

BonJour Guide
PHIL410

In Defense of Pure Reason

pp. 1-6, 15-16, 98-107, 110-120; 206-216

Very generally, BonJour's moderate rationalism entails these three claims:

- i. A priori justification is essential to human knowledge.
- ii. Human knowledge is genuine.
- iii. A priori justification is fallible and internally corrigible.

1. Why, according to BonJour, do we need the *a priori*?
2. What is *a priori* justification, as BonJour understands it?
3. How does BonJour intend to argue for his form of rationalism? (How does this procedure differ from, say, that of Descartes?) What role will examples play in BonJour's discussion?
4. What is "rational insight", as BonJour understands it?
5. What role does "intuition" play in BonJour's scheme? What does he mean by the expression, 'from an intuitive standpoint'?
6. What does it mean to say that rational insight may be fallible? How is fallibility related to corrigibility?
7. How does BonJour propose to solve the problem of induction? What alternative to skepticism does BonJour recommend?