

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

Post by "Cassius" of March 23, 2024 at 1:57 PM

[Quote from Twentier](#)

Epicureanism is my religion, and there's not a goddamn thing anyone can do about it.

You know, when I combine my thoughts after reading that section of DeWitt on "Isonomy and the Gods," with our friend Twentier's statement, I have to comment that if ever in the future there is a resurgence of Epicureanism as a "religion," Norman DeWitt deserves a special place in its "Hall of Apostles." No one else I know of is anywhere close to DeWitt in bringing the implications of the various texts out into the open for us to discuss.



1. The gods are not immortal, just deathless.
2. Isonomia
3. The principle that nature never creates only a single thing of a kind.
4. Prolepsis, as much or more so than images, as the basis of Epicurus' belief in the gods.
5. The importance of the implications of infinity.

All of these things are right there in the various texts, but the writers for laymen rarely seem interested in their significance. Laymen themselves don't have nearly the depth of reading to recognize how they fit together without some of DeWitt's training to bring them together. We'd never be able to bring all these to bear in our discussions here, and if we listened to most modern theorists, who seem to frown on "infinity" and "eternality," we'd never even get started.