

Reasons in Epistemology

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Normative Reasons for Belief	3
2.1	The Ontology of Normative Epistemic Reasons	3
2.1.1	Mentalism	3
2.1.2	Alternatives to Mentalism	4
2.2	Possession and Objective vs. Subjective Normative Reasons	6
2.3	Defeat and Weight	7
2.4	Evidence and the Pragmatic	8
3	Motivating Reasons for Belief	10
3.1	The Ontology of Motivating Epistemic Reasons	10
3.1.1	Mentalism	10
3.1.2	Alternatives to Mentalism	11
3.2	Reasons and the Basing Relation	13
4	Reasons and Other Epistemic Standings	14
4.1	Reasons and Epistemic Justification	14
4.2	Reasons, Coherence, and Epistemic Rationality	16
4.3	Reasons and Knowledge	17
4.4	Reasons, Perception, and Conceptual Content	18
4.5	Reasons, Reasoning, and Logic	20
5	Reasons and the Epistemology-Metaethics Interface	22

1 Introduction

Reasons attract great interest in new literature on the foundations of epistemic normativity. This follows a trend in metaethics, where many take reasons to be the building blocks of normativity, and where sophisticated work on reasons has illuminated long-standing issues about the nature of normativity. Besides the recent upsurge of interest, reasons have played important roles in the past fifty years of work on the nature of knowledge, perception, reasoning, rationality, and justification. This entry provides a comprehensive overview of (i) the literature on the nature of reasons for belief and other doxastic attitudes, (ii) the role that reasons play in discussions of the nature of knowledge, perception, reasoning, rationality, and justification, and (iii) the liaisons between epistemology and meta-ethics that owe to work on reasons and rationality.

This entry is unique in citing work outside of epistemology narrowly understood. Some of the best work on the general nature of reasons has been written by philosophers typically classified as meta-ethicists. They include Maria Alvarez, John Broome, Jonathan Dancy, Pamela

Hieronymi, Niko Kolodny, Derek Parfit, Joseph Raz, T. M. Scanlon, Mark Schroeder, and John Skorupski. While their ultimate aims are meta-ethical, these writers often make general claims about reasons and discuss reasons for belief at length. Awareness of their work in epistemology has already led to major advances in the literature on epistemic reasons.

Because there are no textbooks and few introductory pieces that focus narrowly on reasons in epistemology, this entry dives right into the literature. There are, however, a few pieces that could serve as starting points and a few that stand out as landmark works. Reisner and Steglich-Petersen's (2011) collection on reasons for belief contains a helpful introduction to the literature. Chapters 3 and 4 of Littlejohn (2012) synoptically cover many of the topics below. Landmark contributions by meta-ethicists on the general nature of reasons and rationality include Scanlon (1998: Ch. 1), Dancy (2000), Parfit (2001), and Skorupski (2011). Landmark contributions to the literature in traditional epistemology include Swain (1981), Millar (1991), and Littlejohn (2012).

Dancy, J. 2000. *Practical Reality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Argues that normative reasons are facts and that motivating reasons are possibly non-obtaining states of affairs. While many targets in the book are meta-ethical, Dancy's view is general and has implications for epistemology.]

Millar, A. 1991. *Reasons and Experience*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. [A classic account of how experience provides us with reasons for belief, containing important discussions of the nature of epistemic reasons and reasoning.]

Littlejohn, C. 2012. *Justification and the Truth Connection*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Defends the striking claim that there are no false justified beliefs, and in the course of doing so defends the view that normative reasons for belief are facts. See Chapters 3 and 4.]

Parfit, D. 2001. "Rationality and Reasons" in Dan Egonsson, Bjorn Petterson and Toni Ronnow-Rasmussen (eds.) *Exploring Practical Philosophy*. Aldershot: Ashgate. [Argues that normative reasons of all sorts are facts and that rationality consists in correctly responding to apparent normative reasons, which need not be genuine normative reasons.]

Reisner, A. and Steglich-Petersen, A. (eds.). 2011. *Reasons for Belief*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [A recent collection of papers on reasons for belief that contains a helpful and up-to-date introduction.]

Scanlon, T. M. 1998. *What We Owe to Each Other*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. [Chapter 1 of this book is the *locus classicus* of the "reasons first" approach to normativity, and contains influential discussions of the general nature of reasons and rationality.]

Skorupski, J. 2011. *The Domain of Reasons*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [The largest and most systematic defense of a "reasons first" approach to normativity in the literature, containing several chapters on epistemic reasons.]

Swain, M. 1981. *Reasons and Knowledge*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. [In the course of this book-length defense of a defeasibility account of knowledge, Swain argues that normative epistemic reasons are propositions and that motivating epistemic reasons are mental states. See Chapter 3.]

2 Normative Reasons for Belief

Talk of reasons can be used to pick out importantly different things. Arguably the most important things are normative reasons, which are considerations that count in favor of attitudes or acts. In the epistemic domain, normative reasons are considerations that count in favor of doxastic attitudes like belief, disbelief, and suspension of judgment. This section covers the literature on five issues about normative reasons in epistemology: the ontology of normative epistemic reasons, the possession of normative reasons, defeat and the weight of epistemic reasons, and the status of non-evidential reasons for doxastic attitudes.

2.1 The Ontology of Normative Epistemic Reasons

How should we understand the ontology of normative reasons for belief and other doxastic attitudes? There are two broad sorts of answers to this question: mentalist and non-mentalist.

2.1.1 Mentalism

According to mentalist views, normative reasons for belief are mental states. Mentalist views have long been dominant in epistemology. Some defenders of mentalism restrict the relevant mental states to beliefs and other doxastic attitudes. Call them *doxastic mentalists*. Davidson (1986) is the classic doxastic mentalist. While Davidson is also a coherentist about knowledge and justification, not everyone who holds doxastic mentalism reasons for belief accepts coherentism. Lyons (2009) endorses doxastic mentalism but rejects coherentism by giving a purely reliabilist account of non-inferential justification. Pollock (1974) accepted doxastic mentalism while being an internalist foundationalist: he viewed foundational beliefs as beliefs that are justified without being based on reasons.

Others allow non-doxastic mental states like perceptual seemings to be normative epistemic reasons. Such *non-doxastic mentalists* include Conee and Feldman (2001), Huemer (2001), and Pryor (2000). A minority of mentalists have argued that factive mental states like *seeing that P* are the crucial normative reasons for justified perceptual beliefs. Such *factive mentalists* include McDowell (1995) and Pritchard (2012). They illustrate that endorsing mentalism is not the same as endorsing the internalist view that the normative reasons for belief consist in non-factive mental states.

Conee, E. and Feldman, R. 2001. "Internalism Defended." *American Philosophical Quarterly* 38: 1-18. [In the course of this defense of internalism about justification, a non-doxastic mentalist view about evidence is defended.]

