## Topic 4:

## Arguments

* The Logical Kind, Not The Talk Radio Kind.


## Monty Python's "The Argument Clinic"

## Featuring:

| Michael Palin | as "Man" |
| ---: | :--- |
| Rita Davies | as "Receptionist" |
| Graham Chapman | as "Mr. Barnard" |
| John Cleese | as "Mr. Vibrating" |
| Eric Idle | as "Complainer" |
| Terry Jones | as "Spreaders" |



## Definition: Argument

## Inductive and Deductive Reasoning (1 / 3)

## Definition: Inductive Argument

## Definition: Deductive Argument

## Inductive and Deductive Reasoning (2 / 3)

## Example(s):

## Inductive and Deductive Reasoning (3 / 3)

## What type of argument is this?

3 is a prime number, 5 is a prime number, and 7 is a prime number.
Therefore, all positive odd integers above 1 are prime numbers.

## Structure of a Deductive Argument

$$
\left(p_{1} \wedge p_{2} \wedge \ldots \wedge p_{n}\right) \rightarrow q
$$

## Valid and Sound Arguments (1 / 2)

## Definition: Valid Argument

## Example(s):

## Valid and Sound Arguments (2 / 2)

## Example(s):

## Definition: Sound Argument

## Some Rules of Inference (1 / 2)

Learn these!

1. Addition
2. Simplification
3. Conjunction
4. Modus Ponens

## Some Rules of Inference (2 / 2)

Learn these, too!
5. Modus Tollens
6. Hypothetical Syllogism
7. Disjunctive Syllogism
8. Resolution
\#1: You accidently drop a pen. You know that the pen will fall if it is dropped. How do you know that the pen will fall?

## Examples of Valid Arguments (2 / 4)

\#2: If 191 is divisible by 7 , then $191^{2}$ is divisible by 49 .
191 is divisible by 7 , so $191^{2}$ is divisible by 49 .
Is this argument valid?
\#3: If you email me a love note, l'll send you flowers. If you don't,
I'll study Discrete Math. If I study Discrete Math, I'll do well on the quiz.
Can we conclude that, if I don't send you flowers, l'll do well on the quiz?

## Examples of Valid Arguments (4 / 4)

## \#3: (cont.)

$p$ : You email me a love note
$q$ : I send you flowers
$r$ : I study Discrete Math
$s$ : I do well on the quiz

$$
\begin{aligned}
& p \rightarrow q \\
& \bar{p} \rightarrow r \\
& r \rightarrow s \\
& \therefore \bar{q} \rightarrow s \quad \text { ??? }
\end{aligned}
$$

## Rules of Inference for Predicates (1 / 2)

Four common rules that you need to know:

1. Universal Instantiation

$$
\forall x P(x), x \in D / \therefore P(d) \text { if } d \in D
$$

2. Universal Generalization

$$
P(d) \text { for any } d \in D / \therefore \forall x P(x), x \in D
$$

3. Existential Instantiation

$$
\exists x P(x), x \in D / \therefore P(d) \text { for some } d \in D
$$

4. Existential Generalization
$P(d)$ for some $d \in D / \therefore \exists x P(x), x \in D$

## Rules of Inference for Predicates (2 / 2)

## Example(s):

## Fallacies (1 / 2)

## Definition: Fallacy

Three classic types:

1. Affirming the Conclusion (or ... Consequent)

## Fallacies (2 / 2)

2. Denying the Hypothesis (or ... Antecedent)
3. Begging the Question (a.k.a. Circular Reasoning)

## Fallacies for Fun

1. Fallacy of Interrogation
2. 'No True Scotsman' Fallacy

## Extra Slides

The remaining slides in this topic are some that I no longer cover in class. I won't ask about them on a quiz or an exam, but they could be referenced on a homework or in SIs.

## Specious Reasoning: The Bear Patrol (1 / 3)

Homer: Ah, not a bear in sight. The Bear Patrol must be working like a charm!

Lisa: That's specious reasoning, Dad. [...] By your logic, I could claim that this rock keeps tigers away!


Homer: Oh ... and how does it work?
Lisa: It doesn't work. [...] It's just a stupid rock. [...] But I don't see any tigers around here, do you?

Homer: Lisa, I want to buy your rock.

# From: The Simpsons, "Much Apu About Nothing" 

(Season 7, Episode 151, Production Code 3F20)

## Specious Reasoning: The Bear Patrol (2 / 3)

## Definition: Specious Reasoning

An unsupported or improperly constructed argument. (That is, an unsound or invalid argument.)

## Question: Where is the error in Homer's logic?

$b$ : There are bears in Springfield
$w$ : The Bear Patrol is working
First issue: Which of these is Homer's argument?

| (1) |  | $\neg b$ | (Given) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (2) | $\therefore$ | $w$ | (???) |$\quad$| (1) |  | $w$ | (Given) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |$\quad$| (2) | $\therefore$ | $\neg b$ | (???) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

The first seems most reasonable in context.

## Specious Reasoning: The Bear Patrol (3 / 3)

## Question: Where is the error in Homer's logic? (cont.)

Next, what is the missing piece of Homer's argument?
(2) $\neg b \rightarrow w \quad \leftarrow$ this is what we're trying to show!
(3) $\therefore w \quad$ (1, 2, Modus Ponens)

OK, then, how about ...
(1)
(2)

$$
\neg b
$$

(3) $\therefore u$
(1, 2, um ... Abracadabra?)
(The second form of Homer's argument fails similarly.)

