


General Commentary on Logic-Based Arguments Against Epicurean Physics

Post by "Don" of April 9, 2026 at 7:25 AM

ADMIN NOTE BY CASSIUS: We have set up this category for general observations on the merits and demerits of the "logic-based" arguments. All of them share fundamental erroneous presumptions about proof and evidence, and we can explore those commonalities here. There will be separate threads for the major named arguments so that people who want to ask "what about....?" can address the individual twists and turns of specific arguments.

To be honest, I find these kinds of "proofs" of God to be tiresome, overly complicated wordplay. I couldn't even get through the Wikipedia summary without rolling my eyes. The whole "ontological argument" (of which this appears to be an early variety) strikes me as ...I don't know... too clever by half? A speciously intellectual facade masquerading as deep? The fact that other Muslims found Ibn Sina's Proof unsatisfactory, and other Christians found Anselm's thought experiment lacking, I find outsiders like Epicureans taking the time to refute or counter these a waste of valuable time.



[Ontological argument - Wikipedia](#)

en.wikipedia.org

<https://www.epicureanfriends.com/thread/5023-general-commentary-on-logic-based-arguments-against-epicurean-physics/?postID=39279#post39279>