Three Responses to the Gettier Objection

No False Grounds Approach
(3a_{NF}) S knows that p = Df. (1) S believes that p, (2) p is true, (3) p is epistemically justified for S, and (4) S’s justification for p is not the result of an inference from a false proposition q.

Objection

First Case — Gettier Objection Works
T – (m) Mr. Nogot tells Smith that he owns a Ford and he shows Smith the title to his Ford.
F – (r) Mr. Nogot who is in Smith’s office owns a Ford
T – (h) Someone in Smith’s office owns a Ford

Modified Case — Gettier Example Supposedly Fails
T – (m) Mr. Nogot tells Smith that he owns a Ford and he shows Smith the title to his Ford.
T – (n) There is someone in the office who told Smith that he owns a Ford and showed Smith the title, and this same person has always been reliable and honest with Smith.
T – (h) Someone in Smith’s office owns a Ford

2. (3a_{NF}) is false (too strong)

Defeasibility Approach
(3a_{D}) S knows that p = Df. (1) S believes that p, (2) p is true, (3) p is epistemically justified for S, and (4) there is also no other proposition q such that if S believed q, then p would no longer be epistemically justified for S.

Evidential Defeat

\[ e \] defeats \[ f \] as evidence for \[ p = Df \]. \( e \) is evidence for proposition p, but \( e \) and \( f \) are not evidence for \( p \).

Objections

Problems with Subjunctive Conditionals

Justificational Evidential Defeat
**Factual Evidential Defeat**

**Knowledge with a Factual Defeasibility Clause**

(3aFD) $S$ knows that $p = \text{Df.}$ (1) $S$ believes that $p$, (2) $p$ is true, (3) $p$ is epistemically justified for $S$, and (4) there is also no other proposition $q$ that factually defeats $p$.

**Knowledge with a Justificational Defeasibility Clause**

(3aJD) $S$ knows that $p = \text{Df.}$ (1) $S$ believes that $p$, (2) $p$ is true, (3) $p$ is epistemically justified for $S$, and (4) there is also no other proposition $q$ that justificationaly defeats $p$.

**Objections**

**Causal Approach**

(3ac) $S$ knows that $p = \text{Df.}$ (1) $S$ believes that $p$, (2) $p$ is true, and (3) $p$ is causally (and appropriately) connected with $S$’s belief that $p$.

**Objections**

*No general propositions*

*Problems with Causal Reconstruction*

*Goldman’s Barn Facsimiles*

---

For next time, read Lemos, pp. 31-41, re-read pp.17-21,

1. Be able to articulate the general idea of the Defeasibility and Causal Responses to Gettier’s
2. Be able to distinguish, in an understandable way, between *justificational evidential defeat* and *factual evidential defeat*.
3. Be able to articulate at least one objection to the Defeasibility and Causal Responses.