

# Is Motion One Of The Three Eternal Properties of Atoms? I.E. Are The Three Properties Shape, Size, and MOTION?

Post by "Cassius" of April 16, 2026 at 8:31 PM

[Quote from Matteng](#)

Is modern physics an extension of Epicurean physics and follows from it ?

I would not say that, and I feel certain Martin would not say so either.

Epicurus is targeting his claim of their being an ultimate limit to divisibility to the opposite argument made by prior philosophers - that there is no conceivable limit to divisibility.

That's something that is not resolvable technically, with at least one reason being as observed by Lucretius/Epicurus that the instruments of precision are always going to be themselves composed of something that by nature those instruments cannot measure.

This is very theoretical area and I am not able to talk about it articulately, but there are as I understand it many articles out there on the intersection of philosophy and science that do.

What I think I am confident of, and what Epicurus was confident of, is that we will never know everything we would like to know. There will for all foreseeable future likely be new discoveries and new levels of detail. At the very least the discoveries will extend outward into unlimited space.

We know already that we will never visit every location in the universe nor travel in time as far back or forward as we would like to do. No human being ever has, nor is there any reason to think that one could. Therefore we are not going to ever be able to argue that something has been "proven" to a standard of having examined every corner and every time in the universe.

An impossible standard like that makes no sense for humans to pursue, but yet we have to make decisions on how to spend the short lives that we have, so we have to make decisions on what levels of proof are "good enough" and possible.

Therefore Epicurus suggests a method of deciding what is true and false based on information that IS available to us through the senses, processed rationally by the mind. The ultimate stress of "trusting the senses" I think means exactly that: As humans there is no reason to think we will ever have information beyond that which is confirmed by the senses (and by the instruments which extend our senses) so we have to get comfortable going with what our senses consistently establish to be our reality.

### [Quote from Matteng](#)

Epicurean physics is more realistic and closer to modern physics ( no intentional, governing Logos ). Exciting discussion.

So I think that's the ultimate point. All evidence points to nature working on its own without an external supernatural force behind it. That's the ultimate conclusion of Epicurean physics based on rational processing of the senses. I too see that as consistent with modern physics, but technicians, even though they select standards of certainty they think are practically useful, generally make no claims to address the ultimate correctness of when evidence is sufficient.