

## Thought probes for Phil 2180

For the September 17 lecture on Logical Positivism.

1. Godfrey Smith mentions that mathematics has traditionally posed a problem for empiricism. He further explains how positivists attempted to avoid this problem by appealing to the analytic synthetic decision. What exactly is the problem that they were concerned with, and how is this distinction supposed to solve it?
2. The holist theory of hypothesis testing supposedly raises problems for empiricism. How exactly is holism purportedly incompatible with the verificationist theory of meaning? Do you agree? Also, consider whether you buy Quine's claim that holism undermines the analytic/synthetic distinction.
3. The chapter provides a very brief discussion of the distinction between inductive and deductive logic. This will be an important distinction to understand when we turn to the problem of induction, next week. Do some independent research of your own trying to get clear on this distinction. What is the difference between a deductive and an inductive logic?
4. The chapter ends by claiming that empiricism ultimately an anti-realist thesis. Explain what you take this to mean in your own terms.