

# Issues In The Meaning And Definition of Logic

Post by "Cassius" of August 25, 2021 at 9:35 PM

## [Quote from Don](#)

Wasn't one of Epicurus's big gripes against Socrates that Socrates just ignored the commonly accepted definitions of words or he made up new definitions?

That actually sounds to me more like Cicero's gripe against Epicurus, that EPICURUS was not using words like pleasure in a standard way.... Don't hold me to that but I think so.

## [Quote from camotero](#)

and reason is particular faculty of our own, how come reason is not part of the Canon of Truth? If you ask me, it seems more plausible to find truth in by way of reasoning as the article explains, and the canon is more a canon of morality, rather than of truth.

Camotero with all due respect and affection many of your comments in the recent posts above are (I am confident you are going to find) very off-base as to Epicurus' position. I think you're instinctively taking the majority Platonic / Aristotelian / Stoic position that logic is the center of good reasoning, and I think you're going to find that that (depending on the definition of "logic" and focusing in dialectical logic) is **exactly** what Epicurus rejected as the focus.

Of course working through these issues is exactly what we are here to do, so it will be fun.

However, this thread is already serving as an important reminder to me that it is going to remain a very good idea to jump up and down and shout and all the rest to READ DEWITT FIRST AND/OR EARLY because no one who reads DeWitt will be surprised or taken aback by any of these arguments that deprecate "logic." DeWitt drives home throughout the book how this rejection of Platonic logic is at the heart of his philosophy. So even now I would recommend reading DeWitt's chapters One (for the overview) and Seven and Eight for the focus on these canonical / logical issues. Although due to the way DeWitt presents things telescopically, the same issues appear at multiple places in the book and that's why I recommend the whole thing.

Now don't anyone misinterpret what I just wrote -- I am not chiding anyone. Going through these arguments is extremely helpful to everyone. But the real problem with approaching Epicurus through anyone but DeWitt - even trying to read Diogenes Laertius and Lucretius first - is that it's hard to pick up the significance of the full extent of Epicurus' revolution against virtually ALL who went before him. I am convinced that Epicurus' revolution wasn't based nearly as much on the role of "pleasure" as it was on these issues of the canon and the role of logic. The ethics of Epicurus are strictly secondary and derive from the physics, and the physics

analysis is tightly tied to the canonic.

Of course the bitter truth is that most people are going to come here having read mainly the Cambridge and the Warren and the O'Keefe material. They are mostly as a result going to be so hamstrung on "absence of pain" that they have a long hill to climb to get to the real issues. But these issues of the canonical faculties and the role of logic/conceptual reasoning are where the real battle lies, in my humble opinion! And the opponents of Epicurus are almost more worked up about his rejection of "logic" than they are of his rejection of "virtue" and "religion" -- maybe more so, because the canonic/logic argument is the key to defeating their virtue/piety arguments.