

Warning Concerning Copyright Restrictions

The Copyright Law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted materials. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research. If electronic transmission of reserve material is used for purposes in excess of what constitutes "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

J. L. AUSTIN

PHILOSOPHICAL
PAPERS

THIRD EDITION

EDITED BY

J. O. URMSON

AND

G. J. WARNOCK

Oxford New York Toronto Melbourne

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

1979

Oxford University Press, Walton Street, Oxford OX2 6DP

OXFORD LONDON GLASGOW
NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE WELLINGTON
KUALA LUMPUR SINGAPORE HONG KONG TOKYO
DELHI BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS KARACHI
NAIROBI DAR ES SALAAM CAPE TOWN

© *Oxford University Press 1961, 1970, 1979*

First published by the Clarendon Press 1961

Second edition 1970

First issued as an

Oxford University Press Paperback 1970

Second impression 1976

Third edition 1979

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of Oxford University Press.

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form of binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Austin, John Langshaw

Philosophical papers. - 3rd ed.

I. Philosophy - Collected works

I. Urmson, James Opie

II. Warnock, Geoffrey James

192'.08 B1618.A8 79-40630

ISBN 0-19-824627-7

0-19-283021-x Pbk

B
1618
.A8
1979

*Printed in Great Britain
at the University Press, Oxford
by Eric Buckley
Printer to the University*

II

PRETENDING¹

IN a recent paper² Mr. Errol Bedford argues that 'anger', like other words which would be said to be words for emotions, is not the name of a feeling, despite the existence of such expressions as 'feeling angry'. 'Anger', he argues, is not a name, nor is anger a feeling: there is no specific feeling that angry men as such feel, nor do we, to be angry, have to feel any feeling at all. With this thesis I am not concerned, but only with some remarks that he makes, quite incidentally, about pretending (and I realize it is hard on him to pick these out for intensive criticism). For he thinks that his view may be countered by referring to the case of someone *pretending* to be angry: is this not parallel to the case of someone *pretending* to be in pain, who precisely does not feel a certain feeling (pain) that the man who *is* in pain *does* feel—a feeling of which 'pain' surely is the name?

Can we say that being angry is similar to being in pain in this respect? Let us contrast the cases of a man who is angry and another, behaving in a similar way, who is only pretending to be. Now it may well be true that the former feels angry, whereas the latter does not, but in any case it is not this that constitutes the difference between the fact that the one is angry and the fact that the other is only pretending to be. The objection rests on a misconception of what pretence is. There is necessarily involved in pretence, or shamming, the notion of a limit which must not be overstepped: pretence is always insulated, as it were, from reality. Admittedly this limit may be vague, but it must exist. It is a not unimportant point that it is

¹ Reprinted from *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, Supplementary Volume xxxii (1957-8), by courtesy of the editor.

² *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 1956-7.

usually *obvious* when someone is pretending. If a man who is behaving as if he were angry goes so far as to smash the furniture or commit an assault, he has passed the limit; he is not *pretending*, and it is useless for him to protest afterwards that he did not feel angry. Far from this statement being *proof* that he was not angry, it would be discounted even if it were accepted as true. "He was angry, but he did not feel angry" is not self-contradictory, although it is no doubt normally false. If in a particular case it is difficult—as it may be—to settle the question "Pretended or real?" that can only be because the relevant public evidence is inadequate to settle it. What we want is more evidence of the same kind, not a special piece of evidence of a different kind. Our difficulty in resolving the question "Is he really in pain?" on the other hand, arises from the fact that the only decisive evidence is evidence that he alone is in a position to give.

Since pain gets a perhaps undue share of attention in philosophy, and since Mr. Bedford is not shocking us about pretending to be in pain, let us here leave pain out of it, only remarking that if pretending to be in pain and pretending to be angry are actually as different as Mr. Bedford supposes then surely his statements about pretending, designed as they are to fit the case of anger, should be put in less general terms.

