

Revisiting Issues of The Use of AI in Epicurean Philosophy

Post by “DaveT” of April 1, 2026 at 10:48 AM

[TauPhi](#) [Don](#) [Cassius](#) and fellow forum members: Perhaps some reactions to the editorial use of AI are based on mis-perceptions. If you already know this, you quite understand my comment here.

As an award-winning fiction author, I hired a highly accomplished New York publishing industry editor to get my work to the best of my ability. He did not substantively change my story, nor add to the intense research I did on historical events, but he helped me structure the chapters and some paragraphs, and occasionally made some of my sentences sing. BUT in every specific case, he made clear my decision on accepting or rejecting his advice was final.

I can guarantee that everything we read in the best journals and magazines in popular media and in academia, is reviewed by an official or unofficial team and it is modified to present the best product possible. This is **no different** from using an AI in its present simple form.

I am not aware of instances in either commercial or academic publishing where the author(s) notate their work to identify editorial help. (Exceptions can be seen in long-form books where the author usually thanks at least some of their editorial team.)

As to what AI actually does when it is asked: Current publicly available AI only recognizes patterns in its database that may match and answer the question asked of it. It doesn't think about other questions, if it can be said to think at all. It only recognizes possible answers and spits out the best answer **responsive to the specific request**. If one asks the AI for editorial assistance on structure, syntax, or grammar, that is **all it will provide**.

I suggest the question is no different now with the use of AI than it is for human editorial assistance.