

Discussion of the thread - Against Katastematic Supremacy - Pleasure Is A Unified Whole And Not A House Divided - Forum Editorial Policy

Post by “DaveT” of August 3, 2026 at 4:51 PM

To the Forum generally and [Cassius](#). My quote insertion function isn't cooperating so I'm cutting and pasting you from above: "The only record of Hieronymus of Rhodes is what Cicero says about him as explained in our earlier thread (note from 2019) with the citations. Hieronymus of Rhodes embraced "absence of pain" but not pleasure, as Cicero explains."

I read the thread you link attached of your 2019 thread [Are You Epicurean Or Hieronymian?](#)

Not to nit-pick since none of us on the Forum certainly have the highest level of confidence when Cicero or any other ancient person paraphrases what others have allegedly written. We luckily have some original Epicurus in the absence of first hand Hieronymus.

My main points, questions and propositions

When I read that linked material I noticed it begins with a typo when referring to *pleasure* upon citing PD 3. The corrected sentence at PD 03 is

"The limit of quantity in *pleasures* is the removal of all that is painful. Wherever pleasure is present, as long as it is there, there is neither pain of body, nor of mind, nor of both at once."

The plural word *pleasures* is important to me when contrasted to the typo'd singular word. AND I'll say why in a moment by focusing on the words *limit*, *quantity* and *pleasures*.

Parenthetically, allow me to note that I agree with our newly stated Editorial Policy of the forum. And in that regard, I view the comparison of kinetic vs katastematic pleasures to be an unhelpful diversion from what is most important to me.

Similarly I believe debate of whether pain removal is primary before pleasure is a wasteful debate that obscures the plain meaning of Epicurus' words. Being pain free is the means to enjoying the goal of pleasure.

Please humor me here.

You recently said something I totally agree with. You said in post #6 discussing Aronsen's book: "If our goal is to better the lives of real people rather than pinheads, it's far better to stick to basic points and then work to apply them in real life, not just debate about words and definitions."

Your words address my focus and personal challenge when applying Epicurus. I want a simple description I can repeat to myself on reaching the highest good for happiness. Okay that's not so simple, so let me explain further.

I am struck by the difficulty in matching the pleasure/pain calculus to real life. And the rubber hits the road for me by looking at Epicurus' exact words, not-- repeat NOT at commentary by academics and authors who interpret Epicurus' words one way or the other for their own purposes.

So, tell me if my understanding is wrong when I read PD 3 where it says: "The limit of quantity in pleasures is the removal of all that is painful.", and I think the following: the "limit (singular word) of quantity in pleasures (plural words) is equal but not more than the simple act of removing that singular thing or state I'm experiencing that is painful.

In other words, I can do no better looking for one pleasure alone or added to another and another in order to solve my pain than if I simply address the pain I'm experiencing and rid myself of it partially or completely.

I think Epicurus knew he could not list all pleasures available to us. They are uncountable and unlimited. But he did specifically say if you remove pain it matches the maximum level of all the pleasures you might find. He defines and counts the **one state**, freedom from pain, that anyone can recognize and pursue.

I think this focus allows me to not worry about which pleasure, or how much of it will make me happy more often than sad when navigating the reality of every day life. This focus tells me to first notice what is painful bodily and/or mentally and address the removal of that condition. When I do that I'm left with the various stages of pleasure and happiness however I define it.