Our man, then, is 'behaving as if he were angry'. He scowls, let us say, and stamps his foot on the carpet. So far we may (or perhaps must?) still say 'He is not (really) angry: he is (only) pretending to be angry'. But now he goes further, let us say he bites the carpet: and we will picture the scene with sympathy—the carpet innocent, the bite untentative and vicious, the damage grave. Now he has gone too far, overstepped the limit between pretence and reality, and we cannot any longer say 'He is pretending to be angry' but must say "He is really angry". Mr. Bedford's language seems to me on the whole to mean positively that we must say this *because and in the sense that* behaviour of this extreme sort *constitutes* being really angry.¹

¹ At least the bite 'constitutes the difference' between being really angry and pretending to be angry, the common element being presumably such behaviour as scowling. Some may recall the textbook example, where it is

or is just what we mean by 'being really angry'. If, however, he only means, what he also says, that the extreme behaviour is decisive *evidence* that the man is really angry, that is not only a very different and slightly (if only slightly) more plausible thesis, but also one too weak to serve for his argument: for now we are still not told what really being angry, for which this is only the *evidence*, is, nor therefore shown that it does not involve, or even reside in, the feeling of a feeling—the evidence *might* be evidence that he is feeling a certain feeling.

We have primarily to consider whether Mr. Bedford is right in what he says we should *say*, rather than his claims about what is shown by our so speaking, if we do. If the man takes the bite, he *cannot* 'be pretending'—here surely Mr. Bedford carries the philosopher's professional addiction to furniture to a new pitch of positive concern for it. And if he does really mean that the difference in behaviour 'constitutes the difference between the fact that the one is angry and the fact that the other is only pretending to be', then he must be claiming, not only that once he has taken the bite we *cannot* (truly) say 'He is only pretending to be angry', which seems false, but also that if he merely stamps and goes no further we *cannot* (truly) say 'He is really angry', which seems patently false. I think it must on reflection be agreed that in whichever of the ways the man behaves it is open to us to say *either* 'He is angry' or 'He is only pretending to be angry', and that either statement can be in fact true, depending on the (other) circumstances of the case at least in addition to these features of his behaviour. It is common enough for someone who is really angry to behave in no way violently or even conspicuously: and if someone is pretending to be angry in some emergency where the success of the pretence matters seriously, more anyway than the integrity of any adjacent furniture (which may not even be his own and may in any case be insured), then surely he

only the hair on a gooseberry that stops it from being a grape: by a 'gooseberry', then, we mean simply a hirsute grape—and by a 'grape' likewise simply a glabrous gooseberry.

may hit upon biting the carpet as the very thing to clinch the deception.

Something has gone very wrong. Yet still there are in fact, as we should expect, ways in which limits and the overstepping of limits are relevant to the concept of pretending, as to so many others. On a festive occasion you are ordered, for a forfeit, to pretend to be a hyena: going down on all fours, you make a few essays at hideous laughter and finally bite my calf, taking, with a touch of realism possibly exceeding your hopes, a fair-sized piece right out of it. Beyond question you have gone too far.¹ Try to plead that you were only pretending, and I shall advert forcibly to the state of my calf—not much pretence about that, is there? There are limits, old sport. This sort of thing in these circumstances will not pass as '(only) pretending to be a hyena'. True—but then neither will it pass as *really being* a hyena. The limit overstepped, a limitation upon violence as in the carpet-biting case, is not a boundary between pretending to be a hyena and really being a hyena, but between pretending to be a hyena and behaving like an uncivilized tough, or perhaps between *merely* pretending to be a hyena and pretending to be a hyena *with a difference* of some kind, with knobs on or with ulterior motives. So too if you begin to assault the bric-a-brac when told to pretend to be angry for a forfeit, we need not say that you must be really angry, but only that such antics are too bad and quite uncalled-for when pretending in such circumstances, or perhaps that you are taking advantage of the opportunity to further private aesthetic aims (in which case you may not really be pretending, but only pretending to pretend), or perhaps something else again quite different but still in its way satisfyingly censorious.

