

Gosling & Taylor, The Greeks on Pleasure.

Post by "Cassius" of June 25, 2020 at 6:16 AM

So much in there:

1. Yes the duration issue is of great significance since I think it is natural for us to presume that length is the key or supreme element and it is pretty clear that Epicurus did not hold that. So much implied there that it definitely deserves detailed treatment.

2. "18.1.5 Per Epicurus, kinetic pleasures are those which accompany a change from pain to its removal. Static pleasures are those of conditions where pain is absent, and with it any cause of change. Quite generally, pleasures cannot increase in degree beyond the point of removal of pain, only in type."

This may be a quote and may or may not be true as to Epicurus (I tend to doubt it) but I recall reading somewhere in G & T that the wider view was that any pleasure involving ANY kind of change (not just replenishment) was considered to be kinetic. Perhaps that was from an earlier section but I tend to think that the Epicurean nature of atoms constantly moving means that nothing is essentially static and so I question whether Epicurus would even have considered "static" to be a legitimate category. I am pretty sure the book contains good material somewhere supporting the view that kinetic implies ANY KIND of change, even moving the focus of the mind from one thought to another, so if someone comes across that reference and can pull it out and highlight it so we can find in the future I would appreciate it.

Perhaps that is in [Nikolsky](#) but I think it is somewhere in G&T.