

Epicurean philosophy vs. Stoicism in public popularity

Post by "Don" of March 20, 2021 at 11:39 PM

[Quote from Elayne](#)

I am going to be bold and say that for any specific behavior/virtue you want to name as universally leading to a maximally pleasurable human life, I can name an exception.

Whether you can name an exception to an action in a specific circumstance doesn't really prove anything. Acting justly, prudently, and morally *is* contextual. It may be that the same action in a different situation would not be acting prudently, justly, or morally.

Maybe I should say that in a specific situation, there are actions within that given scenario that would lead to a more pleasurable life for (almost) anyone. The identical action in a different situation may not lead to a more pleasurable life. Therefore, there are no absolute or uniquely virtuous actions; only virtuous actions contextually for a given circumstance.

[Quote from Elayne](#)

People resist understanding that nothing defines pleasure other than the direct experience. Maximum pleasure is not modified or limited by definitions or concepts-- it simply occurs or does not.

There's nothing to argue about here in that pleasure or pain *are* direct experience, just like the senses. Pain and pleasure are two non-rational/pre-cognitive guides we use to make choices and rejections.

How do you define what Epicurus meant by the "limit of pleasure" or the "maximum pleasure"? Can you expand on what you mean by it "simply occurs or does not"? And if it "simply occurs or does not" what use is it to make choices or rejections in an effort to bring the maximally pleasurable life about?