Between Probability and

Certainty

What Justifies Belief

Martin Smith

Contents

Introduction: The Risk Minimisation Conception of Justification

Some philosophers have claimed that cases involving lotteries provide vivid counterexamples to the traditional analysis of knowledge as justified, true belief (see Hawthorne, 2003, p9, Pritchard, 2007, p4). They reason along the following lines: Suppose I hold a single ticket in a fair lottery of one million tickets. Suppose I am convinced, purely on the basis of the odds involved, that my ticket won't win. Do I *know* that my ticket won't win? Intuitively, I don't know any such thing, even if it happens to be true. Presumably, though, I have plenty of *justification for believing* that my ticket won't win – after all, given my evidence, this proposition has a 99.9999% chance of being true. How much more justification could one want? If I'm not justified in believing that my ticket won't win, then surely none of us is justified in believing much at all. Here is a case, then, in which a justified, true belief fails to qualify as knowledge.

This argument seems straightforward enough, and yet there are reasons for being uneasy about it. On reflection, lottery cases seem somehow *different* from the standard Gettier cases that are used to refute the traditional analysis of knowledge. Consider the following: I wander into a room, undergo a visual experience as of a red wall and come to believe that the wall is red. In actual fact the wall *is* red but, unbeknownst to me, it is bathed in strong red light emanating from a hidden source, such that it would have looked exactly the same to me even if it had been white. Intuitively, I do not know, in this case, that the wall is red, in spite of the fact that my belief is both justified and true.

We can observe a number of apparent differences between these two cases. In particular, while my belief in the Gettier case fails to actually qualify as knowledge, it nevertheless seems to be a good or promising *candidate* for knowledge – and would have been knowledge if only conditions in the world had been more obliging. My belief in the lottery case, however, doesn't seem to be the sort of belief that could *ever* qualify as knowledge. In the Gettier case, the problem seems to lie with the *world* – and funny, abnormal goings on therein. In the lottery case, the problem seems to lie with *me* and the way in which I form my belief (see Ryan, 1996, pp136, 137).

The Hawthorne/Pritchard argument betrays a commitment to a certain, quite pervasive, way of thinking about epistemic justification. The picture is something like this: For any proposition P we can always ask how *likely* it is that P is true, given present evidence. The more likely it is that P is true, the more justification one has for believing that it is. The less likely it is that P is true, the less justification one has for believing that it is. One has justification simpliciter for believing P when the likelihood of P is sufficiently high and the risk of ~P is correspondingly low. Call this the *risk minimisation* conception of justification.

This general sort of picture can be identified in the work of a very broad range of epistemologists. Sometimes it is made more or less explicit (see Russell, 1948, chap. VI, Chisholm, 1957, p28, Derksen, 1978, Alston, 1988, Moser, 1988, Plantinga, 1993, chap. 9, Fumerton, 1995, pp18-19, Lewis, 1996, p551, Swinburne, 2001, chap. 3, 2011, Conee and Feldman, 2004, n32, Pryor, 2004, pp350-351, 2005, p181, BonJour, 2010, Goldman, 2011, section 16.7). More often it is left implicit, as in the above reasoning. I don't know of any detailed arguments in favour of this picture, though the following thought is admittedly quite compelling: Most epistemologists are *fallibilists* of one kind or another and hold that a belief can be justified even if one doesn't have evidence that makes it certain – even if one hasn't completely eliminated all risk of error. But if justification can fall short of evidential certainty,

then what else could it possibly *be* if not evidential probability or likelihood? If justification does not require the complete elimination of error risk, then what else could it possibly require if not its minimisation?

When all is said and done, I'm unsure whether I can offer adequate answers to these questions – but I will attempt, in this book, to come to a rather different way of thinking about justification. Some of the views that I'll defend – or at least take seriously – might strike some as obviously wrong. An example might be the view that we can, sometimes, be justified in believing things that are very unlikely to be true, given our evidence. I think that this may in the end be correct – and by 'justification', I don't simply mean justification that is 'practical' or 'prudential', but justification that is *genuinely epistemic*. But I will begin with ideas that are, I hope, less controversial.

It's clear that there is *something* that sets purely statistical evidence apart from evidence of other kinds. In the case described above, my evidence for the proposition that my ticket will lose the lottery is a clear example of evidence that is purely statistical in character. Here is another (based on an example due to Cohen, 1977, §24): Suppose that 100 people attended a concert but only one ticket was ever sold. As such, only one person at the concert attended legitimately and the other 99 were gatecrashers. Suppose we know that Joe was one of the people who attended the concert but have no further information about him. Is Joe a gatecrasher? In one sense it has to be admitted that our evidence in favour of this proposition is very strong indeed. And yet, when pressed, most of us would, I think, be reluctant to give this evidence much weight.

