his sympathies were broad enough to overcome mere differences of

opinion, his spirit generous enough to recognise the intellectual capabilities of another. Both had a common contempt for religious forms and conceptions. Cicero merely sees the ~~case~~ use of the State-religion as a support for the Republic, and so is not outspoken in his attack on it.(1) Both men stand out from their contemporaries, in their breadth of vision, in their love of learning.

Lucretius stands in striking contrast against the current literary background. As in politics he is a nationalist and conservative, so too in the battle of the books, he takes his stand beside the ancients. Since the fall of Carthage, Rome had been in constant communication with Alexandria, the capital of the Greek world. For some time subsequent to its foundation by Alexander the light of learning shone there with a great flame. We see there Euclid, Eratosthenes and Archimedes, Presently wisdom passes away from Alexandria and leaves pedantry behind. Its literature betrays a resultant taste for erudition, and we may note a conscious search for originality and a desire for

the miniature. There arises the 'doctus poeta' typified by ^{men} such as Philetas of Cos, Callimachus of Cyrene, Euphorion of Chalcis--Cicero sums up the Alexandrian poets of his day as "Cantores Euphorionis"(1)--, and much later, Pharthenius of Nicea.(2) The ~~he~~earlier Latin writers had not, however, accepted these Alexandrians as their literary models, but had turned to the older and more original Greeks. It is in the Caesarian and Augustan ages that this Alexandrian literature obtains its great popularity in Rome. Catullus, his friend Cl^la~~l~~vus, and later Gallus, Propertius(3) and Ovid, all succumb to its influence. As is only to be expected the national party set itself to oppose the rising current. To Philetas, Callimachus and Euphorion they oppose Plautus, Ennius, and Pacuvius. If it was written in the sixth century it was good. That century was "the Golden Age which had now unhappily passed ~~away~~ beyond recall."(4) Among the reactionaries we find Marcus Terentius Varro, fixing his gaze upon the past and in action and speech protesting against the innovations of his day. He has never even heard of Alexandria.

In poetry the great 'Laudator temporis acti' is Lucretius. For his models he goes back to a freer and ruder day, among Romans, to Ennius, among the Greeks to Empedocles. For the latter Lucretius has nothing but admiration, "Sicily" he says:

"nil tamen hoc habuisse viro praeclarius in se
nec sanctum magis et mirum carumque videtur.
carmina quin etiam divini pectoris eius
vociferantur et exponunt praeclara reperta,
ut vix humana videatur stirpe creatus."(1)

To Ennius he pays homage in his poem when he states that his work is merely a continuation of the older poet's:

"Ennius ut noster cecinit qui primus amoeno
detulit ex Helicone perenni fronde coronam,
per gentis Italas hominum quae clara clueret,"(2)

The alliteration in the last line is an example of one of the many tricks of diction of which Lucretius avails himself in order to emphasize the archaic tone of his poem. His poetic ornaments are those of the older writers, archaisms alliterations and assonances.(3) All evidences of

his firm intention to give way not a whit to the foibles of his time. The very form of his verse differs from that of his contemporaries.(1)

There is typified in his hexameters the old Roman, his 'gravitas' his main concern walking with stately and majestic tread, unheeding of the crowd that babbles around him. Philosophically he is also a descendant of Ennius who long before had attacked popular superstition and had denied Divine Providence in these words:

"Ego daum genus esse semper dixi et dicam caelitem,
sed eos non curare opinor quid agat humanum genus;
Nam si curent, bene bonis sit, male malis,
quod nunc abest."(2)

It has been observed that the martial imagery of Lucretius is taken from the old war-fare of the Punic war days not from that of his own time.(3) He speaks of elephants; of Scipio and Hannibal as if they were the heroes most present to his mind:⁽⁴⁾

"summa etiam cum vis violenti per mare venti
induperatorem classis super aequora verrit
cum validis pariter legionibus atque elephantis"

and again:

"ut nunc saepe boves lucas ferro male mactae
diffugiunt, fera facta suis cum multa dedere."

or when he sets the example to the man fearing death:

"Scipiadas, belli fulmen, Carthaginis horror,
ossa dedit terrae proinde ac famul infimus esset"

It is "the whole poetic pride and earnestness of the sixth century." (1) Thus he stands, as he seems to have stood in everything altogether aloof from the fashionable literature of his day. One would suppose that for this, if for no other reason, Cicero, an admirer of Ennius and professing great contempt for the newer poetry would have testified to his respect for Lucretius, but he nowhere has done so. Indeed we can only guess at the influence of the poem on the literary contemporaries and successors of Lucretius. The reaction in favour of the older literature never succeeded. Virgil, Horace, and Ovid do not entirely follow his models or his standards. Lucretius is seldom mentioned, and one finds it rather difficult to assign to him any very great influence in the realm of literary thought and expression. Catullus probably

read the poem a short time before his own death.(1) Virgil, though he never mentions his name does show traces everywhere of profound study of, and ~~admiration~~ admiration for the Lucretian poem. This influence is most noticeable and his admiration most outspoken in his early works the 'Eclogues' and the 'Georgies'.(2) Horace imitates Lucretius in many passages of the Satires and Epistles,(3) but outside of these works there is neither Lucretian nor Epicurean influence marked.(4) Virgil and ~~Horace~~ Horace then, are the only two who show in form or expression any noticeable Lucretian influence, though one might add that to have influenced these two is to have set one's mark upon the most of Roman literature which follows.

There is one thing though that is certain and that is, from out of a nation which found little to attract it in disinterested scientific study, Lucretius stands in high relief. The Romans of the day were far behind their Greek predecessors in this respect. There was a thin stream of learning, let Cicero and Lucretius witness, But compare the ascendant periods of Roman empire ^{up} ~~with~~

Periclean Greece. The curiosity of the Greeks is lacking at Rome. The Romans conquer vast provinces, far off lands, but no geographer, no economist appears at Rome, there is no desire to know more of other countries. Their tributes and their rare foods are enough. To their Greek slaves they leave medicine. Physical and chemical sciences do not attract them. Lucretius' scatters the seed, but it falls on the stony ground of Roman indifference and bears little fruit. "The true figure for the classical Roman attitude to Science is not Lucretius, but that Roman soldier who hacked Archimedes to death at the storming of Syracuse." (1) The very terms of science are lacking here Lucretius points out and the novelty of the questions makes it hard for him to make clear "the dark discoveries of the Greeks":

"Nec me animi fallit Graiorum obscura reperta
difficile inlustrare Latinis versibus esse,
multa novis verbis praesertim cum sit agendum
propter egestatem linguae et rerum novitatem;" (2)

and again:

"nec me animi fallit quam res nova miraque menti

accidat exitium caeli terraeque futurum,
et quam difficile id mihi sit pervincere dictis;
ut fit ubi insolitam rem apportes auribus ante."(1)

The religious Roman mind moreover regarded any investigation into the nature of the gods and of the sources of the natural phenomena as an act of impiety. He is afraid that Memmius will fear lest he be viewed as one who strays from the straight and narrow:

"Illud in his rebus vereor, ne forte rearis
impia te rationis inire elementa vianque
indugredi sceleris."(2)

Or lest held under the yoke of religion, he believe:

"terras et solem et caelum, mare sidera lunam,
corpore divino debere aeterna manere,
proptereaue putes ritu par esse Gigantum
pendere eos poenas immani pro scelere omnis
qui ratione sua disturbent moenia mundi
praeclarumque velint caeli restinguere solem
immortalia mortali sermone notantes;"(3)

The Muses grant him new chaplets, he says because:

"avia pieridum peragro loca nullius ante

trita solo. iuvat integros accedere fontis
atque haurire, invatque novos decerpere flores
insignemque meo capiti petere inde coronam
unde prius nulli velarint tempora musae;"(1)

(Though it is not quite true to say that
the Romans were entirely in the dark on matters
philosophical.) The poem as a matter of fact ap-
peared at a most opportune time. Earlier, it
would not have been understood by the still un-
cultured upper-class Romans, later after Cicero's
time, when philosophy and the turns of philosoph-
ical science had become more wide-spread, it would
have lacked novelty and prestige.(2) To Lucretius,
the Epicurean science is the scientific truth of
his day, and it is as the truth that he sets it
forth. Some of the theories he propounds are good,
others are most absurd, but to the Roman of his
time, this was the kernel of his poem, namely, that
it is absolutely decreed what each thing can and
what each thing cannot do, according to the con-
ditions of nature. For the 'qualitates occultae'
of things, he offers the certitude of the 'foedera
naturae'. He is repugnant to any belief in an ex-
t

ternal and divine Creator of the world. Such a belief is all sheer folly. Rather bitterly, he says, the Gods had nothing to gain unless perhaps:

