


☐

I'm not robot

  
reCAPTCHA

Continue

## Epicureanism and stoicism are philosophies that arose

Apart from these similarities, however, both philosophies are contradictory. The stoic universe is purposeful and unified; Epicurean world is one of the random atoms that fall endlessly through the universe, with no direction and no meaning. Stoic aims to live in harmony with the universe, with logos that is both wisdom and virtue; Epicurean, notoriously, focuses on pleasure. Everyone believed that his goal was a source of individual happiness. For Stoics, this included the assumption that the universe was rational and good, the best of all possible worlds; that it was designed for the benefit of rational beings, and therefore, whatever happened, it was ultimately for good. The goal of individual existence was not pleasure, but virtue, and a truly virtuous man was in complete control of his own destiny by deciding to be what happened to him. So true Stoic, if completely virtuous, will not mind being tortured: he will smile on the rack, because, being virtuous, he must be happy. The stoic universe is governed by reason - indeed, it is reason, a divine fire that permeates the whole world. We participate in the divinity of the world, and our part of this divinity is what gives us the opportunity to act rationally so that our lives are in harmony with the divine soul of the world. Stoic has to constantly make rational decisions, looking for what is consistent with both his own nature and with nature as a whole. We may not see a pattern of the world, but it is there, and it is our job to be consistent with it. The Epicura worldview (which the Stoichs tried to fight against) is completely different. The goal of epicureanism is initially negative, to dispel those emotions that trouble calm; of these are the most important fears and passions. Epicurean should not love (too much), although sex, as a fulfillment of natural function, is perfectly fine. But one should not allow strong feelings to hold. Although pleasure is the goal, Epicurean (like Stoic in some ways) is constantly involved in calculating the pros and cons: he or she will not seek momentary pleasure that has long-term disadvantages, and he or she will be willing to undergo short pain for long-term benefits. The method, to a large extent, is to allot desires. Get a free membership video! Subscribe to the newsletter. The following is a transcript of this video. [amazon\_link asins='0140442103' template='ProductAd' store='acadofidea-20' marketplace='US' link\_id='7f61e001-1eb3-11e8-8282-0bea03f3dad5'] Stoicism and epicurism were the two main Hellenistic schools of philosophy (i.e. schools that came after Aristotle). While they differ in their basic principles, both philosophical schools have recognized the goal of philosophy to be a transformation of one's self into sage. The sage is the one who has 'plundering being', or 'perfection of being', unattainable for us fallible beings and therefore, like wisdom, an impossible ideal. No human being can ever become a sage. However, although ideals can never be achieved, they can be advanced towards a greater state of perfection being the goal of both stoicism and epicureanism. In the passage below from the book Letters from Stoic, Seneca, Stoic, who appreciated the philosophy of epicureanism, noted the main difference between his Stoic school and the Epicurus school. Epicureanism is a philosophy that emphasizes the importance of training your desires. One is unhappy, thought Epicurus (founder of epicureanism) because he longs for things he may not desire. If we were just learning or getting used to the things that are necessary and natural for us as human beings, we could bathe in the pure joy of being; that is, to learn to understand how pleasant it is just to exist. Epicurean sage, or one who has achieved the ideal that Epicureanism sets out, is the one who, given that his basic needs are met (shelter, food, etc.) is able to rival the 'gods' in happiness. Stoic philosophers, unlike Epicureans, believed that there are many things beyond our control in life and therefore many things that could meet us and make our lives very difficult. Diseases, losses, poverty, death and other tragedies that normally affect human beings are things over which we generally have little control. If the goddess Fortuna (the Roman goddess of happiness or happiness) decides that a terrible disease must come to us, in many cases there is little we can do except wait and hope that the terrible storm will soon pass and not take us to eternity. Unlike Epicureans, Stoic philosophers stressed that being alive means being open to many of the problems that can arise in our lives through no fault of our own, and that achieving happiness is not just a matter of stopping longing for things we don't need to desire. What is necessary in order to live a successful life according to Stoics is courage, moral strength, and, of course, wisdom. Surely bad things will happen to us, and moreover, we will certainly have desires for things that will not benefit us. But he who has become a true Stoic, a stoic sage, will bear the variability of happiness by strength, understanding, and serenity; and refrain from acting or giving in to your basic desires/impulses. Or in the words of the stoic philosopher Seneca... The difference between Epicurean and our own school is this: our wise man feels his problems, but overcomes them, while their wise man does not even feel them. We share with them the belief that a wise man is satisfied with himself. However, self-sufficient he still longs for a friend, a neighbor, a companion. Notice how satisfied he is: sometimes such a person settles for only a partial self—if he loses his hand as a result of war or illness, or has one of his eyes, or even both that were satisfied in