These substantive possibilities, – that is, qualities, relations, and the like, – are *prior* to existence, in the sense that non-existence is not a necessary proof of non-possibility, but non-possibility is a necessary proof of non-existence. For it is logically impossible that existence should exhaust pure possibilities of any kind. These truths are strictly deducible from the facts of phenomenology, or the analysis of the phenomenon; meaning by the *phenomenon* whatever is present in the mind in any kind of thought.

Phenomenology is the science which describes the different kinds of elements that are always present in the Phenomenon, meaning by the Phenomenon whatever is before the mind in any kind of thought, fancy, or cognition of any kind. Everything that you can possibly think involves three kinds of elements.

Philosophy is divided into (a) *Phenomenology*; (b) *Normative Science*; (c) *Metaphysics*.

...a Phenomenon, that is to say, anything that can emerge in knowledge or in fancy, has in the first place its own peculiar smell, apart from any reflexion or comparisons. But in the second place, the coming of this phenomenon is an event. It strikes me, and I am conscious that it *insists* on recognition. That consciousness of insistence betrays the fact that I have in conservatism *resisted* it. For force without reaction cannot be. Perhaps I even will it to be otherwise; and if so it will be the Phenomenon that will resist. This element is what we chiefly have in mind when we talk of *experience*, which is so much of a cognitive character as insists on sticking. The only remaining element of the Phenomenon is Thought. If we will to alter the phenomenon, we have to make some representation to ourselves of what we propose to do. This is thought. All representation is this third element.