

# What About "Cherophobia" - Aversion to Happiness?

Post by "Cassius" of March 11, 2017 at 6:07 PM

[Ron Warrick](#) [March 3 at 3:13pm](#)

FWIW, Wikipedia has an article on "Aversion to happiness", or cherophobia. Does this explain stoicism and/or resistance to Epicurean philosophy generally?

[Cassius Amicus](#) type unknown

[Cassius Amicus](#) <https://l.facebook.com/l.php?u=https%...qeFGIBmxL-vuQ68>

[Aversion to happiness - Wikipedia](#)

**Aversion to happiness, also called cherophobia[citation needed] or fear of happiness,[1] is an attitude towards happiness in which individuals may deliberately avoid experiences that invoke positive emotions or happiness.[2]**

**EN.WIKIPEDIA.ORG**

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [Remove Preview](#) · [March 3 at 3:22pm](#)

[Cassius Amicus](#)

[Cassius Amicus](#) Looks like the ancient Epicureans had an opinion on this, from Torquatus: "“No one rejects, dislikes, or avoids pleasure itself, because it is pleasure, but because those who do not know how to pursue pleasure rationally encounter consequences that are extremely painful.”"

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [3](#) · [March 3 at 3:28pm](#)

[Ron Warrick](#) type unknown

[Ron Warrick](#) They don't seem to even believe there is a "how".

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [1](#) · [March 3 at 3:35pm](#)

[Cassius Amicus](#)

*Write a reply...*

[Cassius Amicus](#)

[Cassius Amicus](#) "There are four major reasons why happiness may be avoided by various people and cultures: "believing that being happy will provoke bad things to happen; that happiness will make you a worse person; that expressing happiness is bad for you and others; and that pursuing happiness is bad for you and others".[5]

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [2](#) · [March 3 at 3:52pm](#)

[Elli Pensa](#) 

[Elli Pensa](#)  :  : 

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [2](#) · [March 3 at 4:56pm](#)

[Panos Alexiou](#) 

**[Panos Alexiou](#) Elder paisios is the epitome of the idiocy of the Orthodox viewpoint. Superstition, stupidity and misery.**

[Unlike](#) · [Reply](#) · [3](#) · [March 4 at 8:47am](#)

Cassius Amicus

*Write a reply...*

[Forrest Young](#) 

**[Forrest Young](#) Stoicism does not avert happiness, it strives for happiness. The difference between Epicurean and Stoic philosophy on the attainment of happiness is Epicurean doctrine would have you strive for pleasures whereas Stoic doctrine would have you strive for virtues.**

**I personally have found collecting virtues to be far more fulfilling than experiencing pleasures. Pleasures are fleeting, virtues are everlasting.**

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [March 3 at 6:07pm](#)

Ron Warrick

**[Ron Warrick](#) Well, fulfillment is a form of pleasure. If you can maintain a life of predominantly fulfillment, you must be a pretty good pleasure-seeking Epicurean yourself!**

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [1](#) · [March 4 at 12:53am](#)

Forrest Young

**[Forrest Young](#) I would agree. So many view Stoicism in opposition to Epicurean philosophy, but they are both seeking the same end. I believe Stoicism is more to the point, though. I believe it is readily apparent that pleasure ought to be sought and pain avoided, however this is quite vague and doesn't really lend itself to forming a sustainable well of happiness.**

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [March 4 at 3:05am](#) · [Edited](#)

Cassius Amicus

*Write a reply...*

Cassius Amicus

**[Cassius Amicus](#) Forrest Young " So many view Stoicism in opposition to Epicurean philosophy, but they are both seeking the same end. I believe Stoicism is more to the point, though." Oh good grief.**

**"" So many view Stoicism in opposition to Epicurean philosophy,"<< Starting primarily with the ancient Stoics, who knew that the two were irreconcilable and denounced Epicurus with all the anger they could muster, followed closely by the ancient Epicureans, who knew that Stoicism is essentially a living refutation of Nature's goal of the pursuit of pleasure. It took almost two thousand years before it became the world dumbed down enough where significant numbers of people started claiming them to be the same thing.**

**"but they are both seeking the same end." <<< And the reason that they are irreconcilable is that the authorities of both philosophies made clear that the end of Epicurean philosophy is plesasurable living, and the end of Stoic philosophy is virtue, which requires the suppression of pleasure."**

**"I believe Stoicism is more to the point, though." <<< And if you think so then please feel free to proclaim that to the world in the Stoic group of your choice.**

**Exactly why did you apply for membership in this group?**

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [2](#) · [March 4 at 6:24am](#) · [Edited](#)

