Blackburn and the War on Error

Huw Price

October 13, 2006

In the opening line of his essay 'On Truth', Francis Bacon ticks off Pontius Pilate for not giving the subject its due time and gravity—'"What is truth?", said jesting Pilate, and would not stay for an answer.' If Pilate had stayed for an answer, he would have been waiting a long time—four centuries after Bacon, and twenty after Christ, the jury is still out. But things do seem to have been moving along quite nicely, this past century or so; and as Pilate might note with satisfaction, he himself has been getting a better press. Perhaps Nietzsche's extravagant compliment was a mixed blessing: Nietzsche declared ('as offensively as possible', as Will Durant [1929: 25] put it) that

> [t]he noble scorn of a Roman, before whom the word "truth" was shamelessly mis-handled, enriched the New Testament with the only saying *that has any value* ...: "What is truth?" [1918: 135]

—thus offering Pilate an absurdly lavish prize, of somewhat disreputable provenance, for raising the very question from which he had actually walked away. But Pilate need have no such qualms about his tribute from J. L. Austin, who gives him credit not for asking the question but for turning away from it—in this respect, Austin says, 'Pilate was in advance of his time.' [Austin 1950: 111]

Austin's suggestion was thus that in asking 'What is truth?', philosophers been asking the wrong question. Instead, we should have been following Pilate's example, abandoning that question (and perhaps, as Austin recommends, taking up a different one). This is one of the big themes in the philosophy of truth in the past half-century or so, and it is the theme at the heart of Simon Blackburn's latest book—albeit a theme that Blackburn wraps in Bacon, introducing each chapter with a well-chosen sliver from the *Novum Organum.* Happily for his readers, Blackburn isn't averse to a bit of jesting; and in the end he too wants to walk away from Pilate's question. So probably Bacon would have ticked him off, too, given half a chance.

Truth: A Guide for the Perplexed is pitched at the same popular audience as Blackburn's three recent successes, *Think, Being Good* and *Lust,* and offers an engaging introduction to what Blackburn calls 'the Truth Wars'. This is a new name for an ancient conflict, of course. From Plato to Nagel, Protagoras to Rorty, philosophy's two great families have been feuding over this ground for millenia. Blackburn's project is to guide general readers around these battlefields, ancient and modern, and to explain what he himself sees as the best hope for peace. The result is a sharply-observed and entertaining mix of embedded journalism, irenic road-mapping and occasional missile-launching (notably in the direction of Rorty, though Blackburn also finds targets in the opposite camp). It is certainly denser, overall, than Blackburn's other popular books, but that means there's more here for philosophical readers.

Readers familiar with Blackburn's philosophical work won't be surprised to learn that his strategy for walking away—his road-map for peace in the Truth Wars—owes much to Ramsey. The suggestion is that once we come to see (with Ramsey's redundancy theory, or modern minimalists) that truth is much 'thinner' than we thought, we see that the Truth Warriors may have been fighting over nothing. As Blackburn puts it:

> Suppose truth is, as it were, too *small* to sustain the battle. This is the beginning . . . of the first truce in the Truth Wars, . . . the first intimation that whichever side we were on, we may have been fighting phantoms. (55)

For my part, I have a lot of sympathy with Blackburn's suggestion, and with Ramseyean deflationism in general. All the same, I think that Blackburn's peace plan has a fatal flaw. There's a crucial question it fails to address, in my view—a crucial issue whose significance Blackburn fails to see, and whose resolution is a kind of Jerusalem question for the Truth Wars, central and essential to any satisfactory settlement. I think that Blackburn shares this blindspot, ironically, with Rorty (who, as I noted, is one of the protagonists from whom Blackburn seems most concerned to distance himself). In what follows, I want to highlight this lacuna, and to offer an alternative peace proposal—one with the advantage of being sufficiently even-handed to be disliked by both sides, I suspect. I'll also comment on some of Blackburn's shots at Rorty, which seem to me to come from very close range—so much so that if the missiles in question had any teeth, they'd be suicidal. But let's begin with a sketch of the disputed terrain.

1 Introducing the Truth Wars

When we first ask Pilate's question, a natural idea seems to be to explicate truth in terms of 'correspondence to the facts', a matching between thoughts or words on the one side, and the way the world actually is, on the other. Notoriously, however, this idea soon runs into trouble. For one thing, what is this 'matching' or 'correspondence'? We have some idea,

perhaps, how *pictures* might 'match' the world, but for *words* and *thoughts*—well, words fail us. And the task gets harder, apparently, when we realise that many different kinds of things can be true (in science, mathematics, law, art, ethics, and so on). Is it the same kind of matching for all of them? There are also epistemological concerns: how could we know about such a relation of 'matching', or 'correspondence'? We check our beliefs against other beliefs, apparently, not against the world. So the proposal seems to make truth *inaccessible,* at least to mortals like us. Finally, there's the pragmatic issue: if truth is a matter of correspondence, why should we care about it, in the way that we do?

