

Pros and Cons Of Considering Epicurean Philosophy To Be A "Religion"

Post by "TauPhi" of January 23, 2024 at 2:52 PM

[Quote from Nate](#)

In Vatican Saying 29, he literally compares himself to an oracle.

What is your argument here @Nate ? That Epicurus was an oracle because he literally compared himself to an oracle? It may seem that you are trying to put some prophet clothes on Epicurus but by putting forward arguments like that you strip him of his wisdom and present him to public eye as a naked nutcase for people to laugh at. And why wouldn't they laugh at a dude claiming to be an oracle?

Or maybe you're trying to say we should treat everything Epicurus said as gospel? In that case where's the space for philosophy? Where's the room for trying to live wisely by thinking about, discussing and putting to test Epicurus' ideas and see which of these enhance our lives and which are useless? If we take anything as infallible gospel, we are not lovers of wisdom but lovers of being led to slaughterhouse as blind sheep.

[Quote from Nate](#)

I mean to take back those words and return them to their original meanings. "Holy" originally shared a meaning with "Wholesome" or "Healthy", which are excellent descriptions of a key aspect of the Good Life in the Epicurean tradition.

Why would you even attempt to return any words to their original meaning? It's like trying to revert a river with a stick. It's perfectly normal and desirable for languages and their vocabulary to evolve together with people that use them. Languages are meant to change to allow humans for efficient communication. Active languages are not meant to be preserved in their original form and put on display in a museum. And I agree that 'wholesome' and 'healthy' are excellent descriptions. 'Holy' might have meant all that centuries ago but now it means completely different thing. And in 21st century we have words like 'wholesome' and 'healthy' and I don't see any reason why not to use them when talking about something that is wholesome and healthy. You can't expect that people telepathically know that you personally change meanings of words because you like their past meanings. You could have titled your book: 'The Hedonicon: The Wholesome Book of Epicurus' but...

Disclaimer: @Nate. We don't know each other personally and we only passively exchange ideas here on the forum so I want to make sure that you don't imagine me as a vicious troll trying persistently to undermine your work. I am not that person. On the contrary, I think your

book is a great collection of valuable texts and all credit to you for compiling it. All my arguments are strictly related to dangers of mixing religion with philosophy.

...but you chose to use 'Holy'. If I knew nothing about Epicurus and Epicureanism and I came across your book, I'd probably assume it's a book about another nutcase claiming the usual holy nonsense and I'd classify the book as yet another mental diarrhea. And I absolutely don't want this to happen! Your book is a collection of priceless achievement of human thought and people can benefit greatly reading Epicurean texts.