Arul Anandar Journal of Science & Arts

Volume 1, Februray 2026

STRIPPING HAPPINESS TO THE BONE: CYNIC *AUTARKEIA* AS THE ESSENCE OF THE GOOD LIFE

T. Elphinston Kishore

Department of Philosophy, Arul Anandar College (Autonomous), Karumathur, Madurai,

kelphinston@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Man naturally yearns to live long and live well. The people of antiquity mostly answered the question how to live well in terms of eudaimonia (the flourishing life). Philosophers like Aristotle and Epicurus outlined tracks to happiness by way of either virtue, friendship, pleasure or a mix of goods. The Cynics, yet, leaving the flesh, went straight to the bone of contention. Thinkers like Antisthenes and Diogenes set aside affluence, repute, and luxury as obstructions and insisted that true happiness likes in *autarkeia* (radical self-sufficiency) combined to virtue.

This study explores the good life as the Cynic redefined it. It is not a denial of happiness, but getting rid of all fortune that make us dependent, fragile, or enslaved. The paper argues that the Cynic well-being means freedom, drawing on the anecdotes found in Diogenes Laertius and speak against Aristotle, Epicurus, and the Stoics. Diogenes' infamous lifestyle, of dwelling in a jar, deserting possessions, and disregarding kings, was not seen as oddness but a philosophical display. Cynic minimalism is presented as more moderate ideas of happiness and the analysis shows how Cynicism reveals the weakness of a life tied to external goods. The paper hints that the Cynic challenge points out fresh urgency of minimalism amid the problems of consumerism and ecological declines. The lasting lesson of Cynicism is upsetting but liberating. stark but liberating—the less you need, the freer and happier you become.

Keywords: Cynicism, *Autarkeia*, Eudaimonia, Diogenes, Minimalism

INTRODUCTION

At the heart of every age, the quest for happiness (Greek *eudaimonia*) stood as the centre of its philosophy. The question 'what does it mean to live well?' triggered every school of thought like Plato's Academy, Aristotle's Lyceum, Epicurean Garden, and Stoick Proch. Most traditions were for convention blend of virtue with some role of external goods. The Cynics, however, revolted against any conventional way outs, as expressed by Antisthenes and lived up by Diogenes of Sinope.

The Cynics did not consider wealth, honour, and luxury as merely optional extras. They were seen as real hinderance to genuine well-being. Their answer to finding happiness was very simple, though severe, to combine virtue with radical self-sufficiency—*autarkeia*. A happy life, for them, is to limit life to its simplest necessities, rather than depending on something that fortune can give or take away.

This paper explores the Cynic idea of well-being as a thoughtful option for "stripping to the bone" than remaining with the flesh. It aims to reconstruct their radical philosophy and to test its lasting resonance with other enlightened minds. It compares the Cynic views against the differing ancient accounts of Aristotelianism, Epicureanism, and the Stoics, and trying to conceive its implications. It also connects the Cynic insights with modern concerns of consumerism, authenticity, and ecological crisis.

Objective: To examine the Cynic views of well-being by way of historical reconstruction and critical comparison.

Research Question: What insights the Cynics offer for happy life and how do they contribute to the present-day debates on living well?

Thesis: By revising the understating of eudaimonia as a blend of virtue and freedom from external goods, the Cynics advocated a minimalist conception of happiness that contests ancient conventions and modern convictions.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The study is based on the ethics of eudaimonia, the ancient tradition of identifying what contribute to a life worth living. The discussion is found in three major schools:

- **Aristotelianism**: It considers happiness as activity in line with virtue, but supported be necessary external goods.
- **Epicureanism**: It deliberates happiness as pleasure constituted by free of troubles, modest desires, and true friendship.
- **Stoicism**: It conceives happiness as mere virtue, living rationally in tune with nature and demoting external conditions to "indifferents".

The Cynics rejects all these models, rather pushes the vision of self-sufficiency to its limit. Their understanding of well-being needs nothing more than virtue and *autarkeia*. They even disregarded the softer approaches of wealth and friendship of Aristotle, simple pleasures of Epicurus, and "preferred indifferents" of the Stoics.

