What does it mean for something, like the fact that rain is forecast, to be a normative reason for an action like taking your umbrella, or attitude like believing it will rain? According to a popular view, concepts of “reasons” are all concepts of some kind of explanation. But explanations of what? On one way of developing this idea, the concept of a normative reason for an agent S to perform an action A is that of an explanation why it would be good (in some way, to some degree) for S to do A. This Reasons as Explanations of Goodness hypothesis (REG) has numerous virtues and champions. But like every theory of normative reasons it faces some significant challenges, which prompt many more philosophers to be skeptical that it can account for all normative reasons. This paper demonstrates how five different puzzles about normative reasons can be solved by paying attention to the concept of goodness, and observing how it—and consequently, talk about reasons—is sensitive to context. Rather than asking simply whether certain facts are reasons for S to do A, we need to explore how context affects whether it is correct to describe a fact as “a reason” for S to do A.

These five puzzles concern (1) reasons for attitudes of the “right kind”, which depend on the fittingness of an attitude to its object, but apparently not on the value of having that attitude; (2) normative facts as reasons; for example, the fact that the action would be good, which apparently could not itself be an explanation why it would be good; (3) evidence as reasons: reasons that are evidence an action would be good, but apparently are not explanations why it would be good; (4) subjective reasons, which seem from the agent’s point of view to be explanations why action would be good, but cannot genuinely be because the action actually isn’t good; and (5) attitudes as reasons: sometimes we identify an agent’s reason to act as that they believed that p, when this psychological fact apparently couldn’t be an explanation why the action would be good.

Intuitions about these kinds of reasons are contested, but this is a further datum I will attempt to explain—as an artifact of context-sensitivity—rather than ignore, explain away, or hide behind. While all five puzzles appear problematic for REG, each also presents a more general challenge to many other theories of reasons. In demonstrating how REG provides resources to solve them all, this paper is therefore not only a defense of REG against objections, but also one piece of a positive abductive case for REG over its competitors. I first (section 1) survey some virtues of REG, to justify readers’ investment

---

1 Early proponents include Toulmin 1950, Davidson 1963, Williams 1979. I take it to be roughly equivalent to accounts of reasons as answers to ‘why’ questions (Hieronymi 2005), and grounds/truth-makers (e.g. Schroeter & Schroeter 2009); cf. Broome 2008, Kearns & Star 2008.
in the paper. Next (section 2) I tackle the first puzzle, concerning reasons of the “right kind” for attitudes, showing how reflection on our thought and talk about goodness leads toward a theory of goodness as end-relative (ERT), and how this combination of theories, REG+ERT, yields a straightforward solution. In section 3, I explain how ERT implies that talk about goodness is also information-relative. The remaining sections (4-7) show how this information-relativity provides solutions to the four other puzzles in turn.

1. General Virtues of REG

What makes REG a promising theory, and justifies the effort to see whether its apparent problems can be resolved? Philosophers have been drawn to it for a considerable number of virtues, which I will briefly sketch from most general to most specific.

First, REG is an informative thesis which promises to explain what it is to be a reason, in contrast to the widespread view that this property or relation is an unexplainable primitive. While it might be suspected of merely substituting one mysterious primitive (being-a-reason-for) with a different one (goodness or value), I’ll propose a reductive analysis of goodness itself, yielding a fully reductive analysis of what it is to be a reason.

Second, REG is supported by linguistic evidence, together with other reasons-as-explanations theories. The same noun ‘reason’ clearly refers to explanations in its nonnormative uses, as in talk about “reasons” for the unusually wet winter, or “reasons” why people are prone to bias. Words can be ambiguous, but in addition to enjoying the advantage of simplicity over non-explanation theories, REG is supported by the robustness of this pattern of dual use across a range of languages —including Germanic languages (German: ‘grund’) and Romance languages (Spanish: ‘razón’).

Third, REG (with other reasons-as-explanation theories) offers a natural explanation of the holism of reasons: i.e. that a fact that is a reason for doing A in one situation might not be a reason for doing A in a different situation. This is because explanations are holistic in the same way. The fact that it is raining may be an explanation why it would be good to take your umbrella against default background information, but not against the information that gale-force winds are blowing. Similarly, it qualifies as a reason to take your umbrella against the former but not the latter information. Relatedly, it is debated whether a “reason” should be distinguished from mere “background conditions”, or whether

---

4 Like English, these languages have a distinct word for explanation allowing a contrast with reason: ‘erklärung’ and ‘explicación’. (Thanks to Julia Staffel and Jaime Castillo Gamboa). This is potentially problematic, as it presumably marks an actual if subtle difference in meaning. To speculate, note that ‘explanation’ is ambiguous between (explanation1) an act type/token of explaining, and (explanation2) the explainans or content of a successful act of explaining. I suggest ‘reason’, like ‘grund’ and ‘razón’, has the meaning of explanation2, but not of explanation1, making ‘explanation’ a dispreferred translation. Many languages have a dedicated term for normative reasons (e.g. Chinese: ‘liyou’; compare ‘justification’), while some other languages don’t have a noun corresponding to (normative) ‘reason’, their closest equivalent being talk about why it would be good/ one ought to do A (Wedgwood 2015). John Broome reports (ms) that in the earliest recorded use of ‘reason’ in English from around 1225, the writer slides from ‘the reason why one ought to A’ to ‘the reason for A-ing’.
strictly speaking a “reason” includes all such conditions. This is parallel to a debate over whether an “explanation”, strictly speaking, contrasts with or incorporates such conditions. Reasons-as-explanations theories account for these shared features of reasons and explanations.

Fourth, REG is **extensionally promising**, our five puzzles aside. Paradigmatic examples of normative reasons for action are prime candidates for explanations of why acting would be good, in some way and to some degree. For example, the fact that it is raining is both a reason to take an umbrella, and an explanation why taking an umbrella would be good—because it will prevent you from getting wet. (For economy, I will usually omit the qualifier ‘in some way and to some degree’ below, although it is important since we can have reasons for actions that are not good, simpliciter.)

Fifth, REG naturally explains why normative reasons (although not other kinds of reasons) have **weights**. Normative reasons ordinarily have a **pro tanto** character: there can be reasons both for and against an action, of different weights or strengths. Here REG has an advantage over theories of reasons in terms of *oughts*, for example.\(^7\) It doesn’t follow from your having a (or “some”) reason to do A that you ought to do A, but only from the overall weight of all your reasons taken together (“most reason”) favoring doing A.\(^8\) Goodness exhibits the same pro tanto character, as it comes in degrees. It doesn’t follow from A’s being good to some degree that one ought to do A, but it does arguably follow from A’s being best. REG easily explains reasons’ weight as a function of the degree of goodness they explain.\(^9\)

Sixth, REG offers a natural explanation of the **nonadditivity** of the weights of (some) reasons.\(^10\) As is often observed, in figuring out what we ought to do we cannot always add up the weights of all the reasons we have, because some pairs of reasons are normatively “overlapping”. For these pairs, adding their weights would involve an unacceptable form of “double counting”. For example, that rain was *forecast* is a reason to take your umbrella, and it is a different fact—and therefore, presumably, a different reason—from the fact that it *is raining*. Each fact might be a sufficient reason, by itself, to take your umbrella, but their weights cannot be added. Suppose you observe that it is raining, then realize you have a marginally stronger reason not to take your umbrella (e.g. it will take a few minutes to find, making you late to work). It would be absurd then to resolve your deliberations in favor of taking your umbrella on the basis that additionally, rain was forecast. The fact that rain was forecast has no weight

---


\(^7\) For ‘ought’ analyses, see Toulmin 1950, ch. 11, Broome 2004: 34, Finlay 2001: 104. For discussion of this advantage of ‘good’ analyses, see Phillips 1987, Finlay 2006, 2014: 90f, Sinnott-Armstrong 2009, Brunero 2013, Maguire 2016. Broome offers a disjunctive ‘ought’ analysis in response; for objections see Schroeder 2007, Brunero 2013, Kearns & Star 2008, Raz 2011: 21f. However, REG faces a similar problem in reasons for actions that aren’t good to any positive degree. Ralph Wedgwood (conversation) responds that ‘good’ has a variable degree parameter; I’m unconvinced (see Finlay 2014: 41-2), preferring to understand these as explanations of goodness *ceteris paribus*, relative to a restricted information-base (see section 3)—a move admittedly also available to an ‘ought’ analysis. I accept that some reasons are verdictive rather than pro-tanto (Gert 2016), understanding these as a special case of explanations of goodness, i.e. of *best*ness, equivalent to *oughts* (Finlay 2014: 90-1).

\(^8\) I won’t explore the mass noun constructions, “some/more/most reason” here; see Evers 2010, Finlay 2014: 91f, Wedgwood 2015, Fogal 2016.

\(^9\) Evers 2010, Finlay 2014: 92, Wedgwood ms. Compare Maguire’s (2016) suggestion that reasons’ weight is a function of goodness *and* probability; cf. Raz 2011: 115. The end-relational analysis sketched below incorporates probabilities into degrees of goodness. Analyzing weight in terms of degree of *explanation* isn’t promising, since it wrongly predicts that nonnormative reasons would also have weights.

in this scenario over and above the weight of the fact that it is raining. REG explains this, because (i) it accounts for the weights of reasons by the degree and kind of goodness they explain, and (ii) we can have noncompeting correct explanations of the same thing. The fact that it is raining and the fact that rain was forecast are both explanations of the same kind of value that taking your umbrella has, involving your staying dry. Since REG explains normative weight in terms of degrees of value, it explains why two reasons involving the same value will have weights that are not additive.

Finally, REG reconciles central platitudes about rational agency which otherwise seem in tension. On one hand, it is a platitude that a rational agent tries to choose the best available option. On the other hand, it is a platitude that a rational agent chooses the option most supported by her reasons. It is therefore natural to interdefine goodness and reasons, although this consideration is neutral between analyzing reasons in terms of goodness (REG), or goodness in terms of reasons (“buck-passing”).

Observing these seven virtues should be enough to earn REG a hearing, so I turn now to the first of our five puzzles.

2. Reasons for Attitudes of the “Right Kind”: The Puzzle

A well-known obstacle to value-based theories of reasons such as REG comes from the need to account for normative reasons for attitudes, including both doxastic attitudes like belief (“epistemic reasons”) and emotional attitudes like fear, hope, shame, pride, guilt, and anger. Here a distinction is commonly drawn between reasons of the “right kind” and of the “wrong kind”. Reasons of the wrong kind (“state-given”, “pragmatic” reasons) are those involving beneficial consequences of having the attitude; for example, the fact that somebody will reward or refrain from punishing you if you believe, fear, hope, etc. Reasons of the right kind, by contrast, involve the intrinsic fittingness of the attitude to its object (“object-given”), rather than beneficial consequences of having the attitude. The most discussed example is epistemic reasons for belief that $p$, which according to evidentialism consist exclusively in evidence that $p$ is true, independent of positive consequences of believing that $p$. However, the right kind of reasons for emotional attitudes like fear, hope, and shame pattern the same way, depending on the attitude’s fit to its object rather than its beneficial consequences.

On face value, REG provides only an account of “wrong kind” reasons (in terms of the attitude’s value), and doesn’t extend to “right kind” reasons. So if there are any “right kind” reasons—as virtually
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11 The reverse is not true, because the probability of getting wet without an umbrella conditional on its raining is higher than its probability conditional on rain merely being forecast.

12 Rabinowicz & Rønnow-Rasmussen 2004. These labels derive from the attempt to analyze value of various kinds in terms of reasons, the issue being whether a reason is of the right kind to ground the relevant evaluative property. For example, the fact that someone will pay you to believe, fear, or be ashamed that $p$ isn’t the right kind of thing to make it that $p$ is credible, fearsome, or shameful.


everybody agrees—then REG appears at best seriously incomplete.\textsuperscript{15} Some philosophers claim more strongly that “reasons of the wrong kind” are not genuinely reasons at all.\textsuperscript{16} On one line of objection, reasons by definition are things that agents can rationally form attitudes in response to, and we can’t rationally believe, fear, hope, etc. on the basis of considerations of the value of having those attitudes. It is further suggested that “reasons for action” are strictly speaking reasons for intention, a special case of “right kind” reasons for attitudes.\textsuperscript{17} At worst, therefore, there are no normative reasons corresponding to REG at all. This problem motivates rival theories of normative reasons in terms of fittingness,\textsuperscript{18} and is a challenge for REG along with many other theories.

