

IV.—Cicero's *Invective Against Piso*

PHILLIP DELACY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

This article is summarized in the first paragraph.

In the years immediately following his return from exile Cicero made a number of attacks on Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus. The most violent of these attacks was the oration *In Pisonem*, delivered before the senate in 55 B.C. The fact that Piso was an Epicurean was used by Cicero as one of the principal grounds of his invective. It is the purpose of this paper to show that the attack on Piso as an Epicurean is derived from the anti-Epicurean polemic current in the popular philosophical literature of Cicero's time. Cicero directed the general anti-Epicurean arguments against the single Epicurean Piso, without submitting specific evidence to prove that the arguments were appropriate to this particular case.

That Cicero consciously recognized the device of using general arguments in particular cases is clear from the *De Oratore*, where he states that it is impossible for an orator to separate general questions (*infinita* or *theseis*) from specific questions (*finita* or *hypotheseis*). He argues that all specific cases can be classed under some general problem, and that the arguments appropriate to the latter are applicable to the former.¹ It is quite natural to suppose, therefore, that when attacking the Epicurean Piso Cicero did not hesitate to use against him the anti-Epicurean arguments which he had encountered in his philosophical studies. A comparison of his invective with the popular polemic against the Epicureans will show that the same arguments appear in both.

For the sake of convenience the parts of Cicero's attack which deal with the Epicureanism of Piso may be discussed under four heads: 1. the pursuit of pleasure; 2. the denial of divine providence; 3. the withdrawal from public life; 4. the cultivation of friendship.

¹ *De Orat.* 2.133–35, especially the words: *Nulla denique est causa in qua id quod in iudicium venit reorum personis ac non generum ipsorum universa dubitatione quaeratur.*

I. THE PURSUIT OF PLEASURE

One of the oldest charges made against Epicurus and his followers was that they cultivated the most vulgar and coarse physical pleasures. Within the lifetime of Epicurus himself a certain Timocrates, the brother of Metrodorus and a renegade from the Epicurean school, wrote a work in which he charged that Epicurus spent a mina a day on food, and that *δὲς αὐτὸν τῆς ἡμέρας ἐμεῖν ἀπὸ τρυφῆς*. He also claimed that Epicurus and Metrodorus consorted with the courtesans Mammarrion, Hedeia, Erotion, and Nigidion.² Later writers made similar accusations, emphasizing particularly Epicurus' love of food. Timon in his *Silloi* ridiculed Epicurus' lack of culture and love of the pleasures of the belly.³ The Stoic Chrysippus said that the spiritual godfather of Epicurus was Archestratus, the man who travelled all over the world with the avowed purpose of making an inventory of the choicest foods he could find.⁴ Carneades,⁵ Diotimus,⁶ Posidonius,⁷ Cicero,⁸ and in later times Plutarch⁹ and many others carried on the attack.

Cicero's description of the riotous living of Piso has a marked similarity with these attacks on the Epicureans. In the *In Pisonem* Cicero describes in detail the feasts and revels of Piso and his Greek friends.¹⁰ He stresses particularly the pleasures of food and drink, as opposed to the more refined pleasures of eyes and ears.¹¹ Piso's *stupra* are also mentioned.¹² Cicero calls Piso a monster, a beast, a

² D. L. 10.6-7; Cic. *Nat. Deor.* 1.113; cf. E. Bignone, *L'Aristotele Perduto e la Formazione Filosofica di Epicuro* (Florence, 1936) 2.48, 226f.

³ Ath. 7.11 (279 F); 13.53 (588 A-B); D.L. 10.3.

⁴ Ath. 3.63 (104 B); 7.8 (278 E); Bignone, *L'Arist. Perd.* 2.244-47.

⁵ Plu. *Non Posse Suaviter Vиви Secundum Epicurum* 4 (1089 C); see Usener, *Epicurea* 287.

⁶ D.L. 10.3; cf. Ath. 13.92 (611 B); W. Crönert, *Kolotes und Menedemos* (Leipzig, 1906) 22.

⁷ D.L. 10.4; cf. Ath. 7.10 (279 D-E).

⁸ E.g. *Fin.* 1.23-25; 2.7, 21-23, 98, 107; *Nat. Deor.* 1.111-13; *Tusc.* 3.41f.; 5.94.

