

Detailed Contents

<i>Contents</i>	xv
1. Solving the Skeptical Problem	1
1.1. The Puzzle of Skeptical Hypotheses	1
1.2. Contextualist Solutions: The Basic Strategy	3
1.3. Some Old Contextualist Solutions: Lewis’s “Rule of Accommodation”	6
1.4. Some Old Contextualist Solutions: The “Relevant Alternatives” Approach and the Rule of Relevance	10
1.5. The Subjunctive Conditionals Account (SCA) of the Plausibility of AI’s First Premise	13
1.6. SCA, Grandmothers, and Methods	15
1.7. SCA and Some Skeptical Hypotheses that Don’t Work	17
1.8. SCA Confirmed	18
1.9. Nozick’s Own Solution and the Abominable Conjunction	20
1.10. Strength of Epistemic Position and AI’s Second Premise	22
1.11. Strength and Sensitivity	25
1.12. The Rule of Sensitivity and the Beginnings of a New Contextualist Solution	27
1.13. The Rule of Sensitivity and SCA: A Comparison of Our New Solution with the Other Contextualist Solutions and with Nozick’s Solution	29
1.14. Our New Contextualist Solution Clarified and Compared with the Straightforward Solutions	30
1.15. Bold Skepticism and the Warranted Assertability Maneuver	32
1.16. Bold Skepticism and Systematic Falsehood	35
1.17. Begging the Question Against the Skeptic?	37
2. Moorean Methodology: Was the Skeptic Doomed to Inevitable Defeat?	39
2.1. Methodological vs. Substantive Mooreanism	39
2.2. A Quick Look at Moore in Action	40
2.3. Conservatism and Making a “Moorean Choice”	41
2.4. MORE PLAUSIBLE and its Application to the “Moorean Situation”	45
2.5. Damage-Control Conservatism: Making an “Enlightened Moorean Choice” and the Project of Defeating the Skeptic	46
2.6. Was the Skeptic Doomed to Defeat?	49
2.7. A Division among Philosophers over the Intuitive Power of AI’s First Premise	53
2.8. More Curiously Varying Responses to AI’s First Premise: Attempts to Ask Non-Philosophers	55
2.9. Assessment: The Intuitive Power of AI’s First Premise	57
2.10. Contextualist Mooreanism and the Intuitive Complexity Surrounding AI’s First Premise	59
2.11. The Value of AI, Whether or Not the Skeptic Had a Chance	61

X DETAILED CONTENTS

3. Two Substantively Moorean Responses and the Project of Refuting Skepticism	64
3.1. Substantively Moorean Responses to AI, Straightforward and Contextualist, and Our Pointed Question: How Can We Know that We’re not Brains in Vats?	64
3.2. The Project of Refuting Skeptics—and Anti-Skeptics who Are Not Engaged in that Project	66
3.3. Putnam-Style Responses to AI from Semantic Externalism	69
3.4. Two Forms of Arguments from Semantic Externalism	73
3.5. Old Objections: Varieties of Semantic Externalism and Varieties of Skeptical Hypotheses	74
3.6. The Disadvantages of Heroism	78
3.7. The Challenges Facing Non-Heroic, Moorean Alternative Responses	84
3.8. Comparing the Two Moorean Responses to Skepticism	85
4. Contextualism and Skepticism: The Defeat of the Bold Skeptic	87
4.1. Contextualism and the Project of Solving the AI Puzzle	87
4.2. A General Puzzle about Skeptical Inclinations Waxing and Waning vs. the AI Puzzle I’m Trying to Solve	90
4.3. Unspoken AI	93
4.4. Actual, Spoken Disputes over AI: I’m Not that Nice Contextualist!	94
4.5. Are the Skeptic and Her Moorean Opponent Both Making True Claims as They Argue? Some Disputes Are Genuine!	95
4.6. Are the Claims that Our Disputants Are “Trying” to Make Both True? Some Disputes Are Deeply Genuine!	98
4.7. Are the Claims that Our Disputants Are “Trying” to Make Both Deeply Important?	99
4.8. Bold vs. Timid Skeptics	100
4.9. Kornblith’s Attack: Full-Blooded vs. High Standards Skeptics	101
4.10. The Philosophical Interest of the High Standards Skeptic	103
4.11. Do I Respond Only to the High Standards Skeptic? The High Standards Skeptic, the Deplorable Position Skeptic, and the Bold Skeptic	107
4.12. Do I Respond Only to the High Standards Skeptic? The Simultaneous Defeat of the Bold Skeptics of Both Kinds	109
4.13. My Supposedly Thoroughly Externalist Response to the Full-Blooded Skeptic	113
4.14. Indexed AI	115
4.15. Irrelevant to Traditional Epistemological Reflection on Skepticism?	117
4.16. Is My Contextualist Position Inexpressible?	121
4.17. The Factivity Problem	123
5. Lotteries, Insensitivity, and Closure	132
5.1. The Harman Lottery Puzzle	132
5.2. The Explanation: SCA	137
5.3. The Open Future: No Determinate Winner, Losers	138
5.4. The Existence of an Actual Winner: The Eccentric Billionaire’s Lottery	139
5.5. The “Grabber” Lottery and Lewis’s Account	140

