

Is Epicurean life achievable only for well off?

Post by "Cassius" of September 19, 2022 at 3:42 PM

I don't want to monopolize this conversation so I hope some others will comment soon. Having said that however I want to say:

[Quote from waterholic](#)

How do I suggest to those significantly less fortunate to be satisfied with whatever is within their reach?

I think that is exactly the right wording to say "reach.". The standard way of saying " be satisfied with what you 'have' does not address those situations where people can and should seek more than they have. That also has been covered in some recent discussions on "desire." Epicurus clearly contemplates some desires for things we do not currently have to be "good" to pursue, so part of the trick is knowing which are reasonable and which are "beyond our reach" (such as immortality) or which will clearly bring more pain to us than pleasure.

We need to grapple more directly with your question in terms of people who are in fact severely disadvantaged, but it's good to get the general picture clear first.

And certainly even those in the worst physical circumstances are not well served by myths about rewards in heaven or ideals with no basis in reality.

Certainly part of the conversation will involve [VS63](#) as a reminder that undershooting ones potential is as much of an error as overshooting, so one step is evaluating what is possible, and other steps will involve the observations from various sources including Lucretius that money does not and cannot buy eternal life or happiness that is essentially higher or different than what is available on a more modest budget.

In the end there are no magic answers, but connecting with reality rather than with dreams seems the most likely way to do our best in dealing with these problems.