

Issues In The Meaning And Definition of Logic

Post by “Mathitis Kipouros” of August 26, 2021 at 8:25 AM

[Quote from Cassius](#)

I do think, however, in general, that we are suffering from the difficulty of really having a bright line definition of many of these words (logic, reason, dialectic, dialectical logic, etc).

Yes. Even if it's not a Canonical faculty, don't you think is worth being clear about what it is? or what it's not?

[Quote from Cassius](#)

Of all the comments this is probably the most important to articulate better. We confirm that the tower is in fact square by walking toward it, viewing it from different angles, touching it, etc. It is never reason *alone* which does the confirming, it is the reliability of subsequent multiple sensations.

Ok, I see what you mean. But what if we're not able to go closer to the tower? (or the atoms) wouldn't it be nice to have some certainty that perhaps you have an alternative (which we do) to go to the tower? Like, with reason, formulate an indirect way of determining it's shape and testing it. Again, the testing **wil involve the sensations**, (so I'm not disregarding those as essential), but can you see here how reason comes as a very good thing for us. I guess no one has disputed reason that works this way, to our pleasure.

[Quote from Cassius](#)

"Well, comparing multiple sensations to see which is reliably repeated IS a form of "reason" or even "logic!"

I agree this doesn't make sense. But you do need reason in order to be able to use your sensations better, more usefully, in different ways that help you more than in raw, brute fashion. Don't we?

[Quote from Cassius](#)

Ok now on that point it is my position (and I think Epicurus') that there IS no essential difference between humans and other animals. And that precise argument is stated very clearly by Cicero who complains that Epicurus reduces us to the state of animals

by not worshipping reason/logic as he (Cicero) does.

I get it that is not convenient to give humans a special place in the world, but we can nonetheless use reason, and it has been, evidently, advantageous (also disadvantageous) to us. I firmly believe that it's been disadvantageous to us because we haven't been using the other two legs of the canon right, feelings and anticipations, and were these to take a more prominent role in the consciousness of most, many things in the world would change for good. You don't have to go all the way to worship reason, but I'm arguing that recognizing the important place it evidently and materially has in our lives, is of the essence not to oversimplify Epicurean Philosophy. Don't raise it to the level of the canon, I get it, in order to keep it in check and not fall in the trap of over valuing it, I like that, but do recognize it has an active role in the use of the canonical functions, and as such (at least for me) is of the essence to understand it better; I'm not sure that throwing the baby with the bath water of platonic ideals, absurd/paradoxical abstractions, is going to be useful towards understanding that part of Nature better.

About the podcast, I also believe it was Elayne who said it, but, as I'm not sure, and as I wasn't listening to the podcast in that precise moment, hence, not having the full context of that particular part of the conversation, I preferred not to name anyone.

It's a great idea that we should put the doubts or comments directly in the episodes, I'll try and do that.