

245 exigence of the
contrary, the historical imagination for a continuous and
coherent picture not only effects the construction of the past
but also supplies the ~~material~~ means of historical criticism.
Knowledge of forgeries, of apocryphal works, of the trustworthiness
of writers or their weaknesses, and so forth, is all a historical
knowledge, and, while history as critical belief differs from
history as critical reconstruction, still all of the latter is
of a piece.

245

contrary, the exigence of the historical imagination for a continuous and coherent picture not only effects the construction of the past but also supplies the means of historical criticism. One and the same flow of questions not merely promotes data from being potential to being actual evidence but also effects the opposite transition from putative actual evidence for question, A, to genuinely relevant evidence for question, B.

25

aim of the novelist is to show the characters acting and the incidents developing in a manner determined by a necessity internal to themselves."

240-2

To be sure artistic and historical imagination differ, and they do so in three ways. First, the historical picture must be localized in space and time. Secondly, all history must be self-consistent; ~~purely~~ purely imaginary worlds cannot clash and need not agree, but there is only one historical world." Thirdly, the historian's picture has to be justified by its relation to what is called evidence.

It is a datum here and now perceptible. It is a datum

Evidence is potential and actual. Potential evidence is a datum, here and now perceptible

Evidence is potential and actual. Potential evidence is any datum, here and now perceptible, that is relevant to a question the historian is raising. The more historical knowledge we have, the more questions we can raise; and the more questions we do raise, the more data can be relevant to the questions and so potentially evidence.

By the time one has finished that chore, he feels, one will have learnt a great deal about the nature of modern writing of history.

That modern history is not simply believing the testimony of credible authorities, Collingwood considers evident from the fact that modern historians select, construct, criticize, that their criticism is not a matter of believing or refusing to believe but of asking what the author was up to in making his statement and of basing their conclusions history on the results of that investigation

the individual to the group, from private to public
events, from the course of a single life to the course of
the affairs of a community

The underlying issue is, of course, philosophic naivete.
I t takes time to learn to draw the distinction
The distinction between the data of experience, on the one
hand, and the terms meant in singular, assertoric, true
judgements and propositions