The moral is, clearly, that to be not pretending to be, and still more to be not only-pretending to be, is not by any means necessarily, still less *eo ipso*, to be really being. This is so even when the way in which we fail to be (only-) pretending is by

¹ In these circumstances. But if Nero ordered you, in the arena, to pretend to be a hyena, it might be unwisely perfunctory *not* to take a piece right out.

indulging in excessively 'realistic' behaviour: but of course there are also numerous other kinds of case, some to be mentioned later, in which we might be taken to be pretending and so may be said to be not pretending, where the reasons for which we are said not to be (only-) pretending are totally different from this, and such that the notion that not-pretending \supset really being could scarcely insinuate itself. We must not allow ourselves to be too much obsessed by the opposition, in which of course there is *something*, between pretending and really being: not one of the following formulae is actually correct:

- (1) not really being \supset pretending
- (2) pretending \supset not really being
- (3) not pretending \supset really being
- (4) really being \supset not pretending.¹

So set out these formulae lose, I realize, some of their attractiveness: but arguments like Mr. Bedford's show that they can attract; he has actually, if I am not mistaken, fallen principally for (3), which is not by any means the most tempting, though some of his arguments seem to favour (2), a quite independent matter.

'Pretend' is a verb used in various constructions, of which I have so far only mentioned 'pretend to be' followed by an adjective or adjectival phrase or by a substantive with the article: in such cases excessive behaviour will, as we have seen, commonly not produce the result that the performer 'really is', for example, angry. (I hesitate to say it, but surely the obvious reason is that 'being angry' does not consist merely in behaving publicly in some manner: to say this need not commit us to saying that being angry is the same as feeling angry—it is not, any more than being tired is the same as feeling tired—still less that 'anger' is the name of a feeling.) However, we have to consider also the construction in which 'pretend' is followed by 'to A' or 'to be A-ing', especially in cases where the verb 'A' is one which describes the doing of some *deed* (for example, 'bite' as

¹ Actually, 'really' is, like 'actually', really a broken reed in philosophy. See how they twist and turn in example (3) below—the window-cleaner.

opposed to, for example, 'believe'), and more particularly when that deed is of a pretty 'physical' kind (for example, biting as opposed to, for example, giving). If we now consider such a case as this: and if we remember one of the conditions that must be satisfied whenever I am pretending, viz. that there must be something, and something public, that I am actually doing, some action I actually am performing, in pretending and in order to pretend: then we may hope to have found *one* type of case in which what Mr. Bedford claims to hold of pretending in general does in fact hold.

Let us take the case where someone is to 'pretend to take a bite out of your calf'. Here it would be agreed that one thing he must *not* do,¹ however lifelike the pretence, is anything that could be correctly described as '(actually) taking a bite out of your calf': yet plainly too the action he has, in pretending, actually to perform is one which will be up to a point genuinely like the action he is pretending to perform (for what he is pretending is *here* to perform a public physical action), and might, but for precautions, pass over into it.² If he goes far enough he *will* have *really* done the thing he was only to pretend to do: and if he does not go so far, he *cannot* have really done *that* thing. Here, then, we seem to have a case on Mr. Bedford's pattern.

It is owing to the special features of cases of this kind that an impasse can arise over pretending to do something, say hole a putt, in circumstances, say in the presence of a surrounding crowd, where there seems to be nothing one can do at all like holing the putt which will not result in the putt's being actually holed.³ It is easy to pretend to be sitting on a certain chair when

¹ At least intentionally: I neglect complications about the unintentional.

² Of course there is too the rarish and quite different case in which a man pretending to be angry actually *becomes* angry—makes himself angry. I do not think this is of comparable interest.

³ Doubtful, though not inexplicable, cases arise here, because of doubts as to how much is connoted by a putative description of a 'physical' action. Can I pretend to cough? Shall I, if I produce a coughing noise, have actually coughed? Or is 'to cough' different from 'to deliberately cough'?

it is half concealed behind a desk, less easy if it is in full view. (This is different from the less subtle type of case where one cannot pretend to do something because one can do neither it nor, often by the same token, anything even passably like it. Thus you cannot pretend to curl your trunk—though again, of course, if you help yourself to that curious object 'a pretend trunk', i.e. something of which we *pretend that it is your trunk*, you can very likely curl that, and hence also very likely pretend to curl it.)

