

# Knowledge and Reality

## Contextualism

Can a contextualist account of the term “know” provide an answer to scepticism?

## Essential Reading

- DeRose, Keith (1995), “Solving the Skeptical Problem”, *The Philosophical Review*, vol. 104, no. 1, pp. 1-52
- Cohen, Stewart (1999), “Contextualism, Skepticism, and the Structure of Reasons”, *Noûs*, vol. 33, pp. 57-89
- Bach, Kent (2005), “The Emperor’s New ‘Knows’”, in *Contextualism in Philosophy: Knowledge, Meaning, and Truth*, edited by Gerhard Preyer & Georg Peter, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Wright, Crispin (2005), “Contextualism and Scepticism: Even-Handedness, Factivity and Surreptitiously Raising Standards”, *The Philosophical Quarterly*, vol. 55, no. 219, pp. 236-62

## Additional Reading

- Hawthorne, John (2004), *Knowledge and Lotteries*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Stanley, Jason (2004), “On the Linguistic Basis for Contextualism”, *Philosophical Studies*, vol. 119, no. 1/2, pp. 119-46
- Brueckner, Anthony (2005), “Contextualism, Hawthorne’s Invariantism and Third-Person Cases”, *The Philosophical Quarterly*, vol. 55, no. 219, pp. 315-8
- Williamson, Timothy (2005), “Contextualism, Subject-Sensitive Invariantism and Knowledge of Knowledge”, *The Philosophical Quarterly*, vol. 55, no. 219, pp. 213-35

## Past Paper Questions

- Does contextualism offer an adequate solution to scepticism? (2004, 3b)
- Can a contextualist account of the term “know” provide an answer to scepticism? (2009, 7a)
- “Contextualism about the verb ‘know’ is the best response to scepticism.” Discuss. (2010, 2a)
- “When S knows that p, that is a non-linguistic fact about S’s mental state. That fact will obtain regardless of the linguistic context, and, hence, S will know that p in every such context. So epistemic contextualism is false.” Discuss. (2012, 7)
- Are there any reasons to think that “know” is context-sensitive, other than its potentially affording a response to scepticism? (2014, 2a)