

Episode Ninety-Three: Torquatus Leads Us Forward Into Conflict Over Epicurean Ethics

Post by “Godfrey” of October 29, 2021 at 7:45 PM

Referring to post #61, that's why I think it's interesting to compare [PD03](#) and [PD09](#).

PD3 The limit of enjoyment is the removal of all pains. Wherever and for however long pleasure is present, there is neither bodily pain nor mental distress.

I think we agree that the first sentence is a refutation of the argument that pleasures have no limits. To me, the second sentence is adding specificity: if you have pleasure in your belly there is no pain in your belly. Same for your foot, and perhaps for your mind. So if *all* pains, throughout your body and mind, are removed, you've reached the limit of pleasure.

PD9 If every pleasure were condensed and were present at the same time and in the whole of one's nature or its primary parts, then the pleasures would never differ from one another.

I'm reading this as building on the second sentence of [PD03](#). These acknowledge that you can have pleasure in your stomach, or your foot or your mind or wherever. If the pleasure in your foot filled your whole body and mind for one minute, it would be no different than if the pleasure in your belly filled your body and mind for one minute. So, pleasure is pleasure, which is part of a faculty of pathē.

I actually prefer the Hicks 1925 translation of [PD09](#) as it uses "accumulate" rather than "condense". I'm not sure which is more accurate, but I find accumulate to be more illustrative.