

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

Post by "Cassius" of October 29, 2021 at 7:57 PM

[Quote from Godfrey](#)

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 are cross-posting so the flow of our comments may not quite work -- so sorry for that confusion!

The point i want to make by quoting PD3 is to reply to your comment about the second sentence, where you say *"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."*

I think you are right as to the "add specificity" conclusion, which I interpret to mean as "the second sentence bolsters the conclusion of the first sentence by looking at the question from another angle."

But the reason I write this is to ask this: Whenever we say that "the feelings are two, pleasure and pain" and that they don't coexist at the same time, is that not significantly a conceptual assertion? What if someone asserted that Epicurus could have chosen to define the feelings as four (mental pleasure, mental pain, bodily pleasure, bodily pain)? And that a mental pleasure of appreciating an artwork can coexist in time (but not in "place") with a pain in my toe that i felt while I was looking at the artwork?

Would you say that such a person who used four categories was "wrong?"

Does Nature herself create a concept called "pleasure" by which we should understand ALL pleasures to be included? What would you say is the intersection between human nature and the words we use to describe it?