Cheatography

PHI1600: Basics Cheat Sheet

by rdechant via cheatography.com/34738/cs/10899/

Logic

·**Definition**: [definition]

·**Goal**: [definition]

·**Purpose**: [definition]

Arguments, etc.

·**Argument:** [definition]

·**Premises:** [definition]

·**Conclusion:** [definition]

Reasoning

·**Inference:** [definition]

- ·**Style:** [definition]
- ·**Efficacy:** [definition]
- ·**Justification:** [definition]

·**Rationality:** [definition]

- ·**Rational:** [definition]
- ·**Irrational:** [definition]

Statements

·**Content**: [definition]

·**Force**: [definition]

·**Expression**: [definition]

Styles of Inference

Deductive:

Inductive:

Deduction

Induction

Dimensions of Reasoning

·**Inferential:** the varying inferential relations premises and conclusions stand in when connected together via reasoning

·**Representational:** the varying degrees of accuracy statements exhibit when connected with reality via assertion and belief

Norms of Reasoning

Rationality: norm for evaluating the inferential dimension of arguments

> **Rational:** premises successfully justify the inferred conclusion
> [*positive* inferential "value"]
> **Irrational:** premises fail to justify the inferred conclusion
> [*negative* inferential "value"]

Accuracy: norm for evaluating the representational dimension of arguments

> **True:** *positive* inferential "value"
> **Irrational:** *negative* ver "value"

Inaccurate: statement successfully

[*positive* representational "value"]

False: statement fails to veridically represent the actual facts

[*negative* representational "value"]

Recognizing Statements

1. Indicator Words

2. Common Types of Non-Statement

- Commands
- Proposals
- Requests

Recognizing Arguments

1. Indicator Words
2. Logical Order
3. Background Context
4. Common Types of Argument
5. Common Types of Non-Argument

Assessing Validty

Form & Substitution

Assessing Validity, Pt. 2

Conditional Statements

Common Non-Arguments

·[definition]

- · Advice
- · Assertion
- · Description
- · Explanation
- · Exposition
- · Illustraction
- · Reporting
- · Quotation
- · Warning

Validity vs. Strength: Similarities

1. Both depend on whether the truth-conditions of the premises and the truth-conditions of the conclusion are correctly related.

2. Neither depend on the actual true-value of the premises or the conclusion.

Validity vs. Strength: Differences

1. Only deductive inferences can be valid/invalid, and only inductive inferences can be strong/weak.

2. When the premises in a valid argument are all true, it's *impossible* the conclusion is false. When the premises in a strong argument are all true, it's only *improbable* the conclusion is false.

3. Validity is all-or-nothing, but strength is a matter of degree.

1.

For strong arguments, when

it is still For strong arguments, even if the premises are true, the conclusion can s9ll be false.