In order to interpret this essential and radical stance, this paper undertakes two lenses, namely virtue ethics, to situate Cynicism in the larger moral discussions, and minimalism, to emphasize on its strategy of stripping-away. The Cynics are seen the countercultural critiques of dependence on goods and convention that are considered great foes of freedom and happiness. They are, then, not best understood either nihilists or misanthropes.

METHOD AND MATERIALS

To examine the Cynic idea of well-being, this study uses a combined approach of textual analysis, comparative philosophy, and philosophical hermeneutics.

- **Textual Analysis:** The primary sources are in fragments, but with rich anecdotes. The important source is Diogenes Laertius' *Lives of Eminent Philosophers* that contains sayings and stories from Antisthenes and Diogenes of Sinope. In addition to them, some references come from Stoic writings and later traditions, providing further perspectives.

- **Comparative Approach:** The Cynic thinking is placed against the philosophies of Aristotle (*Nicomachean Ethics*), Epicurus (*Letter to Menoeceus*), and the Stoic writers, such as Epictetus, Seneca, and Marcus Aurelius. The comparisons sharply outline the Cynic challenges in terms of what they accepted, rejected, or exaggerated.
- **Secondary Literature:** The modern time studies, on Cynicism, minimalism, virtue ethics, and well-being, help interpreting the Cynic practices better and avoid oversimplification.
- **Hermeneutical Orientation:** The analysis regards Cynicism primarily as a *way of life* than as a set of doctrines. Thought the texts are read within their historical context, their relevance to the present-day debates on consumerism, freedom, and ecological concern.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 The Cynic Concept of Well-Being: Autarkeia

The Cynics were very uncompromising, right from the start. The foundations were set by Antisthenes and Diogenes of Sinope gave the school its lasting image. Diogenes was best remembered for his raggedness, living in barrel, fearless to mock kings, contempt possessions, and even disgust polite society. This type of lifestyle has *autarkeia*, self-sufficienty, as its core single principle.

The Cynics held *autarkeia* as more than economic independence. It was a right and whole orientation to life, the art of requiring almost nothing. They argued that eudaimonia (well-being or happiness) cannot depend on wealth, repute, power, or social acceptance, as they might be snatched away by fortune anytime. Hence, for them, living well means striping life only to what is essential and natural, and finding freedom in it.

4.1.1 Roots of Autarkeia in Greek Thought

The idea of self-sufficiency was not first introduced by the Cynics. It has it's trace in early Greek usage, where *autarkeia* stood for a city or household that is able to provide for itself and not depending on others (Horn, 2014). During the classical Greek period, it entered in ethical debates. Aristotle in his *Nicomachean Ethics* (1.7) called happiness as "something

final and self-sufficient". Aristotle's version, however, was moderate to include virtue plus a minimal use of external goods, namely, health, friendships, and some degree of wealth.

The Cynics redefined and radicalized the concept of self-sufficiency to connote true freedom was independent of luxury and all external supports. As William Desmond (2008) observes, their contention is not whether external goods can be pleasant but such goods are ever necessary at all. Hence, to the one who has consciously trained himself in needing little, belongs happiness.

4.1.2 Diogenes as the Living Example

Autarkeia has a vivid embodiment in Diogenes than in others. He owned nothing, a large storage jar was his abode, and begging was his sustenance. A famous story tells of him throwing his only cup when he saw a child drinking with cupped hands. He declared he had "been in plainness of living" (Diogenes Laertius, VI.37), and that was his simplicity to learn even from a child. Another tale sets him face to face with the Emperor Alexander the Great. When asked what he desired to have from the conqueror of the world, Diogenes is said to have answered "Stand out of my light" (Diogenes Laertius, VI.38).

