

Can Emotions be Trusted?

Post by "Don" of October 7, 2020 at 7:51 PM

[Quote from Susan Hill](#)

[Quote from Cassius](#)

of course we're not talking about individual consciousnesses having any continuance; that's specifically ruled out by other Epicurean theory

Didn't Epicurus outline a physics for immortal gods?

I've found it interesting in my work on the Menoikeus letter (and in KD1) that Epicurus uses "imperishable" specifically to describe the gods. He may use those terms elsewhere, but that's what I'm remembering right now.

You're welcome to see my post and errata on that in the other thread. Here's an excerpt:

Quote

ἄφθαρτον = aphtharton LSJ gives the definition of "incorruptible, eternal, immortal, uncorrupted, undecaying" and gives references to Epicurus, Philodemus, and Diogenes of Oenoanda. At its root, the word is α- "not" + φθαρτον "destructible, perishable." LSJ states φθαρτον is the opposite of αἰδιος = aidios "everlasting, eternal" (related to αἰ "ever, always") which poses an interesting question: Why did Epicurus choose to use ἄφθαρτον instead of αἰδιος or ἀθάνατος? φθαρτον is related to θνητός = thnētos "liable to death, mortal, opposite: ἀθάνατος [athanatos]" (LSJ) φθαρτον is connected to the verb φθείρω = phtheirō "destroy, pass away, cease to be, perish." It seems that Epicurus didn't want to evoke that the gods were simply immortal or eternal but that he wanted to impress upon us the sense that they would not pass away or cease to be. This is in contrast to everything else composed of atoms and void. Everything else is subject to be φθαρτον; only the gods are ἄφθαρτον! How can this be? Could it be that they are ἄφθαρτον precisely because they are mental perceptions, because we do have a Prolepsis of them (More on this difficult term later!)

I'm also not entirely convinced that the gods exist as a mental perception only. That's why they'd be imperishable. Still working my way through that!