# Reading Assignment 12: Is Hume guilty of a quantifier shift fallacy?

**Assigned Reading**  S. Okasha. "Does Hume's Argument Against Induction Rest on a Quantifier-Shift Fallacy?" In: *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society.* Vol. 105. The Oxford University Press, 2005, pp. 237–255

**Questions**  Answer questions one, three, and six below.

1. Give your own example of a quantifier shift fallacy (i.e., an invalid inference from a statement of the form ∀∃ to a statement of the form ∃∀). Okasha does not explain what this fallacy is, and so if you haven't encountered it before, do a bit of research. Next, explain why, according some interpreters, Hume is guilty of a quantifier-shift fallacy.

2. In your own words, describe the difference between normative and descriptive theories of induction.

3. According to Okasha, Hume's description of inductive reasoning is inadequate for two reasons (pp. 242-243). Hume describes only extrapolating from past events to future ones, but there are many non-deductive methods of reasoning, such as *inference to the best explanation.* Second, as Goodman showed, we extrapolate only select past regularities into the future. Give your own examples illustrating (i) induction by enumeration, (ii) inference to the best explanation and (iii) Goodman's new riddle of induction. If you have not encountered these ideas before, you may wish to do a bit of research.

4. According to Salmon and Lipton, does Hume's skeptical argument undermine all inductive inferences, or just induction by enumeration? Does Okasha agree?

5. In your own words, explain why according to Sober's interpretation of Hume, "we have simply traded a vicious circularity for an infinite regress."

6. According to Sober and Norton, "inductive inferences, where rational, do not derive their licence from universal schemas." Give your own example of an inductive inference and of a universal schema that might be used in such an inference. Then contrast the universal schema with a premise that Sober and Norton would claim is useful for justifying the conclusion of the inference.