ledge which will enable him to answer that question is to that extent evidence.

The theory thus identifies the critical method with historical method in general, and one can accordingly see why such insistence is placed on the historian's present as the only genuine material and starting-point for historical enquiry. Something must be accepted before one can ask the question, 'Why did it happen?' No authority may be accepted. The material object present to the historian remains the only possible starting-point. That would seem to be a logical outcome of adopting the critical method as the sole one proper to history. It follows that no history of the past is possible, only of the present—and with this, if by 'past' is meant 'dead past' the author entirely agrees, but, he says, it can be re-enacted by the historian in his own thought and so in his present be known as past, which is to be living past. Only when so re-enacted is the past historically knowable. (Cf. especially the examination of Oakeshott, pp. 157-8.) The thoroughness with which the premises are developed is evident. The practicability of adopting them to write the history of a long bygone age seems doubtful. If, for instance, a historian is ever in the course of a human lifetime to infer the delivery of a speech of Pericles beginning from a printed copy of Thucydides's account of it, he must surely make use of a great deal of incompletely criticised authority to bridge the centuries that intervene. And if he can be allowed to do that on prudential—but as Professor Collingwood insists on non-historical—grounds, the autonomy of history is not so perfect as is claimed.

Too much praise cannot be accorded to the editor, Professor T. M. Knox, for his arrangement of the work from the author's papers. Three-quarters of the book is a history of the growth of the idea of history, in which one can see the author's own views taking shape with reference to past historians and philosophers. In the remaining quarter these views are developed on their own account.

IVO THOMAS, O.P.

MURAL PAINTING. By Hans Feibusch. (Black; 21s.)

This accomplished dissertation on the art and craft of mural painting is both timely and necessary. Timely because, as the author points out, the abundance of talent available today calls for sustained and purposeful employment; and necessary, because of the prevalent lack of collaboration between architects and painters. Mural painting, the author justly maintains, should be an integral part of the structural conception, and the baroque fusion of structure, painting, and sculpture is cited as the greatest historical manifestation of this ideal principle. It is in the light of this principle that he makes his review of the mural techniques of the past, which, although it suggests a view of cultural development that is at least questionable, is not thereby rendered invalid, since his judgments are con-

cerned with the quality of the craftsmanship displayed in the solution of problems, rather than with cultural significance. And in those matters he displays wide sympathies and intimate knowledge.

The technical notes are sufficiently lucid to give the student an excellent introduction to the nature of the problems involved, and should whet the appetite for further information and for practical experiment. It is evidence of the breadth of appeal of the book that it could be read by intending patrons and passive spectators with profit and enlightenment. The student of æsthetics will find the analysis of space-conception in Byzantine, Renaissance, Baroque and Modern art of cardinal importance.

The author's advice to ecclesiastical patrons shows a judgment less sure of itself. 'It is', he writes, 'for the leaders of the Church to take the initiative, to commission the best artists, the real representatives of their time, to give them intelligent guidance in a sphere new to them, and to have sufficient confidence in their artistic and human quality to give them free play'. One may be certain, I think, that the noblest artistic and human qualities are not enough to produce a fully Christian work, for such a work requires virtues not normally available to those not in open communion with the Mystical Body. In this instance, good art is not enough. Henry Moore's *Madonna and Child* is a case in point; it is impossible to say that there is anything distinctively Christian about it, although one has no doubts regarding the artist's integrity of purpose. A full, public Christian art can only be produced by fully integrated Christian personalities in a fully integrated Christian culture. Lamentable as the situation is, it is not to be remedied by such means as Mr Feibusch recommends, for if the time in which we live is not Christian, how shall the real representatives of the time serve the Christian Church? And whether any given time is a reliable judge of its best artists is surely doubtful. However, these more general considerations do not lie within the scope of the book under review, although they are necessarily provoked by it.

Mural Painting has, above all, an altogether praiseworthy candour and singleness of purpose, and a refreshing absence of the irritable polemics and affected archaisms in which devotees of an age-old craft are wont to indulge. It is an important book, and should be widely read and widely acted upon. E. HEMINGWAY.

ADDLED ART. By Lionel Lindsay. (Hollis & Carter; 6s.)

It would be a pity if this warcry of a book were neglected just because it contains a number of questionable assertions and a few really silly ones; or because its English is a bit queer; or because it begins with a bad sonnet. For Sir Lionel Lindsay's polemic is useful as well as amusing. For one thing he knows how to quote and tell