

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

Post by “Mike Anyayahan” of January 10, 2020 at 6:18 AM

Things are beginning to make sense to me. I'm a less than a month old self-declared Epicurean, and I do not claim I have completely grasped all the teachings of Epicurus. In fact, I have high respect on all of you guys here for the profoundness of your understanding of Epicureanism.

However, it seems that Epicureanism is not at all different from other isms I've been to especially on the area of fidelity to the original author.

On one hand, it is reasonable to say that you are not an Epicurean if you hold some views that are likely to compromise the fidelity to Epicurus' basic thoughts.

On the other hand, fidelity compromises its power of application to an ever changing world in which the diversity of language and culture continuously evolves. If we say that Epicureanism is not for everyone, what's the point of telling people about it?

I do not say that fidelity is wrong nor express that revisionism is right, but fidelity requires that a system of thought is clear and complete.

We know that most of Epicurus works did not survive. Only a few fragments from other authors of antiquity are available to us. Moreover, the distance of our time from Epicurus is quite long. Who would know what we are all saying here is what exactly what Epicurus was thinking since even the available original texts keep Epicureans divided in thoughts or views?

Nevertheless, it is also reasonable to say that we are not Epicureans if we are too remote from the basic principles of Epicureanism.

My only question is "To what extent should we stop calling someone Epicurean?"