Forrest Young

**[Forrest Young](#) Please apply some logic which necessitates a virtuous life to suppress pleasure.**

**I applied because I am interested in all schools of philosophy and wish to better myself through comprehensive knowledge.**

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [1](#) · [March 4 at 6:31am](#)

Forrest Young

**[Forrest Young](#)** Personally, I believe goals are a construct of the mind and since Nature doesn't have a mind it would be inaccurate to assume that Nature has any goals. I believe Nature is a consequence of reality which has no goals tethered to it.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [March 4 at 6:33am](#)

Cassius Amicus

**[Cassius Amicus](#)** I have no idea what the first sentence means Forrest. ("Please apply som....\_ Did you read the "about" post and the pinned post before applying? This group is Epicurean, not Stoic. If you want to discuss the differences between the two philosophies then we can do that, as it will be a constant topic. But the people here know that the two are not the same, and after a certain point with each person continuation to insist on that is going to end in removal from the group.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [2](#) · [March 4 at 6:34am](#)

Forrest Young

**[Forrest Young](#)** I'm not claiming the two philosophies are the same, only their end goal is the same, which is to attain happiness in life.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [March 4 at 6:35am](#)

Cassius Amicus

**[Cassius Amicus](#)** As to "goals" of Nature I don't necessarily disagree with that post. The point made by Epicurus is that pleasure and pain are the only faculties given the living things by Nature for the indication of what to choose and what to avoid. "Goals" is a word that has all sorts of connotations and certainly Nature didn't sit around listing out the "goals" of life in the twentieth century. It is mainly Platonists and other philosophic derivatives (like Stoicism) that seem to maintain that such lists exist.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [2](#) · [March 4 at 6:36am](#)

Forrest Young

**[Forrest Young](#)** I doubt I will be removed from the group because I am not acting in a manner which would ever suggest removal to be a necessary action. I am not belligerent and am merely expressing my own philosophical opinions.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [March 4 at 6:37am](#)

Cassius Amicus

**Cassius Amicus** "I'm not claiming the two philosophies are the same, only their end goal is the same, which is to attain happiness in life." <<< And that is exactly the point on which you are not only in disagreement with me, but with every authoritative Stoic and Epicurean who knew their philosophies and ever lived.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [2](#) · [March 4 at 6:37am](#)

Forrest Young

**Forrest Young** Then to what end would you suggest they are hoping to attain?

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [March 4 at 6:38am](#)

Cassius Amicus

**Cassius Amicus** "I am not belligerent and am merely expressing my own philosophical opinions." <<< This group is not an open forum to express philosophic opinions as stated in the Description to the group.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [2](#) · [March 4 at 6:38am](#)

Cassius Amicus

**Cassius Amicus** The Stoics stated plainly that their goal is virtue. And the Epicureans stated plainly that their goal is pleasure. They both knew very well that pleasure and virtue are not the same. What is difficult about that?

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [2](#) · [March 4 at 6:39am](#)

Cassius Amicus

**Cassius**

**Amicus**

<https://www.facebook.com/photo.php?fbid=10206173087469215&set=g.646764225372541&type>

Image may contain: 1 person

**Elli Pensa** [to Epicurean Philosophy](#) May 23, 2015 ·

I say both now, and always, shouting out loudly, to all Greeks and non-Greeks, that pleasure is the highest end of life !

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [Remove Preview](#) · [2](#) · [March 4 at 6:41am](#)

Forrest Young


**Forrest Young** If open discussion of philosophical ideas isn't welcomed, I will gladly remove myself from the group.

"These four definitions or descriptions of passion are in agreement though each emphasizes a different aspect of passion. For example, grief over lost or stolen

property is considered a passion, a species of distress. Since the object of concern (the stolen property) is in truth of no moral worth (indifferent), for it is only our virtuous response to the situation that qualifies as morally good or bad, the impulse identified with the grief is excessive (1). Since we do not heed reason which would tell us that happiness lies in virtue alone, it is also an impulse disobedient to reason (2). Likewise, since the value attributed to an object does not represent its true worth, it is a false judgement (3). Finally, the distress which we experience in the grief manifests itself not as a smooth calm state but as a fluttering or disturbance in our soul (4).

According to Stoic ethics, only virtues are truly good, whereas externals such as wealth, honor, power, and pleasure are indifferent to our happiness since each can also harm us and each ultimately lies beyond our control. These externals then are said to be morally "indifferent" (adiaphoron). When we mistakenly value something indifferent as though it were a genuine good, we form a false judgement and experience passion."

