

**COMENIUS UNIVERSITY IN BRATISLAVA**

**FACULTY OF ARTS**

*Was Cicero really an anti-epicureanist?*

(ŠVOK 2021)

Study programme: Philosophy

Field of study: Philosophy and history of philosophy

Supervisor: Mgr. Zuzana Zelinová, PhD.

Bratislava 2021

Dávid Kurák

Aim of this work will focus on the problematics of Cicero on his attitude towards Epicureanism. Prime issue is to observe and analyse his thoughts through philosophical, political, as well as his personal point of view. Furthermore, to compare and construct arguments within Epicurean doctrine in order to answer the question *if Cicero really was an anti-epicureanist*<sup>1</sup>. Classical interpretation in Hellenistic studies is that Cicero was a strong anti-Epicurean<sup>2</sup>. To find arguments against this interpretative position, so we try to find such textual and argumentative evidence that would question this “common view”. Moreover, this work might present certain hypothesis which could be understood by many as absurd or unreliable in this extend, due to lack of original texts or their interpretations from it, which could provide sufficient arguments for this matter. In addition, ancient philosophers don't consider to great extend a nuance, from which they represent various perspectives, taking different approaches or even taking different steps to include more complex picture of with specific situations or problems which may arise from them. On the other hand, this work could also motivate others to strive deeply into this problematic from which new arguments and hypothesis may arise. Nevertheless, hypothesis and arguments which will be presented in this work, aims to solve problem of a conflict attitude within Cicero's philosophy towards Epicureanism. Methodology of constructing these arguments will proceed as follows. 1) Firstly, basic insight into both philosophical concepts, especially in terms of social aspects. comparison and additional providing arguments in order to estimate how one ought to “act“. Furthermore, it will be also important to interpret Epicurean philosophy even from Cicero's point of view, in order to outline some variations and perspectives of their conflict. 2) Secondly, to focus analysis and observations towards their “common ideas“, mainly in terms of devotion/godliness, separations which arisen from previous comparison of social aspects, as well as the importance of specific passages and interpretations of the texts, which may provide the key to the conclusion of their clash. Furthermore, to specify Cicero's attitude towards Epicureanism in manners of consistency (for example there is a difference between Epicuros' philosophy and later Epicureanism), differences within theory and practice, which may signal stable ground for resolution and last, but not least, to stress out position of philosophical rivalry well known in Hellenistic period. 3) In the final part of this paper we present a comparative analysis of individual arguments that could clarify Cicero's relationship to Epicuros' philosophy.

---

<sup>1</sup> Or even from what it arises.

<sup>2</sup> Long, A. A.: *Hellenistic Philosophers, Vol. 1*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1987.

## Arguments for Cicero's Anti-Epicureanism

### *Taking care of politics*

The most well-known question in which Cicero and Epicurus disagree, is the question of philosopher's interference in public life. Cicero's philosophy aims on a pursue of a virtuous life, taking responsibility for one's actions and getting involve in social matters, which stand in accordance within living in harmony of human nature (*natura*)<sup>3</sup>. Although, Cicero's essence of virtues is indeed metaphysical, its value acquires only through *honestum*, which Cicero connects with duties<sup>4</sup>. It is a duty, the conservation of organized society, arising from practical life, which connects us to the human society on which Cicero placed important emphasis, as "discreet action is more valuable than wise (but inactive) speculation"<sup>5</sup>.

*Honestum* is always utile, for nothing can be expedient, which is not at the same time morally right, neither can a thing be morally right, as being only expedient, yet it is expedient, since it is morally right<sup>6</sup>. In addition, Cicero hold a significant importance into the politics, which holds great responsibility for taking care of whole society. Those who will take charge of affairs of government should remember, that good of the people (fellow citizen) contributes to the common good and take care of whole body of politics, not serving of some one party to betray rest<sup>7</sup>. By this means, according to Cicero, Epicureans judge nothing but their own benefit and expediency, which is dishonest, immoral, and reprehensible<sup>8</sup>.

