

Boris Nikolsky: "Epicurus On Pleasure" - Re-examining the Katastematic / Kinetic Question

Post by "Cassius" of January 27, 2018 at 1:55 AM

What happens when you go down the path of separating static and active pleasure, and concluding that static pleasure is the goal of life? You end up concluding things that are totally

" as did Jeffrey S.

III. Distinguishing joy from pleasure

Having established, then, that Epicurus holds that "all that in which we rejoice is pleasure," let us consider what this thesis entails. It entails, to begin with, that Epicurus does not consider "joy" to be a kind of pleasure, as is usually assumed. For, had Epicurus wished to claim that joy is a pleasure, he would have had to claim that this pleasure is itself something in which we rejoice (since he defines pleasure as that in which we rejoice), and this would lead to an infinite regress: the joy we take in *this* pleasure would itself have to be a pleasure in which we rejoice, and *this* pleasure would have to provide us with a *further* joy, and so on *ad infinitum*. We should rather conclude, then, that Epicurus does not think of joy as a pleasure, but as the intentional state which has pleasure as its intentional object.