[-https://l.facebook.com/l.php?u=http%3...QuOP5YLq0QBLnQk](https://l.facebook.com/l.php?u=http%3...QuOP5YLq0QBLnQk)



Yeah, happiness has nothing to do with Stoicism whatsoever.

[Stoic Philosophy of Mind | Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy](#)

IEP.UTM.EDU

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [Remove Preview](#) · [March 4 at 6:47am](#)

[Matt Jackson](#) image not found or type unknown

**[Matt Jackson](#)** Claiming that virtues are superior to pleasure is a really hard sell here. I find that many virtues are abstract and can't be stored up. You are either honest or courageous by nature, you don't put those things on like a jacket and wear it. You either are a certain nature or you aren't. Abstractions aren't all that satisfying.

Pleasure on the other hand is. Physical pleasures and mental pleasures are all there is in life.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [2](#) · [March 4 at 6:52am](#) · [Edited](#)

Cassius Amicus

**[Cassius Amicus](#)** Yes, happiness has nothing to do with Stoicism whatsoever, I repeat. That selection shows clearly that (1) the goal of stoicism is "virtue", and (2) "happiness" has nothing to do with pleasure.

If stoics want to define happiness as something that lies in virtue alone, regardless of pleasure, then let them, but that is not the way people who are in tune with nature think, and it is actually a perversion of Nature.

Beyond Good And Evil, (Gutenberg edition, translated by Helen Zimmern) Chapter 1, section 9

You desire to LIVE “according to Nature”? Oh, you noble Stoics, what fraud of words! Imagine to yourselves a being like Nature, boundlessly extravagant, boundlessly indifferent, without purpose or consideration, without pity or justice, at once fruitful and barren and uncertain: imagine to yourselves INDIFFERENCE as a power—how COULD you live in accordance with such indifference? To live—is not that just endeavouring to be otherwise than this Nature? Is not living valuing, preferring, being unjust, being limited, endeavouring to be different? And granted that your imperative, “living according to Nature,” means actually the same as “living according to life”—how could you do DIFFERENTLY? Why should you make a principle out of what you yourselves are, and must be? In reality, however, it is quite otherwise with you: while you pretend to read with rapture the canon of your law in Nature, you want something quite the contrary, you extraordinary stage-players and self-deluders! In your pride you wish to dictate your morals and ideals to Nature, to Nature herself, and to incorporate them therein; you insist that it shall be Nature “according to the Stoa,” and would like everything to be made after your own image, as a vast, eternal glorification and generalism of Stoicism! With all your love for truth, you have forced yourselves so long, so persistently, and with such hypnotic rigidity to see Nature FALSELY, that is to say, Stoically, that you are no longer able to see it otherwise—and to crown all, some unfathomable superciliousness gives you the Bedlamite hope that BECAUSE you are able to tyrannize over yourselves—Stoicism is self-tyranny—Nature will also allow herself to be tyrannized over: is not the Stoic a PART of Nature?... But this is an old and everlasting story: what happened in old times with the Stoics still happens today, as soon as ever a philosophy begins to believe in itself. It always creates the world in its own image; it cannot do otherwise; philosophy is this tyrannical impulse itself,

the most spiritual Will to Power, the will to "creation of the world," the will to the causa prima.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [1](#) · [March 4 at 6:51am](#)

Forrest Young

**Forrest Young** The goal of Stoicism is happiness, and the engine which they believe allows happiness is virtue.

I am not trying to sell one as superior to the other. Virtues allow a sustained state of pleasure.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [March 4 at 6:51am](#)

Cassius Amicus

**Cassius Amicus** And the problem there is that "happiness" becomes a weasel word for a concept that no ordinary person would recognize as a state of pleasurable living. Trying to sell the two as the same thing deserves just the label of "Fraud" that Nietzsche assigned to it.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [2](#) · [March 4 at 6:54am](#) · [Edited](#)

Cassius Amicus

**Cassius Amicus** Please provide an authoritative ancient Stoic quote to support this: "The goal of Stoicism is happiness" < They knew better than to make this mistake.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [3](#) · [March 4 at 6:55am](#) · [Edited](#)

Forrest Young

**Forrest Young** I live as closely as I am able to Stoic doctrine and I can assure you I am not living in tyranny. Believe what you like and live in a manner which allows you to be happy. Stoicism has allowed this for me. I'm happy that Epicureanism has allowed this for you.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [March 4 at 6:55am](#)