2.1 Goodness as End-Relational

What REG predicts about what reasons there are depends on how we understand the relevant concept of goodness. I will show that when this is understood in a certain way, sketched in this section, the “right kind” of reasons puzzle—along with our other four puzzles—is amenable to a straightforward and systematic solution.

However, while the concept of goodness does the heavy lifting in this paper, we will also need a better than pretheoretic grasp of the similarly contested concept of explanation. I assume a fairly orthodox model theory, as follows. First to disambiguate, the relevant sense of ‘explanation’ here is that of an explanans, or what plays a “because” role in a true statement of the form ‘p because q’, and not that of an act (type or token) of explaining. Start with the following rough definition of the technical notion of a “complete explanation”, in the tradition of the Deductive Nomological (DN) theory:\textsuperscript{19} p is a complete explanation of q in case p is a set of true propositions that logically entails q but doesn’t include q. Logical entailment may seem too strong here, but p should be understood as including any relevant conceptual truths or essential definitions (occupying the role played by scientific laws in Hempel’s theory of scientific explanation).\textsuperscript{20}

However, our concern will be with ordinary statements about “reasons”, which generally address “partial” rather than complete explanations. This ordinary use is context-sensitive, so that “explanations” and “reasons” are identified relative to a background set of assumptions or information, B.\textsuperscript{21} For example, the fact that I took my umbrella qualifies as an explanation or reason why I stayed dry in the rain, against a set of background assumptions including that if I am in the rain with an umbrella then I use it, and that using an umbrella in the rain keeps one dry. Here is the model semantics I’ll adopt:

\textsuperscript{15} E.g. Gardner 2008, Raz 2011: 42, Way 2013, Brunero 2013; cf. Maguire 2016 who (as a proponent of value-based reasons) draws the radical conclusion that “right kind” reasons aren’t genuinely reasons.
\textsuperscript{17} E.g. Scanlon 1998: 21.
\textsuperscript{19} Hempel 1965.
\textsuperscript{20} DN theories face well-known problems (see Woodward 2014). However, the main problems will be moot for our purposes. (1) The problem of statistical explanations doesn’t arise because the proposed normative explanations (explanantia) won’t be statistical. (They will emerge to be explanations of probabilities, i.e. of statistical explananda, conforming with standard DN solutions). (2) Although this DN theory is admittedly too broad, the problems of irrelevancies and asymmetries don’t arise because the explanantia I’ll propose will be clearly both relevant and metaphysically prior to their explananda.
A fact or true proposition that \( p \) is an explanation (reason) why \( q \), relative to \( B \), in case (i) \( p \) and \( B \) together entail \( q \), and (ii) neither \( p \) nor \( B \) by itself entails \( q \).\[22\]

By default, the content of \( B \) is determined by a function from context. At a rough approximation, it can be identified as the conversational common ground or what the audience can take for granted, except that to identify \( p \) as an explanation of \( q \) functions in discourse (by accommodation) to exclude both \( p \) and \( q \) from \( B \), even if they were already in the common ground. So if a sufficient ground for \( q \) is already known, we can pick out any element of that ground and correctly identify it as an explanation why \( q \). Importantly for our purposes, however, this information-parameter can also be explicitly shifted, as by qualifying an explanation as being “for \( S \)” (or subject-relative). To say that \( p \) is an “explanation/ reason for \( S \)” why \( q \) is (in general)\[23\] to indicate that \( p \) is an explanation relative to \( S \)’s (other) information why \( q \). For example, the fact that I took my umbrella is not an explanation why I stayed dry in the rain for somebody who doesn’t know what umbrellas are.\[24\]

Now consider the concept of goodness. While discussion of our five puzzles, and resistance to REG more generally, has overwhelmingly proceeded as if goodness were a single gradable property that things either have or don’t, this assumption is rejected by work on the semantics of the adjective ‘good’, which suggests it also is a context-sensitive term.\[25\] There is no property of goodness-simpliciter because, as Judy Thomson puts it, to be “good” is always to be good in some way.

In response to a claim that something is “good”, for example, we can ask “good for whom?”, “good for what?”, “good to do what with?” ‘Good’ is an adjective that we often qualify in a wide range of ways and with different kinds of prepositional phrases: good for me/ you/ diabetics/ people/ dogs/ trees/ cars, good to wear/ have/ see, etc. Even when we say that something is “good”, sans phrase, our intended meaning can at least often be precisified by identifying such qualifiers as assumed or implicit. For example, saying ‘Chocolate is good’ is naturally understood as claiming that chocolate is good to eat/taste, rather than (e.g.) to wear, and assertion of ‘Winning the lottery is good’ is naturally understood as saying it is good for the winner, rather than (e.g.) for humankind. While the correct semantics for ‘good’ can’t be settled here,\[26\] my strategy will be to introduce an analysis motivated by the desideratum of a unifying semantics and syntax underlying the diverse ways the word is used, and then show how this theory enables REG to solve all five puzzles. I’ll build this theory incrementally until we have all the resources we’ll need.

To develop this theory with a concrete example, take the simple sentence,

\[
(1) \text{Umbrellas are good.}
\]

\[22\] The second condition is motivated partly by the intuition that facts don’t explain themselves. It may be too strong, since it doesn’t recognize a complete explanation as an “explanation” relative to an empty background. It stands in for some more nuanced condition requiring a genuine explanation to be informative somehow (e.g. \( p \) being metaphysically more fundamental than \( q \)).

\[23\] This isn’t always the right interpretation for normative “reasons for \( S \)”, which often require a normative and not purely epistemic relation to \( S \); see Finlay 2014: 94f.

\[24\] However, identifying \( p \) as an explanation can add elements to \( B \) that weren’t in the common ground (by accommodation), as transparently needed for \( p \) and \( B \) to be together sufficient for \( q \).


\[26\] I attempt this in Finlay 2014, ch. 2.
As uttered in a particular context, this needs to be understood as elliptical for another, more complex sentence, of a form identified through the following progression:

(1a) Umbrellas are good to use.
(1b) Umbrellas are good for people to use.
(1c) Umbrellas are good for staying dry in the rain, for people to use.
(1d) Umbrellas are good for people’s staying dry in the rain, for them to use.
(1e) It is good for people’s staying dry in the rain, for them to use umbrellas.  

In different contexts, (1) could be used as elliptical for indefinitely many other sentences of the syntactic form of (1e),

It is good for S₁’s doing A₁, for S₂ to do A₂.

Consider for example its utterance in response to the question, “What can a painter depict to convey an impression of rain?” Here (1) is naturally interpreted as elliptical for

(1d’) Umbrellas are good for painters’ conveying an impression of rain, for them to depict.
(1e’) It is good for painters’ conveying an impression of rain, for them to depict umbrellas.

According to this analysis, ‘good’ fundamentally expresses a relation between two propositional arguments, which I’ll call the object proposition, p (e.g. people use umbrellas), and the end proposition, e (e.g. they stay dry in the rain).

We can now turn from the syntactic question of logical form to the semantic question of meaning: what does it mean to say that p is good for e? A natural answer is: that p’s obtaining raises the probability of (or “promotes”) e’s obtaining. For example, that people use umbrellas raises the probability that they stay dry in the rain, and that painters depict umbrellas raises the probability that they convey an impression of rain. According to this end-relational theory (ERT), goodness involves a relation to an end or outcome. This sketch leaves many important questions and objections unaddressed, of course.

Some of these involve how to understand the relevant concept of probability; we will return to this.

Combining REG with ERT yields the following analysis:

**REG+ERT (first pass):** To say that R is a “reason” for S to do A is to say, of some end e, that R is an explanation why it would be good/probability-raising for e, if S does A.

---

27 The transition to (1e), effecting an analysis of the goodness of objects into the goodness of states of affairs, interprets the grammatical structure of sentences (1)-(1d) in terms of subject-movement, whereby we satisfy the English grammatical requirement of a subject-term for sentences whose verbs are propositional operators by moving a noun-phrase from the embedded, complement sentence (‘People use umbrellas’) to subject-position. The telltale trace of this movement is the verb left without an object in (1a)-(1d): ‘…to use ___’. For discussion of subject-movement and ‘good’, see Shanklin 2011, Finlay 2014: 29f.

28 The equivalence of “promotion” and probability-raising is challenged for omitting an essential causal relation (see Behrends & DiPaolo 2011 and follow-up literature; cf. Nagel 1970: 51); this is related to the choice between evidential and causal decision theory. I assume it (and, implicitly, evidential decision theory) as a rough gloss, with probability-raising (as analyzed in n. 45) as the preferred term; see Finlay 2014: 39f.

29 For more details and defense, see Finlay 2014, ch. 2. As an instrumental analysis one obvious objection is that it doesn’t account for final goodness. For a reply see Finlay 2014: ch. 7.
Not just any end or outcome licenses a claim that something is a normative reason for action or attitude, of course. Something is correctly said to be “good” (sans phrase) in a particular context only if it is good relative to an end that is in some way salient or privileged in that context, and so likewise a fact is correctly described as “a reason” (sans phrase) in a context only if it is an explanation of goodness relative to a salient or privileged end. This end-relativity of goodness is what will enable REG to solve the “right kind” reasons puzzle for attitudes, as I will now explain.

2.2 “Right Kind” of Reasons for Attitudes: A Solution

Plausibly, by default and in general an end is privileged in a context in virtue of being a desired or preferred outcome for some salient subjects, who are normally some combination of the speaker, audience, and the agent under discussion. We can thereby explain the intuitions of Humean internalists about reasons as the result of privileging the agent’s preferences for outcomes (e.g. Hitler may have had “no reasons” to refrain from genocide, assuming that none of his preferred ends were compromised by it), while explaining the intuitions of externalists, and the categorical nature of moral claims, as the result of privileging the speaker’s or audience’s preferences for outcomes (of course Hitler had reasons to refrain genocide, given the harm it inflicted on innocent people!)

This sharpens rather than resolves our first puzzle. Something is a reason of the “right kind” for an attitude iff it makes the attitude fitting, but raising the probability of an end desired by the speaker, audience, or agent is neither necessary nor sufficient for fittingness. However, when talking about reasons for attitudes there is a competing source of salience for ends, in the reference to the attitudes themselves. These are attitudes that are commonly said to have subagential, “constitutive” ends of their own, which need not be ends desired or intended by anybody. It is commonly said, for example, that the constitutive end of belief is truth (or knowledge). How to precisify this idea of “constitutive ends” is controversial, but for our purposes this doesn’t matter. All we need is that talking about “belief” is sufficient, in normal contexts, to make salient an end like truth.

Consider for example the simple view that our doxastic attitudes or faculties constitutively aim at thereby believing that p if p is true and not believing that p if p is false. On REG+ERT, calling R a “reason to believe that p” would then have a natural interpretation as follows:

Truth-Relative Reasons: R is an explanation (for S) why S’s believing that p would be good for/raise the probability of S’s thereby believing that p iff p is true.

Barry Maguire is therefore incorrect to distinguish our versions of REG on the grounds that “Finlay’s view places no constraints on ends” (2016: n3). I agree with him that a “reason” to do A (simpliciter) is an explanation why doing A would promote an outcome that is “good” (simpliciter). However, some opponents of REG (e.g. Raz 2011, ch. 11) may observe that REG+ERT, with its relativistic analysis of value, was never their intended target.

See also Finlay 2014: chs. 5-8.
On one view it is constitutive of beliefs that they can only be formed in response to considerations that seem to bear on their truth (=evidence). See especially Williams 1973, Shah & Velleman 2005, Hieronymi 2006.
Including ‘thereby’ avoids a special case of “wrong kind of reasons” problem, where believing (incorrectly) that p at t₁ raises the probability of believing (correctly) that not-p at t₂. This is not ad hoc, as the constitutive end of a belief token (as of all these attitudes) is local to that token itself.
In general, an explanation for a subject of why believing \( p \) raises the probability that (one believes \( p \) iff \( p \)) will be something that itself raises the probability that \( p \) over \( \text{not-}p \).\(^{36}\) In other words, it will be evidence for \( p \), on an orthodox definition of evidence. So this interpretation identifies “reasons for belief” generally with evidence, just as evidentialist opponents of REG insist (although not all evidence; see note 38.)

