

Cambridge University Press

0521660610 - Cicero: On Moral Ends - Edited by Julia Annas

Excerpt

[More information](#)

On Moral Ends

Book I

(1) In this work I am putting into Latin themes which philosophers of the highest talent and most refined learning have dealt with in Greek, and I am well aware, Brutus¹, that this will incur criticism of various kinds. Some people, by no means uneducated, altogether disapprove of philosophizing. Others do not criticize it so long as it is done in an easygoing manner, but consider that one should not devote so much of one's enthusiasm and attention to it. There will also be people, learned in Greek and contemptuous of Latin, who say that they would rather spend their time reading Greek. Finally, I suspect that there will be some who will call on me to follow other literary pursuits, claiming that this kind of writing, however elegantly done, is none the less not worthy of my character and position. (2) Against all of these critics I think that some brief reply ought to be made.

To those who pour scorn on philosophy I made an adequate response in the book in which I defend and laud philosophy against the accusations and attacks of Hortensius.² This book appeared to please you and all those whom I consider competent to judge, and so I undertook to write more, fearing that otherwise I might be perceived as exciting people's enthusiasm but unable to sustain it.

As for those who take great pleasure in philosophy, but want it to be practised only to a moderate extent – they are demanding a restraint that is hard to exercise. Philosophy is a pursuit which, once entered upon, cannot be limited or held back. In consequence, I regard as almost more just those who would altogether turn me away from philosophy, than those who would set

¹ Marcus Junius Brutus, c. 85–42, famous as one of the leaders in the assassination of Julius Caesar in 44. He is a suitable dedicatee for this book, since he had considerable philosophical interests (see below, para. 8 and book III, 6). Though he is sometimes considered a Stoic, the evidence is that he identified himself as a follower of Plato, belonging to the hybrid 'Old Academy' school of Antiochus (cf. book V, 8). See David Sedley, 'The Ethics of Brutus and Cassius', *Journal of Roman Studies* (1997), 41–53.

² Quintus Hortensius Hortalus (114–49), a famous orator, introduced by Cicero as a partner in discussion in his lost work *Hortensius* (written in the same year as *On Moral Ends*) in which Hortensius argued against the study of philosophy, and Cicero gave the other speaker, Catulus, arguments in its defence.

On Moral Ends

bounds on the infinite and desire moderation when the greater the study, the greater the reward. (3) If wisdom can be attained, one should not just acquire it but enjoy it to the full. And if its attainment is hard, there is none the less no end to the search for truth except its discovery. To tire of the search is disgraceful given that its object is so beautiful. And if writing philosophy delights, who would be so churlish as to turn one away from it? Even if it is an effort, who is to set a limit on another's industriousness? Terence's Chremes was civil in not wishing his new neighbour 'to dig or plough or bear any burden at all', for he was discouraging him not from industriousness but from menial labour.³ But those who take offence at a pursuit, such as mine, which gives me nothing but joy, are simply prying.

(4) It is more difficult to satisfy those who claim to despise anything written in Latin. What amazes me above all about these people is that their native tongue gives them no pleasure when it deals with matters of the highest import, and yet they willingly read mere plays in Latin translated word-for-word from Greek. After all, who is so inimical almost to the word 'Roman' itself as to spurn and reject Ennius' *Medea* or Pacuvius' *Antiope* on the grounds that one loves the same plays by Euripides but hates Latin literature? Surely, it may be asked, one does not read Caecilius' *Sunepheboi* or Terence's *Woman of Andros* rather than either of these titles by Menander? (5) I disagree so much with this view that, however wonderfully written Sophocles' *Electra* may be, I none the less think that I should read Atilius' bad translation. Licinus described Atilius as 'a wooden writer, but still, I hold, a writer, and so worthy of being read'. For to be completely unversed in our poets is a sign either of extreme indolence or extreme fastidiousness.

In my view no one is well educated who is ignorant of our literature. So do we read Ennius' 'Would that not, in a glade . . .' no less than its Greek original, but disapprove of Plato's discussions of the good and happy life being set out in Latin?⁴ (6) What of it, if I do not perform the task of a trans-

³ Line 69 from Terence's play *The Self-Tormentor* (see next note).

