

Pros and Cons Of Considering Epicurean Philosophy To Be A "Religion"

Post by "Bryan" of March 24, 2024 at 3:53 PM

I believe that DeWitt is technically correct given the narrow modern view of vision. I do wish to add, as we all already know, that Epicurus clearly emphasized visualization of mental images. If "cow" is the object of consideration, he did not want you to just think about the word "cow" and the definition of a cow, and the logic involved in making cow a distinct class, etc., he wanted you, to the best of your ability, to focus on your mental vision of a cow.

For some contrast, I will share Bailey's comments "There do exist divine being or gods: they are innumerable as are the created things which perish and immortal even as created things are mortal. They are, as is proved by their 'idols' which visit us, like in figure to men. In constitution they are eternal in form but composed of transient matter: this matter, which is all 'alike' and contains no alien elements, comes from the innumerable atoms moving in the void between the worlds: in everlasting succession the atoms stream into the 'forms' of the divine being and unite there for the moment to constitute their body. Then they fly off again in the union in which they have now joined, thus forming the continuous succession of like 'idols', which are perceived by the mind and our direct source of knowledge of the existence of the gods."

(Aetius 4.13.1) "Leucippus, Democritus, and Epicurus believe that the visual sensation is the result of the penetration of images."