Faced with these kinds of difficulties, the opposing camp in the Truth Wars puts its weight on the thought that we do seem to care about is how our claims and beliefs 'cohere' with one another—if we argue for the truth of a claim, we support it with other claims. Thus the proposal is that our that beliefs and claims are true if they cohere in the right way with, or are justified in the right way by, our other beliefs. This promises to make truth less inaccessibile than correspondence seemed to leave it, but with a countervailing disadvantage: it seems *too* internal, too subjective. After all, couldn't our system of beliefs be thoroughly coherent, thoroughly self-consistent, but nevertheless completely *wrong?* And again, there's a pragmatic concern: the thought that all the consistency and coherence in the world won't guarantee that a belief is a good one to trust, in practical dealings with the world. (Again, we may *think* it is reliable, but that seems to be a different matter.)

At this point, pragmatism (or at any rate, one of the views of truth called by that name) pipes up, and offers a kind of compromise: perhaps truth just *is* what works—'the expedient in the way of our thinking', as James puts it. This retains some of the 'objectivity', or 'externality' of correspondence, because what works depends on how the world is; but combines it with some of the 'subjectivity' or 'internality' of coherence, because what works *for us* also depends on how we are. But the problem is that false beliefs can be useful, too. As Blackburn puts it, 'there are things it may be expedient . . . for me to believe (for instance that I am the most popular person in the class) but which are not true, and there are things that may be true which it may be deeply uncomfortable and threatening to believe.' (8–9)

Where then to turn for an answer to Pilate's question? Given the centrality of the topic, the impasse would be uncomfortable enough even if it could be safely confined to the philosophical bunker. Notoriously, however, the battle has spread into the streets, and indeed beneath them—the foundations of reason itself seem under threat, just when we need it most. Hence the attraction of finding some way of lowering the temperature, of pulling the plug—some way of walking away from the issue, with our respect intact.

2 Walking Ramsey's plank

Blackburn's route out of this impasse relies on an insight we associate with Frege, and especially with Ramsey. Around the end of the Great War, Frege remarked that

> [i]t is worth noticing that the sentence 'I smell the scent of violets' has just the same content as the sentence 'It is true that I smell the scent of violets'. So it seems ... that nothing is added to the thought by my ascribing to it a property of truth. (Frege 1918-9)

A decade later, Ramsey offers a blunter version of the same kind of thought. He, too, notes that the transition from 'P' to 'P is true' takes us nowhere new—

> It is evident that 'It is true that Caesar was murdered' means no more than that Caesar was murdered, and 'It is false that Caesar was murdered' means that Caesar was not murdered.

—and concludes, 'There is really no separate problem of truth but merely a linguistic muddle.' (Ramsey 1927)

The step from from 'P' to 'P is true' is what Blackburn calls 'Ramsey's ladder', and he notes that Ramsey's point is that this ladder is horizontal—it doesn't take us to a new theoretical level. Elsewhere, Blackburn complains about philosophers who 'take advantage of the horizontal nature of Ramsey's ladder to climb it, and then announce a better view from the top'. (Blackburn 1998b, 78). Here, he suggests that the ladder provides the path that leads us away from the Truth Wars:

> Both the relativist and the absolutist are impressed by Pilate's notorious question 'What is Truth?', and each tries to say something useful at the same high ... level of generality. The minimalist can be thought of as turning his back on this abstraction .... If the issue is whether high tide is at midday, then truth consists in high tide being at midday. If the issue is whether Blair is a fantasist, the truth lies in Blair being a fantasist or not. ... The point is to discourage us from looking for anything more general. (59–60)

Thus Blackburn's recipe for peace in the Truth Wars goes something like this: accept, with Ramsey, that 'It is true that P' means nothing more than 'P'; give up looking for a general theory of truth—a general answer to Pilate's question; and walk away.

3 What minimalism misses

For my part, I agree with Blackburn and his minimalist allies that Pilate's question is the wrong question, at least in its traditional forms, and that we should follow Pilate in walking away from it. However, I think there's another question in the vicinity that we should try

to answer, and that Blackburn misses—a question so central to the old conflict that unless we address it, no would-be peace settlement can be more than a distraction from the main dispute.

