

Plato's Timaeus vs. On Nature, Book 14

Post by "Cassius" of January 28, 2025 at 10:43 AM

[Quote from Bryan](#)

The inclusion of all void and all space as something everlasting makes sense and is consistent with Epikouros, who says that only the (1) void and (2) atoms are whole, unchanging, natures. The Whole is everlasting, but always changing.

The addition of the "change" factor to "eternally the same" is an interesting thing to think about.

Does change in "location" constitute change? If so, atoms are constantly moving, and in that sense, void is constantly relocating.

So atoms and even may move or at least change location, but does the fact that something moves constitute always being in a state of "becoming?"

The whole approach of thinking that something is not real unless it is totally unchanging in every respect smacks of being bogus and the ultimate problem. However before you can be sure the approach is bogus you have to understand what is being asserted.

Sounds like Diogenes of Oinoanda was on exactly the right track:

Quote

Fr. 5

[Others do not] explicitly [stigmatise] natural science as unnecessary, being ashamed to acknowledge [this], but use another means of discarding it. For, when they assert that things are inapprehensible, what else are they saying than that there is no need for us to pursue natural science? After all, who will choose to seek what he can never find?

Now Aristotle and those who hold the same Peripatetic views as Aristotle say that nothing is scientifically knowable, because things are continually in flux and, on account of the rapidity of the flux, evade our apprehension. We on the other hand acknowledge their flux, but not its being so rapid that the nature of each thing [is] at no time apprehensible by sense-perception. And indeed [in no way would the upholders of] the view under discussion have been able to say (and this is just what they do [maintain] that [at one time] this is [white] and this black, while [at another time] neither this is [white nor] that black, [if] they had not had [previous] knowledge of the nature of both white and black.