⁹ Especially in the essay *Non Posse Suaviter Vиви Secundum Epicurum*. Cicero's philosophical works and Plutarch's essays are of course subsequent to the *In Pisonem*; yet there is little doubt that they both embody earlier material that would have been available to Cicero at the time that he wrote the *In Pisonem*. Bignone, "Studi Plutarchei," *RFIC* 44 (1916) 269-75 suggests Antiochus as the common source of Cic. *Fin.* 2 and Plu. *Non Posse*.

¹⁰ *Pis.* 22, 66f.

¹¹ *Pis.* 66; cf. *Fin.* 2.107; *Non Posse* 9-13 (1092 D-1096 C).

¹² *Pis.* 42, 70; cf. *Prov.* 6; *Pis.* 69, fg. 11.

horse, and a pig,¹³ just as in the anti-Epicurean polemic the Epicureans are said to reduce men to the level of animals.¹⁴

There is a particularly close parallel in the popular parody of Epicurean "education" and Cicero's description of Piso's philosophical studies. The comic poet Damoxenus portrayed in his *Σύντροφοι* a cook who claimed to have learned the art of compounding culinary pleasures in Epicurus' school, where he spent four talents, presumably for food, over a period of scarcely two years and ten months.¹⁵ Baton, another comic poet, in his *Συνεξαπατών*, referred to Epicurus as a teacher of wastrels,¹⁶ and the same theme seems to have appeared in Alexis' *Ἀσωτοδιδάσκαλος*¹⁷ and in Hegesippus' *Φιλέταιροι*.¹⁸ So in the oration *Cum Senatui Gratias Egīt* Cicero says that Piso's Epicurean teachers taught not the pursuit of virtue but the cultivation of the pleasures of the body: His utitur quasi praeffectis libidinum suarum, hi voluptates omnes vestigant atque odorantur, hi sunt conditores instructoresque convivii, idem expendunt atque aestimant voluptates, sententiamque dicunt et iudicant, quantum cuique libidini tribuendum esse videatur.¹⁹ The antithesis between virtue and pleasure is itself a commonplace of the anti-Epicurean polemic. The Epicureans, according to their opponents, paid lip service to virtue but ignored it in their conduct.²⁰ So Piso is represented as ignoring the Epicurean precept that virtue is a guarantee of happiness.²¹ These passages show clearly that Cicero described Piso's alleged debauchery after the model of the popular anti-Epicurean polemic.

II. THE DENIAL OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE

Because they denied that the gods watched over the lives of men the Epicureans were accused of impiety. This charge was probably made at a very early date, perhaps even by Timocrates.²² In any

¹³ *P. Red. in Sen.* 14; *Pis.* 31, 37, 69, 72.

¹⁴ *Fin.* 2.31, 111; *Acad. Post.* 1.6; *Non Posse* 7 (1091 C).

¹⁵ *Ath.* 3.60 (101 F-103 B, *CAF* 3.349); cf. Bignone, *L'Arist. Perd.* 2.211-14.

¹⁶ *Ath.* 3.61 (103 C-E); 7.9 (279 A, *CAF* 3.328); cf. *Ath.* 7.9 (279 C, *CAF* 3.327).

¹⁷ *Ath.* 8.15 (336 D-F, *CAF* 2.306f.); see below, p. 52.

¹⁸ *Ath.* 7.9 (279 D, *CAF* 3.314).

¹⁹ *P. Red. in Sen.* 15.

²⁰ *Fin.* 2.44, 70; *Tusc.* 2.15-18; *Non Posse* 2 (1087 C); cf. D.L. 10.138.

²¹ *Pis.* 42, 69.

²² At least, Epicurus discussed *δσιότης* in his work *Περὶ Τιμοκράτους*, Usener, *Epic.* 108, 123. See also Bignone, *L'Arist. Perd.* 2.154f.

case Cicero knew it from the works of Posidonius, as may be seen from the following passage of the *De Natura Deorum*: Verius est igitur nimirum illud quod familiaris omnium nostrum Posidonius disseruit in libro quinto de natura deorum, nullos esse deos Epicuro videri, quaeque is de deis immortalibus dixerit invidiae detestandae gratia dixisse.²³ A special development of this argument appears in Aelian, who says that Epicurus' impiety brought down upon him the anger of the gods.²⁴ In the same way Cicero puts in Piso's mouth the words: (Di) ut noster divinus ille dixit Epicurus neque propitii cuiquam esse solent neque irati. To this Cicero adds the comment: Non facies fidem scilicet cum haec disputabis; tibi enim et esse et fuisse videbit (Caesar) iratos (deos).²⁵ The phrase *divinus ille Epicurus* has the sarcastic implication that Epicurus, having barred the real gods from the world, has set himself up in their stead. So Plutarch ridicules the way in which the Epicureans deified their leader.²⁶ Aelian and Plutarch, of course, lived after the time of Cicero, and he could not have derived from them any of the arguments of the *In Pisonem*; yet the very fact that there is some similarity between the *In Pisonem* and these later writers makes it probable that the anti-Epicurean arguments in question had already been formulated before Cicero's time. Other parallels between Cicero and Plutarch, which will be subsequently pointed out, will further strengthen this supposition.

