

# To What Extent, If Any, Does Modern Physics Invalidate Epicurean Philosophy?

**Post by "Cassius" of August 15, 2020 at 11:56 AM**

Cassius Reply Back to Alan:

Other than Conclusion 5 we are very definitely closing the gap, and I bet we can close it on 5 too. I think Epicurus would say that there is never any logical reason to accept a contention without any evidence at all, and that there is absolutely no evidence of life after death, and much evidence to indicate that life is like everything else, and that all that comes together eventually dissolves back into the elements from which it came (plus many other arguments).

The issue here is that I think Epicurus was ultimately a philosopher and he was in fact fully engaging the other philosophers on their own territory -- logic -- as well as physics. I think he would say that the "true" rules of reason are such that accepting something as possible without any reliable evidence whatsoever would undermine the rules of reasoning which are necessary to live happily. (You would be right to think that I believe this applies to the physics arguments as well.)

Someone reading into this argument further would want to research Philodemus' "On Methods of Inference" and the commentary in the DeLacy translation of what remains of that work.

So maybe someone would want to argue that there IS some kind of evidence of life after death, and if so we could debate that. But in the end I think the direction Epicurus was going is that in order to live happily you have to adopt rules of what you are even going to consider as evidence, and at least for me I see your conclusion 5 too as one of those things which has to simply be ruled out of court for consideration based on the evidence we already have.