On the other hand, Epicurean hold a different perspective of how one ought to live his life, for to achieve "ultimate happiness" as a condition, one should dispose of any pain of a body nor disturbance of a mind<sup>9</sup> (*ataraxia, tranquillitas*). One cannot live reasonably, beautifully and justly, if one does not live blissfully, in terms of a pleasure. In addition, hence Epicurus followed Democritus' theory of atomism, not only body is a construct of atoms, yet also soul is merely "a fine-structured body diffused through the whole aggregate"<sup>10</sup>. Thus, as body dies, souls will also disappear, therefore, Epicureans would care only about benefits and

---

<sup>3</sup> Cicero agrees and adapt view of the world from Stoics philosophy, that everything is formed by and in accordance with (nature/*natura*/principle).; Diog. *Laert. Vit.* 7.87,137.

<sup>4</sup> *Off.* 1.3.

<sup>5</sup> *Off.* 1.44,45.

<sup>6</sup> *Off.* 3.30.

<sup>7</sup> *Off.* 1.25.; *Off.* 1.10.; Therefore, in politics particularly, one ought to preserve and respect the principles of justice (virtuous).

<sup>8</sup> *Off.* 3.28.

<sup>9</sup> *Fin.* 2.17. (1-2)

<sup>10</sup> Epicurus, *Letter to Herodotus* 63.

pleasure achievable in their lifetime, hence they would not care about glory nor legacy. Therefore, for Epicurus there is nothing between pleasure and pain<sup>11</sup>. Epicureans are expected to avoid certain pleasures or endure pains for the sake of greater pleasures<sup>12</sup>.

However, the importance of a public life and social aspects play one of the most important and significant role in matters of their schism. Let's construct the form of a dialog: Cicero on matters of "Epicurean egoism"<sup>13</sup> would argue that They should be grateful as well as humble for the great service that He, Cicero, and his fellow politicians, do for the sake of a state and society, taking care or even preventing wars<sup>14</sup>, so They could live their life in "peace" while "they are traitors to social life, for they contribute to it none of their interest, none of their effort, none of their means"<sup>15</sup>. Epicurus, on the other hand, might as well respond that why he ought to take care of any of those things, since not only it would bring him disturbance of a mind, but also there is no benefit for taking care of a state or worship it's legacy. For what would motivate him? There shall be no "life" after this one, there is no meaning of taking care of public wealth nor thinking about „my child“. Epicurean should focus only on himself, in order to live his life happily, while Those overall chose their part in taking care of political matters.

Another problem, which might arise from this could be Cicero's caution, saying that if there would be any danger, it would be too late to react. One ought to do great things and show bravery in order to prevent or defend such virtues<sup>16</sup> or even protect the peace in which all may prosper. At this point, a very important issue occurs, which needs to be solved within Epicurean doctrine. First is to address issue of *getting involved in politics* from theoretical point of view, to solve if epicurean philosophy would be capable of their *adaptability* to any "political system" or they would need to rely, to the certain extend, on a *conditions* which might occur. Second issue that emerge, is to solve their political attitude from more practical perspective. But first, let's focus on former.

---

<sup>11</sup> *Letter to Menoecus* 127-132.

<sup>12</sup> *Diog. Laert. Vit.* 10.89,90,121., 7.137.

<sup>13</sup> Since „we were not born for ourselves“. *Off.* 1.7.

<sup>14</sup> *Off.* 1. 22-24.

<sup>15</sup> *Off.* 1.9.

<sup>16</sup> *Off.* 1.20, 1.7.

Hypothesis may be presented as follows: From Epicurean point of view, in terms of “benefit-efficiency“, which approach would be more in accordance with easier way to strive for *ataraxia*? Would it be *conditions*, since the better (more tolerable) conditions of a society or running of a state<sup>17</sup>, the easier way to achieve *ataraxia*? It would be surely illogical to think, that epicureans would not choose easier way in order to achieve tranquility, for a price of making effort<sup>18</sup>. However, it could also be the case, where Epicurean philosophy would be so flexible or to put it in a different term *adaptable*, that would sufficient and able to preserve its value no matter which “political system“ would occur? Hence main idea of achieving tranquility is through a benefit. Therefore, an epicurean would always find a way of receiving benefit, striving to achieve happiness, yet still not get involved in politics. *Adaptability* or self-sufficiency would find its function in variety of political systems. Not to forget, that precaution is more of a Stoic idea. This problem arises a serious question within Epicurean doctrine and interpretation of one’s text, which brings us to second problem.