"gratia nostra queat largiri emolumentum

ut nostra quicquam causa genere aggrediantur"(1)

He rejects the teleological view of physiology completely. Nothing is made for the use of man. Any one who denies this, puts effect for cause he says, with 'preposterous reasoning', for:

"nil ideo quoniam natumst in corpore ut uti

possemus, sed quod natumst id procreat usum."(2)

--The fact that the Stoics maintained the contrary view makes Lucretius speak with an added vigour which perhaps clouds his usually keen vision for the moment, and makes his rejection of it somewhat premature-- ^{he continues} No, the world is Atomic, formed by the atoms in their endless combinations and connections. The scientific mind of his day apparently accepted a belief in the existence of such things as atoms as 'Ipso facto' proving the world is not divinely created.(3)

These atoms swerve:

"incerto tempore ferme
incertisque locis spatio depellere paulum,"(1)
and so, man, is given Free-will:

"sed ne mens ipsa necessum
intestinum habeat cunctis in rebus agendis
et devicta quasi cogatur ferre patique,
id facit exiguum clinamen principiorum
nec regione loci certa nec tempore certo."(2)

Here he is combating the Stoic view in a controversy that raged even in his day, that of Free-will as opposed to Necessity. The aim of his inquiry, he keeps reminding us, is not purely scientific but simply to drive fears and superstitions away. He must uproot the miraculous wherever he finds it or wherever there is a possibility of its raising its head. So in the ~~sixth~~ book he sets out to explain away all the senseless fears which beset men who believe that purely natural phenomena, thunderbolts, tempests, lightnings and earthquakes, are portents of divine wrath. The Atomic theory is his weapon against the evils of the Roman national religion, and whatever be the merits of his science for us to-day it must have had power with thought-

ful man of his own day to destroy their belief in the old polytheistic creed destined soon to pass away. His poem in effect is the beginning and end of a period of thought. It resumes all the non-Aristotelian, non-teleological, non-supernatural ideas down to his day. After him Semitic, and Christian belief and philosophy begin to take over and mingle with Greek ideas.(1)

When Lucretius wrote any real belief in that national religion was, among the upper classes well nigh extinct. To those for whom ~~xxx~~ a moral conviction was a necessity, such support was furnished by one or other of the Greek schools of philosophy. They could reasonably expect to find there some sort of explanation for the problems which troubled them. Hence it became usual for a Roman to attach himself to some sect, the tenets of which best-suited his own prejudices or comprehension. There were three philosophical opinions calculated to attract the Roman mind; firstly, that of the Stoa, that virtue is the only good; that there is an "animus mundi" the Gods being its various

manifestations--"as He is in everything so any name will suit Him"--; that the soul has a personal immortality, and that there is a divine government of the world; secondly, that of Epicurus, that the world is formed out of the combination of atoms and that matter is the first principle; that the Gods if they exist at all are powerless; that the soul dies with the body; that pleasure is the end of man on earth: thirdly, and briefly, that of the Academy, that nothing can be known.

Stoicism from the first had been the most popular, as being the most congenial to the Roman character, perhaps due to the fact that Stoicism like Christianity is more a Semitic religion than a Greek philosophy, and so with a greater tendency towards abstract ideas of religion and morality rather than of science and art. More than any of the other philosophies, Stoicism identified itself with the national religion,--the "supernatural stoic, and the allegoric Roman, theology coincided on the whole in their result."(1)

The Epicurean Gods it must be remembered were useless for state and political purposes, having no share nor interest in the government of men.(1) Moreover Stoicism found a strong ally in Roman law. The stoic conception of a great world law or 'Lex naturae' served very nicely as a base for the Roman idea of a 'jus gentium' and thus worked its way into the Praetor's Edict. It is noticeable that not one of the long line of illustrious Roman jurists is found in the Epicurean camp. The leaders of Roman Stoicism evidently knew what their Epicurean contemporaries did not, namely, that to attract the popular mind, it is necessary to concede many a point ~~at~~ to the popular religion and to insinuate its way into that latter, rather than to attempt to overthrow it.(2) A Stoic was eventually ~~to~~ sit on the throne of the Caesars, but in the time of Lucretius the popularity of the system was temporarily on the wane. Many a thinking Roman is not finding it entirely satisfactory as mental food. Cynic and Epicurean join forces to attack it.(3) Lucretius himself takes part in the assault as many passages in the poem give evidence;(4)

whenever, in fact, he refers vaguely to opponents he nearly always is thinking of the Stoics. At this time the system of Epicurus obtained greater repute in Rome. Before the time of Cicero we find no outstanding Roman accepting this doctrine. Amfinius is said to have been the first to write in Latin on the theories of Epicurus.(1) The multitude, says Cicero, hurried to his precepts finding them easy to understand and according well with their own nature, and soon 'Italiam totam occupaverunt'; — though Lucretius seems to disagree with that

"haec ratio plerumque videtur
tristior esse quibus non est tractata, retroque
vulgus abhorret ab hac."(2)—

Cicero is of course including under the heading of Epicurean any one who made ~~xx~~ a profession of pleasure. At any rate the idea of pleasure was easily enough understood, and many a Roman aristocrat took it over unto himself, But the doctrine did not remain unchanged at the hands of these Roman Epicureans; most of whom "ended by having a theory of Epicureanism which corresponded to their habits."(3) A few of them allowed themselves ^{selves} ~~themselves~~ to

become more austere, ostensibly at any rate, in their way of life, but in the main, we may notice it used as an excuse for avoidance of work and duty, or else for a coarse search for sensual pleasure. We have before seen how Sulla and Lucullus abandoned the State. One need no more than mention the names of Piso, and of Verres, as examples of what could happen to the quiet, austere, true Epicurism. Atticus is generally held up as the model of the right Epicurean though one again suspects that he does nothing but use that philosophy as his justification or excuse for avoidance of public duties. He may have lived the most frugal existence at home, but we know that he was intensely busy gathering wealth by all sorts of means, a noticeable one being that of training and leasing bands of gladiators for the public shows.(1)

Among these Epicureans, good bad and all indifferent it is only Lucretius who manifests a warm and great regard for the founder of the school. It is not so much the idea of pleasure as the 'summum bonum'--though he does refer to it as 'dux vitae dia voluptas'--(2)but rather the prospect of the

happy life that may be lived with heart and mind free from care.(1) Again, in contrast to Epicurus "l'irreligion si discrète du maître" breaks out in full and angry force in the Lucretian poem.(2) His aim is to rid men of superstition and fear of the Gods; therefore it is that the Stoic philosophy, with its reconciliation of its own view of Divine Providence with the national theology and superstition, its semi-mystic pantheism, must have been utterly distasteful to him. The two postulates, Atoms and Void, are sufficient, he believes, to account for all phenomena. For these reasons, he accepts the Epicurean doctrine. It is ~~not~~ a philosophy "paralysing to the highest human hope and energy" but "it is to be remembered that he lived at a time when the truest mind may well have despaired of the Divine government of the World."(3)

Lucretius must have had great influence in the propagation of the system among men of the more thoughtful sort. It is noticeable that many literary men began their careers as disciples of the Lucretian theory. Horace certainly did,(4) though he states that he was converted from that

doctrine by a thunder clap in a clear sky.(1)

Horace at best was a free-lance, to be classified as belonging to one or other of the schools was a thing to which he took objection.(2) Apparently he never took Epicureanism very seriously.(3)

There is ~~one~~ however who seems deeply impressed by both Epicureanism and its prophet Lucretius. ~~Virgil~~ Virgil was studying philosophy at Rome about the year 53 B.C. under Siron the Epicurean. The ~~poem~~ poem 'on nature' recently published, must have added zest to his study, for he states his preference for that philosophy in a short poem:

"nos ad beatos vela mittimus portus
magni petentes docta dicti Sironis
vitamque ab omnia vindicabimus cura".(4)

His first acquaintance with Lucretius must have been a pleasing and a lasting one for the traces remain on his mind and are reflected in his work as long as he lived.(5) The traces only, for Virgil feels that he must leave the philosophy which Lucretius preaches, though with great regret. Like Lucretius he too had seen and even experienced the ills of

the last two or three decades, but unlike Lucretius, he feels, or is prevailed upon to feel, that the Lucretian cure is not the proper one for the Roman ^{maladies} ~~ills~~. As Augustus does, he also, recognises that the surest method of restoring the Roman power and greatness, is to revive in the Roman heart and in the Roman mind a sense of affection for the Roman customs and institutions, and a respect for, and sense of duty to the State. Unlike Lucretius he remembers that there was strength and beauty in the old Roman faith before it grew grey and ugly at the touch and breath of superstition and formalism.

