

# Preuss - "Epicurean Ethics - Katastematic Hedonism"

Post by "Cassius" of July 13, 2025 at 11:29 AM

Yes all of those imply that Epicurus recognized a distinction, and we certainly know as well that Epicurus had a much more expansive definition of pleasure.

What those don't state or imply is that Epicurus held pleasures of rest to be more important than those of motion, or that pleasures of rest are the end goal of pleasures of motion. And in fact those very statements make the opposite point, that Epicurus recognized both.

And that is the ultimate dispute, which leads certain people to conclude that the real essence of Epicurean philosophy is "Katastematic Hedonism," rather than pleasure.

None of these authorities such as Gosling and Taylor or [Nikolsky](#) or the rest allege that the distinction was unknown to Epicurus, only that he did not place it at the center of his philosophy or consider it to be his most important ethical concept, which is the way that Pruess phrases it.

<https://www.epicureanfriends.com/wcf/attachment/5730-image-png/>