

# VS11 - VS11 and Kinetic / Katastematic Pleasure

Post by "Hiram" of February 5, 2020 at 11:47 AM

## [Quote from Cassius](#)

And finally, asked another way, is there really any purpose in discussing katastematic/kinetic distinctions other than as a way to promote "pleasures of rest" as superior to any other kind? I really can't think of any other purpose behind the distinction, and that seems to be how it developed and how it is used both then and now. And since elevation of one type of pleasure as intrinsically superior to other types of pleasure would violate core Epicurean principles, I can see the possibility that the subject captured in [VS11](#) came up in an Epicurean argument against that assertion (against the assertion of katastematic pleasure as intrinsically superior).

I really don't think that the author of the Vatican Sayings made the argument that one is equal or superior to the other. You're jumping over the discussion, and questioning why this should even be in the doctrines.

VS 11 is there, so we should make a good-will effort to read it and see what it says. The recognition of the existence of both types of pleasure does not imply the superiority of one over the other.

So one way to look at this is: in what context, while discussing what issues, would Epicurus say something like: "For most men rest is stagnation and activity is madness"? What teaching was being imparted? And WHY did this matter enough for our happiness that it needed to be included in the VS?

The reason why this matters is that the doctrine is being offered here as an alternative to concrete ethical problems (boredom, stagnation, existential ennui, stress, madness, etc.).