Is it however the case that at least when we are pretending to do or to be doing a physical action we are *universally* debarred from actually doing that action itself? We will consider three examples:

1. Two miscreants are surprised in the act and hastily agree, the wherewithal being handy, to pretend to be sawing a tree: in a trice the blade is humming to and fro a bare inch away from the bark. How good a pretence is that? And wouldn't they any longer be pretending to be sawing the tree if they allowed the teeth to bite in? Surely if they want the pretence to be convincing they should set about actually sawing the tree?

2. Yet surely again magicians pretend to saw girls, we've all seen one pretending very successfully to saw a girl in half. Would it really be still a pretence, and a more convincing one, if the teeth were biting in? Or wouldn't it rather have been transformed into grim reality?

3. That chap over there, he's all right I suppose, he's cleaning the windows, eh?

Ah, *him*, he's *pretending* to be cleaning the windows right enough, cleaning 'em a treat too: but I seen him taking note of the valuables through 'em all the time.¹

To unravel these examples, we shall need a few more lemmas: we shall need to bring out more of the full features

¹ Here is another, trick, example, for exercise purposes only:—a man at a party decides, in an attempt to amuse, to pretend to behave vulgarly: the party, however, is of a type at which even to pretend to behave vulgarly is, alas, to behave vulgarly.

of the situation when we are pretending, which is moderately complicated. And first for that goddess fair and free (fairly fair, frailly free), divinest Etymology. *Prae-tendere* in Latin never strays far from the literal meaning of holding or stretching one thing in front of another in order to protect or conceal or disguise it: even in such a figurative use as that in Ovid's 'praetendens culpae splendida verba tuae', the words are still a façade to hide the crime. In English, we do not any longer explicitly refer, in the construction used with 'pretend', to that which the pretender is hiding or dissembling, which in Latin does appear in the dative case.¹ Nevertheless it seems clear that it still is an important feature of pretending, in classic cases if not in all, that the pretender is concealing or suppressing something.

In a case of pretending, then, there will typically be:

(PB) The pretence-behaviour, the actual public performance gone through in pretending, indulged in, as of course it is, for the sake of dissembling.

(Rd) The reality-dissembled, about which the audience is to be hoodwinked. This *may* on occasion include in part, or be wholly identical with

(RBd) Some real-behaviour-dissembled, as for instance when I am really engaged in biting the carpet but disguise this fact by pretending to be kissing it.

Thus when we speak of someone's angry behaviour being only a pretence, *one* thing with which this pretended anger is commonly being contrasted at least in our minds is (Rd) his real emotion, feeling, attitude, or what you will, which, whatever it is, is precisely not 'real anger'. In daily life, indeed, this contrast may be of more interest than the quite different contrast, which has been more stressed by philosophers, between

(PBm) The mere-pretence-behaviour, the actual public

¹ Indeed in English even the accusative case after 'pretend', as in, for example, 'He pretended sickness', though a venerable construction is by now archaic. In the special construction 'pretending not to be' there is however a reference to what is being concealed.

performance gone through in pretending, disregarding its motivation,

and

(GBs) The genuine-behaviour-simulated, which PBm is intended to resemble. This may be related to a further

(Gs) 'Genuinity'¹-simulated, as genuinely behaving angrily is related, for example, to genuinely being angry.

When some simple contrast between 'pretence' and 'reality' comes up in discussion, it is all too often uncertain which of the things here listed is being contrasted with which.

To return now to our three examples. (2)—the girl-sawing—simply supports the rule suggested by the preceding discussion, that in pretending to do A you must not actually do A, or that PBm must not coincide with GBs. Defending this rule, we are tempted to try some special dodge to get out of (1)—the tree-sawing. The miscreants are 'pretending to be sawing the tree' and also 'they are sawing it' in fact, *but* perhaps they are pretending to 'be sawing' it in a sense that covers times earlier and later than the time during which they 'are sawing' it in fact: so that PBm does differ from GBs, it extends over a shorter stretch of time. Or perhaps we should not allow that they 'are (seriously) sawing' it, for example, in the sense that they are not embarked on an operation designed to terminate in the fall of the tree: but it is not clear what this means—suppose the police are suspicious and continue to hang around indefinitely? The case will then become like that of the man who pretends to be playing golf by playing a few strokes: can he prolong the pretence all round the course and yet not be actually playing golf? It is likely that by introducing 'seriously' (and of course

¹ I am driven to this horrible word because I wish to use throughout the second contrast a different term from 'real', which I have kept for the first contrast.

