

# Prolepsis and the Epicurean Gods (discussion split from earlier thread started by Titus)

Post by "Cassius" of June 14, 2026 at 5:46 PM

## [Quote from DaveT](#)

. It's so sad that the extent fragments, the letters, and Lucretius are all we have to resolve the issue of how he could believe in gods that neither he or anyone had ever sensed with the five senses

He could believe in them in exactly the same way he believes in atoms, which he has also never perceived with his five senses.

## [Quote from DaveT](#)

king frankly, when he says there are gods, to me, he believes they exist without evidence

Again, he had the same level of evidence he had as to atoms - all inference, no direct evidence - yet fully "believed" in atoms.

## [Quote from DaveT](#)

Yet, still scratching my head: Under this, his gods being immortal are coexistent with eternal atoms, even though the gods are composed of atoms

Because the gods must act to maintain their deathlessness. forces exist which tend toward dissolution and will cause that if not counteracted, but there is no "fate" which prevents counteracting forces from being sustainable without definite limit.

## [Quote from DaveT](#)

In a way, the apparent inconsistency of methodology illuminates Epicurus' common humanity.

And as for the last part I am not saying this to be contentious but to say what I think and Epicurean from the ancient world would say even if they were alive today and have access to the same science we have:

You have every right to disagree with Epicurus and think that the error you think he committed proves his humanity. An ancient Epicurean would say that the error is yours for not agreeing with Epicurus' argument as to proof from circumstantial evidence. Although I am not an ancient Epicurus, I would say that I would agree with their position even given all the additional science we have today, which I don't think touches in any way the essence of Epicurus' logical argument.