sceptical scenarios. Fourth, one should carefully distinguish the requirement of having a discernible mark of truth from that of antecedently knowing that a mark is a mark of truth. The fact that a philosopher rejects the latter is not sufficient to show that they are "fallibilist" or "externalist" in the contemporary sense. Fifth, one should be careful in interpreting a philosopher's insistence on the proper functioning of faculties or on nature following its normal course. Again, these are not indications that they are "fallibilist" or "externalist" in the contemporary sense, for they may have taken proper functioning to deliver discernible marks of truth, or they may have been operating with a restricted notion of necessity. Finally, one should not assume that it was obvious to past philosophers that no discernible property of beliefs is truth-entailing.

5 The fall of Classical Infallibilism

Classical Infallibilism does not face standard Gettier-style counterexamples. In standard Gettier-style counterexamples it is clear that whatever is discernible to the subject fails to entail truth; so Classical Infallibilists would have no trouble in denying that the subject knows (see sec. 1 above). If Classical Infallibilists face Gettier counterexamples, they are of a more subtle and controversial kind (Williamson, 2013). Suppose that clearly perceiving is discernible and truth-entailing. Still, there will plausibly be a series of barely different cases ranging from clear to non-clear perception. If the first non-clear perception case in one such series is one of error, then the last clear case is arguably not one of knowledge—for it is one in which could easily have been mistaken. Thus the truth-entailing condition is too weak; one should require a property that ensures truth at closes cases as well. Be that as it may, that kind of case is subtle and controversial enough for it not to be surprising that it was not raised by past philosophers. Thus the New Story explains why the Gettier problem was not raised earlier.

Classical Infallibilism does lead to Scepticism, however. Few, if any, of our beliefs bear discernible marks of truth. That is so even on extreme restrictions of necessity and Idealist reconstructions. If our beliefs are wholly about sense-data, past experiences still fail to entail future ones, so we do not have discernible marks of the unobserved. If we restrict the possible to the actual, a property of a belief is discernible only if for all beliefs that have it, one actually believes that they have it. Thus only extremely reflective subjects know anything. Moreover, if marks are grouped into fairly broad kinds (see sec. 2), so that, for instance, *having a clear visual impression that p* counts as truth-entailing only if in general *having a clear visual impression* is truth-entailing, few marks