

Pleasure over truth

Post by “Mathitis Kipouros” of September 15, 2020 at 3:04 PM

Quote

that yoke of destiny (Fate) which the natural philosophers have imposed.

What is that yoke of destiny? I presume determinism.

Who are the natural philosophers? From DeWit I gathered (please clarify if I'm mistaken that Epicurus could be classified as a natural philosopher since part of his philosophy was based on observations of nature as the norm.

Quote

nor to be a cause, though an uncertain one, for he believes that no good or evil is dispensed by chance to men so as to make life blessed, though it supplies the starting-point of great good and great evil.

A cause of *good or evil*? Or a cause of what?

Quote

He believes that the misfortune of the wise is better than the prosperity of the fool. [135] It is better, in short, that what is well judged in action should not owe its successful issue to the aid of chance.

Who is *he*?

What could be that which is well-judged-in-action?

[Quote from Don](#)

If the dying one is in reality not troubled, why do you want to achieve the desire to evangelize?

Indeed, it becomes obvious that if the person is troubled by the false opinions, *our truth* has the potential to set them free. But if they're happy with *their truth*, there's no gain for either to talk about it.

[Quote from Don](#)

I don't see this as a question of the relative value of truth. I see this as a scenario in which prudence needs to be exercised for the most pleasurable outcome overall.

I understand... but the question still remains, and indeed it does look like the value of truth is relative, which may be something that makes us uncomfortable but it might none the less be true. Perhaps, the question should not be if the value of truth is relative, but rather if the value of us honoring our truth is relative, which it seems to be the case.