⁴ Sophocles (c. 495–406) and Euripides (c. 480–407/6) are fifth-century authors of tragic dramas in Greek, which became 'classics' and continued to be performed throughout antiquity. Cicero refers to translations and adaptations of their works into Latin by Quintus Ennius (239–169), who also translated Homer into Latin, and Marcus Pacuvius (c. 220–130). The quotation from Ennius is from the opening lines of Euripides' *Medea*. Porcius Licinus is a poet and critic probably of the end of the second century. Menander (c. 344/3–292/1) is the most famous Greek author of 'New Comedy', of which we have many Latin adaptations by Titus Maccius Plautus (active 205–184) and Publius Terentius Afer (Terence), active in the 160s. We have only fragments of Caecilius Statius (active 179–168), the title of whose play here remains in Greek (the *sunepheboi* are 'young companions'). The Atilius mentioned here as a translator of Sophoclean tragedy may be the same as a writer of comedies earlier than Caecilius.

Cicero is referring to Greek classics in Latin translations which by his day were already part of the Roman literary tradition in their own right.

Perhaps Cicero picks Plato (427–347; see Introduction pp. x–xii, xxi–xxii) as the philosopher most famous for his literary style in Greek. Plato's ideas about the good life are conspicuously absent from the *De Finibus*, except as taken up into Antiochus' hybrid theory (see Introduction, pp. xiii–xiv).

Book I

lator, but preserve the views of those whom I consider sound while contributing my own judgement and order of composition? What reason does anyone have for preferring Greek to that which is written with brilliance and is not a translation from Greek?⁵ If one were to say that these topics have already been covered by the Greeks, then there is no reason to read even as many of the Greek authors themselves as one is supposed to read. For what, in the case of the Stoics, has been left out by Chrysippus?⁶ Yet we read Diogenes, Antipater, Mnesarchus, Panaetius and many others, not least our friend Posidonius.⁷ Does Theophrastus give us only moderate pleasure when he deals with topics already covered by Aristotle?⁸ Do the Epicureans desist from writing in their own fashion on topics which Epicurus and the ancients had already written about?⁹ If Greeks are read by Greeks, on the same subjects covered in a different way, why should not our Romans be read by Romans?

(7) Even if I were to translate Plato or Aristotle literally, as our poets did with the Greek plays, I hardly think I would deserve ill of my fellow-citizens for bringing those sublime geniuses to their attention. Though I have not thus far adopted this method, I do not consider that I am disbarred from doing so. If I think fit, I will translate certain passages, particularly from those authors I just mentioned, when it happens to be appropriate, as Ennius often does with Homer or Afranius with Menander.¹⁰ Nor, unlike Lucilius,¹¹ will I forbid

⁵ Cicero lacks modesty but makes a good point; his own excellent philosophical training puts him in a position to make synoptic and creative use of his sources without excessive dependency on any one of them.

⁶ Chrysippus of Soli (280/76–208/4), third head of the Stoa after its founder Zeno of Citium (c. 334/3–262/1) and Cleanthes of Assos (c. 331/0–230/29) was regarded in the ancient world as the second founder of Stoicism; at a time when Zeno's ideas were subject to divergent interpretations and the influence of the school was becoming dispersed, Chrysippus wrote voluminously (we have 705 book titles) on all aspects of Stoicism in a way that developed and defended Zeno's ideas with rigour, acumen and force, establishing the basic tradition of Stoic teachings.

⁷ Diogenes of Babylon (c. 228–140), Antipater of Tarsus (c. 200–c. 130) were heads of the Stoic school, Mnesarchus of Athens (c. 170–88) a leading figure in it. Panaetius of Rhodes (c. 185–109) and Posidonius of Apamea (c. 135–51) were more cosmopolitan Stoics who associated with leading Romans, introducing them to Stoic thought.

Cicero is not just showing off his learning here; in *On Duties*, for example, he further develops a work of Panaetius and contributes to a debate between the positions of Diogenes and Antipater. However, the intended audience for the present work is not expected to be knowledgeable in such detail.

⁸ Theophrastus of Eresus (372/1–288/7) was the pupil and successor of Aristotle of Stageira (384–322). Little of Theophrastus' voluminous work survives; in the ancient world it was popular and well regarded for its style. Cicero is aware that Aristotle's more serious philosophical works were different from his more popular works (see Introduction, pp. xxii and n. 20).

⁹ Epicurus of Athens (341–270) encouraged his followers to study and memorize his own words, and the school did not value originality, but there is a large Epicurean philosophical literature.

¹⁰ Lucius Afranius (second half of the second century) was a dramatist who made adaptations from Menander (see note 4 above).