The Gs may stand to the GBs as, say, its 'motivation': then such an expression as 'pretending to be angry' will commonly run the two together. But where the GBs is something more purely 'physical', such as 'sawing a girl in half', the Gs, if any, is at a discount.

it is true that their heart is not in sawing the tree, they are only doing it at all to cover up something) we are really already on the way to the treatment which we *must* use for example (3)—the window-cleaner.

Here surely no dodge will help us; we must allow that he is indeed actually cleaning the windows, from start to finish and throughout the whole time he is pretending to be cleaning them. But it is still a pretence, because what he is *really* doing all the time is something different, namely noting the valuables: he is only cleaning the windows to disguise and promote this other activity—RBd goes on during the course of PB, which facilitates it and distracts attention from it. (In other cases RBd may actually be incorporated into PB as a camouflaged part of it.) It looks, then, as though it does not matter if PB does coincide with GBs, so long as the contrast between PB and RBd is preserved.¹

It is worth noting once more that it will seldom be possible to decide with certainty that PBm does coincide exactly with GBs, because in so many cases GBs is apt to be described, and may only be describable, in terms which already import the Gs which underlines it: thus when someone is 'pretending to be angry', the GBs will be 'angry behaviour' or 'the behaviour of an angry man', a description which may be held already to mean that the actions are done 'in anger'. Only when the GBs is describable in pretty purely 'physical' terms which disregard 'motivation' and the like, for example, as 'sawing a girl', shall we be confident of the coincidence.

In the light of example (3), it can now be seen that the supposed rule that in certain cases, such as example (2), PBm must not coincide with GBs, is really only a marginal case of a more general rule. The essence of the situation in pretending is (not so much that my public behaviour must be non-genuine behaviour, as rather) that my public behaviour is meant to

¹ Here is one of the similarities between 'pretence' and 'pretext'. A pretext may be not a genuine reason or not your real reason: a pretence may be something you are not genuinely doing or not what you are really doing.

disguise some reality, often some real behaviour. From this it obviously follows, not only that PB must not coincide with RBd, in which case there would be no disguise, but also that PB must not coincide with *not*-RBd, in which case there would be nothing to be being disguised. Now in a case like that of the magician, the RBd precisely is, or includes, *not* actually sawing the girl in half, so that the GBs, sawing the girl in half, is equivalent to *not*-RBd: hence in such a case it follows directly from the more general rule that PB must stop short of being identical with GBs, as = *not*-RBd. This type of case, where Gs precisely equals or involves *not*-Rd, or GBs *not*-RBd, is of course quite a common one: 'pretending not to be' is a special variety of it.

At least in many cases there seems to be a clear difference in meaning between the expressions 'pretending to A' and 'pretending to be A-ing'. The former seems often to be preferred where it is being pointed out that PBm does not coincide with GBs, while the latter stresses that PB does not coincide with RBd. 'He is only pretending to clean the windows', i.e. what he is doing does not amount to genuinely cleaning the windows; but 'He is only pretending to be cleaning the windows', i.e. what he is really up to is something other than cleaning the windows. Take, again, Potter's gambit, where he makes three random moves and then resigns. If we say 'He's only pretending to play (chess)', we mean that that is not playing chess:¹ but if we say 'He's only pretending to be playing (chess)', we allow that in a way and for all we care he is playing chess, but we mean that he is really up to some deeper game. Children who are ignorant may typically be 'pretending to play chess': children, ignorant or not, who are up to mischief may typically be 'pretending to be playing chess'. The magician who is pretending to saw the girl, i.e. we reassure ourselves, not actually sawing her, may also be said to be 'pretending to be sawing her' if, whether he is or not (and naturally we presume

¹ For some reason. For example, to be genuinely playing chess you must be making your moves with the object of winning, or at least of not losing.

not), he is surreptitiously engaged in something else rather crucial for the success of the illusion.

