## Distinguishing Valid and Invalid Deductive Arguments

The following method can't be used to evaluate *every* deductive argument, but it can be used to evaluate *many* of them.

Let's start by noticing that there are four very common argument forms that we tend to encounter in everyday discourse:

| Valid           |                 | I               | Invalid         |  |  |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|--|
| If (a) then (b) |  |  |
| (a)             | Not-(b)         | (b)             | Not-(a)         |  |  |
| (b)             | Not-(a)         | (a)             | Not-(b)         |  |  |

By translating common sentences like "All dogs are mammals" into a conditional (if \_\_\_\_\_\_) format, we can easily test arguments for validity. Consider the following example:

"Every human has a heart. Jim is a human, so he must have a heart."

We can see that the conclusion of this argument is "Jim has a heart", so we can set the argument up as follows:

Every human has a heart Jim is a human

Jim has a heart

To test this argument for validity, all we need to do is translate the first sentence into a conditional form. Here's a rough guideline for how to do it:

The words "all", "every", and "if" generally introduce the *antecedent* (the "a" term) of our conditional. The words "only" and "only if" generally introduce the *consequent* (the "b" term) of our conditional.

So the sentence "Every human has a heart" can be translated to read, "If something is a human, then it has a heart"

Our argument now looks like this:

If something is a human, then it has a heart. Jim is a human.

Jim has a heart.

Notice that this argument has the same structure as the left-most argument in the table above. Now we know it's valid!

Consider the next argument:

"Only shmurples like purple. Burple is a shmurple, so Burple must like purple."

We can set the argument up as follows:

Only shmurples like purple Burple is a shmurple

Burple likes purple

To find out if it's a valid argument, translate the first premise:

If something likes purple, then it's a shmurple Burple is a shmurple

Burple likes purple.

Once we compare this to the table above, we see that the argument is invalid.

## "CHEAT SHEET" for testing validity

Antecendent words ("If"\_\_\_\_): If, all, every, when

Consequent words ("then"\_\_\_\_) Only, only if, only when

| All cats are fluffy.                        | = If (cat) then (fluffy) |
|---|--------------------------|
| Only cats are fluffy.                       | = If (fluffy) then (cat) |
| I'm tired <mark>only when I'm sick</mark> . | = If (tired) then (sick) |
| I'm sick <mark>if I'm tired</mark> .        | = If (tired) then (sick) |
| <mark>Every tired person</mark> is sick.    | = If (tired) then (sick) |

Only teachers are bald. This means Toño must be bald, because he's a teacher.

| Only teachers are bald= | If (bald) | ther | ı (teacher | ) |
|-------------------------|-----------|------|------------|---|
|                         |           | Α    |            | B |
| T. is a teacher         | =         | В    |            |   |
| T. is bald              | =         |      | А          |   |

Every cat is perfect, but I'm not perfect. So I'm not a cat.

| Every cat is perfect | = If (cat) then (perfect) |
|----------------------|---------------------------|
|                      | A B                       |
| I'm not perfect      | = Not B                   |
| I'm not a cat        | = Not A                   |