

It should not be necessary to point out that the criterion of “understanding” adopted here is very superficial. The use of more satisfactory criteria would imply very extensive studies. To us it is enough to be able to state the following:

*Normally, ps manipulate the q.c.c. very much in the same fashion as the philosophers, in so far as they arrive at formulations closely analogous to the central formulations of truth-theories and they can therefore be said to understand the questions.* Exceptions are few in number if the ps are aged 13 or more. If someone holds that “real” understanding of the q.c.c. is lacking among the ps we shall ask him to answer the following two questions: (1) “Do the philosophers “really” understand the q.c.c.? If so, what is the criterion?” (2) “By which procedure do you want to discern “real” understanding from the kind of understanding discussed here?”

#### **Sect. 64. The Aim and Scope of a List of A- and B-formulations**

(AFFI). — In the introduction, we expressed that the first purpose of our monograph is to lead persons to react with statements analogous to what in philosophical literature is called “opinions on the truth-notion”, “views of the nature of truth”, or “theories of truth”. Our plan proved to be realizable: By asking the test questions of the type called q.c.c., a large number of answers was collected, and embedded in them we discovered formulations of the kind found in the professional theories of truth. In chapter II we have analysed the contents of some of these formulations — the A- and B-formulation-roots — for their own sake, using a selection of them as a fair sample of our total material.

Our next purpose is to analyse the answers to the q.c.c. as verbalized behaviour-wholes. A- and B-formulation-roots have been treated as if they expressed answers to the *same* question, and as if they were all statements of the same thing. The standardization and generalization carried out in this way serve very definite statistical purposes. Detaching the formulations from their context, we gained some insight into their symptomatic value as indicator of the age and education of the ps and into the factors that conditioned the individual choice of answers. To obtain 300 ABf dealing with just the same subject (for instance “statements which are absolutely correct”) it is reasonable to suppose that 300 ps would not be sufficient. Perhaps 1500 or 2500 would do, but it is in no way certain.

The professional truth-theories and especially those formulations of them which were used as prototypes of our so-called “A- and B-formulations” — the “definitions” — do not concern the same thing. A short glance at any list of professional A-formulations shows this. Examples: A. Aall defines “to be true and right” and “the opposite”, Acton says “our belief is true when —”, Aliotta speaks about “il criterio della validità obiettiva delle conosanza”. Aristotle states what “falsehood is” and what “truth is”, Agustinus defines “what is true”, Ayer speaks about the term ‘true’ and ‘false’ ” and