

"Dualism" and "Philology"

Post by "Mike Anyayahan" of January 22, 2020 at 11:18 PM

ADMIN EDIT BY CASSIUS 1/23/20: Because Mike's comments here are pretty technical I have moved this part of the discussion to a new thread. It originally came from the thread: [Feedback From A User](#)

Also: Epicureanfriends is primarily a forum for generalists, and I hesitate to let the public discussion go too deeply into highly technical issues that would leave the general reader behind. If someone wants to explore these issues more deeply, I would appreciate that person providing summary definitions of the terms rather than using them and expecting readers to know them already.

Here is a list of terms that probably should be defined before going further. Rather than simply giving a link it would be preferable to be able to summarize what they mean in a couple of sentences. I don't have the time to do that right now myself but brief definitions of these would need to be provided for the conversation to be meaningful; otherwise it would be better if the people involved discussed them privately using the "conversation" feature: Cartesian dualism; Kantian idealism; Solipsism; Philology

NOW HERE IS MIKE'S POST:

I have noticed that the discussion circled around "innate ideas" and "indeterminacy." All these sound like Cartesian dualism and Kantian idealism. I have not yet read DeWitt deeply so I don't know whether or not he had Cartesian and Kantian root. But even so, DeWitt might be right if he finds proper to resort to abstraction and similitude for the sake of categorization since our sensation must be expressed in words in order for our subjective sensation and experience to be communicated with others. Otherwise, Epicureanism is nothing but one form of Solipsism which I don't think to be the case. Besides, we can see across the works of Epicurus that the importance of reason and philosophy has been repeated and emphasized.

And philosophy involves abstraction. It's not something like this philosopher said this, or this is said elsewhere in a particular passage of the text of this and that scholar or thinker with a particular quote of a context of this and that... That is not philosophy. That is Philology which is a study of what has been said of something. When Epicurus mentioned philosophy, I think he was referring to some sort of abstraction and not to an activity of sharing the ideas of philosophers.