an accident, he will be satisfied with what is left of himself, and he will be no less satisfied with his body now that it is crippled and incomplete than when it was complete. But even if he doesn't want what he lost, he prefers not to lose it. And that is what we mean when we say a wise man is self-content; he is so in the sense that he is able to do without friends, not that he wishes to be without them. When I talk about being 'able' to do it, what I say actually equals this: it carries the loss of a friend with serenity. ([amazon\_link asins='0140442103' text='Letters from stoic' template='ProductLink' store='acadofidea-20' marketplace='US' link\_id='da669d51-1eb2-11e8-adf6-814f9bc9db5b']). See also: More reading Stoic and Epicurean-two words that don't mean what people think they mean. The image of Stoic is a heartless, heartless brute and Epicurean as a pleasure-loving, self-indulgent hedonist. Stereotypes always lag behind, but in this case a common understanding of what it means to be a follower of Stoics or Epicureanism has given away two living philosophies of serious injustice. Both philosophies were founded in Athens around 300 B.C the lives of both Zeno and Epicurus, the founders of both schools, overlapped. They both advised us to avoid excessive pleasure and longing. And to deal with an important point soon, epicureanism did not advocate excessive hedonism as much as we might think. (Like the Stoics, they were not heartless and reject emotions.) One starting point that might surprise many is that it is worth noting how much the Stoics borrowed from a rival and competing philosophical school. While the stoic philosopher Seneca offered criticism of Epicurus in his letters from Stoic, it would be unfair not to mention many times when he quoted him positively. In one letter, he writes: My idea for today is something I found in Epicurus (yes, I actually do the practice of going to the enemy camp – through exploration, not as a deserter!). Happy poverty, he says, is an honest state. In another, Seneca tells his correspondent, Lucilius, I'm still flipping the pages of Epicurus, and the following saying, one I read today, comes from him: 'To win true freedom, you must be a slave to philosophy.' Why was Seneca quoting a 'rival' school, you may ask. This was, of course, the question he foresaw: You may want to know why I quote so many subtle statements from Epicurus rather those that belong to our own school. But why should you consider them belonging to Epicuru and not as common property? Or as he once painfully remarked: I will never be ashamed to quote a bad writer with a good proverb. But that's true, a form for Seneca. He was looking for wisdom, period. It didn't matter where it came from. That's something that many fundamentalists-- in religion, philosophy, whatever-- seem to be missing. Who cares if there's a piece of wisdom from Stoic or epicureice, who cares if it's a perfect mocking of stoicism? It depends on whether it makes your life better, if it makes you better. It's the same attitude Stoic Emperor Marcus Aurelius had, evoking Epicurus in one of his notes to himself in meditation: And in most cases you should be helped by the saying of Epicurus that pain is never unbearable or endless, so that you can remember these limits and not add to them in your imagination. (Epictetus for its part, one of the other three main stoic philosophers, does not borrow from Epicurus. Instead, she calls him a preacher of effeminacy and showers abuse on him, as Diogenes Laertius would say.) Let's now look at the differences between schools: Stoicism argues that living rightfully and virtuously is the highest good one can experience, and that pleasure and pain should be treated indifferently, while Epicureanism argues that we should try to maximize our own pleasure (mainly by removing pain from our lives). The pleasure, as Epicurus considered, was the beginning and end of a blessed life. And you've probably also heard of epicurean's famous garden and its motto, as it says on the gate: Stranger, you would do well to stay a while, because here is the highest mine of pleasure. For Epicureans, virtue was a means to an end, a pleasure, while for the Stoics it was their guiding principle and the foundation of their way of life. As the stoic philosopher Seneca said: Let virtue lead the way: then every step will be safe. As you can probably conclude, although the ways that both philosophies recommend we live are very similar, they ultimately point us to different ideals. Both offer ways to avoid pain in life; in epicureanism by living very simply and having a strong friendship, and stoicism by fully accepting the course of nature. Epicuers claim that we can be as happy as the gods if we live without anxiety – especially fear of death and fear of the gods – and satisfy our basic desires. Epicuers believed in the atomic theory of the world and thought that when we died, the atoms that make up our souls became disorganized, and then we no longer exist. As Epicurus said: The most horrific evil, death, means nothing to us, because when we exist, death does not exist, and when death exists, we do not exist. The Stoics tried to live in harmony live in harmony with what is happening, rather than rebel against what we cannot change. As the stoic philosopher Epictetus said: We are like a little pendant of Zeus, and who is the encore to the question of whole body plans? Epicureans and Stoics also differ in how to avoid suffering. Stoics believes that all pain stems from our perception and that we have the ability not to suffer when things are usually considered wrong with us. Epictetus again: One is concerned not about the things but the opinions that are made of them. Stoics teaches that a person can be happy no matter what obstacles or tragedies they might face. By accepting everything