The change concept according to heraclitus' and parmenide's view

Philosophy



What is change? The definition of change is to make or become different, or to take or use another instead of. If this is the definition of change than what is the definition of becoming? To become something means the process of coming to be something or of passing into a state. For years philosophers and some of world's brightest minds have pondered at these ideas of change and becoming, but two of the most prominent in this discussion are the ideas of Heraclitus and Parmenides. Why the two don't have the same views they both bring about points in their philosophy that are agreed upon by many people alike.

Heraclitus of Ephesus was a pre-Socratic Greek philosopher, and a native of the city of Ephesus. He strongly believed in the idea of becoming and changing. Heraclitus describes these two as not different but rather the same process. For instance the way a river runs downstream and the old water leaves and the new water comes but yet it's still the same river in the end. Or how in each of us is the living and the dead, wakefulness and sleep, youth and old age, and these are all one and the same. It's still the same person but just different in view. Heraclitus idea of becoming and change was talked about in his thesis of "the unity of opposites." He gives more examples of this idea of becoming and changing when he talks about how "cold things become hot and hot things become cold" (page 18) and "how wet things become dry and dry things become wet." He was a strong believer that the way things happen was a cycle so therefore change and becoming were merely the same thing.

While Heraclitus was a believer in change and becoming being one,

Parmenides had a different view on the subject. "Whatever exists, exists,

https://assignbuster.com/the-change-concept-according-to-heraclitus-andparmenides-view/

and there is nothing apart from that which exists" (page 20). While this makes sense he goes onto greater detail about what he means by this and he starts to contradict himself in my opinion. "1) anything we can think or speak about either exists or doesn't exist. 2) Anything that doesn't exist is nothing. 3) We cannot think or speak about nothing. 4) So, we cannot think or speak about what doesn't exist. 5) Therefore, anything we can think or speak about exists." (page 20). It starts off saying we can't think about what doesn't exist and then once he gets to the bottom he says anything we can think or speak about exists.

Homer is the most important Greek poet and many find his views about the universe either spot on or they find them incredible wrong and are filled with questions upon questions about what he means and how does he know and where's his proof. When reading his views I was surprised to find how some topics would make me wonder how he came up with this or discovered it.

But also while reading I came across a few topics that would make me not ask him any questions because I believed in them and many like me do to.

For instance he talks about "what order we find in nature (the patterns of the season, for example) is the product of the steady purposes and aims of the gods" (page 4). I agree with this because there is a very apparent pattern in the universe. Its winter and then a few months go buy and the seasons change, it happens every year. And how he says "the gods' interest revolves only around their own honor and status" (page 4). Again I agree that the gods are more concerned with themselves than they are the people.

As long as nothing is going too wrong they seem to stick to themselves and watch us humans for entertainment.

But when I read " the gods did not reward virtue and punish evil" (page 5). It drew a list of questions that pondered me. Why would the gods not punish those who are evil? Why would they not live by a moral code or good and evil, I mean they are gods they should be the ones in charge of enforcing such a thing and keeping things in balance. But the biggest question was how Homer knew any of this? How does he have communication with the gods? Is such a thing even possible? Does this mean that there isn't a one true God? Also when he talks about Zeus why is he the only one who cares about justice compared to the other gods? If he's the main god and the most powerful as well he should be in charge of making sure that all of the gods follow his commands and not treating humans better just because they give them gifts or flattery. Overall after reading his views I would say that I am definitely more so towards the side of asking questions about his thoughts of the universe.