The question turns on the fact that we take our judgements and assertions to be governed by a certain kind of conversational norm. In effect, it is the issue about the origins and status of this norm. To ask it, we need to bring the norm into view—to highlight it, as a distinctive and (at least in some sense) contingent feature of our linguistic practice. This is difficult to do, I think, because the norm in question is such a familiar part of our conversational practice that it is very hard for us to bring it into focus. My strategy will be to contrast the conversational game as we actually play it to a different kind of game, which lacks the norm in question. Against this background, I'll then make two points: first, that Ramsey's thin kind of truth is compatible with either kind of game, which means that it doesn't account for the norm in question; and second, that as long as the status of the norm remains unresolved, it is bound to be the grounds of new battles in the Truth Wars. If I'm right, there can be no lasting peace until we face up to the issue of the norm in question.

Thus I'm going to distinguish two conversational games, in one of which—not the one we actually play—there is no norm of the relevant sort. But I want to begin with a simpler case, involving an analogous distinction between two kinds of examination. The first kind is familiar from popular 'know thyself' questionnaires, the point of which is simply to reveal the examinee's own state of mind, in relevant respects. Thus if I'm the examinee, and the first question is 'Was Aristotle a Belgian?', I should answer 'Yes' if I believe that Aristotle was Belgian and 'No' if I believe he was not. The crucial point is that there is no 'objective' standard that I need to meet: as long as my answers accurately reflect my own beliefs, I won't lose any marks. Call this the *autological* examination, or auto-exam, for short.

Now contrast this auto-exam to the kind of examination still familiar in most schools and universities. In this case, someone who answers 'Yes' to the the question 'Was Aristotle a Belgian?' loses a mark—gets the question *wrong,* as we'd say—because, as we'd put it, 'Aristotle wasn't a Belgian'. One can imagine a candidate, perhaps even a misguided institution, objecting to this kind of examination on the grounds that it casts the examiners in the role of gods, trying to assess a student's answer from an ideal Archimedean standpoint. Rid ourselves of quasi-religious metaphysics, and isn't it just our word against theirs, examiners versus examinees? We think that Aristotle was Greek, the candidate thinks he was Belgian, but there's no divine umpire to settle the matter. Doesn't this mean that there's something suspect about this sort of examination?

If this is a practical question, the answer is certainly 'No'. After all, the system has been working quite nicely for centuries, despite the fact that its examiners have never been gods. What we examiners actually do isn't to assess our students from a god-like Archimedean viewpoint, but simply from our own viewpoint: roughly, we mark them wrong when their

answers are not the ones that we would give ourselves. In a practical sense, then, this kind of examination—*heterological* examination, as we might call it—doesn't require an absolute standpoint after all. It requires the standpoint of *others,* not the standpoint of *gods.*

But it may require a kind of pretense of such an Archimedean standpoint. Perhaps it works more effectively if both sides see the students as aiming for an objective standard of which the examiners are good but not infallible judges, than if correctness is simply seem as a matter of agreeing with the examiners. If so, then perhaps the notion of correctness at the core of the practice is a kind of useful myth. We might concede this but still want to keep the practice going, apparently. We might think that we produce better engineers, doctors and philosophers if we put trainees through this ordeal than if we don't, for example. (Perhaps the myth is generally conducive to success in these endeavours, as it were, even though the relevant notion of correctness cannot be identified case-by-case with successfulness, for the reasons that undermined the pragmatist answer to Pilate's question.)

For the moment, I want to stress two things about this case. The first is that we can 'fake' the objective, Archimedean examination, by applying the relevant norm from our own standpoint—the result is still very different from an auto-exam. The second is that we can add the purely transparent kind of truth-predicate thoughout, *in either kind of exam,* without making any difference. We can imagine an auto-exam in which I have to write down 'It is true that Aristotle was a Belgian' or 'It is false that Aristotle was a Belgian', for example. If it is an auto-exam at one end of Ramsey's horizontal ladder, it remains an auto-exam at the other. Ramsey's thin kind of truth is simply insensitive to the distinction between the two kinds of examination—which means that if we want to explain the difference, we need to look somewhere else.

4   Conversation as a war on error

We can draw a parallel distinction between two kinds of assertion, or conversation. In one kind ('autological conversation'), the aim is simply to give voice to what one actually believes, as accurately as possible. In the other kind ('heterological conversation'), the aim is as if one's assertions were answers in a heterological examination, with one's interlocutors taking the role of the examiners. In the second case but not the first, in other words, it as if one's utterances are being held to be account to an objective standard—a standard that mere sincerity doesn't guarantee.

