

Discussion of Blog Article - "Reality Does Not Require Being Eternally The Same"

Post by "Cassius" of April 2, 2026 at 9:13 PM

[Quote from TauPhi](#)

We certainly can claim knowledge. We can't claim that our knowledge is equivalent to the truth about how things are.

I clipped a number of statements to comment on but probably this one was all that is necessary. Whether we talk about "knowledge" or "truth" or "reality" or any other similar word, the issue is whether we can ever have confidence that our major conclusions about supernatural forces and life after death will ever need to be revised. I see Epicurus as being completely clear that there are issues like that at which we have no need of further observation, and the only compelling conclusion is "no" as to each. Holding those questions open as "maybe there will be new information tomorrow" creates needless doubt and anxiety, and more than that, has no logical basis, because you are speculating without evidence, and to do so means you are willing to give up your grip that Nature gave you on THIS world out of a speculative/imaginative possibility that "something else" may possibly - again without evidence - exist which will contradict the sum total of your and human prior experience.

[Quote from TauPhi](#)

ur knowledge will never be the truth about how things actually are. And this statement is not incompatible with Epicurean philosophy.

We disagree. I believe this statement is fundamentally at odds with Epicurean philosophy. In Epicurean philosophy it is "the truth" that there are no supernatural gods and no life after death.

We can all take personal positions on that in our personal lives, but there's only one position on those issues consistent with Epicurean philosophy, and to say otherwise is to simply ignore the totality of what is reliably recorded. Where in any reliable citation can you find ANY opening for any other position?

[Quote from TauPhi](#)

There are only subjective, human faculties in Epicurus' canon: feelings, senses and anticipations.

And based on those faculties it is reasonable to reach confident conclusions which you can reasonably say are knowledge about truth and reality.

[Quote from TauPhi](#)

There's not even one canonical faculty that would allow us to measure how things are outside of our human experiences.

The faculties provide evidence on which we are confident that the nature operates through irreducible particles. The faculties provide the data but "true reason" produces the conclusions. That is why the sense are never wrong, but some opinions are wrong and others are right. And those right opinions constitute knowledge of truth and reality.

[Quote from TauPhi](#)

Your equivalences sound more like: There are stairs to knowledge we need to climb but we can't see the end of them therefore we must declare that the stairs don't exist.

There are indeed stairs to knowledge, and in some opinions we can have greater confidence than in others. It is skepticism to say that there is a staircase but never a final conclusion on any subject, and that the staircase goes on "forever."

The issue we're focusing on of course is that of dogmatism in Epicurean philosophy, not whether "everyone" has to agree on the subject. People are free to take whatever positions they like, but at some point it becomes obligatory on people who say that they are Epicureans to take a position on whether this is or is not part of Epicurean philosophy.

And this is where I think some of us have come to an understanding: they pick and choose what elements of core Epicurean philosophy they want to adapt, and they label themselves accordingly. That's why you (Tau Phi) have been frank in stating that you are not an Epicurean, and I appreciate your frankness and we operate on those parameters.

We simply disagree on these issues of skepticism. I'll close this post by saying that I'd be happy for someone to cite to me some very clear Epicurean texts that support the arguments Tau Phi is raising, but I don't expect Tau Phi himself to do that because he acknowledges that his position is not Epicurean.+