

anything but what I could then substantiate and could still explain, if it should seem advisable. Even the criticism of Prof. Münsterberg's English was not intended as a piece of gratuitous impertinence, but as a serious explanation of what seemed to me the obscurity of his thought. I realised, perhaps more keenly than Prof. Münsterberg, the immense difficulty of expounding so abstruse a philosophy in a popular and lucid and yet adequate way; I felt that he had chosen a mode of expressing his ideas in which he could not do himself justice, that it evinced a certain lack of consideration for his readers not to remove every obstacle from their path that would yield to literary treatment, and that with a little more care and less haste wonders might have been effected. After reading Prof. Baldwin's statement, I can see that every allowance should have been made for articles which have been published and republished 'by special request,' but I fail to follow his argument that a grave loss would be inflicted upon English literature if Prof. Münsterberg should take a single review so seriously to heart as to cease to write in English. This is an *ignoratio elenchi*; for the question, surely, is not whether his work should or should not be rendered accessible to English readers, but whether adequate precautions should have been taken to ensure its appearance in proper literary form. I have no doubt that in future Prof. Münsterberg will not, if he so chooses, have the slightest difficulty in producing his next work in excellent English, and if this should be the happy outcome of the present controversy, English readers of philosophy, so far from suffering loss, will have much reason to thank MIND for so fearlessly publishing a criticism which was at least honest.

F. C. SCHILLER.

Where it is possible for competent critics to differ so widely about the value of a book, it seems advisable to have appreciation of it written from different points of view. I am, therefore, pleased to announce that Mr. R. B. Haldane has consented to write an article commenting on Prof. Münsterberg's work for the April number of MIND.

ED.—G. F. S.

I should be glad to have the opinions of logicians as to whether the implication, *If it is probable that A is certain, it is certain that A is probable*, is always true. My own final opinion (after a preliminary stumble over a treacherous paradox) is that it is not. The implication, of course, always holds good when the word *true* is put for *certain*, for then the antecedent and consequent are equivalent by definition; but, from the probability unsubjective point of view, the words *true* and *certain* are not synonymous.

HUGH MACCOLL.

The *Ethical World*, the weekly record and advocate of democratical movements edited by Dr. Stanton Coit and Mr. J. A. Hobson (17 Johnson's Court, E.C.), shows much increased spirit and an impressive list of new writers with the new year. This week's number (Jan. 6) contains a vigorous article on "The Ethics of Journalism," by H. W. Massingham, an article which gains interest from the recent trouble in the *Daily Chronicle* Office; an article by Mr. Keir Hardie on the "Outlook for Labour"; a declaration of faith in "Ethics and Democracy," by Dr. Stanton Coit; and the first half of a short story of peace and war, entitled "Glorious Recollections!" by the Baroness von Sultner, the well-known authoress of "Lay Down Your Arms!"