

# Pleasure over truth

Post by "Cassius" of September 16, 2020 at 5:31 AM

[Quote from camotero](#)

thus, perhaps, trying to communicate it regardless of circumstances)

1 - I would generally say that looking at anything "regardless of circumstances" is going to be a bad idea. Even with pleasure, we sometimes choose pain.... so context is going to be important.

[Quote from camotero](#)

So the naturalists are the Democritean determinists?

Seems like I have seen some translations actually suggest other names for this, but I am coming up short on details other than that they're almost certainly determinists, though not necessarily Democritean. I wonder if "naturalists" is not a more modern term that might not be exactly correct.

[Quote from camotero](#)

Great pont and I will check that out, thanks.

Another example, camotero, if you are not familiar with it, is in Lucian's "Aristotle the Oracle-Monger," where Lucian specifically criticizes an Epicurean for being too vocal in attacking the lead character at the wrong time and thereby almost getting himself killed. So to the extent your honoring your truth comment was directed at speaking out regardless of context, that example is going to be directly on point, if we consider Lucian to be reflective of Epicurean views. (Of course by making his statement he was disagreeing with the Epicurean he criticized, so there's a difference of opinion there apparently).

**"what business had he to be the only sane man in a crowd of madmen...?"**

<http://epicurism.info/etexts/Alexander.html>

Quote

As I have said, Alexander was much afraid of Epicurus, and the solvent action of his logic on imposture.

On one occasion, indeed, an Epicurean got himself into great trouble by daring to expose him before a great gathering. He came up and addressed him in a loud voice,

'Alexander, it was you who induced So-and-so the Paphlagonian to bring his slaves before the governor of Galatia, charged with the murder of his son who was being educated in Alexandria. Well, the young man is alive, and has come back, to find that the slaves had been cast to the beasts by your machinations." What had happened was this: The lad had sailed up the Nile, gone on to a Red Sea port, found a vessel starting for India, and been persuaded to make the voyage. He being long overdue, the unfortunate slaves supposed that he had either perished in the Nile or fallen a victim to some of the pirates who infested it at that time; so they came home to report his disappearance. Then followed the oracle [indicting the slaves with murder], the sentence, and finally the young man's return with the story of his absence.

All this the Epicurean recounted. Alexander was much annoyed by the exposure, and could not stomach so well deserved an affront; he directed the company to stone the man, on pain of being involved in his impiety and called Epicureans. However, when they set to work, a distinguished Pontic called Demonstratus, who was staying there, rescued him by interposing his own body; **the man had the narrowest possible escape from being stoned to death—as he richly deserved to be; what business had he to be the only sane man in a crowd of madmen, and needlessly make himself the butt of Paphlagonian infatuation?**

This was a special case; but it was the practice for the names of applicants to be read out the day before answers were given; the herald asked whether each was to receive his oracle; and sometimes the reply came from within: To perdition! One so repulsed could get shelter, fire or water, from no man; he must be driven from land to land as a blasphemer, an atheist, and—lowest depth of all—an Epicurean.