Cassius Amicus

**Cassius Amicus** Please provide an authoritative ancient Stoic quote to support this: "The goal of Stoicism is happiness" < They knew better than to make this mistake.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [1](#) · [March 4 at 6:55am](#)

Cassius Amicus

**Cassius Amicus** If you are happy **Forrest Young** in any recognizable sense of that

word then your happiness has nothing to do with Stoicism.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [March 4 at 6:56am](#)

Forrest Young

**[Forrest Young](#)** Cassius, you are a fool and I refuse to engage you any longer. You completely miss the point of philosophy in the first place if you are able to unapologetically sit there and make claims about my personal relationship with the ideas of my reality.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [March 4 at 6:58am](#)

Cassius Amicus

**[Cassius Amicus](#)** Removed from the group....

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [2](#) · [March 4 at 6:58am](#)

Forrest Young

**[Forrest Young](#)** Reflection of living with virtuous character provides me with happiness. You cannot possibly deny how I feel.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [March 4 at 6:59am](#)

Elli Pensa

**[Elli Pensa](#)** Forrest Young wrote <<For example, grief over lost or stolen property is considered a passion, a species of distress. Since the object of concern (the stolen property) is in truth of no moral worth (indifferent).>>

The WHAT ? If someone would grab your land that is needed to cultivate it for feeding your children and your family...or you have built your home on it...You say that is not a virtue to feel sad (pain) for this, and just doing something to take it back and to feel pleasure again with your family??

-----

And since pleasure is the first good and natural to us, for this very reason we do not choose every pleasure, but sometimes we pass over many pleasures, when greater discomfort accrues to us as the result of them: and similarly we think many pains better than pleasures, since a greater pleasure comes to us when we have endured pains for a long time. Every pleasure then because of its natural kinship to us is good, yet not every pleasure is to be chosen: even as every pain also is an evil, yet not all are always of a nature to be avoided. Yet by a scale of comparison and by the

consideration of advantages and disadvantages we must form our judgment on all these matters. For the good on certain occasions we treat as bad, and conversely the bad as good.(Epicurus epistle to Meneceus)

[Unlike](#) · [Reply](#) · [2](#) · [March 4 at 7:00am](#)

Cassius Amicus

**Cassius Amicus** "Reflection of living with virtuous character provides me with happiness. You cannot possibly deny how I feel." <<< Another statement unsupportable by authoritative stoicism. The founders/leaders of stoicism made clear that their goal was virtue and not happiness. If this were a Stoic group he would probably have been removed even sooner, for heresy to stoicism

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [1](#) · [March 4 at 7:02am](#)


Cassius Amicus

**Cassius Amicus** Another major issue here which we never got around to addressing is the problem that arises from failing to define "happiness" clearly. That's a stumbling block in discussing things with Aristotelians as well because that is where the real differences between Aristotelian and Epicurean ethics come to light. What is "happiness" has to be considered first.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [3](#) · [March 4 at 7:04am](#)

Elli Pensa

**Elli Pensa** The sad thing is that the stoical indifference is not only for their property. **THEIR INDIFFERENCE GOES FOR THEIR FAMILY MEMBERS too.** Because if there would be a case to lost someone ..**THEY WILL BE INDIFFERENT,** because this is **VIRTUE**!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

**Image may contain: 1 person, text**

[Unlike](#) · [Reply](#) · [3](#) · [March 4 at 7:06am](#) · [Edited](#)

Matt Jackson

**Matt Jackson** Virtues are relative too. What is "good" to say a jihadist is not to others who find their definition of good twisted. So it's impossible to define a universal virtue across all cultures and situations. Whereas pain and pleasure are defined by nature.

[Unlike](#) · [Reply](#) · [3](#) · [March 4 at 9:05am](#)

Cassius Amicus

**Cassius Amicus** Matt I don't think there is anything more key than that observation.

And Epicurus saw it too and it's the real basis of the ethics without which none of the rest of it makes sense.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [3](#) · [March 4 at 9:25am](#)

Cassius Amicus

[Cassius Amicus](#) And of course when you talk about the defining of the goal you are talking about epistemology, which is why pain and pleasure are key primary components of the Epicurean canon, while "logic" is not. Logic is useless without the direction set by pleasure and pain.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [3](#) · [March 4 at 9:33am](#)

[Elli Pensa](#)

[Elli Pensa](#) *Fg. 70. Beauty and virtue and such are worthy of honor, if they bring pleasure; but if not then bid them farewell!*

*Fg. 116. I summon you to sustained pleasures and not to empty and trifling virtues, which destroy your confidence in the fruits of what you have.*

====>Epicurus<====