I should not, however, like to claim that this is the whole story about 'pretending to A' and 'pretending to be A-ing'. For consider two further cases:

4. Someone in the next room out of sight keeps up a string of remarks such as 'Check', 'Your move', &c., and occasionally taps pieces of wood together. We should say 'He is (only) pretending (for the benefit of us in the next room) to be playing chess', but scarcely 'He is (only) pretending to play chess'. Why is this?

5. A boy in an arm-chair is making tugging and twisting movements with his arms, accompanied by gear-change and other raucous noises. He is 'pretending to be driving a racing-car', but scarcely 'pretending to drive a racing-car'. Why? A possible answer is this. In neither case is the behaviour of the pretending party sufficiently like the genuine article (GBs) for it to be in point to mark the distinction between the two. To pretend to drive a racing-car, he would need a racing-car: as it is, there is no serious prospect of deception. And in case (4) the deception is worked indirectly, mainly by words: if his actual actions were observed, there would again be no serious chance of deception. It might be urged, too, that both these cases of 'pretending to' have some affinity with 'pretending that', of which more later, which generally requires the continuous present tense after it. On the other hand, the difference between, say, 'pretending to sit' and 'pretending to be sitting' is at least sometimes clearly just the familiar difference between 'he sits' and 'he is sitting', so that it will not do to claim that the two forms of expression are used to mark any one single distinction.

So far we have not strayed very far from our starting-point, a consideration of the limits which must not be overstepped in the pretence-behaviour. Only in special cases is the limit between 'pretending to do A' and 'really doing A' of much interest, and even then it is of minor importance in clarifying

the whole notion of pretending. When something claimed to be pretending is ruled out by reason of 'going too far', this will commonly mean something such as 'going beyond what was socially permissible on that occasion' rather than 'slipping into doing the actual thing'. But now further, there are other conditions of a quite general kind to which behaviour must conform if it is to qualify as pretence-behaviour: the following examples may serve to bring out some of them:

6. Trapped on a branch against the moon, we decide to pretend to be owls: you give a colourable hoot while I pull up my legs and hunch my shoulders up to my ears.

7. As I am engaged in filching one of your goats, you return inopportunately through the dusk: with a baffled snarl I bound off into the adjacent bush. Was this 'pretending to be a panther'? Or what if instead I slink about the kraal with menacing grunts?

8. Told to pretend to be a hyena at a party, you recline and appear to sleep.

9. In similar circumstances, you proceed to jump around powerfully on your hind legs, boxing with your fists and fondling something in your pocket.

These are all somewhat facetious cases of 'pretending to be an' animal. It may be worth pointing out that 'pretending to be a hyena' in the let's-pretend, make-believe, party-forfeit way, is a very recent usage, perhaps no older than Lewis Carroll, and the same indeed seems to apply to at least most usages in which we pretend to be something other than ourselves. One of the most conspicuous facts in the history of the word 'pretend' is that of late it has come to be more popular and to be applied more widely than formerly.

In (6) I do better than you. We both *imitate* the owl, you perhaps rather better in voice than I in silhouette: but you stop short of pretending to be an owl, because you fail to attempt to disguise the fact that you are not one—mere imitation does not imply dissembling anything. In (7), while it seems clear that I am pretending if I slink around, this becomes much more doubtful if I bound away, *right* away and *promptly*: for it to be

a clear case of pretending I, my human person, must *remain on the scene* to be hidden under the pretence, but as things are it is plainly preferring to be hidden under the bush. If, to startle me, you quack in a passable way from the undergrowth, you are scarcely pretending to be a duck (for you are not on the scene nor in need of disguise), as you would, however, be, very probably, if I trod on you in the dark and you quacked. Of course in all these cases you might be trying to *make me believe* that you were a panther or a duck: but not all such deceptions are achieved by pretending—I can make you believe I am angry by many methods without ever pretending to be angry.

In case (8), at the party, there is of course no question of my trying to convince you *seriously* that I am something other than myself; but still, on the party level, my performance must be convincing, I must dissemble my humanity under a simulated hyenity. I contrive to fail on both counts at once, because my behaviour is as much human as hyenine—how then could it distract attention from my humanity, to which so many other things point, or prompt anyone even to think specially of hyenas? A pretence must be not merely like but *distinctively* like the genuine article simulated: you will hardly pretend to be angry by simulating the behaviour of an angry man in perfect control of himself (though of course it might help if you were to *say* 'I am angry' too).