Davidson, D. 1986. "A Coherence Theory of Truth and Knowledge" in Lepore, E. (ed.) *Truth and Interpretation: Perspectives on the Philosophy of Donald Davidson*. New York: Blackwell. [This paper defends a coherence theory of knowledge and relies on doxastic mentalism in supporting it.]

Huemer, M. 2001. *Skepticism and the Veil of Perception*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield. [This book defends a non-doxastic mentalist view about epistemic reasons in the course of a larger defense of an internalist version of epistemological direct realism.]

Lyons, J. 2009. *Perception and Basic Beliefs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Defends doxastic mentalism in the course of arguing against the view that all beliefs are justified by reasons and defending a new form of process reliabilism.]

McDowell, J. 1995. "Knowledge and the Internal." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 55: 877-93. [Defends factive mentalism.]

Pollock, J. 1974. *Knowledge and Justification*, Ch.1. Princeton: Princeton University Press. [Chapter 1 provides a discussion of the nature of reasons for belief and their connection to justification and knowledge.]

Pritchard, D. 2012. *Epistemological Disjunctivism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Defends factive mentalism in the course of a larger defense of epistemological disjunctivism.]

Pryor, J. 2000. "The Skeptic and the Dogmatist." *Nous* 34: 517-49. [Defends non-doxastic mentalism about reasons for perceptual beliefs in the course of defending a Moorean response to skepticism.]

2.1.2 Alternatives to Mentalism

A few epistemologists reject mentalism about normative reasons. There are two major alternatives. According to *factualism*, normative reasons for belief are facts. Williamson (2000) and Littlejohn (2012) defend factualism and both take facts to be true propositions. A more moderate factualist position is taken by Ginsborg (2006), who distinguishes two normative senses of "reason" but claims that the primary sense treats normative reasons as facts. It is worth noting that all factualists and non-mentalists will draw a distinction between *being a reason* and *providing a reason* or *possessing* a reason, and agree that mental states *provide* reasons or *help us to possess* without thinking that they are the reasons; see Williamson (2000: 197).

The main alternative to factualism is *abstractionism*. According to one version of abstractionism, normative reasons for belief are propositions that might be false. This view is found in an unqualified form in Dougherty (2011), Fantl and McGrath (Chs.3-4), and Swain (1981: Ch.3). This is not the only conceivable version of abstractionism. Dancy (2000) rejects any identification of reasons with propositions. He holds that normative reasons are facts in the sense of *obtaining states of affairs* and that motivating reasons are states of affairs that are possibly non-obtaining. One could imagine a version of abstractionism that would identify

normative reasons with states of affairs that might be non-obtaining (though Dancy only accepts the idea for motivating reasons).

People outside of the mainstream epistemology literature have defended factualist accounts of normative reasons for belief. Writers like Broome (2004), Dancy (2000) and Parfit (2001) have made general claims about the ontology of normative reasons, identifying reasons for belief as well as reasons for action with facts. Epistemologists interested in reasons should profit from this work.

Broome, J. 2004. "Reasons" in Wallace, R. J., Smith, M., Scheffler, S. and Pettit, P. (eds.) *Reason and Value: Themes from the Moral Philosophy of Joseph Raz*. Oxford University Press. [Argues that normative reasons are facts that contribute to weighing explanations of what we ought to do and believe.]

Dancy, J. 2000. *Practical Reality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [See earlier description.]

Dougherty, T. "A Defense of Propositionalism about Evidence" in Dougherty, T. (ed.) *Evidentialism and its Discontents*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Argues that evidence consists in propositions.]

Fantl, J. and McGrath, M. 2009. *Knowledge in an Uncertain World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [This extended defense of pragmatic encroachment contains endorsements of the idea that reasons are propositions and of the idea that normative reasons can consist in false propositions; see Chapters 2 and 3.]

Ginsborg, H. 2006. "Reasons for Belief." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 72: 286-318. [This paper illustrates the importance that meta-ethical work on reasons can have for epistemology. The author argues that there are two important notions of a normative reason for belief, one captured by the idea that reasons are facts and one captured by the idea that reasons are beliefs. But she defends the conceptual priority of the first notion.]

Littlejohn, C. 2012. *Justification and the Truth Connection*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [See earlier description.]

Parfit, D. 2001. "Rationality and Reasons" in Dan Egonsson, Bjorn Petterson and Toni Ronnow-Rasmussen (eds.) *Exploring Practical Philosophy*. Aldershot: Ashgate. [See earlier description.]

Swain, M. 1981. *Reasons and Knowledge*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. [See earlier description.]

Williamson, T. 2000. *Knowledge and Its Limits*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [In the midst of this classic defense of knowledge-first epistemology, it is argued that evidence consists in true propositions that we know. See Chapter 9.]

2.2 Possession and Objective vs. Subjective Normative Reasons

A second question in the literature concerns the *possession* of normative reasons for belief. There is an intuitive distinction between good reasons we have and good reasons that merely exist. If some lemonade is arsenic-laced, that fact is a powerful reason not to drink even if one is no position to appreciate it. Nevertheless, one is not irrational if one is in no position to appreciate this fact. Only reasons that we have seem to matter for rationality. This distinction can be drawn in epistemology. There might be good reasons that we have not yet discovered for certain conclusions (e.g., undiscovered evidence on the crime scene). Reasons that are not *essentially* possessed are sometimes called *objective reasons* and reasons that are essentially possessed are sometimes called *subjective reasons*.

The nature of possession is a central issue. Some recent discussions are organized around the status of the *Factoring Account*. According to the Factoring Account, for one to have a reason to ϕ consists in (i) there independently being a reason to ϕ , and (ii) one's standing in some relation of possession to this independently existing reason. Schroeder (2008) rejects this account and defends a dualist account on which subjective normative reasons are not just a special kind of objective normative reason. Lord (2010) defends the Factoring Account against Schroeder's objections.

A further question concerns the relation that one must bear to a normative reason to possess that reason. While this question may seem to presuppose the Factoring Account, even Schroeder addresses it. Schroeder (2011) defends a "low bar" account, holding that one possesses P as a normative reason iff P is the content of some presentational mental state (e.g., belief or seeming). Schroeder's discussion is partly a response to Feldman (1988), who claimed that one could only have P as evidence if it was epistemically rational for one to believe P. Neta (2006) provides a critical survey of many reductive accounts of possession.

Discussions of possession intersect with discussions of access. While access conditions on justification are often associated with internalism, they are not essentially internalist. Gibbons (2006) and Littlejohn (2011) defend externalist access conditions and set high bars on the possession of normative reasons for belief.

Feldman, R. 1988. "Having Evidence" in Austin, D. (ed.) *Philosophical Analysis*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. [A nuanced exploration of the nature of the possession relation that argues that one can only possess P as evidence if one has propositional justification for believing P.]

Gibbons, J. 2006. "Access Externalism." *Mind* 115: 19-39. [Argues that access constraints on justification can be understood in externalist terms and defends the idea that possessing a normative epistemic reason is a matter of being in a position to know the fact that is this reason.]