How one should understand *getting involved in politics* from a practical point of view? As it is well known, Epicurean garden was located outside the walls of Athens, holding an idea of the retiring and non-political character while not been located far from Plato’s Academy<sup>19</sup>. To outline the vision of an epicurean view of a society and world they live is “the world in which we live is not the product of a divine and philanthropic design; it is part of an infinite universe in which worlds form and dissolve in autonomous combinations of atoms in an infinite void“<sup>20</sup>. It needs to be taken into a consideration, as well as to remember, that people live together in a space, where they interact with each other and share also share it. Therefore, it needs to be understood that Epicureans needs to deal with a world they “seem to occur“. This part shows a very important issue in which on one hand, Epicurus is perceived as a respectful authority<sup>21</sup>, while on the other as someone who’s philosophy lacks consistency<sup>22</sup>. Furthermore, it is uneasy to answer, if there needs to be strict diversification between an authority and dogma of Epicurus and his latter student successors. Nevertheless, there are

---

<sup>17</sup> Imagine for example differences between free citizen in democracy (*res publica in this case*) and slave in tyranny.

<sup>18</sup> For example, “we must risk our lives for the sake of friendship“. Epicurus, *Key doctrines* 28 In: Okál, M.: *O šťastnom živote*. 2013.; However, this matter will be analysed in greater extend in latter chapter and arguments.

<sup>19</sup> Warren, J.: *Cambridge Comparison to Epicureanism*. 2009, p. 9.

<sup>20</sup> Warren, J.: *Cambridge Comparison to Epicureanism*. 2009, p. 15.

<sup>21</sup> Kalaš, A, 2005, p.75.

<sup>22</sup> *Off.* 3.33. ; *Tusc.* 5.9. ; 3.15. ; *Off.* 1.2. ; *Off.* 1.23.

indeed evidences, which proves that some “Epicureans“ were indeed involved in politics, e.g. assassination of a Caesar<sup>23</sup>.

After all that has been said, what needs to be likewise took into consideration, is that for Epicureans it is useless to assume, that they would take care or involve in politics in order to help other epicureans and their “legacy“ into the future. Epicurean as an individual has no means to get involved in this matter, since his life starts and ends on the very edge of a birth and death. For there is no afterlife to be feared nor taken into account. What he needs to be primarily focused on is his time that he has, while he is alive. Thus, it bring the observation and focus of this study to another layer, and that is to analyse term of a godliness and looking up to (something/someone), interconnected with interpolitical base, one’s behaviour, actions and taking responsibility for one’s own life (in accordance with one philosophy).

---

<sup>23</sup> Warren, J.: *Cambridge Comparison to Epicureanism*. 2009, p. 53-54.

## Arguments for Cicero's Anti-Epicureanism

### *Godliness, interpolitical basis and practical actions*

In this very chapter, observation will specify some of the key aspects of both philosophies, in which commonalities may be found. For Cicero, ethics is not only practical manner, but principally its essence lie in metaphysics. Cicero mainly refers to Gods, in order to adopt moral principles, with accordance of greatness of a soul and other virtues<sup>24</sup>. Hence, even though one could hide all dishonest actions even from the eyes of Gods<sup>25</sup>, he ought not to do so, since *honestum* demands for its own virtue<sup>26</sup>. For example, in *De Officiis*, while talking about greatness of a souls and fortitude, Cicero brought interesting connection of the great Hercules and his fully merited place in the council of the gods<sup>27</sup>. Cicero's practical application of knowledge and abilities are connected with the spread and lasting of a legacy<sup>28</sup> which is enduring through glory<sup>29</sup>. Therefore, it is our deed to perform our actions in accordance with virtues. In conclusion, Cicero would urge us to strive for a carrier (e.g. of a *consul*) in order to perform great action/deeds which would be worthy of God's appreciation / approval, as well as "beneficial" (*honestum*) for public.

Contrastingly, Epicureans would not agree and argued, that why one ought to spend thirty years of his life, only to achieve this "useless" position, while they could spend that time on order to strive for *ataraxia*? For a wise man don't strive for a longest life, but the most pleasant one<sup>30</sup>. Moreover, it is not important, if an epicurean would devote his thirty years of his life trying to achieve or actually achieving *ataraxia*, since there is no difference of one

---

<sup>24</sup> *Tusc.* 2.8,9,10.

