
If Marinone intended to publish an edition of Cicero’s Paradoxa Stoicorum for senior high school or junior college students, his results are satisfactory. The text, except for punctuation and one or two minor points, is Plasberg’s. The introduction gives a sound historical background, a brief literary note and a short but good treatment of the place of the paradox in Stoic thought. I should have preferred a slightly fuller treatment of the notions of κατάθηκα and καθήκον; notably references to the Stoic dogma ὅτι πάντα εὐ ποιήσει ὁ σοφός (SVF I 216 f.) and even to the notion of προοπτή are lacking. The latter notion does not occur in Cicero’s Paradoxa, and the result of this omission is an oversimplification of Stoic ethics.

The commentary, while much indebted to Lee (London, 1953), gives in many places fuller, sometimes better (e.g. in § 1: saepe), but quite often superfluous, notes: it seems hardly necessary to write (§ 29) si ... eripuisses ..., tum ... confiter: periodo ipotetico dell’ irrealità, or to print (§ 43) nullum quaestum (oggetto) turpem (predicativo) putas: „non ritieni disonesto nessun guadagno”. Students who cannot work this out themselves had better not try to read Cicero’s Paradoxa—a minor work, rightly regarded by M. as a rhetorical exercise, yet worthy of a more scholarly treatment than it could be given in the present edition.
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ABOUT TEXTS AND PSYCHOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION


This thesis consists of four chapters. The first ventures on a reconstruction (from the data on the doctrine and life of Epicurus) of his character and motives: it is from a desire to dominate (this term occurs rather too frequently in the first 15 pages) that Epicurus fiercely opposes all philosophical tradition and traditional ties, and that he renounces all social ambition. His strong personality makes him the undisputed leader of his associates, who thus satisfy his need of sympathy and harmony, the antipole of his autonomous pride. Later, Epicurus restores only those emotional-social ties which leave his philosophy unmented, as appears from his participation in the Athenian festivities, for instance. Chapter II
treats of Roman Epicureanism in the second century before Christ, the parallelism between the autonomy of the Roman leaders under the influence of the Greeks and their unbridled lust of power and rivalry. B. analyses the life of T. Albucius, the first Epicurean among Roman politicians. In Chapter III B. traces the psychological background of the doctrine and life of Lucretius, following especially M. Rozelaar, _Lukrez, Versuch einer Deutung_ (Amsterdam 1943). According to B.'s conclusion, Lucretius belonged to the class of the _nobiles_, the doctrine of Epicurus drew him away from the normal political career, his frustrated desire to dominate now realized itself in his literary art, his style reveals neurotic traits (Rozelaar), while inconsistencies in his theories can be accounted for psychologically from his affective attitude towards his subject matter. Lucretius becomes the critic of his class; like the Ionian philosophers of nature, through his philosophy he seeks the way back to himself and to lost harmony, but in vain, because he does not, like Epicurus, find a circle of congenial associates. Chapter IV describes Cicero's philosophical development, which under the stress of Caesar's dictatorship and Tullia's death grew rigorously Stoical, in view of which he was opposed to Epicureanism and taxed his Epicurean friends with duplicity. In practice the difference between Stoicism and Epicureanism appears not to be very great; it is primarily a psychological difference, but Cicero fails to realize this.

The above is a brief summary of the contents of the book. It undoubtedly contains a number of true remarks on details, and the treatment indeed reveals great sympathy with the authors discussed; yet I am bound to raise serious objections as well. B. wants to explain too many things psychologically and for this starts too little from the texts themselves, with the result that he unintentionally fails to do justice to the genius of Lucretius, for instance. I shall discuss Chapter III at some length, because in this the weakness of the method emerges most clearly. When Lucretius expounds his atomic theory with crystal clarity and chisels it in monumental Latin, it is a mistake for B. to say with Rozelaar and Michel that the poet „aus Angst vor . . . der Welt . . . . sich in die fiktive, die Gegenwelt flüchtete”, „aus Angst vor . . . . der Realität in den Rausch” (p. 2). His doctrine was neither an intoxication nor a fiction, but a theory which came closer than any other to the world-picture of modern science, teeming with keen observations and transparent through logical thinking power, worded in a manly and laboriously achieved poetic language. Only in a few cases does B. himself analyse a text of Lucretius directly; I shall go more fully into these passages because they constitute the most personal work of the author.