Does REG+ERT yield the correct analysis of “right kind” reasons for belief? I don’t think it is possible to answer this question here, as there are at least two confounding factors. First, while Truth-Relative Reasons certainly faces objections and potential counterexamples, there is a lack of philosophical consensus on exactly when something is an epistemic reason. Second, REG+ERT is not committed to this precise analysis as it rather provides a template that can be applied to rival (evidentialist and nonevidentialist) conceptions of the constitutive end(s) of belief; for example, the end of believing \( p \) iff the probability of \( p \) is greater than (some value) \( n \).\(^{37}\) So to ultimately judge its success one might need first to resolve the controversy over the constitutive or proper end of belief. But what we have found is that when combined with ERT, REG does support a reading of “reasons for belief” that depends on a subject’s evidence and not at all on her desires or interests, and therefore that it has the resources in principle to accommodate “right kind” reasons for belief.\(^{38}\)

The same template can be applied systematically to generate accounts of right-kind reasons for other attitudes. It is commonly said, for example, that desire aims at the good. So REG+ERT predicts that talk about a “reason to desire” will have a natural interpretation as an explanation why desiring that \( p \) would be good for thereby desiring that \( p \) iff \( p \) is good. Other kinds of (“state-given”) benefits, like monetary rewards for desiring, will not provide reasons to desire in this sense.\(^{39}\) Similarly, intention plausibly aims,

\(^{36}\) Proof: \( \text{pr}(Bp \rightarrow p) \) is equivalent to \( \text{pr}((Bp \lor \neg p) \land (\neg Bp \lor p)) \). When \( \neg Bp \), the second conjunct’s probability is 1, and so the probability of the conjunction is just the probability that \( Bp \lor \neg p \), i.e. \( \text{pr}(\neg p) \). When \( Bp \), the first conjunct’s probability is 1, so the probability of the conjunction is just the probability that \( Bp \lor p \); i.e. \( \text{pr}(p) \). Therefore, \( Bp \) raises the probability that \( Bp \rightarrow p \) only if \( p \) is more likely than \( \neg p \). Since an “explanation” of \( x \) is something without which (ceteris paribus) \( x \) would not be true, any explanation why \( Bp \) raises the probability that \( Bp \rightarrow p \) will itself be something that makes it the case that \( \text{pr}(p) > \text{pr}(\neg p) \) — except when \( \text{pr}(p) \) is itself dependent on \( \text{pr}(Bp) \), as with self-fulfilling beliefs.

Is this exception a problem for REG+ERT? Consider (R) that it is within your power to make \( p \) true or false; e.g. suppose \( p \) concerns your own future actions, and that believing \( p \) raises the probability that you believe \( p \) iff \( p \) because it raises the probability that you act so that \( p \). \( R \) is plausibly not evidence for \( p \) prior to your forming the belief that \( p \); might it nonetheless be a reason to believe \( p \), as Truth-Relative Reasons appears to predict? The counterintuitiveness of this might be softened by observing that if so it is equally a reason to believe \( \neg p \), and hence to not believe \( p \). Any such reasons would cancel each other out, making it unhelpful to mention them. Alternatively, such cases could be excluded by replacing \( S \)’s believing \( p \) in the analysis with a generic subject’s believing \( p \) with \( S \)’s information, making \( p \) probabilistically independent of \( Bp \).

\(^{37}\) Thanks to Jaime Castillo Gamboa for discussion.

\(^{38}\) One problem arises from the template itself rather than its application to any particular end. REG+ERT may seem to deny the possibility of outweighed reasons for belief (see also note 7), because plausibly there is an explanation why believing \( p \) raises the end’s probability only if believing \( p \) does raise that probability. To illustrate for Truth-Relative Reasons, evidence raising the probability of \( p \) from 0.1 to 0.2 doesn’t meet this condition, because believing \( p \) when one’s evidence puts its probability under 0.5 makes it less likely that you believe \( p \) iff \( p \). Some epistemologists indeed deny that such evidence is a reason to believe (e.g. Roush 2005: 158), but some readers may find it too radical an implication. My preferred solution is to accommodate such reasons in terms of ceteris paribus goodness, or probability-raising relative to a restricted information-base excluding one’s other evidence. (The information-relativity of goodness is explored in section 3.) Work is needed to show this can be done nonarbitrarily, but partners in guilt are plentiful since standard probabilistic analyses of evidence need similar moves to account for redundant evidence, received when the probability of \( p \) is already 1.

\(^{39}\) It might be objected that this analysis requires a noninstrumentalist theory of goodness incompatible with ERT. However, instrumental desire is plausibly aimed at instrumental goodness as analyzed by ERT, and we can consistently deny both (i) that
approximately, at what is all-things-considered best to do, in which case talk about a “reason to intend” will have a natural interpretation as an explanation why it would be good, for thereby intending to do A iff A is all-things-considered best to do, to intend to do A. This analysis blocks “toxin puzzle” cases: the fact that intending to drink poison will yield a monetary reward is not an explanation why intending to drink poison would be good for thereby intending to drink poison iff drinking poison is all-things-considered best to do, and therefore is not a “right-kind” reason for this intention. Similarly, fear aims approximately at the dangerous, hope aims at that which is both possible and good, shame aims at what is to one’s discredit, and amusement aims at the funny. So we can understand a “reason to fear (hope, be ashamed, be amused) that p” as an explanation why it would be good, for thereby fearing (hoping, being ashamed, being amused) that p iff p is dangerous (both possible and good, to one’s discredit, funny) to fear (hope, be ashamed, be amused) that p.

REG+ERT systematically generates results in all these cases that preserve the features of “right kind” reasons with which it is alleged that REG is incompatible. An added bonus is that it also offers an explanatory analysis of fittingness, which some philosophers claim to be an unanalyzable primitive:40 for an attitude to “fit” its object is for that attitude to realize or promote its constitutive end when directed at that object. Reasons of the “right kind” for attitudes are facts that explain why an attitude fits its object in this way. Finally, REG+ERT also explains the conflict in intuitions about reasons for attitudes. If we privilege the salience of attitudes’ constitutive ends over other ends such as those desired by the subjects or speakers, then it is correct to deny that “wrong-kind” reasons are appropriately cited as reasons at all. We might do so, perhaps, on the ground that agents cannot (at least rationally) form attitudes in response to any but “right-kind” reasons, making it conversationally pointless or misleading to mention any other kind. But if we rather privilege (e.g.) subjects’ desired ends over those constitutive ends, then in those contexts we rightly recognize pragmatic reasons as such, and perhaps even deny that “right-kind” reasons are reasons at all.

3. From End-Relativity to Information-Relativity

While the hypothesis that goodness is end-relative directly provided a solution to our first puzzle, the solutions to our other four puzzles are less direct, and require exploring a further way in which ERT implies that the concept of goodness is context-sensitive. Above I analyzed goodness-for-an-end in terms of raising the probability of the end. This prompts further questions, because there are different senses of probability; for example, we can distinguish between objective and subjective probabilities.

While the analysis of the concept of probability is itself difficult and controversial, a powerful, flexible, and unifying approach is to interpret it also as context-sensitive, and involving a relation to an information-base which can vary from context to context. On this view, claims about probabilities are made and evaluated against an information-base assumed as a conversational background, as in

---

orthodox linguistic treatments of natural language modals.\textsuperscript{41} By default this background can be identified as the common ground in the conversation. This makes claims about probability (and goodness) relative to the same kind of information parameter as claims about explanation (as analyzed in section 2.1). For simplicity, I will assume by default that in statements about normative reasons, explanation and probability/ goodness are relativized to the same background information.\textsuperscript{42}

However, this further argument of ‘good’ can be made explicit or shifted with a ‘given...’ or ‘relative to...’ clause; e.g. ‘Relative to what we know, the probability of staying dry is higher if you take an umbrella’; ‘Given what the weather forecast says, it would be good to take an umbrella’. It will prove fruitful to interpret this argument intensionally—again following the orthodox treatment of modals, identifiable with a particular description or property (e.g. what we know) which, in a context, determines as its extension a set of propositions (informally, a partial sketch of the world), relative to which the relevant probabilities are determined. Formally, the information-base is a function $b$ from a world $w$ to a a set of propositions $B=b(w)$. The payoff for this complication is that talk about what is probable, good, or a reason relative to what $S_1$ believes can be distinguished from talk about what is probable, good, or a reason relative to what $S_2$ believes, even if $S_1$ and $S_2$ have exactly the same beliefs; this will prove important below.

This generates the final form of my analysis of normative reasons statements:

\textbf{REG+ERT:} To say in a world $w$ that $R$ is a “reason” for $S$ to do $A$ is to say, of some end $e$ and information base $b$, that $R$ is an explanation in $w$ why given $b$ it would be good/probability-raising for $e$, if $S$ does $A$.\textsuperscript{43}

We can then analyze objective probabilities as relative to an information-base defined in some objective way (e.g. the world’s state at time $t$), and subjective probabilities as relative to an information-base defined in terms of information available to some subject.\textsuperscript{44} The significance for our remaining puzzles is that this generates different information-relative senses of goodness. For example, we can distinguish between objective kinds of goodness, as raising the objective probability of an end, and subjective kinds of goodness, as raising the subjective probability of the end for some subject.\textsuperscript{45} We can further discriminate between statements about subjective goodness relative to the agent’s information, and statements about subjective goodness relative to the speaker’s or judge’s information. The rest of the paper demonstrates how this information-relativity of goodness provides solutions to the four remaining puzzles.

\textsuperscript{41} E.g. Kratzer 2012.

\textsuperscript{42} With one important exception: the information-base for the goodness must include the “reason” $R$ itself (as helping to determine the goodness), which is excluded from the explanation’s information-base.

\textsuperscript{43} Our analysis suggests that ‘a reason for $S$ to do $A$’ is ambiguous between ‘a reason [for $S_1$], for $S_2$ to do $A$', and ‘a reason for $S_1$, [for $S_2$] to do $A'$; see Finlay 2014: 94f. Here I avoid complications by assuming the identity of $S_1$ and $S_2$.

\textsuperscript{44} For discussion see Finlay 2014: 39f. Note that “subjective probabilities” here are not psychological credences, but measures of a possibility-space defined by a subject’s beliefs or evidence, which can diverge from her credences.

\textsuperscript{45} I shall assume that $p$ “raises” the probability of $e$, relative to $b$, iff the probability of $e$ given $b$ and $p$ is higher than the probability of $e$ given $b$ and “$p$ (Finlay 2006, 2014: 39f).
4. Normative Facts as Reasons: The Puzzle

A second puzzle for REG involves cases of normative facts that are themselves normative reasons. For example, the fact that doing A would be good is itself arguably a reason to do A. If so, this looks like a problem for REG, which would then imply that the fact that doing A would be good is itself an explanation why doing A would be good. But plausibly nothing can be literally self-explanatory; i.e. no proposition p is such that p is an explanation why p. So it appears there are some reasons to do A that aren’t explanations why it would be good to do A.

The following scenario provides such a case:

Posting Money. Ingrid’s trusted, reliable friend Hannah tells her that it would be good for her to put $500 in an envelope and post it to a particular, unfamiliar address N in another city. She doesn’t explain why this would be good.

Ingrid intuitively now has a reason to post money to N, whereas previously she was unaware of any reason to do so. At least, it would be reasonable for her to post money, and plausibly an action is reasonable only if the agent has a reason for it. (The relationship between “there being” a reason for an agent, and that agent “having” a reason, is debated; here I assume fairly uncontroversially that the possessive constructions generally indicate the agent’s awareness). Of course, one reason Ingrid now has is the fact that

(R3) Hannah told her that posting money to N would be good.