The Greek philosophies then, first assailed the position and ~~not~~ ultimately served in the stead of the Roman religion. From the first the State realizing the necessity of a strong national faith to aid its workings fought the invaders grimly, and indeed in the year 161 B.C. the Greek philosophers and rhetoricians were dismissed from Rome.(1) As the Hellenic culture opened wider horizons to the Roman mind, as the capacity for speculative thought increased, it was only natural that philosophy should overcome the initial resistance shown to it.

Soon indeed it replaced the old faith among the men of the higher ranks. By this time it is safe to say that no one of them believed in the slightest in the State religion, and if they did retain the outward forms of observance, it was merely for political convenience, for such occasions as the announcement of a coming thunderstorm to disperse the 'comitia' until another and more **auspicious** time--for them. With the setting up of the Empire, and in the attempt to bolster his new-found throne with the aid of a **strong** conservative tradition, Augustus attempted to restore the old faith along with the old manners. He enlisted on his side the poets and other literary men. To some extent he succeeded in restoring the old ritual but the old faith was gone, never to return to Rome.

It was bound to be so. In his day there was nothing simple or appealing in the old Roman popular religion once theology and superstition had had their will with it. It ~~was~~ now a dark and ugly thing and as such had necessarily to retreat before the advancing enlightenment. Bearing the state of the Roman religion in mind we are enabled to judge

with more fairness the work of Lucretius, and we are enabled to see the legitimate basis for his attack on it. We might note at this point that what Lucretius called 'religio' as a whole, Mr. Fowler points out is divided by Cicero and Varro into 'religio' and 'superstitio'.(1) To Lucretius his fellow-Romans tremble at the frown of a religion which looks down on them from above. With the message that his master, Epicurus, brought back from the great immensity he will dissipate that fear of death and of the Gods which masquerades, so he believes, under the name of Religion.

From the cradle to the grave, the Roman was followed and haunted by hundreds of divinities, all apparently most precise and exacting, for they saw to it that any slip in a sacrifice, or in a performance of the 'sacra' due to them involved its appropriate penalty. Nor was that all, the poor wretch, living in fear of their capricious wills all his life was after his death, a hostage to these divinities, to suffer punishment should any of his descendants be careless in their performance

of the prescribed rights. The Roman religion allowed a belief in a post-mortem existence of the soul, and like all religions that allow a belief in *a personal immortality, it did not discourage a belief in* a series of agonies and tortures in that other world for those who had been remiss in this.(1)

Just two years after the birth of Lucretius, the practice of offering human sacrifice to the Gods was the subject of a 'senatusconsultum': "ne homo immolaretur".(2) The vividness of the passage describing the sacrifice of Iphigenia at Aulis testifies that he had often heard that such a thing was one of the many "scelerosa atque impia facta" of which religion is capable.(3) Add to these the fact that the long years of civil war accused the indifference of the Gods to the weal of man. What love or reverence could there be in their hearts for Gods who remained callous to the "lust of blood, that makes a scheming slaughter house of Rome." There could be only one answer to such indifference and that was an equal incredulity in the existence and powers of such deities. They are the object of the scorn of Lucretius, Ovid tells most scandalous tales of them. The bolts of the Gods are laughed at.(4)

It is more correct, however, to say that unfortunately this disbelief in the Gods and in the fear of this future vengeance was not altogether common or sincere. The men of culture, the writers and political leaders had little respect or use for the Gods. A careless ^gnosticism prevailed; though many a sceptic at that often turn^{ed} tail in adversity as Lucretius knew well:

"et nigras mactant pecudes et manibu divis
inferias mittunt multoque in rebus acerbis
acrius advertunt animos ad religionem."(1)

We wonder if Lucretius is not mistaking the merely conventional observance of religious rights, practiced by most Romans for appearances' sake, for a sudden revival of religion in the individual.

Even among Epicureans, there seems to have been a tradition of conformity, and that it was "alive in Lucretius'time is clear from Philodemus' treatise" though "it can hardly be supposed that Lucretius similarly observed the festivals at Rome."(2)

Lucretius at any rate thought he had a large enough audience, and we can quite believe that the ordinary man of the street still had a very wholesome

^{fr}
respect of the divine powers, though their influence for good was nil.

Once religion had been handed over to the State authorities, it became a matter of rigid and formal procedure in which the ordinary Roman could take little part or interest. When peril and danger beset the State, he turned to strange ~~new~~ Gods for aid. To the native lore, the Oriental mysticism "introduced not only unbelief but also superstition in its most offensive and dangerous form to Italy." (1) The Phrygian worship of the Magna Mater gained an official standing in Rome in 205 B.C. There was an awe-inspiring attraction in the cult and it gained many devotees. Catullus and Lucretius (2) evidence the importance of it at Rome by the long passages both give to it. From Persia came the worship of the sun-god Mithra, said to have been brought to Italy by the pirates. Egypt sent over its "wearisome and mystical host of grotesque divinities." (3) In 58 B.C., when Lucretius was writing his poem, they were with difficulty repelled from that Holy of Holies, the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, and forced to retire to the suburbs. (4) No amount of

official suppression, however, was to drive these Oriental religions entirely from Rome. Indeed they attracted to themselves more and more adherents, especially among the lower classes. They could do what the Roman religion was by this time incapable of doing; "ils satisfaisaient d'avantage premierement les sens et le sentiment, en second lieu l'intelligence, enfin et surtout la conscience" says M. Cumont.(1) Add to this the fact that they all held out a belief in immortality and their popularity is easily explained.

Magicians, fortune-tellers, astrologers all busily plied their trades:

"Fallacem Circum vespertinumque pererro
Saepe Forum adsisto divinis;"

to quote Horace.(2) Everywhere "a portentous mysticism found in the general distraction--political, economic moral religious--the soil which was adapted for it, and grew with alarming rapidity."(3)

Lucretius looks around him and sees this worship of divinities and performance of sacred rights:

"deum per magnas numina gentis

pervulgarit, et ararum compleverit urbis
suscipiendaque curarit sollemnia sacra,
quae nunc in magnis florent sacra rebu' locisque,
unde etiam nunc est mortalibus insitus horror
qui delubra deum nova toto suscitatur orbi
terrarum et festis cogit celebrare diebus,"(1)

Then a kind and noble purpose seizes him. There is a battle to be fought with the religion that arouses such a horror in men's minds. The guerdon of victory for him will be the consequent peace of heart and mind for men, when once he has established that the world is not made by the Gods, that men live free from wilful divine interference, and that Nature obeys her own laws. Men, he says, not understanding the objects of their dreams, attribute ~~to~~ to them life everlasting and power over all things, and assign to them temples in heaven because there they could nightly see 'flying flames and the night wandering torches of the sky.' (2) In that fashion arose religion and worship of the Gods. (3) Here the poet forgets he is a philosopher preaching a doctrine, and breaks out in a deeply passionate cry against those who invented this religion so

full of menace, so pregnant with woes and tears for us and our descendants:

"O genus infelix humanum, talia divis
cum tribuit facta atque iras adiunxit acerbis!
quantos tum gemitus ipsi sibi, quantaque nobis
vulnera, quas lacrimas peperere minoribu' nostris!"(1)

No, he exclaims, that is not religion, nor is it true piety:

"velatum saepe videri
vertier ad lapidem atque omnis accedere ad aras
nec procumbere humi prostratum et pandere palmas
ante deum ~~in~~ delubra nec aras sanguine multo
spargere quadrupedum nec votis nectere vota,"

Nay, rather, the true piety, the true religion, is to see things clearly with a mind at peace:

"sed mage pacata posse omnia mente tueri."(2)

Certainly it is not with a passionless calm, nor with the impartiality of a scientific seeker after truth that the poet weighs the pros and cons of religion and theology. The evils of which he sees the popular religion as capable arouse in him, not a cool contempt but a seething hatred and disgust.

