

## **Reform vs revolution: prospects for a knowledge first epistemology of testimony**

Rachel Fraser

Most epistemologists of testimony - reductionists and anti-reductionists - agree that only on a 'radically counterintuitive picture' might hearers obtain testimonially based knowledge that P when they have very good evidence (or very good apparent evidence) that a testifier is unreliable (Lackey, 2008). Standard epistemological ideologies typically use the notion of defeat to theorise such cases: hearers are required to have no defeater for the claim that a speaker is reliable. This paper shows that a Williamsonian epistemology of testimony cannot use the ideology of evidential probability to replicate the mechanics in play in putative defeat cases. I finish by saying something about whether we ought to regard these revisionist commitments as a mark against knowledge-first epistemology.