

## Two Types?

Post by "Cassius" of January 10, 2020 at 8:11 AM

### [Quote from Elayne](#)

I am not like Cassius on this point, in that I do think there are beliefs that make a person not Epicurean.

As I see it, Elayne and I are not very far apart on this point. As I see it the only distinction in our positions is that I try to be very contextual and define "for what purpose" when I talk about something being Epicurean or not, such as "for purposes of the S of E" or "for purposes of posting on Epicureanfriends. Elayne is certainly approaching it correctly, however, from my point of view, in working toward a standard list of attributes for what "Epicurean" means, just like we use words in any general context. And from that general point of view my conclusion is that the texts are very clear that it Epicurus held it to be central to his philosophy to accept the position that the universe was never created by any supernatural forces / god, for the reasons Elayne states above. In fact so central that the issue of where the universe came from and his dismissal of "chaos" as an acceptable answer is what launched his philosophy career in the first place.