

# The Neglect of Metrodorus' Economics

Post by "Elayne" of February 16, 2020 at 7:42 AM

Hiram, let me be more clear-- I don't believe Metrodorus was promoting a "natural measure" of anything, as different to or opposed to a "pleasurable measure." I said "if" he had done so, I would have told him he was wrong. I am not calling Metrodorus wrong or silly. I am calling the way this material is being interpreted wrong-- and the concept of "natural" as a goal for measurement in place of pleasure is absolutely silly. I doubt Metrodorus did it.

You have a repeated tendency to glom onto words in the philosophy that are not pleasure and start elevating them as criteria instead of pleasure. Happiness, wellbeing, natural-- it goes on and on. I really think you should check yourself on this. Why, oh why, are you reluctant to stick to pleasure as your single goal? You are leading your readers in all kinds of unhelpful directions.

When we point out what you are doing, you start prooftexting. But this invariably has been taking single phrases out of the context of the whole, which has made me think you don't understand the whole. You don't understand how differently you are using these words than how they are used by Epicurus.

The income studies aren't measuring "natural"-- they are measuring pleasurable. And income and wealth are different anyway-- related, but different.

Instead of the focus on natural, if you instead wrote about the economics of pleasure, directly, it would be both true to the ancient writings and applicable to modern life. It's a real shame that you are not being direct about pleasure and instead constantly reframe.