

Dancy's difficulty and why strong factualism cannot resolve it

Claire Field

Dancy attempts to fulfil two separate desiderata of a theory of normative reasons: providing considerations that make an agent's belief correct, and giving an account of an agent's believing that allows her epistemic conduct to be rationally intelligible, in spite of its also being mistaken. I will show how the attempt to meet both of these desiderata generates a difficulty when combined with the following claim: it is only facts that can make a belief the correct one for an agent to hold. I show how a view I call Strong Factualism resolves the difficulty, and argue that it does so only at great intuitive cost. I go on to suggest how alternative views may be able to resolve the difficulty without incurring the intuitive cost.