

In discussing the efficacy as well as the validity and the effectiveness of a witness, I have concluded as follows:

"Whereas the validity of a witness, in the relevant sense, depends solely on whether or not it is appropriate, even as its effectiveness depends solely on whether or not it is believed, its efficacy depends *both* on whether or not it is borne consistently in accordance with its own meaning as an existential communication *and* on whether or not it is received [as] or taken to be exactly that, with or without its also being received or taken as true" (Notebooks, 10 December 2007; rev. 8 December 2008).

As I've continued to reflect on it, however, I've come to realize that this conclusion, even if correct, may mislead in suggesting that the responsibility of the bearer of witness extends somehow to securing something other or more than its validity, i.e., its efficacy. Important as it is that the distinction between the validity of a witness and its efficacy be upheld, it is just as important to realize that all that the bearer of witness can be reasonably charged with securing is the validity of a witness. Otherwise put: the only thing the bearer of a witness can do by way of securing its efficacy is to secure its validity—specifically, its appropriateness.

That this implies that the bearer must be concerned with the appropriateness of a witness to the *question* it is supposed to address as well as to its answer seems clear enough. But beyond securing the appropriateness of a witness to both its answer *and* its question, there is nothing the bearer of witness can do to secure its efficacy. Everything else depends on the recipient of the witness—on her or his taking it *as* the existential communication it cannot fail to be if it is formulated appropriately *and* received accordingly.

1 September 2009