Stories of Philosophy - An Introduction Through Original Fiction and Discussion 1st edition Davis Test Bank

SKU: 9780190903695-TEST-BANK

Instructor's Manual and Test Bank to accompany

Stories of Philosophy

An Introduction Through Original Fiction and Discussion

by Thomas D. Davis

Oxford University Press
2019

Stories of Philosophy - An Introduction Through Original Fiction and Discussion 1st edition Davis Test Bank

Contents

CHAPTER 1. LOGIC
Chapter Summary 3
Learning Objectives 4
Tests 4
Web Links 9

CHAPTER 2. APPEARANCE AND REALITY
Chapter Summary 10
Learning Objectives 11
Tests 11
Web Links 15

CHAPTER 3. THE NATURE OF MIND
Chapter Summary 16
Learning Objectives 17
Tests 18
Web Links 22

CHAPTER 4. FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY
Chapter Summary 23
Learning Objectives 24
Tests 24
Web Links 28

CHAPTER 5. GOD AND SUFFERING
Chapter Summary 29
Learning Objectives 30
Tests 31
Web Links 35

CHAPTER 6. MORALITY
Chapter Summary 36
Learning Objectives 38
Tests 39
Web Links 43

Stories of Philosophy - An Introduction Through Original Fiction and Discussion 1st edition Davis Test Bank

CHAPTER 1. LOGIC

Chapter Summary

Reading 1: "Philosophy Is Murder: A Nebuchadnezzar Hulk Mystery"
Professor William Lancaster, chairman of the philosophy department at Fountain College, is shot to death in his study at his home. He had separate appointments with four other professors—Bergmann, Lord, Trilling, and Stout. One of those professors was to be fired and is presumably the murderer. The detective, Nebuchadnezzar Hulk, comes across a logical puzzle on the deceased's desk pad that indicates who is the murderer. The reader is challenged to solve the puzzle before Hulk reveals the solution.

Reading 2: "Another Pilgrim's Progress"
Pilgrim convinces her brother, Caution, to leave the devastated town of Status Quo to try to find the Heavenly City, even though Caution doubts such a city exists. Along the way they meet characters and situations that represent logical fallacies, such as Pop, who does his thinking by "following the crowd"; Circles, the beggar, who uses circular arguments that "beg the question"; an authority who's anything but; Hasty, who jumps too quickly to conclusions; and Faith, who has confident beliefs that seem to be immune to any possible counterevidence.

DISCUSSION

Arguments
Stresses that philosophy focuses on arguments that offer premises in support of the truth of a conclusion. Discusses the logical form of an argument and how deductive arguments are symbolized. Defines a valid deductive argument form as one such that if the premises are true, the conclusion must be true. Defines a sound deductive argument as a valid deductive argument with true premises. Distinguishes deductive and inductive arguments.

Deductive Arguments
Discusses logical symbolism further and gives examples of valid deductive argument forms such as modus ponens, modus tolens, disjunctive syllogism and hypothetical syllogism. Discusses two invalid argument forms—the fallacy of denying the antecedent and the fallacy of affirming the consequent— and demonstrates informally why the former is a fallacy.

Inductive Arguments
Discusses inductive arguments in general and focuses on analogical induction (also called argument from analogy), inductive generalization, and hypothetical induction (also called abduction or inference to the best explanation. Discusses how the latter is used by the detective in "Philosophy Is Murder."

Fallacies in Reasoning
Discusses the following fallacies (sketched roughly here) with reference to the story "Another Pilgrim's Progress":

Stories of Philosophy - An Introduction Through Original Fiction and Discussion 1st edition Davis Test Bank

1. Provincialism: accepting or rejecting a conclusion on the basis of one's identification with a particular group;
2. Ad hominem: attacking the person rather than the argument;
3. Straw man: misinterpreting a position or argument so as to make it seem more vulnerable to criticism;
4. Slippery slope: arguing, without good evidence, that any move in a certain direction will inevitably lead you to slide past other possibilities to some terrible extreme;
5. False dilemma: falsely reducing the possible positions at issue so as to make the position for which one is arguing seem more reasonable;
6. Appeal to force: presenting a threat in place of an argument;
7. Equivocation: using crucial word or phrase that shifts meaning within a single argument;
8. Begging the question: using some version of the conclusion as a premise.
9. Inconsistency: using statements that contradict one another;
10. Appeal to popular opinion: assuming that what's popular is true;
11. Hasty conclusion: drawing a conclusion without making a reasonable effort to determine if there is other relevant evidence;
12. Suppressed evidence: suppressing evidence not favorable to one's conclusion;
13. Appeal to authority: assuming that if a claim can't be disproved, it is probably true; and,
14. Impervious hypothesis, presenting an hypothesis or belief that seems to be immune to any possible counter-evidence.

