

Le vocabulaire philosophique. By EDMOND GOBLOT. Paris, A. Colin. 1901. Pp. xiii + 489.

One is surprised that a single individual should attempt, alone, to compass the entire realm of philosophy in a terminological dictionary. The boldness of such a venture will rouse admiration if the effort attain a certain degree of excellence, while it can but excite ridicule if the result fall below the same instinctively felt level. M. Goblot's work happily belongs to the former category: still, we may liken his success to that of an experienced waiter, who manages to meet the wants of a roomful of guests after a fashion—whereas if several waiters had responded the work would have been done with more thoroughness and greater ease. In the same way, we feel that the cooperation of a certain number of specialists is essential to the completeness and accuracy of any philosophical dictionary. Whether the author had any such assistance we do not know; there is no hint of it in the book itself. Of indirect aid, such as citation and use of authorities, there is abundant evidence; but this is satisfactory only where the lexicographer himself is thoroughly familiar with the subject.

In view of the wide range covered, one cannot but feel satisfaction over the general exactness of the definitions (a large number of which from every department were selected as a test), tempered by a shade of uncertainty regarding any crucial points which one might wish to settle by the aid of this work. M. Goblot himself, in the introduction, thus expresses himself regarding the aims and limits of his dictionary: "1. Nous nous sommes proposé de faire connaître aux profanes, aux élèves, aux étudiants—peut-être même aux maîtres et aux philosophes, lesquels sont étudiants toute leur vie,—le sens usuel des mots. Ils devront donc avoir constamment sous la main notre *Vocabulaire*, et le consulter fréquemment, soit en lisant, soit en écrivant. Et nous ne saurions trop leur recommander d'y chercher, non seulement les mots étranges et d'aspect technique, mais surtout les mots les plus familiers de la langue vulgaire, dès que la moindre obscurité se rencontre dans leur emploi; car ces mots usuels reçoivent souvent, en philosophie, une signification toute spéciale, et sont les plus équivoques. * * * 2. Nous avons parfois,—prudemment, timidement même,—proposé des réformes du langage reçu. * * * Le travail que nous présentons au public est, à la vérité, fort imparfait. On voudra bien le considérer comme un essai. Il se perfectionnera, s'il a l'heureuse fortune d'avoir des éditions successives." A mixture of confidence and diffidence which leaves one untrammelled in the formation of his own opinion of the work.

The field which M. Goblot aims to cover is, thus, nothing less than the entire domain of philosophy. It will be interesting to note his conception of the extent of this domain and his ideas as to the relative importance of the several branches included. The themes connected with logic are treated with the greatest fulness. The various forms of judgment and inference, and the endless array of terms associated with these processes by Scholasticism, are given; among the A's alone, *e. g.*, *abduction*, *abstraction*, etc., *absurde*, *per accidens*, *méthode d'accord*, *a contrario*, *in adjectivo*, *alternative*, *ambiguïté*, *analyse*, *antécédent*, *jugement d'antériorité*, *antithèse*, *raisonnement apogogique*, *apodictique*, *argument*, *assertion*, *assertorique*, *axiome*. All the types of syllogism and their formulas (*barbara*, etc.) are discussed. In fact, so far as logic is concerned, the work amounts almost to a text-book. Metaphysics is almost, if not quite, as well represented; the chief ontological and epistemological concepts are included, together with many less important ones, and some possessing merely historical interest. The article on *âme*, one of the longest in the book, discusses the principal theories of the soul, though without doing full justice to so broad a topic. Next in order, perhaps, should be ranked psychology. If the large number of terms relating to mental pathology be included here, the psychological vocabulary will appear extremely full. Yet when we come to examine this topic more minutely we shall find some astonishing omissions. In the evolution terminology the work is very thorough (see especially *évolution*, *variabilité*, *concurrence vitale*, *espèce*). Sociology and philosophy of religion are well represented. It is gratifying to find the basal concepts of mathematics and physics included (*continuité*, *fonction*, *intégration*, *non-euclidien*; *force*, *moment*, *mouvement*, etc.). Terms connected with the anatomy of the nervous system are also numerous, but the ground for inclusion or omission is not clear in many cases. Ethics is the branch which suffers most in treatment. The definitions are noticeably brief; often the ethical significance of a term is hopelessly subordinated to the psychological (*e. g.*, *motif*, *intérêt*, *déterminisme*).

This leads us to speak of another matter in which the *Vocabulaire* is extremely deficient, viz., a broad historical grasp of terminology. We can scarcely criticise the omission of particular school names (Stoicism, Cartesianism, etc.) which cover a whole mass of separate doctrine; we refer rather to the general disposition on the part of the author to regard these terms from a fixed standpoint, instead of tracing them through their successive phases of historical development. Occasional exceptions (*e. g.*, *durée* and *temps*) serve only to accentu-

ate the general practice. The influence of Maine de Biran is too predominant in the discussion of contemporary thought, and that of Descartes in the early modern phases, while the Scholastic interpretation colors too strongly the products of Greek thought. Seldom is there an endeavor to distinguish the meaning of terms as used by different schools of thought; a single authority usually suffices.

