

What Would Epicurus Say About Searching For "Meaning?"

Post by "Cassius" of January 12, 2024 at 5:09 PM

I think [Eikadistes](#) 's latest graphic is applicable to our discussion here. When Democritus implied or stated that there's nothing in "reality" except atoms and void he should have taken greater care to explain what he meant by reality. If your definition of "reality" requires an unchanging and eternal existence, then darn right, nothing has that except atoms and void. But if your definition of "reality" is of relevance to human beings, and includes the kind of reality that includes railroad trains that will mow you down if you stand on their tracks when they come through, then to say that nothing exists "in reality" except atoms and void is the height of stupidity. I feel sure Democritus wasn't stupid, and I hope he made that distinction in real life. But regardless of that it does sound like Democritus got caught up in skepticism and hard determinism, so maybe he was in fact adversely influenced by his own theories. Rather than corrupt his ideas as Cicero accused Epicurus of doing, Epicurus straightened them out in some very important aspects.

EPICURUS
WAS HERE



"[Epicurus] called Nausiphanes a jellyfish, illiterate, a charlatan, and a whore. Plato and his followers he called 'Dionysian toadies,' and Plato himself 'golden'; Aristotle was 'a wastrel' who squandered his patrimony, fought in battles, and sold potions; Protagoras a 'delivery man,' 'Democritus' scribe,' and a 'village schoolmaster'; and Heraclitus is an 'agitator,' **Democritus 'Dumocritus' ...**"

Diogenes Laërtius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, Book X

DUMB-OCRITUS

