

Discussion of Blog Article

Post by "Todd" of May 20, 2026 at 1:59 PM

[Cassius](#), I came across this old post of yours:

[Quote from Cassius](#)

According to Wikipedia, Hieronymus of Rhodes lived from c. 290 - c. 230 BC, while Epicurus lived from 341-270 BC. That means that Hieronymus lived after Epicurus, and had Epicurus' works to reference, but Epicurus was no longer around to respond to Hieronymus. If indeed Epicurus had taken the position that "absence of pain" is a correct and full statement of the goal of life, why would Hieronymus have had to deviate from Epicurus, and why would Cicero have had to set them up as opposites?

To me, this is a strong argument against the absence of pain view. I'm not sure if others would find this as persuasive, or if it would fit well in the article though. There is also this quote from Cicero in the course of the discussion you're referring to:

Quote from Cicero, De Finibus, 2.6.18

[Epicurus] might have confined the name of pleasure to this state of freedom from pain, and despised pleasure as Aristippus understands it; or else, if he approved of both sorts of pleasure, **as in fact he does...**

The quotes you have from Cicero are good too, but you can't get much more clear than this.

Also a minor nitpick:

Quote from Blog article

It transforms a vigorous, life-affirming system into something that looks, in practice, indistinguishable from the Stoic, Buddhist, or ascetic counsels that Epicurus directly opposed.

Obviously it is the *counsels* that Epicurus opposed. But it could also be read as Epicurus opposing those schools, which is not true. Especially that word "directly". I would suggest re-wording this somehow.