phers and on non-inferential knowledge. Many periods and authors are yet to be discussed. Inferential knowledge is particularly troublesome for Classical Infallibilism; it is worth examining whether philosophers faced the predicted trouble. Some events remain to be explained: why Scepticism became influential again the Modern period, why Idealism was not attractive before the Modern period, why Classical Infallibilism did not collapse before the mid-twentieth century. We should also investigate how views on knowledge interacted with views on necessity, belief and content, all of which appear in the Classical Infallibilist's definition of knowledge. The role of Classical Infallibilism in broader epistemology should also be explored: how it impacted conceptions of inquiry, science and norms of belief. The history of the influential idea of indication of truth is also worth studying in detail.

One question the New Story obviously raises is: why was Classical Infallibilism so widely and strongly held? A *scholarly* hypothesis would be that Classical Infallibilism was somehow transmitted through the Western philosophical tradition. Several may be explored.[131] A *folk* hypothesis would be that Classical Infallibilism is somehow rooted in the ways (Western) people ascribe knowledge. Since its recent demise in analytic circles is unlikely to have had any influence on non-philosophers, we should be able to observe these roots now. Hence psychology can be brought to bear on the New Story. Since ordinary people are not sceptics, they are not straightforwardly applying an implicit Classical Infallibilist theory of knowledge. But they do tend to deny knowledge in the light of indiscernible possibilities of error.[132] Whatever mechanisms are responsible for that tendency may have contributed to the long-lasting appeal of Classical Infallibilism.[133] Needless to say, scholarly and folk hypotheses may be combined.

The interaction between history and psychology goes both ways. The Legend has been taken as *prima facie* evidence that the folk conception of knowl-

[131]One is transmission of the positive Hellenistic conception. However, even though Hellenistic epistemology filtered into neo-Platonism and medieval Aristotelianism, its wider impact remains to be established. Another is transmission on the authority of sceptical arguments: by trade, philosophers are taught to take sceptical arguments seriously, and so they endorse conceptions of knowledge that make these arguments serious. That hypothesis reverses the natural order of explanation. Another is that Classical Infallibilism was primed by some widely-read texts, such as Plato's *Republic*. Or course a combination of such factors is possible.

[132]See Nagel et al.'s (2013) *Sceptical Pressure* case. In the control story, Emma believes that a piece of jewellery displayed in a shop is a diamond necklace. In the sceptical pressure variant, it is added that "Emma could not tell the difference between a real diamond and a cubic zirconium fake just by looking or touching". The addition drops the number of subjects who ascribe knowledge (in a forced-choice paradigm) from 75% to 41%. See also Nichols et al. (2003).

[133]One simple suggestion is that people are applying a Classical Infallibilist conception but with only a salient sample of error possibilities in mind. However I doubt that knowledge ascription goes merely by way of applying some implicit theory. For all we know it could involve a mix of heuristics, comparison to paradigm cases, and bits of theory.