

# Can Determinism Be Reconciled With Epicureanism? (Admin Edit - No, But Let's Talk About Why Not)

Post by "Titus" of February 26, 2024 at 4:47 PM

## [Quote from Cassius](#)

As Dawkins says "we feel as if we are not deterministic -- and that's all that matters."

Isn't this the position of Epicurus in the Letter to Menoecus?

*"(He thinks that with us lies the chief power in determining events, some of which happen by necessity) and some by chance, and some are within our control; for while necessity cannot be called to account, he sees that chance is inconstant, **but that which is in our control is subject to no master**, and to it are naturally attached praise and blame." (Bailey translation)*

I especially remind a German translation by Laskowsky. He renders the bold print as follows:

"und es an uns stehe, ob wir uns einem Herrn unterwerfen wollen!"

**"and it is up to us whether we want to submit to a master!"**

Laskowsky's translation might be questioned, but I like his wording very much, because it centers self-reliance and independent personal reasoning. It's in particular important, because I think otherwise we are in danger of appreciating every kind of logic that is approaching us in an beguiling way.

It's how Ca(t/ss)ius Cat would tell us: "And yet others will say that, *"No thing can be known!" All the while they will offer their own truth to loan.*" 😊