Littlejohn, C. 2011a. "Evidence and Armchair Access." *Synthese* 179: 479-500. [Argues that access constraints on justification can be understood in externalist terms but sets the bar lower than knowledge or being in a position to know.]

Lord, E. 2010. "Having Reasons and the Factoring Account." *Philosophical Studies* 149: 283-96. [This paper defends the Factoring Account of having a reason from Schroeder

(2008)'s objections and also suggests that the relation of possession should be understood in terms of being in a position to know.]

Lord, E. 2013. *The Importance of Being Rational*. Ph.D. Thesis, Princeton University. [In the course of this defense of the claim that rationality consists in correctly responding to the normative reasons that one possesses, Lord argues that the access constraint on possession should be understood in terms of being in a position to know. He also argues that access is not the only necessary condition for possessing a normative reason.]

Neta, R. 2006. "What Evidence Do You Have?" *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 59: 89-119. [Argues against a great number of attempts to analyze possession in non-normative terms and defends the conclusion that nothing more informative can be said about what it is to possess evidence except that it is what rationally regulates belief-formation.]

Schroeder, M. 2008. "Having Reasons." *Philosophical Studies* 139: 57-71. [Argues against the Factoring Account of possessing a reason, and argues that we must accept a dualist view on which there are objective and subjective normative reasons, where neither is analyzable in terms of the other]

Schroeder, M. 2011. "What Does It Take to 'Have' a Reason?" in Reisner, A. and Steglich-Petersen, A. (eds.) *Reasons for Belief*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Provides a novel defense of a "low bar" account of possession on which merely believing that P or having some other presentational mental state with the content that P is sufficient for possessing a reason to believe P.]

2.3 Defeat and Weight

One role for normative reasons in epistemology is illuminating the nature of defeat. It is attractive to think that all defeaters for justified beliefs are either reasons to disbelieve, reasons to suspend belief, or reasons to place less weight on the reasons to believe that one originally had. Schroeder (2012a) defends this hypothesis. He explains the defeaters discussed by writers in the pragmatic encroachment literature and gives an account of what it is to have a *sufficient* reason. Schroeder (2011) sketches a general account of weight and provides a reasons-based account of defeat in ethics and epistemology. For an early discussion of defeaters and the distinction between rebutting and undercutting defeaters, see Pollock (1986: 38-39).

There are defeaters for knowledge as well as defeaters for justification. Might these also be analyzed in terms of reasons? In the literature on defeasibility theories in the 1970s and 1980s, defeaters for knowledge were often analyzed counterfactually. They were understood as facts that *would* make it no longer rational for the epistemic subject to believe what she believes *if* she were aware of them. Arguably the mistake was not the appeal to defeaters but rather the conditional fallacy, as Shope (1983) suggests. If we instead take objective normative reasons to be fundamental, we might be able to resurrect a simpler version of the defeasibility account held earlier by theorists like Klein (1971), Lehrer and Paxson (1969), and Swain (1981). In his (2012a) and so far unpublished work on the analysis of knowledge, Mark Schroeder makes

these suggestions. For a comprehensive overview on defeaters for both knowledge and justification, see Sudduth (2008).

Lehrer, K. and Paxson, T. 1969. "Knowledge: Undefeated Justified True Belief." *Journal of Philosophy* 66: 225-37. [A classic defense of a defeasibility theory of knowledge.]

Klein, P. 1971. "A Proposed Definition of Propositional Knowledge." *The Journal of Philosophy* 68: 471-82. [Another classic defense of a defeasibility theory of knowledge.]

Pollock, J. 1986. *Contemporary Theories of Knowledge*. Savage, MD: Rowman & Littlefield. [This is the first place where the distinction between undercutting and rebutting defeat was drawn.]

Schroeder, M. 2011. "Holism, Weight, and Undercutting." *Nous* 45: 328-344. [Provides a reasons-based account of defeat and an account of the weight of reasons that captures particularist insights while holding onto the idea that normative theorizing is in the business of generalization]

Schroeder, M. 2012a. "Stakes, Withholding, and Pragmatic Encroachment on Knowledge." *Philosophical Studies* 160: 265-285. [Explains how pragmatic encroachment works by arguing that pragmatic factors affect the sufficiency of one's epistemic reasons by constituting right-kind reasons to suspend judgment.]

Shope, R. 1983. *The Analysis of Knowing*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. [This book documents the history of the defeasibility theory and other analyses of knowledge from Gettier to the early 1980s and shows how the conditional fallacy is the root of many of these theories' problems.]

Sudduth, M. 2008. "Defeaters in Epistemology" in Fieser, J. and Dowden, B. (eds.) *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ISSN 2161-0002, <http://www.iep.utm.edu/ep-defea/> [A very detailed overview of the literature on defeaters of both justification and knowledge.]

Swain, M. 1981. *Reasons and Knowledge*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. [See description above.]

2.4 Evidence and the Pragmatic

Which types of considerations can provide normative reasons for doxastic attitudes? Are all normative reasons for doxastic attitudes evidence? Can pragmatic considerations be real normative reasons for doxastic attitudes? Might there be a form of pragmatic encroachment whereby pragmatic factors can affect the weight of one's epistemic reasons? These questions are the focus of a large literature.

It might sound odd to ask whether pragmatic considerations can be normative reasons for doxastic attitudes. Isn't it obvious that there can be good practical reasons for belief? But there are genuine controversies here. Some writers have denied that one can have good practical

reasons for belief. They argue that what appear to be practical reasons for belief are only reasons for the act of *causing ourselves to have a belief* or for *wanting to have the belief*. Defenders of this view hold that only pieces of evidence are genuine reasons for belief. Kelly (2002), Shah (2006), and Parfit (2011, v.1: Appendix A) defend this view. For arguments directed against these “strict evidentialists” and in favor of the possibility of pragmatic reasons for belief, see Reisner (2009). Hieronymi (2005) defends a middle view. She agrees that there is a distinction between “right” and “wrong” kinds of reasons for attitudes and holds that pragmatic considerations are wrong-kind reasons for belief. But she believes that these considerations can still be normative reasons for belief rather than reasons for something else (e.g., the act of making oneself have a belief).

The earlier writers focus on whether pragmatic factors can be genuine reasons for belief. But there are doxastic attitudes other than belief—viz., suspension of judgment and disbelief. Moreover, not all reasons are reasons *for*: some reasons are reasons *against*. Schroeder (2012a) and (2012b) argues that pragmatic considerations can be reasons of the right kind for suspension of judgment and against belief. He uses this insight to provide a rationale for pragmatic encroachment on knowledge. This is a more direct argument than arguments found, for example, in Stanley (2005), who is motivated by intuitions about cases. Other theoretically driven arguments can be found, however, in Fantl and McGrath (2009).

Fantl, J. and McGrath, M. 2009. *Knowledge in an Uncertain World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [See description above.]

Hieronymi, P. 2005. “The Wrong Kind of Reason.” *The Journal of Philosophy* 102: 437-457. [Provides an account of the distinction between right and wrong kinds of reasons for attitudes that has implications for epistemology and ethics.]

