

Comments and Thoughts on DeWitt, Chapter 3

Post by “Elli” of April 17, 2020 at 9:26 AM

[Don](#) χαίρειν (greetings),

I would like to say that for someone to be skeptical and doubtful for a professor inside the Academic field who claimed that he understood Epicurean Philosophy deeply, is not a bad tactic, but the effort to find errors where there are not, it is not creative and beneficial, and for yourself and for the others like yourself.

The clinging to a deep analysis word by word and even me that I am greek, frankly, I can't understand all the greek texts, but the whole picture is clear, WHEN the concepts of the words as they synthesized and connected are giving you the same whole picture. In a few words, the whole meaning of any text has a dynamic if it can be applied in the reality of life. Because the Hellenes first they lived, and then they wrote whatever they lived.

Where do you find DeWitt any trace for leading you to the imaginative things and issues? And where DeWitt claims that Logos /abstract logic, as well as the elimination of desires, and pressure of feelings are the issues that Epicurus is speaking for? E.g. please read carefully for making a syncretism, on the basis of the first principles of EP, among Baileys' translation and DeWitts' translation on the letter to Meneoceus. There you'll realize some of the shades on differences that exist between a stoic and an epicurean man. 😊