As with other problem sets, this will be a group assignment. Ideally, groups should consist of three members, all of whom are in the same discussion section. You will reconstruct the following arguments from the exchange between Laurence Bonjour and Michael Devitt concerning the nature of a priori knowledge. All reconstructions should be in standard form; strive to make your arguments sound using the process of “triangulation” discussed last week.

(A) **Bonjour’s opening shots.** Reconstruct what you consider to be the two best arguments from the following:

- Bonjour’s “Argument from Examples of a Priori Reasons” (begins on p.100)
- One of Bonjour’s two “Dialectical Arguments.” (begins on p.101)
- Bonjour's rejection of moderate empiricism (begins on p.103)
- Bonjour’s rejection of radical empiricism (begins on p.104)

(B) **Devitt’s opening shots.** Here you must do two things:

1. Devitt considers four objections to his anti-a priori view (pp. 107-111). Reconstruct what you consider to be the toughest objection to Devitt’s view, and his response to that objection. Thus, these should be two arguments: the objection, and Devitt’s reply.
2. Additionally, Devitt rejects the a priori on the grounds of its obscurity (begins on p.111). Reconstruct this argument.

(C) For each of the arguments you reconstructed in Parts A and B, criticize those arguments either using the various replies (which begin on p.115), or by coming up with your own reply. Note that if you’ve done a good job in Parts A and B, then your arguments are your best attempt to render Bonjour’s and Devitt’s arguments sound. Thus, a rebuttal must show that, despite your best efforts, these arguments are unsound, i.e. that they are either:

1. Invalid, in which case you should construct a counterexample, or
2. Have false premises, in which case you should construct a further argument, the conclusion of which is the negation of one of Bonjour/Devitt’s premises. (As an example, look at how we criticized Premise (1*) of the abortion argument on the PPT.)

**Something to keep in mind:** This is an exercise in critical thinking; it’s not a test of your faith in any philosophical position. Consequently, it’s less important that every group member believes the same thing, and more important that there’s some consensus about what a smart proponent or opponent of a given view would put forward as an argument. You’ll get a chance to take a stand when we debate these readings in discussion section on Wednesday.

**Something to be thinking about (no need to write about this):** Is your rebuttal a good one or is there a better way to interpret the arguments to which you’re objecting? Keep this in mind, and, when there is a potential for revising the argument so as to maximize its prospects of being sound while remaining faithful to the author’s intent, revise accordingly. Consider how this might affect your objection.