# PHIL 105 - Implication/Conditional logic

# **Summary**

Conditional statements have an if or a when word in them. They can come in three equivalent forms. The antecedent is sufficient for the consequent and the consequent is necessary for the antecedent. Denying the consequent is a useful argumentation strategy.

## Conditional

At is a sentence, not a statement.

if [they havent died] then [they're still alive today]

if [antecedent] then [consequent]

The conditional is any way of presenting the antecedent and consequent.

A conditional always has both.

The antecedent is sufficient (it is enough for the consequent).

The consequent is necessary for the antecedent.

Can write it in different ways.

if = when

if [antecedent] then [consequent]

- = [consequent] if [antecedent]
- = [antecedent] only if [consequent]

#### only if

emphasizes necessity. but equivalent.

You may purchase alcohol if you're at least 19

This doesn't say that a 16 year old can't buy alcohol.

We're going to walk home unless we find a gas station soon.

We're going to walk home if we do **not** find a gas station soon

A unless B = A if not(B)

# Syllogisms with conditional

if F then G

F

therefore G

Affirming the antecedent Invalid

G

therefore F

Affirming the consequent Valld

#### Contrapositive

if F then G

if not G then not F

If F then G

not F

therefore not G

Denying the antecedent Invalid

not G

therefore not F

Denying the consequent Valid

#### Only if

Im not taller than 2m only if im taller than 1m.

Im not taller than 2m therefore im not taller than 1m Denying the antecedent Invalid

- = im not not taller than 1m
- = im taller than 1m

Im not taller than 2m therefore im not taller than 2m Denying the consequent Valid

## DC for objections

Bob thinks god exists, Abby thinks God does not exist

Bob's objection:

Abby's conclusion has to appear in the argument as an antecedent

if [god does not exist] then [there wouldn't be a universe]
there is a universe

therefore god exists

This is a valid DC argument. Abby has to reject one of the premises

Abby's objection:

Bob's conclusion has to appear in the argument as an antecedent

**if** [god exists] **then** [there wouldn't be pointless natural suffering] there is pointless natural suffering

therefore god does not exists

This is a valid DC argument. God has to reject one of the premises