¹¹ Gaius Lucilius (c. 180–102/1) was a Roman author best known for cutting satires and invectives, a friend of Scipio Aemilianus (see next note).

On Moral Ends

anyone from reading my work. How I wish that a Persius were alive today! Still more a Scipio or Rutilius.¹² Lucilius, fearing the criticism of such people, said that he wrote for the ordinary folk of Tarentum, Consentia and Sicily. Here as elsewhere he writes with panache: but really in his day there were no critics learned enough to make him struggle to meet their favourable judgement, and his writings have a lightness of touch which reveals a consummate elegance but only moderate learning.

(8) Besides, which reader should I fear, given that I have been bold enough to dedicate my book to you, Brutus, a man who yields not even to the Greeks as a philosopher? Indeed it was you who roused me to the task by dedicating to me your wonderful book *On Virtue*. However, I believe that the reason why some people are averse to Latin literature is that they have tended to come across certain rough and unpolished works which have been translated from bad Greek into worse Latin. I sympathize with these people, provided only that they consider that the Greek versions too are not worth reading. On the other hand, if a Latin book has a worthy subject and is written with dignity and style, who would not read it? The only exception would be one who wanted to be called a Greek pure and simple, as in the case of Albucius when he was greeted by Scaevola who was praetor in Athens. (9) Lucilius again narrates the occasion with great charm and perfect wit, and has Scaevola say brilliantly:

‘Albucius, rather than a Roman or Sabine, a fellow-citizen of those distinguished centurions Pontius and Tritanius, who held the standard in the front line, you preferred to be called a Greek. And so when I was praetor in Athens, and you came to pay your respects, I greeted you in the way that you preferred. “*Chaire*, Titus!” I cried, and “*Chaire*, Titus!” cried my lictors, my whole cavalry and my infantry. Hence your hostility to me, Albucius, hence your enmity.’¹³

(10) Scaevola was right. I for my part never cease to wonder where this excessive distaste for home-grown products comes from. This is certainly not the place for a lecture on the subject, but my view is, as I have often argued, that, far from lacking in resources, the Latin language is even richer than the

¹² Lucilius wrote that he did not wish his works to be read either by the ignorant or by the very learned, using a certain Persius as an example of the latter (see Cicero’s *On the Orator* II, 25). Here Cicero wishes for a learned and sympathetic audience such as was available to the earlier writer.

Publius Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus Africanus (185/4–129), prominent Roman statesman and general, in 146 captured and destroyed Carthage. He was friendly with various intellectuals, and interested in Greek culture, and has been seen as the centre of a ‘Scipionic circle’ of aristocrats with intellectual interests. Cicero presents an idealized picture of him in his earlier work *On the State*.

Publius Rutilius Rufus (c. 160–c. 80) a friend of Scipio’s, but less successful, went into exile in 92 after a conviction for corruption; he thereupon wrote an influential history of his times.

¹³ *Chaire* is a Greek greeting. By having his official Roman entourage greet the Roman Albucius in Greek, the poem’s Scaevola implies that Albucius’ love of all things Greek has made him lose his pride in his Roman identity. This kind of anxiety and chauvinism about Greek culture was not uncommon among Romans.

Book I

Greek.¹⁴ When, after all, have we, or rather our good orators and poets, lacked the wherewithal to create either a full or a spare style in their work, at least since they have had models to imitate?

As for me, as far as my public duties are concerned, and their attendant struggles and dangers, I consider myself never to have deserted the post at which the Roman people placed me. Surely, then, I ought to strive as hard as I can to put my energy, enthusiasm and effort into improving the learning of my fellow-citizens as well? There is no need to waste time picking a fight with those who prefer to read Greek texts, provided only that they do read them, and do not just pretend to. My task is to serve those who either wish to enjoy writings in both languages, or, if they have available to them works in their native tongue, do not feel any need of works in Greek.

(11) On the other hand, those who would rather I wrote on a different topic should be equable about it, given the many topics on which I have written, more indeed than any other Roman. Perhaps I shall live to write still more. In any case, no one who has habitually and carefully read my philosophical works will judge that any is more worth reading than this one. For nothing in life is more worth investigating than philosophy in general, and the question raised in this work in particular: what is the end, what is the ultimate and final goal, to which all our deliberations on living well and acting rightly should be directed? What does nature pursue as the highest good to be sought, what does she shun as the greatest evil?

