

A Method Transcendentali

Inductio

Methodus lati ordinat media ad finem

Methodus stricti ordinat media ad finem, non

determinabilem, sed idealem - In investigatione
in determinabilem vel determinabilem, ^{re}

scientifica quarelibet utique generam et causam, quod

~~utrumque~~ generam sit in veritas - ~~sed~~ de

utrumque quarelibet pro parte et investigatione, quarelibet

non superfluit methodus, et determinabile cognoscunt

aliam in vel causam vel veritas.

Ad methodos investigatas ~~utique~~ peribiles, in
necessarias, sunt acquisitionis et generalitatis empiricae -

Ita hinc methodus investigatae scientificae peribiles generatae,

scripturae processus adhibiti, prospectu in processu

ad finem inducantur, unde generatae non aliquid praesumptum

methodum concludi et proponi potest.

Quod tamen esse non potest fundamentum methodum ^{universal}

~~fundamentum~~ ^{universale}
P enim est fundamentum Q ubi non aut

P est, prius quam Q

si P, tunc Q

si non P, tunc non Q

De inguinita et generalitate empirica
tam ut methodus quaedam
tam debet nisi enclavari probabilis
revisioni perpetua subiacet, nam sua fundata a investigationibus
praebetis, de alia et non fundari poterunt in investigationibus futuris

Unde prout reactio de methodo transcendentali
quae scilicet omnes methodos alias
fundamentum praebet tam ipse sibi tam
aliis methodis omnibus
quae transcendentales dicitur propter universalitatem suum aliquam primariam

Conceptus MT

Investigatio methodi transcendentali

~~duplex potest~~

① Methodus transcendentalis et distinctio cognitio circa actus cognoscitivos
propositio Methodi (distinctio) comprehensivitas

Methodus transcendentalis est cognitio distinctiva
et praesuppositio finis
in methodis particularibus finis est "cognoscere tale obiectum"
et methodus transcendens finis est "cognoscere fundamentum
cognoscendi quocumque
modo a nobis cognoscitur"

Methodus "cognoscere tale obiectum" in verbis praesupposita

① requiritur actus cognoscitivus seu phases successivae

② requiritur directivitas actuum et series

haec sunt conditiones necessariae

| seu actibus seu habetur cognitio
| seu directivitate seu habetur per actus non aliquos ob obiectum

haec sunt conditiones sufficientes

lectio enim et equitudo et actus directivus, habet "cognoscibiliter"

haec sunt conditiones propriae

nam "cognoscere directum" non est nisi
terminus processus in quo praesupposita actus
et series directivitas stabilitas

(NB)

Existencia directi affirmati et non-existentia directi negati,
utroque est conditio propria et necessaria ad "cognoscere directum et
negativum (et negativum)"; et non est conditio sufficiens - cum
dote non existente et non-existentia, finis potest, et
nulla existencia cognoscitivus cum et sicut actus quibus affirmati directivitas

② Fundamentum esse generis "cognoscere dentem"

esse MT equosum & plerumque

iam autem modo deservo, implere,

Spontaneas, naturales, cognoscitur

Nam fundamentum est | actus
directivus

[sed minus actu cognoscitur aliam nam conscientia
omnes normas generis directiva a non-directiva determinate

ad unumquemque generis essentialiter nam actus
Esse sua sponte processu cognoscitur equat

③ Esset MT non potest esse fundamentum tan sci tan aliam indivisionem

Nam ① non absolute in ipso sua determinate

② non necessarie absolute ad omnes aliam equationem

③ non potest unum sponte attributa a omni communi.

Kilb MT ^{potest} est fundamentum tan sci tan aliam indivisionem

equationem est equitas directiva esse

esse est fundamentum omni equationis directiva

esset ipse natura equationis divinorum

4. Helms *Wissenschaftslehre* delirio *in* *noto*
 investigatione empirica quae *revisioni* *radicali* *in* *subiecto*

(a) Elementum empiricum, *bona* *parte*, *entia* *in* *part*
remanens *proxi* *betam* : *esse* *rem* *concreta* *quae* *concreta* *concreta*
novas : *esse* *de* *part* *spati* *quae* *proxi* *in* *concreta*
 Unde *quibus* *proxi* *deductio* [*defini*, *prohibet*] *in* *ipso*
 Unde *in* *a* *elemento* *empirico* *non* *dependet*, *et* *proxi* *in* *—*
quae *in* *mentis* *et* *alibi* (*termini* *prohibet*) *esse* *componunt*
actus *quae* *in* *concreta*, *novas* *quae* *de* *part* *spati* *quae* *in* *concreta*

(b) Possibilitate revisionis radicalis
 Quomodo *elementum* *empiricum* *entia* *in* *part*,
non *ideo* *equale* *in* *concreta* *quae* *concreta* *concreta* *quae* *concreta*
non *idem* *proxi* *sed* *etiam* *radicaliter* *non* *concreta* *proxi*

Nam ① *elementum* *in* *est* *hypothetica* *ad* *concreta* *quae* *concreta*
 "non" "vel *elativa*" "non *proxi* *Entia*"

② *possibilitate* *revisionis* *habet* *suas* *conditiones*
 * *MT* *proxi* *in* *talis* *et* *in* *conditione*
possibilitate *revisionis* *includit*
 quae *a* *revisione* *proxi* *proxi*, *revisione* *in* *proxi*

II *MT* *in* *concreta* *in* *concreta*, *et* *in* *concreta* *in* *concreta* *in* *concreta*
possibilitate *revisionis* *in* *proxi* *in* *concreta* *in* *concreta*

