

Welcome Max Duboff

Post by “Max DuBoff” of July 8, 2026 at 8:44 AM

Thanks for these points, Don and Cassius! Cassius, to be clear, I really was not saying Epicurus is (or was ever understood to be) a value dualist. I was providing a friendly amendment to his view. On Moral Ends 2.9 is a very interesting passage, about which I have a lot of thoughts. But indeed, it shouldn't be taken to mean that *all* pleasure is absence of pain, because it conflicts with 1.37: "For we don't pursue only this pleasure which excites our nature itself by some pleasantness and is apprehended by the senses along with a certain pleasantness, but we regard as greatest that pleasure which is apprehended once all pain has been removed" (my translation).

Thanks for those interpretations, Don! Those definitely make sense. My main concern is that, when you say these passages are trying to show that pleasure is the goal, the features they're pointing to are characteristic of katastematic pleasure, not of kinetic pleasure. Now, if you have a G&T/[Nikolsky](#) view, pointing to katastematic pleasure is enough to show it's kinetic too. Kinetic pleasure doesn't have a limit, but katastematic pleasure does. (That's one of the challenges to G&T's view.)