

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

Mayavee Singh

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The author has opted for an intriguing topic of moral philosophy and argumentatively explored 'good' and 'bad' are logically attributive (by P. T. Geach) and defended against counter-arguments. Indeed, the author makes a valiant attempt to discharge critics' charge against Geach's logical distinction, albeit some problems in the paper are as follows:

The author commences (introduction part) with Moore and directly encounters Geach and then mentions Geach's objection against Oxford moralists, who concede good's primary role is to commend, without any reference or citation (repeating the same mistake in the next section of the paper). Furthermore, while defining Geach's examination of the nature of the adjectives good and bad, the author uses the logically attributive phrase and then cites some commentators' very short quotations as a seal of acceptance of Geach's claim, simultaneously advocates that this is not their sole role and places it with Moore, then adds another commentator Ross (in philosophy, the word 'commentator' is not adequate for referring to any scholar, as the author has stated several times) where the connection of ethics and good's predicative use is how connected, is not exemplified explicitly.

In the following heading, Geach's arguments about "good" and "bad", the author should make clear the difference between 'grammatically predicative and attributive' and 'logically predicative and attributive'. Similarly, more clarification is needed for the relationship between the alien adjective and logically attributive claims about good and bad.

In the heading, "good" and "bad's functions as "primarily" descriptive reflects a problem in quotation marks ("bad's), and moreover, some explanation is required from Plato and Aristotle's points of view about the descriptive force behind good and bad. Though the author only pointed out Plato and Aristotle's names, as cited by MacIver, and there is no elucidation on par or at odds with the claim.

In conclusion, the author should have restated the problem more concisely. It was not required to elucidate with an example fully to prove his point. Moreover, this conclusion should be ended up with the author's suggestion and recommendation rather than a question with God knows the informal language.

Some more proper references and in-text citations with page numbers are required in the paper to expound the nature of the adjectives 'good' and 'bad'. The author has mainly cited Geach's aspect with page number and, often, does not cite the page number in the rest of the philosophers' perspective.

In short, *prima facie*, the introduction part is unable to pose what the author tries to examine in the paper, and its vagueness leaves this paper in a lurch. However, the further parts of this paper turn down this approach and point out counter-arguments and its rebuttal more lucidly. Thusly, the author has been advised to incorporate all the mentioned



comments before the publication.