Should I draw the conclusion that Joe gatecrashed the concert and treat him accordingly? Should I go about asserting that Joe is a gatecrasher – should I, for instance, inform his friends, his family, his employer? Should Joe be taken to court and appropriate

punishment applied to him? Most of us would be very apprehensive about taking such steps just on the grounds that Joe attended the concert and that 99 out of 100 attendees were gatecrashers. And this is not just a philosopher's intuition – under prevailing legal practice, in a broad range of jurisdictions, statistical evidence of this kind would not be deemed sufficient for a positive finding of fact to the effect that Joe gatecrashed the concert (for some relevant references see Kaye, 1982, section I, Allensworth, 2009, section IIB). From the perspective of the risk minimisation conception, though, this apprehensiveness is puzzling. After all, there's no question that our evidence makes it *very likely* that Joe gatecrashed the concert. By believing, asserting and acting upon this proposition, we would only be running a very small risk of error.

Perhaps when it comes to believing and asserting that Joe gatecrashed and applying appropriate sanctions to him, we wouldn't be willing to tolerate *any* risk of error, no matter how small. But this really seems not to be the case – for we would be perfectly willing to do such things on the strength of *other kinds* of non-conclusive evidence. Suppose that, instead of our having statistical evidence in favour of Joe being a gatecrasher, we have some eye-witness testimony to that effect. Suppose a witness testifies that she clearly saw Joe scaling the fence at the concert or some such. As long as we had no reason to doubt the reliability of this testimony, we would usually be willing to take it at face value – and to repeat it and act upon it. Most of us would be quite comfortable with Joe being appropriately punished on the strength of evidence such as this. And, under prevailing legal practice, testimonial evidence of this kind, provided it is not contradicted or otherwise called into question, could constitute sufficient grounds for a finding to the effect that Joe gatecrashed the concert.

We are all perfectly aware, though, that testimony is fallible. Just because an eye-witness testifies that Joe gatecrashed the concert, this doesn't *make it certain* that he did – he may still be innocent. Witnesses are sometimes mistaken and they sometimes lie. The eye-

witness testimony undoubtedly makes it *likely* that Joe gatecrashed but, plausibly, it doesn't make quite as likely as *99%* – and yet this is precisely how likely the proposition is, given the statistical evidence about which we seemed so apprehensive. By believing that Joe gatecrashed on the basis of the testimonial evidence, we would actually be running a *higher* risk of error than we would in believing this on the basis of the statistical evidence. As such, the risk minimisation conception straightforwardly predicts that the latter belief should be more justified than the former. Yet this would seem to be the very opposite of the truth.

Maybe there is nothing here that should seriously trouble a risk minimisation theorist. Maybe our judgments about the case reflect an unreasonable bias against statistical evidence and we should train ourselves to give them up. But if we were to try and devise a theory of justification that really did do justice to our judgments here, what would it look like? Apart from anything else, it would need to be a view on which justification somehow demanded *more* than probability, but *less* than certainty – a view on which no amount of purely statistical evidence could make for justification, even though something like testimonial evidence could.

As I've mentioned, the testimony to the effect that Joe gatecrashed the concert still leaves open that possibility that he is innocent. This was an open possibility before we received the testimony and it remains so afterwards. What the testimony does, though, is force us to *reconceptualise* this possibility – to view it in a different sort of light. Once we've received the witness testimony, there is *something that it would take* in order for Joe to still be innocent – it would take a deceit, it would take a misperception, it would take some sort of departure from *normal circumstances*.

In contrast, if my only evidence against Joe is that he attended the concert and that 99 out of 100 attendees were gatecrashers then, while it may be unlikely that Joe is innocent, it wouldn't really take any departure from normal circumstances for this to be true. While I

might, in a sense, be surprised to learn that Joe is innocent, in another sense there shouldn't be anything particularly surprising about this, given my evidence. I know that one of the attendees was innocent – and it is no more surprising that this should turn out to be Joe than anyone else. If I believe that Joe gatecrashed, on the basis of the statistical evidence, then my belief could turn out to be false without anything abnormal having transpired. If I believe that Joe gatecrashed on the basis of testimony, then it would take some abnormal circumstance to part my belief from the truth. Viewed in this way, the testimonial evidence really does seem to offer something more than the statistical evidence does.

These observations are in no way peculiar to testimonial evidence per se. Suppose *I* am an eye-witness to Joe's gatecrashing – suppose I get a clear look at him scaling the fence. Like testimonial evidence, direct perceptual evidence does more than just 'load the dice' in favour of a proposition. My perceptual experience may make it less likely that Joe is innocent, but it also makes this possibility *demand something more* – hallucination, perceptual malfunction, disguise etc – it makes it demand a departure from normalcy. Purely statistical evidence is distinctive for *not* having this effect.