Given that there is violent disagreement on these matters among the most learned philosophers, who could think that it is beneath whatever dignity one may care to bestow on me to inquire into the question of what is best and truest in every area of life? (12) We have our leading citizens debate the question of whether the offspring of a female slave is to be regarded as *in fructu*, with Publius Scaevola and Manius Manilius on one side, and Marcus Brutus dissenting.¹⁵ To be sure, this kind of question is an acute one, and far from irrelevant for the conduct of civil society – I am happy to read such writings and others of the same sort, and shall go on doing so. But shall questions that relate to life in its entirety then be neglected? Legal discussions might have better sales, but philosophical discussions are certainly richer. However, this is a point which one may leave the reader to decide. For my part, I consider that this work gives a more or less comprehensive discussion of the question

¹⁴ Cicero defends the capacity of Latin to translate Greek philosophy, given the relative paucity in Latin of developed abstract vocabulary and lack of the syntactical devices (such as the definite article) which are heavily used in philosophical Greek. For Cicero as a philosophical translator, see J. G. F. Powell, 'Cicero's translations from Greek' in J. G. F. Powell (ed.), *Cicero the Philosopher*, Oxford 1995, 273–300.

¹⁵ A legal dispute: if a female slave is hired by B from her owner A, does a child born to her during this period belong to A or to B? Publius Mucius Scaevola, consul in 133, Manius Manilius, consul in 149 (who appears as a character in Cicero's *On the State*) and Marcus Junius Brutus (active in the early first century, a distant relative of Marcus Junius Brutus the assassin of Caesar) were all famous jurists and legal theorists of the past.

On Moral Ends

of the highest goods and evils. In it I have investigated not only the views with which I agree, but those of each of the philosophical schools individually.

(13) To start from what is easiest, let us first review Epicurus' system, which most people know best. You will discover that the exposition given by me is no less accurate than that given by the school's own proponents. For we wish to find the truth, not refute anyone adversarially.

An elaborate defence of Epicurus' theory of pleasure was once given by Lucius Torquatus, a man learned in every philosophical system. I gave the response, and Gaius Triarius, a young man of exceptional seriousness and learning, was present at the discussion.¹⁶ (14) They had each come to call on me in my house at Cumae, and after a short discussion on literature, of which they were both keen students, Torquatus said: 'Since we have for once found you at leisure, I am determined to hear what it is about my master Epicurus which I shall not say you hate, as those who disagree with him generally do, but which at any rate you do not approve of. I myself regard him as the one person to have seen the truth, and to have freed people's minds from the greatest errors, and handed down everything which could pertain to a good and happy life. I feel that you, like our friend Triarius, dislike him because he neglected the stylistic flourish of a Plato, Aristotle or Theophrastus. For I can hardly believe that his views do not seem to you to be true.'

(15) 'You are quite mistaken, Torquatus', I replied. 'It is not the style of that philosopher which offends: his words express his meaning, and he writes in a direct way that I can comprehend. I do not reject a philosopher who has eloquence to offer, but I do not demand it from one who does not. It is in his subject-matter that Epicurus fails to satisfy, and in several areas at that. Still, since there are "as many views as people", perhaps I am wrong.' 'Why is it that he does not satisfy you?' asked Torquatus. 'For I consider you a fair judge, provided you have a good knowledge of what Epicurus says.' (16) 'All of Epicurus' views are well-enough known to me', I replied, 'assuming that you do not think that Phaedrus or Zeno, both of whom I have heard speak,¹⁷ were misleading me – though they persuaded me of absolutely nothing except their earnestness. Indeed I frequently went to hear these men with Atticus, who was an admirer of both, and who even loved Phaedrus dearly. Atticus and I would discuss each day what we had heard, and there was never any dispute over my understanding, though plenty over what I could agree with.'¹⁸

¹⁶ The dialogue is set in 50 at Cicero's country house at Cumae, on the coast north of Naples. On Torquatus and Triarius see Introduction, pp. xv–xvi and n. 10.

¹⁷ Phaedrus (probably of Athens, 138–70), whom Cicero heard in Rome; see Introduction p. xi. Cicero admired his character and his elegant style, unusual for an Epicurean. Zeno of Sidon (c. 150–after 79/8) was head of the Epicurean school in Athens, and Cicero heard him lecture there in 79–78. Cicero dislikes his abusive style; for example he called Socrates 'the clown from Athens'. Zeno's works have all been lost, but the content of some of his lectures and classes survives in the work of Philodemus of Gadara, one of his pupils, especially his work *On Signs*.

