

The Neglect of Metrodorus' Economics

Post by "Cassius" of February 14, 2020 at 3:01 PM

The problem I see here is not that Elayne does not have proper respect for Metrodorus, but that you (Hiram) are submitting fragmentary / speculative texts in support of people like Metrodorus saying things that appear to be in contradiction to the core Epicurean texts which are themselves clear.

Here, in this situation, we know from many many text references that there is NO "bright line test" on application of any tool because the end result is "does it bring pleasure?" and that given the nature of the universe there CAN BE no "one size fits all" answer.

That's really the problem I have been trying to express here. Elayne (and anyone who builds from the ground up) is going to start with that premise, and they are not going to be tempted to look for a bright line test in anything, especially something as specific and contextual as "wealth."

Discussing a "natural measure" of anything is always, in Epicurean terms, going to be contextual, but by implying otherwise (which you are doing in your writing about this subject, and which the article we are discussing otherwise, you are falsely suggesting that Metrodorus would have taken a position different from Epicurus -- and I say falsely because the texts you are citing are fragmentary and speculatively reconstructed, and they could easily be read in a way that is totally harmonizable with Epicurus himself.

This issue is very similar to the attempt to construe Lucretius in a way that differs from Epicurus, which I also gather from some of your past writings Hiram is an interest of yours,

The pattern that I am seeing here is that you are looking for deviations among the Epicurean leaders, probably so as to support the contention that Epicurean philosophy needed to evolve in the past - and *still needs to evolve* - to meet needs which you personally feel need to be addressed, but either were not addressed, or more accurately, were addressed in ways that you disagree with personally.

I would not be so blunt about this but for your stating that this is a continuing editorial problem for the leadership of this forum. I do not see it that way at all, and I think the problem is much more in your determination to "improve" Epicurean philosophy in a way that is not supported by the core reliable texts.