

Thomas Nail - Returning to Lucretius

Post by "Patrikios" of January 28, 2026 at 9:19 PM

[Quote from Cassius](#)

*Thomas Nail appears to be an example of someone looking to bend the simplicity of atomic nothing-comes-from-nothing physics to **allow for the existence and control of supernatural otherworldly forces.***

There's no way to stand up to fantasizing except to insist on real evidence given to us by nature as self-evident, and that's what Epicurus' canonics is all about.

[Cassius](#) ,

I don't quite see where you make this assumption that Thomas Nail is introducing "**supernatural otherworldly forces**". Or have I mis-read your post #14.

I read Nail's papers more as simply mis-translating [as [Bryan](#) pointed out in post #10] to infer that Lucretius understood and was trying to write about the flow and folds of nature as if Lucretius' **prefigured** Quantum wavefunctions.

*"However, in addition to these insights, my books have tried to argue that Lucretius also **prefigured** quantum theory's understanding of entanglement and indeterminacy." [Thomas Nail]*

I can see Nail's work as a "strong misreading" of DRN—philosophically productive but historically stretched. Where, Nail could have simply drawn careful **analogies** between Lucretius's atomic swerve (clinamen) and quantum indeterminacy and wave functions driving motion; Nail went further to present this as historical claim to be seen in passages of DRN.

However, I find no mention of Nail discussing "**supernatural otherworldly forces**". In fact the forces that occur from "motion" create effects which our human senses can not detect, may be better understood today by modern quantum effects.

I thought the critique given by professor Michael Bennett of Nail's work which I quoted his conclusion in my post #11 clarified that Nail was not proposing "**supernatural otherworldly forces**" in his theory of motion.

Quote

Nothing I have said poses a challenge to the project of developing an ontology of motion adequate to the ethical, political, aesthetic and scientific realities of the present day. Nor have I called into question the consistency or originality Nail claims for the theory of motion presented in the first book of Being and Motion (BM 13). In fact, I have perhaps emphasized its originality—though at the expense of Lucretius's.

Thanks for your commentary, as it helps me keep reading!

As I have time to read many of the other Nail papers, I'll have a better understanding. Starting with: "[THE PHILOSOPHY OF MOVEMENT - An Introduction](#)"