

# The "Natural and Necessary List" Question

Post by "Cassius" of August 20, 2021 at 9:42 AM

## [Quote from Don](#)

4) Cassius , you're bringing in the words "rigorously logical" and Epicurus's argument for pleasure as that to which everything else points is the exact opposite of that, especially in the Cicero section you quote. "Torquatus" is specifically saying Epicurus didn't need "elaborate argument"; he simply needed to point out that pleasure was the thing every living thing strives for. That is the definition of a Chief Good.

Yes I realize that what you are saying is inherent in this discussion. Torquatus is saying that Epicurus didn't need that but Torquatus is specifically saying also that he (Torquatus) disagreed and thought the elaborate argument was a good idea. That contradiction seems to be what we are talking about and deciding how to wrestle with. My way of resolving it (at least for the moment) is to take the problem as contextual and saying "sometimes you do argue that way, and sometimes you don't." My preference is not to argue that way, and I think that's the best approach and the ultimate way to resolve the issue, but I can't deny that lots of very educated Epicureans seemed to think that there was a time and a place for everything -- if only to illustrate that logic can't ultimately resolve the issue.

In other words there may be better ways to say it but "it's rigorously logical to emphasize that logic cannot resolve the question." -- because we have previously defined the limits of logic and that it is insufficient.