The Two Dogmas Of Empiricism

Osaruese Odeh

Two Dogmas

- The first belief is there is exist a fundamental distinction between truths that are analytic, grounded in meanings independently of matters of fact, and truths that are synthetic, or grounded in fact.
 - ► Examples
 - "Radiologists are doctors"
 - "Radiologists are rich"
- Reductionism
 - The belief that each meaningful statement can be reduced to some logical construct in regards to terms which refer to immediate experience.

Quine Views

- Quine proposes three arguments against the logical empiricist
 - There is no synthetic/analytic distinction
 - ▶ There is no reductionism
 - > These two presuppositions are one and the same. There is no distinction

Logical Empiricists

In the attempts to create a connection between our sense data and science

- centered on understanding meaning, in the attempts to further develop Hume's claim that matters of fact trace back to initial sense experience
- This they referred to as the Verification theory of meaning
 - A sentence is meaningful if it is verifiable on the basis of observation
 - Any unverifiable sentence is meaningless
- The problem that arose was determining how sentences should be verified

Analytic and Synthetic Distinctions

- Ayer proposes two arguments
 - A statement has meaning if and only if the proposition it expresses is either analytic or empirically verifiable"
 - A statement is verifiable if some possible sense-experience would be relevant to the determination of it truth or falsehood
- Synthetic Distinction (Observation & Science)
 - Empirical
 - Methods of verification
- Analytic Distinction (Math & Logic)
 - Probability
 - Logic
 - Nonsense

Analytic Characterization (A1-A5)

- Analytic statements are true in all possible worlds
- Analytic true statements cannot be false, conversely, analytic false statements cannot be true
- The denial of an analytic statement is a self-contradiction
- The analytic statement is one in which the concept of the predicate is contained in the concept of the subject
- Analytic statements are true in virtue of meaning

Synonymy

- The argument presented against the analytic/synthetic distinction
- Quine presents three characterizations of synonymy
 - Logic
 - Dictionary definitions
 - Interchangeability

Logic (Meaning postulates)

Carnap presents meaning postulates a means of characterizing synonymy

- The use of axiom to show that two statements are synonymous of one another within any theory
- Theories are best understood through state-descriptions
 - ▶ They associate truth values to atomic sentences of theory
- Following the semantic rules we are able to construct complex sentences, ensuring that all substitutions of synonymous expressions will maintain analyticity
 - Carnap's analytic sentences

Logic (Meaning Postulates) Cont..

- Quine argues that the problem with this characterization is that fail to explain analyticity
- Carnap ways produces many semantic rules for synonymy, it may provide a definition but it fails to show us how to apply it
- Quine criticism of Carnap is we fail to truly characterize analyticity, but express its essence
- Stating analytic statements are true by definition presupposes synonymy rather than explains it

Explication & Interchangeability

- Quine argues that characterization of synonymy as substitutive is faulty
- Linguistics imposes restrictions on synonymy
- He argues that we can only assume substitution in regards to term for term, the problem arises when we attempt to substitute term for words.
 - Bachelor and bachelor of arts
- Quine argues that due to its inconsistency we are faced with claims which tells are unable to express analyticity but presuppose it

Characterization

- Quine argues against these characterizations, stating that analyticity could not exist independent of logical truth
- Synonymy must also be explicated wither by definition or in terms of interchangeability
- Since these characterizations fail then there can be no analytic/synthetic distinction