Kelly, T. 2002. “The Rationality of Belief and Some Other Propositional Attitudes.” *Philosophical Studies* 110: 163-196. [Argues that the expected consequences of having beliefs are not genuine reasons for belief and makes analogous points about other attitudes, concluding that there is a broad “Consequentialist Fallacy” behind much theorizing about reasons for attitudes.]

Parfit, D. 2011. *On What Matters*, Volume 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Appendix A argues that the expected consequences of having certain beliefs, desires, or intentions are never reasons for those beliefs, desires or intentions.]

Reisner, A. “The Possibility of Pragmatic Reasons for Belief and the Wrong Kind of Reasons Problem.” *Philosophical Studies* 145: 257-272. [Defends the possibility of pragmatic reasons for belief.]

Schroeder, M. 2012a. “Stakes, Withholding, and Pragmatic Encroachment on Knowledge.” *Philosophical Studies* 160: 265-285. [See description above.]

Schroeder, M. 2012b. “The Ubiquity of State-Given Reasons.” *Ethics* 122: 457-488. [Argues against Parfit’s attempt to draw the distinction between right and wrong-kind reasons on the basis of a distinction between object-given and state-given reasons. He

proceeds by showing that state-given reasons easily constitute right-kind reasons that bear on the correctness of certain attitudes and makes some of the same points that Schroeder (2012a) makes in connection with pragmatic encroachment.]

Shah, N. 2006. "A New Argument for Evidentialism." *The Philosophical Quarterly* 56: 481-498. [This paper provides an argument for the strict evidentialist view that only pieces of evidence can be genuine reasons for belief.]

Stanley, J. 2005. *Knowledge and Practical Interests*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [A defense of pragmatic encroachment on knowledge that is driven primarily by intuitions about cases.]

3 Motivating Reasons for Belief

Talk of reasons does not always pick out something normative. For one thing, we can talk about the *reasons why* someone believes something without thinking that these are good reasons. Reasons-why are often called *explanatory reasons*.

Not all the reasons *why* people believe are reasons *for which* they believe. Perhaps a reason why Schopenhauer had pessimistic beliefs is that he was depressed. But this was probably not a reason for which he believed philosophical pessimism: instead, it disposed him to find apparently good reasons for being a philosophical pessimist, which then became the reasons for which he believed. The reasons for which people think and act are called *motivating reasons* in the broader literature on reasons and rationality. It should be noted that this is a term of art. Using the term in epistemology is not meant to presuppose doxastic voluntarism: motivating reasons are nothing more and nothing less than reasons for which people think and act. This section covers the literature on reasons for belief in this non-normative, motivating sense.

3.1 The Ontology of Motivating Epistemic Reasons

One set of questions mirrors our first set of questions about normative epistemic reasons. What sorts of things are motivating epistemic reasons? Are they mental states, facts, propositions, or something else?

One might expect people to give the same answers to the ontological questions about motivating reasons that they give to the ontological questions about normative reasons. But this is not the case. Besides the epistemologists mentioned below, Raz (1975) and Smith (1994) held that normative reasons for action and belief were facts but that motivating reasons for action and belief were mental states. This kind of divided ontology has become less common among meta-ethicists after Dancy (2000).

3.1.1 Mentalism

The dominant view in epistemology is that motivating epistemic reasons are mental states. Indeed, some writers who reject mentalist accounts of normative epistemic reasons embrace mentalist accounts of motivating epistemic reasons. Swain (1981) is an example. Mentalist

accounts of motivating epistemic reasons are more often presupposed than defended in epistemology. But Turri (2009, 2011) offers extensive arguments for mentalism about motivating epistemic reasons and against the alternatives. While Davidson (1963)'s causal argument for mentalism was primarily an argument about motivating reasons for action, the argument extends to motivating reasons for belief, as Turri (2011) notes.

Sometimes linguistic considerations are used against mentalist views. We often say things like "Susanne's reason for believing that God doesn't exist is that there is unnecessary suffering in the world." Pryor (2007) offers an extended critique of this linguistic argument.

Dancy (2000)'s argument against mentalism about motivating reasons for both action and belief turns on the thought that it must be possible to act or believe for good reasons. Since Dancy takes good reasons to be facts, he takes mentalism about motivating reasons to imply that it is impossible to act or believe for good reasons. Turri (2011) critically assesses this argument. While Dancy's argument is influential in meta-ethics, it has not gone without resistance.

Davidson, D. 1963. "Actions, Reasons, and Causes." *Journal of Philosophy* 60: 685-700. [Contains classic arguments for viewing motivating reasons as causes.]

Pryor, J. 2007. "Reasons and That-Clauses." *Philosophical Issues* 17: 217-244. [An extended critique of linguistic arguments against mentalism.]

Raz, J. 1975. *Practical Reason and Norms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Chapter 1 combines a factualist account of normative reasons for action and belief with a mentalist account of motivating reasons for action and belief.]

Smith, M. 1994. *The Moral Problem*. Oxford: Blackwell. [Chapter 4 defends a mentalist account of motivating reasons for action and the fifth chapter defends a factualist account of normative reasons for action.]

Swain, M. 1981. *Reasons and Knowledge*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. [See description above.]

Turri, J. 2009. "The Ontology of Epistemic Reasons." *Nous* 43: 490-512. [This paper argues against factualism and abstractionism about motivating epistemic reasons and in favor of mentalism.]

Turri, J. 2011. "Believing for a Reason." *Erkenntnis* 74: 383-397. [Provides an account of the epistemic basing relation and a further defense of mentalism.]

Wallace, R. J. 2003. "Explanation, Deliberation, and Reasons." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 67: 429-35. [Agrees with Dancy about normative reasons while rejecting his anti-mentalism about motivating reasons.]

3.1.2 Alternatives to Mentalism

The alternatives to mentalism about motivating epistemic reasons resemble the alternatives to mentalism about normative epistemic reasons. Some hold that motivating epistemic reasons

are facts. Unger (1975) and Hyman (1999) are examples. Others hold that they are propositions. Armstrong (1973: 78-9), Audi (1986) and Millar (2004) are examples. For a balanced discussion of some arguments against viewing reasons of all kinds (motivating or normative) as propositions, see Turri (2012).

Although non-mentalist views are sometimes supported on the basis of ordinary language considerations, there are also ordinary language arguments against non-mentalist views. Notice that when an agent's rationale for thinking or acting is false, we are forced to say things like "She believed that P because she believed that Q". We cannot felicitously say "She believed that P for the reason that Q". These arguments receive extensive critical discussion in Alvarez (2010) and Dancy (2000). While both focus primarily on motivating reasons for action, the points they make extend in an obvious way to motivating reasons for belief.

Alvarez, M. 2010. *Kinds of Reasons*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [This book defends factualism about motivating and normative reasons for action and belief and critically assesses some arguments for mentalist views.]

