

Do Pigs Value Katastematic Pleasure? (Summer 2022 K / K Discussion)

Post by "Cassius" of October 19, 2022 at 4:25 PM

[Quote from the article](#)

But we may as well admit at once that the distinction is vague.

Very much agreed on that point!

That reasoning sounds about as logical as any as an attempt to unravel things. But in my own view I can't get past the view that

[Quote from article](#)

If 'kinetic' refers to change, then 'katastematic' refers to non-change,

and it seems to me that in life there really is no such thing as "non-change." "Sustainability" is one thing, but if we are alive, then we are changing, and I have a hard time thinking that a characteristic ("non-change") which can't really apply to living things at all constitutes something that Epicurus would be seriously concerned about. It strikes me almost like a concept such as "omnipotence" or "omniscience" -- which are concepts that might arguably apply to divinities or something else that is non-human, but which doesn't ring true in discussing humans.

Even as the article discusses, a condition of "satisfaction" (such as being full after a meal) does not truly last very long, and relatively quickly recedes into the background and becomes hard to distinguish from working up a new appetite. And in that sense to me, being "satisfied" (full after a meal) is just another pleasure, not some special state that is separate in kind from the whole hunger-eating-satisfaction-hunger cycle. One might as well look at any other part of that cycle as being just as important as any other.

At any rate, I don't think there's a problem in Epicurus with all this -- the only problem is with living people today who try to turn the whole philosophy into a dissertation on "katastematism."

Epicureanism as "Katastematicism" is not the right direction and doesn't add anything except more syllables 😊

Thanks again Nate!