

# Who to believe?

**Post by “Pacatus” of May 27, 2023 at 6:54 PM**

Personally, I don't have any problem with the variety of interpretations - which I suspect is inescapable in any milieu that does not stifle critical thinking.

I would be much more concerned about any sharp-edged, cookie-cutter definition about what a “True Epicurean™” must be and do. But, then again, I would not be much concerned about whether or not my understanding/interpretation of Epicurus fit the contours of that cookie cutter. (Till the Inquisitors show up, anyway 😬 😊 - but then, Epicurean philosophy, as I see it, is really not amenable to any Inquisition. 😊 ) But, then again - again - I don't mind being convinced that I am wrong, or at least would do well to rethink things (though I might be a bit stubborn along the way 😞 ).

After all, a hard rule-based (command-based, imperative-based) approach is more in line with Platonism / Stoicism / Kantianism - and strict creedalistic religions. I find an Epicurean outlook to be freeing from all that (and, in my case, has taken years to come to).

With all that said, there are certain lineaments of the philosophy that I think can be discerned (such as non-supernaturalism) - even as that discernment is advanced by continued study, and by dialectical discussion from multiple perspectives - as takes place on here every day. And, as my understanding has been thereby deepened (hopefully), I find myself more relaxed and at ease about it all.

~ ~ ~

Note: Perhaps my favorite portrait of Epicurus is Frances Wright's fictional account in *A Few Days in Athens* - partly because of how she portrays him responding to issues like this one: robust reasoning, but always with graciousness and a kind of easy grace.