In (9), you evidently have a wrong idea of what a hyena is. The puzzle, such as it is, is exactly parallel to that about the man who, trying to draw a map of France, draws an outline which is that of Italy: its solution throws no special light on pretending, but rather on doing and intending to do in general—for pretending to be doing something is of course as good a case as another of doing something. You are meaning or trying to pretend to be a hyena, but actually behaving like a kangaroo: this is the correct and the shortest accurate way of describing the situation. There is *no* short answer to the question 'Is he pretending to be a hyena or isn't he?' nor to 'Is he

pretending to be a hyena or a kangaroo?' since such simple expressions are not adequate to cope with such a complicated case.

It is quite misleading to handle pretending in the way it is so often handled, as identical with being (or being doing) except that some special feature is left out—and Mr. Bedford is no worse in this respect than those he is attacking, who say, for example, that pretending to be in pain is just the same as being in pain except that you do not feel pain, or that pretending to be angry is behaving like a really angry man only without feeling like one. Even if there were, what there is not, a general bar against PBM being the same as GBs, and even if it were possible, which even then it would not be, to give a *general* account of the precise way in which PBM must *always* fall short of GBs, still such an account would not explain pretending: for there are many situations in which I behave like an angry man without being really angry, which are nevertheless not cases of pretending. For example, I may be a rough diamond, or have odd manners, or be strangely insensitive, or not be attending to what I am doing: or I may be acting or rehearsing, or merely imitating or mimicking. And yet these are only some of the simplest things from which pretending has to be distinguished, much less near to it than, say affecting or shamming or feigning or posing as. To be pretending, in the basic case,¹ I must be trying to make others believe, or to give them the impression, by means of a current personal performance in their presence, that I am (really, only, &c.) *abc*, in order to disguise the fact that I am really *xyz*. To neglect to notice all this is to put in the bathwater without the baby.

Even so, we are far from having a full account of the nuances of pretending. For example, in a pretence there is for preference

¹ I neglect here such parasitic cases as let's-pretending and pretending-to-oneself, besides, for the present, pretending-that. Still less have I space to take on 'pretensions', 'the Old Pretender' and the like: but it is not too difficult in fact to fit all these into their appropriate niches in the concept, and sometimes they shed light, as, for example, the contrast between 'affected' and 'pre-*tentious*' may help to point the contrast between affecting and pretending.

an element of the extempore, and in the situation that prompts it an element of emergency—there is at least something that has to be hidden. True, there are 'elaborate' pretences: but if there is too much of this, with making-up and dressing-up like an actor rather than a mimic or a diseuse, we begin to prefer to speak of, say, impersonation or imposture or disguise. To pretend to be a bear is one thing, to roam the mountain valleys inside a bearskin rather another. True, there are prolonged pretences—'How long', the cry goes up from the eternal drawing-room, 'must we two go on pretending to one another?'—but still we prefer to say that Col. Barker posed for twenty years as a man rather than that she pretended for twenty years. Again, if there is no sort of urgency to hide what we elect to hide, we may prefer to speak of a leg-pull or of affectation or a pose. Yet these are nuances, for it is probably legitimate enough, in these days, to extend 'pretending' to cover most of these cases if we do not care for precision, just as we can use 'pretended he was going to' to cover those cases where, more specifically, 'he made a feint', i.e. where he made a small movement in one direction to distract his opponent's defence, masking his true *intention*.

There remains, however, more to be said about one essential feature of pretending, namely that the pretender must be present and active in person to effect the deception by dint of his current behaviour. In the example of the panther above, the awkwardness is not merely that what is to be disguised is not 'on the scene' to be disguised, but also that the pretender is not on the scene to do the disguising, features both essential to pretending though of course not essential to many other forms of deception. I may camouflage a factory as a housing estate, in order to deceive the enemy in an emergency, but this is not to pretend that it is a housing estate (still less does it pretend to be a housing estate). I may pretend to have been furious by emerging from the conference room breathing hard and making derogatory remarks about the proceedings: but not by leaving traces in the conference room—bitten carpets,

maybe—designed to make you think I was furious at the time. In pretending, *contemporary behaviour* misleads as to *contemporary fact*, here the contemporary fact that I am not one recovering from or still suffering from the after-effects of fury, or mulling over fresh memories of fury.

