

What Would Epicurus Think of the Big Bang?

Post by “Bryan” of January 15, 2024 at 10:50 AM

When he shows the equation that “explains everything” yet nevertheless states that there are “parts of which no one on the planet understands,” I think he is playing the game Diogenes of Oinoanda mentions below:

“[Others do not] explicitly [stigmatize] natural science [as unnecessary], being ashamed to acknowledge [this], but use another means of discarding it. For, when they assert that things are inapprehensible, what else are they saying than that there is no need for us to pursue natural science? After all, who will choose to seek what he can never find? Now Aristotle and those who hold the same Peripatetic views as Aristotle say that nothing is scientifically knowable, because things are continually in flux and, on account of the rapidity of the flux, evade our apprehension. We on the other hand acknowledge their flux, but not its being so rapid that the nature of each thing is at no time apprehensible by sense-perception.” (Diogenes of Oinoanda, Fr. 5, trans. Smith)

“...if [the Stoics] call [thoughts] empty on the ground that, while they have a corporeal nature, it is exceedingly subtle and does not impinge on the senses, they have expressed themselves wrongly, [since it was necessary to call] them corporeal, despite their subtlety. If on the other hand they call them empty on the ground that they have no corporeal nature at all – and it is in fact this rather than the former which they mean – how can the empty be represented? What then are they?... for films which are so subtle and lack the depth of a solid constitution cannot possibly possess these faculties.” (Fr. 10)

I feel that the explanation the presenter repeats -- basically the endorsed explanation since the world wars -- simply takes pre-suppositions from other schools, which are contrary to our school, and then labors to argue that recent experiments and technological advances prove their pre-suppositions correct.