(We’ll explore a problem involving this kind of reason in section 5). But the normative status of R3 as a reason to post money surely depends on whether what Hannah tells her, that

(R2) Posting money to N would be good,

would itself be a reason to post money if true. Ingrid wouldn’t recognize R3 as a reason to post money if she were convinced that Hannah’s claim (R2) is false, for example, and being told that p is generally only a reason if p would itself be a reason, if true.

It is controversial whether normative facts like R2 are ever normative reasons to act. This is denied especially by “buck-passing” theorists who define the goodness of an action or attitude by the existence of reasons for it. If they are right then there is no genuine problem for REG here. But I believe they are mistaken. The intuitive case for denying the claim comes from the observation that offering normative facts as reasons is often unhelpful and inappropriate. Consider:

46 Versions of this problem have been raised by Daan Evers (2010: 412) and Mike Ridge (correspondence); my treatment in this paper expands on Finlay 2014: 94n.
47 E.g. Schroeder 2008; Williams 1979 takes them rather as (defeasibly) suggestive of an agent’s motivationally “internal” reasons, while Gibbons 2010 denies that the difference is significant. I distinguish five different readings in Finlay 2014: 103-114.
48 An exception: when being told that p functions as a sign of something else that is a reason to do A. But Posting Money isn’t like this.
Posting Money—Explained: Asked why it would be good for Ingrid to post money to N, Hannah explains that N is the address of Ingrid’s long-estranged brother Francis, with whom Ingrid would love to be reunited. Hannah further explains that Francis is contemplating relocating to the city where Ingrid happens to live, a move that depends on an otherwise unlikely influx of cash.

Ingrid now has a reason for posting money to N that can be described (in short) as the fact that

(R1) N is her brother’s address.

It would be strange, now, to tell Ingrid that she has an additional reason to post money to N, which is the fact R2 that doing so would be good.

As others have pointed out, however, this can plausibly be explained by the nonadditivity of the weights of some reasons. Since R2, the goodness of posting money to N, is itself explained by R1, the fact that N is Francis’s address, R2 has no normative weight over that of R1. This goes some way toward explaining why presenting R2 to Ingrid as an “additional reason” is inappropriate, although I’ll suggest below that REG+ERT can improve on it.

That the normative fact R2 can still have the normative weight of a reason is supported by the following consideration. Suppose that in the original Posting Money scenario (where Ingrid doesn’t know R1) she has complete trust in Hannah and therefore comes to believe confidently that posting money to N would be good, without knowing why. If asked, “What reason do you have to post money?” she could appropriately reply, “My reason is that it is good.” All else equal, an agent who believes that doing A would be good, without any further information, can rationally decide to do A on this basis, so it also seems such facts can play the characteristic psychological role of normative reasons in our deliberations. So it remains a problem for REG if R2 cannot be an explanation why acting would be good.

Similar considerations apply to normative facts concerning the existence of reasons. Suppose Hannah tells Ingrid simply that

(R4) There is a reason for Ingrid to post money to N,

and so Ingrid comes to believe this. It seems Ingrid now has a reason to post money, and that R4 is one of the reasons she now has. At least, she could rationally decide to post money on this basis. This also looks embarrassing for REG, which analyzes R4 as saying that there is an explanation why doing A would be good. The bare existential fact that there is an explanation why doing A would be good doesn’t itself seem like it could be an explanation why doing A would be good. These problems for REG and other

---

50 Schroeder 2009a, Heuer 2010b.
51 Citing R3 might be more natural. However, (i) this may pragmatically suggest a smidgeon of doubt about Hannah’s reliability, and (ii) we can suppose that Ingrid forgets R3/ how she learned of R2.
52 See Heuer 2010b: 149. Might R1 still be the relevant reason for explaining Ingrid’s rationality? Although she doesn’t know R1 she still knows that there is some fact that is a reason to post money. But this overlooks that Hannah has given Ingrid a reason to post money, which she now has (although as discussed below the fact that there is a reason to do A is itself plausibly a reason to do A).
explanation theories encourage rival theories of normative reasons, such as the view that they are the premises of sound practical reasoning.\textsuperscript{53}

4.1 Normative Facts as Reasons: A Solution

A solution to this puzzle emerges from REG+ERT’s feature of information-relativity. We saw in section 3 that the relativity of ‘good’ to an informational background generates different senses of goodness. While perhaps nothing can explain itself, I’ll now show that the goodness\textsubscript{1} of S doing A can be—and indeed, in precisely the right circumstances is—an explanation of the goodness\textsubscript{2} of S doing A, through a context-shift in the information-base \(b\).\textsuperscript{54}

Consider our original scenario, Posting Money. ERT tells us that the normative information that Hannah provides Ingrid, (R2) that it would be good for her to post money to \(N\), must be interpreted as involving at least two implicit arguments for ‘good’: an end \(e\) and an information-base \(b\). While there are significant issues surrounding the choice of \(e\), I will assume that \(e\) is picked out under the description an outcome Hannah has in mind that Ingrid would prefer if fully informed.\textsuperscript{55} The salient information-base is presumably Hannah’s information, as the context is transparently one where Hannah is advising Ingrid from her position of fuller information. So we should interpret R2 along the following lines:

R2-ER: The probability relative to Hannah’s information \((b_{h})\), of an outcome Hannah has in mind that Ingrid would prefer if fully informed \((e)\), is higher if Ingrid posts money to \(N\) \((p)\) than if not \((\sim p)\).

Formally,

\[
\text{R2-ER: } \Pr(e|b_{h} \land p) > \Pr(e|b_{h} \land \sim p).
\]

What we need to know is whether R2-ER is correctly identified as a reason for Ingrid to post money. According to REG+ERT, this is a question of whether R2-ER is an explanation for Ingrid why her posting money would raise the probability of \(e\) relative to the salient information-base. What information-base is this? Since we’re talking about “reasons for Ingrid”, the most natural candidate is \(b\): Ingrid’s information (including supplementation with what Hannah tells her); i.e. information Ingrid could take into account in her deliberations. The answer to our question, I’ll argue, is positive. The fact that posting money would raise the probability of \(e\) relative to Hannah’s information is indeed an explanation for Ingrid why posting money would raise the probability of \(e\) relative to Ingrid’s information.

While I believe that this claim is intuitively compelling, arguing for it will require some work, which I’ll tackle in two steps. Readers satisfied with the intuitive claim can skip to the section’s end. The first step is to establish the truth of the explanandum, that posting money is indeed good relative to Ingrid’s

\textsuperscript{53} E.g. Williams 1979, Setiya 2007, Raz 2011: 23. Wedgwood 2015 claims we should recognize normative reasons of both kinds, rejecting the possibility of a unified account.

\textsuperscript{54} Some cases might also be resolved by appeal to end-relativity. For example, that doing A would be good for my children’s welfare is an explanation why doing A would be good for ends I care about; cf. Evers 2010: 412.

\textsuperscript{55} See Finlay 2014: ch. 5, 6.
information. The second is to establish that R2-ER indeed stands in the explanans relation to that explanandum.

Step 1: Posting money would be good relative to Ingrid’s information.

Unfortunately, a full demonstration of the explanandum turns out to be extremely difficult. But we can construct a strong presumptive case, as follows. Ingrid’s information consists of (i) her background information, relative to which posting money isn’t good for e; (ii) the information that Hannah provides her, i.e. that there is a fuller body of information, relative to which posting money is good for e; and importantly (iii) that she has no other relevant information. Now consider the intuitive and widely-accepted Principle of Reflection:

**Reflection**: If (i) a subject knows at time $t_1$ that at a later time $t_2$ with strictly more information and no cognitive disfunction her credence in a proposition $p$ will be $n$, and (ii) she does not know that her credence in $p$ at some other later time $t_3$ will be something other than $n$ on the basis of even fuller information, then her credence in $p$ at $t_1$ ought also to be $n$.

There are three potential obstacles to applying this principle to Posting Money, but they seem easily overcome. First, Reflection remains controversial despite its appeal, and has some alleged counterexamples. However, our case doesn’t seem to bear any relevant similarity to these. Second, Reflection is formulated in subjective Bayesian terms as a constraint on rational credences, whereas we are working with a different, nonpsychological interpretation of “subjective probabilities”. However, we can reasonably assume that the credence a subject ought rationally to have in $p$ corresponds to the probability of $p$ relative to her information, and thus interpret Reflection in a nonpsychological way.

Third, Posting Money isn’t necessarily a scenario in which the subject will herself have the additional information in the future. However, since Ingrid correctly trusts Hannah as an epistemic authority, she correctly believes that were she to have Hannah’s additional information without cognitive disfunction she would assess the probabilities just as Hannah does. It seems arbitrary to accept the temporal Principle of Reflection but not a modal version, because the difference seems immaterial between (i) what a better-informed Ingrid will believe in the future, and (ii) what a better-informed Ingrid would believe. We can derive the following version of the principle:

**Modal Reflection**: If (i) a subject knows there is some specific additional information $I_1$ beyond what she already knows such that the subjective probability of $p$ relative to the conjunction of $I_1$ and her (other) existing information is $n$, and (ii) she doesn’t know of the existence of any further specific information $I_2$ beyond what she already knows such that the subjective

---

56 In effect, this would be to prove a version of the Principle of Reflection.
57 Based on van Fraassen 1984.
58 Jake Ross points out that conjunct (ii) is both idiosyncratic and redundant, since conjunct (i) and the Principle of Reflection together entail it. I include it nonetheless because its counterpart in the modalized version proposed below is nontrivial.
59 E.g. the Sleeping Beauty problem (Elga 2000).
60 I assume here that trusting Hannah as an epistemic authority entails assuming that without cognitive disfunction one would share Hannah’s priors.
probability of \( p \) relative to the conjunction of \( I_1, I_2 \), and her existing information is something other than \( n \), then the subjective probability of \( p \) relative to her existing information is also \( n \).

We can conclude that Ingrid’s subjective probabilities will be the same as the probabilities that Hannah communicates. Of course, Hannah doesn’t communicate precise probabilities relative to her information, only that the probability of \( e \) relative to her information is greater if Ingrid posts money than otherwise. So Ingrid’s subjective probability for \( e \) given \( p \) will be a range we can roughly identify as the interval with the lower bound (noninclusive) of the probability of \( e \) given the conjunction of Ingrid’s information and that she doesn’t post money, and the upper bound (inclusive) of 1.

\[
pr(e|\sim p \land b_i) < pr(e|p \land b_i) \leq 1
\]

**Step 2: R2-ER is an explanation why posting money would be good relative to Ingrid’s information.**

Recall from section 2.1 that our working model of what it is for a fact \( p_1 \) to be correctly identified in a context as an “explanation” of another fact \( p_2 \) is for there to be a set of information \( B \) assumed in the context, such that the combination of \( B \) and \( p_1 \) —but not \( B \) by itself—entails \( p_2 \). What we therefore need to find is that R2-ER (posting money raises the probability of \( e \) relative to Hannah’s information) is sufficient to make it the case that posting money raises the probability of \( e \) relative to Ingrid’s information, when combined with some further propositions in the relevant background. Since we’re concerned with reasons or explanations for Ingrid, we can identify this background \( b \) as Ingrid’s other relevant information.

As it happens, we already implicitly accomplished this in the first step above, arguing for the truth of the explanandum from a set of propositions that included R2-ER. However, here is the deductive argument laid out explicitly. (In order to simplify what would otherwise be an unwieldy presentation, I assume ERT in using ‘good’ as shorthand for ‘raises the probability of \( e \)’, and ‘value’ for ‘effect on the probability of \( e \)’). We can identify a minimal set \( b(w) \) of specific propositions and general laws from which the explanandum can be deduced from R2-ER (Posting money is good relative to Hannah’s information), as follows:

1. Ingrid’s information \( B_i \) includes information about the value of posting money relative to Hannah’s information \( B_h \).
2. \( B_i \) includes the information that \( B_h \) is strictly richer than \( B_i \).
3. There is no body of information \( B_x \) such that \( B_x \) is strictly richer than \( B_i \) and \( B_h \), and \( B_i \) includes information about the value of posting money relative to \( B_x \).

