

Friendship discussion (moved from 20th conversation)

Post by “Pacatus” of April 29, 2025 at 3:21 PM

Just as an aside (tearing myself briefly from my reading assignment – as my hypertexting brain asserts itself 😏).

[AxA](#) said: “The philosophy encourages applying “common sense” and using “basic meanings” of words, but that can lead to projecting back an imaginary “English Epicurus” when we apply all the connotations of English translation words back to the original philosophy. “Edward Curris” lol.” 👍👍👍 on that.

I just want to add that I don’t think that even the plainest of plain speech can be reduced to some *one-meaning-for-one-word-for-all-cases* – in any non-artificial language at least. Or even for a phrase that includes, say, adjectival or adverbial modifiers and that may recur in varying contexts. All speech (and writing) is semantically dependent on context, which is the basis for Wittgenstein’s dictum: “Don’t look for the meaning, look for the use.”

And, as [AxA](#) points out, that can be even more *tricksy* in translation, where the context is not immediate, but needs itself to be searched out – as well as carrying the risk of “projecting back an imaginary ‘English Epicurus’.”