

Pros and Cons Of Considering Epicurean Philosophy To Be A "Religion"

Post by "Cassius" of March 20, 2024 at 1:05 PM

Point 1

[Quote from Peter Konstans](#)

Atoms themselves were forged in stellar explosions but where exactly the raw physical energy that set the universe alight ultimately comes from is unknown. Since the universe can't have just 'popped up' as the late Hawkings believed we must assume that it actually has divine roots.

Point 2

[Quote from Peter Konstans](#)

We must then suppose that the universes emanate from the energies of divine entities that dwell in a realm beyond time and space that we cannot observe.

Point 3

[Quote from Peter Konstans](#)

Just as the Epicureans prayed to the gods not to request favors but to contemplate them and receive some of their divine essence, it can be assumed that the gods contemplate the One and that this contemplation results in a burst of creative energy that perpetually generates finite universes.

OK then Peter I presume then that these are your personal viewpoints and you are not representing them as consistent with Epicurean philosophy. Fair enough if you think those positions could be supported by "modern science," but not Epicurean viewpoints, as I understand your statement of them.

Because certainly in Epicurean terms:

- 1 - Atoms are eternal and were never created at any point in time from energy or anything else.
- 2 - I guess you're basing that on point one, but it's definitely not the Epicurean position.

3 - I see no Epicurean reason for thinking that gods contemplate "The One" any more than we contemplate "the one," because Epicurean are atomists and there is no "the one."