Even Epicurus himself is said to have remarked with bitter contempt: "if God listened to the ~~far~~ prayers of man, all men would quickly have perished: for they are forever ~~praying~~ praying for evil against one another." (1) We might note that these attacks are ^{directed} ~~devoted~~ not so much ~~against~~ religion as against theology.

There is a rather pathetic halt in his brave outburst against the Gods in the passage immediately above quoted. Yes, he says, it is true piety to despise this worship of Gods, and to possess a mind at ease. Then the sudden doubt arises in his mind:

"nequaeforte deum nobis immensa potestas
sit, vario motu quae candida sidera verset,
temptat enim dubiam mentem rationis egestas,
ecquaenam fuerit mundi genitalis origo," (2)

For a moment the insufficiency of his philosophy seems to shake him, for he continues:

"praeterea cui non animus formidine divum
contrahitur, cui non correpunt membra pavore,
fulminis horribili cum plaga torrida tellus

contremit et magnum percurrunt murmura caelum?
non populi gentesque tremunt, regesque superbi
corripiunt divum percussi membra timore,
nequid ob admissum foede dictumve superbe,
poenarum grave sit solvendi tempus adultum?
summa etiam cum vis violenti per mare venti
induperatorem classis super aequora verrit
cum validis periter legionibus atque elephantis,
non divum pacem votis adit ac prece quaesit
ventorem pavidus paces animasque secundas,
nequiquam, quoniam violento turbine saepe
correptus nilo fortur minus ad vada leti?
usque adeo res humanas vis abdita quaedam
obterit et pulchros fascis saevasque securis
proculcare ac ludibrio sibi habere videtur."(1)

It is a long passage, almost too long one thinks for a philosopher who has put boyhood fears away from him. Whether this is mere poetry or a sudden insight into the man's real feelings, we are not prepared to say. The last three lines of the quotation seem proof that Lucretius recognised some external, almost super-natural force. The

'vis abdita quaedam' seems to have all the characteristics of a 'Numen' as the Italian conceived it. It is the animistic, the essential Italian, view of nature.(1) But I do not believe in attaching too much significance to passages, such as the above, which seem to indicate that Lucretius was still under, in a measure, the influence of some dread of divine tyranny and domination. Mr. Tyrrell, I think, is putting it rather strongly when he states that Lucretius argues as one "whose reason is convinced that he is saved but whose whole spirit shudders at the thought of damnation."(2)

I do wonder, however, whether or not the poet is justified in taking the view he does of the Italian belief in immortality. The ordinary Epicurean would not be likely to give such attention to his post-mortem fate. Horace refers to 'pale death' very rarely, and then only with regret for the cessation of life's pleasures. To him, it is a realm of shades and a place of ennui and inaction.(3) ~~Indeed,~~ The whole doctrine of personal immortality was regarded askance by the cultivated men of the

time. Caesar denies it openly in the senate, and Caesar was 'pontifex maximus.'"(1) Servius Sulpicius in a letter to Cicero expresses doubt in the belief that there is any feeling in the dead.(2) Catullus states that after death there will be for him merely one long night of eternal sleep.(3) We may take it that these men represent the opinion of the upper classes. What of the uncultivated Roman? Was there such a wide spread belief in Hades and its torments as Lucretius would imply? He speaks of the 'pit and black Tartarus', of the gates of Orcus.'(4) He devotes long passages to the fear of Acheron:

"metus ille foras praeceps Acherontis agendus,
funditus humanam qui vitam turbat ab imo
omnia suffundens mortis nigrore neque ullam
esse voluptatem liquidam puramque relinquit."(5)

This fear of death, he says, maybe the bottom of all the vices that afflict men. The lust for wealth and power, the hatred of poverty, all may originate in this one fear:

"haec vulnera vitae
non minimam partem mortis formidine aluntur."(6)

Indeed paradoxically enough this fear of death may in some cases lead to death:

"et saepe usque adeo, mortis formidine, vitae
percipit humanos odium locisque videndae,
ut sibi consciscant maerenti pectore letum
obliti fontem curarum hunc esse timorem."(1)

We have before cited a passage from Plautus(2) as evidence that at an early stage in its history, the Roman people had come into contact with Etruscan art and the many depictions of the torments of Hades which appeared to have been a deeply ingrained belief of the Etruscan mind. Then, too we must remember the miserable burial ceremonies of the poor. The bodies of their dead were thrown into great pits-'puticuli'- on the Esquiline Hill:

"huc prius angustis eiecta cadavera cellis
conservus vili portanda locabat in arca.

hoc miserae plebi stabat commune sepulchrum."(3)

It is quite possible that the sight of their miserable bodily fate might have given rise to a belief in a similar fate for the soul. The popular superstitions that centred about many places demonstrate that the belief in the existence of an [^]ether world

was common. In Campania Lake Avernus was believed to be an entrance to the lower world. The Campus Martius was held to be a 'campus ignifer'. Indeed the altars of Dis and Proserpina were discovered there in the last century.(1) We have the festival of the 'Lemuria' as proof that the fear of the dead, of ghosts and demons was very marked in Rome.(2) It is quite possible then that the poor and the common suffered from such a fear as Lucretius asserts. It is noticeable that the epitaphs found on many tomb stones over the graves of slaves, gladiators and others of the ~~ppp~~ressed and poverty-stricken of the first and second centuries of the Empire read in this fashion:

"Non fui, fui, non sum, non curo,"

and in other cases in this way:

"Nil sumus et fuimus. Mortales respice, lector,

In nihil ab nihilo quam cito recidimus."(3)

Evidently then Lucretius must have had some influence on the lower strata of Roman society and the poet did not "batter" ^{on} the walls of the pale realm" in vain. Despite the factors that may have combined to detract from the boldness of his assault upon the

state religion and the current belief in immortality, credit must be given to the poet, for his undoubted sincerity. The fear of the Gods and of death, he believed, muddied the stream of life. Whether or not he exaggerates its importance is not the question. He aimed to destroy the structure of a vicious system, of an evil theology, and such a thing is worthy of destruction by any man in any age. He does a service to real religion itself, indeed, in his "wholesome contempt for 'superstitio' and all the baser sides of religious belief and practice, old and new." (1)

Morality is or should be inherent in religion, but in the Roman religion of this time, it was not. To ~~Eu~~cretius, religion is not merely worship of the Gods and its forms, but includes all the world's vice and folly. The poet feels that in attacking religion, he is not weakening but rather confirming morality. "Tantum religio potuit suadere malorum", (2) he exclaims, and assuredly there was valid ground for his charge. As he sees it, not only reason but also conscience, are afflicted by

the Roman superstition. Certainly, Gods with desires and lusts, hates and deceits were not calculated to serve as checks on the unbridled passions of the last days of Republican Rome. He might have said what Chateaubriand said later "la culte de tante de divinités infames pouvait-il maintenir des mœurs que les lois ne soutenaient plus?"(1)

So after superstition and the fear of death, Lucretius turns against the manners of contemporary society, with its soul-tormenting passions and desires. It is these desires that force men to live a life of fever and fret far removed from the ease and quiet which should be theirs. "Ex cupiditatibus odia discidia ~~discordia~~ discordiae seditiones bella nascuntur" as Cicero has it.(2) These desires arouse in men an insatiable thirst for power, wealth or the love of another and while he seeks to slake his thirst his life slips by uselessly: "quia semper aves quod abest, praesentia temnis, imperfecta tibi elapsast ingrataque vita."(3)

Lucretius gives evidence of one truly Roman trait, the censure of contemporary manners

in the vein of satire. Satire is the one branch of literature the Romans claimed as their own.(1) This assertion may or may not be true, but the satiric sense is certainly one that is most inherent in the genius of the race. In most of their great writings, this peculiar trait tends to come to the surface. In the line of succession from Ennius to Juvenal, Lucretius must be given a place. The note of satire is heard throughout the poem, and rises to full pitch in the passages on the fear of death, on ambition and greed, on the blind passion of love.(2) If the essence of the satiric talent is the ability to penetrate beneath the masks men wear, to peer into the mind and into the heart, and there to discover the hidden motives of action, to bring them to light and to point out their mean or vile character by direct attack or allusion, then our poet is a satirist. He does not, however, fix upon, as the object for his shafts any particular vice or any particular man or men, not against a Metellus, Lucius or Carbo, but against the eternal passions that ruin men's

lives in any age and were especially prominent in his own day. What we are looking for is the impress of his age upon the poet and his work, and this we may find in abundance, as when in the opening passage of the second book he draws what might well be a picture of the Roman society of his day,(1) and again his portrait of the ambitious and envious in the third book.(2) His best verses, states M. Martha, owe their beauty above all to his detestation of contemporary vices.(3) Thus the pleasure in reading them is enhanced by the fact that to their real worth is added a historical value. Lucretius as well as Sallust serve to give us clear out portraits of the social vices of the period. We find an echo of the poet in the historian when he describes how: "primo pecuniae, deinde imperi cupido crevit;---ambitio multos mortalis falsos fieri subegit, aliud clausum in pectore aliud in lingua promptum habere"⁽⁴⁾-, etc

The poet looks down upon his fellow-men from the serene temples of his philosophy and considers how pleasant it is to be free from all the cares which vex man-kind, but he cannot remain,

as Horace ⁰dies, a mildly amused spectator of the human scene. The stupidities of life goad him to lash out at them in verses powerful and angry. What is it that the poet sees as he looks down on his country-men coming and going before his eye? A restless and discontented world; no one lives content with the lot which either chance or thought has given him;(1) all are under bondage to greed, ambition or passion.

