

Tranquility v Pleasure

Post by “Hiram” of February 25, 2020 at 1:37 PM

[Quote from Mike Anyayahan](#)

[Hiram](#) I remember there was a thread where I quoted Torquatus that pleasure is the removal of pain, and there is no state between pleasure and pain. If ataraxia is not opposed to pleasure, is it pleasure? Is it the removal of pain? For stoics, ataraxia is not the removal of pain but numbness. The pain is simply not felt, but it exists.

And if ataraxia is the removal of pain, it also means pleasure. And if ataraxia and pleasure are the same, why is there a need for these two words to exist across Epicurean texts? Why not use only either pleasure or ataraxia alone?

Numbness is APATHEIA. Apathy. This is a Stoic ideal.

Ataraxia isn't numb, it means no-perturbations, and if we follow Epicurus' logic that all sentience is either pleasurable or painful, ataraxia would be pleasurable.

I think the reason why Epicurus used ataraxia is because he was arguing that we can not experience pure pleasure for as long as we experience perturbations like fear of death or of the gods, or unlimited desires. So one of the existential and psychological tasks of an Epicurean is to remove these.

(Julien de la Mettrie adds unwarranted remorse to the list of perturbations we should remove--in other words, feeling religious guilt for things that we should have no guilt about)