On the other hand, too much can not be said in praise of the distinctions, sometimes subtle and original, which the author draws between certain cognate terms. Thus, his suggested differentiation between dissociation and abstraction, making the former a general process and the latter a resolution into mental atoms, might commend itself to English-speaking psychologists as well as French. His careful delimitation of universal and general, on the one hand, as opposed (respectively) to particular and individual (or singular), on the other, might also prove of advantage. So, too, the distinction between *mémoire*, *souvenir* and *réminiscence*, though in part inapplicable to English terminology, suggests a valuable distinction.

The psychological side of M. Goblot's work merits some special attention on our part. And here we find ourselves at once pleased and disappointed. In many respects exhaustive and abreast of the times, there is occasionally an omission so surprising in character as to cause us no slight astonishment. Let us take the sense of vision as an illustration. In physiology we find *adaptation* and *accommodation*, but not *convergence*; in anatomy, *chiasma* and *couche optique*, but not *œil* nor *rétiline*. There is a brief definition of *vision* as 'acte du sens visuel,' and of *vue* as 'faculté de percevoir les sensations de lumière et de couleur,' but *lumière*, *optique*, *couleur* and even *sens visuel* are wanting, though the *sens thermique* and *sens de l'équilibre* are treated; on the other hand, *cécité*, *achromatopsie*, and *hémianopsie* are allowed a place. Under the heads of *binoculaire* and *distance* the visual space perception is discussed, though inadequately, and this is supplemented, under *acuité des sens*, by a discussion of near- and far-sightedness. This will serve to indicate the disproportionate treatment. The articles on *conscience* (consciousness), *attention*, *association*, *sensation*, *perception*, *intellectuel*, etc., are very full, while the affective and motor sides are only imperfectly represented.

The present reviewer will not presume to make an estimate of the terminological distinctions which belong to the genius of the French language; neither will he pass upon the technical exactness of some of the definitions. For the beginner in philosophy and for the general student, the work should prove serviceable; its omissions and limita-

tions, however, prevent its acceptance as an authority in any case; nor is it likely to prove of any great value to the English reader.

We close with an example chosen at random from among the shorter articles; it is typical of the style of treatment adopted in a majority of cases; a few definitions are limited to a single sentence; some discussions extend to 300 words or more, but this is exceptional. "Compossible: Mot de Leibnitz. Un événement qui, pris séparément, est possible, peut n'être pas *compossible* avec le reste de l'univers. Dieu conçoit 'tous les mondes possibles,' des systèmes d'êtres et d'événements qui sont cohérents en eux-mêmes, mais dont chacun exclut tous les autres. Chacun d'eux est donc un système complet de compossibles, et Dieu, qui les connaît tous, choisit *le meilleur*."

H. C. W.

LOCALIZATION OF BRAIN FUNCTION.¹

1. *Experimental researches upon the cerebral localization of the tactile, olfactory and gustatory senses.* G. ANDRIANI. Ital. Cong. of Psychiatry, 1896.
2. *Ueber die Entwicklung der Rindencentren.* A. BARY. Arch. f. Physiol., 1898, 341.
3. *Ueber die Lage der motorischen Rindencentren des Menschen nach Ergebnissen faradischer Reizung derselben bei Gehirnoperationen.* W. VON BECHTEREW. Arch. f. Physiol., 1899, 543.
4. *Ueber die sensiblen Functionen der sog. motorischen Rindenzone des Menschen.* W. VON BECHTEREW. Arch. f. Physiol., 1900, 22.
5. *Zur vergleichenden Physiologie des Grosshirns.* A. BICKEL. Arch. f. d. ges. Physiol., 1898, LXXII., 190.
6. *Ueber corticale Reizung der Augenmuskeln.* R. DU BOIS-REYMOND und P. SILEX. Arch. f. Physiol., 1899, 174.
7. *A note on the comparative intellectual value of the anterior and posterior cerebral lobes.* C. CLAPHAM. Journ. Med. Sci., 1898, XLIV., 290.
8. *Cortical motor centres of the Opossum.* R. H. CUNNINGHAM. Journ. of Physiol., 1897-8, XXII., 264.
9. *Beobachtungen an einem Affen mit verstummeltem Grosshirn.* F. GOLTZ. Arch. f. d. ges. Physiol., 1899, LXXVI., 411.

¹ This article is intended to give a brief résumé and review of the principal articles upon the function of the cerebrum which have appeared since 1895.