

Philosophy 100
1st Examination - KEY
Fall 2006
Dr. Odell

1. Define the following terms¹. (5 pts. each)

- a. Soundness: The other dimension for the assessment of arguments. **It is a function of content. A sound argument is a valid argument with all its premises true.** An unsound argument has one or more premises false. (Or any logically equivalent explicitly unambiguous paraphrase.)
- b. Invalidity: Validity is the main dimension for the assessment of arguments. Validity is a function of form. A valid argument has a valid form. **In contrast, an invalid form is instantiated with the following result: all the premises are true, and the conclusion is false.** (Or any logically equivalent explicitly unambiguous paraphrase.)
- c. Syllogistic mood: The mood of a syllogism is a function of the kinds of standard form categorical propositions that compose it. **To state the mood of a syllogism one must first state the kind of proposition that the premises are, and then one must state the kind of proposition that the conclusion is.** (Or any logically equivalent explicitly unambiguous paraphrase.)
- d. Monism: **The metaphysical theory that there is ultimately only one kind of being.** (Or any logically equivalent explicitly unambiguous paraphrase.)
- e. Necessary Condition: **If x is a necessary condition for y, then if not x, then not y.** (Or any logically equivalent explicitly unambiguous paraphrase.)
- f. Metaphysics: **The branch of philosophy concerned with fundamental or ultimate kinds of being** or questions like, “What kinds of things are there ultimately?,” “Does God exist?,” “Do universals exist?” etc. . (Or any logically equivalent explicitly unambiguous paraphrase.)
- g. Quasi Numerical Proposition: **Any proposition whose subject is essentially modified by quantifiers suggesting scalar magnitude (like ‘most,’ ‘few’) which cannot be reduced to quantifiers like ‘some’ or ‘all.’** (Or any logically equivalent explicitly unambiguous paraphrase.)
- h. Polytheism: **Belief in and worship of more than one god or goddess.** (Or any logically equivalent explicitly unambiguous paraphrase.)

2. Put the following argument into standard form² (5 pts.), name its mood and figure (5 pts.), and determine validity or invalidity via the rule technique (5pts.). State all rules that are violated.

- a. Some humans are important persons, hence, because some humans are not intelligent persons, no intelligent persons are important persons.

Some *M* are *P*
Some *M* are not-*S*
∴ No *S* are *P*

S = All entities that are intelligent persons
M = All entities that are humans
P = All entities that are important persons

IOE₃

¹ The sections highlit in boldface denote the essential portion of the definition

² Note: Translation of *S*, *M*, *P* classes need not be verbatim as in the key, however, for full credit the translation should be in terms of logically equivalent paraphrases, explicitly specified in terms of noun phrases.

Rules Violated

Rule C: No standard form categorical syllogism is valid unless one of the occurrences of the middle term is distributed. (Or any logically equivalent explicitly unambiguous paraphrase.) (Justification: *M* occurs as the subject in both premises, which are, respectively, I and O categorical form sentences)

Rule D: No standard form categorical syllogism is valid that has a term distributed in the conclusion that is not distributed in the premise in which it occurs. (Or any logically equivalent explicitly unambiguous paraphrase.) (Justification: the conclusion is an E categorical form sentence. So both *S* and *P* are distributed. However, *P* is not distributed in the major premise, since it's a predicate term of an I form categorical sentence.)

3. Translate the following sentences into standard form categorical sentences³. (5 pts. each)

(a) If it is a Porsche, then it is beautiful.

All S are P (A-form) *S* : All entities that are Porsches. *P* : All entities who are beautiful.

(d) Not every politician is dishonest.

Some S are not-P (O-form) *S* : All entities that are politicians. *P* : All entities who are dishonest

(e) Only the brave deserve the fair.

All S are P (A-form) *S* : All entities that deserve the fair. *P* : All entities who are brave

(f) Albert Einstein was not giddy.

No S* are P (E-form) *S** (singularly referring): The class of entities consisting of only one member (Albert Einstein). *P* : All entities who are giddy.

4. Critically discuss *one* of the following topics⁴. (25 pts.)

(a) **Anselm's ontological argument**

15 pts: Content

10 pts: Discussion of problem(s)

Note: Since one of my posted handouts translated (as an exercise) Anselm's argument into an AAA₁ (to show that it in principle can be translated into a valid form) deduct 5 points if the argument is only presented in this AAA₁ form. (In other words, for full credit, the *reductio ad absurdum* form must be explicitly and thoroughly presented). In terms of critical discussion, I'd deduct 5 points if Gaunilo's objection is merely stated, without an explanation (I.e., if no mention is made that 'existence' doesn't work as a predicate.) Similarly, I'd deduct 3-5 points if no mention is made of the circular notion of 'necessary existence.'

(b) **Faith as a basis for belief**

Can't disentangle content from discussion of problem(s). Discussion should minimally contain some cogent mention of : lack of overwhelming evidence (~8 pts) and lack of intuitively reasonable basis of 'faith-based' notions (~8 pts). Moreover, some mention should be made (by way of example) of slippery-slope issue(s) of categorization of groups denoted as 'faith-based.' (~8-9pts).

³ Note: Translation of *S*, *P* classes need not be verbatim as in the key, however, for full credit the translation should be in terms of logically equivalent paraphrases, explicitly specified in terms of noun phrases.

⁴ As we discussed Friday, there are some shades of grey here...I'm just floating a range of points to award/deduct per issue in relation to overall cogency and thoroughness of discussion of other points the student may have written down.

- (c) **Personal experience as a basis for belief in God "If answering essay question (c), as part of your discussion of personal experience as a basis for belief, please compare and/or contrast this supposed basis with authority as a basis for belief"**

Can't disentangle content from discussion of problem(s). Discussion should minimally contain some cogent mention and explanation of 'authority' vis-à-vis personal experience (from the Russell reading). In other words, discussion should include problem of how background upbringing can bias interpretation of subjective experience(s). (10-12pts). Moreover, cogent discussion (a' la Odells lecture) should also mention (by way of example...i.e. 'Son of Sam,' saints starving themselves in the desert, etc.) problems associated with reliability of subjective experience vis-à-vis subjective certainty. (13-15 pts)

- (d) **The Problem of Evil**

10 pts content

15 pts discussion of problem(s)

On the content side, a clear explanation must be given of what makes 'evil' a problem vis-à-vis the theological concept of God. I'd only award 5 pts if no mention is made of the theological conception of God (or at least some logically equivalent unambiguous paraphrase.) Discussion of problem(s) should include all of the stock responses and counter-responses in Odell's lecture and handout. ("We need evil to appreciate the good" (5 pts) "Why so much evil, then?" (5) If the essay is weak, but the student mentions something concerning the inherently logical problems of unqualified superlatives (all powerful/good etc) I'd award a few points (maybe 2-3?) Although, as Dimi mentioned, this *is* a separate issue (since the PE deals with a relational problem between a conception of God versus one's experience of the world, whereas the logical issue deals with intrinsic incoherence of a conception of God.) Still, I think if anyone discusses this perhaps a few extra points can be added (though none should be deducted if they don't discuss this.)