Ambition is the greatest obstacle to happiness, and consequently it is against that vice that he first turns his weapons. The vividness and bitterness of the portrait may be due to some personal disappointment suffered while running the 'gradus honorum' but it is hardly likely or even necessary for it to have been so. His native city gave him many an example of the vice he so scathingly denounces. He could see Romans:

"certare ingenio, contendere nobilitate,
noctes atque dies niti praestante labore
ad summas emergere opes rerumque potiri."(2)

Abdicating their freedom of will to attain their ends:

"quandoquidem sapiunt alieno ex ore petuntque
res ex auditis potius quam sensibus ipsis,"(1)
until at last they are made reckless by ambition:

"denique avarities et honorum caeca cupido
quae miseros homines cogunt transcendere finis
iuris,"(2)

once having transgressed the bounds of law, nothing
will arrest them in their mad race and soon indeed,
they turn on each other in internecine strife:

"sanguine civili rem conflant divitiasque
conduplicant avidi, caedem caede accumulantes;
crudeles gaudent in tristi funere fratris
et consanguineum mensas odere timentque."(3)

All in vain, for no sooner do they reach their ob-
jectives, than envy, which has been growing with
their success overtakes them at last and hurls them
ignominiously into oblivion:

"Sisyphus in vita quoque nobis ante oculos est
qui petere a populo fascis saevasque securis
imbibit et semper victus tristisque recedit.
nam petere imperium quod inanest nec datur umquam,
atque in eo semper durum sufferre laborem,

hoc est aduerso nixantem trudere monte
saxum quod tamen (e) summo iam vertice rursus
volvitur et plani raptim petit aequora campi."(1)

The poet with good observation notes that virtue does not necessarily reside with the poor and humble. They may be less pretentious but are not therefore the less vain or greedy. They are eaten by envy as they watch the successful man and pass by and bemoan their own sad fate:

"macerat invidia ante oculos illum esse potentem,
illum aspectari, claro qui incedit honore,
ipsi se in tenebris volvi caenoque queruntur."(2)

The rich and powerful of the day pass in review before the poet; in the Forum, at the head of armies and fleets, at their overladen tables in their extravagantly furnished mansions.(3) The portraits are all Roman. The "local colour" is there. As we read, there arises in our minds the figure of a Caesar, a Pompey, Cicero.

As greed for wealth and office blinds men and poisons the sources of happiness, so too does the passion of love. The poet rails against this with surprising fervor. What Horace regarded as a

means of occasional pleasure, Lucretius attacks "as a bane and a curse." (1) We must beware, however, of accusing Lucretius of having had his wings singed in the flame. He is not a Catullus turning to vent his miserable rage against the source of his disappointment. The violence of the poet's famous attack may possibly have been sharpened by some personal suffering but the dislike of Love is quite correct Epicurean tradition. (2) Let us recall too, the state of contemporary sexual morality. The relations between men and women were very loose. It is a period of general debauchery. The general decay had not, of course, failed to have its effect on the women of the day. The old Romans had prided themselves on the purity of their domestic life. Even to the very hearth of the family the deplorable consequences of extension of Empire, with its resultant influx of Oriental wealth and slaves, are apparent. The institution of slavery is always a fruitful source of vice, and so it was at this time. The women of the Roman households were of course most susceptible to any vitiating influence emanating from this source. We find women entering into

political intrigue. For a Clodius we have a Clodia. The 'cultu puella' appears. Sallust gives us the picture of a Sempronia among the followers of Catiline, one to whom "cariora semper omnia quam decus atque pudicitia fuit." (1) Marriage had ceased to have any attraction for women who preferred their moral and legal freedom. (2) Divorce had become alarmingly common and easy to obtain. The increase of celibacy and childlessness worried the graver minds of Rome. All in all, it is not unnatural that Lucretius should have detested the women of his day and class. One thinks of Lucretius in this respect as a grave Roman of the old school. A woman who sang and danced would be an object of suspicion to him. M. Martha ~~tells~~ tells us that it is the Roman citizen coming to the fore, deeply aroused by the fortunes destroyed, the debts and careless expenditures of money, the honour tarnished, the duties forgotten under the yoke of this passion. "Ce tableau est bien romain surtout la longue énumération des dépenses." (3) The sketch, at any rate, is strikingly cynical and piercing:

"Adde quod absumunt viris pereuntque labore,
adde quod alterius sub nutu degitur aetas.
labitur interea res et Babylonica fiunt,
languent officia atque aegrotat fama vacillans.
(unguenta) et pulchra in pedibus Sicyonia rident
scilicet et grandes viridi cum luce smaragdi
auro includuntur teriturque thalassina vestis
assidue et Veneris sudorem exercita potat.
et bene parta patrum fiunt anademata, mitrae,
interdum in pallam atque Alidensia Ciciaque vertunt."(1)

As the end of the search for wealth and
power was in vain so here too:

"nequiquam, quoniam medio de fonte leporum
surgit amari aliquid quod in ipsis floribus angat,
aut cum conscius ipse animus se forte remordet
desidiose agere aetatem lustrisque perire,
aut quod in ambiguo verbum iaculata reliquit
quod cupido adfixum cordi vivescit ut ignis,
aut nimium iactare oculos aliumve tueri
quod putat in vultuque videt vestigia risus."(2)

There follows a long passage devoted to
the blindness of lovers, too long to quote here but
the burthen of it is:

"nam faciunt homines plerumque cupidine caeci
et tribuunt ea quae non sunt his commoda vere."(1)

Lucretius concludes his attack by contrasting the pleasures and charms of matrimony and domesticity with the turmoil of the unhealthy passion he has just depicted. Epicurus, it is true, had discouraged marriage and children as detracting from perfect happiness,(2) but Lucretius is at this point, one thinks, truly Roman. One may, he says, sometimes find a woman, not a beauty perhaps, but one who will wear well, and one whom you might even learn to love in time.(3) Here he expresses the old Roman burgher's idea of marriage, one certainly not that of a love match. Affection might and often did arise later. Service to State and Family is the 'motif'. Marriage is 'gravitas and pietas'.

Moliere imitates the passage,(4) though it is softened to conform to an age that is more precious in its outlook, and to a nature incapable of the towering poetry of the Roman.

The whole scene then is a very dark one. Superstition, ambition, greed and passion torment man incessantly. Dull Care sits by the door and

croaks its melancholy refrain. Rich man, poor man, all seek but a modicum of happiness and find even that is impossible of complete attainment. A capricious fortune plays gleefully with the long schemes of man. The poet arises from his contemplation sick at heart:

"o miseras hominum mentis, o pectora caeca!

qualibus in tenebris vitae quantisque periculis
degitur hoc aevi quodcumque!"(1)

The vanity of human wishes is clearly apparent to him; but there is, he alleges, a method of living life with a measure of happiness. These passions may be restrained and checked. Man must leave all else and turn to the study of Natural Law, he must consider his position in the light of Eternity, not of the brief hour he has here on earth:

"iam rebus quisque relictis
naturam primum studeat agnoscere rerum,
temporis aeterni quoniam, non unius horae,
ambigitur status"-- (2)

By his study he will learn that all that Nature requires in order that he obtain comparative happiness is that 'pain hold aloof from the body, and

that the mind enjoy a feeling of pleasure exempt from care and fear'.(1) The ~~ture~~^{ture} 'Voluptas' is calm of heart and senses. It is not the indifferent 'apathy' of the strict Epicureanism, nor is it the 'carpe diem' attitude of a Placcus or a Khayyam. We can imagine our poet shaking his head at such lines as these:

"Drink; for you know not whence you came, nor why

Drink: for you know not why you go, nor where."

