

Being

- ① what is to be known by the totality of true judgements
 - ② by understanding something about something
 - ③ the system of the pure laws to know
- Equivalents
- ① pure laws is understood
 - ② pure laws are known by their system
 - by coming to an understanding of
 - of on ground out to an end

Why should that be being? // every proposition presupposes a notion of being
 & so every argument presupposes a notion of being
 is involved in a relation with

Arg. 3-12 66 5 for wisdom

wisdom ① for first kind or ② gift of the

but Arg wisdom is developed by Arg wisdom
 first an argument from authority - except in case of
 Dante's Virg. Noel etc - credit for all arguments
 because goes beyond that to that.

What is genesis of wisdom?

Procedure seq. approximation 1-8 wisdom
 9-10 judgment
 11 seq. approximation
 12 notion of being
 13 notion of objectivity
 14 notion
 15 counter-position

Unless ^{one is} being is Aquinas 2a, one is in counter-position
 one's account of knowledge cannot be what is intelligibly grasped
 & rationally known

Line of getting sceptic to talk

By being is known by experience of resistance Scheler
 you rationally affirmed, it is not knowledge of being
 you experience of resistance, not rationally affirmed
 Hence See not just Peirce but Sartre v. Derrida

being

(2)

Arguments: but is this a basic notion can be decided
but in sense that basic notions can be defended
opposed position shows that is common

Either being is what is known by totality of true judgments

or " by some " " "

or " by false judgments

or " by my judgment

If what is known by totality,

(1) then we do not deal with an intellectual act or

Transparence // being is what is known by ^{knowing} truth
truth is what is known by knowing being

(2) since we do not reach truth & knowers are do not reach it
we know that we do not know being fully

If what is known by some

(1) then a part by all

(2) otherwise which form is knowledge & which are not

(3) how can they be true if they do not correspond to being

Being

③

② if being is what is known by false judgement,

③ then being is irrational or unintelligible

eg. A can be both B or not-B as it is false

∴ being is what is self-contradictory

① in this judgement false or true

if false, irrational to assert it

if true, then it is ~~not~~ knowledge ^{withing} ~~of being~~

for being is known not by true but by false judgement

③ if being is what is known without any judgement

then it is known a by experience alone

b by experience + thought

a is a mathematician

b is empiricist, human, idealist, relativist, existentialist

Scholar
Nietzsche
Tropos

being

(4)

being is what is known by itself of true judgement

if on this basis then follows all the acknowledges property of being