<sup>25</sup> Thence it is assessed whether the act itself is dishonest. *Off.* 3.9,19.

<sup>26</sup> Good virtuous act, demanding for its own value, it merits praise, even though it be praised by none which dwells in the fellowship of a man from their nature (*natura*).(*Off.* 1.4., 3.7,8.); *Tusc.* 2.20.

<sup>27</sup> A great hero does not possess fear of death nor pain, "undergo the greatest toil and trouble for sake of adding or saving the world" (*Off.* 3.5.) through greatness of a soul, recognizing goodness, which lies beyond the suffering of the body (anti-epicureanism?) and lastly, he performed deeds great and legendary, worthy of everlasting legacy and gloria, worthy to be remembered.

It is also worth remembering, that Cicero distinguishes between two kinds of glory, one called *fama* (superficial, shallow/bad form of glory, that people often associate with the lust for wealth, power, etc.), the second called *gloria* (true, good form of glory). If someone has the opportunity to say / do something as great as good, one has a duty to do so. Thus, this form of a *gloria* will ensure that the legacy reaches to most of a people. In this case too, participation in politics is associated with a "glory".

<sup>28</sup> *Off.* 3.2., 1.20.

<sup>29</sup> *Off.* 2.9

<sup>30</sup> *Letter to Menoeceus* 126,127.

length of his life. To put it more precisely, there is no difference for epicurean to live twenty and hundreds of years, as long as he experiences *ataraxia*. As soon as his life has faded, there is no existence anymore, since there is no afterlife. Therefore, for epicurean there will be only a time, that he can spend to achieve happiness. Furthermore, the fundamental ambition of the Epicureans was to imitate the blissful life of the gods<sup>31</sup>, that is, to achieve the blissful life of the gods<sup>32</sup>, since as according to Epicurus, Gods has no worries nor are any of the virtues attributed to him<sup>33</sup>, as Stoics describe it, since all the virtues function and their character lies solely in interpersonal relationships<sup>34</sup>. Moreover, God do not interfere within a human life, therefore achieving, as well as failing to achieve happiness, is only a result of themselves<sup>35</sup>.

Additionally, both for Cicero as well as Epicurus, in terms of “fate“, our actions create or enable a certain form of reaction, responses (responsibility) within our lives, since some things are in our power<sup>36</sup>. Furthermore, term of godliness seems to be one of key relations, which indicate us common ground of both philosophers. Godliness is form of appraisal/appreciation in which we look up to and try to imitate or try to act in accordance with, in order to get closer or to experience a part of divinity of Gods<sup>37</sup>. Therefore, for Epicurean it is a way to imitate ultimate *ataraxia*, while for Cicero virtuous Gods are instance worth following. It’s important to notice that godliness, while being aspect of one’s theoretical/metaphysical bases, it also shows significant application of a practical actions. Comparing and contrasting microcosmos and macrocosmos, lower and higher form of political/social layer of a world<sup>38</sup>. For example, Cicero while acknowledging close-knit of social bonds of a society with *natura*, state, humankind<sup>39</sup>, yet he also undermine position and “work“ (actions) of butchers or fisherman<sup>40</sup> as something “less“, since they are far from everyday virtuous approach of a “wise man“.

---

<sup>31</sup> Kalaš, A., *New challenges of Greek philosophy*. 2005, p.76.

<sup>32</sup> *Letter to Menoeceus* 135.

<sup>33</sup> *Letter to Menoeceus* 123,124.

<sup>34</sup> Epicurus, *Key doctrines* 31-37.

<sup>35</sup> *Letter to Menoeceus* 133,134.

<sup>36</sup> Compare *Letter to Menoeceus*, 127 and *Off.* 1.32.

<sup>37</sup> Kalaš, A., Wollner, U., 2008, p. 5-28.

<sup>38</sup> Note 20.

<sup>39</sup> *Off.* 2. 3., 21.

<sup>40</sup> *Off.* 1. 42.; Showing a difference between high-state politics (*consul*) and his deeds, environment (location) compared to the countryside.



