

Practical Pleasure-Pain Perspectives: How Different is 99% Pleasure From 100% Pleasure?

Post by "Don" of October 5, 2023 at 11:47 PM

I am becoming more convinced that the three contiguous PDs 9, 10, 11 all express counterfactuals the way they're grammatically structured in the ancient Greek, the way they are grouped together, and just the way [PD11](#) reads. Each doctrine is stating an If.. statement that expresses a situation that is counterfactual, "it is not the case that..."

If every pleasure were condensed and were present at the same time and in the whole of one's nature or its primary parts...

But every pleasure cannot be condensed.

If the things that produce the delights of those who are decadent washed away the mind's fears about astronomical phenomena and death and suffering, and furthermore if they taught us the limits of our pains and desires,...

But those things do not wash away the mind's fears.

If our suspicions about astronomical phenomena and about death were nothing to us and troubled us not at all, and if this were also the case regarding our ignorance about the limits of our pains and desires...

But we are troubled by our suspicions ...

Those "If..." statements are setting up that first segment of an argument which is resolved in the "then..." statement. To rephrase...

Every pleasure cannot be condensed, *so pleasures do differ from each other.*

Things that produce the delights of those who are decadent don't wash away the mind's fears, *so they are not filled with every joy and would contain not a single pain or distress.*

We are troubled by our suspicions death and we are ignorant of the limits of pain and desire, *so we have a need for studying what is natural.*

In each of those, the second argument (then...) of switched to its opposite (negative > positive; positive > negative) in rephrasing the full doctrine. This is reinforced for me in looking at [PD11](#).

For reference:

[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.

[PD10](#) If the things that produce the delights of those who are decadent washed away the mind's fears about astronomical phenomena and death and suffering, and furthermore if they taught us the limits of our pains and desires, then we would have no complaints against them, since they would be filled with every joy and would contain not a single pain or distress (and that's what is bad).

[PD11](#) If our suspicions about astronomical phenomena and about death were nothing to us and troubled us not at all, and if this were also the case regarding our ignorance about the limits of our pains and desires, then we would have no need for studying what is natural.