

Welcome Max Duboff

Post by “Max DuBoff” of July 14, 2026 at 1:32 PM

[Quote from Cassius](#)

[Quote from Max DuBoff](#)

To be clear, though, I think Epicurus absolutely endorsed the claim that a good (i.e., blessed) life is a perfect/complete one. But that was a choice. And it's a choice that fits uncomfortably with hedonism. Personally, I'm very convinced that Epicurus was right about hedonism and right that the absence of pain is a pleasure. I'm less convinced he was right that a blessed life is a perfect/complete life.

Max in my case I like to build up from the earlier premises to the higher ones, so before we even get to the implications of PD3 and PD4 there is PD1 and PD2. Where do you land there? Do you agree or disagree with Epicurus that there are no supernatural gods, that gods do not reward friends and punish enemies, and that there is no existence after death? In my case, it is *because* I strongly agree with him on those first two doctrines that I find it inconceivable that - despite all his other statements about active pleasures - he would have held katastematic pleasures to be the only ones that contribute to a blessed life, as you are claiming.

Yes, I strongly agree with PD 1 and 2. How would that support your claim, though? What makes the gods blessed is that they're not troubled--i.e., they have katastematic pleasure. And the reason to be extra certain about the Epicurean view of death is so we don't think we'll suffer after death. So even there katastematic pleasure is forefront.

(And yep, meant to say NOT pleasure vs. ataraxia, thanks.