These stories about Diogenes are more than colourful anecdotes. They are performative in nature depicting his philosophy of life. They project happiness is not something can be given by wealth, status, or political power. True freedom is not awarded by powerful people, but realized by renunciation of every dependency. As Navia (1996) rightly observes, the worldly power (Alexander) goes to conquer empires, the philosophical independence (Diogenes) goes after conquering oneself.

4.1.3 Askēsis: Training for Freedom

Autarkeia in its truer sense is a discipline and not just a creed, which made the Cynics to practice askesis, the deliberate training in all sorts of hardship—sleeping rough, living comfortless, exposing to oneself to ridicule, heat, or cold. They were not forms of self-punishment, but seen as rehearsals for freedom from everything. By living without the conventional approval, possessions, or protection, they proved that happiness is not depending on these external goods (Branham & Goulet-Cazé, 1996). The philosopher

Epictetus who came after centuries praised Diogenes as the model of true liberty (Epictetus, *Discourses* III.22). He viewed him as one who trained his desires so well that no one or nothing could enslave him, and that indicated the less one needs, the freer he becomes.

4.1.4 Parrhesia: Truth-Telling as a Way of Life

The idea of *autarkeia* also strengthened the Cynic practice of parrhesia, living fearless and with frank speech. This gave the power to the Cynics to speak truths that others did not dare to, for they owed nothing to any patrons or society. The same empowered Diogenes throwing biting satire, performing shameless public acts, and ridiculing customs. Again, this testified that to have freedom of speech, one should have freedom from all needs (Foucault, 2001).

4.1.5 Why Autarkeia Defines the Cynic Good Life

The Cynics' argument is that happiness is not assured by having much, but needing little. When desires are disciplined, even poverty becomes wealth (Dudley, 1937). They turned dependency upside down, showed possessions and honours can enslave people. In this way they claimed to have found a freedom that cannot be given by any fortune. This sort of freedom made them the advocates of cosmopolitanism (Navia, 2005). Diogenes identified himself as a "citizen of the world" (Diogenes Laertius, VI.63), the vision that flowed from *autarkeia*. Meaning to say, if happiness needs nothing external, then everyone belongs everywhere and nowhere to be fixed to. The good life, thus for the Cynics, is not knotted to property, prestige, or polis, but to the radical freedom of the soul in independence.

4.2 Cynic Well-Being vs. Competing Accounts

The minimalist account of the Cynic that happiness needs only virtue and self-sufficiency set them odds with almost all other major schools of antiquity. The opposing versions from Aristotle, Epicurus, the Stoics, and even early Christians suggested some space for external goods, pleasure, or duties in achieving eudaimonia. The Cynics did all these away with and set their sharp critique against the rivals and proved them with their boldness of their experiments.

4.2.1 Cynicism vs. Aristotelian Eudaimonia

Aristotle had a famous definition of eudaimonia: "activity of soul in accordance with virtue" (*Nicomachean Ethics* I.7). However, for him, virtue was not enough for flourishing, rather a baseline of external goods. They included health, friendships, some wealth, and certain political activities (Kraut, 2018). His reasoning was practical as he envisaged a virtuous life supported by these external goods without which it would be stunted.

The Cynics did not accept this and that is evidence from Diogenes' dismissal of what Alexander the Great offered him. His words "stand out of my light" is not a simple disrespect, but captures their conviction of virtue suffices by itself (Diogenes Laertius, VI.38). Thus, what Aristotle wove external conditions into the attainment of happiness, the Cynics stripped them out wholly (Desmond, 2008).

From the standpoint of the Cynics, Aristotle's position was seen as a subtle dependency of happiness on health or friends, and it is not truly safe. They insisted that true freedom rests in lowering one's needs to the level where fortune has influence on you (Dudley, 1937). Aristotle might accuse them of senselessly reducing happiness to mere survival and stripping so bare would risks losing richness and depth. This dilemma leads to tension between happiness as about resilience against fortune or as bout fullness of human activity with external supports.

