

The Use of Negation in Epicurean Philosophy Concepts

Post by "Cassius" of April 22, 2025 at 7:08 AM

[Quote from vlasalv](#)

In that light, certain pains might be endured for the sake of greater inner peace, if they lead to that deep serenity.

There's definitely a lot to think about in coming to terms with what Epicurus means by the word pleasure, but just as with "gods," Epicurus did not change the word, just made its use more precise.

The danger in giving up the word "pleasure" and substituting "peace" or anything else in its place is that the result is to narrow the definition and to imply that what people ordinarily think of as pleasure is not part of the goal, and that danger is present whether the word one chooses is "peace" or "tranquility" or "absence of pain" or anything else. The ancient writers were very clear in stating that Epicurus was held to be an advocate of "pleasure," and that words like tranquility or peace fall within pleasure, not the other way around. As Epicurus is reported to have said, he would not know what the good is were it not for pleasures that we all understand to be pleasures. For example:

Quote

Athenaeus, Deipnosophists, XII p. 546E: "Not only Aristippus and his followers, but also Epicurus and his welcomed kinetic pleasure; I will mention what follows, to avoid speaking of the "storms" {of passion} and the "delicacies" which Epicurus often cites, and the "stimuli" which he mentions in his On the End-Goal. For he says "For I at least do not even know what I should conceive the good to be, if I eliminate the pleasures of taste, and eliminate the pleasures of sex, and eliminate the pleasures of listening, and eliminate the pleasant motions caused in our vision by a visible form."