

# Differences between Epicureanism and Cyrenaicism

Post by "Cassius" of November 6, 2021 at 6:47 AM

Good points as to those quotes, but without the surrounding context we don't have the important part of the assertion that is generally made, which is that pleasures of rest are superior and the goal of pleasures of action. In fact by the absence of those statements in these excerpts we have the opposite implication, that such conclusion does not exist. And the reason for DL looking for those excerpts to pull out is what [Nikolsky](#) explains - the division suggested by Carneades.

Note also this footnote from page 444 of the [Nikolsky](#) article, and the section it references;

<sup>17</sup> 10.136. True, Diogenes refers to words by Epicurus himself; however, as I will try to show further on, he interprets them in a way different from what Epicurus originally meant.

So I think again we're basically in agreement as to our final interpretation, the issue is what is to be done with that interpretation. I know you are saying you don't see any harm in using it, and I agree, just so long as we all stay aware that the implications that some pleasures can by value judgment be determined to be higher or lower is not allowed to take root and grow, because THAT is the lever by which the Platonists seek to overturn the whole analysis. You don't do that yourself because you are now convinced that moral value judgments do not supercede pleasure (or at least I think you are 😊). But the majority of the world is not convinced of that, and they will immediately join the k-k distinction to the value judgment that only katastematic is worth pursuing, and that is why you see that assertion in virtually every modern article written about Epicurus.

So there's a problem to be dealt with and I look forward to everyone's suggestions on how to do so. 😊