Armstrong, D. M. 1973. *Belief, Truth and Knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Chapter 6 contains some reasons for thinking that reasons are propositions, though the arguments are hedged and it is unclear whether the author thinks that there are just different legitimate ways to talk about reasons.]

Audi, R. 1986. "Belief, Reason and Inference." *Philosophical Topics* 14: 27-65. [This discussion of the epistemic basing relation recommends viewing reasons as propositions, though the author reserves the technical expression "reason state" for the beliefs that enable certain propositions to serve as our reasons.]

Dancy, J. 2000. *Practical Reality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [See description above.]

Hyman, J. 1999. "How Knowledge Works." *Philosophical Quarterly* 49: 433-51. [In the course of arguing that knowledge is the ability to be guided by the facts, Hyman defends a factualist conception of motivating reasons.]

Millar, A. 2004. *Understanding People*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Chapters 1 and 2 discuss motivating and normative reasons for belief and Millar views both as propositions.]

Turri, J. 2012. "Reasons, Answers, and Goals." *Journal of Moral Philosophy* 9: 491-499. [Critically discusses some arguments against viewing reasons as propositions, though Turri elsewhere rejects this view for independent reasons.]

Unger, P. 1975. *Ignorance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Chapter 5 argues that motivating reasons must be facts that we know.]

3.2 Reasons and the Basing Relation

What does it take for a consideration to be one's motivating epistemic reason for some doxastic attitude—i.e., the reason for which one holds that doxastic attitude? Discussions of the basing relation in epistemology are, at bottom, discussions of this question. Theories of the basing relation have traditionally split into three categories, as Korcz (1997) observes: causal theories, counterfactual theories, and doxastic theories.

Defenders of causal theories include Armstrong (1973: Ch. 6) and Moser (1989). Both of are open to understanding motivating epistemic reasons as propositions; indeed, Armstrong explicitly argues for this view. They don't claim that the propositions are causes of belief, but rather claim that a proposition R is someone's motivating epistemic reason for believing P only if certain causal relations hold between that person's belief in R and her belief in P. When counterfactual analyses of causal notions were popular, Swain (1981) defended a counterfactual analysis. This led to a very complicated analysis due to conditional fallacy problems.

Causal theories of the basing relation face the same worries about deviant causation that plague causal theories generally. Recent attempts to solve the problems of causal deviance have been made by Wedgwood (2006) and Turri (2011). Another long-standing worry about causal theories concerns their inability to address "gypsy lawyer" counterexamples from Lehrer (1971). Until recently, the main alternatives to causal theories have been doxastic theories, which demand that the subject see an apparent reason-giving connection between R and her belief in order for R to count as her motivating reason. Tolliver (1982) argues against causal accounts and in favor of a doxastic account. Korcz (1997) provides some reasons for thinking that a pure doxastic theory is unacceptable and proposes a hybrid causal-doxastic theory. More recent literature features a new theory that combines the insights of causal and doxastic theories—viz., the dispositional theory of Evans (2012).

Armstrong, D. M. 1973. *Belief, Truth and Knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Chapter 6 provides a causal analysis of the basing relation.]

Evans, Ian. 2012. "The Problem of the Basing Relation." *Erkenntnis*. Online first; DOI: 10.1007/s11229-012-0111-1 [This paper provides a novel dispositional analysis of the basing relation.]

Korcz, K. 1997. "Recent Work on the Basing Relation." *American Philosophical Quarterly* 34: 171-191. [This paper provides a comprehensive survey of work on the basing relation from the early 1970s and to the late 1990s, and provides a statement of the author's own causal-doxastic account.]

Lehrer, K. 1971. "How Reasons Give Us Knowledge." *The Journal of Philosophy* 68: 311-313. [This paper presents the classic gypsy lawyer counterexample to causal analyses of the basing relation.]

Moser, P. 1989. *Knowledge and Evidence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [This book contains a causal account of the basing relation that improves on the causal accounts of the preceding decade.]

Swain, M. 1981. *Reasons and Knowledge*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. [Chapter 2 provides counterfactual analyses of the causal notions that the author uses to analyze the basing relation in Chapter 3.]

Tolliver, J. 1982. “Basing Beliefs on Reasons.” *Grazer Philosophische Studien* 15: 149-161. [This paper attacks causal analyses of the basing relation and defends a doxastic theory.]

Turri, J. 2011. “Believing for a Reason.” *Erkenntnis* 74: 383-397. [This paper provides the most up-to-date causal account of the basing relation.]

Wedgwood, R. 2006. “The Normative Force of Reasoning.” *Nous* 40: 660-686. [This paper provides a novel solution to the problem of deviance that plagued earlier causal accounts of reasoning and basing.]

4 Reasons and Other Epistemic Standings

Much literature on reasons in epistemology focuses on how reasons relate to other objects of epistemological interest. This section covers discussions of the connection between reasons and (i) justification, (ii) rationality, (iii) knowledge, (iv) perception, and (v) reasoning.

4.1 Reasons and Epistemic Justification

Must all justified beliefs be based on reasons? Lyons (2009a) and (2009b) argues that the answer is ‘No’ and provides a purely reliabilist account of justified belief. Millar (1991: Ch. 6) has also defended the idea that there are “groundless” justified beliefs. Both authors use ‘reasons’ and ‘grounds’ interchangeably.

While it is hard to find earlier reliabilists explicitly denying that justified beliefs must be based on reasons, earlier reliabilists did provide accounts of justification seemed to make it possible for justified beliefs to be based on no reasons. Goldman (1979) claimed that a belief is *prima facie* non-inferentially justified iff it is the output of an unconditionally reliable belief-independent belief-forming process. It seems clear that there could be belief-forming processes of this kind that do not involve basing on normative reasons. Indeed, Goldman (1999) suggests that beliefs can be justified without being based on any normative reasons that one currently possesses when he presses the forgotten evidence objection against accessibilist internalism.

While many skeptics about the necessity of reasons for justification are externalists, not all are. Earlier it was noted that Pollock (1974) defined foundationalism so that it entailed that some justified beliefs are not based on reasons. But Pollock is no externalist. And Wright (2004) argues that there are entitlements for belief that are not grounded in epistemic reasons—though it is unclear whether he regards entitlement as a form of justification.

Epistemologists who defend the necessity of reasons for justification include evidentialists like Conee and Feldman (2004). Friends of the necessity of reasons for justification are not limited to evidentialists or internalists. Littlejohn (2011b) upholds the necessity of reasons for justification but not an evidentialist or internalist. Comesaña (2010) defends a reliabilist form of evidentialism.

The question of the necessity of reasons for justification is not the only interesting question to ask about the relationship between reasons and justification. Another interesting question is whether holding one's beliefs for good reasons is sufficient for doxastic justification. Turri (2010) defends a negative answer to this question, arguing that there are incompetent ways to base beliefs on good reasons that preclude doxastic justification.

Comesaña, J. 2010. "Evidentialist Reliabilism." *Nous* 44.4: 571-600. [Defends a fusion of evidentialism and reliabilism.]