These remarks do not, of course, amount to some new theory of justification – not yet. At present, they are perhaps little more than suggestive slogans – and they contrast sharply with my formulation of the risk minimisation conception as a relatively clear and precise thesis. My primary aim, in this book, is to try and make something more of these ideas – to build them into something that would count as a viable alternative to the risk minimisation conception.

While my way of thinking about justification may be unfamiliar, it is connected to a more familiar way of thinking about *knowledge*. Many epistemologists have been attracted to the idea that, in order for a belief to qualify as knowledge it must be *safe* from error – it is necessary that the belief could not easily have been wrong. This is often spelled out in terms

of possible worlds: In order for a belief to be knowledge it must be true in all close or similar possible worlds at which it is held. In order for a belief to be justified, on my view, there is also a set of possible worlds throughout which the belief must be true wherever it is held. These are not worlds that are 'close' or 'similar' as such, but worlds that are *normal*.

One might wonder whether those who adopt a safety condition upon knowledge have some additional incentive to adopt a structurally similar condition on justification, such as the one I defend here. There may be some truth to this – but we should proceed with caution. What is clear, though it has not been widely observed, is that combining a safety condition upon knowledge with the risk minimisation conception of justification makes for a kind of *ill-fit* between the two norms. As I will be arguing, there are in fact a number of familiar ideas about knowledge that sit very uneasily alongside the risk minimisation conception of justification.

I mentioned above that the risk minimisation conception of justification is left implicit in the work of a number of epistemologists. But the acceptance of this picture is, by and large, more self-conscious in the so-called 'formal epistemology' tradition where it has been brought to the fore via the paradoxes of rational acceptability. The risk minimisation conception, as it stands, is incompatible with the principle that justification is closed under multiple premise deductive consequence – the principle according to which, if one has justification for believing each of a set of premises, and these premises together deductively entail a conclusion, then one has justification for believing the conclusion. The lottery and preface paradoxes both serve to make this incompatibility vivid.

In spite of its incompatibility with the letter of the risk minimisation conception, the closure principle is one that some epistemologists hold dear. As such, there have been a number of attempts to refine or modify the risk minimisation conception in the hope of

circumventing the lottery and preface paradoxes without having to abandon multiple premise closure. Such attempts turn out, however, to be beset by purely formal difficulties. A series of impossibility results, as I shall discuss, come close to demonstrating that nothing recognisable as a refinement of the risk minimisation picture can be consistently combined with multiple premise closure.

My own theory of justification, in contrast, *is* consistent with multiple premise closure, and offers a different sort of treatment of the lottery and preface paradoxes. It's important to bear in mind that these paradoxes are not puzzles waiting to be 'solved' in such a way as to preserve *all* of our pretheoretic impressions. Any treatment of the paradoxes will have to trade off advantages against disadvantages – and my own theory of justification simply strikes this bargain in a very different way to the risk minimisation conception. The lottery and preface paradoxes will both be discussed in detail, along with a number of related puzzles.

In this book, I will be presenting a range of arguments against the risk minimisation conception of justification – arguments of which this introduction has offered a brief preview. But it's not on the strength of arguments that the risk minimisation conception ever became the dominant view and, I suspect, it won't be dislodged by arguments either – or, at least, not by arguments *alone*. The risk minimisation conception is part of a complex of ideas that really do have a remarkable coherence and power – and this may go a long way towards explaining its enduring popularity. It's for this reason that the provision of some kind of alternative is of the utmost importance. My primary aim here is to develop this alternative.

Bibliography

Allensworth, R. (2009) 'Prediction markets and law: A sceptical account' *Harvard Law Review* v122(4), pp1217-1229

Alston, W. (1985) 'Concepts of epistemic justification' *The Monist* v68(1), pp57-89

Alston, W. (1988) 'An internalist externalism' *Synthese* v74(3), pp265-283

Alston, W. (1995) 'How to think about reliability' *Philosophical Topics* v23(1), pp1-29

Arló-Costa, H. and Pedersen, A. (2012) 'Belief and probability: A general theory of probability cores' *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* v53(3), pp293-315

Audi, R. (1993) *The Structure of Justification* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Audi, R. (1995) 'Memorial justification' *Philosophical Topics* v23(1), pp31-45

Audi, R. (2001) 'An internalist theory of normative grounds' *Philosophical Topics* v29(1/2), pp19-46

Bar-Hillel, M. (1980) 'The base rate fallacy in probability judgments' *Acta Psychologica* v44(3), pp211-233

Bar-Hillel, M. and Wagenaar, W. (1991) 'The perception of randomness' in *Advances in Applied Mathematics* v12(4), pp428-454

Barbey, A. and Sloman, (2007) 'Base rate respect: From ecological rationality to dual processes' *Behavioural and Brain Sciences* v30(3), pp241-297

Bhaskar, R. (1975) *A Realist Theory of Science* (Leeds: Leeds Books Ltd.)

