

# Welcome Max Duboff

Post by “Max DuBoff” of July 3, 2026 at 7:50 AM

## [Quote from Godfrey](#)

I feel the need at this point to add in my reading of some of the PDs, which when carefully considered (at least to me), delve into further parsing pleasure as intensity, duration and location. All pleasure is pleasure, full stop. The way to differentiate between various pleasures is not by attempting to rank the pleasures but by looking closely at their intensity, location and duration. For example:

[PD09](#). *If every pleasure were condensed and were present at the same time and in the whole of one's nature or its primary parts, then the pleasures would never differ from one another.*

Thanks for this idea. Although I largely agree with Cassius just below, it's good that you raised this, because one of the biggest developments in 20th-century scholarship on Epicurus was less attention paid to PD 9. I don't mean to necessarily say that's a good or bad thing; but Rist and Diano, for example, placed a lot of weight on it, and scholars rarely do now. I'm with Cassius, though: saying that all pleasure would be indistinguishable if (somehow) combined doesn't mean all pleasure is indistinguishable now.

Side note: anyone who can read Italian should check out Carlo Diano. He's super interesting but not widely remembered outside of Italy (except for his influence on Rist, but his interpretations are often more interesting than Rist's imo). His papers on Epicureanism were collected in the 1974 volume *Scritti Epicurei*--though I admit it might be a bit tough to find without a university library (and I haven't been able to find a digital copy).