

Is gratitude a katastematic or kinetic pleasure?

Post by "Cassius" of November 2, 2023 at 3:04 PM

[Quote from burninglights](#)

what Plato calls pleasure, Epicurus calls kinetic pleasure, and what Plato calls the neutral state, Epicurus calls katastematic pleasure!

And that labeling would be important to emphasize IF we saw that Epicurus himself in his letters, or Lucretius in his poem, or Diogenes of Oinoanda on his wall were insisting on that labeling as a clear point. [Nikolsky](#) and Gosling and Taylor says we don't see that, and that Lucretius and Epicurus and Diogenes of Oinoanda are all using the word "pleasure" as the best term to describe tightly integrated word referring to all possible types of pleasure.

As I see it the best argument that Epicurus did insist on that labeling is the list of articles that Diogenes Laertius cites. However contrary to that argument is [Nikolsky](#)'s observation that Diogenes Laertius was writing as a cataloger who (just like we may be doing today) was looking at Epicurus with the expectation to apply these labels to Epicurus' framework - a framework that does not necessarily turn on "motion" at all.

Where I think we all agree is that it is very important to emphasize that the normal natural state is one of pleasure, even in the absence of active stimulation.

What we don't agree on, or at least I don't see us being sure of, is that the key issue in discussing this natural state involves "motion." Both "kinetic" and "katastematic" appear to focus on "motion" vs. "rest," while "Pleasure" entails both. And I'd be open to the idea too that "motion" and "rest" probably do not describe all the possible types of pleasure, and that whether "in motion" or "at rest" or "otherwise," any experience that is not painful falls under "pleasure."