tool of tools, is the cherishing mother of all significance" (E & N, 186). This is not a complete statement of Dewey's pragmatic view, but it will intrigue those who might want to read some American epistemology or metaphysics, perhaps even something involving philosophy of language and meaning. In arriving at his extremely misleading characterization Palmer might have mis-read passages such as ". . . for meaning is a method of action, a way of using things as means to a shared consummation, and method is general, though the things to which it is applied are particular" (E & N, 187).

There are other complaints, e.g., Palmer seems to give Mill's interpretation of how Kant's categorical imperative works (pp. 218, 19). However, in a work that covers the history of philosophy from early Greek to middle of the 20th century this is to be expected. We all have our own strong and weak areas, our own strong views on this and that. I don't want to leave the reader with a negative impression, for I was not so left. Students may well find *Looking at Philosophy* a useful guide in finding their way through the many arcane texts we assign in an introductory or history of philosophy course.

Bernard Rosen, Philosophy, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210 USA

Classic Philosophical Questions, 6th Edition, James A. Gould, ed.
Merrill, 1989, 591 pp., $22.95 pbk.

JESÚS A. DÍAZ

The number of editions a book has been through since its first publication and the interval between them are gauges of market demand. *Classic Philosophical Questions* (CPQ), now in its sixth edition, was first published in 1971; an average of 3.5 years has passed between editions. Continuing demand for textbooks is created by instructors, based on their perceptions of usefulness, so these facts speak well for this book.

CPQ is an anthology for use in undergraduate introduction to philosophy courses. It contains selections from various sources, almost all unanimously recognized as classics. The selections come from the ancient, medieval, and modern periods. The book has nine sections: I./ The Trial of Socrates (Apology, Phaedo, and Crito); II./ The Methodologies of Philosophy (Peirce, Feigl, and Russell); III./ Ethics (James, Mill, Aristotle, Bentham, Kant, Nietzsche, Sartre, Ruth Benedict, and four others); IV./ Theory of Knowledge (Descartes, Locke, Hume, Kant, Reid, Hospers, Bergson, and six others); V./ Metaphysics (Plato, Hume, Berkeley, Russell, Taylor, and Malcolm); VI./ Philosophy of Religion (Anselm, Aquinas, Paley, Kierkegaard, Tillich, Hick, Pascal, Griffiths, and Dostoevski); VII./ Political Philosophy (Dostoevski, Marx, Engels, Mussolini, Dewey, Mill, Muller, Firestone, and Blackstone); VIII./ Aesthetics (Ducasse, Beardsley, Collingwood, and Tolstoy); and IX./ The Meaning of Life (Tolstoy and Camus).

The instructor can cover the sections in any order, for none presupposes that another has been previously read. I open my introductory course with Socrates'

trial, and then assign Sartre as preparation for Section IX. Section VI follows, but I momentarily divert to one of the selections from Hume (Section IV) to show how Aquinas' five ways, due to their reliance on sense data, are vulnerable to Hume's arguments about our inability to know causal connections by empirical means. I go on to Section IV after finishing VI. Sections III and VII follow, and I close with the selection from Russell's *The Problem of Philosophy* (Section II), where he defends the value of philosophy despite its failure to provide answers or solve its problems.

Each of these nine sections is divided into subsections; these subsections, whose titles are always stated as interrogative sentences, are composed of two or more selections which give different answers to the title question. For example, Section VII opens with the question "What is freedom?" Dostoevski's passage defends the view that freedom is authority, John Stuart Mill's the view that freedom is democracy and that free speech should be unlimited.

This method of opening with a question and using selections providing alternative answers is a chief strength in this book, for it clearly signals that final answers (if there are any) have not been found. It is regrettable, however, that only seven out of a total of 22 title questions are answered by more than two readings. Some of the remaining 15 questions answered by only two selections may give students the mistaken idea that the issue has only two sides. Nowhere is this danger greater than in the Firestone/Blackstone and Tolstoy/Camus exchanges. Firestone presents the view of a radical feminist, Blackstone a moderate to conservative position; Camus represents an agnostic position on the meaning of life, Tolstoy a theist. Other approaches to these issues are not included.

Each selection begins with a biographical sketch of the author and a list of his or her principal publications, except for Bradley, Reid, Hospers, and Taylor, for whom no publications are listed. These biographies are followed by introductory explanations which explain the selection about to be read and relates it to other selections in the same or other sections. For example, the explanation preceding the selection from Ducasse's *The Philosophy of Art* outlines some of the basic questions aestheticians ask and announces the position Ducasse defends. A similar explanation introduces a passage from Beardsley's "Tastes Can Be Disputed" and contrasts it with Ducasse's.

Study Questions always follow these explanations. Such questions alert students to the key ideas in the selection they are about to read. In the preface, Gould suggests that instructors may find it valuable to structure the class around these questions. Let us look at two randomly selected examples to get an idea. The selection from Hume's *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding* has five such questions: 1) What is Hume trying to illustrate by the example of the billiard balls? 2) What is the difference between the "will" and the example of the billiard balls? 3) What three arguments does Hume give against the idea of "willing" proving the idea of power or necessary connection? 4) How does Hume believe the idea of necessary connection arises among events? 5) How does he define cause? The selection from Firestone's *The Dialectic of Sex* also has five questions: 1) In what sense is male culture parasitical? 2) How does Firestone characterize romanticism? 3) Explain: "sex privatization." 4) Explain: "beauty as an ideal serves a political function." 5) Explain: "We demand the elimination of eroticism."