On a contrary, starting from this point, let's look at the previous problem of epicureanism in terms of *adaptability* or *conditions*. As it was mentioned previously, the key of epicurean philosophy is to achieve tranquility. For a wise man it is necessary to understand, that from all goods, the best good in terms of *ataraxia* is to acquire a friend<sup>41</sup>. Every/ all of friendship is a virtue on itself. However, it is based on utility<sup>42</sup>! Friendship originates from benefit and one ought to even risk a life for a friend<sup>43</sup>. What does it indicate? Being an epicurean, you “need“ to do some effort in order to achieve *ataraxia* ( e.g. acquire a friend). Therefore, while it may seem, that *conditions* would have an impact / committed to an Epicurean in order to “help“ him achieve tranquility, *adaptability* provides more complex picture. From passage of Plutarch, it is shown that Epicurean would rather give than receive benefit<sup>44</sup>, however, it is important not to forget, that it an idea that serves personal individual benefit. Moreover, if this interpretation would be in a support of *adaptability*, it would hold doctrinal idea of *not getting involved in politics*.

To form a clearer picture, lets imagine this scenario: An Epicurean will learn, that all time he has is between birth and death. He also learns, that he needed to do an effort to understand/learn this philosophy, in order to “get closer“ to achieve *ataraxia*. He needs to form a friendship, which would benefit him, since the benefit of a friend will “save“ him from uncertain future and ease his pain of mental disturbance. For he needs to first “give a benefit“ in order to receive it. However, he understands that his ultimate goal is to achieve *ataraxia* and key aspect (not self-sufficient, but a necessary condition) to it, is only through benefit. He then may risk his life for an epicurean friend, since if he would be successful, he would receive a benefit, which will be at least of the same value (that he has given). He might as well not take any precautions, besides giving benefit of a friend, since not only everything happens by coincidence, he will not fear of a death nor afterlife. He may not as well care for “change of political system“, since he does not care about epicureans apart from itself (into the future). For he may spend twenty-five years of his life, from which two were in *ataraxia*, which is an ultimate beatitude, while someone had spent hundreds of it, without any success.

---

<sup>41</sup> Epicurus, *Key doctrines* 27., In: Okál, M.: Epicuros, O šťastnom živote. 2013.

<sup>42</sup> Epicurus, *Key doctrines* 23.; This passage is very important in terms of interpretation Epicurean doctrine. (Πᾶσα φιλία δι' ἑαυτὴν αἰρετὴ/ἀρετὴ ἀρχὴν δὲ εἴληφεν ἀπὸ τῆς ὠφελείας). Original text could be interpreted in two way: One is to understand that αἰρετὴ in a way: (that friendship) is something we choose for itself or secondly, of ἀρετὴ, which indicates: (that friendship) is a virtue on itself. In terms of our interpretation of a text and construction of this work, latter would be better (right) interpretation, since Epicurean “goal/ultimate goal“ is *ataraxia*, while friendship is a key to it. However, it is not worth of praising on its own. Epicureans form friendships in order to receive benefit, which would “help“ them achieve *ataraxia*.

<sup>43</sup> *Key doctrines* 27,28.

<sup>44</sup> Plutarch, *Mor* 778C

Since time itself for an Epicurean is limited, his *adaptability* and self-sufficiency of his philosophy<sup>45</sup> will help him prevail in any “political system“.

To put it all together, an Epicurean walk in his world freely, showing no importance to legacy, wealth, evil Gods etc. His ultimate goal is to achieve the absence of pain of a body and disturbance of a mind. Therefore, he focus all of his energy towards himself, while having another “friend Epicurean“, which would “save“ him from uncertain future (which is absolutely uncertain). Conclusively, godliness plays a significant role on both philosophical concepts. It does not only shows, how practise of one’s philosophy in terms of *how one ought to act* in significantly interconnected with a “metaphysical“ lever of a philosophical concept, yet also it shows an application of a practical interpretation (acting in accordance with) of a text. Lastly, to remember an importance of a social aspects of one’s life (an environment) and a time period (specific age) of a philosopher, which may define a more complex picture of observation. This brings us to a last point, that needs to be analysed. That is to connect social, philosophical and historical aspects of both philosophies, as well as to outline important interconnection within theory and practice.

---

<sup>45</sup> World-view, perspective of one’s mind/consciousness.

