	MAY 2024 JUNE 2024
	Sun 5 12 19 26 Sun 30 2 9 16 23 Mon 6 13 20 27 Mon 3 10 17 24
July	Wed 1 8 15 22 29 Wed 5 12 19 26 Thu 2 9 16 23 30 Thu 6 13 20 27
MONDAY 183-183 '24	Fri 3 10 17 24 31 Fri 7 14 21 28 Sat 4 11 18 25 Sat 1 8 15 22 29
both under the same umbrella-	namely, the logical structure
of inclusion fexclusion leg; belonging	g or not belonging of terms).
So when he talks about conversion	n of universal negative (privative)
both under the same umbrella— of inclusion/exclusion/eg; belonging Sowhen he talks about conversion premises, hes treating terms abstr	eactly, not ontologically.
. His legic operates at the level	of terms and classes, not
individual existence assertions.	and the property of the property of
. When he says "belongs to every	" or " belongs to none" he is
talking about the logical relations	of predicates to subjects—
not recessarily about whether ex	ther term exists metaphysically.
· Apistotles system lacks explicit	
cases—that is, it doesn't requi	re the subject term to refer
to something that exists. This become	res especially relevant in:
to to the lange of the second of	Mal bearing Olah Do al
involving negations and privatives	A
	(B)
Notes	
That of belongs to every by the	10 wall belong to some A.
for it it belongs to none, neith	er will A belong to any b;
· And if A belongs to every B, then For if it belongs to none, neith but it was assumed to belong-	to every one.