As in the case of heterological exams, our interlocutors don't have to gods, to subject our assertions to this kind of 'objective' standard. It is sufficient that they apply the standard on the basis of their own beliefs: if we say 'Aristotle was a Greek' and they believe that he was actually Belgian, they are entitled to say, 'That's not *correct*—your claim is *mistaken.*' Indeed, the main difference between this case and that of the corresponding exams is that conversation is symmetric. Both sides are playing the same game, and each in entitled to

act as 'examiner' with respect to the other. (Heterological conversation is the heterological examination of all against all, as it were.)

I hope it is clear that as a matter of fact, our conversational practices are substantially those of heterological conversation rather than autological conversation. In my view, this fact is of great significance for the issues which have always been at the heart of the Truth Wars—though its significance has usually been overlooked, I think, probably because the relevant features of conversational practice are so familiar as to seem unremarkable.

What have these issues got to do with the Truth Wars? Simply that to all intents and purposes, the question 'What is truth?' is the same question as 'What is this correctness and incorrectness, rightness and wrongness, that we claim for various moves in our conversational games?' The point of the case of autological conversation is to throw the significance of these questions into relief, by pointing out that we can imagine a conversational game that lacks this particular kind of normative standard. And the bare redundancy theory of truth doesn't address the issue, because the truth predicate it offers us is so thin that it works equally well in either game.

Like most minimalists, Blackburn misses this point. But what he misses is not the fact that conversation has such a normative standard. On the contrary, here he is calling loud attention to it, by way of pointing out where some forms of relativism go wrong:

> [T]here is no one place from which it is right to look at the Eiffel tower, and indeed no place that is better than another, except for one purpose or another. But when it comes to our commitments, we cannot think this. If I believe that O. J. Simpson murdered his wife, then I cannot at the same time hold that the point of view that he did not is equally good. It follows from my belief that anyone who holds he did not murder his wife is *wrong*. They may be excusable, but they are out of touch or misled or thinking wishfully or badly placed to judge. I have hit a bull's-eye, which they have missed. (65–66, my italics)

Rather, what Blackburn misses is what I've highlighted by distinguishing two kinds of conversational games: the fact that there's something important that needs explaining here, viz., that in the game as we actually play it, there is a norm, or a bull's-eye, of precisely this kind. At another point he says that '[t]o make an assertion at all is to put a view into the public space, up for acceptance and rejection.' (68) Again, he's right, but he misses the question: *why* are our assertions treated like this? Why aren't a chap's beliefs treated as entirely his own affair, as it were—as they are, by default, in the game I've called autological conversation?

At a couple of points Blackburn seems to suggest that minimalism itself supplies all the relevant norms. In particular, he claims, it supplies the kind of 'bull's-eye of truth' needed to rebut Rorty's charge that there's no place for a conversational norm stronger than that of justification, or solidarity with one's fellows. 'Thus,' Blackburn says,

> minimalism showed us that any sentence comes with its own 'norm' of truth. If the issue is whether pigs fly, the truth would consist in pigs flying, and that is what we must investigate. If the issue if whether Cambridge is north of London, it is a different investigation, but equally directed at truth, that is, at whether Cambridge is north of London. (160–161)

But imagine 'Pigs fly' and 'Cambridge is north of London' as two questions on an auto-examination—a multiple choice version, with two boxes for each question, labelled 'True' and 'False'. In this case, ticking the 'True' box for 'Pigs fly' doesn't put an assertion that pigs fly into the public arena, up for acceptance and rejection. All it puts on the line is the examinee's sincerity, or perhaps his self-awareness. As before, the lesson is that Ramsey's kind of truth does not supply the norm that governs the public arena—the norm in virtue of which we take it that if I say 'Pigs fly' and you say 'Pigs don't fly', one of us must be *wrong*. Whatever that norm is, it isn't something that comes for free with Ramsey's disquotational truth predicate. As we've seen, Ramsey's thin notion of truth is compatible with either form of the conversational game.