At least eight changes differentiate the sixth edition from the fifth. The Phaedo has been added to Section I, and the selection from Russell's *The Problems of Philosophy* I alluded to earlier has been moved from the first to the second section. Benedict replaces Sumner as spokesperson for ethical relativists. Plato's Myth of Gyges replaces de Mandeville's defense of egoism. Hume's skepticism about causal connections is countered by Reid rather than Whitehead, but the explanation on page 275 still asserts a selection by Whitehead is forthcoming. Shulamith Firestone represents feminism, replacing Sandra Lee Bartky. Selections from Aristotle and Bergson have been dropped from Section VIII.

CPQ is one of several anthologies aimed at the same audience. The judgment of which is best can only be made by each instructor, based on course content and objectives, student population, and other factors. Nonetheless, reviewers serve their readers best by comparing the book reviewed to its competitors. The comparisons that follow are brief, due to limitations of space. I shall only mention books with publication dates close to CPQ's latest edition. The sources to be compared fall in one of two categories. Category A includes anthologies with selections all will regard as philosophical (perhaps I am naive enough to believe philosophers will agree on this). Anthologies in category B contain the type of selections in category A plus recent sources that try to make philosophy relevant to contemporary issues. These include applied philosophy, feminism, and passages from nonprofessional philosophers. Limitations of space force me to discuss just one book in each category and merely list others. CPQ is in category B.

J. F. Crowley's *The Changing World of Philosophy* (Wadsworth, 1989) is a competitor in category A. Several of Crowley's selections are from the same sources as CPQ, but Crowley has readings from Epictetus, Hegel, and Wittgenstein, three authors CPQ omits. Interstitial explanations and chronological arrangement of the selections differentiate this anthology from CPQ. This arrangement might make it awkward to give reading assignments in nonchronological order. By emphasizing epistemology, metaphysics, ethics, and political philosophy, Crowley's anthology is more focused than CPQ. All selections end with study questions and bibliographies. Crowley's editing of Descartes' *Meditations* is better than Gould's. The latter edited the First and Second Meditations only; the former edited all six Meditations, thus showing the reader Descartes' foundationalism did not stop with knowledge of one's existence as a thinking thing. Crowley also has good selections from Rawls and Nozick; it is disappointing that Gould's section on political philosophy contains no selections from these philosophers. Other sources in category A are: L. Pojman's *Philosophy: The Quest for Truth* (Wadsworth, 1989) and J. Feinberg's *Reason and Responsibility* (Wadsworth, 1989, 7th edition).

Bowie, Michaels, and Solomon's *Twenty Questions: An Introduction to Philosophy* (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1988) is a candidate in category B. Like CPQ, this book has sections dealing with philosophy of religion, epistemology, ethics, aesthetics, political philosophy, and the meaning of life; but it also has sections on philosophy of science, creationism *vs.* evolution, the mind-body problem, the relation between computers and the brain, philosophy of language, free will and determinism, personal identity, emotions, abortion, death, and sexual equality. The nine selections on the meaning of life are sufficiently diverse to make the section immune from the sort of criticism which applies to Gould's section on the same topic.

As far as I know, *Twenty Questions* is one of the very few anthologies of its class which includes a significant number of works by nonwhite and women authors. (All of Gould's selections, except Firestone and Benedict's, are by white men; Crowley's are all by white men). These inclusions were motivated by the editors' view that "while most traditional philosophers are white males, many students are not. Students need to know that people like them sometimes do philosophy" (v, Preface). Some fourteen percent of the approximate total of 160 authors are women. But the record on nonwhite authors, regardless of gender, is less impressive. Only four selections are taken from them, and three of these average two pages each. A short story by Caribbean writer Jamaica Kincaid is seven pages long. Though the editors present Kincaid's story as "a picture of a friendship between two (school) girls that can serve as a basis for further reflection on the views of friendship offered by the philosophers you have read" (601), some might interpret it as a lesbian love story; but this interpretation is by no means conclusive. My unfamiliarity with Kincaid and her work, and the editors' lack of explicitness, makes it hard to assess if the editors tried to include a passage from a gay or lesbian author. If this was their purpose, it would have been better accomplished by selecting papers that explicitly explore the ideals of the gay and lesbian movement. Works by Richard Mohr and Sarah Hoagland come to mind, though there are others. Whatever the case, Kincaid's story exemplifies a feature this book and CPQ share —the use of several selections from nonprofessional philosophers who raise philosophical issues. CPQ's nonphilosophers include anthropologist Ruth Benedict, Dostoevski (two selections from *The Brothers Karamazov*), and Mussolini. Instructors whose interests interface literature and philosophy may find this approach attractive. Other sources in category B are: E. D. Cohen's *Philosophers at Work* (Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1988) and R. P. Wolff's *About Philosophy* (Prentice Hall, 1989).

Gould's anthology and its kin are aimed at those instructors who believe an introduction to philosophy should involve original sources rather than textbooks. But most original sources are written by the professional philosopher for his or her colleagues; as such, the writer has assumed a background students in introductory courses cannot be expected to possess. Gould's editing job makes it possible for instructors to have the best of both worlds—to expose their students to the richness of philosophical literature and to do so in a manner they can comprehend.

Instructors selecting this approach must assume the responsibility of delivering informative and lively lectures that compensate for the absence of those things the editing process has left out. (CPQ has some selections simple enough to require no lectures). The content of these lectures will change from reading to reading, but will normally contain an explanation of the problem the writer dealt with, the historical setting, the assumptions made, an analysis of the argument, alternative solutions, general background information, . . . This is as it should be. Introductory courses are places where most students confront philosophy for the first—and for many the only—time in their lives. Our task is to expose them to the richness of the literature while sharing our expertise with them; thus, for those instructors whose pedagogic objectives fit CPQ, I recommend it without major reservations.

Jesús A. Díaz, Philosophy, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio 44242-0001 USA