

Promising New Book ("Living For Pleasure") and Great New Article ("Are The Modern Stoics Really Epicurean?") Both By Emily Austin

Post by "Cassius" of November 19, 2022 at 7:37 AM

I didn't really finish my thought did I?

So when she says *Epicurus thinks sexual pleasure and committed romantic relationships are natural, but unnecessary, desires (or so I argue). In the terms of this book, they are extravagant desires, and all extravagant desires can adorn the tranquil life if you do them right.*

...that's a departure and an improvement from the standard academic implication that Epicurus was an ascetic and advised against sexual pleasure and romantic relationships completely.

But she still leaves open and in fact embraces the conclusion that they "can adorn the tranquil life if you do them right" which is less than a full-on endorsement of considering the possibility that for some/many people they may be not only natural but "necessary for happiness."

That's where the terminology is an improvement from the standard awful academic implications, but still leaves further to demolish the ascetic implications of the academic perspective entirely, which aren't justified in what we have from Epicurus himself in Menoecus.

"can adorn the tranquil life" needs to proceed further to open the door to "*depending on the person, necessary for happiness.*"