

Questions for Clark, M. Knowledge and Grounds: A Comment on Mr. Gettier's Paper.

1. In what sense are the cases introduced by Gettier stronger than what would be needed?
2. Why is it not sufficient to add condition (iv) to the tripartite definition?
3. Why cannot the chains of grounds be too long?
4. What is a fully grounded belief?
5. What is the definition of knowledge proposed by Clark?
6. Which condition in that definition is not satisfied in the Gettier cases?
7. What is Clark's argument to show that a belief can be fully grounded without being justified? Is it forceful?
8. Why, according to Clark's definition of knowledge, aren't cases of so-called incorrigible knowledge (I know that I am in pain) cases of genuine knowledge?
9. What is Clark's view about the "KK principle" (if x knows that p then x knows that x knows that p)? Is it plausible?
10. Is it possible to introduce Gettier cases that are counter-examples to Clark's definition of knowledge?