

Discussion of the Society of Epicurus' 20 Tenets of 12/21/19

Post by "Cassius" of January 5, 2020 at 4:35 PM

In the above discussion I don't think that Hiram is including all of the detail that even in the partial form that we have it that Epicurus / Lucretius cited. I think if you check Dewitt you will see that there is both (1) the argument from anticipations, which is most fully preserved in the Velleius narrative in Cicero's "On The Nature of the Gods," and (2) the direct receipt of "images" though space by the mind.

Those who reject Epicurus' theory tend to focus on the images argument and blend that into the anticipations argument, but someone attempting to weigh all the evidence of what the texts contain would need to consider both the anticipations argument and the "images" argument.

There's a lot going on in the consideration of [Epicurean gods](#), and my personal viewpoint is that Hiram is hanging too much weight on his own personal weighing of the current state of scientific evidence, which is by definition not complete and is ever changing. It's definitely a problem also to site the evidence that the universe is expanding (that refers to the OBSERVABLE universe) to contradict the Epicurean theoretical position that the universe is boundless in size. I have to admit that that one always bothers me. Just because the part of the universe that we have OBSERVED seems to be expanding from a central point does not countermand the logical deduction that the universe is boundless in size, and that presumably there are all sorts of other areas that are expanding or collapsing or whatever based on their own histories.

To talk about the "universe" as expanding from a center is going to be out of court from the beginning in Epicurean terms. Of course we can go back to the issue of definitions and say that "universe" doesn't mean EVERYTHING, and if so that's fine, but that's not the traditional use of the term "universe."