Moderation is what Lucretius advises. The love of drink and of food which had reached such tremendous proportions by this time,(2) despite constant legislative attempts to restrain it, receives no support at all from the poet.

Did Lucretius correctly understand the causes or the significance of the 'luxuria', 'ambitio', 'avaritia' he so laments and assails. He has accurately enough observed the externals of decay and restlessness in the individual and in the State. Whether he guessed the cause or knew the remedy, I am not certain. Mr. Ferrero in an illuminating essay(3) points out that the second outbreak of the so-called 'corruption' in Rome

occurred after the conquest of the East by Lucullus and Pompey. That would just fit in with our poet's time of writing. The conquest resulted in a pouring into Italy of Oriental wealth and tributes. Great, and to these Romans, almost fabulously wealthy provinces were opened up as sources of great Roman incomes. What happened to the Romans was not so much a falling off in religious belief, decline of old manners Greek 'poison', or any of the other usually assigned causes so much as sudden 'money'. The facility of acquisition of wealth proved too attractive. Mommsen has termed the Rome of this period a "commonwealth of princes and beggars, princely debts and princely liabilities." (1) With wealth coming first and virtue next we should expect to find a corrupt society, and we do find it to be so. Civic welfare is not in harmony with private ambitions. Given lack of interest in civic affairs, there results lack of care for family institutions. It follows that once family discipline is relaxed, religious and moral principles must do the same. The frantic legislation against sexual (~~immortality~~) immorality and adultery shows that the

wiser minds of Rome were aware of the fact that the birth rate was decreasing. Lucretius, is we think, here sensible of the danger to the Roman state, but does not, nor of course could he, understand the 'why' of it. "The indefinite multiplication of wants," as Mr. Gide has it, "has created modern civilization and all that we call progress." (1) The Romans had had their primitive, simple wants multiplied immensely by expansion and colonization with resultant inpouring of wealth. In his own generation, though the poet has not remarked it, the influx was too rapid, and a general shakiness resulted. It is probable then, that the poet attacks the society of his time realizing the danger to the State, but it is more probable that he himself did not look that far. He himself merely is not of a suitable temper to be attracted by the 'ambitio', 'luxuria', and 'avaritia' he so vehemently attacks.

As we are better able to understand a Milton or a Dante from the knowledge we possess of their times, so too with Lucretius. In an age of

confliction tendencies, political and emotional, everything is likely to be seen in a heightened colour. If, in such a period, there be a man capable of expressing himself in some literary form, then we are likely to see his age reflected in the heightened tone of his work. Especially is this true of an age where the old orders clash with and give way to the new, where the men of letters either take their place in the ranks of the moderns and prophecy great days to come or else stand firm, their gaze turned back into the past while they watch in dismay their beliefs and institutions tumble around them. The Caesarian age was one of unparalleled intensity. Event after event, incomprehensible, disheartening, bewildered the minds of men. To-day and for us, the meaning of it all is quite clear. We know now that these events were the symptoms of political change from Republican to Imperial Rome, and the natural restlessness of a people suddenly rich in material things, but not yet sufficiently educated to know the true uses and end of such things. To

the Romans of the time, neither reason for, nor end of the turmoil was apparent, to them it was senseless and prophetic of doom. Not for them was there a meaning in the hatreds and differences of opinion, in the general selfishness and corruption, in the lawlessness and violence, which went on before their eyes. The play enacted itself before them as they looked on in amazement; a play with players who were not certain of their parts nor of their fellow-actors; they appear for a time, act and re-act, then disappear behind a curtain that drops before they are ready. It is against such a background that the poem of Lucretius ought to be read and studied. It makes clear why the poet begins his long work by an invocation to Venus to bring love into the hearts of everyone, to bring a halt to warfare on land and sea, to bind the arms of Mars with her own while she pleads for peace for her Romans, 'for he cannot, the poet says, write with untroubled mind in this, the unhappy time of his country.'(1)

The purpose of this essay has been to

draw Lucretius against his background, political, social, cultural. We have dealt with these topics and their various sub-headings. At times the contrast is clear, at others it is not. More contemporary evidence would be of the greatest aid. His own opinions must be gathered from the internal evidence of his work. For one reason or another his contemporaries maintain a curious silence about the man and the poem. It has been left for later ages to study the poem and to attempt to reproduce the man. He cannot be said to have, in the main, formed or changed the thought of his own day. He did not make his way into the hearts of his fellow-Romans as did Ennius, Virgil and Horace. His books were not destined within a few years of his death to be thumbed over by boys in the cheap schools. At the best his audience was a limited one. Then again he is too far removed from the high road of life. He feels the ordinary imperfections of humanity with a hypersensitiveness. Perhaps had his contempt for Italian and Roman ideas of religion and divinity been less harsh and more sympathetic, the appeal and the

.-----

power of Lucretius might and ~~probably~~ would have been a more lasting one. He denounces the ~~wicked~~-wickedness and weakness of Roman society and the futility of the religious forms to which it clings, but he has no real remedy to offer, something to attract and grip the conscience of the Romans and serve as a support for conduct. His remedy is the wrong one for such an active and turbulent age as the one in which he lived. One may see its appeal to minds weary of endless political and philosophical quarrels, but ~~the~~ withdrawal of public life it suggests is not the answer to the problem of the age. Unfortunately, and as is so often the case, his one object was the welfare of his fellow-men yet he remained neglected of them. He has nothing but pity for the sad state of man, and it is to ~~them~~ in order that they may lead happier ~~lives~~ that he offers his philosophy.

Notes and References.

Page 2

- 1) II. 1150-1153

Page 3

- 1) Mommsen: "History of Rome" Vol. V p.477

Page 4

- 1) Ibid. Vol. IV. p.59---88 B.C.

Page 5

- 1) Plutarch "Lives" ~~xxx~~1 "Sulla now busied himself with slaughter, and murders without number or limit filled the city.

Page 7

- 1) Ad Q. fr. 2.3. 1-2.

Page 8

- 1) Ad. Att. 1. 17; and see Fowler: "Social Life at Rome." Ch. IV.
- 2) See M. Boissier: "Cicero and his Friends" pps. 123-158,
- 3) Mommsen 'op. cit' ~~1~~ IV. p.187.

Page 9

- 1) From 215 B.C. on, a series of such laws were passed. In 81 B.C. a 'Lex Cornelia'.
- 2) Opening passage of Book 11.

Page 9(cont)

3) "De ~~★~~Con. Cat. 12-13

cf. Lucr. 111.70-71; and Froude " Society in Italy in the Last Days of the Roman Republic."

Page 11

1) In his continuation of the Chronicles of Eusebius for the year A.U.C. 655. see Munro 11.p.93.

Page 12

1) An article in the Westminster Review Vol.117. pps. 299-346, suggests that Lucretius had a lawyers education: "He certainly exhibits great forensic skill."

2) Masson J. 'Atomic Theory of Lucretius' p.183.

Page 13

1) See Cicero.ad. Fam. 7.1.

2) Martha.'Le Poeme de Lucrece' p.30.

3) Lucretius.V. 1205 ff. ~~xxx~~

Page 14

1) 111. 1052-1070.

2) J.A. Symonds, in the Fortnightly Review Vol.23.p.49

Page 15

1) "Religious Experience of the Roman People" p.405.

Page 15 (cont)

- 2) Epistles 1. 2. 27-29.
- 3) 111. 1073-1075.

Page 16

- 1) "Roman Poets of the Republic" p.283.
- 2) V. 826-836; 11. 1150-1163.
- 3) 11. 1164-1174.

Page 17

- 1) See Fowler "Rome" pps. 124-126--re Agriculture.
- 2) Plutarch "Lucullus" XL1.
- 3) ~~Ibid.~~ "Sulla" XXXVII.

Page 18

- 1) 1. 28-33; 11. 40-45; 49-53; 111. 59-63; 70-74.
- 2) Ad Att. ~~1~~2.22.
- 3) Ad Fam. 6. 15.

Page 19

- 1) Cf. Sellars 'op.cit.' p.288.

Page 20

- 1) 11. Prologue 1-52
- 2) 111. 59-61.
- 3) V. 1152-1155.
- 4) 1. 26-28; 42; 140-145-etc.

