

PD09 - Condensed Pleasure

Post by "Cassius" of March 25, 2019 at 4:04 PM

[Quote from Elayne](#)

I cannot think of any static pleasure which was not initiated by a kinetic one, kinetic including a thought or a perceptible bodily action. Can you?

On this issue I sense that there are some very specific philosophical arguments involved about which I am not aware. I came away from my reading of Gosling & Taylor, Elayne thinking that he was documenting that if we dive deep enough into the sources, we will find that the ancients meant what they said when they said "static" -- they meant something that involves NO MOTION, NO CHANGE IN STATE whatsoever.

Where I am going here is that one of the flaws of the entire "static" category is that of course NOTHING in an Epicurean universe is truly unmoving or unchanging. Movement and change are constant. I think that this is one of the most compelling reasons why "static pleasure" as a category in the Epicurean framework needs to be looked on with extreme suspicion .

Unfortunately I am very aware that this point needs documentation to some ancient text, and I cannot provide it at the moment, but I am pretty sure it is in Gosling and Taylor when they first bring up the arguments about the natures of pleasure.

In fact, Elayne, as I think about what you are writing, the Gosling & Taylor book would be of tremendous use to you.