

Should Epicurus be viewed as a pure consequentialist, virtue ethicist, or both?

Post by "Cassius" of May 8, 2026 at 3:46 PM

[Quote from wbernys](#)

I was already a little unsure about posting this.

No - I'm glad you posted. if you were thinking it it's likely others are too, so always feel free to speak up.

This goes along with Dave's question. Aside from those of us who are really into the topic there's always a general level of background discussion among people who are mildly interested, and it's there that the subtle connotations of the words end up being influential.

If people just accepted the superficial labels then no one would take any serious interest in Epicurus because the superficial labels are coded by society to keep people in line and within society's quad rails.

This forum is here for those who take ideas seriously and want to make up their own minds about things.

This is where I was just thinking and citing earlier this week some of the opening words of DeWitt's book - the second sentence of chapter one in fact

Quote

At the very outset the reader should be prepared to think of him at one and the same time as the most revered and the most reviled of all founders of thought in the Graeco-Roman world.

There's no middle ground on Epicurus. If you don't realize that when you read opinions about Epicurus that you're reading opinions about explosive stuff, then either you or the person you're reading doesn't realize what being talked about at all.