

Repackaged Epicureanism from a Christian writer?

Post by "Cassius" of September 1, 2024 at 5:20 PM

[Quote from Robert](#)

I can see some possible objections. An Epicurean might not use the phrase "becoming more fully human," and "God" here is presumably the Christian version (though perhaps perfect and incorruptible, as an Epicurean deity should be). Still, the idea seems to be that we humans can reach a divine state through a practice of mindful living, as opposed to traveling after death to some mysterious region outside of physics and nature.

i see your point Robert and think you're on the right track. Certainly the embrace of focusing on living now and denying christian distinctions between body and soul ring true to Epicurus.

And as you say the problem would be in the connotations of how "god" is used there, and "saving" life, and becoming "more fully human."

And last but not least, it's always a major red flag in my book when a formulation completely fails to use the word "pleasure." There are lots of people who have lots of good ideas on lots of things, but in my view probably the core trait of something being "Epicurean" is that it is willing to stand up and say straightforwardly that it is the "pleasure" of living that makes life worth living. It can sound like a word game sometime to insist on the word "pleasure," but anyone whose not willing to go all the way to the use of that term, in defiance of all the normal prejudice and peer pressure against it, isn't really in sync with Epicurus. Being willing and unafraid to stand up for "Pleasure," as in Emily Austin's book title "Living for Pleasure," is to me one of the best possible litmus tests to apply.

And sadly this is where a lot of the "atheist" literature out there fails so badly. The "Good without God" approach accepts the Platonic and other premise that there is a "good" other than "pleasure," and in the end that philosophical debate is the real battleground.