

Dead Reddit / The "Isms" Thread

Post by "Eikadistes" of November 26, 2019 at 12:58 AM

So, why NOT "Epicureanism"?

The path to wisdom **demands** that we **experience nature directly** and **NOT indirectly** as an abstract system. In other words - *to connect the last few paragraphs* - we should **NEVER** reduce the immediacy of our experiences to a mere "**-ism**"; were we to make the mistake of **-ising** our individual experiences, and the **anticipations** that develop from that **FRESH** experience, we will have stunted our own development on the path to wisdom.

Furthermore, while we may all sincerely admire the person of Epicurus, and delight in the historical texts that resulted from the activity of his Garden, **our** path to wisdom - unlike every other **-ismic** school of thought - is neither dependent upon allegiance to a centralizing leader, nor upon a golden age of history, nor upon a doctrinal institution. *Christianity* could not have existed without *Christ and his mythic Kingdom of Heaven*. *Platonism* could not have existed without *Plato and his mythic World of Forms*. *Stoicism* could not have existed without the *Stoics and their Cosmic Virtue*. Were these figures never to have existed, no one would have ever truly experienced the fantasies of their mythic promises.

Our **EPICUREAN PHILOSOPHY** - the natural, undeniable pursuit of pleasure - is not dependent upon Epicurus to have ever existed, *because*, Nature, itself, is so much larger, more important, and more fundamental than his historical personage. Without the man we call "Epicurus", we still would have sensed the energetic environment of particles around us, felt the churning of feelings of pleasure and pain within us, and anticipated the consequences of our choices. Even if the "**Epicur-**" part of our philosophy were missing from our language, the philosophy, itself, would be the same. Vocabulary aside, the wise person would still engage the natural world, and pursue pleasure to its fullest.

"**Epicureanism**" (or, also, "**Epicurism**") carries a connotation - albeit *very slightly* - that our path to wisdom is *just another -ism*, comparable to other doctrinal institutions, that is useful **ONLY** as an abstract system, advertised to misguided masses who must accept unverifiable truths that have been promised by an unknowable super-person. It is not quite as purposeful to call ourselves "**Epicureanists**" who follow "**Epicureanism**" as it is to identify as "**Epicureans**" who pursue "**Epicurean philosophy**", the **natural path to wisdom**. The tools for our endeavor rest within our own, natural bodies; **Nature, itself**, is the greatest teacher, not "religion", or any other idealisms.

Now, *all this being said*, for practical purposes, there most **certainly** isn't **anything** inherently wrong about employing the term "**Epicureanism**". The "**Epicurean-**" part is still the same, and

an "**-ism**" could just mean a "**philosophy**" which, in Modern English, correctly indicates our loving of wisdom, apart from any oath to a mythic principle. Nonetheless, I will personally choose to write "Epicurean philosophy" whenever possible, to keep my anticipations **FRESH**, to indicate to other, natural beings that our interactions are bigger than *disembodied souls paddling ideas back and forth in a court of Mind*, and to remind myself that our path to wisdom is not a map that has been given to us from an eternal place of perfection, but that we each carry a well-calibrated compass within ourselves that knows the world, and guides us to happiness.

(One more, quick, closing thought: no one on this planet deserves the title of "Epicurean" more than a happy dog, and - ironically - they will always be incapable of assigning that title, or receiving it).