

PART 1 - Key Terms

Empirical evidence - evidence obtained from observation (science)

Intuition - an intellectual seeming (we know it without checking some fact in the world)

Argument - a set of reasons which, considered as a whole, support a particular conclusion

Premise - the reasons within an argument

Conclusion - what you are meant to believe given the premises

Logic - the branch of philosophy concerned with general theories of what makes arguments good or bad

 Formal logic- evaluating arguments in formal languages like mathematics

 Informal logic- evaluation arguments in natural languages like English

Truth-values -

Validity - a valid argument is an argument such that if the premises are true, then the conclusion must be true. Otherwise it is invalid

Soundness - a sound argument is an argument that is valid and all of its premises are true. Otherwise it is unsound

Informativeness - an informative argument is an argument in which the conclusion is sufficiently different from any single premise

Question-Begging - an argument in which the conclusion repeats one of the premises

Principle of Charity - interpret an argument so it has the best chance of being sound while still capturing the author's intent

Limited Skepticism - skepticism about a particular kind of knowledge, for example a moral skeptic or a theological skeptic

Absolute Skepticism - we cannot have knowledge of anything, or at the very best only a very narrow range of facts

The Dreaming Argument for Skepticism - we cannot know anything because we cannot know if we are sleeping or awake

Post Hoc Ergo Propter Hoc – a type of fallacy. Just because some event came after another event, doesn't mean the first event caused it

The Cogito – I think, therefore I am (Descartes)

External World Skepticism – the philosophical position that we cannot have knowledge anything other than facts about our current existence and mental states

Dilemma Argument – a valid argument form that sets up a disjunction (a set of exclusive options joined by "or" statements) and then shows the conclusion follows from every open option

Moorean Shift – a strategy for refuting a philosophical argument with a very controversial premise. The "shifter" formulates a new argument with the negation (opposite) of the conclusion as a premise. And then uses that argument to argue to one of the original premises is false

Methodism – we cannot know whether we know something if we don't know how we know it

Particularism – we can know something without knowing how we know it

Testimony – evidence obtained from the reports of others

Hume's Def. of Miracle – a violation of a law of nature

Necessitarian Conception of Law of Nature – a law of nature is a necessary regularity (ex: necessarily if water is heated to 100 degrees C then it will boil)

Hume's Conception of Law of Nature – a law of nature is a well-established regularity, something observed over and over again without finding discrepancy

Principle of Induction – if in all previous observed cases a statement holds true, then it will continue to hold true in all unobserved cases and all future observed cases

Natural Theology – the study of God through ordinary experiences and philosophical argument. Attempting to find arguments for God's existence that do not require special revelation from God

Ontological Argument – Anselm's argument for God's existence

Design Argument – tries to use empirical evidence to argue for God's existence

Reductio Ad Absurdum – an argument that assumes a principle and shows that it leads to a contradiction. Because there are no true contradictions, the assumption must be false

Guanilo's Parody – replace God with "the lost island"

Principle of Abduction – if a statement provides the simplest, most comprehensive explanation of some surprising phenomenon, then you are justified in believing it

PART 3

Descartes dreaming argument for skepticism

- P1. If I know something, it is because my senses have not deceived me
- P2. When I sleep, my senses deceive me
- P3. I cannot know whether I am sleeping or awake
- C. I cannot know anything

Counterargument – P1 and P3 can both be true, but in some situations you actually are awake even if you don't know it

Descartes – you have to know that your senses are working properly (opposed to Moore)

The evil demon argument for skepticism

- P1. If I know anything, then I know I am not being deceived by a powerful evil demon
- P2. I do not know whether I am being deceived by a powerful evil demon
- C. I do not know anything

Hume's argument against miracles

- P1. A miracle is a violation of the laws of nature
- P2. Testimony would support belief in a miracle only if it is more likely that the miracle occurred than that the testimony is false
- P3. It is always more likely that testimony is false than that a law of nature was violated
- C. Testimony never supports belief in miracles

The Ontological Argument

- P1. God is the being than which none greater can be conceived
- P2. The atheist thinks God exists in the understanding but not in reality
- P3. Existing in reality is greater than existing just in understanding
- P4. If God exists just in understanding, then we can conceive of a greater being
- P5. But by P1, there is no greater conceivable being than God