

cious; since only the Positivists claimed to derive the validity of such arguments from any general thesis, the refutation of the general thesis is quite beside the point.

I believe that future generations will regard Wittgenstein as a great philosopher. I do not believe that they will look back on 1945-1959 in Oxford as a Golden Age in philosophy, though I think philosophy in Oxford is very much healthier than it is, say, in Paris. There can certainly be fruitful criticism of predominant trends in recent and current Oxford philosophy from a Wittgensteinian point of view, and also from the standpoint of mathematical logic: there *could* also be constructive criticism of Wittgenstein's later philosophy from some independent position, though no one has wholly succeeded in producing it yet. But of Gellner's book one can say only that it is a depressing illustration of the philistinism of what he calls the 'general educated public' in this country that they could be deceived by a book which does not even have the smell of honest or seriously intentioned work.

NOTICE

Forthcoming articles in BLACKFRIARS include 'Religion and the Anthropologists' by Professor E. Evans-Pritchard, a study of Teilhard de Chardin by Dr Bernard Towers and a survey of recent German Theology by Cornelius Ernst, O.P.