---

\(^{61}\) One often knows that there is some (nonspecific) further information or other that, if one learned it, would raise the probability of \( p \), and similarly some further information that would lower the probability of \( p \). Modal Reflection assumes that such information is irrelevant to our subjective probabilities (i.e. balances out) until we learn something specific, such as that **Hannah has additional information on which \( p \) is more likely**. Unless this is correct, I suggest, the original Principle of Reflection couldn’t be true either.

\(^{62}\) Note that the lower bound has to be read de dicto intensionally, and is extensionally extremely vague. In reality, Ingrid has pragmatic information that further precisifies her subjective probabilities. For Hannah’s statement to be helpful, Hannah must believe that the degree to which \( e \) is more likely if Ingrid posts money is sufficiently significant (as weighted by the desirability of \( e \)) to outweigh the disvalue to Ingrid of parting with her money. Put simply, posting money must be **significantly good**, relative to Hannah’s information, to be worth mentioning.

From these premises we can deduce:

C1. B₁ entails that posting money is good relative to B₁.  (From R2-ER, P1).

C2. Bᵱ entails that posting money is good relative to a body of information strictly richer than Bᵱ.  (From C1, P2).

C3. Posting money is good relative to Bᵱ.  (From C2, P3, L1).

We have therefore identified a background relative to which R2-ER, the goodness-relative-to-Hannah’s-information of posting money, is an explanation of the goodness-relative-to-Ingrid’s-information of posting money.⁶³

The goodness₁ of an action relative to one body of information B₁ can indeed be an explanation of the goodness₂ of that action relative to another body of information B₂, and hence (according to REG+ERT) a reason for that action relative to the right context.  It is also easily seen that our demonstration involves the right context.  In asking whether R2 is a reason for Ingrid to post money, the most natural interpretation is of an explanation for Ingrid, i.e. relative to Ingrid’s other information, and thereby something she could recognize as an explanation and take into consideration in her deliberation.  Premises P1-P3 are, indeed, precisely the salient items of Ingrid’s background information, and Modal Reflection is so intuitive that we expect rational agents to conform their assessments of subjective probability to it.  Given default assumptions about context, therefore, REG+ERT predicts it is correct to say that R2 is a reason for Ingrid to post money.

Importantly, this result was contingent on B₁ being strictly richer than B₂, as in Posting Money and other cases of normative testimony from better-informed advisors, and so it doesn’t overgeneralize to the wrong contexts.  REG+ERT correctly doesn’t predict that facts about goodness provide agents with reasons (at least, with normative weight over and above their other reasons) when the goodness is relative to equal or poorer information.  So in Posting Money—Explained, where Ingrid has all Hannah’s information including (R1) that N is Francis’s address, the fact R2 that posting money would be good relative to Hannah’s information provides her with no (nonoverlapping) reason for posting money, supervening as it does on her other information.  We thereby accommodate and explain the buck-passers’ observation that citing R2 as a “reason” in such a context would be inappropriate.  Relative to a context that includes the background information that explains why posting money is good relative to Hannah’s information, the supervening fact R2 does not meet our criteria for an explanation of the goodness of posting money, because the background is already sufficient for the explanandum by itself.  Rather than explaining denials that something is a reason on the (potentially unsatisfying) grounds that it is a reason with overlapping weight, we can agree that against such a background, these facts are indeed not reasons at all.

Enlightened with this understanding of the context-sensitivity of reasons-talk, we can see how buck-passers’ arguments against normative facts as reasons proceed by specifying a context where this

⁶³ I suggest that any of the facts in b(w) could be appropriately cited as a “reason” for Ingrid to post money, with R2-ER taking its place in the background.  Readers can test this against their own intuitions.
subvening information is saliently in the common ground. Meanwhile the arguments of their opponents proceed by specifying contexts where the subvening information is excluded. So REG+ERT also has the virtue of diagnosing and explaining the entrenched disagreement over whether normative facts can themselves be reasons: it depends on the relationship between the information-base of those normative facts and the other facts in the salient background (e.g. known by the agent).

This solution extends to the case of facts about reasons themselves being reasons. If Hannah tells Ingrid merely that (R4) there is a reason for her to post money to N, we can analyze this as the claim that there is an (undisclosed) explanation (R1) why posting money would raise the probability of an (undisclosed) desired end e relative to Hannah’s richer information B₁. This fact R4 is itself information which explains why posting money would raise the probability of e relative to Ingrid’s poorer information B₂, and therefore according to REG+ERT is appropriately identified as a reason for Ingrid to post money. Because this is again contingent on R₄’s status as a reason being relative to a poorer informational background than R₁’s status as a reason, there is no danger of double-counting or an infinite recursion of higher-order reasons with independent normative weights.

5. Evidence as Reasons: The Puzzle

A third, well-known puzzle for REG arises from cases where evidence intuitively counts as a reason—not for belief, as with epistemic reasons, but for action. We already observed such a case in Posting Money, in which we noted that the fact R₃, that Hannah told Ingrid it would be good to post money to N, is plausibly a reason Ingrid has to post money. The problem for REG is that this fact R₃ is apparently not a plausible candidate for an explanation why post money would be good.⁶⁴ In general, the fact that somebody tells you that p is not an explanation why p. If what an advisor tells you is true, then at least in ordinary cases its truth is prior to her telling you about it. If Ingrid were to ask Hannah, “Why would it be good for me to post money to N?”, she would rightly not accept “Because I told you so” as a helpful or informative reply. Ingrid would be asking after the facts that prompted Hannah to make her claim in the first place.

It seems, therefore, that in cases of normative testimony we can have reasons to act that aren’t explanations why acting would be good, contrary to REG. These reasons apparently take the form rather of evidence it would be good for S to do A. (Often, evidence that p is an explanation why p, since explanations of something are one kind of evidence for it. However, testimonial evidence is a prominent kind of exception, which will be my focus here.) On this basis, some philosophers argue for a general theory of normative reasons as evidence—rather than explanations—of normative status.⁶⁵ It is

⁶⁴ Kearns and Star deny this on the grounds that the normative status is overdetermined (2011: 507-8). But an advisor can’t make it the case that p if it is already the case that p, just as a flying rock can’t make it the case that/be an explanation why a window is broken if the window is already broken before the rock passes through it. They alternatively suggest an action’s normative status always depends on the agent’s information. This would imply, implausibly, that normative testimony (i) isn’t true before/unless offered (contrary to the overdetermination claim), and (ii) makes itself true.

⁶⁵ Especially Kearns & Star 2008, 2009, Thomson 2008. In Finlay 2001: 104f I slid between describing reasons as “explanations” and “indications” of normative facts. Kearns and Star’s analysis is in terms of evidence of ought-facts rather than goodness, which I’ll treat as a restricted evidence-of-goodness view (see n. 7). Switching to an unrestricted evidence-of-goodness theory
controversial whether this approach can account for all normative reasons, but it is a significant
challenge to REG (and other theories) as a unified account if even some reasons take the form of
evidence, and not explanations, of goodness.

5.1 Evidence as Reasons: A Solution

A solution to this puzzle also emerges from REG+ERT’s distinction between different senses of
“goodness” generated by information-relativity. While it may be true that mere testimonial evidence
about something cannot be an explanation of that very same thing, testimonial evidence for goodness₁
(relative to background b₁) can be an explanation of goodness₂ (relative to background b₂) even when it
isn’t an explanation of goodness₁.

The correct analysis of the concept of evidence is controversial, but the following account is plausible at
a first pass: a fact R is evidence that p for a subject S in case R is information that raises S’s subjective
probability that p; i.e. if p is more likely given the conjunction of R and S’s other/ background
information B₁ than it would be given B₁ by itself. The fact that Ingrid’s trusted friend Hannah tells her
posting money would be good is then evidence that posting money would be good (for some
undisclosed desired end, and relative to Hannah’s information), while obviously not constituting any
explanation why it would be good in that same respect. However, we just saw in section 4 that the fact
(R2) that it would be good in that respect is an explanation why posting money would be good relative
to Ingrid’s lesser information B₂. This can be extended from the fact R2 itself to the testimonial evidence
for that fact, R3: that Hannah told Ingrid it would be good. R3 is an explanation why Ingrid’s posting
money would increase the probability of (the undisclosed desired outcome e relative to Ingrid’s lesser
information B₂. (“Why would posting money increase the probability, relative to Ingrid’s present
information, that e?”; “Because Hannah told her it would be good/increase the probability of e, relative
to her fuller information, if she did.”) On REG+ERT this just is to say that R3 is an explanation why it
would be good, relative to Ingrid’s information, for her to post money.66

So even testimonial evidence that it would be good₁ for S to do A can be an explanation why it would be
good₂ for S to do A. We merely need an informational context-shift between the “goodness” that is
evidenced, and the “goodness” that is explained. This context-shift isn’t gratuitous or ad hoc, because it
is exactly what we should expect. Trustworthy advisors offer testimony about what is “good” from the
standpoint of fuller information than is possessed by their advisees, which is why we naturally
understand Hannah’s claim as relative to her fuller information Bₖ. But agents have to make their
decisions based on what is “best” from their own standpoint, which is why we naturally understand talk
of Ingrid’s reasons as relative to her poorer information Bᵢ.

---

66 If Ingrid asks Hannah why posting money would be good, she will likely not view “Because I told you so” as a helpful reply,
because she most naturally wants to know why it is good relative to Hannah’s information, not relative to her own (which is no
mystery).
REG+ERT therefore accommodates the fact that evidence for the goodness of an action can be a reason for that action, and also makes intuitively correct predictions about when it is a reason. The phenomenon of evidence-as-reasons, then, actually supports REG+ERT.\textsuperscript{67}

6. Subjective Reasons

Our final two puzzles involve so-called “subjective” and “motivating” reasons. These puzzles arise from cases where it seems natural to say that an agent has a reason to do A although, due to the agent being mistaken or uninformed somehow, there are apparently no good candidates for a reason—especially construed according to REG as an explanation of goodness. The problems stem from the apparent double-factivity of explanation claims: \( p \) can only be an explanation why \( q \) if \( p \) and \( q \) are both the case.\textsuperscript{68} (This claim is controversial; we’ll discuss it further below). In this section I focus on a problem from explanandum-factivity, while in section 7 I turn to a problem arising from explanans-factivity.

Consider the following variation:

\textit{Posting Money—In Vain}: All the information Ingrid acquires (in \textit{Posting Money—Explained}) is correct, but there’s a further, unknown fact: her brother is about to meet somebody and fall in love, which will end all his thoughts about moving to the city where Ingrid lives. If he receives money in the post, he will just blow it on a boozy party, which he will later regret.

In this case there is apparently nothing actually good about posting money. Given explanandum-factivity, this would imply that there can be no genuine explanations in this scenario of why posting money would be good, and therefore no reason to post money according to REG.\textsuperscript{69}

Does Ingrid have a reason to post money in this case? Different considerations pull in opposite directions. On one hand, if an advisor like Hannah were to discover this additional information, it would be misleading or deceptive for her to continue telling Ingrid she has a reason to post money, as REG predicts. But on the other hand it seems natural for us to say, in a third-personal context, that Ingrid has a reason to post money. If she were actually to post money we would say she did it for a reason. And if we were asked what that reason was, we might reply that her reason is (roughly) R1: that N is her brother’s address.\textsuperscript{70} Here we explain her action by citing a “reason” that both motivates and rationally justifies it. This poses a problem for theories like REG that appear to imply there is no reason to act in

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{67} This solution expands on Finlay 2014: 93-4. I now think, but haven’t demonstrated, that a fact is evidence of goodness relative to richer information iff it is an explanation of goodness relative to some body of poorer information. How then can we adjudicate between reasons-as-explanations and reasons-as-evidence theories? The former are favored as accounts of the concept of a normative reason by at least the second (linguistic evidence) and fifth (explaining normative weight) virtues catalogued in section 1.
\item \textsuperscript{68} E.g. Raz 2011: 16. A similar problem arises when the explanatory connection is broken (e.g. Gettier cases in epistemology). I believe the solution below for apparent failures of explanandum-factivity extends to these cases.
\item \textsuperscript{69} Jacob Nebel (fc) offers an easy escape: he radically denies that normative explanations are explanandum-factive, on the basis of ordinary practices of juxtaposing reasons one ought with reasons one oughtn’t. I prefer to interpret these claims compatibly with explanandum-factivity as involving different \textit{ceteris paribus} oughts (i.e. context-shifts).
\item \textsuperscript{70} It seems more natural to identify her reason as \textit{that N is her brother’s address and he is thinking of relocating to her city but is short of money}. In our context this helps to clarify Ingrid’s relevant information.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
such cases. A similar problem is posed by cases of *perverse* reasons, where the fact that the agent believes is apparently not a normative (or a “good”) reason. For example: ‘His reason for pulling his sister’s hair was that it would annoy her.’\textsuperscript{71} Here too it seems there couldn’t be an explanation why acting would be good because that explanandum is false.

