

The Ethics of Epicurus and its Relation to Contemporary Doctrines by Jean-Marie Guyau. Edited by Testa and Ansell-Pearson, translated by Testa

Post by "Cassius" of May 3, 2023 at 12:33 PM

[Quote from Godfrey](#)

Where I get uncomfortable (in a good way 😊) is with his narrowing the goal to a single focus of serenity

This is something I wanted to expand on before I saw your last post. I have the same issue with "homeostatus" or any similar words which leaves open the possibility that a human being might decide that his or her best life is sitting crosslegged on a floor staring at a candle.

I think this is behind the ambiguity of Chrysippus' hand analogy too.

We have to start with an understanding of what the normal healthy living thing does with its time so that we can understand what is presumed to be the result when all pain is eliminated.

I know in my case (and I suspect I am far from alone) any construct of the ultimate good or goal must convey as essential a view of what it means for the organism to function at peak performance. While I reject the view that "man is the rational animal" and therefore the exercise of reason is the highest way to spend ones time, I do think we can derive from our nature that we have a full set of bodily and mental faculties to exercise as part of a normal and healthy life, so that any generalization of a life of total pleasure with zero pain is going to incorporate in it the exercise of those capacities.

I am out of time to continue but this is the direction I would carry this, and it is my main complaint about the whole issue of using "absence of pain" as if it were a full and complete statement of the goal. The positive side of the exercise of mental and bodily functions to experience pleasure is the issue that can no longer (if it ever could) be left to unstated implication.