

Dead Reddit / The "Isms" Thread

Post by "Hiram" of December 21, 2019 at 2:02 PM

[Quote from Cassius](#)

Has that been reviewed by Hiram or others as representative of a collective view of the Society of Epicurus? I note the opening reference to that and it seems to be written as such, but I wasn't clear. The last paragraph in general, and the final sentence in particular, sounds like it was intended as such, and wasn't part of your earlier comments on this subject if I recall correctly. And in that context I am interested in the thought process behind the last sentence, because I don't really agree with that formulation myself. I would probably not comment about except for the inference that this might be intended to be a statement of the Society of Epicurus (if that was intended) in which case I think the conclusion is something to discuss further.

I would particularly question "***the distinguishing feature of Epicurus' wisdom is his insistence that pleasure is the supreme goal of life***" and "

The wisdom of pleasure was NOT invented by any one prophet, nor divinely revealed to illuminate humanity; simply, Epicurus was one of many insightful friends who observed this reality, and shared in the wisdom of pleasure."

I reviewed the essay and when he posts it, i was going to link my own essay on isms so that people see some of the discussions that we have had on this

<http://societyofepicurus.com/on-isms/>

The entire essay was authored by Nathan and even reflects his own creativity with different kinds of fonts etc so I want to respect his voice, and I also think this is a well articulated essay.

As for statements of the Society of Epicurus, I would not be comfortable with requiring everyone to share each and every opinion in unison. We now share the Tenets. We can build from there.

Concerning Nathan's closing statement I approve of it and would prefer if he does not change it. I would like @Nathan to continue developing as an Epicurean intellectual with his own ideas. Our final authority is nature and the canon, so for instance we know that Epicurus was wrong about the size of the sun because of the canon. For a similar reason I can see and appreciate Ilkka's third / atheistic interpretation of the gods, which he and I argue is in line with the canon.

Finally it was Aristippus who invented pleasure ethics, and it was Anniceris the Cyrenaic who invented hedonic calculus. So while Epicurus perfected pleasure ethics to where we know it today, with the help of his friends, and we are right to almost revere him, I am also ok w

Nathan's statement that we do not see him as a kind of prophet. Many after and before him, like Diogenes of Oenoanda and Michel Onfray, and the Lokáyata school in india, and Yang Chu of china, have made contributions of their own to pleasure ethics.