5.6. The “Grabber” Lottery and Hawthorne’s Account	142
5.7. The Existence of an Actual Winner: The Newspaper Lottery	143
5.8. SCA and the Newspaper Lottery	144
5.9. What About “My Paper is Accurate”?	146
5.10. Probabilistic Thoughts and Statistical Reasons	147
5.11. Causal Connections	149
5.12. That There is a Chance of Winning is the Whole Point of the Lottery!	151
5.13. The Big Pay-Off, Etc.	152
5.14. Our SSP Solution Applied to the Harman Lottery Puzzle	152
5.15. The Standard Contextualist Solution to the Harman Lottery Puzzle	156
5.16. The Intuitive Pull (Felt by Some) Toward Judging that We Do Know that We’ve Lost the Lottery	156
5.17. Ordinary-Strength Claims to Know that Someone Has Lost the Lottery: The Case of Andy, Nico, and Lou	157
5.18. Ordinary-Strength Claims to Know that Someone Has Lost the Lottery: “Come Off It!”/“Get Serious!” Claims	159
5.19. Hawthorne’s Objection and Multi-Premise Closure	160
5.20. Toward Intuitive Closure: Problems and Refinements	163
5.21. Yet Another Problem: The Aggregation of Risk	165
5.22. Fixing the Closure Principle to Address the Problem of the Aggregation of Risk Undermines Hawthorne-Like Objections	167
5.23. An Infallibilist Evasion of the Problem?	169
5.24. Micro-Risks of Error and the Failure of the Infallibilist Evasion	170
5.25. The Infallibilist Evasion and Standard Contextualist Solutions to the Lottery Puzzle	173
5.26. Intuitive Closure and Oxford Closure	173
6. Insensitivity	175
6.1. Counterexamples and Philosophical Theories	175
6.2. Insensitivity Accounts: Direct and Indirect	177
6.3. The Attack by Counterexamples on Insensitivity Accounts and Two Lines of Response to this Attack	179
6.4. Terminology: We Will Here Use “Sensitivity” and “Insensitivity” to Refer to the Refined Notions	181
6.5. Why Insensitivity Accounts Seem on the Right Track—Even if There Are Counterexamples that Have Not Yet Been Successfully Handled	182
6.6. Perilously Nearby Counterexamples: Schiffer’s and Williamson’s Enhanced BIV Hypotheses, and Hawthorne’s Non-Player Lottery Case	183
6.7. My Old Refinement: CE	186
6.8. “Real” Exceptions to IA’s Generalization: Low-Strength, True Claims to “Know” that Skeptical Hypotheses Are False	188
6.9. Williamson’s Distance Underestimator	192
6.10. Relative Insensitivity	195
6.11. Degree-of-Belief Insensitivity	196
6.12. Williamson’s Strange Creatures	197
6.13. Strength of Belief, Basing, and Williamson’s Strange Creatures	200

xii DETAILED CONTENTS

7. How Do We Know that We're Not Brains in Vats? Toward a Picture of Knowledge	202
7.1. Two Types of Explanation-Based Answers to Skepticism and the Problem with Giving Only the Positive Explanation	202
7.2. Combining the Positive and Negative Explanatory Approaches to Skepticism: Toward a Not-so-Partial Picture of Knowledge	205
7.3. Pictures, Theories, and Examples	206
7.4. Developing the Picture: Closeness, Restrictions, and the Coordination of Safety with Sensitivity	208
7.5. Single- or Double-Safety?	211
7.6. Pointed Questions and Challenges Facing Contextualist Mooreans	214
7.7. Keeping it Easy to Know _o that We're not Brains in Vats	216
7.8. Our Knowledge _o that We're not BIVs and the Charge of Vacuousness	218
7.9. What Is, and What Is Not, Important to Knowledge on the Basic Safety Approach: A Parable	220
7.10. Radical Skeptical Hypotheses, A Prioritism, and Split Cases AI	222
7.11. The Basic Easy Account of How We Come to Know _o that We're not BIVs	227
7.12. Epistemic Justification, Epistemic Conservatism, and the Basic Easy Account of How We Come to Know _o that We're not BIVs	228
7.13. A Prioritism vs. Dogmatism	230
7.14. Problems for Dogmatism	232
7.15. Deeply Contingent A Priori Knowledge: An Intolerable Problem for A Prioritism?	235
7.16. A Priori Knowledge: The Veins in the Marble	237
7.17. Deeply Contingent A Priori Knowledge and Radical Skeptical Hypotheses: Why Necessity Isn't Necessary	240
7.18. A Less Fanciful Account of How We Come to Think We Are Not BIVs and the Dogmatist Account of How Such Beliefs Come to Be Justified	243
7.19. Should We Ascribe a Basing Relation Here Without any Conscious Inference? Problems for Dogmatism (Again)	244
7.20. An A Prioritist Account	245
7.21. Dogmatism vs. A Prioritism on Two Questions	247
7.22. An Evaluation of Split Cases AI	248
7.23. How Do We Know that We're Not Brains in Vats?	250
Appendix A: Pryor and Byrne's Comparisons	255
Pryor	255
Byrne	262
Appendix B: Experimental-Philosophy-Style Surveys on AI's First Premise	265
Appendix C: Do I Even Know _o Any of This to Be True? Some Thoughts about Belief, Knowledge, and Assertion in Philosophical Settings and Other Knowledge Deserts	268
Appendix D: Weakened Closure and Skeptical Arguments	279

Appendix E: Attempts to Explicate Intuitive Fallibilism and the Distinction between Intuitive and Genuine Conflict (GC-) Fallibilism	285
Contextualism, Skepticism, and Intuitive Fallibilism	285
The Non-Entailing Reasons/Evidence Account of Intuitive Fallibilism	286
Accounting for Intuitive Fallibilism in Terms of Risk, Chances, or Possibilities of Error?	288
Genuine Conflict (GC-) Fallibilism Distinguished from Intuitive Fallibilism	289
Characterizing Intuitive Fallibilism in Micro Terms	289
Appendix F: Stine-Validity, Stalnaker-Reasonableness, and Fallibilist Positions on the Infallibilist's Tensions	291
<i>References</i>	295
<i>Index</i>	303