

learnt to consider as the outer world. This we have in common with other persons whose existence we had, as it were, to discover in our infancy, and who have taught us through signs and language to assign to our own self a modest and retiring position among men and things. The explorer of the firmament of the soul will have to recognise as equally real those regions in the field of consciousness which are less fixed, more changing, containing experiences which do not recur with similar regularity, and which, in consequence, we do not externalise; which we share with other minds in vague forms not lending themselves to exact definition. Such exact definition—this term being employed as it is when we speak of the definition of an object under the microscope or the telescope—is dependent on location in space. We may indeed perhaps be right in maintaining that all definite and clear knowledge depends ultimately upon the spatial nature of the constellations or complexes of our sensations; that even logic, with its laws of identity and contradiction, rests upon spatial distinction; and that through this qualification, what in the field of consciousness partakes, and only so far as it partakes, of the spatial property, is capable of rising into the clear daylight of exact thought. Such a view seems implied, if not emphatically stated, by Kant when he maintained that any knowledge was only so far scientific as it partook of mathematics. The whole edifice of this exact knowledge, as it has been built up through generations of thinking minds and as it is largely imparted to each of us individually through intersubjective communion with others, includes and rests upon a conception of

42.
The definite
contrasted
with the
vague.