

Transcendentalist would say categories of the understanding, and I acknowledge that understanding is necessary to formulate them, but not that it has them otherwise than through experience, in which pure sensation is the primary, physical perception, or reflection *per* sensation, the secondary, and logical reflection upon consciousness itself, the tertiary element.) Of course, we cannot definitely decide what questions are answerable unless we can definitely decide what categories are ultimate, and there are many Agnostics who content themselves with asserting the ultimateness of consciousness, while leaving the categories unsettled. This is only a seemingly simple solution of a really complex problem; for consciousness means anything and everything until we get at its specific modes, and are able to distinguish the truth about it from fallacies about it, both alike being parts of it.

I will take, by way of example, one category of consciousness, which is, perhaps, the most fundamental—namely, *singular* or *historical existence*: the complementary opposite of generalized existence, or nature. When we look back on the stream of experience, and note that a number of conscious states have succeeded one another, we not only remark, concerning a particular state, that it was of this or that kind, but that it occupied a definite time-position in the series, and was, therefore, in reality, perfectly distinct from states which occupied a different time-position, although those states might be wholly undistinguishable from it in quality, character, or nature. One tick of a clock was just as distinct from the next as any two things can ever be. When, through sight and touch, together with muscular and organic sensations, we acquire the knowledge of a world of matter in space, and learn to measure time itself by the march of outward circumstance, we find that every object and every event has space-position (or positions) united to objective time-position. Even our own states of consciousness have a space-position, identical with some at present undetermined portions of our individual nervous systems. This space-position is not position generalized and idealized, as in comparing fixed positions within an equilateral triangle, taken as a sample of all such triangles. It is position determined, so far as terrestrial objects are concerned, geographically, or as within geographical limits, and, so far as celestial objects are concerned, astronomically. Whatever has the combination of real space-position with real time-position exists in the historical mode of existence, or as a unique item of the cosmos; and every class of objects or events, every kind of material, every property, relation, or law, which is scientifically generalized, is generalized from historical instances. Historical existence, then, is an ultimate category of consciousness; not only of consciousness in its aspect of a physio-psychological activity, but of consciousness in its representative or signficatory aspect. If now we ask *why* things exist in the historical mode, we are asking a question which is only answerable on the assumption that we can somehow dispense with that mode as an ultimate datum, or wriggle ourselves outside of its universal sub-modes of time and space. This assumption is false to all experience, and, therefore, the question is unanswerable.

It may, of course, be said that, whenever a question is unanswerable for