Bird, A. (2007) 'Justified judging' *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* v74(1), pp81-110

Blome-Tillmann, M. (2009) 'Contextualism, safety and epistemic relevance' *Philosophical Studies* v143(3), pp383-394

BonJour, L. (2010) 'The myth of knowledge' *Philosophical Perspectives* v24(1), pp57-83

Borges, J. [1935] *A Universal History of Iniquity* Hurley, A. trans. (Penguin Books, 2004)

Boutilier, C. (1994) 'Conditional logics of normality: a modal approach' *Artificial Intelligence* v68(1), pp87-154

Boutilier, C. and Becher, V. (1995) 'Abduction as belief revision' *Artificial Intelligence* v77(1), pp43-94

Buchak, L. (2014) 'Belief, credence and norms' *Philosophical Studies* v169(2), pp285-311

Butler, J. [1736] *The Analogy of Religion* (London: J.M.Dent and Co., 1906)

Carnap, R. (1950) *The Logical Foundations of Probability* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press)

Chalmers, D. (2011) 'The nature of epistemic space' in Egan, A. and Weatherson, B. eds. *Epistemic Modality* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Chandler, J. (2010) 'The lottery paradox generalized?' *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* v61(3), pp667-679

Chisholm, R. (1957) *Perceiving* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press)

Christensen, D. (2004) *Putting Logic in its Place* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Cohen, L. (1977) *The Probable and the Provable* (Aldershot: Gregg Revivals)

Cohen, L. (1979) 'On the psychology of prediction: whose is the fallacy?' *Cognition* v7(4), pp385-407

Cohen, S. (1984) 'Justification and truth' *Philosophical Studies* v46(3), pp279-295

Cohen, S. (1988) 'How to be a fallibilist' *Philosophical Perspectives* v2, pp91-123

Cohen, S. (1999) 'Contextualism, scepticism and the structure of reasons' *Philosophical Perspectives* v13, pp57-88

Comesaña, J. (2005) 'Unsafe knowledge' *Synthese* v146(3), pp395-404

Comesaña, J. (2009) 'What lottery problem for reliabilism?' *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* v90(1), pp1-20

Comesaña, J. (2010a) 'An evidentialist reliabilism' *Noûs* v44(4), pp571-600

Comesaña, J. (2010b) 'Reliabilism' in Bernecker, S. and Pritchard, D. eds. *The Routledge Companion to Epistemology* (London: Routledge)

Conee, E. and Feldman, R. (2004) 'Evidentialism' in *Evidentialism: Essays in Epistemology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Conee, E. and Feldman, R. (2008) 'Evidence' in Smith, Q. ed. *Epistemology: New Essays* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Cosmides, L. and Tooby, J. (1996) 'Are humans good intuitive statisticians after all? Rethinking some conclusions from the literature on judgment under uncertainty' *Cognition* v58(1), pp1-73

Cournot, A. (1843) *Exposition de la Théorie des Chances et des Probabilitiés* (Paris: Hachette)

Delgrande, J. (1987) 'A first order logic for prototypical properties' *Artificial Intelligence* v33(1), pp105-130

Derksen, A. (1978) 'The alleged lottery paradox resolved' *American Philosophical Quarterly* v15(1), pp67-74

DeRose, K. (1995) 'Solving the skeptical problem' *Philosophical Review* v104(1), pp1-52

DeRose, K. (1996) 'Knowledge, assertion and lotteries' *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* v74(4), pp568-580

DeRose, K. (2004) 'Sosa, safety, sensitivity and skeptical hypotheses' in Greco, J. ed. *Ernest Sosa and His Critics* (Oxford: Blackwell)

Descartes, R. [1628] *Rules for the Direction of the Mind* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911)

Descartes, R. [1641] *Meditations on First Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

Dougherty, T. (2011) 'In defence of propositionalism about evidence' in Dougherty, T. ed. *Evidentialism and its Discontents* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Douven, I. (2002) 'A new solution to the paradoxes of rational acceptability' *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* v53(3), pp391-410

Douven, I. (2006) 'Assertion, knowledge and rational credibility' *Philosophical Review* v115(4), pp449-485

Douven, I. and Williamson, T. (2006) 'Generalizing the lottery paradox' *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* v57(4), pp755-779

Douven, I (2008) 'The lottery paradox and our epistemic goal' *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* v89(2), pp204-225

Dretske, F. 'Epistemic operators' *Journal of Philosophy* v67(24), pp1007-1023

Dretske, F. (1971) 'Conclusive reasons' *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* v49(1), pp1-22

Earman, J. (1992) *Bayes or Bust? A Critical Examination of Bayesian Confirmation Theory* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press)

