

Comparing "Pleasure = Absence of Pain" to "Body = Absence of Void;" A Cite to Lucretius 1:503

Post by "Cassius" of August 25, 2023 at 5:54 PM

One implication of this:

We know due to the extending reasoning in Lucretius how Epicurus came to the conclusion that only atoms and void have an ultimate unchanging existence, that nothing has ultimate unchanging existence other than atoms and void, and that everything is made of atoms and void and only atoms and void.

That reasoning tells us how he "defined" atoms and void and how he deduced their existence and how he reached his "nothing but atoms and void" perspective.

Do we have a similar understanding of the chain of reasoning by which Epicurus concluded that Nature gives us only Pleasure and Pain by which to choose and avoid (Torquatus, Diogenes Laertius) and why the two do not mix and one cannot exist where the other is present ([PD03](#))?

In other words, are we confident why Cicero was wrong to insist that most people are experiencing neither pleasure nor pain?

Are we confident why Chrysippus was wrong in asserting that the outstretched hand in a normal condition -- in which it is apparently not feeling a specific stimulus of pleasure) is not feeling pain or a lack of pleasure in that condition? (Simply saying "pleasure is the absence of pain" just begs the question - *Why* must we consider pleasure to be the absence of pain?)

And last of all, why are we confident that the host pouring the wine can be considered to be in the greatest of pleasure when the guest drinking it may not be?

It seems to me that these issues are all closely interrelated with the reasoning about atoms and void.