ABSTRACT: Philosophers often make, or rely on, rather exotic-sounding modal claims, such as: “Personal fission is impossible”, “The laws of physics could have been different from what they are”, “Zombies are possible”. Among contemporary epistemologists of modality, it has become relatively common to endorse the sceptical view that we are not justified in making such claims. In contrast, we are often justified in making modal claims concerning everyday matters, like, “It is possible for this table to break”, and scientific matters, like “It is possible for a liquid to have the properties of a gas”. This conclusion should be worrisome for many philosophers. In light of that, this talk is devoted to exploring a way of resisting it, by appealing to pluralism about epistemic value.