

Happy Twentieth of September 2019!

Post by "Cassius" of September 20, 2019 at 8:54 AM

Also: (1) We have a series of prior posts on the Tsouna essay which can be found here: [The Anticipations](#) There's a lot in that essay so it's difficult to summarize it without reading it in full - and as you noted it is long.

(2) I scanned your latest commentary on it that you wrote in this latest post, and I think I generally agree where you are coming from in your criticism and your conclusions. But to be even more clear, if I remember correctly, the controversy boils down to a difference of opinion between Tsouna and David Sedley, who she references in the article. I also seem to remember thinking that the real issue is also linked to whether to consider anticipations in any way "intuitive," which is the description DeWitt gives. There's a lot to unpack here and too much to cover without rereading the essay in detail. But DeWitt's warnings about converting anticipations into meaning nothing more than "concepts" are I think in line with your conclusions in your post. I am not comfortable that Tsouna shares that opinion, though, so I think readers need to be cautioned that her approach and analysis is likely in conflict with DeWitt and probably at least some of Sedley's work too.

And all this is related to the issue of whether there are FOUR criteria of truth, as Laertius says that "the Epicureans generally" (as opposed to Epicurus himself) held to be the case. I consider that to be probably the most dangerous aspect of all of this, and I agree with DeWitt that it is obvious why Epicurus held only three criteria, while the "other Epicureans" added the fourth. In order to eventually come up with a comprehensive view of anticipations I think those issues which DeWitt highlights need to be included in the analysis, and as I recall Tsouna fails to mention DeWitt or his views at all. (I need to check and will revise this if needed.)