Earman, J. and Roberts, J. (1999) '"Ceteris paribus" there is no problem of provisos' *Synthese* v118(3), pp439-478

Earman, J., Roberts, J. and Smith, S. (2002) 'Ceteris paribus lost' *Erkenntnis* v57(3), pp281-301

Easwaran, K. (2009) 'Probabilistic proofs and transferability' *Philosophia Mathematica* v17(3), pp341-362

Egan, A. (2006) 'Secondary qualities and self-location' *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* v72(1), pp97-119

Enoch, D., Fisher, T. and Spectre, L. (2012) 'Statistical evidence, sensitivity and the legal value of knowledge' *Philosophy and Public Affairs* v40(3), pp197-224

Eriksson, L. and Hájek, A. (2007) 'What are degrees of belief?' *Studia Logica* v86(2), pp185-215

Fallis, D. (1997) 'The epistemic status of probabilistic proof' *Journal of Philosophy* v94(4), pp165-186

Falk, R. (1981) 'The perception of randomness' *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference for the Psychology of Mathematics Education* (Grenoble: Laboratoire IMAG)

Falk, R. and Konold, C. (1997) 'Making sense of randomness: Implicit encoding as a basis for judgment' *Psychological Review* v104(2), pp301-318

Fantl, J. and McGrath, M. (2002) 'Evidence, pragmatics and justification' *Philosophical Review* v111(1), pp67-94

Fantl, J. and McGrath, M. (2009) *Knowledge in an Uncertain World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Foley, R. (1987) *The Theory of Epistemic Rationality* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press)

Foley, R. (1992) 'The epistemology of belief and the epistemology of degrees of belief' *American Philosophical Quarterly* v29(2), pp111-121

Foley, R. (1993) *Working Without a Net* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Foley, R. (2009) 'Beliefs, degrees of belief and the Lockean thesis' in Huber, F. & Christoph Schmidt-Petri, C. eds. *Degrees of Belief* (Dordrecht: Springer)

Fumerton, R. (1995) *Metaepistemology and Scepticism* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield)

Fumerton, R. (2004) 'Epistemic probability' *Philosophical Issues* v14(1), pp149-164

Goldman, A. (1976) 'Discrimination and perceptual knowledge' *Journal of Philosophy* v73(20), pp771-791

Goldman, A. (1979) 'What is justified belief?' in Pappas, G. ed. *Justification and Knowledge* (Dordrecht: Reidel)

Goldman, A. (2011) 'Towards a synthesis of reliabilism and evidentialism? Or: Evidentialim's troubles and reliabilism's rescue package' in Dougherty, T. ed. *Evidentialism and Its Discontents* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Gundersen, L. (2004) 'Outline of a new semantics for counterfactuals' *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* v85(1), pp1-20

Hájek, A. (2003) 'What conditional probability could not be' *Synthese* v137(3), pp273-323

Hambourger, R. (1980) 'Belief in miracles and Hume's Essay' *Noûs*, v14(4), pp587-604

Hammerton, M. (1973) 'A case of radical probability estimation' *Journal of Experimental Psychology* v101(2), pp242-254

Harman, G. (1968) 'Knowledge, inference and explanation' *American Philosophical Quarterly* v5(3), pp164-173

Harman, G. (1986) *Change in View* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press)

Hawthorne, James (1996) 'On the logic of nonmonotonic conditionals and conditional probabilities' *Journal of Philosophical Logic* v25(2), pp185-218

Hawthorne, James and Bovens, L. (1999) 'The preface, the lottery and the logic of belief' *Mind* v108(2), pp241-264

Hawthorne, James. (2009) 'The Lockean thesis and the logic of belief' in Huber, F. and Schmidt-Petri, C. eds. *Degrees of Belief* (Dordrecht: Springer)

Hawthorne, John. (2003) *Knowledge and Lotteries* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Hazlett, A. (2006) 'How to defeat belief in the external world' *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* v87(2), pp198-212

Hempel, C. (1965) *Aspects of Scientific Explanation and Other Essays in the Philosophy of Science* (New York: The Free Press)

Hempel, C. (1988) 'Provisos: A problem concerning the inferential function of scientific theories' *Erkenntnis* v28(2), pp147-164

Hill, C. and Schechter, J. (2007) 'Hawthorne's lottery puzzle and the nature of belief' *Philosophical Issues* v17(1), pp102-122

Ho, H. (2008) *A Philosophy of Evidence Law: Justice in the Search for Truth* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Huber, F. (2009) 'Belief and degrees of belief' in Huber, F. and Schmidt-Petri, C. eds. *Degrees of Belief* (Dordrecht: Springer)

Hume, D. [1748] *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000)

Ichikawa, J. (2014) 'Justification is potential knowledge' *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* v44(2), pp184-206

