

Are You Epicurean Or Hieronymian?

Post by "Cassius" of March 3, 2021 at 8:54 PM

[Quote from Titus](#)

because in my understanding this is a key part of Epicurean philosophy.

I don't doubt that that is your understanding at all, as that is the prevailing view in the academic world at large. That's why we're very clear in our terms of service and our welcome post and in the "Not Neo Epicurean Graphic" and the "Our Posting Policy" graphic that that is not the prevailing view here, and at some point we limit the continued argument for that position.

Now of course in saying all that I'm not intending to say that you have approached the line or in danger of that in any way, but just to acknowledge the truth that the academic world is hugely hostile to the view of Epicurus taken by Norman Dewitt and the writers listed in the "Don't be a Stoic in Disguise" Post in the right sidebar on the front page.

Basically the main reason this forum was founded and has sustained itself to date is in opposition to that view and to provide a place for those who think differently to compare notes and arguments against that viewpoint.

Note: I realize in this post and in what I am quoting from yours there is a danger in losing the focus on what "this" is. To summarize once again, possibly the best way of stating what I am arguing for is a "common sense" definition of the word pleasure, as ordinary people understand that word, which includes BOTH pleasures of "rest" and also "joy and delight" from the point of view that "all pleasures are desirable" and the only reason that one might choose not to pursue certain pleasures is that in the context of that person the pursuit would bring more pain than pleasure. This is the opposite of the "minimalism for the sake of minimalism" approach or any approach that embraces asceticism as the true end, rather than pleasure. But of course that's just a brief summary of the viewpoint you can find (hopefully!) permeating the great majority of posts on this forum.