



OXFORD JOURNALS
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

ANALYSIS

Is Epistemic Preferability Transitive?

Author(s): Roy A. Sorensen

Source: *Analysis*, Vol. 41, No. 3 (Jun., 1981), pp. 122-123

Published by: Oxford University Press on behalf of The Analysis Committee

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3328066>

Accessed: 03/11/2009 17:48

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=oup>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Oxford University Press and The Analysis Committee are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Analysis*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

I do not mean to imply that I still think 'Truth and Use' the best or most illuminating way of responding to Dummett's ideas, but I cannot see that Tennant's criticisms even engage with the line I was taking.

University College London

© COLIN MCGINN 1981

IS EPISTEMIC PREFERABILITY TRANSITIVE?

By ROY A. SORENSEN

ALTHOUGH the 'heavier-than' relation is transitive, Edgington has shown that 'probably-heavier-than' is not ('On the Possibility of Rational "Inconsistent" Beliefs', *Mind*, October 1968).

Suppose each of three boxes contains three objects which have the following weights, in pounds:

Box A: 2, 6, 7

Box B: 1, 5, 9

Box C: 3, 4, 8

Now consider repeated comparisons of two randomly selected objects, one from Box A and one from Box B. Since each of the three A objects is equally likely to be paired with each of the B objects, there are nine equally likely A-B comparisons. In five of the nine comparisons, the A object is heavier than the B object

Edgington goes on to describe the B-C and A-C comparisons but I shall merely list the pairings:

A-B			B-C			A-C		
2, 1	6, 1	7, 1	1, 3	5, 3	9, 3	2, 3	6, 3	7, 3
2, 5	6, 5	7, 5	1, 4	5, 4	9, 4	2, 4	6, 4	7, 4
2, 9	6, 9	7, 9	1, 8	5, 8	9, 8	2, 8	6, 8	7, 8

In 5/9 of the possible outcomes the A object is heavier than the B object, so an object from A will probably be heavier than a B object. Similarly, an object from B will probably be heavier than a C object. Surprisingly, in 5/9 possible outcomes the C object is heavier than the A object, so an object from C will probably be heavier than an A object.

In 'A System of Epistemic Logic' (*Ratio*, December, 1972), Chisholm and Keim present "The Calculus of Epistemic Preferability". They take epistemic preferability to be a transitive relation but adopt as an axiom the 'broader principle according to which the relation of "not-being-epistemically-preferable-to" is transitive.'

$$(A_2) [\sim(pPq) \ \& \ \sim(qPr)] \supset \sim(pPr)$$

One reads (A₂) as: If it is not the case that p is epistemically preferable to q, and it is not the case that q is epistemically preferable to r, then it is not the case that p is epistemically preferable to r.

A counterexample to (A₂) can be constructed if one takes Edgington's observation as a guide. Let A, B, and C be disjoint groups of equally talented researchers. Each of the groups has three subgroups whose sizes correspond to the weights in Edgington's three boxes. One subgroup from each of A', B', and C' is randomly selected to work on three independent problems. The problems are equally difficult and are such that the likelihood of a correct solution is directly related to the number of researchers working on it. The three subgroups then submit their different conclusions, a, b, and c, respectively. By consulting the list of possible outcomes of this random selection, one can infer that a is more likely to be correct than b, and b is more likely to be correct than c, but surprisingly, c is more likely to be correct than a. Therefore, a is epistemically preferable to b, and b is epistemically preferable to c, but a is *not* epistemically preferable to c. So one has a counterexample to (A₂).