# Opening Post On Distinguishing Epicurean Philosophy from Buddhism

### Post by “Hiram” of December 18, 2018 at 3:08 PM

the end in B. is nirvana, which means "extinction" (of the fires of desire)

this is confused / and not the same as with sukkha (bliss, delight, pleasure), which is the opposite of dukkha (suffering, dissatisfaction, existential angst), which is the problem that Buddha was attempting to solve. Because sukkha is the opposite of dukkha, it's often thought of as "the end" (and in Nichiren Buddhism it is).

I also think it's fair for someone who wants to delve in the differences in doctrine to consider to what extent the upayas (= efficient means) of the Buddhists can serve Epicurean ends--because many of them do, and a blind dismissal of them comes off as insincere, impractical, fanatical and uninformed. Do we want pleasure or not, and do we consider it worthy of cultivation? If we do, we will study the means to it diligently and not dismiss the means because they are not the end.

It is clear that both in Epicurean philosophy, as well as in scientific studies, and in many other (secular or religious) wisdom traditions (like Buddhism, and also hygge, sumac kawsay, etc.), there are many upayas / efficient means that lead to a life of pleasure. The clear designation of these as "means" helps to not confuse the issue.