

From a logical viewpoint it might seem that enough has been said, but two points merit special attention. In the course of Chapter XIV or, at least, by Chapter XVII the reader will be able to hold in a single coherent view the totality of contradictory positions on knowledge, objectivity, and reality. But such a perspective is dialectical or metalogical. It cannot be produced by the logical arts of definition, postulation, and inference. It can be indicated by a book only in so far as there is a communication of insights that in some remote fashion is analogous to the operation of memory or to the migration of feelings. Hence, particularly in our first ten chapters which deal with the genesis of concepts and judgments, of terms and propositions, the only possible vehicle for the essential content of our analysis is a prological and even preconceptual mode of communication.

Secondly, our goal is insight into insight and that goal is reached inasmuch as the insight that is sought rises upon a differentiated series of illustrative insights. But the illustrative insights have to be elementary. We cannot reproduce whole frontlines and, if we could and did, we should do out our purpose. Hence, our illustrations have to be simple insights stripped from their context of further complementary insights that correct, qualify and just, and refine. Now such stripping will pain specialist readers. If they miss our point entirely, it may even convince them that insight itself is as superficial as our illustrations. However, specialists have in their own understanding the remedy for their pain, for they always can bring to light the complementary insights by asking themselves why our illustrations are unsatisfactory. Moreover, if they do so, they can advance rapidly towards an insight into insight while, if they merely grumble that this set of words is strong and that not misleading, they risk encouraging an oversight of insight and even a flight from understanding.