

Epicurus' Prolepsis vs Heraclitus' Flux

Post by "Cassius" of July 15, 2025 at 12:40 PM

DaveT the font style options appear under the three dots with the drop down next to it in the menu bar above each editing screen.

[Quote from DaveT](#)

I doubt many lay people will ever read this book, and fewer yet among spiritualists. I often try to ask about the potential impact of anything presented as fact from the position of the layperson, also. Not sure it matters to ask about the impact of modern physics, when it comes to philosophical inquiry, though.

I do think that physics and philosophy intersect, and it seems to me that clearly Epicurus thought so also. Use of physics or psuedo-physics theory to argue that everything is essentially unknowable dates as far back as before Epicurus, and it still goes on today. If someone concludes that everything is unknowable, and they try to be consistent in their thoughts, then they'll abandon philosoehy and everything else as well.

[Quote from DaveT](#)

I doubt many lay people will ever read this book, and fewer yet among spiritualists. I often try to ask about the potential impact of anything presented as fact from the position of the layperson, also. Not sure it matters to ask about the impact of modern physics, when it comes to philosophical inquiry, though. As a basis for argument among the well educated, OK, fine, but for ordinary teaching and learning? Only the process of logical deduction (like in science) is important when discussing Epicurus, right?

I agree that the process of logical deduction is important, but only if it actually helps you reach important conclusions. This is my difference with Frances Wright, who tried to divorce physics from Epicurean philosophy and reach no conclusions about the universe whatsoever. To each his own, but my read of the situation is that for a lot of people (and I'd wager a majority, though I have no way to prove it) that doesn't work. You can't just leave "the existence of a supernatural god" and "eternal life or punishment after death" to the category of "maybe" without profound harmful consequences.

[Quote from DaveT](#)

I like this quote from Richard Powers who wrote that there is not anything that is "a matter of fact....there is only observing and humility." I think that is a fair request for

the layperson as well as the experts in any field. And as for the foundations of physics, scientific discovery is never 100 percent certain, the scientists always challenge their community to disprove their conclusions, and that is the search for knowledge, isn't it?

And I guess that quote is the basic problem, if one concludes that there is nothing that is a "matter of fact" at all. Not referring to you or your interpretation of it, of course, but in general I just profoundly disagree with that sentiment when spoken in philosophical terms. And consistent with earlier comments in this very thread, the test is not whether there is some cosmic supernatural universal truth, but whether something is true to us. And there are plenty of things that are a "matter of fact" for us, including (I would say) that there are no supernatural gods and no continuing life after death.