

THE SENSITIVITY PRINCIPLE IN EPISTEMOLOGY

The sensitivity principle is a compelling idea in epistemology and is typically characterized as a necessary condition for knowledge. This collection of fourteen new essays constitutes a state-of-the-art discussion of this important principle. Some of the essays build on and strengthen sensitivity-based accounts of knowledge and offer novel defences of those accounts. Others present original objections to sensitivity-based accounts (objections that must be taken seriously even by those who defend enhanced versions of sensitivity) and offer comprehensive analysis and discussion of sensitivity's virtues and problems. The resulting collection will stimulate new debate about the sensitivity principle and will be of great interest and value to scholars and advanced students of epistemology.

KELLY BECKER is Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of New Mexico. He is the author of *Epistemology Modalized* (2007).

TIM BLACK is Associate Professor and Chair of Philosophy at California State University, Northridge.





THE SENSITIVITY PRINCIPLE IN EPISTEMOLOGY

EDITED BY
KELLY BECKER
and
TIM BLACK





CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town,

Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107004238

© Cambridge University Press 2012

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2012

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data
The sensitivity principle in epistemology / edited by Kelly Becker and Tim Black.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references (p.) and index.

ISBN 978-I-107-00423-8 (hardback)

1. Knowledge, Theory of. I. Becker, Kelly, 1966- II. Black, Tim.

BD161.S46 2012 121'.6–dc23

2012015434

ISBN 978-1-107-00423-8 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate. Information regarding prices, travel timetables, and other factual information given in this work is correct at the time of first printing but Cambridge University Press does not guarantee the accuracy of such information thereafter.



Contents

List of contributors		<i>page</i> vii
Preface		ix
I	The resilience of sensitivity Kelly Becker and Tim Black	I
PART I DEFENSES, APPLICATIONS, EXPLICATIONS		
2	Nozick's defense of closure Peter Baumann	II
3	Sensitivity meets explanation: an improved counterfactual condition on knowledge Peter Murphy and Tim Black	28
4	Sensitivity from others Sanford Goldberg	43
5	Knowledge, cognitive dispositions and conditionals Lars Bo Gundersen	66
6	Methods and how to individuate them Kelly Becker	81
PA	RT II CRITICISM	
7	Truth-tracking and the value of knowledge <i>Jonathan L. Kvanvig</i>	IOI
8	The enduring trouble with tracking Jonathan Vogel	122

V



vi	Contents	
9	What makes knowledge the most highly prized form of true belief? Peter D. Klein	152
PAF	RT III IN FAVOR OF SAFETY OVER SENSITIVITY	
Ю	In defence of modest anti-luck epistemology Duncan Pritchard	173
II	Better safe than sensitive John Greco	193
12	False negatives Steven Luper	207
PAF	RT IV SENSITIVITY WITHOUT SUBJUNCTIVES	
13	Roush on knowledge: tracking redux? Anthony Brueckner	229
14	Sensitivity and closure Sherrilyn Roush	242
Bib	liography	269
	Index	



Contributors

PETER BAUMANN Professor and Chair of Philosophy Swarthmore College

KELLY BECKER
Associate Professor of Philosophy
University of New Mexico

TIM BLACK Associate Professor and Chair of Philosophy California State University, Northridge

ANTHONY BRUECKNER Professor of Philosophy University of California, Santa Barbara

SANFORD GOLDBERG Professor and Chair of Philosophy Northwestern University

JOHN GRECO Professor and Leonard and Elizabeth Eslick Chair in Philosophy Saint Louis University

Associate Professor, Research Programme in Philosophy, Arts Aarhus University, Denmark Associate Professor of Philosophy Oslo University, Norway Associate Fellow Northern Institute of Philosophy University of Aberdeen, UK

vii



viii

List of contributors

PETER D. KLEIN Professor of Philosophy Rutgers University

JONATHAN L. KVANVIG Distinguished Professor of Philosophy Baylor University

STEVEN LUPER Professor and Chair of Philosophy Trinity University

PETER MURPHY Associate Professor of Philosophy University of Indianapolis

DUNCAN PRITCHARD
Professor and Chair of Epistemology
Department of Philosophy
University of Edinburgh

SHERRILYN ROUSH Associate Professor of Philosophy University of California, Berkeley

