

d'Esthétique (pp. 72-88): CHARLES LALO. — Report of the activities of the first Congress of Esthetics held at the University of Berlin, Oct. 6-9, 1913. *Notes et Documents. Commémoration de Roger Bacon*: FRANCOIS PICALET. *Analyses et Comptes rendus.* Félix le Dantec, *La Science de la Vie*: CH. PIEDALLU PHILOCHE. Ph. Chaslin, *Éléments de Sémiologie et Clinique Mentales*: EUGÈNE BERNARD LEROY. Fr. Paulhan, *L'Esthétique du Paysage*: L. ARRÉAT. Leslie Morton Turner, *Le Conflit Tragique chez les Grecs et dans Shakspear*: L. ARRÉAT. K. Jungmann, *René Descartes*: A. PENJON. *Revue des Périodiques.*

Lamanna, E. P. *La Religione nella Vita dello Spirito.* Firenze: La "Cultura Filosofica." 1914. Pp. 496. 7 L.

Limentani, Ludovico. *La Morale della Simpatia.* Genoa: A. F. Formigini. 1914. Pp. xvi + 260. 4 L.

Poincaré, H. *Wissenschaft und Methode.* Leipzig und Berlin: Verlag von B. G. Teubner. 1914. Pp. vi + 283. 5 M.

Rehmke, J. *Die Seele des Menschen.* Leipzig: Verlag von B. G. Teubner. 1913. Pp. 109. 1.25 M.

Seashore, Carl Emil. *Psychology in Daily Life.* New York and London: D. Appleton and Company. 1913. Pp. xviii + 226. \$1.50.

Schinz, Max. *Die Anfänge des französischen Positivismus.* Strasburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner. 1914. Pp. xii + 266. 6 M.

Ten Broeke, James. *A Constructive Basis for Theology.* New York: The Macmillan Company. 1914. Pp. ix + 400. \$3.00.

West, Michael. *Education and Psychology.* London: Longmans, Green and Company. 1914. Pp. viii + 341. \$1.50.

White, Douglas. *Forgiveness and Suffering.* Cambridge: University Press. 1913. Pp. xi + 133.

NOTES AND NEWS

At the meeting of the Aristotelian Society on May 15, Miss F. Rosamond Shield read a paper on "The Notion of a Common Good." That the good is common is an analytic proposition accepted by those who hold that there are fundamental ethical concepts of an irreducible nature; the objectivity of the good involves this common character and transcendence of private opinion. Two reasons why this truism sometimes fails to find acceptance are: (1) Belief that the good of different individuals is conflicting; (2) Confusion of two distinct positions: (a) the good is common; (b) whatever is, is right. The source of the first error seems to lie in confusion between "good" and "interest" on the part of the individual, and in unwillingness to admit that anything may be good which offers little or no hedonistic advantage. Again, conflict of claims between individual and society does not necessarily destroy the validity of common good; neither claim may be fully justified. Nor is it affected by the fact that all good has to be realized under conditions which impose limitations, as well as afford opportunities. The principle of the common good is not necessarily equivalent to optimism, nor to belief in the value of any particular *status*

quo; its chief use is as a criterion; if any apparent good can not show itself to be common, its value must be challenged. Nor does it lead to the Tolstoyan extreme of non-resistance and passivity; content of the good varies with circumstances. According to one view the common good is the goal, rather than the presupposition of ethical endeavor, with consequent denial of its *a priori* character; but what is, from a chronological standpoint, conceived as goal, may be, logically, a necessary implication throughout. The common good is based not simply on the fact of the essential sociality of men, but on the gradual incorporation of facts by reflection into an ideal. The common good demands impartial acceptance of vicariousness. Dr. Dawes Hicks, in opening the discussion, remarked that we were dealing with a problem as old as Plato, and as much alive to-day as in his time: the issue as to whether what we call "the good" is something objective, something actual to be apprehended, and to influence the individual consciousness, or whether it is subjective in the sense that it arises in individual consciousness itself. The term "common" seems to introduce a difficulty, for though it may be easy to contrast the conception of general good with individual interest, when we come to apply it to communities themselves, it becomes impossible, if not meaningless. If the statement of T. H. Green, "God is all that the human spirit can ever hope to become," is the meaning of the term "good," it makes the notion of the development of humanity unreal, for all that is aimed at exists already. Dr. Percy Nunn defended the notion of a purely objective good in the realist sense given to it in the works of Mr. Russell and Mr. Moore. The term "common" added to "good" appears difficult to reconcile with this notion. If we recognize the relationship of anybody to a good, it is difficult to hold the doctrine of its independent objectivity. Dr. Wildon Carr contended that the difficulty arose from the implication that what was good when viewed as an individual whole must retain its character in all the parts into which it could be broken up in analysis. The good might be such that to divide it is to destroy it, and in this sense there was philosophical truth in the saying "There is none good save God." Mr. Delisle Burns called attention to the metaphysical as distinct from the ethical aspect of the question. What is the essential oneness to which you are pointing by the term "common"? If this oneness is between two persons, their continued individuality destroys the definition. The essential oneness is not between myself and the good, but between my neighbor and myself, and if the plurality is gone, there is no meaning left for the term "common."—*Athenaeum*.

PROFESSOR E. C. WILM, Ph.D., LL.D., of Wells College, has been appointed lecturer in philosophy and acting head of the department at Bryn Mawr College for the year 1914-15.

DR. WILLIAM ERNEST HOCKING, professor of philosophy in Yale University, has accepted a chair of philosophy in Harvard University.

DR. R. F. A. HOERNLE, of Durham University, has been appointed assistant professor of philosophy at Harvard University.

DR. EDWARD GLEASON SPAULDING has been promoted to a full professorship in philosophy at Princeton University.