

# "Being," "Becoming," and Epicurus

Post by "Cassius" of July 30, 2019 at 9:06 AM

Here is a summary of the "being" vs "becoming" issue from this link:  
<http://metaphysicist.com/problems/being/>

[Home](#) > [Issues](#) > [Being](#)

## Being and Becoming

Information philosophy greatly simplifies the classic dichotomy between Being and Becoming that has bothered metaphysicians from Parmenides, [Plato](#), and [Aristotle](#) to [Martin Heidegger](#).

Being is part of the essential nature of some [abstract entities](#). They are ideas that exist in the immaterial realm of pure information and do not change.

Becoming is the essential nature of concrete material objects, which are always changing.

[Change in space and time](#) is a characteristic of all concrete material objects.

Some abstract immaterial entities also change, like the time of day. Only those abstract entities that do not change in time are those with "Being."

Consider the statue made from that lump of clay in our metaphysical problem of [colocation](#). It certainly looks to be unchanging as it sits on its pedestal. But with the earth's rapid rotation, its revolutionary travel around the sun, and our Milky Way flying around the Andromeda galaxy, the statue is dramatically moving in space and time, apart from the barely observable deterioration of its surface and the microscopic motions of its atomic constituents.

One could argue that if the statue could be positioned in the inertial frame of the cosmos, that average position of all the galaxies, surely it would sit still in space, but according to special relativity this too is wrong. In the infinitely many inertial frames in relative motion, the statue's space coordinates are changing, and its time coordinate changes inexorably in all frames.

Presuming this is an accurate summary, then a word could be this:

"Being is part of the essential nature of some [abstract entities](#). They are ideas that exist in the *immaterial* realm of pure information and *do not change*."

This would appear to be pure Platonism and totally contrary to Epicurean physics and understanding of the nature of the universe.

The entire issue of talking about "becoming" vs "being" is bogus because there is no such thing as "being" -- ideas in an immaterial realm.

Every discussion of this, once entered by accepting the validity of "being," is a disaster, because "being" in these terms is a fantasy that does not exist.

I tend to think that this is a common method of anti-Epicurean philosophers - using terminology that appears to mean something but really refers to nothing that exists.

So my working presumption is that this "being" vs. "becoming" issue has no value in understanding the universe, but that understanding the terminology is important so that we can avoid being confused by these arguments.

Anyone have a different take on "being" vs. "becoming?"