A common way of resolving these tensions is to distinguish between *objective* reasons, understood roughly as facts that weigh in favor of acting, and *subjective* reasons, understood roughly as considerations that appear from an agent’s perspective to weigh in favor of acting—or alternatively, that rationalize acting.\textsuperscript{72} This allows us to disambiguate and say that Ingrid has only a subjective reason to post money, but no objective reason. While REG accounts for objective reasons, it may seem poorly suited to account for subjective reasons due to the explanandum-factivity of explanations. (Explanans-factivity is also a problem, since theories of subjective reasons identify these “considerations” as the *contents* of the agents’ beliefs which needn’t be factual. To keep these issues distinct, in this section I restrict attention to “subjective” reasons that are factual or the contents of true beliefs, addressing potentially nonfactive reasons in section 7.) Accommodating this distinction is a challenge for a range of theories of reasons, and so many philosophers conclude there is a fundamental ambiguity in talk about normative reasons.\textsuperscript{73} Perhaps one sense can be defined derivatively on the other: “subjective” reasons, for example, as the things an agent believes that would be “objective” reasons if the agent’s beliefs were all true.\textsuperscript{74} So defenders of REG could simply scale back their ambitions, and restrict their claims to objective reasons. However, I’ll argue that when combined with ERT, REG needn’t limit its ambitions in this way.

One possible approach is to adopt an “inverted-commas” analysis of these claims. Ingrid’s reason for posting money isn’t really a reason at all, because it is merely Ingrid’s “reason”; i.e. what Ingrid herself takes to be a reason or explanation why posting money would be good, a reason-according-to-Ingrid.\textsuperscript{75} This move has some virtues: it saves us from needing to recognize a semantic ambiguity in the word ‘reason’ itself (assuming that inverted commas make a semantic contribution to a sentence), it preserves the explanandum-factivity of genuine reasons-statements while accounting for apparent counterexamples like *Posting Money—In Vain* as involving merely supposed explanations, and extends easily to cases of perverse reasons, which are plausibly reasons-according-to-the-agent.

This solution is arguably not without cost, however. First, it seems revisionary, since reasons statements of these kinds often seem sincere and do not wear scare-quotes on their sleeves. Second, it involves an arguably schizophrenic stance attributing rationality or reasonableness to an agent’s behavior while maintaining the absence of any genuine normative reasons for that behavior.\textsuperscript{76} Finally, it may fail to

\textsuperscript{71} Some philosophers might suggest this is merely a “motivating reason”, which isn’t any kind of normative reason. I address these in section 7. However, subjective reasons can be attributed even when there is no motivation. An agent can be unmoved by her subjective reasons, or even (on some interpretations) unaware that they are reasons for her; for discussion see Finlay 2014: 104-5 and below.


\textsuperscript{73} E.g. Schroeder 2008, Skorupski 2010, Hornsby 2011.

\textsuperscript{74} E.g. Schroeder 2009b. This approach struggles to accommodate perverse subjective reasons, unless one opts (as Schroeder does) for a controversial Humean theory on which these would be objective reasons.

\textsuperscript{75} Finlay 2014: 109f, Hawthorne & Magidor fc.

\textsuperscript{76} See Gibbons 2010, Lord 2010, Comesaña & McGrath 2014.
account for all the data: “subjective reasons” statements seem appropriate even in cases where the agent fails to take the consideration to be a reason. Suppose Ingrid fails to recognize R1, the fact that N is her brother’s address, as a reason to post money. Then we could say that R1 is a reason that Ingrid has to post money as a way of offering rational criticism of her, but presumably could not mean to say that R1 is a reason-according-to-Ingrid.

As I’ll next demonstrate, combining REG with ERT provides the resources for a different solution that unifies “objective” and “subjective” reasons with a single unifying theory, and without any of these potential costs.

6.1 Subjective Reasons: A Solution

Observe first that once combined with ERT, REG provides a straightforward solution to the perverse reasons puzzle. In cases of perverse reasons (e.g. that pulling her hair would annoy one’s sister), the action might not be good relative to any ends that we value, but is good relative to ends desired by the agent. The end-relativity of ERT allows us to identify a sense in which the action is good, satisfying the requirement of explanandum-factivity. Neither is this solution ad hoc: in the context of talk about “S’s reasons” or “reasons S has”, we should expect that S’s desired ends will be particularly salient, making this a natural reading.

A directly parallel solution is available for the subjective reasons puzzle in virtue of the information-relativity of REG+ERT. As readers may already have noticed, the presentation of the puzzle above assumed an “objective”, or more accurately, speaker or judge-relative sense of value. Ingrid’s posting money doesn’t raise the probability of being reunited with her brother relative to our information, once we’ve learned about his impending relationship, and so it isn’t a good thing to do relative to our information (or objectively, relative to all the facts). But posting money does raise the subjective probability of that end for Ingrid, or relative to Ingrid’s information, as we saw in previous sections. By ERT, this means that posting money is subjectively good, relative to Ingrid’s information.

So REG+ERT predicts that there is a sense of goodness on which “subjective reasons” like Ingrid’s in Posting Money—In Vain meet the explanandum-factivity condition. The “reason” in this case, (R1) that N is her brother’s address, is indeed an explanation why posting money is good in this sense. So REG+ERT identifies a reading on which R1 is a reason for Ingrid to post money. This is also a reading relevant to normative assessments of the rationality of the action, which are based not on the facts or what is known to a third party, but rather on the information available to the agent herself. Further, this reading will be especially salient when talking about a reason “for Ingrid”/ that Ingrid “has”, given that REG encourages reading this as an explanation for Ingrid/ that Ingrid has. Relativization or attribution of an explanation to an agent can be expected to direct our attention to that agent’s information, and thereby to what is subjectively good relative to this information. These cues aren’t similarly available

78 Henning (2014) offers a similar contextualist, information-relative account unifying objective and subjective reasons which I largely endorse (cf. Finlay 2012, 2014, Wedgwood 2015, Hawthorne & Magidor fc). But he draws the conclusion that REG is false (p. 621) because he assumes value is always objective, unlike reasons and oughts.
when we instead talk about whether it would be good if the agent acts, which explains why the default interpretation of ‘Posting money to N is good’ is of goodness relative to our fuller information (judge-relative or objective goodness), while the default interpretation of ‘Ingrid has a reason to post money’ is agent-relative or subjective, giving rise to the apparent explanandum-nonfactivity problem for REG.\textsuperscript{80}

The practice of ascribing “subjective” reasons therefore poses no explanandum-nonfactivity problem for REG when it is combined with ERT. On the contrary, REG+ERT is a unifying account that correctly predicts that talk about “reasons” will have both judge-relative and agent-relative (or subjective and objective) interpretations, and when each will be more natural.

7. Attitudes as Reasons

Our fifth and final puzzle arises from cases where it seems natural to say that an agent has a reason for acting although the content of the agent’s relevant belief (what they take to be their reason) is false. Consider:

\textit{Posting Money—Error:} As in \textit{Posting Money-Explained}, except that Hannah and Ingrid are both misinformed, because N is actually the address of a perfect stranger.

There is still plausibly a sense in which Ingrid has a reason to post money to N in this scenario. In support of this intuition observe that (i) given what she believes posting money would be reasonable, and it would arguably be strange to say an agent acted reasonably although she had no reason for acting that way,\textsuperscript{81} and (ii) if she does post money, it seems right to say that she does it for a reason, and strange to say she does it for “no reason”. These points are familiar from the puzzle of subjective reasons in section 6. But here I’m not concerned with the truth of the explanandum, that posting money to N would be good, rather with the truth of the explanans. The thing that Ingrid believes, the obvious candidate for her reason to post money, (R1) that \textit{N is her brother’s address}, is not true.

Many people have the intuition that it is somehow incorrect or infelicitous for us, knowing this, to say that the reason Ingrid has to post money is that R1, as this would seem to commit us to the truth of R1. This intuition is not in itself problematic for REG, which naturally accounts for it by the apparent explanans-factivity of our concept of explanation. Saying that the explanation of \textit{p} is \textit{that q} seems to imply that \textit{q} is true.\textsuperscript{82} The problem rather emerges from what we naturally say about such cases instead. If asked what Ingrid’s reason for posting money is, arguably the most natural reply would be:

‘The reason Ingrid has to post money to N is that she believes that N is her brother’s address.’

Similarly, if she goes ahead and posts money it seems natural to say,

\textsuperscript{80} Contrast ‘There is a reason to post money to N’, which encourages a more objective/speaker-relative reading.


\textsuperscript{82} It is, however, a problem for many nonfactive analyses of subjective reasons, like Schroeder 2009b, Comesaña & McGrath 2014.
The reason for which Ingrid posted money to N was that she believed that N is her brother’s address.’

Here we apparently identify Ingrid’s “reason” as the fact that

(R5) Ingrid believes that N is her brother’s address.

These responses cite actual (psychological) facts, and as such satisfy the requirement of explanans-factivity—but not in a way that looks amenable to REG. For R5 doesn’t seem like it could be an explanation why posting money would be good or raise the probability of their reunification.83 This puzzle is again more general, since R5 seems a bad candidate for a normative reason for Ingrid to post money on many theories. As Mark Schroeder writes,

Suppose that a fully informed and beneficient bystander is tallying pros and cons of [S’s acting]. He’s just noted the fact [that q] in the cons column. Does he now reflect, “but on the other hand, at least there’s this much to say for it—[S believes that p]”? This seems like a strange thing to say. [S’s acting] is no better of an idea, just because he is in the dark... When he is deliberating about what to do, what he believes matters to him only if it is an indication of how things actually are.” (2008: 62)84

Attentive readers may notice that this presentation of the puzzle seems again to assume a judge-relative or objective sense of goodness or probability. To tip my hand, I will propose below (in section 7.3) a solution in terms of agent-relative or subjective goodness.85 Our path won’t be direct, however, because there are at least two prominent responses to this puzzle already available in the literature. To motivate my new solution I’ll first explore why we mightn’t be completely satisfied with these alternatives. However, I won’t advance it as a competing solution, as REG+ERT is sufficiently flexible to be compatible with other readings. A central difficulty in addressing these puzzles is that people’s intuitions here are often conflicting or indeterminate.86 It is another advantage of REG+ERT’s flexibility that it can explain and accommodate these divergences by showing how many different legitimate readings of reasons sentences there are.

7.1 Attitudes as Reasons: Limitations of the Ambiguity Solution

Perhaps the orthodox response to this puzzle is to disambiguate, following Michael Smith (1994), and to say that reasons-statements that cite the agent’s attitudes identify only an agent’s motivating reasons, which aren’t any kind of normative reason at all, but merely an explanation why the agent acted or was motivated.87 If this ambiguity solution is right then there is actually no problem for REG here, since REG is only a theory of normative reasons.