Page 21

- 1) See Catullus X.&XXVlll
- 2) Cicero: ad Q. fr. 2. 15. 2.
ad att. 4. 17. 2.
- 3) Ad Fam. 13. 1.

Page 22

- 1) Vide supra. p.11 note 1.
- 2) ad Q. fr. 2. 9.

Page 23

- 1) Munro ll. p. 94.
- 2) See the letter to Memmius cited above. p.21.note 3.
- 3) Martha, op. cit. appendix pps.351 ff.

Page 24

- 1) Ibid.
- 2) In two pamphlets:
 1. "Cicero's knowledge of Lucretius' Poem."
 2. "Lucretius' and Cicero's Verse."

Page 25

- 1) Fowler: "Roman Ideas of Deity" p.8.

Page 26

- 1) Tusc. 111.45
- 2) Brought to Rome in 73 B.C.

Page 26 (cont)

- 3) ^{Vide} Prop. 111. 1. 1-2.
- 4) Mommsen. op. cit. V. p. 463.

Page 27

- 1) ~~1~~ 1. 729-733.
- 2) 1. 116-118.
- 3) See Munro op. cit. introduction p. 106 for numerous examples: "None scatters them about more prodigally than Lucretius."

Page 28

- ~~10~~
- 1) See Quintilian X. 1. Lucretius is ~~difficilis~~ 'difficilis'; and Munro. op. cit. p. 103
- 2) A fragment of the 'Telamo', in Merry 'Fragments' p. 62.
- 3) Mommsen. V. p. ~~page~~ 475.
- 4) The following passages are found in v. 1226-1228; 1303-1305; 1339 ff.

Page 29

- 1) Mommsen. vide supra p. 28. note 3.

Page 30

- 1) See Simcox 'Latin Literature' vol. 1. p. 116. on lines 387-408 of the 'Peleus and Thetis' as an "inspired protest against the impiety of Lucretius"

Page 30 (cont)

- 2) Eclogues 6. 31-40; Georgics ll. 475 ff.
- 3) ^{Eg.} Sat. 1. 1. 101-103 and Lucr. v. 83 and ll. 646-651.
- 4) Merrill "On the influence of Lucretius on Horace".

Page 31

- 1) H.G. Wells: "Outline of History " p.462.
- 2) l. 136-~~39~~ and v. 97-100. But compare Cicero Tusc ll. 35. where he implies that Latin is as good as Greek for the purposes of philosophical science.

Page 32

- 1) v. 97-100.
- 2) l. 80-82.
- 3) v. 114-121.

Page 33

- 1) l. 925-930.
- 2) Martha. op. cit. p.273

Page 34

- 1) v. 166-167.
- 2) lv. 823-857 has "most modern a ring"; Bailey, "Greek Atomists and Epicurus" p.476.
- 3) v. 156-194.

- Vll-

- Page 35

- 1) ll. 216 ff.
- 2) Ibid 289 ff.

Page 36

- 1) H.F. Osborn: "From the Greeks to Darwin" p.64.

Page 37

- LO Mommsen, op. cit. lv. p.202.

Page 38.

- 1) Bailey, op. cit. p. 438
- 2) See Fowler, "Social Life at Rome" p.331
- 3) Varro, in his Satires, e.g. the "Eumenides".
- 4) Eg. l. 465; 635 ff; 1052 ff.

Page 39

- 1) Cicero, Tuscul. lv. 3.
- 2) l 943-945
- 3) F.A. Lange, "History of Materialism" vol.1 p.128.

Page 40

- 1) Cf. Boissier op. cit. pps. 131-132; and Cicero ad att. 4. 4b.2; 4.8a.2; 6.1.13; 16.3.1.
- 2) ll. 172.

Page 41

- 1) V. 18-21.
- 2) Martha, op. cit. p. 21

Page 41 (cont)

- 3) Sellars, op. cit. p. 407.
- 4) Sat. 1.4. 101-103.

Page 42

- 1) Odes. 1. 34; and contrast Lucr. Vl.247 ff. and 400.
- 2) Ep. 1.1-14.
- 3) Vide supra p. 30 note 4
- 4) One of a collection of minor poems, "Datalepta"
- 5) Vide Supra p.30 note 2.-but Camont denies this is Epicureanism at all: "After Life in Roman Paganism" p.210.

Page 43

- 1) By a Sc. 'de Philosophiis et Rhetoribus'.

Page 45

- 1) "Religious experience of the Roman People" p.377

Page 46

- 1) Cf. Plautus. 'Captivi' Act V, Se.3.
- 2) Masson J. op. cit. p. 195
- 3) l. 80-101.
- 4) Vl. 387 ff.

Page 47

- 1) lll. 52-54.
- 2) Bailey, op. cit. p. 478.

Page 48

- 1) Mommsen. op. cit. lll. p. 114

Page 48 (cont)

- 2) Lucr. ll. 600-643; Catullus LXIII. and cf. Varro
"Eumenides" in Merry p.204.
- 3) Mommsen, ll. p. 446.
- 4) Cumont, 'Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism' p.122.

Page 49

- 1) Cumont. Ibid p. 172.
- 2) Sat. 1.6. 112-113.
- 3) Mommsen, op. cit. IV. p.211; and see Cumont: "L'astrologie et la magie" Ch. VII; and Fowler: "Religious Experience, etc" p. 53.

Page 50

- 1) V. 1165 ff.
- 2) Ibid. 1169-1193; and Cf. Bailey, op. cit. p.438.

Page 51

- 1) V. 1194-1197.
- 2) Ibid. 1198-1203; Compare Fowler "Rel. Exp." p.359 ff;
and Bailey, op. cit. p.480 ff.

Page 52

- 1) Bailey, op. cit. p. 477.
- 2) V. 1208 ff.

Page 53

- 1) V. 1218-1235.

Page 54

- 1) Fowler "Roman Ideas of Deity" p. 48; and the passages there cited.
- 2) 'Lucretius' in the 'Atlantic Monthly' Vol. 74 p. 57.
- 3) Odes 1.4. 13-20.

Page 55

- 1) Sallust, 'Catiline' 51.20.
- 2) Ad. Fam. 4.5.
- 3) Catullus 5.6.
- 4) Ill. 966 and Vl. 764.
- 5) Ill. 31 ff.
- 6) Ill. 63-65

Page 56

- 1) Ill. 79-82.
- 2) Ante, p. 46. note 1.
- 3) Horace. Satires. 1.8. 8-10

Page 57

- 1) Cf. Virgil. Aen. Vl. 240 and Seneca 'Apocolocyntosis' Xlll. 1. and note thereon. Ed. A. P. Ball.
- 2) Fowler, "Rel. Exp." p. 393 ff.
- 3) Cumont, "After Life in Roman Paganism" p. 10.

Page 58

- 1) Fowler op. cit. p. 361.
- 2) l. 101

Page 59

- 1) "Genie du Christianisme" lV. 6. 13.
- 2) de Fin. 1. 13. 43. Fowler op. cit. p.376.
- 3) 111. 957-958

Page 60

- 1) Quintilian X. 1. 93.
- 2) Prologue to Bk. 111; Ibid 978 ff; lV. 1121 ff;
V. 1005 ff; 1105 ff.

Page 61

- 1) 11. 1039⁶⁶, and 111. 1003 ff. and V. 1116 ff.
- 2) 111. 58-77; and V. 1120 ff.
- 3) Martha op. cit. p.199
- 4) Sallust op. cit. X and Cf. Lucr. 111.55-61.

Page 62

- 1) Cf. Horace Sat. 1.1.
- 2) 11. 11-13; 111. 995

Page 63

- 1) V. 1133-1134
- 2) 111. 58060; V. 1126.
- 3) 111. 70-73.

Page 64

- 1) 111.995-1002.
- 2) 111. 75-77.
- 3) 11. 23 ff.

Page 65

- 1) Tyrrell. op. cit. (p.54 note 2) p. 63
- 2) Bailey op. cit. p. 521

Page 66

- 1) Sallust op. cit. XXV.
- 2) The 'manus' marriage was very unpopular by this time. "Free Marriage" and easy divorce were more attractive. Augustus in 19 B.C. passed a 'lex Julia de adulteriis' with severe punishments for that offence and with greater restrictions on divorce.
- 3) IV. 1121-1130. Martha op. cit. appendix p.382.

Page 67

- 1) IV. 1121-1130.
- 2) Ibid.1133-1140.

