

Can you be an epicurean and use some logic with the senses?

Post by "Cassius" of May 15, 2019 at 8:28 AM

Mousikos thank you for pointing this out, I had not focused on it earlier. I agree with your conclusion and I am always very suspicious when an Epicurean text is translated as extolling "only reason" over feeling. Yes reason is important but it is not one of the three canonical faculties listed by Epicurus, and I suspect mangling or alteration when I see a quote like that.

Before I accept that quote as accurate I would want to have access to the original material and see what part of it is "reconstructed" from fragmentary text. I would want to see what the text before and after this section said. And absent firm and clear textual evidence that this translation is well supported, I would not consider it to be consistent with what I understand to be Epicurus' position or worthy of equal status as other, better supported Epicurean texts..

In fact, in focusing on "reason" vs. "unreason" and talking about "words" and "perfection" -- this sounds more Stoic to me than Epicurean.

[Mousikos - Part of the background of this discussion is that I presume this comes from [the French collection of Epicurean fragments by Delattre that Hiram and I have discussed elsewhere](#). I now have a copy of that book but I don't read French and have not yet found passages which describe the origin of the texts it quotes and what part are reconstructed. I thank Hiram for finding this book and pointing it out, but until I see some of this material documented in English with descriptions of what part is reconstructed and what is not, I have to consider this material as only semi-reliable at best. And even if this part quoted in blue is correct, who is to say that the paragraph before it did not say "And now I am going to quote from ___ the Stoic, who was truly an imbecile."]