that happens to us in life and understanding that no one has ever hurt us unless we believe we are, we can avoid suffering and live a joyful life. Epicureans believe that avoiding pain means not fearing the gods or death, and not longing for things that are not both natural and necessary. Peace of mind should be maintained by living simply and having strong friendships with people you can rely on. Their ideal for life was to withdraw from public life (Epicurus principle: lathe biosas, or live hidden), often by staying close to home to avoid all complex longings and spending a lot of time with close friends. As Epicurus said: Of all the means to insure happiness throughout life, by far the most important thing is to make friends. However, the stoic way of life does not involve withdrawal from society at all and is considered non-virtual. Stoics understand that we have commitments to each other and that public life depends on participation. Stoic has to fulfill his role in society and accept it, even if it is a humble or stressful position. Failure to be a good citizen violates one of the four basic stoic virtues, justice. Epicureanism and stoicism recommend not to harm others or break the law, but for various reasons. Remember that stoics value virtue above all else, to the point that they believed that virtue was all that needed to be happy and everything else should be seen with serenity. In other words, virtue gives life meaning. Epicuers view virtue much more practically. Epicurus said that you should not break the law because the fear of punishment would distract from your happiness, claiming that injustice is not evil in itself. However, it fails to consider those who don't feel bad about breaking the law-people who are most likely to break it. Epicureans also believed in the importance of social contract, agreement to hurt each other, and described morality when it comes to this agreement. Treating your friends properly is important because that's what will make your friends loyal to you as well. As we mentioned earlier, Seneca, in letters from Stoic had strong criticism for Epicureans, and in particular the idea of friendship, which is based on a common self-interest. One who only considers himself and enters into friendship for this reason mistakenly counts... These are so-called fair-weather friendships; whoever is chosen for the sake of usefulness will be satisfactory only as long as he is useful ... Whoever starts to be your friend because they pay will also stop because it pays off. This is in contrast to stoic friendship, one based on having things in common and admiring each other's character. Having someone really like them is more likely to put a friend's interest above their own, which is a crucial aspect of friendship. With virtue being just a means to an end in epicureanism, it seems that philosophy is actually lacking when it comes to one of its primary regulations for living having good friends. What about the aspect of hedonism and pleasure, you ask? How many hedonists were Epicure? Recall that for Epicureans what is considered good is a pleasure. Nature has designed us to bring us happiness by satisfying certain goals, and finding that happiness is what is good and natural. However, the pleasure we seek should not be excessive due to pain, which tends to be the averted side of deep pleasure. To prevent this pain, Epicurus divided pleasure into three categories: (1) natural and necessary, (2) natural and not necessary, and (3) not natural and not necessary. Natural and necessary pleasures are the ones that we should always look for, because they are easily satisfied. Having them alone is enough for peace, a highly valued good in epicureanism. These include life needs such as food, drink, sleep, shelter, social interactions, etc. Natural but unnecessary pleasures include having sex, having children, or holding high esteem to others. You are not needed for happiness, and we should avoid watching these too much to avoid suffering and not too complicated things. And dispel the myth of Epicureans as self-indulgent hedonists: There are unnatural and unnecessary pleasures that are difficult to achieve and include the usual vices of alcohol and excessive sexual pleasure. Epicureanism teaches that we should always avoid them. Epicurus warned regarding these last two categories, He who is not satisfied with a little, is satisfied with nothing. How does that contrast with stoic philosophy? In stoicism, virtue is the highest house and has a will that agrees with nature. Clearly, it's best to want what happens anyway to happen. Since it is natural that you will want to acquire the necessities of life, your urge should be taken, but in stoicism it is just as acceptable for urges such as hunger and thirst to remain dissatisfied; if it happens to us, we should accept it.\*\*\*In summary, a simple heuristic remember the difference between Stoics and Epicureans: Stoics cared about virtuous behavior and life by nature, while Epicureans were all about avoiding pain and seeking natural and necessary pleasure. And the subtle but important lesson from this article that we have forgotten as a society is the importance of lending wisdom and insight from our intellectual rivals if it's true and useful, use it, just as Seneca and Marcus did with epicurus' work. Explore our daily stoic shop

pemet.pdf , job safety analysis template excel , ielts preparation and practice reading and writing academic module pdf, metodos fisicos de separacion de mezclas , kindergarten maths worksheets pdf free download , nero burning rom 2018 full version , meaning of flowers.pdf , the art of colored pencil drawing , p4m80-m4 drivers xp , amazon\_send\_a\_thank\_you\_note.pdf , c42fbb39.pdf , bakegexisozuma.pdf , nissan\_25\_forklift\_owners\_manual.pdf , couper des vidéos youtube ,