

Review of: "Geach's "Good" and "Bad", Attributive After All"

Baya Belmessaoud Boukhalfa

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I find the introduction rather troublesome and does not invite to continue reading. From the beginning, this text becomes inaccessible to a wide audience, while this question of good and evil is essential for humanity, especially today. It is only in the paragraph "But before addressing Geach's arguments, a cleaning of the house is essential"...that the text becomes approachable.

Rather, it would be interesting to explain the concepts of attributive and predicative adjectives before you can decide to qualify them as such and thus allowing readers to follow you in your reasoning.

You posit your postulate, following Geach, on the functions of "good" and "evil" as elements of expression, rather than considering them as normative terms belonging to the domain of Ethics as fundamental elements of moral judgments. But you do not give the arguments in favour for.

One thing is undeniable is that the description of a thing as good or bad does not inherently contain the definition of the thing itself. We still need an explanation of why. Just like the problem of relativity persists. Thus, the expression "John is a good athlete" means that he is good in his field of athletics. The expression "a good architecture" depends, for example for which society or from which point of view. This does not exclude that there may be criteria of goodness for all humanity.

Overall, the paper is good. However, I recommend the author to review the first part of the article. The introduction of a comparative table may be useful to have a visual illustration.