¹⁸ Titus Pomponius Atticus (111–32), a lifelong friend of Cicero's and recipient of many of his letters. His sympathy for Epicureanism, though Cicero dislikes it, made him a safely neutral

Book I

(17) ‘Then tell me about it’, said Torquatus, ‘I very much want to hear what you take issue with.’ ‘Firstly’, I replied, ‘his physics, which is his proudest boast, is totally derivative. He repeats Democritus’ views,¹⁹ changes almost nothing, and what he does try to improve, he seems to me only to distort. Democritus believes that what he calls “atoms” – that is, bodies which are indivisible on account of their density – move in an infinite void, in which there is no top, bottom or middle, no innermost or outermost point. They move in such a way as to coalesce as a result of collision, and this creates each and every object that we see. This atomic motion is not conceived to arise from any starting-point, but to be eternal.

(18) ‘Now Epicurus does not go greatly astray in those areas where he follows Democritus. But there is much in both that I do not agree with, and especially the following: in natural science, there are two questions to be asked, firstly what is the matter out of which each thing is made, and secondly what is the power which brings a thing into being. Epicurus and Democritus discuss matter, but neglect the power or efficient cause. This is a defect common to both men.

‘I turn to the failings peculiar to Epicurus. He believes that those same solid and indivisible bodies move downwards in a straight line under their own weight and that this is the natural motion of all bodies. (19) At the same time our brilliant man now encounters the problem that if everything moves downwards in perpendicular fashion – in a straight line, as I said – then it will never be the case that one atom can come into contact with another. His solution is a novel one. He claims that the atom swerves ever so slightly, to the absolutely smallest extent possible. This is how it comes about that the atoms combine and couple and adhere to one another. As a result, the world and all its parts and the objects within it are created.

‘Now this is all a childish fiction, but not only that – it does not even produce the results he wants. The swerve itself is an arbitrary invention – he says that the atom swerves without a cause, when the most unprincipled move that any physicist can make is to adduce effects without causes. Then he groundlessly deprives atoms of the motion which he himself posited as natural to all objects that have weight, namely travel in a straight line in a downwards direction. And yet he fails to secure the outcome that motivated these inventions. (20) For if all the atoms swerve, none will ever come together; while if some swerve and others follow their natural tendency to fall in a straight line, then, firstly, this will be equivalent to placing the atoms in two separate classes, those that move in a straight line and those that move

political figure on whom Cicero could rely. He acquired his nickname of Atticus through his love of Attica – that is, Athens and its culture (this is referred to in v, 4).

¹⁹ Cicero frequently accuses Epicurus of taking much of his philosophy from Democritus of Abdera (c. 460–c. 350), the major defender of atomism. The charge is repeated at book ii, 102 and book iv, 13. (In book v Democritus figures as an ethical philosopher; see v, 23 and 87.) Atomism may not have been as basic to Epicurus as Cicero suggests; he took it over as being the best science of his day, but gave it his own philosophical role.

On Moral Ends

off-line; and secondly, the disorderly clash of atoms which he posits – and this is a problem for Democritus too – could never bring about our ordered universe.²⁰

‘Then again it is highly unscientific to believe that there is an indivisible magnitude. Epicurus would surely never have held that view had he chosen to learn geometry from his friend Polyaeus rather than make Polyaeus himself unlearn it.²¹ Democritus thought the sun was of great size, as befits a man of education, well-trained in geometry. Epicurus thought that it was maybe a foot across. He took the view that it was more or less as big as it looked.²²

(21) ‘Thus when he changes Democritus he makes things worse; when he follows Democritus there is nothing original, as is the case with the atoms, the void, and the images (which they term *eidōla*)²³ whose impact is the cause of both vision and thought. The notion of infinity (what they call *apeiria*) is wholly Democritus’, as is the notion of innumerable worlds being created and destroyed on a daily basis. Even if I have no agreement with these doctrines myself, I would still rather Epicurus had not vilified Democritus, whom others praise, while taking him as his sole guide.

