

Dialogue on Katastematic Pleasure

Post by “Maciej” of February 17, 2018 at 5:42 AM

It was great pleasure reading your exchange (all of you) but while you are focusing on Cicero's interpretation and critique, which is in itself important, you fail to take into consideration central Epicurean text about ethics. And in light of these passages katastematic\kinetic distinction should be debated. Even Wenzel seems to make the same mistake when he rushes to Cicero's interpretation without introduction based on the letter.

From letter to Menoecus:

Quote

The steady contemplation of \different desires\ enables you to understand everything that you accept or reject in terms of the health of the body and the serenity of the soul — since that is the goal of a completely happy life. Our every action is done so that we will not be in pain or fear. As soon as we achieve this, the soul is released from every storm, since an animal has no other need and must seek nothing else to complete the goodness of body and soul. Thus we need pleasure only when we are in pain caused by its absence; but when we are not in pain then we have no need of pleasure.

And later he adds:

Quote

when we say that pleasure is the goal, \we mean\ to be free from bodily pain and mental disturbance. For a pleasant life is produced (...) by sober reasoning, searching out the cause of everything we accept or reject, and driving out opinions that cause the greatest trouble in the soul.

Yes. Epicurus says this himself. When he says that pleasure is the goal he means freedom of pain and anxiety. All context is here. Period.