This brings me to the last point I shall consider, the construction 'pretending that'. It may be the availability of this handy and flexible construction that has led to the ever increasing popularity of 'pretend', since such neighbouring verbs in the family as 'affect', 'feign', 'dissemble', and the like have never acquired a 'that' construction. It may even seem that, equipped with a that-clause, pretending achieves emancipation from some of the limitations inherent in pretending-to: when pretending-to I can deceive only as to *my own* states or activities, and contemporary ones at that, but surely when I 'pretend that it was in the garage yesterday' I deceive as to something other than my own states or activities, and something non-contemporary at that.

However, it is not easy to be certain that there is in fact any systematic difference between pretending-to and pretending-that, let alone that just suggested.¹ What is the difference between pretending to be on your way to Antarctica and pretending that you are on your way to Antarctica? Or between pretending not to remember her face and pretending that you do not remember it? One feels inclined to say: with pretending-that the stress is on the suppression or concealment of knowledge or memory or thought or belief or awareness, in short of some 'cognitive state', and what is simulated is likewise some cognitive state.² Thus to pretend that you are in love with her is to dissemble your awareness that you are not, to pretend to be in love with her is to dissemble your indifference or aversion to her. Hence the fact, it might be argued, that in pretending-

¹ It might be relevant, but would take too long, to consider the other verbs ('hope', &c.) which can take both constructions: they are not particularly numerous.

² Yet it seems scarcely right to say: 'pretend that' = 'pretend to believe (or the like) that'.

that the pretence-behaviour is particularly liable to take the form of verbal behaviour, since that is particularly apt for creating impressions about our cognitive states. Moreover the apparent emancipation of pretending—that can be on these lines both accounted for and discounted: when I pretend that it was in the garage yesterday I am still only dissembling *my own current* awareness (memory, knowledge, belief) that it was not: but of course awareness can be *awareness* of things other than my own states or activities, and of non-contemporary things.

Moreover it seems possible in this way to account for pretending-to-oneself or let's-pretending, the former of which strongly, if not exclusively, prefers the 'that' construction. Here we have a sort of 'make-believe'—we suppress our actual beliefs and simulate others.

Yet still in all cases of pretending—that, though it may be only a cognitive state that is simulated and though verbal devices may be often employed, it remains true that there is an immediate connexion with non-verbal behaviour. Pretending that I am on top of a mountain may seem a less active affair at first than pretending to be on top of a mountain, yet still it differs very considerably from merely imagining that I am on top of a mountain: pretending—that is a preliminary to or even accompanied by behaviour such as inhaling deeply or pointing downwards ('Let's pretend we're giraffes and eat the leaves'), while imagining—that is a preliminary perhaps only to asking myself certain questions—How should I feel?, &c., while my public behaviour will scarcely go beyond a faraway look, which is certainly no part of the imagining. For this reason I can 'always' imagine, for example, that my prison walls are not there, but it may be 'no good' pretending they are not there, they are solid enough to stop me doing the things that follow on the pretending.

But how far can all this be pressed? Is pretending to be playing chess always so very different from pretending that you are playing chess, or again (perhaps still more) from pretending you are playing chess? Perhaps all that should be said

is that the more it is a case of going through the motions the more likely we are to prefer 'to be playing' or 'to play': while the less this is necessary and the more we can put the deception across by verbal means or by simulating a belief the more we shall prefer the 'that' construction.

What, finally, is the importance of all this about pretending? I will answer this shortly, although I am not sure importance is important:¹ truth is. In the first place, it does seem that philosophers, who are fond of invoking pretending, have exaggerated its scope and distorted its meaning. In the second place, in the long-term project of classifying and clarifying all possible ways and varieties of *not exactly doing things*, which has to be carried through if we are ever to understand properly what doing things is, the clarification of pretending, and the assignment to it of its proper place within the family of related concepts, must find some place, if only a humble one.

¹ I dreamt a line that would make a motto for a sober philosophy: *Neither a be-all nor an end-all be.*