

sense, when God causes anyone to perceive Socrates: there is a “constant and regular relation” between God’s concept and the person’s perception; when another person is simultaneously caused to perceive Socrates, both of their perceptions express a “common nature” — viz., God’s concept of Socrates.

Notice that only the unavailable (a), a corporeal-substance-Socrates, would help Leibniz answer Strawson’s most poignant philosophical challenge — his call for a common spatio-temporal world complete with a “demonstrative element” for reidentifying particulars (Strawson, 119). Brown doesn’t address the reidentification issue. He does consider the spatio-temporal requirement, claiming that even the monad-world “could not exist deprived of spatio-temporal phenomenal bodies and their objective correlatives” (79). To bolster this claim, Brown cites Leibniz’s claim that monads “have a certain kind of situation in extension” (G II 253). That’s pretty vague. Leibniz is handwavingly saying, *somehow monads and extension are related*. (Notice also: “extension,” not “space.” I’m letting Brown and Strawson follow some texts in blurring that important distinction here.) It’s a very thin textual thread on which to hang a response to Strawson’s worry that there’ll be no way for someone in Leibniz’s world to point to a public place at a time and indicate that *this snub-nosed guy, the same one that I saw when I was here yesterday, is Socrates*. Indeed, in the text which mentions Socrates, Leibniz’s perceiver, on saying “there’s Socrates,” seems merely to be noting that a Socrates-sense-datum in what Strawson calls her “private space” (Strawson, 124) resembles yesterday’s Socrates-sense-datum — or perhaps someone else’s Socrates-sense-datum in *his* private space. Nothing in the passage forces us to look on Socrates as a

reidentifiable particular enduring through time and inhabiting a public, extra-perceptual space.

Much remains to be done to turn back the full force of the Strawsonian front advancing on Leibniz. But Brown’s study helps show that the historical Leibniz isn’t as hopelessly outmaneuvered as Strawson lets on.

RECENT WORKS ON LEIBNIZ (1990-91)

Central Themes: Spinoza and Leibniz, Studia Spinozana, vol. 6 (Hannover: Walther & Walther, 1990).

Cover, Jan Arthur, *Leibniz on Causality and Time: An Essay in Reductive Metaphysics* (Syracuse University, Dissertation, 1990).

Ishiguro, Hide, *Leibniz’s Philosophy of Logic and Language*, 2d ed. (Cambridge U. Press, 1990).

Jolley, Nicholas, *The Light of the Soul: Theories of Ideas in Leibniz, Malebranche, and Descartes* (Oxford U. Press, 1990).

Kulstad, Mark, *Leibniz on Apperception, Consciousness and Reflection* (*Philosophia*, 1991).

Leibniz, Humboldt, and the Origins of Comparativism, Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, Series III, vol. 49 (John Benjamins, 1990).

Murray, Michael James, *The Second Leibnizian Labyrinth: Psychology, Theology, and Freedom* (U. of Notre Dame, Dissertation, 1991).

Sleigh, R. C., Jr., *Leibniz and Arnauld: A Commentary on their Correspondence* (Yale U. Press, 1990).

CALL FOR CONTRIBUTIONS:

We need your help. You are all invited to contribute to these pages in future issues. To maintain a modest size and cost, we've established an upper limit of three (3) typewritten manuscript pages (standard type size) for each entry. (In rare cases, exceptions to this limit might be in order.) In order to be considered for the 1992 *Review*, **book reviews** must be received by **September 30, 1992**. This will allow us to send a copy to the book's author or editor for review before the final version is printed. Any other news items must be received by **November 30, 1992**. It would help if you could send a note ahead of time announcing your intent to write a piece, and your estimate of its length. Also, if possible put your submission on a 3 1/2-inch floppy disk (single, double-sided, or high density) either as a text-only file or (preferably) in Microsoft Word 4.0 format for Macintosh. Please send it to the Glenn Hartz, Philosophy Department, Ohio State University, 1680 University Drive, Mansfield, Ohio 44906 USA (E-mail: hartz.1@osu.edu Fax: (419) 755-4241 Phone: (419) 755-4354).

EDITORIAL POLICY:

The editorial policy will be to print everything of sufficient interest to our members, allowing for reasonable limits of space and a certain amount of editorial judgment. If changes in the submitted text are required, an effort will be made to get the author's approval before altering it. We will adopt the following attitude towards the difficult issue of a publisher's commercial interest. Our goal will be to notify our members of a sampling of the best

work on Leibniz, no matter who publishes it. If a certain press or journal is featured more prominently in certain issues, this just means that during that particular year it turned out some interesting Leibniz material which caught the attention of someone willing to write about it. Which books and articles are actually announced or reviewed depends mainly on the membership — that is, those who volunteer to write up and submit notices and reviews. There will be no attempt to skew the *Review* towards a particular press, just as no favoritism will be shown to any particular school or style of Leibniz studies. This policy is provisional and is likely to evolve in these early stages in large part on the basis of input from the membership and the Executive Committee.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:

We gratefully acknowledge the efforts of those who wrote items for the *Review*. Funding for the printing and mailing of the *Newsletter and Review* has been generously provided by the Mansfield Campus and the College of Humanities of The Ohio State University. We also wish to thank Tammy Smith for her help with the typesetting.