

Lewis, 'Elusive knowledge', and DeRose, 'Solving the skeptical problem'

1. What is this 'compelling argument that we know next to nothing'? (Lewis) Is it compelling? Are the premises even 'plausible'? (DeRose)
2. 'S knows P iff P holds in every possibility left uneliminated by S's evidence'. Explain.
3. What are Lewis's rules that tell us what we may properly presuppose in our ascriptions of knowledge? Are they plausible?
4. Lewis argues that his story doesn't 'deconstruct itself'. Is he right?
5. Assess Lewis's account in the light of DeRose's paper (published a year earlier).
6. What is DeRose's own solution to the skeptical problem? Does it work?



MIT OpenCourseWare
<https://ocw.mit.edu/>

24.401 Proseminar in Philosophy II
Spring 2020

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: <https://ocw.mit.edu/terms>.