(22) ‘Take next the second main area of philosophy, the study of inquiry and argument known as logic.²⁴ As far as I can gather, your master is quite defenceless and destitute here. He abolishes definition, and teaches nothing about division and classification. He hands down no system for conducting and concluding arguments; he gives no method for dealing with sophisms, or for disentangling ambiguities; he locates judgements about reality in the senses, so that once the senses take something false to be true, he considers that all means of judging truth and falsehood have been removed.^a

(23) ‘Pride of place he gives to what he claims nature herself ordains and approves, namely pleasure and pain. For him these explain our every act of pursuit and avoidance. This view is held by Aristippus, and the Cyrenaics²⁵ defend it in a better and franker way than Epicurus does; but I judge it to be

²⁰ Cicero is prejudicial in his presentation of the ‘atomic swerve’, whose nature and role are extremely controversial; for survey and discussion see W. Englert, *Epicurus on the Swerve and Voluntary Action*, Atlanta, Ga. 1987.

²¹ Polyaeus of Lampsacus (c. 340–278/7) was an early convert to Epicureanism and became one of the four major founding figures of the school. Originally a prominent mathematician, he abandoned this when Epicurus, according to Cicero (*Varro* 106) convinced him that geometry was all false, since atomism precludes infinite divisibility.

²² Cicero is again being unsympathetic; the Epicurean view is more complex. See J. Barnes, ‘The size of the sun in antiquity’, *Acta Classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debreceniensis* 15, (1989), 29–41.

²³ *Eidōla* are thin films of atoms which constantly stream from the surfaces of things and whose impact on our sense organs accounts for the ways we represent things in perception and thought.

²⁴ Epicurus ‘abolishes’ definition in rejecting traditional philosophical arguments about things’ nature as futile, relying instead on direct evidence from the senses; this issue comes up below at 29 (and see note 31) and book II, 4 (and see note 6). ²⁵ See Introduction p. xviii.

^a It is likely, given the abruptness of the transition to the next paragraph, that some text has been lost at this point.

Book I

the sort of position that seems utterly unworthy of a human being. Nature has created and shaped us for better things, or so it seems to me. I could be wrong, of course. But I am quite certain that the man who first won the name of “Torquatus” did not tear that famous chain from his enemy’s neck with the aim of experiencing bodily pleasure. Nor did he fight against the Latins at Veseris in his third consulship for the sake of pleasure. Indeed, in having his son beheaded, he even appears to have deprived himself of many pleasures. For he placed the authority of the state and of his rank above nature herself and a father’s love.²⁶

(24) ‘Take next Titus Torquatus, who was consul with Gnaeus Octavius. Consider the severity with which he treated the son whom he gave up for adoption to Decius Silanus. This son was accused by a deputation from Macedonia of having taken bribes while praetor in that province. Torquatus summoned him into his presence to answer the charge, and having heard both sides of the case, determined that his son had not held office in a manner worthy of his forebears, and banished him from his sight.²⁷ Do you think he acted thus with his own pleasure in mind?

‘I need not even mention the dangers, the efforts, and, yes, the pain that the very best people endure for the sake of their country and family. Far from courting pleasure, such people renounce it entirely, preferring in the end to bear any kind of pain rather than neglect any part of their duty.

‘Let us turn to cases that are no less significant, even if they appear more trivial. (25) Is it pleasure that literature affords you, Torquatus, or you, Triarius? What of history, science, the reading of poetry, the committing to memory of acres of verse? Do not reply that you find these activities pleasurable in themselves, or that your forebears, Torquatus, found theirs so. Neither Epicurus nor Metrodorus²⁸ ever offered that sort of defence, and nor would anyone who has any sense or is acquainted with Epicurus’ teachings.

‘As to the question why so many people are followers of Epicurus, well, there are many reasons, but what is most alluring to the masses is their perception that Epicurus said that happiness – that is, pleasure – consists in performing right and moral actions for their own sake. These good people fail to realize that if this were so then the whole theory is undermined. For once it is conceded that such activities are immediately pleasant in themselves,

²⁶ Titus Manlius Imperiosus Torquatus, a fourth century Roman, consul three times, legendary for strict and harsh rule-following, exemplified in various stories. Though abusively treated by his father, he loyally saved him from prosecution for it. He acquired the name Torquatus from the torque he took from a Gaul he killed in single combat in 361. Later, when his own son, serving under him, disobeyed orders to fight a similar duel, Torquatus had him executed on the spot.

²⁷ This happened in 141. The son thereupon committed suicide; his father refused to attend the funeral.

²⁸ Metrodorus of Lampsacus (331–278), one of Epicurus’ original associates, regarded as a co-founding figure of the school.