

Welcome Max Duboff

Post by "Max DuBoff" of July 5, 2026 at 2:33 PM

[Quote from Cassius](#)

[Quote from Max DuBoff](#)

I understand "the goal of nature" as particularly connoting katastematic pleasure (following the use of this term in Men. 133 and VS 25, where it most naturally refers to katastematic pleasure).

If there were a fate it would be that we would once again be going down the Katastematic/Kinetic rabbit hole and all that it entails. DeWitt, Gosling and Taylor, Emily Austin, and Boris [Nikolsky](#) can be lined up military-style against virtually the entire rest of academia, with one side incorporating joy and delight along with tranquility into the wider concept of pleasure as all that is desirable, and one side narrowing the goal by elevating "tranquility" to the only thing that is really worthwhile and the only reason we need "pleasure" in the first place.

Max, do you see the lines dividing differently? It will be useful to go through detailed argument but I suspect it would be more efficient to state the end-points as soon as possible. Surely the ancient world did not require battalions of experts to understand Epicurus, or he would not have been so popular (and hated) so we ought to be able to describe the conclusions in human form too.

Certainly, I agree it's a rabbit hole (one I spent quite a while going back and forth on as I wrote my dissertation, and which I'll continue to wade into in the future). I don't actually know that Austin supports that position; I'll have to look back at her book but I don't currently have it with me. As I noted above I think there are four major positions of katastematic pleasure:

- 1) Unimpeded atomic condition (which fits closely with, but doesn't entail, the Rist/Diano view that all kinetic pleasure supervenes on katastematic pleasure)
- 2) No real distinction with kinetic
- 3) Intentional state
- 4) Just fulfillment of needs