

Theories of Time - University of Oregon Webpage

Post by "Cassius" of December 26, 2024 at 5:20 AM

I also want to commend Joshua's second link for bring out the point I will underline in the quote here. This refers to Parmenides' argument that motion is impossible, but I point it out because this illustrates how these abstract logical assertions can have highly practical (in this case damaging) implications:

Quote

Nevertheless the above arguments seem rationally compelling. We are thus faced with a dilemma:

Either the arguments, despite their persuasiveness, conceal a fallacy.

Rationale: Since valid arguments can never yield a false conclusion, an argument that yields a false conclusion must be invalid. But change is real, because it is so strongly attested by the evidence of our senses so that the conclusion led to by these arguments is false. Hence the argument must be invalid.

Project for the future suggested by this option: discover what this fallacy consists in, and display it to others. (This might mean making some progress in the philosophy of mathematics.)

Or our senses are constantly deceiving us when they register change and motion.

Rationale: There is no fallacy to be discovered in the above arguments, and the conclusion of any valid argument must be true.

*Project for the future suggested by this option: **practice those disciplines that help us progressively to detach us from the senses -- from our body in general. (This might mean practicing some form of asceticism.)***

Display More

With this conclusion:

Quote

Parmenides is reported to have chosen the latter option. It was his view that the testimony of reason was stronger than the testimony of the senses (reasons tell us what can and cannot be the case). Accordingly, he is associated with the view that motion, change, time (all embraced under the term "Becoming") are illusions, and that

reality ("Being") is One and Eternal.

Quote

This position is congenial to those who are inclined to identify this Being with God, and to relegate all else (the many and the changing) -- hence, the material world testified to by the bodily senses, but also any individual personal identity, and hence the supposed experiences of all such entities -- to the category of unreal appearance. God, on this view, is the only reality.

Note that suffering of any sort, because it involves conflict, falls into the domain of the many and the changing. Hence the identification of God with the Parmenidean One can be made to serve the purposes of [theodicy](#). If we classify theodicies by the different kinds of strategies they adopt for solving the problem of evil, then the "Parmenidean" varieties form a group within the larger family of theodicies that **deny the reality of evil.**