

Recent / New Edition of Diogenes Laertius - And Problems With it!

Post by “Mike Anyayahan” of January 28, 2020 at 12:00 PM

[Quote from JJElbert](#)

The weight of the biographical evidence suggests to me that the Bailey translation is less accurate.

As far I learned, DeWitt, with similar views as yours, also used the Bailey translation as I read on the bibliography:

"Meanwhile a return to moderation becomes observable in R. D. Hicks' Stoic

and Epicurean (London, 1910), and to this virtue urbanity was added by Cyril Bailey

in his Epicurus and his Greek Atomists (Oxford, 1925 and 1928); but the amplification of fallacy still went on, culminating in the ascription to Epicurus of belief in

"the infallibility of sensation."

Does it affect the credibility of his book *Epicurus and His Philosophy*?

[Quote from Cassius](#)

Mike this is the never-ending theme. if you think Epicurus was a coward leading the charge to escape all pain, then you will interpret him one way. If you think he was a courageous conqueror leading the charge against false religion in the pursuit of pleasure as nature teaches it, then you interpret him totally differently.

That is actually my dilemma since I am still unaware which translation is authoritative. If I resort to DeWitt's interpretation, I am also unaware if the translation he used was authoritative, too.