

Issues In The Meaning And Definition of Logic

Post by “Mathitis Kipouros” of August 26, 2021 at 9:09 AM

[Quote from Cassius](#)

the repeatability of the senses

Do you mean the ability to repeatedly use the senses as tests, right?

By the way, this brings up to mind another possible cause for confusion. Perhaps we're conflating the inaccuracies of language with the inaccuracies of reason. It's obvious to me that we have to agree on the same meanings of language as the medium to communicate our arguments, but the confusion that derives from it doesn't invalidate the reasoning it is trying to communicate. It's a similar instance of the case of value vs. truth, that DeWitt used. If the meaning of language is not properly agreed upon, the argument, or exposition of reasoning, may end up not being useful, but not because of that the argument is false, and when all the meanings are properly agreed upon, we are going to be able to see the truth of the argument.

Also, I know it could seem, to some, a hassle to have to be clarifying meanings of terms all the time, but it can be a pleasurable activity too, as I've seen in many threads around here. It's a joy that not other animal on earth gets the luxury of experiencing. There's so much depth of experience available in that activity. Not only the pleasure of the process, if you're nerdy like me, but the pleasure of reaching clarity with friends about a concept that is going to be useful to the group. But we need not satanize concepts and abstractions, we need to agree that concepts are good, are a material part of our human nature (they rest in the atoms of our minds), and helpful to move forward with a certain context of time and space. Thus, they are going to have to be "brought to present value" whenever that context changes, but that, again, can be very pleasurable too.

I think that paragraph from Laertius, while giving importance to the proper, constant and repeated engagement of sensations, (which is great, and probably a huge problem when not done) doesn't disregard reason at all, but rather reinforces it's importance.

I feel a bit more confident that the term "critical thinking" could be the modern meaning of "true reason". The "critical" part is what makes it material and useful for us, as a test, perhaps, yes, of a second order to the sensations, preconceptions and feelings, but an indispensable test nonetheless.