Page 68

- 1) Ibid. 1153-1155.
- 2) Bailey op. cit. p. 521.
- 3) IV. 1278 ff.
- 4) "C'est la seule épave qui nous reste de la traduction de Lucrece entreprise par Molière lorsqu'il étudiait sous Gassendi" A note on this passage in ~~this~~ M. Thirons, édit de "Le Misanthrope".p410.

Page 69

- 1) II. 13-15
- 2) III. 1071 ff.

-Xl11-

Page 70

- 1) 11. 17-19.
- 2) Sallust op. cit. Xl11; and Cf. Fowler "Social Life at Rome" p. 281.
- 3) "Corruption in Ancient Rome".

Page 71

- 1) V. 388. *op.cit.*

Page 72

- 1) " Principles of Political Economy" p. 34 .

Page 74

- 1) Bk.1. 1-43

Bibliography.

1. Bailey, Cyril: "The Greek Atomists and Epicurus"
Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1928.
2. Boissier, Gaston: "Cicero and his Friends"
New York, Putnam's Sons, 1897.
3. British Quarterly Review: "The Atomic Theory of Lucretius"
Volume 61; pps. 162-181; October 1875.
4. Carter, J.B.: "The Roman Elegiac Poets"
D.C. Heath & Co. Boston; New York, 1900.
5. Catullus: "Catulli Veronensis Liber"
Recognovit, R. Ellis: Londini, Apud Macmillan et Soc.
A.D. MDCCCLXVI
6. Cicero: "Selected Letters" ed. F.F. Abbott.
Ginn & Co. Boston 1899.
(b) 'Correspondence' ed. R.Y. Tyrrell, 7 vols.
Dublin 1879-1901. Dublin University Pr.
(c) "Tusculan Disputations" with an English transl.
by J.E. King, London, W. Heinemann, 1927.
(The Loeb Classical library)
7. Cruttwell, Charles: " A History of Roman Literature"
Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1908.
8. Cumont, Franz; (a) "After Life in Roman Paganism"
New Haven, Yale Univ. Press 1923.
(b) "Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks^x
and Romans" N.Y. C.P. Putnam's Sons, 1912.
(c) "Les Religions Orientales dans le
paganisme Romain", Paris 2 ed. rev.E. Leroux 1909.

9. Duff, J.W.: " A Literary History of Rome"
F. Fisher Unwin Ltd. London, 4th ed. 1920.
10. Edinburgh Review, The: "Lucretius and his Times"
Vol. 203 pps. 137-169. 1906.
11. Ennius, Quintus: "Fragments". In "Selected fragments of early Roman poetry" ed. W.W. Merry,
Oxford, 1891, Clarendon Press.
12. Fowler, W. Warde: "Rome" H. Holt & Co., N.Y. 1912
 (b)"(The) religious experience of the Roman people from the earliest times to the age of Augustus".
 MacMillan Co., Lond., 1911
 (c) "Roman ideas of deity in the last century before the Christian era". London, MacM. & Co. 1914.
 (d) "Social life at Rome in the age of Cicero"
 MacM. Co. N.Y., 1909.
13. Froude, James A: "Society in Italy in the last days of the Roman Republic". In "Short Studies on Great Subjects". 3rd series Vol. 3. pps. 185-209,
Scribner's, Armstrong Co., N.Y. 1877.
14. Ferrero, Guglielmo: "Corruption in Ancient Rome"
In "Characters and Events of Roman History".
Transl. from the Italian by Frances Ferrero.
Putnam's Sons, N.Y. 1909.
15. Hicks, R.D.: " Stoic and Epicurean" , London, Longmans Green & Co. 1910.

16. Hirst, M.E.: "A Reference to Lucretius in Cicero's 'Pro Milone'". Class Rev. Vol. 43. no.5 Nov. 1929.
17. Holmes, T. Rice: "The Roman Rep. and The Founder of the Empire". Vol. 2, Oxf. Clarendon Press, 1923.
18. Horace, Q. Flaccus: (a) "Satires" Ed. Arthur Palmer. Lond. MacM. Co. 1885.
(b) "Epistles" Ed. A.S. Wilkins, MacM. Co., Lond. 1919.
19. Housman, A.E.: "The First Editor of Lucretius" Class. Rev. Vol. 42. Sept. 1928.
20. Inge, W.R.: "Society in Rome under the Caesars" John Murray, London, 1888.
21. Lamarre, Clovis: "Histoire de la Litterature Latine" (Vol.2 pps. 460 ff.) Paris 1901. Librairie de Ch. Delagrave.
22. Lange, F.A.: "History of Materialism" transl. by E.C. Thomas, London, 1877, Trübner. 3 vols.
23. Litchfield, H.W.: "Cicero's Judgment on Lucretius" Harv. Studies in Class. Phil. Vol.24. pps.147-159, 1923
24. Lucretius, T. Carus: (a) Libri Sex; Recg. Cyrillus Bailey Ed. Altera. 1921. Oxf. Clarendon Press.
(b) Translation by Bailey Oxf. 1929.
(c) Libri Sex; with notes and transl. H.A.J. Munro, G. Bell & Sons, Lond. 1900.
25. Mackail J.W.: "Latin Literature" Murray, Lond. 1895.

26. Martha, Constant: "Le Poeme de Lucrece" Cinq. ed. Paris, 1896, Libr. Hachette et Cie.
27. Masson, J.: "The Atomic Theory of Lucretius contrasted with Modern Doctrines of Atoms and Evolution". G. Bell & Sons Lond. 1884.
28. Merrill, Wm. A.: (a) "Cicero's Knowledge of Lucretius' Poem" U. of Cal. Publ. in Class. Phil. Vol. 2 pps.35-42
(b) "Lucretius' and Cicero's Verse" Ibid. Vol. 5. no. 9 pps. 143-154.
(c) "On the Influence of Lucretius on Horace" Ibid. Vol. 1. no. 4 pps.111-129.
29. Mommsen, Theodor: "History of Rome" translated by W. P. Dickson, 5 vols. N.Y. Scribner's Sons 1898.
30. Orians, R.B.: "Lucretius and Cicero", Class. Rev. Vol.42 Dec. 1928 pps.215 ff.
31. Osborn, H.F.: (a) "Men of the Old Stone Age" 3rd ed. Scribner's Sons, N.Y. 1928.
(b) "From the Greeks to Darwin" Scribner's Sons, N.Y. and Lond. 1927.
32. Plutarch: "Lives" With an English translation by Bernadotte Perrin. W. Heinemann Lond. MacM. Co. N.Y. 1914 (Loeb Classical Library)
33. Sallust: "Catilina". Ed. W.C. Sumners, Cambridge Univ. Press 1921.
34. Santayana, George: "Three Philosophical Poets", Cambridge Harvard Univ. 1910.
35. Sellar, W.Y.: "~~Roman Poets of the Republic~~" 3rd Ed. Rev.

35. Sellar, W.Y.: "Roman Poets of the Republic" 3rd
Ed. Rev. Oxf. 1889. Clarendon Press.
36. Simcox, G.A.: "A History of Latin Literature"
2 Vols. N.Y. Harper & Bros. 1883.
37. Slaughter, Moses S.: "Roman Portraits" Yale Univ.
Press New Haven, 1925.
38. Symonds, J.A.: "Lucretius as a Roman" Fortnightly
Review, 1875, Vol.23, pps. 44-62
39. Teuffel, W.S.: "Geschichte der römischen Literatur"
5th Ed. Rev. by Ludwig Schwabe. Transl. by C.W.
Warr, G. Bell & Sons, Lond, 1891.
40. Tyrrell, R.Y.: (a) "Lucretius" in the Atlantic Monthly
Vol. 74, pps. 56-66. 1899. Houghton, Mifflin & Co.
Riverside Press, Cambridge Mass.
(b) "Latin Poetry" MacM. & Co. Lond. 1895.
41. Virgil: "Bucolics and Georgics" Ed. Papillon and Haigh.
Oxf. Clarendon Press. 1891.
42. Varro, M. Terentius: "Fragments" in W.W. Merry's
"Fragments of Early Roman Poetry".
43. Wallace, W.: "Epicureanism" Pott, Young & Co. Lond. and
N.Y. 1880.
44. Westminster Review, The: "Epicurus and Lucretius"
Vol.117, pps.299-346, 1882.
45. Wells, H.G.: "Outline of History" Doubleday, Doran and
Gundy, Toronto, 1920.