4.2.2 Cynicism vs. Epicurean Ataraxia

Epicurus had another way to happiness: *ataraxia* (tranquillity) and *aponia* (absence of pain). Just like the Cynics, he advocated simply living. He distinguished desires into three categories assigning each of them with fitting group of people: natural and necessary ones that the learned to satisfy, natural but unnecessary ones that the moderate would have, and the vain that the abandon want to choose (Epicurus, *Letter to Menoeceus*). Though both the camps superficially look alike, suspended luxury, and counselled simple living, their methods and goals departed. While Epicurus withdrew into the quiet sanctuary of his Garden, he cultivated friendship and engaged in modest pleasures away from public life. The Cynics, to the opposite, lived in the open, risking scorn and hardship, intentionally upsetting the public, proved their independence (Branham & Goulet-Cazé, 1996).

The attitude of the Cynics towards pleasure was still more striking. Epicurus held modest pleasure as intrinsic to happiness. But the Cynics deemed pleasure as incidental at best and a trap at worst Navia (1996). The asceticism of Diogenes was not a way to maximize pleasure but an assertion that virtue alone counted. Then, it becomes clear that Cynic understanding of wellbeing is more harsh, stark, and combative than Epicureans grasp of tranquillity.

4.2.3 Cynicism vs. Stoic Eudaimonia

The Stoc spirit was closest to the Cynic essence. The founder of Stoicism, Zeno of Citium was a student of the Cynic Crates, and naturally one could expect the Stoic thought retaining strong Cynic resonances (Long, 2006). Like the Cynics, the Stoics claimed virtue alone was true good and all externals as "indifferents." Stoics resembled the Cynics valuing self-discipline and resilience through askesis. Nevertheless, both the schools parted away in other stances.

Stoics tamed the Cynic radicalism and taught that virtuous living is possible even while holding social roles, like statesman, merchant, parent, and soldier. For Stoics the externals might be "preferred indifferents," but still they could be engaged in without giving in virtue. The Cynics jeered at such concession, because even preferring health over sickness or wealth over poverty meant submitting certain parts of one's freedom. They insisted to renounce all external supports and live on those that fortune could never take away (Desmond, 2008). The difference could be understood in an imagery form that the Stoic sage reign in a palace but the Cynic sage dwelt in a barrel. Though both claimed freedom, one sought it in balance with the society whereas the other in open rejection of it.

4.2.4 Cynicism vs. Christian Asceticism

Christianity, though not a Hellenistic school, is connected with Cynic ideas, especially in its ascetic aspects. The direction of Jesus (Luke 18:22) to sell possessions and the exhortation of Paul (Philippians 4:11-12) to contentment resonates with the Cynic approach to wealth. The vows of poverty and detachment in later monasticism also parallel the Cynic standards (Brown, 1988). However, their motivations differ as the Christian ascetics saw renunciation as obedience to God, means to eternal life, or following Christ, the Cynics looked it as purely philosophical, a reasoned approach to freedom and virtue. Their avoidance of possessions

was not connected to divine will but liberation from convention. Two approaches, thus, superficially similar in practice differ in foundation (Elm, 1994), one theological and another radical secular.

4.2.5 The Edge of the Cynic Experiment

The Cynic account stands stark against its rivals: Aristotle's external goods, Epicurus' modest pleasures, and the Stoics' preferred indifferents, and Christianity's spiritual obedience were all considered as unnecessary by the Cynics. They were satisfied with virtue and self-sufficiency. It was the mark of their radicalism which stood for their strength and also their weakness. Positively it made them unique in their resilience, immunity to fortune, and fearless before power, at the same time negatively it risked them restraining flourishing into sheer survival, ignoring the communal, relational, and creative aspects of life. Nevertheless, their extreme stances forced the rival schools to clarify their own concessions. They also challenge and leave our assumptions unsettling as to whether what we think we need are our real need or only by stripping them all we could find our true happiness.

