# The Legend of the Justified True Belief Analysis[*]

## Julien Dutant

### Feb. 5th 2015 — penultimate draft

In the last few decades a certain picture of the history of epistemology has gained wide currency among epistemologists. The Legend, as I will call it, is summarised in the claim that:

> Edmund Gettier's landmark paper successfully refuted the traditional analysis of knowledge. (Sosa et al., 2009, 189)

As my label indicates, I think that the Legend is false. Not that Edmund Gettier did not refute the Justified True Belief analysis of knowledge. He did. But the analysis was not the traditional one.

Even though the Legend figures in almost every epistemology handbook, I do not expect a strong resistance to the claim that it is false. The Legend is not widespread because it has been powerfully defended—it has hardly been defended *at all*—but because no better picture is available.[1] Such a picture is precisely what this paper intends to offer. Call it the New Story.

Like the Legend, the New Story is painted in broad strokes. It ignores a lot of historical detail and involves a significant amount of rational reconstruction. Yet I think it offers a recognisable portrait of the history of epistemology and provides an illuminating perspective on the present of the discipline.

[1]Thus Mark Kaplan's (1985, 352-353) criticisms and Ayers's (2003, 15) incidental remark that the Legend is "manifestly false" have largely been ignored. Antognazza (2015, 167–73) and Pasnau (2013) are the most extensive criticisms of the Legend to date. I discuss them in section 4.