Sketch ^{system} of knowing equational sets

^{how} knowing ^{knows} is not a common sense ^{equally} applicable
to all equational sets ^{being} ^{regarding} ^{understanding} ^{etc}
but means a comprehension of equational sets,
a structure to set of sets ^{or} ^{deterministic} ^{relationships}]

Structure from IP of Regel: what is expressed by sense

is expressed about by understand, what is expressed about
is what is imagined and described words, what is
imagined is what is understood, what is
both imagined (common words) & expressed by understanding (form)
on combined in the concept (definition ^{is} ^{thought}, ^{hypothesis},
theory), what is expressed in the concept is reflected in (usage)
what is reflected in is what is seen to possess sufficient
evidence for a prospective judgment, what is
seen to possess sufficient evidence is what is permitted

in judgment process of permitted from depth of sense & depth of judgment.
condition of possibility: what is the what that is expressed
expressed with imagined understanding etc - it must be seen & the
same throughout - it is the ess understanding, depth
of fund set applied to data grouped in large concepts -
extent of a set seen to possess sufficient evidence also applied

Structure

what is known subject : it is not the subject
since subject of some knowledge called "knowing";
the knowing is a structure - it is the
structure (not of practical objects that determine
the content of being) -

the
the practical objects are - essence - particular -
judgment - form - content matter content in
concept - particular matter added by reflection to them

since any proportional degree of human
will be qualitative for action - but corp exists

Structure for VP of subject on + structure must

sense, imagination, understanding, conscience, reflect,
through the essence, & judgment - concrete subject is a body

at least expressed internally -

the subject is the active principle of the process

he must be intelligent - else no good act - as conscience

he must try to understand - else no imagination

he must actually understand - else no group of form abstracted conscience

he must conscience - else no conscience of form

he must be rational, with activity group different from logical principles, and necessarily

he must be intentional, with a group of not understanding is essential

he must be essentially
intentional
necessarily - discovered how he works in intentional

The subject is the cross class action principle

the name of the person

is fact they are given

need to attend about identity

need to verify, represent, by imaginary symbols,
to analyze, reject, weigh evidence, judge

N.B. same structure as Kumar's object sanctity given

Chpts 1-10 - [advertisements
marketing]

Chp 11 - quality, weight evidence, judging

General proof

either ^{on some} account of directivity shapes the criteria
 of experiential, normative, and absolute directivity
or it does not

if it does ^{not}, then the hypothesis can be ruined on the score

- ① that it does not satisfy the criteria
- ② that it is shaped or killed
- ③ that it is ~~absolutely~~ doubtful

if it does, then either it amounts that

the direction is not relative to the criteria of exp. norm. absol. directivity
 or it does not

(in the former case it is coherent
 in the latter it is not)

Particular case of general truth = propositional
coherence

from criteria to definition of truth

unconditional → unconditional positivity = operation "is"

equation between what you say of you & what is

TM shows
 what propositional
knowing is
 propositional
 presentation for
 saying and a way
 down to operation
knowing

The Real

Ontology, Metaphysics = an account of the real

operation or non-operation

You cannot intelligibly blatantly say that positivism is not propositional
 because of real

have systematic elucidation of epistemic issues of knowing, directivity, reality

knowing that real is
 "is" is not propositional
with positivism

Objective knowing or transcendental process

What? | not what is merely imagined merely object of thought and sense to be
— | but what is

Basic intention, freedom — unconditioned is unconditioned

would then not be a reality
truly other than anything
in course ^{of} becoming again?

If you ask about it, you have conceived

Affirmation — unconditional
not limited by unconditioned

What is opposed? — unconditioned

is not conditioned by subject's freedom

what subject happens to

feel, emerges, feel

is inclined to think

works are so

Objective — Conditioned transcendental condition of knowing a subject

of structure of human mind

Subjective

~~transcendental~~ finite conditions that relate to
the closed world
contingency, possible conditions

condition has a meaning when condition or restriction — ground

Structure of human mind is ① unconditioned ground
② demand for a condition

transcendental condition of knowing a subject is not restrictive
do not found a distinction between "process" and "object" — they understand
possibility of that distinction — they are

Objective our theory is conditional $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{by background conditions of theory and/or} \\ \text{by structure of human mind} \end{array} \right.$

Assertion is significant if background conditions are substantive, if they ground a distinction between $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{objects} \\ \text{facts} \end{array} \right. \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{really} \\ \text{appear} \end{array} \right.$

Assertion is meaningless, if background conditions are such as to exclude possibility of distinction between $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{really} \\ \text{appear} \end{array} \right.$

background conditions are $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} 1^{\circ} \text{ unrestricted range} \\ 2^{\circ} \text{ unconditional} \end{array} \right.$

why is this not merely formal validity
because it does not qualify all valid
judgments by those app "they appear" K_r
is unconditional regard not what appears
but what is

Transcendental Method & History : $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{categories / method consciousness} \\ \text{development of logic} \longrightarrow \\ \text{development of scientific methods} \\ \text{further developments of} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{internal} \\ \text{intellectual} \\ \text{human nature} \end{array} \right. \text{ then some fit in} \end{array} \right.$

Real Appearance $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} 1^{\circ} \text{ showing "scientific" reality under CS appearance} \\ 2^{\circ} \text{ subdividing "out there"ness} \\ 3^{\circ} \text{ Reality is what would be known if human beings} \\ \text{not constructed to be and diversely, anticipated} \end{array} \right.$

Prof. Salsari, Digiante

La Var., g. 1, a. 9

Mano Rucini