

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	<i>page xi</i>
I HOW SIMPLE IS TRUTH?	I
1 'What Percy says is true' means (1) 'For some <i>p</i> , both Percy says that <i>p</i> and <i>p</i> '.	1
2 Cohen's objection that mechanical substitution for ' <i>p</i> ' in (1) will not work.	3
3 A Quinian objection that (1) involves quantification into an opaque context.	4
4 Jones's objection that (1) is elliptical.	6
5 'Objectual' and 'substitutional' quantification: (1) does not commit us 'ontologically' to Propositions.	10
2 PREDICATING TRUTH	16
1 The 'ascriptivist' theory of truth fails to eliminate 'true' as a predicate.	16
2 So does Ramsey's 'redundancy' theory.	17
3 Strawson's later theory appears to be taking 'true' as a predicate, but two versions of the theory must be distinguished. 'As A's statement has it, X is eligible' and 'Things are as A says they are'. Pronouns of laziness and bound variables.	18
4 An argument to show that 'As A's statement has it, X is eligible' does not predicate anything of A's statement refuted.	21
5 But what 'As A's statement has it, X is eligible' predicates of A's statement is not that it is true. This <i>is</i> predicated of it by 'Things are as A says they are' or its more formal equivalent (16) 'For some <i>p</i> , both A's statement states that <i>p</i> and <i>p</i> '.	26
6 Nevertheless, it is not possible to give an explicit definition of '— is true'.	28
3 TRUTHS	32
1 What sort of things are true to be discovered by examining the logic of expressions like 'What Percy says'.	32
2 Preliminary examination of the analogous 'What the postman brought'. This is an incomplete symbol and a second-level predicate.	32
3 'What Percy says' is also an incomplete symbol, and so does not refer to anything.	38

- 4 But 'What Percy says' in its deep structure is *not* a second-level predicate, although in some contexts it is a second-level function, e.g. with 'is believed by Pauline' as argument. 41
- 5 The symbolic representation of 'What Percy says is true' does *not* split into function and argument. The argument here evaporates. 42
- 6 Kneale's explanation of the redundancy of 'It is true that —'. Sentences where the Proposition said to be true is designated but not expressed taken as primary. 43
- 7 Jones reverses this order, but his doctrine leaves the existence of the word 'true' unexplained. 45
- 8 The explanation to be sought in the fact that the surface structure of our language presents 'What Percy says' as a second-level predicate requiring a first-level predicate as its argument. 46
- 9 Quantifiers to be distinguished from second-level predicates. Quantifiers can be combined just with sentential variables to produce complete sentences. The definite description operator to be regarded as a quantifier. It provides a symbolic equivalent of 'What Percy says is true' which has no predicative expression corresponding to '— is true'. 48
- 10 The 'verifier' of a proposition containing 'What the postman brought' will contain the name of an object not named in the proposition verified. Not so the 'verifier' of a proposition containing 'What Percy says'. The former is 'indirectly', although not 'directly', about something. The latter is not even 'indirectly' about anything. 54
- 4 FALSEHOODS 61
- 1 'What Percy says is true' and 'What Percy says is false' seem to be contraries, not contradictories. Russellian and Strawsonian views about the relationship between them. 61
- 2 Geach's doctrine of multiple assertion extended to cover sentences containing definite descriptions. 'What Percy says is true' tantamount to the joint assertion of 'Percy says just one thing' and 'For every p , if Percy says that p , p '. 63
- 3 'Percy says just one thing' presupposed rather than entailed by 'What Percy says is true'. The Strawsonian 'Things are as Percy says they are' also presupposes this, and is thus preferable as an analysis to the Aristotelian 'Percy says of what is that it is'. 66
- 4 'What Percy says', like 'What the postman brought' presupposes something. So does the use of a proper name. This partly responsible for the inclination to regard 'What Percy says' as referring to an object. 69

5	Revised formulae for the <i>analysantia</i> of 'What Percy says is true' and 'What Percy says is false'.	72
5	CORRESPONDENCE	74
1	The Correspondence Theory must regard truth as a relational property. Difficulty of finding an object to which what is called 'true' is on this view said to be related. Similar difficulties in regarding being married as a relational property. Both more properly classified as quantificational properties.	74
2	Being married relational in the sense that a relational expression '— is married to . . .' enters into its analysis. Truth relational in this sense only if '— corresponds to . . .' enters irreducibly into its analysis. The claim of 'Things are as Percy says they are' to give an analysis of 'Percy's statement corresponds to the facts'. Warnock's objection to the claim rebutted.	79
3	Neither term of the correspondence relation survives our analysis, an analysis which involves the existential quantifier. The same quantifier, binding two variables, does the work done by both terms of the correspondence relation. Nor does any two-place predicate occur in our final analysis of 'Percy's statement corresponds to the facts'.	85
4	Residual sense in which truth is relational. Warnock's confusion between relational property and contingent property exposed. Sense in which to discover whether a proposition is true we have in general to look 'outside' the proposition. Our analysis of 'true' contains, if not a relational expression, at least a function of two arguments, namely '— and . . .'.	87
5	More than mere conjunction required for the analysis of truth. Mackie's 'comparison account'. Propositions of the form 'For some x , Fx and Gx ' assert that a second-level relation holds between two first-level concepts. They are composed of a second-level verb and two first-level verbs. Propositions of the form 'For some p , Jp and Dp ' analogously composed of a second-level adverb and two first-level adverbs. The second-level adverb occurs also in our analysis of 'What Percy says is true'. Analogies thus reach back from this to straightforwardly relational propositions and explain the inclination to call truth relational. Talk of the relation of correspondence is in this way understandable.	91
	Appendix: List of inset, numbered expressions discussed in the text	97
	Bibliography	99
	Index	102