

Welcome Philosofer123!

Post by "Cassius" of May 2, 2019 at 6:54 AM

Wow retired at 46 - that's great!

I have not read (or even heard of) the Preuss book. I see in its blurb on Amazon it states:

"the argument focuses on Epicurus' understanding of the nature of pleasure, and pain and on the distinction between kinetic and katastematic pleasure."

Sounds like this is an example of how important it is whose views of Epicurean philosophy you read.

Based on DeWitt, Gosling & Taylor, [Nikolsky](#), and others, I would argue that major emphasis on a "distinction between kinetic and katastematic pleasure" is not Epicurean at all, nor did Epicurus consider it to be an important distinction. I continue to observe that emphasis on that is a good indicator that someone will end up with a Stoicized version of Epicurus that in my view turns the philosophy upside down.

By no means do I expect everyone to agree with me on that, but I know that not everyone has even been exposed to this contrary argument, since the that position (the Preuss position, apparently) is what is primarily taught in all academic and internet discussion of Epicurus.

In my view the way to research the contrary argument, and to see how damaging the emphasis on kinetic-katastematic distinction can be, would probably be to start with [Nikolsky's Epicurus on Pleasure](#) (which argues that this was a later viewpoint well after Epicurus), followed by the chapters on Epicurus in [Gosling and Taylor's "The Greeks on Pleasure"](#) (on which [Nikolsky](#) says he got his original inspiration). I would add to this the Wentham article ([Cicero's Interpretation of Katastematic Pleasure](#)). But likely none of this would even be considered of intense interest to someone who got his start with the [DeWitt book on Epicurus](#), which hardly mentions those categories except to point out how - even if one considers the categories relevant - that Epicurean philosophy embraces both.