

Epicureanism and Scientism: What are the main differences?

Post by “Little Rocker” of July 24, 2024 at 9:48 AM

[Quote from Martin](#)

Whereas the formation of preconceptions from sensations may be interpreted as a precursor of science, the feelings as another leg of the Epicurean canon go much further than the narrow scope of science.

This seems right to me. Martin mentioned Rosenberg (and I might add Paul and Patricia Churchland), and one of their key theses is 'eliminativism' about mental states. I have heard Rosenberg say we should dispense with 'feeling' language altogether.

[Quote from Kalosyni](#)

There is Epicurus and his canonic...and wondering if there is a name or label for the part which says to be sure you are bringing up multiple hypotheses and do not settle too quickly onto one explanation for causes of phenomenon?

I've seen this just called 'Epicurean multiple explanation' or treated as the 'Doctrine of Multiple Explanation.' And it seems super relevant to what [Martin](#) wrote earlier.

I was reminded of a passage I read recently about Epicurus' indifference to finding the right explanation. Actually it seems like more than indifference--he actually recommends not getting invested in finding the actual explanation.

Quote

'The ethical and epistemological turn in Epicureanism has the curious effect that what has appeared to many modern commentators to be the most materialistic and least teleological of ancient philosophies (in short, the most scientific) represents at the same time a deliberate turning away from examination, experiment. and the elimination of competing hypotheses for astronomical, cosmological, and meteorological phenomena' (Lehoux).