4.3 Well-Being as Freedom

The Cynics did not regard comfort, status, or harmony between virtue and external goods as the essence of happiness, rather it was freedom from possessions, conventions, and power. Their conception of *autarkeia* (self-sufficiency) cannot be separated from *eleutheria* (freedom). Thus, the Cynic happiness could be defined as freedom stripped to bone, i.e. the aptitude and ability to live without dependence, fear, or submission.

4.3.1 Freedom from Possessions

For the Cynics, the most understandable form of this freedom was liberation from wealth. Diogenes demonstrated such freedom in his life that was full of lessons in renunciation. His very act of discarding a cup when he saw a boy drink with cupped hands goes more than a charming anecdote (Diogenes Laertius, VI.37). It depicts the Cynic convicting that what we desire, will enslave us, and what we desire to possess, will own us at the end. Diogenes' gesture of giving up even the simplest object confirmed that well-being depends not on what we have, but on what we can do having them not. This bold approach of the Cynics sharply

contrasts the famous Aristotle, for whom a measure of external goods was crucial to flourishing (*Nicomachean Ethics* I.8). The Cynics thought freedom was not contained in wisely managing goods, but in refusing the very need for it, as all dependency lead to chains (Branham & Goulet-Cazé, 1996).

4.3.2 Freedom from Social Norms

The Cynics firmly believed that freedom from the invisible domination of convention (*nomos*) is also central. The scandalous acts of Diogenes, like eating in public, begging shorn of shame, and performing private acts in market, shocked Athenians (Diogenes Laertius, VI.69). Though the onlookers viewed them as offensive, for Diogenes they were exercises stripped away from non-natural standards in shamelessness (*anaideia*) (Foucault, 2011). Their focus was to expose the emptiness of custom and not to involve in oddness. They also disvalued social opinion as deeply enslaving element than the possession of material goods would do. Thus, for them, indifference to ridicule and the courage to live in accordance with nature than going by convention constituted freedom. To break these chains, they used fearless truth telling (*parrhesia*) and shameless as tools.

4.3.3 Freedom from Power

The Cynics confronted power courageously and that is typified by Diogenes' encounter with Alexander. When offered any wish to be granted, Diogenes asked the conqueror only to step aside and not to block the sun (Diogenes Laertius, VI.38). The message is very clear that no-thing or no-body could improve the happiness of a person who already needed nothing. This is the truest form of freedom which is not a mere negative liberty (being left alone), but positively an existential immunity. When what you value cannot be given or taken away by fortune, how can any ruler master you (Long, 1996). In this logic, the poor philosopher was freer than the rich kings.

4.3.4 The Practice of Freedom

The sort of freedom the Cynics envisaged did not come easily, rather it had to be trained for long. The stark idea of the Cynic *askesis*, the practice of enduring hard facts, like cold, hunger, ridicule, and contact, was a philosophy lived in the flesh and blood. They repeatedly

tested their independence from all comfort and approval, and thus they made such freedom into a way of life than a slogan. Epictetus later summarized the deal as "He is free who lives as he wishes to live; who is neither subject to compulsion nor to hindrance, nor to force…" (*Discourses* IV.1). The Cynic sage personified this principle living as he wished by eliminating all that was needed by convention and which could be held against him.

4.3.5 Well-Being as Radical Independence

All the dimensions of Cynic wellbeing taken together points out a radical independence. It was not the type of freedom to chase goals but the very type of freedom from the goals themselves and the need to pursue them. It was not a freedom to accumulate goods, but a freedom from needing to do so. In this way, their philosophy of happiness feels both inspiring and unsettling. It was inspiring because it replicated resilience and fearlessness and unsettling because it demanded people to give up possessions, reputation, pleasure, and social belonging that they held so dear to them (Nussbaum, 1994). Cynic freedom is extreme when compared with the modest pleasures of Epicureanism or the balance within society of Stoics. It centred upon the supremacy of autonomy to its furthest edge to ask the question of 'how much can be given up in human life and still call it way to happiness.' Diogenes and his followers came up with uncompromising answer that true happiness springs forth only when every chain is broken.

