

The Use of Negation in Epicurean Philosophy Concepts

Post by “Rolf” of April 21, 2025 at 8:02 AM

Really interesting discussion, thanks everyone. I'll be sure to check out [Nikolsky](#) and later G&T, though I feel I should first get a broad understanding of the philosophy via Austin and DeWitt.

That said, I'm not sure I quite see the point at issue here. Pleasures vary in duration, intensity, and location. Of course I would prefer a katastematic pleasure. More sustainable, longer lasting pleasure. It's like asking someone if they want \$1000 now or \$100 per month for 2 years. It's a matter of prudence.

At the same time, I don't think that turns such pleasures into a specific goal. The goal is still just pleasure generally. I forget who said this, perhaps it was an older forum post, but getting wrapped up trying to define pleasure and pain sort of takes away from the whole “pleasure and pain are our inherent, instinctively knowable guides” thing. I do understand that it's important to discuss this stuff though - I find myself especially interested in hearing criticisms and flawed takes on Epicureanism. It helps me to understand what is **not** Epicureanism. I suppose you could say I'm not just looking for an understanding of epicurean philosophy, but an absence of misunderstanding. 😊

[Cassius](#) Would you be able to sum up this flawed view of katastematic pleasure that mainstream academia purports?