Jeffrey, R. (1956) 'Valuation and acceptance of scientific hypotheses' *Philosophy of Science* v23(3), pp237-246

Jenkins, C. (2007) 'Entitlement and rationality' *Synthese* v157(1), pp25-45

Jonakait, R. (1983) 'When blood is their argument: Probabilities in criminal cases, genetic markers and, once again, Bayes' theorem' *University of Illinois Law Review* 1983, pp369-421

Kahneman, D. and Tversky, A. (1972) 'On prediction and judgment' *Oregon Research Institute Research Bulletin* v12(4)

Kahneman, D. and Tversky, A. (1973) 'On the psychology of prediction' *Psychological Review* v80(4), pp237-251

Kaplan, M. (1995) 'Believing the improbable' *Philosophical Studies* v77(1), pp117-146

Kaplan, M. (2013) 'Coming to terms with our human fallibility: Christensen on the preface' *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* v87(1), pp1-35

Kaye, D. (1982) 'The limits of the preponderance of the evidence standard: Justifiably naked statistical evidence and multiple causation' *American Bar Foundation Research Journal* v7(2), pp487-516

Keynes, J. [1921] *A Treatise on Probability* (London: Macmillan press, 1973)

Koehler, J. (1996) 'The base rate fallacy reconsidered: Descriptive, normative and methodological challenges' *Behavioural and Brain Sciences* v19(1), pp1-17

Kolmogorov, A. [1933] *Foundations of Probability* (New York: Chelsea Publishing Company, 1950)

Korcz, K. (1997) 'Recent work on the basing relation' *American Philosophical Quarterly* v34(2), pp171-191

Kripke, S. (1980) *Naming and Necessity* (Oxford: Blackwell)

Kroedel, T. (2012) 'The lottery paradox, epistemic justification and permissibility' *Analysis* v72(1), pp57-60

Kvanvig, J. (2009) 'Assertion, knowledge and lotteries' in Pritchard, D. and Greenough, P. eds. *Williamson on Knowledge* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Kvanvig, J. and Menzel, C. (1990) 'The basic notion of justification' *Philosophical Studies* v59(3), pp235-261

Kyburg, H. (1961) *Probability and the Logic of Rational Belief* (Middleton: Wesleyan University Press)

Kyburg, H. (1970) 'Conjunctivitis' in Swain, M. ed. *Induction, Acceptance and Rational Belief* (Dordrecht: Reidel)

Kyburg, H. (1971) 'Epistemological probability' *Synthese* v23(2-3), pp309-329

Lehrer, K. (1974) *Knowledge* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)

Lehrer, K. (1980) 'Coherence and the racehorse paradox' in French, P., Uehling, T. and Wettstein, H. eds. *Midwest Studies in Philosophy v5* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press)

Leitgeb, H. (2014a) 'A way out of the preface paradox' *Analysis* 74(1), pp11-15

Leitgeb, H. (2014b) 'The stability theory of belief' *Philosophical Review* v123(2), pp131-171

Lemos, N. (2007) *An Introduction to the Theory of Knowledge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Leplin, J. (2009) *A Theory of Epistemic Justification* (Dordrecht: Springer)

Leslie, S. (2008) 'Generics: Cognition and acquisition' *Philosophical Review* v117(1), pp1-47

Levi, I. (1981) 'Should Bayesians sometimes neglect base rates?' *Behavioural and Brain Sciences* v4(3), pp342-343

Levi, I. (1983) 'Who commits the base rate fallacy?' *Behavioural and Brain Sciences* v6(3), pp502-506

Lewis, D. (1973) *Counterfactuals* (Oxford: Blackwell)

Lewis, D. (1979) 'Attitudes de dicto and de se' *Philosophical Review* v88(4), pp513-543

Lewis, D. (1980) 'A subjectivist's guide to objective chance' in *Studies in Inductive Logic and Probability* vol. II (University of California Press)

Lewis, D. (1996) 'Elusive knowledge' *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* v74(4), pp549-567

Lin, H. and Kelly, K. (2012), 'A geo-logical solution to the lottery paradox, with applications to nonmonotonic logic' *Synthese* v186(2), pp531-575

Littlejohn, C. (2012) *Justification and the Truth Connection* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Loftus, E. (1996) *Eyewitness Testimony* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press)

Lopes, L. and Oden, G. (1987) 'Distinguishing between random and non-random events' *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition* v13(3), pp392-400

Ludlow, P. (2005) 'Contextualism and the new linguistic turn in epistemology' in Preyer, G. and Peters, G. eds. *Contextualism in Philosophy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Lycan, W. 'On the Gettier problem problem' in Hetherington, S. ed. *Epistemology Futures* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Lyon, D. and Slovic, P. (1976) 'Dominance of accuracy information and neglect of base rates in probability estimation' *Acta Psychologica* v40(4), pp287-298