Conee, E. and Feldman, R. 2004. *Evidentialism: Essays in Epistemology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [This collection of essays contains defenses of the authors' internalist version of evidentialism.]

Goldman, A. 1979. "What Is Justified Belief?" in Pappas, G. and Swain, M. (eds.) *Justification and Knowledge*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel. [The *locus classicus* of process reliabilism.]

Goldman, A. 1999. "Internalism Exposed." *Journal of Philosophy* 96: 271-293. [Argues against internalism about epistemic justification and contains some counterexamples to the view that justified beliefs must be based on reasons that are accessible from the current time-slice.]

Littlejohn, C. 2011b. "Reasons and Belief's Justification" in Resiner, A. and Steglich-Petersen, A. (eds.) *Reasons for Belief*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Defends the link between justification and reasons in a non-evidentialist, externalist form.]

Lyons, J. C. 2009a. *Perception and Basic Beliefs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [See earlier description.]

Lyons, J. C. 2009b. "Perception and Virtue Reliabilism." *Acta Analytica* 24: 249-261. [Provides further arguments against the necessity of good reasons for justified belief.]

Millar, A. 1991. *Reasons and Experience*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. [Chapter 6 expresses doubts about whether reasons are necessary for justified belief.]

Pollock, J. 1974. *Knowledge and Justification*, Ch.1. Princeton: Princeton University Press. [The book covers many major topics in epistemology, but chapter 1 provides a discussion of the nature of reasons and their connection to justification and knowledge.]

Turri, J. 2010. "On the Relationship between Propositional and Doxastic Justification." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 80.2: 312-26. [Argues that basing one's belief on an undefeated epistemic reason is insufficient for doxastic justification and proposes analyzing propositional justification in terms of doxastic justification rather than *vice versa*.]

4.2 Reasons, Coherence, and Epistemic Rationality

A hot topic in the last fifteen years has been the relationship between reasons, rationality, and normativity. There was a time when rationality was regarded as the normative authority *par excellence*. But recent years have witnessed increasing doubts about this idea. These doubts are driven in large part by the idea that objective reasons are the gold standard of normativity and by certain views about the nature of rationality. Theorists like Scanlon, Broome and Kolodny all take the core requirements of rationality to be requirements of coherence. Given certain views about the logical form of these requirements, it is easy to see why someone might be skeptical about their normative significance.

Broome (1999) viewed these requirements in a wide scope fashion. Consider the “enkratic” requirement to have attitude A if one believes one ought to have A. For Broome, this hypothetical requirement is equivalent to a ban against a conjunction of states: it requires one not to both believe that one ought to have A and lack A. While Broome’s picture was popular in the early 2000s, the terrain shifted with Kolodny (2005). Kolodny argued that coherence requirements are narrow scope requirements. Kolodny’s version of this view predicts that the enkratic requirements are detaching requirements.

This led Kolodny to deny that there are conclusive reasons to be rational. The obvious worry concerns bootstrapping. Suppose it is true that there are conclusive reasons to comply with the requirements of rationality. The detaching readings of enkratic requirements will generate conclusive reasons to drop or form certain attitudes whenever one believes that there are conclusive reasons to drop or form these attitudes. But it is hard to believe that our beliefs about whether we have conclusive reasons are self-verifying! Hence, Kolodny (2005) and (2007) encouraged skepticism about the normativity of rationality and provided an error theory. While Broome still holds the wide scope picture, he too has become skeptical about the normativity of rationality; see Broome (2005) and (2008). Reisner (2011) addresses the issue for epistemic coherence requirements and argues that we need not be skeptics.

While this literature has great importance for epistemology, the impact has only begun to show. One example is Jackson (2011), who questions some arguments for “seemings internalism” by appealing to a non-detaching picture of the rational pressure exerted by seemings. Another example is Pryor (2004). In his assessment of Moorean responses to skepticism, Pryor claims that the relation of being rationally committed to certain doxastic attitudes by other doxastic attitudes is “non-detaching”. After claiming that a belief is rational if none of one’s other doxastic attitudes rationally commit one to abandoning it, Pryor (2004: 365) echoed Broome: “This makes ‘being rational’ a different quality than having justification.” While Pryor (2004: 375) cites Broome, he expressed reservations about using a wide scope interpretation to capture the idea that coherence requirements are hypothetical. It is worth comparing Lord (2011), who has shown how to accept a narrow scope interpretation while viewing coherence requirements as rationally escapable.

Broome, J. 1999. “Normative Requirements.” *Ratio* 12: 398-419. [The *locus classicus* of the wide-scope interpretation of requirements of rationality.]

Broome, J. 2005. “Does Rationality Give Us Reasons?” *Philosophical Issues* 15: 321-37. [The first place where Broome expresses doubts about whether there is a tight con-

nection between being rational and correctly responding to reasons.]

Broome, J. 2008. "Is Rationality Normative?" *Disputatio* 11: 153-71. [Considers many possible explanations of the normativity of rationality and concludes that none of them work.]

Jackson, A. 2011. "Appearances, Rationality and Justified Belief." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 82: 564-93. [Shows how certain arguments for seemings internalism about epistemic justification rest on conflating being justified with not being irrational.]

Kolodny, N. 2005. "Why Be Rational?" *Mind* 114: 509-560. [The *locus classicus* of skepticism about the normativity of rationality, and also provides a defense of a narrow-scope interpretation of requirements of rationality.]

Kolodny, N. 2007. "How Does Coherence Matter?" *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 107: 229-263. [Extends Kolodny (2005)'s doubts about the normative significance of rationality and his error theory.]

Lord, E. 2011. "Violating Requirements, Exiting from Requirements, and the Scope of Rationality." *Philosophical Quarterly* 61: 392-399. [This paper shows how narrow-scopers about the requirements of rationality can consistently agree that these requirements are rationally escapable.]

Pryor, J. 2004. "What's Wrong with Moore's Argument?" *Philosophical Issues* 14: 349-378. [Puts Broomean insights to work in a nuanced discussion of Moorean anti-skeptical arguments which explains their dialectical ineffectiveness consistently with their justificatory force. The author does, however, express doubts about whether wide-scoping is the right way to capture Broome's insights.]

Reisner, A. 2011. "Is There Reason to Be Theoretically Rational?" in Reisner, A. and Steglich-Petersen, A. (eds.) *Reasons for Belief*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Takes up the question of the normativity of epistemic rationality and defends an optimistic answer.]

Scanlon, T. M. 1998. *What We Owe to Each Other*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. [Chapter 1 contains an influential argument for thinking that requirements of rationality should be understood very narrowly, which is presupposed by Broome and Kolodny.]

4.3 Reasons and Knowledge

Discussions of the relationship between reasons and knowledge mirror discussions of the relationship between reasons and justification. Some have denied that reasons are necessary for knowledge while seeming to leave it open whether they are necessary for justification. Examples include Dretske (1991), Sosa (2007), Greco (2010) and Moon (2012). Greco and Sosa do claim that there is an epistemic status weaker than knowledge that does not require reasons.

