du sentiment par laquelle il comprend ce qui lui manque pour être ce qui est."

Upon this basis the book proceeds to show in detail the manner in which art has been a progressive realization of elementary forces of life by means of the emotions of reality which it affords. The chapters upon the æstheticising of the categories of space and time, of unity and infinity, upon the social necessity of reflection upon the real, and the essentially æsthetic qualities of the past as compared with the present and future are interesting, both as developments of M. Pérès' doctrine, and also as specimens of fine metaphysical analysis.

In conclusion we may call attention again to the originality of these analyses of the sentiments of the Real and the Beautiful.

WILBUR MARSHALL URBAN.

URSINUS COLLEGE

Studies of Good and Evil. JOSIAH ROYCE. New York, D. Appleton & Co. 1898. Pp. xv+384.

In this collection of essays Professor Royce has presented the principles of his idealistic philosophy in their application to the problems of life. They show the author at his best in the sphere of concrete thought. His idealism is here essentially a philosophy of reality. He touches upon various themes, most of which bear upon the ethical aspects of life. His topics range from the problem of Job to modern character studies in the essays on *Meister Eckhart* and *Jean Marie Guyau* and such social problems as are suggested by *The Squatter Riot of 1850 in Sacramento*. The several essays on consciousness and also the one entitled *The Case of John Bunyan*, must prove of special interest to the student of psychology; those who are interested especially in the mental experiences of the abnormal type will appreciate Professor Royce's exhaustive analysis of Bunyan's religious experience.

JOHN GRIER HIBBEN.

The Conception of God. A Philosophical Discussion Concerning the Nature of the Divine Idea as a Demonstrable Reality. By JOSIAH ROYCE, JOSEPH LE CONTE, G. H. HOWISON and SIDNEY EDWARD MEZES. New York, The Macmillan Co. 1897. Pp. xxxviii + 354. Price, \$1.75.

These papers were originally presented in a discussion concerning the being of God which was held under the auspices of the Philosophical Union of the University of California. To the main discussion there is added a supplementary essay by Professor Royce outlining

his position more in detail. The main argument is by Professor Royce, and is unfolded with his usual skill and dialectic subtlety. In the implications of our ignorance he finds the intimation of an absolute knowledge, and in the attribute of omniscience he discovers the germinal concept of God, insisting, however, that absolute knowledge also implies love, will, wisdom and the other divine attributes. His position of monistic idealism is combated by Professor Howison, who urges the impossibility of reconciling an immanent God with the free activity of individuals. Professor Royce, in rebuttal, discusses at length the principle of individuation which according to his view lies in that exclusive interest which is characteristic of the individual will. He, therefore, very stoutly maintains that the unity of the world in terms of self-consciousness does not destroy individuality as Professor Howison would insist, but, on the contrary, while transcending the category of individuality, the unity of consciousness need not, however, sunder the individuals which are embraced in it.

Professor Mezes' main criticism of Professor Royce's argument is that the concept of God as given by Professor Royce seems to lack the elements of spirituality. In defense, however, it is urged that the idea of spirituality, so far as it is a valid idea, must be one of the ideas which the Absolute finds fulfilled in his experience. In other words, Professor Royce contends that the idea of spirituality is implied in his concept of God, inasmuch as an absolute knowledge and experience must be an absolute knowledge and experience of the spiritual as well as of the purely intellectual elements of consciousness.

Professor Le Conte in this discussion urges that the concept of God is illumined by a true interpretation of the phenomena of evolution. He finds in the process of evolution a real progress from what he designates a diffused form of Divine Energy to a personal form. Professor Royce does not seem, however, to be in sympathy with Professor Le Conte's metaphysical interpretation of the theory of natural evolution, and insists, moreover, that along such lines of thought very little progress will be made towards a solution of the vexed problems of evil, of immortality, or of freedom.

This discussion is of special significance inasmuch as it has not been a mere clashing of conflicting opinions, but, on the contrary, the several participants seem to agree substantially "in recognizing," as Professor Howison himself remarks, "in some form or other an organic correlation among the three main objects common to philosophy and religion—God, Freedom, Immortality."

JOHN GRIER HIBBEN.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.