Makinson, D. (1965) 'The paradox of the preface', *Analysis* v25(6), pp205-207

McDowell, J. (1982) 'Criteria, defeasibility and knowledge' *Proceedings of the British Academy* v68, pp455-479

McGlynn, A. (2012) 'Justification as would-be knowledge' *Episteme* v9(4), pp361-376

McGlynn, A. (2014) *Knowledge First?* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan)

McHugh, C. (2014) 'Fitting belief' *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* v114(2), pp167-187

Menzies, P. (2004) 'Difference making in context' in Collins, J. ed. *Causation and Counterfactuals* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press)

Millikan, R. (1984) *Language, Thought and Other Biological Categories* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press)

Moser, P. (1988) 'The foundations of epistemological probability' *Erkenntnis* v28(2), pp231-251

Nelkin, D. (2000) 'The lottery paradox, knowledge and rationality' *Philosophical Review* v109(3), pp373-409

Neta, R. and Rohrbaugh, G. (2004) 'Luminosity and the safety of knowledge' *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* v85(4), pp396-406

Nickerson, R. (2002) 'The production and perception of randomness' *Psychological Review* v109(2), pp330-357

Nozick, R. (1981) *Philosophical Explanations* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press)

Owens, D. (2000) *Reason Without Freedom: The Problem of Epistemic Normativity* (London: Routledge)

Pappas, G. and Swain, M. (1978) 'Introduction' in Pappas, G. and Swain, M. eds. *Essays on Knowledge and Justification* (London: Cornell University Press)

Peijnenburg, J. and Atkinson, D. (2014) 'The need for justification' *Metaphilosophy* v45(2), pp201-210

Pietroski, P. and Rey, G. (1995) 'When other things aren't equal: Saving "ceteris paribus" laws from vacuity' *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* v46(1), pp81-110

Plantinga, A. (1993) *Warrant and Proper Function* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Pollock, J. (1970) 'The structure of epistemic justification' in Rescher, N. ed. *Studies in the Theory of Knowledge* (Oxford: Blackwell)

Pollock, J. (1986) *Contemporary Theories of Knowledge* (Rowman and Littlefield)

Pollock, J. (1990) *Nomic Probability and the Foundations of Induction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Priest, G. (2001) *An Introduction to Non-Classical Logic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Pritchard, D. (2005) *Epistemic Luck* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)

Pritchard, D. (2007) 'Sensitivity, safety and anti-luck epistemology' in Greco, J. ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Scepticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Pritchard, D. (2012) *Epistemological Disjunctivism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Pryor, J. (2000) 'The skeptic and the dogmatist' *Noûs* v34(4), pp517-549

Pryor, J. (2004) 'What's wrong with Moore's argument?' *Philosophical Issues* v14(1), pp349-378

Pryor, J. (2005) 'Is there immediate justification?' in Sosa, E. and Steup, M. eds. *Contemporary Debates in Epistemology* (Oxford: Blackwell)

Rabin, M. (1980) 'Probabilistic algorithm for testing primality' *Journal of Number Theory* v12(1), pp128-138

Ramsey, F. (1926) 'Truth and probability' in Braithwaite, R. ed. *Foundations of Mathematics and Other Essays* (London: Kegan, Paul, and Trubner, 1931)

Rantala, V. (1982) 'Impossible worlds semantics and logical omniscience' *Acta Philosophica Fennica* v35, pp106-115

Redmayne, M. (2008) 'Exploring the proof paradoxes' *Legal Theory* v14(4), pp281-309

Reed, B. (2010) 'A defence of stable invariantism' *Noûs* v44(2), pp224-244

Reynolds, S. (2013) 'Justification as the appearance of knowledge' *Philosophical Studies* v163(2), pp367-383

Ross, B. and Levy, N. (1958) 'Patterned prediction of chance events by children and adults' *Psychological Reports* v4, pp87-124

Russell, B. (1948) *Human Knowledge: Its Scope and Limits* (London: Unwin)

Ryan, S. (1991) 'The preface paradox' *Philosophical Studies* v64(3), pp293-307

Ryan, S. (1996) 'The epistemic virtues of consistency' *Synthese* v109(2), pp121-141

Savage, L. (1972) *Foundations of Statistics* (New York: Dover)

Schick, F. (1966) 'Consistency' *Philosophical Review* v75(4), pp467-495

Schiffer, S. (1991) 'Ceteris paribus laws' *Mind* v100(1), pp1-17

Scriven, M. (1959) 'Truisms as grounds for historical explanations' in Gardiner, P. ed. *Theories of History* (New York: Free Press)

Señor, T. (1996) 'The prima/ultima facie justification distinction in epistemology' *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* v56(3), pp551-566

