

# Episode 237 - Cicero's OTNOTG - 12 - Isonomia And The Implications of Infinity

Post by "Cassius" of July 11, 2024 at 9:04 AM

1. Here on Earth, we observe for ourselves many different types of people and animals.
2. We observe that some live longer lives, some live shorter lives.
3. We observe that some live more pleasant lives, some live less pleasant lives.
4. We also observe that nature never makes only a single thing of a kind.
5. Because of our understanding of the atoms, we confidently expect that the universe is boundless, and that it has always existed and will continue to exist for a boundless period of time. We therefore expect that there are boundless numbers of other "people" in the universe, many of whom are a part of species which have been around a lot longer than we have.
6. Given the above, why would we *\*not\** expect that some of those species have extended their length of life, and their experience of pleasure, so that both their lives and there pleasures are unending, uninterrupted by death or pain? And why would we *\*not\** expect that we benefit from thinking about how they might have achieved that goal, so that we ourselves can make our pleasures and our lives last longer and without interruption to the extent we are able? Stated positively, it seems to me that Epicurus is saying that we *\*should\** reach those conclusions.

Does there really have to be anything more to Epicurean theology than that? Is not *\*everything\** beyond that which causes so much controversy (expectations of omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence), false opinions that people under the influence of non-Epicurean perspectives are adding in, *\*none\** of which false opinions are appropriate when Epicurean physics and canonics are consistently applied?

From this perspective, and taking into account how far we observe medical science has come in less than 2000 years, I would say that Epicurean theology is *\*more\** persuasive than it was in 50BC or 250BC!

Maybe somebody can convince me that the above chain reasoning is not a fair summary of Epicurean theology, but to the extent it *\*is\** a fair summary, I am personally 100% convinced of its validity! 😊

Edit: I would say that "prolepsis" comes in mostly to allow stages 1, 2, and 3 to occur - but 1,2, and 3 are not examples of prolepsis themselves. Without a faculty of prolepsis, we would "look" but we would never "see" things that lead us to form concepts such as Earth, "we," "people," "animals," or any of the rest of the concepts being used to construct this chain reasoning. I

would say a faculty of prolepsis is necessary to organize and construct every step of the chain reasoning, but that none of the individual links in the chain are themselves "a prolepsis."