**The problem of epistemological existence of ‘I’**

According to the western philosophical schools, knowledge is indefinable and there is no such existence of knowledge which can be observed or make any sense in human mind. But with the same aspect, it was accepted as “knowing in the same of knowing how”.

Gilbert Ryle includes a term called ‘Capacity Verb’ to describe the knowledge in the global platform. He wanted to describe the knowledge as a capacity verb which expresses human feelings and it is purely decided by the human mind. For example, when I tell that I know Mr. John, which implies I have some ideas about Mr. John like, if someone asks about Mr. John, then I can describe his looks or some nature or provide them with some relative information regarding Mr. John. But we cannot conclude or make any definition of knowledge in such a way because my senses are purely based on our human organs and it can make any false statements. So, in the ultimate way, there is now such a definition and existence of knowledge which can make any sense.

**‘I Think Therefore I am’ – RENE DESCARTES:**

According to Descartes we cannot doubt about our own existence and if I think or I have the thinking ability then I can prove my existence easily. But when a man is in a state of coma and he cannot express his feeling and he does not have any thinking ability, then how should I state his existence? So in this stage, we have to disapprove his existence and we have to count him as a ‘non-existent substance’. But this is the not the right way to prove about any human existence and we cannot judge people’s existence by this particular statement.

This is obvious that people who have thinking ability and who can express their feeling through words and those who have the power of making their own statement, we cannot doubt their existence any more. May be their statements are wrong but this is not related with their own existence. We cannot doubt our own existence and because ‘if I breathe that means I am alive’, ‘if I am visible that means I am a living elements’ and ‘if I am thinking than I am exist’.

**Epistemological doctrine:**

Through this statement of Rene Descartes, we cannot define our knowledge. I can define our existence to some extent but what is knowledge? This is a complicated question in philosophy. If I approve that I am thinking and I exist, so I can make any statement which expresses my knowledge then it will become a blind conclusion of knowledge. My own ‘functional existential figure’ is approved my human existence but it cannot initiate my knowledge as true and I am not an authority to express any statement as true or uncountable. Every statement is facing open argument and all these statements are purely based on the ‘structural-de-structural’ process.

**The problem of epistemological existence of ‘I’:**

Ethical statements can be analytic because we can analyze them from our own perspective. Philosophical statements are much similar to mathematical judgments. We can describe or express our ‘provisional statements’ and those who consider our statement can take its positivity. But I cannot make any statement by the name of ‘knowledge’ because when I express any statement and I claim its positivity and rightness then I have to explain the reasons behind the structure of my statement. If there will be any argue or defamation that arrives against my statement, then my statement will be treated as wrong and my knowledge will become nullified. ‘Knowledge’ should be un-doubtable and I can prove my existence but I cannot prove my ‘knowledge as knowledge (un-doubtable)’.