

Welcome Bartleby!

Post by "Cassius" of November 29, 2020 at 3:35 PM

Good to hear from you Bartleby. If you read through the site at all you will see that head and shoulders above all others I recommend the DeWitt book. There are many disputes as to how to interpret Epicurus, and I won't suggest to you that there is any way you can know that you should accept the viewpoints you'll read here on this forum over those you will read most other places - the only judge of that can be your yourself. But many of us have found that the DeWitt approach summarizes in one place a clear alternative to the conventional analysis of Epicurus, and it is the best place to begin to check out that viewpoint.

I summarize these recommendations in the sidebar on the front page which I will paste here in case you're on a smartphone and don't see the sidebar. In this comment i suggest starting with a couple of articles, but in any order these sources will present you the alternative analysis:

Quote

Don't Be A "Stoic In Disguise!"

Many people who come here have been influenced by the alleged importance of a distinction between "kinetic" and "katastematic" pleasure. This argument is unsound, probably not of Epicurean origin at all, and can be very damaging to a proper understanding of Epicurus. To research this issue, start with [Boris Nikolsky's "Epicurus on Pleasure,"](#) which argues that the katastematic issue was not introduced by Epicurus and reflects a later Stoic-influenced viewpoint. Next, read the chapters on Epicurus in [Gosling and Taylor's "The Greeks on Pleasure,"](#) from which [Nikolsky](#) got the inspiration for his article. The whole section on Epicurus is good, but be sure to read their Chapter 19 "Katastematic and Kinetic Pleasure." Add to that the Wentham article ["Cicero's Interpretation of Katastematic Pleasure,"](#) which highlights how emphasis on katastematic pleasure contradicts other core aspects of Epicurean philosophy.

Those shorter articles should then take you back to the best general book on Epicurus, [Norman DeWitt's "Epicurus and His Philosophy."](#) DeWitt provides a sweeping overview of Epicurus which hardly mentions the katastematic - kinetic distinction except to point out how - even if one considers the categories relevant - Epicurean philosophy embraces **both types**. If you don't read anything else at this website, check out the articles listed above, and you'll see how important this issue is to a proper understanding of Epicurean philosophy. And if you are brand new to the study of Epicurus, be sure to start your study with DeWitt's **"Epicurus and His Philosophy."**