It follows that there's a residual form of Pilate's question, absolutely untouched by the suggestion that we deflate truth in Ramsey's way: What are these norms of 'rightness' and 'wrongness', 'correctness' and 'incorrectness—this bull's-eye that distinguishes ordinary heterological conversation from the autological alternative? It might seem tempting to make the notions of rightness and correctness follow truth itself, in walking Ramsey's deflationary plank—a temptation encouraged by the fact for many purposes, 'true', 'right' and 'correct' are interchangeable. But this would simply deprive of us Blackburn's distinction between ways of looking at the Eiffel tower and ways of taking a view about whether O. J. Simpson murdered his wife. For better or worse, our ordinary conversational practice does admit such a distinction, and we can't sweep it under the carpet simply by forcing all the predicates we use to express it into the minimalist box—the right lesson, rather, is that we were too hasty in forcing truth itself into that box.

5   Back to the battlefields?

Does this mean that we are back where we started, forced to take up arms once more in the old battles? Not at all, in my view, for there is another strategy for defusing the old questions—a strategy of which, about other topics, Blackburn himself is one of the leading contemporary proponents. The key move is to step back from the contested metaphysical question—Pilate's 'What is truth?', or in general 'What is X?', where X is the matter in question—to a calmer, more anthropological question: 'What's going on when creatures like us talk about Xs?' This approach thus deflates the traditional metaphysical questions by replacing them with more tractable, more human, alternatives. Much of Blackburn's philosophical career has been devoted to the development and defence of

a subtle version of this genealogical strategy, which he calls 'quasi-realism'. Concerning a wide range of topics—among them, notably, both moral and modal discourse—he has argued convincingly that this genealogical perspective can be both illuminating and largely non-revisionary (undermining neither our right nor our inclination to go on talking in the same way).

My suggestion is simply that we make the same genealogical move in the case of truth, regarded as the distinctive norm at the core of heterological conversation. Think of conversation as a game invented by our ancestors. I suggest that the basic rule, the rule we all internalised as we learnt to play, is that when we disagree with someone, we can challenge, by saying 'That's *wrong,* you're *mistaken!*' We score points when someone agrees with us—when they say 'That's right!'—and that gives us an incentive to offer *reasons* for our beliefs. (Of course, the suggestion allows that the bare rules can be qualified by other rules, say of politeness, authority and etiquette, and that these might vary from time to time, and community to community.) And the crucial idea is that the norms that drives the game—the norms that turn mere expression of individual opinion into a kind of interpersonal war on error—are norms of our own invention. (To invent them just *is* to learn to play this game.)

Why do we play the game in this way? This is the genealogical question, and it's tempting to try to answer it in a doubly Darwinian spirit: the game enhances our fitness, by providing a dialectical environment in which the fittest ideas tend to float to the top. For the moment, however, what matters is not where the path leads, but the orientation we adopt in deciding to explore it. We walk away from Pilate's question by moving from asking 'What is truth?' to explaining our practice of talking of truth and falsity. I've suggested that a crucial element in that practice, an element not satisfactorily addressed by Ramsey's bare minimalism, is the role of truth as the defining norm of heterological conversation.

As peace proposal for the Truth Wars, my suggestion offers something to both sides. On the one hand, the conversational game seems to require that we *treat* truth as objective—no one is allowed to win just by believing that they've won. In this sense, the absolutists were right. But we don't need to be gods to play it—we always base our challenges on our own beliefs, and in the end, it is a norm of our own invention. In this sense, the relativists were right. Of course, both sides may feel that it offers them too little, or offers too much to their opponents; but peace always requires compromise.

6   Regarding Rorty

As I said earlier, Blackburn isn't the only person who misses this crucial conversational angle on the old puzzles about truth. Someone who does so, ironically, is Richard Rorty, the champion of conversation as an alternative to the old truth-driven game. Discussing Crispin Wright's claim that truth is a normative constraint on assertion, for example, Rorty

begins by telling us why pragmatists such as himself are inclined to identify truth with justification:

> Pragmatists think that if something makes no difference to practice, it should make no difference to philosophy. This conviction makes them suspicious of the distinction between justification and truth, for that distinction makes no difference to my decisions about what to do. [Rorty 1998: 19]

He goes on to argue that the claim that truth is a normative constraint on assertion falls foul of this principle of no difference without a practical difference:

> The need to justify our beliefs to ourselves and our fellow agents subjects us to norms, and obedience to these norms produces a behavioral pattern that we must detect in others before confidently attributing beliefs to them. But there seems to be no occasion to look for obedience to an additional norm – the commandment to seek the truth. For – to return to the pragmatist doubt with which I began – obedience to that commandment will produce no behavior not produced by the need to offer justification. [Rorty 1998: 26]

My suggestion, on the contrary, is that there is an important and widespread behavioral pattern that does depend on the fact that speakers do take themselves to be subject to such an additional norm. Moreover, it is a pattern that Rorty can't afford to dismiss as a by-product of bad philosophy, viz., conversation itself, or at any rate a central aspect of conversation as we know it.