JONATHAN VOGEL Professor of Philosophy Amherst College



Preface

In the fall of 1991, while working as a financial analyst for a large insurance company and preparing applications for graduate school, I audited John Dolan's epistemology seminar at the University of Minnesota. We read Robert Nozick's *Philosophical Explanations*, which struck me as such a misguided reply to skepticism that I dedicated my application's writing sample to saying exactly why (which I no longer recall). Fast forward to 2001 (because in the interim I studied almost no epistemology whatsoever), when I was an Assistant Professor at Centre College in Kentucky and Sandy Goldberg invited me to participate in a reading group at the University of Kentucky to discuss DeRose and Warfield's (1999) *Skepticism: A Contemporary Reader*. My task was to present Nozick's epistemology, and I was surprised to find myself not only explaining but also endorsing it.

I began doing research in contemporary epistemology and defending Nozick's idea that, in order to know that p, it must be the case that one would not believe that p if it were false. But the more I investigated work on this so-called 'sensitivity' principle, the more I found that it had really taken a beating in the literature. This led me to think that someone ought to put together a book on sensitivity and give philosophers a chance to rethink the counterexamples and criticisms, defend and elaborate the sensitivity principle, perhaps reinterpret it, all with a view to resuscitating the centerpiece of Nozick's theory of knowledge. My reading led me to several papers by Tim Black that were sympathetic to Nozick, but also took Nozick's basic idea in new directions, some of which I didn't want to follow, but which clearly constituted original thinking on some well-known problems. In no time we were collaborating on this book. I thank Tim for agreeing to work with me, and for helping to make this book far better than it otherwise would have been. Tim and I are grateful to those at Cambridge University Press and its affiliates for their diligence and support, especially Hilary Gaskin, Lucy Gibson, Anne Lowe, Christopher Feeney, and Emma Wildsmith.



x Preface

I want also to thank all the contributors to this volume. Without exception, they took up the challenge of explicating, extending, poking, prodding, and recasting sensitivity in ways that, I hope and trust, will make this book an important contribution to epistemology. I want to thank Sandy Goldberg and Duncan Pritchard in particular for getting me started on a career in epistemology and for being amazingly supportive ever since. I could say a lot more about these two gentlemen, but everyone who knows them knows what I am talking about.

KΒ

I came to the sensitivity principle indirectly, not through the work of Nozick or Fred Dretske or Alvin Goldman, but through the work of Keith DeRose, who makes use of the principle in his epistemological contextualism. I was then - and am now - convinced that contextualism is not to be preferred over certain invariantist alternatives, and so I set out to show that one could make use of the very same principle, the sensitivity principle, in constructing an invariantism that is just as plausible as, if not more plausible than, contextualism. In trying to construct a sensitivity-based invariantism, I encountered a disheartening number of negative appraisals of sensitivity as a condition for knowledge. As I began to examine these, however, I realized just how many of them were either criticizing too rudimentary a notion of sensitivity or objecting that sensitivity violates a much too simple version of the epistemic closure principle. One of the main virtues of this volume, then, is that it gives some very talented epistemologists a chance to build on and strengthen the sensitivity principle that we inherited from Nozick, as well as the chance to defend sensitivity-based accounts against objections that I think of as misguided. It is also a virtue of this volume that it gives some very talented epistemologists a chance to say why they (continue to) object to sensitivitybased accounts, even when those accounts have been strengthened and expanded as they have been over the past forty years or so.

Along with Kelly, I would like to express my deep gratitude to all of the contributors to this volume; it has been a pleasure to work with them and to learn from their contributions. I thank, as always, Albert Casullo for his help and guidance as a mentor in epistemology and in philosophy. I also want to thank Peter Murphy, one of the very best epistemologists I know, for his support and collaboration. It is an absolute joy to work with him, to learn from him and to see, from watching him work, how one can find success in epistemology through an uncompromising dedication to the discovery of the truth. Finally, I thank Kelly Becker,



Preface xi

with whom I have had the utter pleasure of editing this volume. Kelly works harder than almost any philosopher I know; he is extraordinarily patient and understanding; and I have learned a great deal from him, both about epistemology and about how to see a project through. I hope that our collaboration, in addition to all the work done by the contributors to this volume, makes for a rewarding and important contribution to epistemology.

ТВ