

Source: [KBISOSMasterIndex](#)

---

#flo

Zach's Take: [KB20200828003333](#) Jack's Take: [KBhISOS101Theaetetus](#) Reading: [KBTheaetetusReading](#).pdf

---

1 |

## *THEAETETUS*

Starts by questioning the trust of others knowledge

Disregard Theo's statement of their faces being alike because is not an artist – this doesn't quite follow.

### **Socrates / Plato on Knowledge**

*Sophos* and *sophia* = *expert* and *expertise*

Thea -> Claims that knowledge is perception

Soc -> Argues differing perception of the world + false perceptions

Soc -> perceptions is true for the perceiver,

Soc -> perception = sight, perception = knowledge, memory = knowledge, close your eyes and you are "forgetting."

To say 'He doesn't see' is to say 'He doesn't know', if 'sees' is 'knows'?

Then we have got to say that perception is one thing and knowledge another?

Then knowledge is to be found not in the experiences but in the process of reasoning about them; it is here, seemingly, not in the experiences, that it is possible to grasp being and truth.

Knowledge cannot be found in "sense perception at all," and instead to find knowledge we must engage in thought (judgment)

*True – – Judgment*

(With an account / argument)

Correct judgment accompanied by *knowledge* of the differentness breaks.

1. Knowledge is arts and sciences
2. Knowledge is perception
3. Knowledge is true opinion

**Personal Thoughts: What is Knowledge?**

*Knowledge* does not need to be *truthful* for it to be considered knowledge. We cannot know what is truly, *truthful*. Even things that we “know” aren’t truthful today is / was considered knowledge. Eg. Leaches.

Instead, knowledge should be defined as a set of statements which we assume to be true?

Knowledge = things we know But I think therefore I am and whatnot rendered that definition useless.

Given that we cannot know whether or perception is true or not, it means that any useful definition of knowledge must ignore truth.