## Theory and practice. Resolution of Cicero's anti-epicureanism.

By 'philosophy' Epicurus means a philosophical way of life and not only a set of doctrines<sup>46</sup>. "For discreet action will presuppose learning and practical wisdom, it follows, therefore, that discreet action is of more value than wise (but inactive) speculation."<sup>47</sup> To put this matter strictly practically, as for Cicero in terms of politics, as well as for an Epicurean in ancient times<sup>48</sup>, one must "act" in theatre in certain way in order to achieve their goal. Whether in terms of defence of some philosophical conception or living a life to achieve your goal, one must also make a actions. It is difficult yet also important to stress out the apparent, however real, division between practice and theory. Since we do not live in "perfect world of theory", but rather we are forced to applicate it in our practical life. However, this might cause a severe mistake, misunderstanding, mis-conclusions and many practical varieties. There can be no such thing as divine providence or divination. There is, therefore, no justification for an attempt to propitiate the gods, although, as we shall see, there is a good reason for the Epicurean philosopher to participate in the cults of his city<sup>49</sup>. Or for Cicero to act in certain way, that will help him in his practical life to get a position of a political figure<sup>50</sup>.

By all means, is a consistency really an issue of Cicero's criticism of Epicurus? They both construct their philosophical conception on the term of beatitude, which may also serve as a room for strict dualistic criticism, while not taking into account that they both "might achieve their own form of beatitude". Same idea could be applied in terms of a friendship (*amicitia*). For example, it is well known, that Cicero had an Epicurean friend Atticus, as well as form various dialogues with Epicureans<sup>51</sup>. However, when Cassius replies to Cicero concerning the 'specters' of Catius, he takes occasion to defend pure Epicureanism, asserting that, while it is by no means easy to convince men in advance of the truth of the rival Stoic tenet, a good man must inevitably experience pleasure and freedom from envy as a result of

---

<sup>46</sup> DL 10.20. The strict meaning of philosophy not as a set of doctrines to be mastered and defended but a way of life is exemplified in DL 10.17.

<sup>47</sup> *Off.* 1.45.

<sup>48</sup> Kalaš, A.: *Hellenism*. 2005.

<sup>49</sup> Warren, J.: *Cambridge Comparison to Epicureanism*. 2009, p. 15.

<sup>50</sup> Although, he might "try" to always act in accordance with *honestum*, at least, "for an eye", he sometimes needs to make certain actions in order to save *res publica*.

<sup>51</sup> Additionally, "Cicero does not argue that Epicureans cannot form an actual *amicitia*, but only those, who are interested in relationships that are based on usefulness". - G. Evangelou in *Reconciling Cicero's Anti-Epicureanism in De Amicitia with his Friendship with Atticus*, ch. 6. (Words vs Deeds (1009))

his virtuous conduct; although aiming at pleasure, never lost his grasp on exemplary, virtuous, conduct<sup>52</sup>.

From a social/political point of view Cicero might address to epicureans in same manners as on butchers<sup>53</sup>, putting them on a same level, since they “do not contribute anything to public matters“ (political). However, this may arise from his political goals and practicality. Another example might also show similar approach. On one sight, Cicero showing clear understanding of an Epicurean doctrine<sup>54</sup>, criticizing Epicureans for their inconsistency or not speaking logically or thoughtfully<sup>55</sup>. On the other, referring merely to them as “a hunters of a sensual pleasures“, by twisting their words for his own “benefits“ or basis for his philosophical concept. Moreover, there not needs to be only philosophical rivalry, both theoretical, as well as practical, as an attractiveness for the masses, but also a political one. Cicero’s attitude toward the Epicurean doctrine falls into three parts: silence and disregard of the doctrine (before his exile), tolerant awareness of its harmful effects on many individuals (after his return and before outbreak of civil war), and open hostility towards a philosophy that “makes the state itself impossible“ (in his philosophical dialogues). Cicero indeed felt a necessity of combatting the Epicurean doctrine for political reasons<sup>56</sup>. Furthermore, Lucretius evangelism had a good chance to progress of Epicurean movement<sup>57</sup>.