Skepticism, Faith and Philosophy

Discusses skepticism in its various forms and ends with the type of skepticism that will be confronted in Chapter 2, namely skepticism about a world of physical objects and other minds existing outside one's own mind—the "problem of the external world."

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

By the time you've finished reading this chapter you should be familiar with:

- what an argument is;
- the differences between deductive and inductive arguments;
- the differences between valid and invalid deductive arguments;
- the logical symbols introduced in "Philosophy is Murder" and repeated here;
- the specific examples of valid and invalid arguments given;
- three types of inductive arguments;
- the fifteen informal fallacies discussed; and
- what skepticism is.

TESTS

***True/False Questions* (5)**

*1. A valid deductive argument must have a true conclusion.

Stories of Philosophy - An Introduction Through Original Fiction and Discussion 1st edition Davis Test Bank

A. True.
*B. False.

2. A valid deductive argument can't have inconsistent premises.
A. True.
*B. False.

3. The following argument is valid: "We live on Mars; therefore, we live on Mars."
*A. True.
B. False.

*4. The following statement is a fallacious argument: "I haven't quite made up my mind."
A. True.
*B. False.

5. The following statement is an example of false dilemma: "Either it is raining or it's not."
A. True
*B. False

***Multiple Choice Questions* (20)**

*1. A "valid argument" concerns the
A. truth of the premises.
*B. the connection between the premises and conclusion.
C. the persuasiveness of the argument.
D. the truth of the premises.

2. "Either it's going to rain tomorrow or it isn't." This argument is best symbolized as
A. p v ~ q
B. ~ p v q.
C. p ⊃ q.
*D. p v ~ p.

3. With a valid deductive argument we know that
A. the premises are true.
B. if the conclusion is true, the premises are probably true.
C. the conclusion is true.
*D. None of the above

*4. If this is 2094, then it is the twenty-first century
It is 2094

It is the twenty-first century

The above argument is:

*A. valid.
B. sound.
C. invalid.
D. None of the above

5. The valid argument modus tollens is symbolized as:
A. If p, then q; p; therefore q.
*B. If p, then q; not q; therefore not p.
C. Either p or q; not p; therefore q.
D. None of the above

*6. The valid argument hypothetical syllogism is symbolized as:
A. If p, then q; p; therefore q.
B. If p, then q; not q; therefore not p.
C. Either p or q; not p; therefore q.
*D. None of the above

7. Either moral questions are like scientific questions or they're like questions of taste.
It's not the case that moral questions are like scientific questions.

Moral questions are like questions of taste.

The above argument is an example of:
A. modus ponens.
*B. disjunctive syllogism.
C. hypothetical syllogism.
D. modus tollens.

*8. If we have free will, then our choices aren't caused.
If our choices aren't caused, then our choices happen by chance.

If we have free will, then our choices happen by chance.

The above argument is an example of
A. modus ponens.
B. disjunctive syllogism.
*C. hypothetical syllogism.
D. modus tollens.

9. If p, then q
Not p

Not q

The above argument is an example of the fallacy of
A. affirming the antecedent.
*B. denying the antecedent.

Stories of Philosophy - An Introduction Through Original Fiction and Discussion 1st edition Davis Test Bank

C. affirming the consequent.
D. denying the consequent.

*10. Reasoning that someone is guilty “beyond a reasonable doubt” would be an example of what type of reasoning?
A. Deductive reasoning
*B. Inductive reasoning
C. Circular reasoning
D. None of the above

11. “Don’t believe what Professor Ingram says in his physics class. I hear he cheats on his wife.” This would be an example of
A. circular reasoning.
B. argument from authority.
*C. ad hominem argument.
D. appeal to popular opinion.

*12. “People seem to like what John has to say. I’d believe him if I were you.” This statement involves what fallacy?
A. Circular reasoning
*B. Appeal to popular opinion
C. Ad hominem argument
D. Begging the question

13. “There can’t be global warming. Just look at how cold it was last week.” This statement involves a(n)
A. appeal to ignorance.
*B. hasty conclusion.
C. inconsistency.
D. slippery slope.

*14. “We’ll get him a fair trial and then hang him.” This statement would likely be an example of the fallacy of
A. provincialism.
*B. inconsistency.
C. appeal to force.
D. appeal to authority.

15. “Get your head on straight. You’re going to get in trouble with your neighbors believing things like that.” This statement would likely be an example of the fallacy of
A. inconsistency.
*B. appeal force.
C. false dilemma.
D. slippery slope.

*16. “Let the government into our lives, and they will take over everything.” This statement would likely be an example of the fallacy of

Stories of Philosophy - An Introduction Through Original Fiction and Discussion 1st edition Davis Test Bank