

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 5, 2026 at 10:34 AM

[Quote from Cassius](#)

But are you telling me that Epicurus was blind to the differences between pleasures that he discussed in [PD09](#)

No, emphatically no. [PD09](#) actually supports my proposition. Here, from our Texts on the Forum site: *"If every pleasure could be intensified so that it lasted, and influenced the whole organism or the most essential parts of our nature, pleasures would never differ from one another. [PD09](#) - "If all pleasure had been capable of accumulation,—if this had gone on not only by recurrence in time, but all over the frame or, at any rate, over the principal parts of man's nature, there would never have been any difference between one pleasure and another, as in fact there is."* Hicks (1925)

When I read PD3 *"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."*

Compare: "If every pleasure could be intensified so that it lasted...." with "The limit of quantify in pleasures...."

Can you see how I think they support one another without dismissing my literal reading that once you eliminate pain, you've got pleasure? Again, my point is trying to answer the question of how can I verbalize for myself and others the sheer simplicity of Epicurus' teaching of how to find the ultimate good. It is like he might have said: "Once you deal with pain, I trust you to carry on using Prudence, to find more pleasures in this lifetime of yours."