

# Discussion of the Society of Epicurus' 20 Tenets of 12/21/19

**Post by "Cassius" of January 8, 2020 at 6:27 PM**

1 - I think you are correct Oscar. Epicurus held but one position; the discussion of "acceptable" means to Hiram (as I understand it) positions that he considers it acceptable for modern Epicureans to take and still be part of the Society of Epicurus. You are right to observe that those are very different things.

2 - As to whether it is correct to say that Epicurus was an atheist, I also agree that it is wrong to label him an atheist without explaining the nature of [Epicurean gods](#). If the definition of atheist requires that gods being rejected are supernatural, then Epicurus was an atheist. If the definition of atheist means that the gods being rejected could be nonsupernatural, then Epicurus was clearly NOT an atheist. But it all turns on the definitions.

3 - As to the ultimate question I think you are aware of my personal position, so I won't repeat it here unless someone asks.