

## **Stop making sense? A puzzle about evidence and epistemic rationality**

Clayton Littlejohn

In this paper, I discuss a puzzle about epistemic rationality. It seems plausible that it's rational to believe a proposition if you have sufficient evidential support for it. It seems plausible that our first-order and higher-order attitudes ought to match. It seems rather unfortunate that these two claims are in tension with one another. I'll look at three ways of trying to resolve this tension and argue that the best way to do this is to accept the controversial fixed-point thesis (i.e., the thesis that says that mistaken beliefs about what rationality requires of you are mistakes of rationality). I'll offer a novel explanation as to why the fixed-point thesis is correct and offer an argument against evidentialist approaches to epistemic rationality.