

Plutarch's Major Works Against Epicurus

Post by "Cassius" of July 30, 2025 at 6:48 PM

[Quote from DaveT](#)

Since it looks to me that almost everything we attribute as Epicurus' thoughts are second hand except perhaps the few original records extent we are forced to accept those records as good faith efforts by other men who support Epicurean philosophy.

That's a large part of the problem. Plutarch and Cicero are the ones who play up this alleged competition between types of pleasure, and they are not doing so because they are friends of Epicurus. When Diogenes Laertius mentions that Epicurus noted the two types, he says Epicurus valued BOTH, and he does not place them in conflict or competition with each other.

It is a large part of [Nikolsky's](#) (and others') argument that we do NOT see this alleged= in types accorded significance in those who are supporters of Epicurus. Even Torquatus, who can only speak words Cicero allows him to say, talk as if pleasure is a wide but unified concept where no conflict between types exist.

I am glad that this does not cause you a problem, but as also referenced in our discussion this past Sunday, a significant part of my efforts are to be sure that it does not cause any more problem to others than absolutely necessary.

And unfortunately, as [Nikolsky](#) observes, almost every standard treatment of Epicurus in the outside world acts as if the most important thing to know about Epicurean pleasure is that "*katastematic* pleasure" is the *real* goal of Epicurean philosophy.