III. THE WITHDRAWAL FROM PUBLIC LIFE

The Epicurean precept, *λάθε βιώσας*, was frequently attacked by the opponents of the Epicurean school. It was pointed out that Epicurus preferred the life of pleasure to the life of public service. The comic poet Alexis in his *Ἀσωτοδιδάσκαλος* presented a character Xanthias who parodied the Epicurean point of view:

6 Τὺρβαζε, Μάνη. γαστρὸς οὐδὲν ἥδιον.
αὖτη πατήρ σοι καὶ πάλιν μήτηρ μόνη.
ἀρχαὶ δὲ πρεσβεῖαι τε καὶ στρατηγίαι
κόμπτοι κενοὶ ψοφοῦσιν ἀντ' ὀνειράτων.

²³ Cic. *Nat. Deor.* 1.123; cf. Plu. *Adversus Colotem* 22 (1119 D-E); 27 (1123 A); 30 (1124 E).

²⁴ *De Providentia* fg. 39 Hercher; cf. Bignone, *L'Arist. Perd.* 2.154f.

²⁵ *Pis.* 59; cf. 46.

²⁶ *Non Posse* 7 (1091 B-C); *Adv. Col.* 17 (1117 A-C).

- 10 ψύξει σ' ὁ δαίμων τῷ πεπωμένῳ χρόνῳ·
 ἔξεις δ' ὅσ' ἂν φάγησ τε καὶ πίης μόνα,
 σποδὸς δὲ τᾶλλα, Περικλῆς, Κόδρος, Κίμων.²⁷

The charge was also made that if the heroes of Greece and Rome, such as Themistocles and Camillus, had been guided by Epicurus' teaching they would not have accomplished their great tasks. As Plutarch says, καὶ μὴν εἴ γε τοῖς χρηστοῖς λανθάνειν καὶ ἀγνοεῖσθαι παραινεῖς, Ἐπαμεινῶνα λέγεις "μὴ στρατῆγαι" καὶ Λυκούργῳ "μὴ νομοθέτει" καὶ Θρασυβούλῳ "μὴ τυραννοκτόνει". . . . εἰ Θεμιστοκλῆς Ἀθηναίους ἐλάνθανεν, οὐκ ἂν ἡ Ἑλλὰς ἀπέώσατο Ξέρξην· εἰ Ῥωμαίους Κάμιλλος, οὐκ ἂν ἡ Ῥώμη πόλις ἔμεινεν· εἰ Δίωνα Πλάτων, οὐκ ἂν ἡλευθερώθη ἡ Σικελία.²⁸

These charges appear in sections 53 to 63 of Cicero's *In Pisonem*. After describing Piso's unheralded return from his province (53–55), Cicero remarks: At audistis patres conscripti philosophi vocem. Negavit se triumphi cupidum umquam fuisse. Cicero then proceeds to attack Piso's statement that he did not want a triumph. According to Cicero no upright person would refuse the glory of a triumph. He contrasts Piso's attitude in this matter with that of Pompey: Ter iam homo stultus triumphavit; and he points out that all the great Roman heroes must have been very stupid and misguided men, from Piso's point of view.²⁹ He then composes an imaginary letter which Piso might write to Caesar, dissuading him from celebrating a triumph. Piso is represented as saying, among other things: Inania sunt ista—mihi crede—delectamenta paene puerorum, captare plausus, vehi per urbem, conspici velle. Quibus ex rebus nihil est quod solidum tenere, nihil quod referre ad voluptatem corporis possis.³⁰

In amplifying this discussion of Piso's lack of interest in public recognition, Cicero says: Est animi lucem splendoremque fugientis iustam gloriam qui est fructus verae virtutis honestissimus re-

²⁷ Ath. 8.15 (336 F). For variant readings see *CAF* 2.306f. and H. van Herwerden, *Collectanea Critica* 121. Alexis' authorship of the passage was questioned by Meineke, *FCG* 1.397f. The name of Epicurus is not mentioned in this passage, but the reference to him is quite certain. See Bignone, *L'Arist. Perd.* 2.228–32.

