

# Reverence and Awe In Epicurean Philosophy

Post by "Cassius" of October 25, 2020 at 9:00 AM

There's a lot of complexity in that last exchange that I don't really have an immediate comment on. However on this part:

## [Quote from Susan Hill](#)

Epicurus did not have supernatural beliefs, (and I argue that neither do I), but everything I have read insists he was not an atheist. There are certainly different flavours of atheism, so I am careful to not categorize your beliefs. There are even more flavours of theism than there are atheism.

I guess saying "he was not an atheist" requires that we be clear that "atheism" as understood today requires a supernatural element, and that we be clear that [Epicurean gods](#) were not supernatural.

How do we find a more compact way of explaining this without always raising detailed caveats that are too unwieldy for common conversation? Because if we don't, every time we write about this then our words are too easily taken out of context so as to be dangerously confusing.

I am thinking that it helps somewhat to use the phrase "classical Epicurean" views to refer to the ancient Epicureans rather than the later Stoic mishmash of ideas, and a classical Epicurean would understand this perspective on divinity without having it constantly re-explained.

But we need a way to do this specifically in regard to religion, or even as we talk to each other we are apt to be confusing and switch back and forth between different meanings.