Siegel, S. (2006) 'Which properties are represented in perception?' in Gendler Szabo, T. and Hawthorne, J. eds. *Perceptual Experience* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Siewert, C. (1998) *The Significance of Consciousness* (Princeton: Princeton University Press)

Skyrms, B. (1967) 'The explication of 'X knows that p'' *Journal of Philosophy* v64(12), pp373-389

Smith, M. (2007) 'Ceteris paribus conditionals and comparative normalcy', *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, v36(1), pp97-121

Smith, M. (2009) 'Transmission failure explained' *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* v79(1), pp164-189

Smith, M. (2010a) 'What else justification could be' *Noûs* v44(1), pp10-31

Smith, M. (2010b) 'A generalised lottery paradox for infinite probability spaces' *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* v61(4), pp821-831

Smith, M. (2012) 'Some thoughts on the JK-rule' *Noûs* v46(4), pp791-802

Smith, M. (2014) 'Knowledge, justification and normative coincidence' *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* v89(2), pp273-295

Soames, S. (2002) *Beyond Rigidity: The Unfinished Semantic Agenda of Naming and Necessity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Soames, S. (2011) 'Kripke on metaphysical and epistemic possibility' in Berger, A. ed. *Saul Kripke* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Sosa, E. (1999a) 'How to defeat opposition to Moore' *Philosophical Perspectives* v13, pp137-149

Sosa, E. (1999b) 'How must knowledge be modally related to what is known?' *Philosophical Topics* v26, pp373-384

Spohn, W. (1988) 'Conditional ordinal functions: A dynamic theory of epistemic states' in Harper, W. and Skyrms, B. eds. *Causation in Decision, Belief Change and Statistics vol II* (Dordrecht: Kluwer)

Spohn, W. (2009) 'Survey of ranking theory' in Huber, F. and Schmidt-Petri, C. eds. *Degrees of Belief* (Dordrecht: Springer)

Spohn, W. (2012) *The Laws of Belief: Ranking Theory and its Philosophical Applications* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Stalnaker, R. (1976) 'Propositions' in MacKay, A. and Merrill, D. eds. *Issues in the Philosophy of Language* (New Haven: Yale University Press)

Stalnaker, R. (1978) 'Assertion' in Cole, P. ed. *Pragmatics* (New York: New York Academic Press)

Stalnaker, R. (1984) *Inquiry* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press)

Stanley, J. (2005) *Knowledge and Practical Interests* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Stanley, J. (2008) 'Knowledge and certainty' *Philosophical Issues* v18, pp33-55

Stanovich, K. and West, R. (2000) 'Individual differences in reasoning: Implications for the rationality debate?' *Behavioural and Brain Sciences* v23(5), pp645-665

Steglich-Petersen, A. (2013) 'Truth as the aim of epistemic justification' in Chan, T. ed. *The Aim of Belief* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Sturgeon, S. (2008) 'Reason and the grain of belief' *Noûs* v42(1), pp139-165

Sutton, J. (2007) *Without Justification* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press)

Swinburne, R. (2001) *Epistemic Justification* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Swinburne, R. (2011) 'Evidence' in Dougherty, T. ed. *Evidentialism and its Discontents* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Thomson, J. (1986) 'Liability and individualized evidence' in Parent, W. ed. *Rights, Restitution and Risk* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press)

Villegas, C. (1964) 'On qualitative probability σ-algebras' *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* v35(4), pp1787-1796

Vogel, J. (1990) 'Are there counterexamples to the closure principle?' in M. Roth and G. Ross (eds.), *Doubting: Contemporary Perspectives on Skepticism* (Dordrecht: Kluwer)

Vogel, J. (1999) 'The new relevant alternatives theory', *Philosophical Perspectives*, v13, pp155–80

Weatherson, B. (2005) 'Can we do without pragmatic encroachment?' *Philosophical Perspectives* v19, pp417-443

Weatherson, B. (2011) 'Knowledge, bets and interests' in Brown, J. and Gerken, M. eds. *Knowledge Ascriptions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Weatherson, B. (2014) 'Probability and scepticism' in Dodd, D. and Zardini, E. eds. *Contemporary Perspectives on Perceptual Justification and Scepticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Weatherson, B. (ms) 'Smith on justification and probability', http://brian.weatherson.org/SoJaP.pdf

Wedgwood, R. (2008) 'Contextualism about justified belief' *Philosophers' Imprint* v8(9), pp1-20

Wells, G. (1992) 'Naked statistical evidence of liability: Is subjective probability enough?' *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* v62(5), pp739-752

Williamson, T. (1992) 'Inexact knowledge' *Mind* v101(2), pp217-242

Williamson, T. (2000) *Knowledge and its Limits* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Wright, C. (1992) *Truth and Objectivity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press)

Zalabardo, J. (2012) *Scepticism and Reliable Belief* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)