²⁸ *De Latenter Vivendo* 3f. (1128 F ff.). Cf. Cic. *Fin.* 2.60–68. The antiquity of this charge appears from Metrodorus' disparaging references to the "saviours of Greece," Plu. *Non Posse* 16 (1098 C); *Adv. Col.* 33 (1127 B–C). Metrodorus was apparently answering such charges as those made by Plutarch. See Bignone, *L'Arist. Perd.* 2.248.

²⁹ *Pis.* 56–58. D.C. 40.63 attests to Piso's desire for a quiet life.

³⁰ *Pis.* 59–61.

pudiare.³¹ He means by this that Piso avoids public recognition because Piso lacks *vera virtus*; Piso flees from the light in order to hide his crimes. Cicero proceeds to enumerate some of these crimes in the following sentence. The contrast here expressed between light and virtue and glory on the one hand, and darkness and vice and obscurity on the other, is again a commonplace of the anti-Epicurean polemic. Plutarch says that the Epicureans' desire to live in obscurity is itself an indication of their depraved life; for deeds of evil need darkness, but virtue seeks light and fame.³²

In developing the analogy between vice and darkness Cicero states that Piso's vices have brought down on him the hatred of the senate and the Roman people. He says that Piso lives in seclusion because he is afraid to expose himself to the fury of the people. Cicero dares him to appear at the games soon to be celebrated.³³ Piso's seclusion, then, is not merely a cover for vice; it is an escape from the righteous anger of the people. It is Piso's punishment for his crimes, for he is marked with *ignominia* and the *conscientia scelerum*. Discoursing at length on the nature of punishment Cicero points out that not even the Epicureans regard mere physical suffering as punishment. For Cicero the real punishment of vice is the *laceratio famae*; hence Piso's disgrace affords Cicero more pleasure than any corporeal punishment could possibly do.³⁴

In these passages Cicero has once more employed a philosophical commonplace as a means of expressing his malice toward Piso. Plutarch uses practically the same doctrine of reward and punishment in his attack on the Epicureans. According to Plutarch the Epicureans were hated by the common people. The *ἄχλων θυμοί* were among the hazards with which the Epicureans had to contend.³⁵ Even Epicurus admitted, according to Plutarch, that fame is a source of pleasure.³⁶ But if good reputation is pleasant, bad reputation must be painful. Hence the Epicureans, suffering from a bad reputation, must live a painful life.³⁷ In another part of his attack Plutarch says that obscurity and darkness are themselves the

³¹ *Pis.* 57; cf. the contrast between *gloria* and *turpitudine* in 63f.

³² *De Lat. Viv.* 4 (1129 A-C). Bignone (*L'Arist. Perd.* 2.599) believes that Plutarch's source was Heraclides Ponticus.

³³ *Pis.* 64f.; cf. 33.

³⁴ *Pis.* 42-45; cf. 98f.

³⁵ *Non Posse* 6 (1090 E); 21 (1102 B).

³⁶ *Non Posse* 18 (1099 F).

³⁷ *Non Posse* 19 (1100 C-D).

punishment of impiety and lawlessness. Evildoers are punished in the lower world not by corporeal suffering, for they no longer have bodies which can suffer, but by ἀδοξία καὶ ἄγνοια καὶ παντελῶς ἀφανισμός.³⁸

The remarkable similarity between Plutarch's *Moralia* and Cicero's *In Pisonem* on this whole theme of seclusion, darkness, vice, ill repute, and punishment on the one hand, as opposed to public service, light, virtue, fame, and reward on the other, leads to the conclusion that both authors used a common source; for it is not likely that Plutarch used Cicero's *In Pisonem* as a source for a philosophic essay. Though the history of these arguments is difficult to trace,³⁹ it is quite probable that they had appeared in the anti-Epicurean literature before Cicero's time, and that Cicero adapted them to his attack on Piso.

