

# Repackaged Epicureanism from a Christian writer?

Post by "Robert" of September 1, 2024 at 8:38 PM

## [Quote from Cassius](#)

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.

Hi, Cassius,

I'm glad you brought this up--it's been on my mind. Not to use the word "pleasure" would, I agree, amount to misrepresentation. So I probably should clarify that I don't see the passage as being genuine Epicureanism--but perhaps an example of Epicureanism bubbling up within a nominally Christian framework,

As far as I know, no Christian would unabashedly espouse "pleasure" as a good in itself. Yet these things get to be complicated. I had a conversation recently with someone from an evangelical Christian background. I asked her what the draw was. Her answer: "it just feels good."