

# Ramsey + Moore = God

David J. Chalmers and Alan Hájek  
Philosophy Program, Research School of Social Sciences, ANU

Frank Ramsey (1931) wrote:

If two people are arguing 'if  $p$  will  $q$ ?' and both are in doubt as to  $p$ , they are adding  $p$  hypothetically to their stock of knowledge and arguing on that basis about  $q$ . We can say that they are fixing their degrees of belief in  $q$  given  $p$ .

Let us take the first sentence the way it is often taken, as proposing the following test for the acceptability of an indicative conditional:

'If  $p$  then  $q$ ' is acceptable to a subject  $S$  iff, were  $S$  to accept  $p$  and consider  $q$ ,  $S$  would accept  $q$ .

Now consider an indicative conditional of the form

(1) If  $p$ , then I believe  $p$ .

Suppose that you accept  $p$  and consider 'I believe  $p$ '. To accept  $p$  while rejecting 'I believe  $p$ ' is tantamount to accepting the Moore-paradoxical sentence ' $p$  and I do not believe  $p$ ', and so is irrational. To accept  $p$  while suspending judgment about 'I believe  $p$ ' is irrational for similar reasons. So rationality requires that if you accept  $p$  and consider 'I believe  $p$ ', you accept 'I believe  $p$ '.

Consider also an indicative conditional of the form

(2) If I believe  $p$ , then  $p$ .

Suppose that you accept 'I believe  $p$ ' and consider  $p$ . To accept 'I believe  $p$ ' while rejecting  $p$  is tantamount to accepting the Moore-paradoxical sentence 'Not- $p$  and I believe  $p$ ', and so is irrational. To accept 'I believe  $p$ ' while suspending judgment about  $p$  is irrational for similar reasons. So rationality requires that if you accept 'I believe  $p$ ' and consider  $p$ , you accept  $p$ .

According to the Ramsey test, it follows that all instances of (1) and (2) are acceptable to a rational subject. But if one accepts all instances of (1), one should accept that one is omniscient. And if one accepts all instances of (2), one should accept that one is infallible. So the Ramsey test and Moorean reasoning entail that rational subjects should accept that they have the epistemic powers of a god.<sup>1</sup>

## Bibliography

- Ramsey, F. P. 1931. General propositions and causality. In R. B. Braithwaite, ed., *The Foundations of Mathematics and Other Logical Essays*.  
van Fraassen, B. 1980. Review of *Rational Belief Systems*. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 10: 497-511.  
Williams, J. (MS). The failure of the epistemic Ramsey test.

---

<sup>1</sup> The problem for the Ramsey test raised by (1) is closely related to the problem arising from "Thomason conditionals" such as 'If my business partner is cheating on me, I will never know it' (van Fraassen 1980). The problem is avoided by the different version of the test suggested by the second sentence of the quotation from Ramsey: an indicative conditional 'if  $p$  then  $q$ ' is acceptable to  $S$  iff  $S$ 's conditional probability  $pr(q|p)$  is high. We thank John Williams, who discusses related problems in his (MS), for helpful discussion and comments.