IV. THE CULTIVATION OF FRIENDSHIP

The cultivation of friendship, one of the most distinctive features of Epicurean society, was attacked on the ground that the Epicureans cultivated friendship for the sole purpose of increasing the amount of pleasure in their lives. They knew nothing of true friendship, which rests not on the pursuit of pleasure but on virtue.⁴⁰ Their small intimate groups afforded the opportunity for a more intensive pursuit of vice. The fact that the Epicureans admitted courtesans into their societies was cited as evidence for this charge.⁴¹ Cicero uses a similar line of attack in his description of Piso's *sordidissimi greges*, who spent their time drinking, dancing, and feasting.⁴²

In amplifying the attack on Epicurean friendship, the opponents of the school argued that as friendship of powerful and wealthy men was found by the Epicureans to be a source of rather considerable pleasure, they indulged in flattery and all other forms of servility. Epicurus flattered Mithras and Idomeneus, that by so doing he

³⁸ *De Lat. Viv.* 7 (1130 D-E). The charge of insanity, which Cicero uses against Piso in *Pis.* 46f., is a Stoic commonplace sometimes used against the Epicureans; cf. *Arr. Epict.* 2.23.20-22.

³⁹ See above, note 32.

⁴⁰ *Fin.* 2.82. This charge was probably made in Theophrastus' *Περὶ Φιλίας*. See Bignone, *L'Arist. Perd.* 2.287ff.

⁴¹ *Non Posse* 16 (1097 D-E).

⁴² *Pis.* 22; cf. 1 grex noviciorum, 13 illo ganeorum tuarum nidore atque fumo; for the meaning of the phrase in 67 Graeci stipati quini in lectulis, saepe plures, see B. L. Ullman, "Horace on the Nature of Satire," *TAPhA* 48 (1917) 121.

might increase his store of pleasures;⁴³ and concerning the wise man he made the statement: *καὶ μόναρχον ἐν καιρῷ θεραπεύσειν*.⁴⁴ Epicurean meetings were represented as assemblies of flatterers, with everyone praising everyone else without limit.⁴⁵ In Cicero's account of Piso servility appears in the person of the Greek Epicureans who cultivated Piso's friendship, especially in Philodemus: *Graecus facilis et valde venustus nimis pugnax contra senatorem populi Romani esse noluit*. Philodemus was not by nature vicious, but only a *Graeculus*, *assentator*, *poeta*, who was importuned by his patron to describe his vices in poetry.⁴⁶

The many similarities, both generic and specific, between Cicero's invective against Piso and the ancient anti-Epicurean polemic indicate clearly that Cicero adapted the general arguments to his particular case, in conformity with his rhetorical theory of the relation of *thesis* and *hypothesis*. It is beyond the scope of this paper to examine the merits of the general anti-Epicurean polemic; but it is clear from the material presented that Cicero's statements about the Epicurean Piso deserve little credence. The mere fact that Cicero used these general arguments suggests that he lacked direct evidence about Piso's conduct and his relation to his Epicurean friends. Cicero gives very little substantiation for his charges. He mentions only one visit to Piso, on which occasion Piso said that he was sick, though Cicero tries to insinuate that his illness was merely a cover for his debauchery.⁴⁷ His other evidence is indirect and inferential, as for example his comparison of Piso with the Epicurean Albucius.⁴⁸ At a very crucial point in his argument Cicero introduces the poems of Philodemus as evidence of the conduct of Piso.⁴⁹ Now the epigrams of Philodemus that have been preserved in the *Palatine*

⁴³ Ath. 7.11 (279 F); D.L. 10.4f. The antiquity of this charge is indicated by the fact that Epicurus himself, apparently as a counter-charge, called Plato a Διονυσιοκόλαξ, D.L. 10.8. See Bignone, *L'Arist. Perd.* 2.131.

⁴⁴ D.L. 10.120.

⁴⁵ Ath. 5.12 (182 A); cf. *Non Posse* 18 (1100 B).

⁴⁶ *Pis.* 70. Cicero does not mention Philodemus by name, but Asconius identifies him in the scholium to *Pis.* 68 (Stangl 20).

⁴⁷ *Pis.* 13. The words *involuta capite*, *soleatium*, suggest the *πυλίδιον*, which is used as a mark of the pursuit of pleasure in *Adv. Col.* 33 (1127 B).

⁴⁸ *Pis.* 92; *Prov.* 15. In another place (*Pis.* 66) Cicero refers to Piso's discourses (*disputationes*) as evidence.

⁴⁹ *Pis.* 68–71. Cicero avoids quoting any of the poems, saying that they would offend the dignity of the senate.

Anthology do not exhibit a high moral standard; but they are quite in the literary tradition of the Greek epigram, and they certainly reveal nothing about the conduct of Piso.⁵⁰ Even if we assume that Cicero knew of epigrams now lost which professed to be describing Piso's vices, such epigrams would provide only indirect evidence of questionable value.

