

# Table of contents

Introduction . . . . .	1
Chapter 1	
Lucretius drew the Critique from an earlier Epicurean polemic . .	11
1.1 Lucretius' information is second-hand . . . . .	20
1.2 Lucretius' source was an Epicurean text . . . . .	35
1.2.1 Lucretius' use of <i>homoeomeria</i> . . . . .	36
1.2.2 The choice of Heraclitus as representative monist .	40
1.2.2.1 The Stoics as fire monists? . . . . .	43
1.2.2.2 The Stoic denial of void in the world? . . .	44
1.2.3 Lucretius' arguments against the limited pluralists . . . . .	46
1.2.3.1 Lines 753–781 . . . . .	46
1.2.3.2 Lines 782–802 . . . . .	47
1.2.4 The Epicurean angle . . . . .	50
1.3 Conclusion . . . . .	56
Chapter 2	
Books XIV and XV of Epicurus' <i>Περὶ φύσεως</i> . . . . .	58
2.1 The content of books XIV and XV . . . . .	58
2.1.1 Book XIV was not dedicated to polemic . . . . .	59
2.1.1.1 Evidence from the format of <i>PHerc.</i> 1148 .	59
2.1.1.2 Columns I–XXII . . . . .	60
2.1.1.3 Columns XXIII and XXIV . . . . .	63
2.1.1.4 Evidence from the <i>sezioni</i> . . . . .	66
2.1.2 Epicurus did not discuss Heraclitus' theory <i>ΠΦ</i> XIV . . . . .	78
2.1.3 Epicurus did not refute Empedocles' theory in <i>ΠΦ</i> XIV . . . . .	79
2.1.4 Book XV was not dedicated to criticism of Anaxagoras . . . . .	84
2.1.4.1 <i>Cornice</i> 2 . . . . .	86
2.1.4.2 <i>Cornice</i> 3 . . . . .	105
2.1.4.3 <i>Cornice</i> 4 . . . . .	110

2.1.4.4	<i>Cornice 5</i>	116
2.1.4.5	<i>Cornici 6 and 7</i>	122
2.1.4.6	<i>Cornice 8</i>	125
2.2	Other considerations intrinsic to Epicurus' work	128
2.3	Do ΠΦ XIV and XV depend on Theophrastus' Φυσικαὶ δόξαι?	131
2.3.1	Was Plato the last of the limited pluralists in Theophrastus' Φυσικαὶ δόξαι?	137
2.3.2	The detail of the arguments against Plato and air monism	138
2.3.3	The dating of ΠΦ XIV and of Theophrastus' Φυσικαὶ δόξαι	143
2.4	Conclusion	145

### Chapter 3

Lucretius' use of sources in <i>DRN I</i>	147
3.1 The source of <i>DRN I</i> .156–598 and 951–1107	147
3.2 Did Lucretius change source after line 598 of <i>DRN I</i> ?	152
3.3 The Critique does not derive from the same source as 155 ff.	158
3.4 The connection between lines 634 and 635	160
3.5 Why did Lucretius have the Critique at the centre of book I?	163
3.6 Was Epicurus the source of the Critique?	168
3.7 Did Lucretius use a later Epicurean source?	171
3.7.1 The choice of Heraclitus	177
3.7.2 Lucretius' use of <i>homoeomeria</i>	179
3.8 Conclusion	181

### Chapter 4

Lucretius in the Critique	182
4.1 Heraclitus as a general	182
4.2 Heraclitus' army	185
4.2.1 <i>Stolidi</i> and <i>inanes Graii</i>	186
4.2.2 Sound and truth	190
4.2.3 <i>Inversis sub verbis</i>	199
4.3 The theme of the path and the search for truth	208
4.3.1 Lines 657–59	209
4.3.2 Lines 690–700	211
4.4 Empedocles and Sicily	212

4.4.1 Empedocles' language: poetry as revelation . . . .	213
4.4.2 Lucretius' praise . . . . .	216
4.4.3 Etna . . . . .	223
4.4.4 Lucretius' endorsement of Empedocles' discoveries	224
4.4.5 The four elements: Empedocles' disastrous fall . .	231
4.5 Lucretius' presentation of Anaxagoras' theory . . . . .	235
4.5.1 Lucretius' transliteration <i>homoeomeria</i> . . . . .	236
4.5.2 Parody of Anaxagoras . . . . .	238
4.6 The mortality of Anaxagoras' <i>primordia</i> . . . . .	239
4.7 Lucretius' strategy in lines 859–74 . . . . .	243
4.8 The analogy of letters and atoms . . . . .	245
4.8.1 Lines 823–29 . . . . .	247
4.8.2 Intertextuality . . . . .	250
4.8.3 Lines 906–14 . . . . .	251
4.9 Formularity . . . . .	253
4.10 The parallelism between lines 803–29 and 897–920 . . .	255
4.11 The Critique as 'dialogue' . . . . .	257
4.12 Conclusion . . . . .	264
Appendix (A) Two stages of composition? . . . . .	267
Appendix (B) The format of <i>PHerc.</i> 1148 and <i>PHerc.</i> 1151 . . . .	273
Appendix (C) Do Epicurus' <i>Ad Herodotum</i> and <i>Ad Pythoclem</i> reflect continuous books of ΠΦ? . . . . .	283
Abbreviations . . . . .	289
Bibliography . . . . .	291