83 Except perhaps against the background assumption that Ingrid’s beliefs are true, which doesn’t apply here since we cite the agent’s belief in case we suspect this belief is false.
84 See also Gardner & Macklem 2004, Alvarez 2010: 139.
85 Schroeder now also accepts an information-relative diagnosis of this data (ms), although he rejects REG, holding that reasons are normatively fundamental.
86 For example, Dancy (2000, 2014) holds that a falsehood like R1 can be correctly identified as an agent’s reason, while Alvarez (2010: 141f) and Hawthorne & Magidor (fc) hold that the agent really does have no reason to act in such cases.
87 Also Lord 2010. Strictly, Smith identifies motivating reasons not as facts about attitudes, but as the attitudes themselves as the causes of action/motivation. For discussion see Dancy 2000: 122-3, Alvarez 2010: 125f.
There is much to be said for this response. We do need to recognize a distinction between normative reasons and (nonnormatively) explanatory reasons, which is fully compatible with the broader identification of “reasons” with explanations that inspires REG. Facts about agents’ beliefs like R5 are often and appropriately cited simply as nonnormative (e.g. causal) explanations or “reasons” why they acted. This seems the correct interpretation of

‘The reason why Ingrid posts money to N is that she believes that N is her brother’s address’,

which seems functionally equivalent to the nonnormatively explanatory statement,

‘The reason why the leaves turned orange was that autumn had arrived’.

Problems potentially arise, however, with reasons statements of the following forms:

(3a) The reason for which Ingrid posts money to N is that she believes N was her brother’s address;
(3b) The reason that motivates Ingrid to post money to N is that she believes N is her brother’s address.
(3c) Ingrid’s reason for posting money to N is that she believes N is her brother’s address;
(3d) The reason Ingrid has for posting money to N is that she believes N is her brother’s address.

One striking thing about these sentences is that they all employ locutions that are clearly infelicitous for obvious cases of nonnormative explanatory statements.\(^8\) Compare:

(4a) #The reason for which the leaves turned orange was that autumn had arrived;
(4b) #The reason that motivated the leaves to turn orange was that autumn had arrived;
(4c) #The leaves’ reason for turning orange was that autumn had arrived;
(4d) #The reason the leaves had for turning orange was that autumn had arrived.

These various locutions we use to attribute agents’ motivating reasons strongly suggest that they are about “reasons” of a kind that agents reflect on and are motivated by consideration of, rather than merely explain why an agent acts. Plausibly it is normative reasons, rather than simple (non-normative) explanatory reasons, that play this role.

The fact that statements of the form of (3a)-(3d) function to explain why an agent acted is often assumed to entail that these “reasons” themselves must be explanations of the action, but this is mistaken. While such statements indeed function (at least often) to explain why the agent acted or was motivated, it doesn’t follow that the point of calling something a “reason” in these statements is (even partly) to describe it as an explanation why the agent acted, as opposed to a reason in some normative sense.\(^9\) Suppose someone says, “The dream for which he dropped out of school was to become a movie star,” or “The person for whom she gave up her seat was her brother.” It would be absurd to claim that since these statements are explanations of action, the words ‘dream’ and ‘person’ here mean explanation why. Citing an agent’s normative reasons is a legitimate way of explaining why they acted.

---

\(^8\) Hawthorne & Magidor (fc) miss this in interpreting statements of the forms in (3a)-(3c) as mere explanatory reasons. Some people report finding these sentences slightly odd; I offer an explanation for this intuition below.

Having a normative reason isn’t sufficient explanation of action all by itself, of course, but the fact that Ingrid had a normative reason to post money is a sufficient explanation why she did against the background assumptions that she was (i) aware of it, (ii) unaware of any stronger countervailing reason, and (iii) disposed to be motivated by the normative reasons she recognizes.\(^90\) Normative reasons are just the kinds of things agents are motivated by.

In the veridical cases where we accept that what the agent takes as a reason is a fact, it is accordingly normal to explain action by citing the fact believed as the reason, rather than the psychological fact that she believes it:

(5a) The reason for which Ingrid posts money to N is that N is her brother’s address;
(5b) The reason that motivates Ingrid to post money to N is that N is her brother’s address;
(5c) Ingrid’s reason for posting money to N is that N is her brother’s address;
(5d) The reason Ingrid has for posting money to N is that N is her brother’s address.

Here it is very plausible and widely accepted that these sentences explain the agent’s action or motivation by identifying the normative reason, (recognition of) which motivated her to act. This supports an interpretation of an agent’s “motivating reasons” as the normative reasons she had/recognized, for which she acted/ was motivated; i.e. ‘The reason [for Ingrid to post money to N,] for which Ingrid posted money to N, was that N is her brother’s address.’\(^91\)

These considerations undermine the motivation for the ambiguity solution, but aren’t fatal to it. Plausibly, whenever an agent acts there is a nonnormative explanation why, in addition to any potential explanation by normative reasons. The practice of reporting (the facts that are) normative reasons in the veridical case is something the ambiguity solution can explain. Just like we can explain an action by saying what the normative reason for it was, so too can we explain an action undertaken for a (factual) normative reason that R by identifying R as the (nonnormative) explanation of the action, against the background assumptions that the agent was factually informed and motivated accordingly.\(^92\) Rejecting the ambiguity solution for a normative interpretation of these statements returns us to our puzzle about how psychological facts like R5 could be appropriately reported as agents’ reasons when they are apparently not relevantly normative reasons, which is sometimes taken as a compelling reason for accepting it.

In addition to the awkward linguistic data sketched above, the ambiguity solution faces a further problem that we sometimes cite psychological facts like R5 as “reasons” in contexts that transparently involve normative explanation (or subjective reasons) and not, or not exclusively, explanation of action or motivation.\(^93\) For example, in *Posting Money—Error* it is presumably rational for Ingrid to post

\(^{90}\) E.g. Raz 2011: 28f. If these propositions aren’t already in the background, the act of explaining an agent’s action by citing a normative reason will put them there via accommodation, since we know these are the conditions under which a normative reason standardly explains action.

\(^{91}\) See Mantel 2014 for some objections to this line of reasoning.

\(^{92}\) This explanation also has the resources to explain the asymmetry between veridical and nonveridical cases, in a similar way to the Gricean story I sketch in section 7.3 below.

\(^{93}\) One could respond by analyzing rationalizing reasons as a certain kind of psychological explanation of action or motivation (Davidson 1963, Williams 1979, Raz 2011: 27)—or vice versa (Smith 1994: 95).
money, given her beliefs and preferences, and on this basis we can appropriately say that Ingrid rationally should post money, despite our knowledge that her belief is false. This invites the normative question, “What reason does Ingrid have to post money?”, to which it seems strange to reply that she has no reason, or that it is R1, that N is her brother’s address—which seems to commit us to its truth. It seems more natural to respond with (3c) or (3d).

Although I have been following the ordinary practice of describing these as “motivating reasons” statements, note that these replies—unlike (3a) and (3b)—seem appropriate even if we don’t know whether Ingrid will post money or is motivated to do so, and indeed even if we know that she is not motivated in this way. Perhaps she has failed to recognize the content of her belief as a reason to act, or is irrationally unmoved by this recognition. As observed in section 6, these statements could be offered as rational criticism of Ingrid. Presumably, therefore, this isn’t to identify either a “motivating” reason or an explanation of motivation. I’ll next turn to strategies for reconciling the puzzle of attitudes as reasons with a normative interpretation.

7.2 Attitudes as Reasons: Limitations of the Appositive Solution

The most prominent rival account of attitudes-as-reasons sentences like (3a)-(3d) suggests that their surface grammar is misleading. According to this interpretation (championed particularly by Jonathan Dancy), ‘s believes’ is not correctly understood as contributing a component of the normative reason itself, but rather appositively (in Dancy’s terminology) as a parenthetical aside, with at least the dual functions of (i) attributing belief in the supposed reason to the agent, and (ii) distancing the speaker from that belief. On this view, these statements are more transparently formulated as follows:

(6a) The reason for which Ingrid posts money to N is that, as she believes, N is her brother’s address;
(6c) Ingrid’s reason for posting money to N is that, as she believes, N is her brother’s address.

This appositive solution also has many virtues. It unifies the “reasons” reported in veridical and nonveridical cases as the same kind of thing, and provides an explanation why we refer to the agent’s belief in just those cases where we don’t share that belief (i.e. to signal that we don’t). It also enjoys a number of advantages over the ambiguity solution. It recognizes that “motivating reasons” statements explain actions by citing what agents took to be their normative reasons, accounts for the difference in locutions between motivating and purely explanatory reasons statements, and extends to cases where an agent’s beliefs are apparently cited as “reasons” in contexts of rational criticism and not explanation of action.

Appositivism solves one part of REG’s problem with these sentences, since it analyzes away the problematic cases in which facts about attitudes seem to be identified as reasons, despite apparently

94 This might be accommodated with a context-shift from a worse (agent’s) to a better (judge’s) informational background.
95 Henning 2014: 597.
96 Unless perhaps a “motivating reason” is understood as something with the potential to motivate; cf. Smith 1994: 96.
97 Collins 1997, Dancy 2000, Finlay 2012, 2014, Henning 2014. Jacob Nebel suggests (conversation) that ‘as she believes, p’ actually expresses the speaker’s commitment to the truth of p. I can get either reading depending on prosody (whether the appositive is uttered sotto voce or with extra stress), but ‘so she believes’ seems less ambiguous.
98 They are often treated (e.g. Dancy 2000: 138, 166f) as in competition, although I suggest are better seen as supplementary.
not being explanations why acting would be good. However, in doing so it restores the explanans-factivity problem. According to this view, Ingrid’s reason in *Posting Money—Error* is actually R1: that N is her brother’s address. But R1 is false, so there is no such fact. Mostly, discussion has focused on the question of how these statements could be explanations of action or motivation when they appeal to nonfactual things. I don’t think this is a serious problem, and endorse Dancy’s answer: these motivating reasons statements explain an action by indicating what there was to be said for it from the agent’s point of view. Since the appeal to an agent’s beliefs creates an intensional context, we can explain this motivation by citing nonfacts.99 The more relevant (and difficult) problem for our purposes is: how could R1 be Ingrid’s normative reason, when R1 is not the case? If normative reasons are facts (as is widely agreed), then there is no such reason as R1. How could Ingrid have a reason that doesn’t exist? Or how could something be Ingrid’s reason if it isn’t a reason, “a reason that is no reason”?100

Should we reconsider the assumption that explanations are explanans-factive? Dancy suggests we should reject it for explanations (e.g. of motivation or action) involving intensional contexts. However, we saw that on appositivism the point of identifying something as a (motivating) “reason” is not to identify it as an explanation of motivation, even if the point of the statement itself is to explain motivation. This problem is especially sharp for REG. If we understand reasons as explanations of *goodness*, then we can’t obviously appeal to the intensionality of belief to account for Ingrid’s having a reason.101 Might we reject explanans- or reasons-factivity anyway?102 More can be said for this option than we can discuss here, but it brings further difficulties. What kind of thing is Ingrid’s reason on this view? One suggestion is that these are reasons or facts that “exist” but do not “obtain”.103 We may worry about the coherence of this: to call something a “fact” is in part to say it obtains. And if something nonfactual could genuinely be a normative reason, then we might expect to be able (bizarrely!) to cite propositions we know to be false, like R1, in answer to a question, “What reasons are there to act?” (E.g. “Why ought I to do A?” “Because I’ll give you a million dollars if you do!” “Will you really?” “No, but that’s a pretty good reason to do A!”) I’ll rather proceed on the assumption that p cannot be a genuine explanation why doing A is good if p is false, and show instead that there is a solution on REG that doesn’t require giving up explanans-factivity.

Another appositivist-friendly suggestion is that we have two different senses of normative reasons here: objective reasons, which are factual, and subjective reasons, which as contents of agents’ beliefs needn’t be factual.104 This apparently escapes the explanans-factivity problem by rejecting REG or any

---

99 Dancy 2000: 146f, Finlay 2014: 113n; cf. Raz 2011: 30. However, I don’t agree that the nonfact R1 is the real explanans (Dancy 2000: 132), or that this kind of explanation needs no explanans (Dancy 2014). Rather, these statements implicate (factual) explanantia, such as R5. But the “reason” cited in these statements isn’t the explanans for why the agent acted, but rather the (supposed) explanans for why acting would be good.

100 Dancy 2000: 142.

101 This issue is obscure in Dancy’s treatment, because he doesn’t ultimately accept the analysis of reasons as explanations (although he comes close to endorsing REG in 2000: 7-8), rejecting the possibility of an informative analysis. For him, rejecting reasons-factivity therefore doesn’t entail rejecting explanans-factivity.

