

Presenting the Principal Doctrines in Narrative Form

Post by "Don" of June 22, 2023 at 8:11 AM

[Quote from Cassius](#)

Good idea. We really need to pin this down. It's logical to have a way to keep track of the sentences, but the artificial division introduces an overlay of meaning that needs to be kept in the background - by "force" if necessary.

It's a similar situation to the Bible in that there were no "verses" in the original texts. Scholars started dividing the New Testament into verses in the 1400-1500s. Maybe the artificial divisions are an outgrowth of that tendency.

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chapters_and_verses_of_the_Bible#%3A%7E%3Atext%3DMost attribute these](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chapters_and_verses_of_the_Bible#%3A%7E%3Atext%3DMost%20attribute%20these)

[Quote from Cassius](#)

Plus I don't think we should lose sight of the "celestial book" references

~~I'm sorry, can you refresh my memory on the "celestial book" reference?~~ Oops, never mind. I found the discussion:

Post

[RE: Toward a New Interlinear Gloss of De Rerum Natura](#)

Any way you can use one of the text versions posted to Internet Archive? It would probably require some editing but might include more options?

I was considering doing an interlinear of the [Principal Doctrines](#) or the Letter to Menoikeus until I remembered the Epicurus Wiki did a good job on both: http://wiki.epicurism.info/Main_Page/ I'll keep working on my in-depth analysis of the Letter and possibly integrate some interlinear text there.



Don

June 1, 2021 at 11:08 PM

[Quote from Cassius](#)

If Epicurus or the later school leaders had thought separation and numbering were important or helpful, then presumably they could easily have numbered them

<http://www.epicureanfriends.com/thread/2629-presenting-the-principal-doctrines-in-narrative-form/?postID=24665#post24665>

themselves - and if they did not, that is significant.

It certainly appears to me that they did not number the PDs.