From a different perspective, to combine yet again these varieties of philosophical, social and historical blending (an importance of a relation between application and practicality of a certain philosophical concept), watch closely this last example. On a grief, Cicero argues that: “...so does philosophy act, after it has removed grief in general; still, if any other deficiency exists... should banishment bring a dark cloud over us, there is for each its appropriate consolation, which you shall hear whenever you please... But we must have recourse again to the same original principle, that a wise man is free from all sorrow, because it is vain, because it answers no purpose, because it is not founded in nature, but on opinion and prejudice, and is engendered by a kind of invitation to grieve, when once men have imagined

---

<sup>52</sup>. *Some epicureans in Rome*: In: The Johns Hopkins University Press. Volume XXVIII, No. 15. February 4, 1935 Whole no. 759. p. 115.

<sup>53</sup> Note 40.

<sup>54</sup> *Tusc.* 3.17, *Fin* 1,2.

<sup>55</sup> *Tusc.* 5.9., 3.15.

<sup>56</sup> Maslowski, T.: *The Chronology of Cicero’s Anti-epicureanism*. 1974, p. 55-56.

<sup>57</sup> Maslowski, T.: *The Chronology of Cicero’s Anti-epicureanism*. 1974, p. 75-78.

that it is their duty to do so”.<sup>58</sup> However, how does sees duty to mourn, yet not taking “wise, virtuous” responsibility to take care for a state?<sup>59</sup> To find a link, look closely on Cicero’s friend Atticus. “Cicero’s flight into exile and his separation from the Roman public precluded him from displaying honour and virtus in suicide.”<sup>60</sup> Not only was Atticus the one, who consolidate Cicero, when he lost this daughter, yet also an “Epicurean“ friend who helped him during exile. Cicero complains “if only I should see that day when I thank you for convincing me to live. I still strongly regret it.”<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup> *Tusc.* 3.34. Additionally, “when they seek to oblige some, they need to be careful not to offend others. For oftentimes they hurt those, whom it is inexpedient to offend.“ *Off.* 2.19.

<sup>59</sup> For it was a custom in ancient Rome to mourn for at most three days and then get back to your political duties. However, Cicero was not „capable“ of doing so.

<sup>60</sup> Smith, W. P.: Cicero and suicide contemplation in late republics. 2015, p. 97.

<sup>61</sup> *Att.* 3. 3

In conclusion, there are many varieties of differences, that divide Cicero from Epicureanism. Looking deeply into an Epicurean conception, to solve a problem of *getting involved in politics*, it has been shown, that it is interconnected with a social/practical reflexion of a certain period and application of a certain doctrine. Looking at Cicero's philosophical concept, it is also affected by his "own perspective", his social/political attitude, which was hugely influenced by his interconnection with his own manners, within importance of politics, virtues and "acting" in accordance with *natura*. Last but not least, to stress an importance to look deeply into a connection between philosophical, political and historical aspects, for to observe, analyse and recognise a complex understanding and application of a theoretical conception into the practical one, in accordance with a terms like godliness, beatitude or even a friendship. Putting it all together, it's hardly suitable to address to Cicero as „strict and consistent anti-epicureanist“.

## Bibliography:

- [1] CICERO: *De finibus bonorum et malorum*. Harvard University Press, 2014.
- [2] CICERO: *De Officiis*. Stanford University Library, 1989.
- [3] CICERO: *Tusculanae disputationes*. Paravia, 1984.
- [4] EPIKUROSOV: *O šťastnom živote*. Thesis, 2013.
- [5] KALAŠ, A.: *Hellenism - Ascent or Descent of Greek philosophy?*. In: *Studia minora Facultatis Philosophicae Universitatis Brunensis*, B 52, 2005.
- [6] KALAŠ, A.: *Hellenism - New challenges of Greek philosophy*. In: *Studia minora Facultatis Philosophicae Universitatis Brunensis*, B 52, 2005.
- [7] LONG, A. A.: *Hellenistic Philosophers, Vol. 1*. (translations and commentary). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- [8] MASLOWSKI, T.: *The Chronology of Cicero's Anti-epicureanism*. 1974
- [9] SMITH, W. P.: *Cicero and suicide contemplation in late republics*. 2015
- [10] *Some epicureans in Rome*: In: *The Johns Hopkins University Press*. Volume XXVIII, No. 15. February 4, 1935 Whole no. 759.
- [11] WARREN, J.: *Cambridge Comparison to Epicureanism*. 2009