# PHILOSOPHY RESEARCH ARCHIVES

PUBLISHED, MARCH, 1983

VOL. VIII



1982

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

| 1. | CARTESIAN DEDUCTION  | 1   |
|----|--|-----|
| 2. | Richard W. Momeyer, Miami University (Ohio)<br>SOCRATES ON OBEDIENCE AND DISOBEDIENCE TO THE LAW                 | 21  |
| 3. | William Sacksteder, University of Colorado<br>HOBBES' <u>LOGISTICA</u> : DEFINITION AND COMMENTARY               | 55  |
| 4. | Stephen F. Barker, Johns Hopkins University INTENSIONALITY AND INTENTIONALITY                                    | 95  |
| 5. | Merrill Ring, California State University, Fullerton<br>SENSATIONS AND KINAESTHETIC KNOWLEDGE                    | 111 |
| 6. | Thomas R. Foster, Ball State University SYMMETRICAL UNIVERSES AND THE IDENTITY OF INDISCERNIBLES                 | 169 |
| 7. | Robert van Gulick, Rutgers University<br>FUNCTIONALISM AS A THEORY OF MIND                                       | 185 |
| 8. | Warren Schmaus, Illinois Institute of Technology<br>THE CONCEPT OF ANALYSIS IN COMTE'S PHILOSOPHY OF MATHEMATICS | 205 |
| 9. | Lawrence G. Becker, Hollins College<br>KNOWLEDGE AS DOUBLY ANCHORED TRUE BELIEF                                  | 223 |

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

| 10. | J. van Brakel, University of Utrecht<br>CONVENTIONS IN NAMING   | 243 |
|-----|---|-----|
| 11. | Philip Lawton, Trinity College (Hartford)<br>EXISTENTIAL THEMES IN HEGEL'S PHENOMENOLOGY  | 279 |
| 12. | David Basinger, Roberts Wesleyan College<br>ANDERSON ON PLANTINGA: A RESPONSE   | 315 |
| 13. | John Forge, The University of New South Wales<br>TOWARDS A THEORY OF MODELS IN PHYSICAL SCIENCE   | 321 |
| 14. | Joseph W. Smith and Antoon Boey,<br>The Flinders University of South Australia<br>HABERMAS "HEGELIZED"                                  | 339 |
| 15. | William M. O'Meara, James Madison University<br>GEWIRTH AND ADAMS ON THE FOUNDATION OF MORALITY   | 367 |
| 16. | Nancy J. Holland, Hamline University<br>TWO AS AN ODD NUMBER: ON CUMMING ON DERRIDA ON<br>SHAPIRO ON HEIDEGGER ON VAN GOGH              | 383 |
| 17. | Daniel D. Lyons, Colorado State University THE LAST WORD ON COERCIVE OFFERS(?)  | 393 |
| 18. | George R. Carlson, Witwatersrand University INTERNALISM AND SELF-DETERMINATION  | 415 |
| 19. | Edward H. Henderson, Louisiana State University<br>A CRITIQUE OF RELIGIOUS REDUCTIONISM   | 429 |
| 20. | Charles E. Jarrett, Rutgers University MATERIALISM  | 457 |
| 21. | Phillip D. Gosselin, Brandon University<br>MORAL RESPONSIBILITY AND THE POSSIBILITY OF DOING OTHERWISE                                  | 499 |
| 22. | R.J. Connelly, San Antonio<br>NECESSARY ORDER IN THE PRIMORDIAL NATURE OF GOD IN WHITEHEAD  | 513 |
| 23. | Wesley Morriston, University of Colorado<br>PIKE AND HOFFMAN ON DIVINE FOREKNOWLEDGE AND HUMAN FREEDOM                                  | 521 |
| 24. | David and Randall Basinger, Roberts Wesleyan College<br>DIVINE DETERMINATENESS AND THE FREE WILL DEFENSE:<br>SOME CLARIFICATIONS        | 531 |
| 25. | Ronald W. Ruegsegger, Nyack College<br>JUDGING, BELIEVING, AND TAKING: THREE CANDIDATES FOR THE<br>PROPOSITIONAL ATTITUDE IN PERCEPTION | 535 |

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

### CONTENTS OF MICROFICHE SUPPLEMENT TO VOL. VIII

 Robert S. Brumbaugh, Yale University HISTORY AND AN INTERPRETATION OF THE TEXT OF PLATO'S PARMENIDES

ABSTRACT. The present study aims at giving factual support to the thesis that the <u>Parmenides</u> is serious in intention, rigorous in logical demonstration, and stylistically meticulous in its original composition. While this consideration may be tedious, still it is useful. Against a past history which has claimed to find the tone hilarious, the logic fallacious, the work inauthentic, the text in need of bracketing by divination, the whole incoherent—against these eccentricities a certain firm sobriety seems called for. I hope that my conclusions find support and persist through fluctuations of philosophic and philological styles.

The main difficulty with my thesis is that the text as we now have it (in Burnet's and Dies' editions) shows exceptions to every rule that might apply to style and even to logical structure. Thus it is almost but not quite uniformly true that each theorem opens with a theorem statement; that each is marked by a "questioning" response; that each deduction is valid when formalized in propositional calculus; and so on. Are the exceptions the result of careless composition; are they deliberate warnings not to take the proofs too seriously; or are they the result of errors in transmission? One way to test this is to reconstruct early versions of the text: if these show more logical rigor than the later versions the notion of a wholly valid original is supported; if they do not, the result may point toward the need for a less serious interpretation. thing to look for is the possibility that, here and there, parts of a coherent original text are uniquely conserved in sources other than the principal mss, B, T, and W. This assumes, of course, that the "original" text in question is the one with the best logical form, and that assumption seems justified. As a matter of fact, later copyings almost universally show deterioration, not improvement in style and logic.

My textual findings are more compatible with some lines of interpretation than with others. Thus I offer some reasons for not accepting treatments of the work as a joke, mystical revelation, or abrupt metaphysical revision. The structure of the dialogue is best explained, I think, by reading it as an indirect proof that some non-Platonic interpretations of the theory of forms are unsatisfactory. In particular, these are the Megarian versions (represented in the first part of the dialogue by Zeno, in the second by the First Hypothesis), and the Anaxagorean version put forward by Eudoxus (represented in the first part by Cephalus and his friends from Clazomenae, in the second by the Second Hypothesis). At the same time, the dialogue shows

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

the need for a philosophic method other than the "hypothetical-deductive" way of <u>dianoia</u>; presumably this other method is the "dialectic" discussed in <u>Republic</u> VII. It also follows that any interpretation of the <u>Phaedo</u> which falls into either the Eudoxian or Megarian difficulties was not--at least at the date of <u>Parmenides</u>--Plato's intended reading.

Findings concerning the relations and reliability of the manuscripts of this dialogue also apply to the texts of the other Platonic dialogues which these mss contain.

Further, the  $\underline{Parmenides}$  is such an important work both historically and instrinsically that any insight which textual study can bring to its interpretation is a contribution to Western philosophy.

- Paul K. Moser, Vanderbilt University BIBLIOGRAPHY ON PROPOSITIONS AND TRUTH-BEARERS: FROM FREGE TO 1981
- 3. Michael Palmer, Marquette University BIBLIOGRAPHY ON PLATO'S CRATYLUS