But they do not use the term ‘justification’. Greco uses the term ‘k-normative status’, while Sosa uses ‘epistemic competence’ and ‘adroitness’. Other writers who deny that reasons are necessary for knowledge explicitly agree that reasons are necessary for justification. They rely on this assumption in arguing that justification is unnecessary for knowledge. Kornblith (2008) is an example. He accepts a reasons-based account of justification and denies on this basis that knowledge requires justification. He cites Goldman (1967) as an earlier example. While all these writers agree that absence of unreasonableness is necessary for knowledge, some people reject even this claim. See Lasonen-Aarnio (2010).

Dretske, F. 1981. *Knowledge and the Flow of Information*. Palo Alto: CSLI Publications. [Defends a theory of knowledge on which reasons are unnecessary for non-inferential knowledge.]

Dretske, F. 1991. “Two Conceptions of Knowledge: Reliable vs. Rational Belief.” *Grazer Philosophische Studien* 4: 15-30. [Attacks the idea that reasons are necessary for knowledge.]

Goldman, A. 1967. “A Causal Theory of Knowing.” *Journal of Philosophy* 64: 357-372. [Goldman suggests at the end of this classic defense of a causal theory of knowing that knowledge does not require justification. In drawing this conclusion, he assumes—in sharp contrast to his later thinking—that justification must be understood in an internalist way.]

Greco, J. 2010. *Achieving Knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Chapters 3 and 4 argue against understanding knowledge as requiring reasons, though Greco seems to presuppose that epistemic reasons must be understood as internalist evidentialists understand them.]

Kornblith, H. 2008. “Knowledge Needs No Justification” in Smith, Q. (ed.) *Epistemology: New Essays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Argues that we should resurrect the early Goldman’s idea that knowledge does not require justification rather than accepting a strongly externalist picture of justification.]

Lasonen-Aarnio, M. 2010. “Unreasonable Knowledge.” *Philosophical Perspectives* 24: 1-21. [Argues that one can know that P even if one is unreasonable in believing that P.]

Moon, A. 2012. “Knowing without Evidence.” *Mind* 121: 309-331. [Argues that we can know that P without believing that P on the basis of evidence.]

Sosa, E. 2007. *Apt Belief and Reflective Knowledge*, v. 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [In discussing intuitive knowledge in Chapter 3, Sosa suggests that this knowledge is best understood in terms of competences that are not reasons-based.]

4.4 Reasons, Perception, and Conceptual Content

Reasons play an important role in recent discussions of the contents of perceptual experience. Some have thought that we can defend the claim that perceptual experiences have conceptual

content on the basis of the claim that perceptual experience provides reasons for belief. This idea goes back to McDowell (1994) and receives an extended defense in Brewer (1999) and (2005). Heck (2000) and Byrne (2005) both provide critical assessments.

Brewer has changed his mind. He now denies that perceptual experience has content at all, favoring an “austere relationalist” account of perceptual experience. See Brewer (2006). For a critical discussion of Brewer’s new view and a defense of the conceptualist picture on the basis of considerations about the reason-providing character of experience, see Ginsborg (2011). Schellenberg (2011) also provides a defense of perceptual content that captures the epistemological insights of Brewer’s more recent austere relationalist view.

Other epistemologically significant conclusions have been drawn from the premise that perceptual experiences provide reasons for belief. Lyons (2009) defends doxastic mentalism about reasons for belief and argues that experiences of the kind that provide justifying reasons are beliefs. But he does not take this to support coherentism. On the contrary, he takes it to show that not all justified beliefs are justified by reasons! Millar (2011)’s account of how perception provides reasons for belief has some related implications. Millar thinks that it is by exercising certain recognitional abilities in perception that we come to gain perceptual reasons for belief. But Millar understands recognition as a kind of knowledge. This leads him to accept a version of knowledge-first epistemology—a view that he might not accept if he took there to be a reductive explanation of how we gain reasons for belief.

Brewer, B. 1999. *Perception and Reason*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Contains Brewer’s defense of the thesis that possessing a reason requires the concepts necessary to articulate the proposition that constitutes that reason, as well as Brewer’s defense of conceptualism about perceptual content.]

Brewer, B. 2005. “Perceptual Experience Has Conceptual Content” in Steup, M. and Sosa, E. (eds.) *Contemporary Debates in Epistemology*. Oxford: Blackwell. [An updated version of Brewer’s argument for conceptualism about perceptual content on the basis of its reason-providing power.]

Brewer, B. 2006. “Perception and Content.” *European Journal of Philosophy* 14: 165-181. [Marks the shift in Brewer’s thought to an austere relationalist or “no content” view of perceptual experience.]

Byrne, A. 2005. “Perception and Conceptual Content” in Steup, M. and Sosa, E. (eds.) *Contemporary Debates in Epistemology*. Oxford: Blackwell. [Critically discusses Brewer’s arguments for conceptualism on the basis of the reason-providing character of perceptual experience.]

Ginsborg, H. 2011. “Perception, Generality, and Reasons” in Reisner, A. and Steglich-Petersen, A. (eds.) *Reasons for Belief*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [This paper critically assesses the shift in Brewer’s thought and provides a defense of the claim that perceptual experience has conceptual content in response to Brewer’s new doubts about the idea.]

Heck, R.G. 2000. "Non-Conceptual Content and the 'Space of Reasons'." *Philosophical Review* 109: 483-523. [Critically discusses McDowell's argument for conceptualism on the basis of the reason-giving character of perceptual experience, and shows how a non-conceptualist could explain this datum.]

Lyons, J. 2009. *Perception and Basic Beliefs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [See earlier description.]

McDowell, J. 1994. *Mind and World*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. [Contains McDowell's classic defense of conceptualism on the basis of the reason-providing power of perceptual experience.]

Millar, A. 2011. "How Visual Perception Yields Reasons for Belief." *Philosophical Issues* 21: 332-351. [Argues that recognitional abilities explain how we can come to possess normative reasons through perception.]

Schellenberg, S. 2011. "Perceptual Content Defended." *Nous* 45: 714-750. [Provides a defense of the thesis that perceptual experience has representational content that captures the epistemological insights of Brewer's more recent work.]

4.5 Reasons, Reasoning, and Logic

It is common to see introductory logic textbooks suggesting tight links between logic, good reasons, and reasoning. But in epistemology, the tightness of the connection has been questioned. Harman (1984) famously denied that there is any tight connection. It is, after all, implausible that we have good reasons to believe the most arcane logical consequences of our justified beliefs simply because these are logical consequences. We would only seem to possess these reasons if we are in a position to recognize the entailment relations. But as Harman noted, even if one recognizes that one's beliefs entail a conclusion, the proper response to this might be to drop those beliefs, not accept the conclusion.