102 E.g. Dancy 2000: 131f, 146-7, Fantl & McGrath 2009: 100f, Henning 2014: 34, Comesaña & McGrath 2014. Henning suggests that contextualism allows for explanans-nonfactivity, since reasons-claims can be made relative to false information; I am unsure, because the reason itself isn’t part of the information-base.


104 E.g. Schroeder 2008. Despite originally claiming that “normative” and “motivating” reasons statements apply one concept of a reason to different questions, Dancy concedes (according to Schroeder 2008: 67n) the need to discriminate different
explanatory analysis for subjective reasons. It also potentially has costs. First, it multiplies senses of ‘reason’ in a way we might wish to avoid. Second, if there is such a nonfactive sense of ‘reason’, then we still face the problem of explaining why falsehoods can’t be cited in response to the question, “What reasons are there to act”? Third, if we are using a nonfactive sense of ‘reason’ then we arguably lack a compelling explanation why we feel a need to insert ‘S believes’ in reporting reasons in nonveridical cases. Dancy claims that this indeed isn’t necessary, noting the suggestion of factivity can be canceled either explicitly or contextually. Even so, however, we need a satisfying explanation for the intuition and tendency.

One further move dissolves all the difficulties just sketched. This is to explain away reasons statements in nonveridical cases as inverted-commas uses of ‘reason’, as described in section 6. Ingrid’s reason for posting money in Posting Money—Error isn’t really a normative reason at all, because it is merely Ingrid’s “reason”, or a reason-according-to-Ingrid of why posting money would be good. This move doesn’t really multiply senses of ‘reason’, as it rather just observes a familiar, general kind of nonliteral use. It is therefore fully compatible with REG as a unifying analysis, and preserves the explanans-factivity of all genuine reasons-statements, explaining away apparent counterexamples like (3a)-(3d) on the appositive reading as involving merely supposed reasons. Since these statements don’t identify what speakers themselves consider genuine reasons, it straightforwardly explains why we wouldn’t cite them when asked what reasons there are (this also extends to the problem of perverse reasons). The use of ‘S believes’ in nonveridical cases is explained by the desideratum of making clear that we as speakers don’t ourselves accept these as facts or reasons. It also explains why the need for ‘S believes’ is defeasible in the way Dancy claims, as the insertion is redundant when speaker nonacceptance is explicit or salient.

Perhaps this is a satisfactory solution to the problem of attitudes-as-reasons, as I have accepted in previous work. However, the residual issues sketched in section 6 might be thought to provide objections. To apply those to our present puzzle: (i) it is an arguably revisionary and nontransparent interpretation of these sentences, since it requires both the controversial appositivist reading of ‘S believes’ and the controversial inverted-commas reading of ‘reason’. (ii) Because it does not recognize the existence of any genuine normative reasons for the action, it fails to account for the agent’s rationality or reasonableness in performing that action. (iii) Relatedly, it may fail to cover all the relevant cases. As observed in section 7.1, attitudes-as-reasons sentences of the forms,

(3c) Ingrid’s reason for posting money to N is that she believes N is her brother’s address;
(3d) The reason Ingrid has for posting money to N is that she believes N is her brother’s address;

can be used not only as “motivating reasons” statements, but as “subjective reasons” statements in cases (e.g. of rational criticism) where the speaker knows that Ingrid is not motivated to post money and

---

105 Schroeder’s (2008) explanation is that subjective reasons are essentially relational: something is a subjective reason for some agent S, not tout court. The principle is questionable: parenthood is also an essentially relational property, yet we can intelligibly say which people are parents.

106 Dancy 2000: 132-3; see also Comesaña & McGrath 2014 for a pragmatic solution.
perhaps doesn’t even recognize her belief R1 as a reason to do so. Presumably what we mean by ‘Ingrid’s reason’ or ‘the reason Ingrid has’ in these cases cannot be a reason-according-to-Ingrid as the inverted-commas solution maintains. We seem rather to be identifying something as having a genuine normative status for Ingrid.

7.3 Attitudes as Reasons: An Information-Relativity Solution

Perhaps these concerns are overblown or can be overcome. But we might now observe that REG+ERT provides the resources for a new analysis of such statements that avoids all the problems surveyed above.107 This solution again turns on the information-relativity introduced by ERT. The fact (R5) that Ingrid believes that N is her brother’s address may not explain why posting money would raise the probability of their reuniting relative to our information, and thereby its judge-relative (or objective) goodness.108 But it does in a certain sense explain why posting money would raise the probability of their reuniting relative to Ingrid’s information, and thereby its subjective goodness for Ingrid.

This is subtly but significantly different from the way we found subjective goodness explained (in section 5) by evidence of objective goodness, like testimony from better-informed advisors, and (in section 6) by incomplete information. The fact that Hannah says posting money would be good (R3), in Posting Money—Original, and the fact that N is Ingrid’s brother’s address (R1), in Posting Money—in Vain, are each explanations why posting money would be good relative to what Ingrid believes de re. That is to say, they are explanations relative to the extension b,(w), the set of (other) propositions that Ingrid believes. By contrast, in Posting Money—Error the fact that Ingrid believes that N is her brother’s address (R5) is an explanation rather of why posting money would be good relative to what Ingrid believes de dicto. That is to say, they are explanations relative to the intension b, what Ingrid believes.109 Against the background information that Ingrid believes that her brother is looking to relocate to her city but is short on funds, R5 is an explanation why the probability of their reuniting is higher, relative to Ingrid’s beliefs, if she posts money than otherwise: an explanation of de dicto subjective goodness.

So REG+ERT predicts a sense of goodness on which facts about agents’ reasons-beliefs are indeed explanations of the goodness of acting. This interpretation of “motivating reasons” statements in terms of de dicto subjective goodness has many virtues. (i) It preserves the double factivity of reasons/ explanations: both the explanandum (the subjective de dicto goodness of acting) and—unlike on the appositive reading—the explanans (here, the psychological fact) are factual. (ii) It takes the sentences at face value, and doesn’t have to re-parse the “reason” clause in a nontransparent appositive way, or postulate an inverted-commas use of ‘reason’. (iii) Because the explanandum is both normative and factual, this analysis can explain (unlike either the nonfactualist or inverted-commas

---

107 This section develops suggestions in Finlay 2014: 113-4.
108 Dancy dismisses such a solution (2000: 60f), on the grounds that there is only one normative question about what the agent ought to do. I disagree; we can distinguish, for example, between the questions of what it is rational for an agent to do (i.e. given her information), and what it is advisable for that agent to do (i.e. given our information). This is compatible with granting there is only ever one practical or deliberative question about what to do given a particular context of information and goals (Finlay 2014: 154f).
109 Conversely, R1 and R3 would not be explanations for you of why posting money to N would be good relative to Ingrid’s information de dicto, if you weren’t aware of the content of Ingrid’s information.
interpretations) why the agent stands in a genuine, and not merely apparent, normative relation to the action. (iv) Furthermore, the kind of normativity involved—involving the pressure that an agent’s own attitudes or subjective probabilities place on her—is exactly the kind we should expect to find in such cases; i.e. the normativity of rationality.110 (v) Because this explanandum is normative (why would it be good to act?) rather than behavioral or psychological (why is she motivated to act?), it extends easily to the uses of sentences like (3c) and (3d) in contexts where the agent isn’t motivated, such as rational criticism.

This account is not ad hoc, and easily explains why we asymmetrically switch to reporting this kind of psychological reason precisely in nonveridical cases. De dicto subjective (or psychological) reasons statements provide less information than de re subjective (or “content”) reasons statements, because the latter convey not only the information about the “actual” reason to act that the agent correctly recognized, but also (implicitly, by accommodation) information about the agent’s attitude and the consequent rational appropriateness of the act, and in a particularly succinct way.111 By Grice’s pragmatic maxims of quantity (“Say the strongest thing you can”) and manner (“Be succinct”), we can therefore expect speakers to report de re or content reasons whenever possible. However, if talk about reasons or explanations is indeed explanans-factive then we cannot felicitously cite these “reasons” when we don’t accept them as true, inverted-commas uses aside. In these cases we can be expected to say the strongest thing that is true, which is the de dicto, psychological reason statement. This statement explains why the agent acted—or, in cases of rational criticism, should have acted—in light of what made it rational to act. Finally, we can explain why we naturally think that facts like R5 could not be explanations why acting would be good, creating the appearance of a puzzle for REG. When considering the question of whether acting would be good, by default we assume a context where our own fuller information is salient,112 rather than the context of the agent’s information (and ends) relative to which the action is relevantly good.

I see one potentially significant problem for this interpretation, which arises from sentences like (3a) (“The reason for which Ingrid posted money was that she believed...”) and (3b) (“The reason that motivated Ingrid to post money...”). Unlike (3c) and (3d), these sentences are unambiguously concerned with agent’s motivation rather than what it is rational for the agent to do. But agents aren’t normally motivated to act by reflecting on psychological facts about themselves, or by taking such facts to be reasons—although such higher-order deliberation sometimes happens.113 If Ingrid were asked, in Posting Money—Error, “What was your reason for posting money to N?”, we would expect her to answer “It was that N is my brother’s address”, and not “It was that I believed that N is my brother’s address” (at least, prior to discovering her error). So this interpretation suggests that such motivating reasons statements should usually be infelicitous, because they misidentify the thing that the agent took to be her reason.

---

110 The normativity of rationality is controversial (for skepticism about the guiding role of rational requirements see Kolodny 2005; for skepticism about their violability see Finlay 2009, Lee 2018). Here I use ‘normative’ in a broader sense including the “merely evaluative”.
111 Cf. Raz 2011: 30f.
112 Or a strongly objective context: consider Schroeder’s invitation to imagine “a fully informed and beneficent bystander.”
This may ultimately emerge as a virtue rather than a vice of the solution, however. Intuitions and judgments about the felicity of (3a)-(3d) are contested, and we are now in a good position to explain why. Plausibly, it is this problem that underlies resistance to these sentences. Given the close connections and similarities between well-formed reasons statements of the various kinds observed in this section, i.e. nonnormative explanations like

‘The reason why Ingrid posts money to N is that she believes N is her brother’s address,’

supposed normative reasons statements like

‘The “reason” for which Ingrid posted money to N is that, as she believed, N was her brother’s address,’

and de dicto subjective normative reasons statements like

‘The reason Ingrid has to post money to N is that she believes that N is her brother’s address,’

it is hardly surprising if speakers get confused and use an inappropriate or misleading form, or if different theorists fix on different readings of the same sentences, leading to conflicting intuitions. So while the new interpretation proposed here on the basis of REG+ERT cannot explain all the uses and intuitions involving so-called motivating reasons sentences by itself, I suggest it is a necessary part of a complete explanatory package—perhaps even the only piece we were missing.

Conclusion

Despite its many virtues, the unifying theory that normative reasons are explanations of goodness (REG) faces some prima facie serious objections, including the five puzzles explored in this paper: (1) “right kind” reasons for attitudes, (2) normative facts as reasons, (3) evidence as reasons, (4) subjective reasons, and (5) attitudes as reasons. I have argued that solutions to all five puzzles are systematically generated by combining REG with a particular, end-relational theory of goodness (ERT), which was not designed on an ad hoc basis for the purpose of solving these puzzles, but rather taken “off the shelf” as an analysis developed in response to independent metaethical and semantic considerations. This constitutes a powerful case for both REG and ERT, and especially their combination, with wide-reaching implications for our understanding of both reasons and value.

There is an important lesson for philosophers writing about reasons, who generally assume it is a simple, yes-or-no question whether a particular fact R is a reason for an agent S to do A.114 The context-sensitivity of our talk and thought about both goodness and explanation imply rather that the correctness of identifying R as “a reason” for S to do A is heavily dependent on conversational context such as salient ends and background information. Overlooking this makes inevitable the widespread confusion and intractably conflicting intuitions that we find in the contemporary debate over reasons.

114 This point isn’t original to this paper, of course; see e.g. Henning 2014, Finlay 2006, 2014: ch. 4.
The good news is that by recognizing and attending to this context-sensitivity these conflicting intuitions can be both explained and reconciled.\(^{115}\)
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