

## Question Set 2

Due September 18th at 8pm. Submit your work in PDF or Word format, through Canvas.

### Part A. Logic Exercise

To remind yourself of what a deductively valid argument is, first check out [this useful video](#). For each of the arguments below, determine whether or not they are deductively valid. If the argument is valid, you do not have to explain your answer. For the invalid arguments, describe a *counterexample* — a possible state of affairs in which all the premises are true, but the conclusion false.

1. P1. Spain has a queen.  
P2. No country that has a queen has a president.  
C. Not every country has a president.
  
2. P. The United States has a president.  
C. Not every country has a king.
  
3. P. Everybody loves Kanye West.  
C. So, there is someone who is loved by everybody.
  
4. P1. Few Sicilians approve of abortion.  
P2. Many atheists approve of abortion.  
C. So, few atheists are Sicilians.
  
5. P1. All bears are either brown or black.  
P2. This bear is not brown.  
C. So, this bear is black.
  
6. P1. All firefighters are philosophers  
P2. Most philosophers are left-handed  
C. So, most firefighters are left-handed
  
7. P. Everybody loves their mother.  
C. So, there is someone who is loved by everybody.

8. P1. Either Joe owns a red hat and a red coat or he owns a blue hat and a blue coat.  
P2. Joe owns a red hat.  
C. So, Joe owns a red coat.
  
9. P1. If Agnes is thoughtless, then she does mischief.  
P2. But Agnes does mischief only if she is bored.  
P3. Agnes is thoughtless but not bored.  
C. So, Agnes is a thoughtless hippo.
  
10. P1. Anyone who loves somebody is loved by everyone.  
P2. Romeo loves Juliet  
C. So, everyone loves Juliet.

### **Part B. Questions about the Reading**

Typical answers should be about a paragraph per question. Be direct and to-the-point, and use simple words and short sentences.

*G.E. Moore and Jim Pryor*

11. Moore purports to give a proof that there is a world external to the mind. Write down his proof in premise-conclusion form. Is this a valid argument? Would you call it a *proof*? Give reasons.
  
12. Write down a Moore-style proof to refute one of the skeptical hypotheses we considered last week (e.g. the hypothesis that you are a disembodied spirit deceived by an evil demon). How might a defender of skepticism respond to your proof?
  
13. Pryor argues that some perceptual experiences give us immediate justification for their contents. For instance, having a visual experience as of seeing a hand gives you immediate justification for thinking that there is a hand there. But having a visual experience as of seeing a Honda Accord does not give you immediate justification for thinking there is a Honda Accord there. Explain what, according to Pryor, the difference is between the two cases.
  
14. Here is a variant of the Good Case/Bad Case argument for Skepticism:
  - P1. If I were a vividly dreaming amputee, then I would have the same justification I actually have (i.e., I would be justified in believing the same things).
  - P2. If I were a vividly dreaming amputee, then I would not know that I have hands.

P3. My justification determines what I know.

C. So, I do not know I have hands.

Where does this argument go wrong, according to Pryor? That is, which of these premises would he deny?

*Robert Stalnaker and Hilary Putnam*

15. Explain in what way beliefs are like footprints (according to Stalnaker).
16. Explain why Putnam thinks that the claim that all of us are all brains in vats is *self-refuting*.
17. Putnam's argument seems to undermine Brain-in-a-Vat arguments for skepticism, since it gives us a way to rule out the possibility that we are brains in vats. Is there an analogous way to rule out other skeptical scenarios? [Discuss *at least one* of the following: the hypothesis that your whole life has been a dream; the hypothesis that you have been living in a version of the Truman show your entire life; the hypothesis that the apparent zebra in front of you is in fact just a cleverly painted mule.]
18. One partial defence of Skepticism against Putnam runs like this. Even if Putnam has given us a way to rule out the possibility that we have been a brain in a vat our entire lives, it does not give me a way of ruling out the following scenario: "Although I led a normal life up to then, my brain was lifted from my skull last night at 2am, and transferred into a vat. So since waking up this morning, all my experiences have been manufactured." Explain why this variant of the brain-in-a-vat scenario cannot be refuted by using Putnam's reasoning.

### **Part C. Definitions**

Define each of the following terms as accurately as you can. Write in full sentences, use your own words, and give examples where helpful.

19. **Dogmatism**
20. **Fallibilism**
21. **Factivity**
22. **Validity**
23. **Soundness**
24. **Brain in a Vat**
25. **Semantic Externalism**
26. **Relational Property**