

#	Question	Asker Name	Asker Email
1	Sweet kitty! (not a question)	Teresa Burke	teresa.burke@gallaudet.edu
2	Can it be rational to bullshit, and if so, do we need to accommodate that?	Kolja Keller	kolja.keller@rochester.edu
3	I wonder whether someone who wanted to defend a Burger-like view might do so by appeal to the sort of norms that come out of Millikan's function-first proposal?	Sandy Goldberg	s-goldberg@northwestern.edu
4	Do you think that the "all things considered" rationality can ever provide us with useful defaults?	maxim smyrnyi	emaxim@gmail.com
5	Interesting! But there is an important generality problem/question here that needs addressing — when applying the safety principle — wrt method, domain, etc. otherwise, yeah, we have little testimonial knowledge. (Agree that children's testimony present interesting problems, though.)	Anna-Sara Malmgren	malmgren@stanford.edu
6	Why think that the method is "believing whatever my father says"? After all, in the epistemology of memory literature we typically take into account the epistemic standing of the content that one "recollects"; why not do the same with testimony (as the interpersonal analogue of memory)?	Sandy Goldberg	s-goldberg@northwestern.edu
7	You said in an aside "safe-for-Emmet." Does that mean you're thinking of relativized safety?	Axel Mueller	muell@northwestern.edu
8	Is there going to be a problem with testimonial chains? Is knowledge going to wane as the chain continues?	Catherine Elgin	catherine_elgin@harvard.edu
9	I may have missed this: how is "content" being understood and individuated in order to make the judgments in any particular case that content isn't preserved?	Jonathan Reibsam	jonathan.reibsam@ciu.edu
10	I might have missed this, but would demonstrative modes of presentation (e.g., the sense of "that F") count as one of the preservation failures you're interested in? If I recall, classical and neo-fregeans are sort of stuck with a sort subjectivity in these mops.	Blake Batoon	arnelblake_batoon@ucsb.edu
11	Question of clarification? (Might have missed something.) Is the recovered content supposed to be merely similar to what's intended? (In canonical cases.) That might be problematic, but I didn't get the argument for that, if that was the claim. And it's not clear it's problematic that the communicated content is merely similar to what's literally asserted. Perhaps I misunderstood.	Anna-Sara Malmgren	malmgren@stanford.edu
12	Do you think there is a difference between online testimony, e.g., a Facebook post, and offline testimony, given the research on online context collapse?	Boaz Miller	boaz.miller@gmail.com
13	Great talk, thanks Joey. How do you see underlying philosophy of mind as informing (perhaps in a very implicit or subterranean way) these epistemological/pragmatics debates? Even language like "recovery" presupposes an underlying definiteness and uniqueness of what the speaker thought.	Tim Kenyon	tim.a.kenyon@gmail.com
14	Will a robot have quasi-testimony?	Francis Remedios	francisxr28@gmail.com
15	Would looking at the literature by reductionists about testimony or group testimony give some models that could fit well for algorithms?	Kolja Keller	kolja.keller@rochester.edu
16	In the case of books an agent creates a mechanism for "creating knowledge" in the recipients who interpret the output of the mechanism in some context. "Contextual interpretation" seems to create enough of localized "autonomy". One can develop feelings for books. What is so special about the case you are describing?	maxim smyrnyi	emaxim@gmail.com
17	If more than one person testifies that P (identical testimony) then that's generally stronger evidence for P. Have you thought about whether the same holds for machine/AI testimony?	Finnur Dellsen	fud@hi.is
18	Ori: would your concept of quasi-testimony also apply to involuntary testimonially relevant human utterances (say, a spectator of a soccer match screaming "goal" without thinking when taking in a score)?	Axel Mueller	muell@northwestern.edu
19	Ori: is there as strong a case for anti-reductionism about quasi-testimony as here is about testimony? (I don't assume anti-reductionism here; only want to know whether you think the case of quasi-testimony is parallel.)	Sandy Goldberg	s-goldberg@northwestern.edu