4.4 Contemporary Relevance

Cynicism may seem like an antique curiosity, a life style so strange to the community: a philosopher dwelling in a jar, begging in public, and mocking the society itself. Nevertheless, their radical simplicity has something to offer to the present-day humanity, where craving consumer excess, wild social media influence, and hostile ecological crisis prevail. The Cynics place a call of renewed urgency with their clear core lesson that not multiplying possessions or conforming to conventions will guarantee happiness, but reduce needs and live freely can.

4.4.1 Cynicism and Minimalism

Modern minimalism reverberates with the Cynic ideal of simplicity. Minimalist advocates like Joshua Fields Millburn and Ryan Nicodemus (2016) suggest reducing possessions and to focus on only what really matters. Diogenes' gesture of neglecting his cup on seeing a child drink with bare hands forestalls the minimalist principle of when objects add not essential value, they are only burden and not a blessing. However, there is a clear difference between the stances of both the attitudes. Contemporary minimalism emerged from the affluent societies and could easily transformed into a curated lifestyle, such as updated furniture and selected clothes. Cynic minimalism, on the contrast, neither aesthetic nor optional engagement. The ragged coat and deserted barrel of Diogenes were not stylistic choices but existential account of when dependence ends, freedom begins (Branham & Goulet-Cazé, 1996).

4.4.2 Cynicism and Anti-Consumerism

Cynicism also finds its resemblances with anti-consumerist critiques. The present-day society runs endless on acquisition as it equates identity and happiness with consuming more. That would have been, for the Cynics, a laughing phenomenon and sign of illusions. For them, wealth meant needing little, as Diogenes is said to have affirmed that one who is content with the least has the most in his life (Navia, 2005).

Modern critic Tim Jackson (2009), in his book *Prosperity Without Growth*, argues reverberating similar view that consumerism corrodes wellbeing and devastates the earth. The Cynics had well anticipated this judgement by holding the idea that greedy desire is a form of enslavement. Therefore, they trained themselves to be content with bare minimum and showed that freedom comes not in raising our standard of living but in lowering our level of need (Hadot, 1995).

4.4.3 Cynicism and Authenticity

Cynicism has an area of resonance in the principle of authenticity. Instead of going by the masks of social convention, the Cynics valued *parrhesia*, the bold truth-telling, and shamelessness as remedies (Foucault, 2011). The public incitements, begging in the streets,

and mocking the Athenian customs, of Diogenes were to expose illusions and drive life to its natural course.

The hunger for authenticity runs deep in the face of modern transformed digital uniqueness and performative lifestyle. For philosopher Charles Taylor (1991), it is a moral idea to live true to oneself and discounting external expectations. The same was practiced by the Cynics, but in its rawest form. Their incitements may feel rude now, but their caution to be careful of the prison of living for facades, has timeless value.

4.4.4 Cynicism and Environmental Ethics

The present-day ecological crises highlight the Cynic relevance further. Their radical simplicity, reuse option, and living in accordance with nature anticipated today's environmental ethical principles. Again, Diogenes' denial of goods, use of waste objects, contentment with little, all go well with principles of low-impact living (Navia, 1996). For ecological survival, thinkers like Serge Latouche (2009) put forth "degrowth" economies that minimize consumption for ensuring ecological survival. The Cynic practice of less use of goods foreruns the same spirit even before climate change was a concern. That indicates what required is not additional technologies but a fundamental shift in attitude towards desire reducing limitless accumulation to radical self-sufficiency.

4.4.5 Limits of Cynic Relevance

Cynicism is also not without limits. Its severe independence sounds dislike for humanity as it neglects the social ties and communal tasks that many ancient traditions consider as essential to human wellbeing. Their total isolation from society is not practical nor desirable in modern contexts too (Nussbaum, 1994). Cynic incitements also can slip into cynicism in the modern disapproving sense. It can be seen as mocking without much meaning and agitating without beneficial purpose. However, as Michel Foucault (2001) observed, ancient Cynicism not a mere defiance, but an agreeable form of "philosophical militancy" and a disciplined commitment to living truthfully. Only with such depth, the principles of Cynics are to be approached and the contrary trivializing their challenge would lead to upsetting results.

