

# "Nothing Comes from Nothing" and Parmenides

Post by "Cassius" of January 21, 2021 at 10:41 AM

Matt how do you see this relating to the way Epicurus analyzed the question. My gut reaction is that what you are describing is such high-level logic, based so strongly on the word definitions without any connections with observations in "this" world, that Epicurus would not recommend relying on such an argument. I could be wrong, but this might be a good example to show that Epicurean logic as described in Lucretius and Philodemus always starts with that which is observable and rests primarily on what we do and do not observe. However I may be misunderstanding the Parmenides position.

It's in this respect that I strongly agree with what I think is or what I think should be Elayne's main point -- that use of "pure logic" as a reasonable grounds for making big conclusions is to be ruled out as an acceptable method. In fact I might say that it sounds like Parmenides's argument would suffer from the same problems as we are discussing to be the problem with hypotheticals and abstractions in the first place -- there are too many assumptions being made for someone who is grounded in the evidence of the senses to have confidence in the result.