

## PD09 - Condensed Pleasure

Post by "Cassius" of March 25, 2019 at 3:53 PM

Elayne on section one as to DeWitt's interpretation, I think DeWitt is making a good effort to make sense of it, but I am not entirely convinced his point is the complete one. Whenever I hear the static/kinetic distinction being raised, or see it said that this was important to Epicurus, I question the analysis. I am sorry that the best I can do is to point in the direction of researching this, but there are several sources on this that would be a good idea to check.

Perhaps the most clear is Boris Nikolosky's Epicurus on Pleasure (in files section here.) [Nikolsky](#) argues that kinetic/static was of no significance to Epicurus at all, and that the only reason it is discussed is that later writers (Cicero, Laertius) had by their day become accustomed to that distinction from other writers, and they attempted to fit Epicurus into that same pattern. If I recall correctly [Nikolsky](#) cites a "Division by Carneades" as the source of this categorization.

For his own insight, [Nikolsky](#) credits Gosling & Taylor's "The Greeks on Pleasure" which is a treatise that starts from the earliest Greek philosophers and traces their views on pleasure. By the time they come to Epicurus, Gosling and Taylor conclude that the "absence of pain" problem that we have today is erroneous, and they put forth an argument similar to what you see me repeating, that "pleasure" always means something that is normally understood by everyone, and that "ataraxia" or "absence of pain" is not a particular esoteric type of pleasure.

There is another article, by Wentham, that makes the same point.

All of these would probably need to be considered in evaluating DeWitt's conclusion. I would say at this point in my study that time and intensity have something to do with condensation, but probably NOT the kinetic/static issue.