

Prolepsis of the gods

Post by “DaveT” of July 3, 2025 at 5:41 PM

Do our learned friends here take issue with the following discussion by DeWitt? Please be specific and explain why the below is inapposite to this thread.

I ask because the posts discussed earlier are overwhelming me. The following comments and quotations in DeWitt seem to respond to the original query in this thread.

“EVIDENCES FROM SPECIFIC CONTEXT

In the extant texts of Epicurus the term prolepsis occurs four times in a specific context. The first has reference to the divine nature and the second and third to justice; the fourth applies to the concept of time.” P.146 DeWitt

“The discussion of the divine nature is found in the letter to the youthful Menoeceus.⁴⁴

It is there declared “that the pronouncements of the multitude concerning the gods are not anticipations (prolepseis) but false assumptions.”” p.146

“The second and third examples of the term prolepsis are found in Authorized Doctrines 37 and 38; the topic is justice. Just as in the case of the divine nature, the first requisite is to discern the essential attribute or attributes. It is Nature that furnishes the norm and implants in men the embryonic notion or prolepsis of justice in advance of all experience. Hence it is called “the justice of Nature,” as in Doctrine 31: “The justice of Nature is a covenant of advantage to the end that men shall not injure one another nor be injured.” Setting aside the idea of the covenant, which is a separate topic,...” p.147