While Harman's points have proven influential, they arguably overlook important distinctions and dialectical possibilities. Earlier, we saw that meta-ethicists distinguish between objective and subjective normative reasons, or between the reasons there are and the reasons we have. Harman's first point only has straightforward bearing on the relationship between logic and possessed or subjective normative reasons for belief. And its significance remains unclear. Some have doubted whether recognition of the entailment provides the deepest explanation of how we can come to possess certain logical reasons; cf. Boghossian (2003) and Dogramaci (2012). In any case, Harman's first point does not undermine tight connections between logic and objective reasons for belief.

Harman's second point does not undermine certain ways of establishing a tight link between entailments and objective normative reasons for belief. We could follow Broome (1999, 2013) in taking the conclusive reason to prohibit a certain combination of doxastic attitudes rather than to require any particular doxastic attitude. One could hold that if P entails Q, there is a conclusive objective epistemic reason not to both believe P and disbelieve Q. Streumer

(2007) has defended this type of view and critically assessed Harman's arguments. For another important discussion of Harman, see Field (2009).

Other attacks on the connection between logic and correct reasoning have come from formal quarters. Christensen (2004) has argued that the proper response to the preface and lottery paradoxes is to abandon deductive consistency as a rational requirement on full belief. Christensen's worries cannot be addressed by appealing to Broomean wide-scoping.

Boghossian, P. 2003. "Blind Reasoning." *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society Supplementary Volume 77*: 225-248. [Argues against standard versions of inferential internalism and inferential externalism, and attacks the idea that recognition of entailment relations is what fundamentally explains how one's knowledge of certain propositions can provide one with sufficient reasons to believe some but not other logical entailments of these propositions.]

Broome, J. 1999. "Normative Requirements." *Ratio* 12: 398-419. [See earlier description.]

Broome, J. 2013. *Rationality Through Reasoning*. Oxford: Blackwell. [The definitive and up-to-date expression of Broome's views about reasons, rationality, and reasoning in the epistemic and practical domains.]

Christensen, D. 2004. *Putting Logic in Its Place*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. [Argues extensively against coherence requirements on full belief that are grounded in logic, though the author is in favor of Bayesian coherence requirements and skeptical about the importance of full belief.]

Dogramaci, S. 2013. "Intuitions for Inferences." *Philosophical Studies* 165: 371-399. [Like Boghossian (2003), this paper casts doubt on the idea that recognition of entailment relations is what fundamentally explains how one's knowledge of certain propositions can provide one with sufficient reasons to believe some but not other logical entailments of these propositions.]

Field, H. 2009. "What Is the Normative Role of Logic?" *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society Supplementary Volume 83*: 251-68. [Critically assesses Harman's case against any tight connection between logic and good reasoning.]

Harman, G. 1984. "Logic and Reasoning." *Synthese* 60: 107-127. [This is the locus classicus of Harman's doubts about the connection between logic, normative reasons for belief, and good reasoning.]

Streumer, B. 2007. "Reasons and Entailment." *Erkenntnis* 66: 353-374. [This paper provides a sophisticated wide-scope account of the relationship between logical entailments and normative epistemic reasons.]

5 Reasons and the Epistemology-Metaethics Interface

New interest in reasons has increased the cross traffic between epistemology and meta-ethics. This concluding section documents some of this activity.

As early as Railton (1997), meta-ethicists began to appreciate similarities between epistemic and moral reasons. Epistemic reasons are categorical like moral reasons are categorical, authoritative like moral reasons are authoritative, intrinsically prescriptive like moral reasons are intrinsically prescriptive, and so on. These are all features that that inclined error theorists like Mackie to label moral reasons as “queer”. If the queerness of these properties is a good reason for being an error theorist in ethics, it is equally a good reason for being an error theorist in epistemology. Yet an error theory about epistemic reasons is arguably implausible and even self-defeating, as Cuneo (2007) argues. This suggests a “companions in guilt” strategy for realists. Of course, the devil is in the details. This strategy has received critical attention; see Olson (2011). Anti-realists such as Street (2011) run the argument in the opposite direction.

Another locus of cross traffic is in recent discussions of internalism/ externalism controversies in meta-ethics. While these controversies are not structurally identical to the similarly named controversies in epistemology, recent writers have landed on interesting analogies.

In meta-ethics, two distinct internalist theses receive discussion, which Darwall (1983) labeled *existence internalism* and *judgment internalism*. Existence internalism claims that R is a normative reason for S to ϕ only if S bears a certain motivational relation to R. There is wide disagreement among internalists about the character of the motivational relation. But one idea is that R would motivate S to ϕ if S were fully informed and conformed to all requirements of coherence. Markovits (2011) explores some analogies between the existence internalism/externalism debate and the debate between coherentists and foundationalists in epistemology, taking existence internalism to be analogous to coherentism. While she agrees that we should reject coherentism, she argues that there are no analogues of basic beliefs in the practical domain, and that this is part of why we should be existence internalists.

Judgment internalism is the view that judgments about normative practical reasons are essentially motivating, at least in certain idealized circumstances. Judgment internalism plays an important role in arguments for expressivism. Might there be a defensible epistemic analogue of judgment internalism? Mitova (2011) explores this possibility. Chrisman (2012) also discusses the tenability of epistemic judgment internalism and its role in arguments for epistemic expressivism.

Chrisman, M. 2012. “Epistemic Expressivism.” *Philosophy Compass* 7: 118-126. [Surveys the literature on expressivism in epistemology.]

Cuneo, T. 2007. *The Normative Web*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Argues that typical arguments for anti-realism about moral reasons can be equally used to defend anti-realism about epistemic reasons. The author takes this to be a *reductio* of anti-realism about moral reasons.]

Darwall, S. 1983. *Impartial Reason*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. [In addition to containing helpful discussions of the difference between normative and motivating

reasons and critical assessments of Humean theories of both, this book is the source of the distinction between “judgment internalism” and “existence internalism”.]

Markovits, J. 2011. “Why Be an Internalist about Reasons?” *Oxford Studies in Metaethics* 6: 141-165. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Provides some new reasons for accepting existence internalism about normative practical reasons and defends some disanalogies between epistemic and practical reasons.]

Mitova, V. 2011. “Epistemic Motivation: Toward a Metaethics of Belief.” in Reisner, A. and Steglich-Petersen, A. (eds.) *Reasons for Belief*. [Explores in detail what judgment internalism in epistemology would look like.]

Olson, E. 2011. “Error Theory and Reasons for Belief” in Reisner, A. and Steglich-Petersen, A. (eds.) *Reasons for Belief*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Attacks the “companions in guilt” strategy of Cuneo (2007).]

Railton, P. 1997. “On the Hypothetical and the Non-Hypothetical in Reasoning about Belief and Action” in Cullity, G. and Gaut, B. (eds.) *Ethics and Practical Reason*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Explores the analogies between the apparently non-hypothetical character of reasons for belief and the apparently non-hypothetical character of moral reasons.]

Street, S. 2011. “Evolution and the Normativity of Epistemic Reasons.” *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 35: 213-248. [Extends evolutionary debunking arguments to the domain of epistemic reasons.]