

Epicurus' Hierarchy of Needs

Post by “Kalosyni” of June 3, 2025 at 8:53 AM

[Quote from Don](#)

it takes back or reclaims that "negative connotation" and turns it on its head. That negative connotation of "extravagant" strikes me as potentially Puritanical.

I personally feel that "extravagant" still ends up keeping the Puritanical connotation, and seems to convey that you "should" only indulge very rarely.

[Quote from Don](#)

[Quote from Rolf](#)

Would you say “natural”, “necessary”, and “empty” are suitable terms to use?

Well, if it was good enough for Epicurus... 😊

PS. Okay, let me add that "Yes, I know Epicurus didn't use “natural”, “necessary”, and “empty” because he spoke Greek." But those translations are about as close to literal as one gets for φυσικαί, ἀναγκαῖαι, and κεναί.

I like this idea of only: "natural, necessary, and empty".

We could think about it this way:

- natural = Is it natural? Does it come to us from nature? (We will need to be clear about what exactly are all the desires that nature gives to us).
- necessary = Do we need it to survive? Do we need it for our well-being (and to feel blessed/happy).
- empty = Is it actually unnecessary for both survival and well-being? Is it an opinion not from nature but generated by greed for massive riches, non-stop variations of sensation, massive power/control/status (all of which are empty opinions).