

Epicureanism and Scientism: What are the main differences?

Post by “Little Rocker” of July 24, 2024 at 1:33 PM

I suppose I'm playing Devil's Advocate here, but I admit that I struggle to understand the point of introducing some of the explanations except to have multiple ones--that eclipses are caused by bad air, that the moon comes into and out of existence daily, etc.

[Quote from Cassius](#)

I can't imagine that in his intention to refute the skeptics who said that "nothing is knowable" he would have erased any distinction between "the more and less probable.

Maybe it wouldn't be so strange to concede equipollence in some cases to explain why you reject it in others.

I mean, don't get me wrong, in some ways he's at least in the ballpark of recommending the intellectual virtues of science-- considering multiple explanations when sensory evidence won't settle the question, humility about the possibility that future science will refute you. I just need to look at the text again to see if he's ever like, 'but don't generate implausible explanations just to muddy the water,' or 'but you should feel free to narrow it down to the more probable.' Or, 'sure, there's only one actual best explanation, but we would all do well to recognize our intellectual limitations when it comes to discovering it.'