

# "Epicurean Philosophy: An Introduction from the 'Garden of Athens'" edited by Christos Yapijakis

Post by "Eikadistes" of January 12, 2023 at 12:22 PM

## [Quote from Cassius](#)

I presume we are seeing a little roughness in the Greek to English translation, but aside from that what do you make of the list Nate? The "confirmed" and "cannot be confirmed" by the senses, but harder to tell about the "valid / invalid" labeling.

I am still deconstructing the expressions that the author employs to explain the principles of Epicurus' analogical logic, so I am reserving an opinion about the second statements of each point.

For the most part, I find that the list coheres with the beginning of the *Epistle To Herodotus* and the elementary propositions defined therein. There are several items (as I predicted) which they organized as two separate points (*infinite void* and *infinite particles* being one example) instead of one. I think this is inevitable and mostly inconsequential. Like I mentioned before, I would be comfortable merging the first two propositions (*no creation* and *no destruction*) into one, though I am equally happy to recognize it as two, distinct points. Some of the points are two sides of the same observation, and can be appropriately expressed as such, so I am fine with those.

I think that some of their points are a little redundant. For example, 1. (*that bodies exist*) and 5. (*that everything consists of bodies, except 6. void*). Also, point 2. (*the principle of linear, temporal causality, that one or more causes precede an effect*) seems to be implied by 3. and 4. (*that nothing is born out of nothing, and that nothing is annihilated*). Also, points 7. (*atoms having an unchanging and unbroken existence*) and 8. (*atoms being impenetrable*) seem to be derivative of 4. (*nothing being annihilated*) so I would not personally include them. Point 14. (*no divine intervention*) seems implied by their recognition of 2. (*things have temporal causes*) and 5. (*everything is made of bodies*).

As [Todd](#) mentioned, 18. seems almost Platonic, and I do not find support for this proposition in Epicurus' texts. I may be missing something in translation, but at this point I do not accept this one.

I will need to dig through what the author calls "analogical" and "Aristotelian logic" because I imagine that this criterion helped them organize each of their points, even when some seem (to me) to be redundant.