CONCLUSION

The Cynics redefined happiness as radical freedom and this novel perspective nevertheless unsettles us. They remind us that human flourishing or wellbeing does not depend on possessions, power, or status, but on the guts to strip all these external goods away. Their critique finds resemblances in modern perspectives of minimalism, anti-consumerism, authenticity, and ecological callings. Their extreme stances also warn against neglect of relational and cultural richness of human life. As the humanity plunge into a world of consumption and conformity, the Cynics give us an awakening call to a severe but liberating truth that happiness and satisfaction need not come about adding more goods, but about needing them less.

REFERENCES

1. Aristotle. (1999). *Nicomachean ethics* (W. D. Ross, Trans.). Batoche Books. https://historyofeconomicthought.mcmaster.ca/aristotle/Ethics.pdf
2. Branham, R. B., & Goulet-Cazé, M. O. (Eds.). (1996). *The Cynics: The Cynic movement in antiquity and its legacy*. University of California Press.
3. Brown, P. (1988). *The body and society: Men, women, and sexual renunciation in early Christianity*. Columbia University Press.
4. Desmond, W. (2008). *Cynics*. Routledge.
5. Diogenes Laertius. (1925). *Lives of eminent philosophers* (R. D. Hicks, Trans.; Vol. 2). William Heinemann. https://dn790000.ca.archive.org/0/items/livesofeminentph02dioguoft/livesofeminentph02dioguoft.pdf
6. Dudley, D. R. (1937). *A history of Cynicism: From Diogenes to the 6th century A.D.* Cambridge University Press. https://www.holybooks.com/wp-content/uploads/A-History-of-Cynicism.pdf
7. Elm, S. (1994). *"Virgins of God": The making of asceticism in late antiquity*. Oxford University Press.
8. Epictetus. (1904). *Discourses of Epictetus* (G. Long, Trans.; J. L. Spalding, Intro.). D. Appleton and Company.

https://dn790003.ca.archive.org/0/items/discrsepictetus00epiciala/discrsepictetus00epiciala.pdf

9. Epicurus. (n.d.). *Letter to Menoeceus* (R. D. Hicks, Trans.). The Internet Classics Archive. Retrieved [insert access date], from https://classics.mit.edu/Epicurus/menoec.html
10. Foucault, M. (2001). *Fearless speech* (J. Pearson, Ed.). Semiotext(e).
11. Foucault, M. (2011). *The courage of truth: The government of self and others II* (G. Burchell, Trans.). Palgrave Macmillan.
12. Hadot, P. (1995). *Philosophy as a way of life* (M. Chase, Trans.). Blackwell.
13. Horn, C. (2014). Autarkeia. In H. Cancik, H. Schneider, & C. F. Collins (Eds.), *Brill's New Pauly*. Brill.
14. Jackson, T. (2009). *Prosperity without growth: Economics for a finite planet*. Routledge.
15. Kraut, R. (2018). Aristotle's ethics. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy* (Fall 2018 ed.). Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University.
16. Latouche, S. (2009). *Farewell to growth* (D. Macey, Trans.). Polity Press.
17. Long, A. A. (1996). *Stoic studies*. University of California Press.
18. Long, A. A. (2006). *From Epicurus to Epictetus: Studies in Hellenistic and Roman philosophy*. Oxford University Press.
19. Millburn, J. F., & Nicodemus, R. (2016). *Minimalism: Live a meaningful life*. Asymmetrical Press.
20. Navia, L. E. (1996). *Classical Cynicism: A critical study*. Greenwood Press.
21. Navia, L. E. (2005). *Diogenes the Cynic: The war against the world*. Humanity Books.
22. Nussbaum, M. C. (1994). *The therapy of desire: Theory and practice in Hellenistic ethics*. Princeton University Press.
23. Taylor, C. (1991). *The ethics of authenticity*. Harvard University Press.