It follows that Blackburn has the wrong response to Rorty on this matter, in my view. What he should have said is not that we get the disputed norm for free from minimalism—I've argued that that's simply not true—but that it is a norm we invent for ourselves, and a norm which plays a crucial role in our conversational practice. It seems to me that since Blackburn and Rorty clearly agree, more generally, that our norms have human rather than supernatural origins, there's no reason why they shouldn't agree about this particular norm.

Blackburn takes other shots at Rorty, but as I noted earlier, some them come from such close range that they seem almost suicidal. If his missiles were armed, he'd be in grave danger of sacrificing large parts of his own edifice, in ridding us of the Rortyian 'menace'. Consider, in particular, this protest against Rorty's anti-representationalism:

> To many of us . . . the solution looks worse than the problem: language is not there to represent things – how ridiculous! . . . For, after all, a wiring diagram represents how things stand inside our electric bell, our fuel gauge represents the amount of petrol left in the tank, and our physics or history tells how things stand physically or historically. (153)

As Blackburn's philosophical readers will know, however, this charge comes from someone whose single most significant contribution to the discipline has been to show us how subtle

the question whether a vocabulary is really in the representing business can be; to argue that ways of talking which *look* for all the world as if they are genuinely representational—moral talk, or modal talk, for example—can actually be playing some different role.

Indeed, in enlisting Wittgenstein as a patron of the quasi-realist program, Blackburn has even canvassed sympathetically the idea that there is no distinction between the descriptive and the non-descriptive:

> Wittgenstein could even afford to throw 'description' into the minimalist pot. Even if we have to say that all commitments describe their coordinate slices of reality, we can still say that they are to be theorized about in a distinctive way. You come at them differently, offering a different theory of their truth-aptitude .... You may end up, that is, saying that these assertions describe how things are with values, probability, modality, and the rest. But the way you arrive at this bland result will be distinctive, and it will be the bit that matters. (Blackburn 1998a)

There are two ways to read the implications of this suggestion for representationalism: either it amounts to a global rejection of representationalism, a way of saying *globally* what expressivists and non-cognitivists usually say *locally*. Or it saves representationalism, but at the cost of stripping it of all theoretical content—of deflating the notion so much that it no longer plays any role in our theorising about the relationship of language and thought to the world. But it is hard to see how either reading differs significantly from Rorty's rejection of representationalism; hard to see how someone who finds himself close to Wittgenstein on these matters could possibly be far from Rorty. So I think that if the wiring diagram and the fuel tank spelt trouble for Rorty, they'd be bad news for Blackburn, too—quasi-realism itself would be at risk in the ensuing conflagration.

Thus in Blackburn's uncomfortable relationship to Rorty, I think we see a familiar predicament—a would-be peacemaker, from one side or other, unable to detach himself sufficiently from old loyalties and allegiances. In Blackburn's case, however, the plight has a particular poignancy. If I'm right, Blackburn's own philosophy holds the key to a genuinely distinctive route to peace in the Truth Wars—among other things, to a genuinely distinctive account of why truth *matters.* So behind all the insights and entertainments of *Truth: A Guide for the Perplexed,* there lurks, for me, a deep perplexity about the author's own philosophical inclinations: concerning truth itself, why doesn't he grasp the richly-laden olive-branch that his own work seems to offer?

7   Bibliography

Austin J. L. 1950: 'Truth', *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society,* Supplementary Volume 24, 111–129.
Blackburn, S. 1998a: 'Wittgenstein, Wright, Rorty and Minimalism', *Mind* 107, 157–182.

Blackburn, S. 1998b: *Ruling Passions: A Theory of Practical Reasoning,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Durant, Will 1929. *The Mansions of Philosophy: A Survey of Human Life and Destiny,* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Frege, G. 1918–9: 'Thoughts', in Brian McGuinness (ed.) *Gottlob Frege: Collected Papers on Mathematics, Logic, and Philosophy,* Oxford: Basil Blackwell (1984), 351–72.

Ramsey, F. P. 1927: 'Facts and Propositions', *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society,* Supplementary Volume 7, 153–170.

Rorty, R. 1998: 'Is truth a goal of enquiry? Donald Davidson versus Crispin Wright', in *Truth and Progress: Philosophical Papers Vol. 3,* New York: Cambridge University Press, 19–42.