Another indication of Cicero's lack of knowledge about Piso appears in the inconsistencies of Cicero's description of him. In sections 42 and 69 of the *In Pisonem* he tells us that Piso had only a superficial and inaccurate knowledge of the Epicurean philosophy; in section 59 Piso is a finished and polished Epicurean, and in 66 Cicero alludes to his philosophical discourses. Again, according to sections 66 and 67 Piso lives in such vulgar luxury that he doesn't even have fine dinner service. There is nothing in his house which is choice or elegant, and nothing very expensive except his lust. Yet elsewhere Cicero tells us that this same man emptied all the Greek temples of their statues, paintings, and ornaments.⁵¹ In one place Cicero says that Piso concealed his vices behind a *vultum inportunum*;⁵² in another place he tells us that Piso persuaded Philodemus to celebrate these same vices in his verses.⁵³

Cicero's explanation that Piso had been able to conceal his vices from everyone but Cicero himself is another indication of the weakness of Cicero's case. For it implies that Piso did not generally suffer from that ill repute that Cicero elsewhere attributed to him, when he challenged him to appear in public. Since Piso did not have a bad reputation, Cicero could not make his slanderous charges sound plausible without explaining why Piso's vices had not been previously known.⁵⁴

Cicero's failure to substantiate the general anti-Epicurean charges that he has used against Piso and his Epicurean associates

⁵⁰ *Anth. Pal.* 11.44 is the only extant epigram of Philodemus that mentions Piso. It contains an invitation to a dinner at the Epicurean school; and far from depicting a luxurious feast, it says that the simplicity of the food will be more than made up for by the excellent company.

⁵¹ *Sest.* 94; cf. *Prov.* 7.

⁵² *P. Red. in Sen.* 15; cf. *Pis.* 1.

⁵³ *Pis.* 70.

⁵⁴ The charge of hypocrisy was itself a commonplace of the attack on sham philosophy. It probably underlies the *supercilium* and the *barbato Epicuro* (*barbaro* is a variant reading) of *Pis.* 20, for beard and eyebrows were recognized marks of sham philosophers, cf. Arr. *Epict.* 2.8.24; 4.8.15; Luc. *Pisc.* 11f. Epicurus was charged with hypocrisy in matters of religion by Plu. *Non Posse* 21 (1102 B) and Cic. *Nat. Deor.* 1.123.

should warn us not to accept without careful examination his picture of Epicurean society. In particular his statements about Philodemus' relation to Piso do not merit the credence that has frequently been put in them.⁵⁵ Some of his statements are undoubtedly correct, for they can be confirmed from other sources. From Philodemus' own works it is known that, as Cicero says, he was a friend of Piso, that he was a poet, and that his interests were broader than those of the average Epicurean. Yet Cicero makes in addition certain remarks about Philodemus' character. He says in sections 68-70 of the *In Pisonem* that Philodemus was a flatterer who sought Piso's patronage in such a way that he never departed from Piso's presence; and that being unable to teach Piso the intricacies of the Epicurean philosophy, Philodemus permitted himself to be dragged down to the level of his patron. Cicero's purpose here is to heap further abuse on Piso and to give a plausible reason for using Philodemus' epigrams as evidence of Piso's character. The charges of servility and moral degradation were, as we have seen, elements of the anti-Epicurean polemic; and as long as they lack specific confirmation they do not constitute a reliable source of information about Philodemus.⁵⁶

In conclusion, I have maintained that Cicero's invective against Piso as an Epicurean exemplifies the rhetorical theory that arguments applicable to a general question may be used concretely of any specific case falling under the general class. Cicero has embodied in his invective popular anti-Epicurean arguments regarding the pursuit of pleasure, the denial of divine providence, the withdrawal from public life, and the cultivation of friendship. Cicero's failure to substantiate these arguments by specific evidence arouses the suspicion that they do not give an accurate picture of Piso's conduct and character.

⁵⁵ See *RE s.v.* "Philodemus" 2444f. (Philippson); Herbert Bloch, "L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus in Samothrace and Herculaneum," *AJA* 44 (1940) 485-93; Marion Tait, *Philodemus' Influence on the Latin Poets* (Diss. Bryn Mawr, 1941).

⁵⁶ Cf. W. Allen, Jr. and P. DeLacy, "The Patrons of Philodemus," *CPh* 34 (1939) 59-65.