

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

Post by "Cassius" of January 22, 2024 at 7:05 PM

I am not talking to anyone in this thread but I can imagine certain lurkers hyperventilating right now. Everyone needs to understand that the "gods" that Epicurus was talking about, and that as I understand it Nate is talking about, are not literally Zeus and Venus and the rest. If we go down the road of "piety toward the gods" too far without reminding everyone forcefully what [Epicurean gods](#) ARE, and ARE NOT, then we get into the same misunderstandings that we have about pleasure, virtue, and other terms.

I don't think the texts support the view that Epicurus was talking about reverence toward Zeus, Yahweh, or any other conventional gods, as those names are commonly understood. We have to start back at the beginning of the sequence, on what is the nature of divinity, before we can make sense of the downstream discussions of piety.

Divinity is not "Nature itself" either, but it's a capacity that exists within nature that makes possible beings who while not supernatural are still worthy of "reverence" because of the benefit that such reverence brings to us in bringing us further into consistency with Nature itself and the pleasure that nature gives as guidance.