

# The Notre Dame Fire

Post by "Cassius" of April 18, 2019 at 3:38 PM

Yes that is my understanding. Even though Liantinis wrote against Stoicism (as I understand it) he was more of an Aristotelian/Platonist and he did not agree with a number of fundamental Epicurean presumptions. That's much the way I see Nietzsche, -- as having much insight into what Epicurus was doing, but allowing themselves to be "turned off" by the "absence of pain" issue. Now why didn't they analyze the "absence of pain" the same way we do, and look to all the many other statements in favor of the normal interpretation of "pleasure."?

That's a question that deserves a lot of thought. Were they?

(1) So turned off by the drumbeat of the majority interpretation that they didn't think it was worthwhile to fight it?

(2) Were they such original thinkers that they really saw themselves as such rebels personally that they didn't want to be considered to be part of anyone's "team" or "school?"

Of course:

(3) Maybe they just disagreed with what DeWitt, Gosling & Taylor, [Nikolsky](#), and others can see, along with us.

But I tend to think the reason is a mixture of (1) and (2) . The passages that support normal pleasure are clear and numerous, and they totally conflict with the superficial interpretation of the lines in the letter to Menoecus. It's easy to see that something is missing from the surviving texts, and that there must be a key that harmonizes the apparent conflicts. Rather than looking for that key, I guess they (especially Nietzsche) just decided it was better to come up with his own brand of "will to power."