

Syllogistic Reasoning and Canonical Reasoning

Post by “Cassius” of August 17, 2020 at 9:30 PM

I will paste here a few paragraphs that appear to me to be highlights so someone skimming can decide if they want to read the whole thing:

ultimate reality.¹⁸ Yet the Epicureans maintained that on the empirical level language involves no distortion of reality. By a psychological and half-unconscious process based on accumulated experiences, objects have been divided into classes according to their similarities and differences; and by virtue of this process, which produces what Epicurus called “anticipation,” or “apperception” (προληψίς), the person who uses or hears a word knows the sort of object to which that word refers. This is not to say that there is any sort of mental entity to which words refer; it is rather an approach to the later nominalistic view that words refer directly to objects and that the role of the person who relates words to objects is a purely functional one. The validity of this function is assured by the fact that the “anticipation” is based on accumulated experience and thus represents a very broad induction.¹⁹

Important observation from the Epicurean Polystratus, that values are just as real as objects, although neither are reflections of Platonic forms, because they are real TO US:

EPICUREAN LOGIC AND METHODOLOGY 147

contradict appearances.²³ Finally, he gives an empirical approach to the problem of relations. He attacks the stand that relativity has any metaphysical implications. Those who argue that beauty and ugliness are not real by nature because they vary with individuals and situations would also have to admit that largeness, heaviness, and swiftness are unreal; but in doing so they would be going against the facts of experience. Polystratus' own view is that we must recognize as equally real both objects which remain the same in all situations, such as bronze and stone, and relations which always vary with situations. Relations do not exist in the way that objects do, but they are none the less real; and it would be foolish to deny the existence of either objects or relations, or to try to reduce one to the other.²⁴ Polystratus' chief concern in this analysis of relations lies, of course, in the realm of value. He is defending the empirical view that values are not absolute in a Platonic sense, yet they are nevertheless real elements in human experience.