

PHI 103 - Inductive Logic
Lecture 1

Analogical Arguments

Inductive Logic

Part 1 - Analogical Reasoning

Induction: An argument whose conclusion follows with a *degree of probability* from the premise(s).

Evaluation -

- Strong/Weak - the *amount* and *relevance* of evidence
- Cogent/Uncogent - are the premises true?

Analogy: Inferring *unknown* properties/facts from *known* similarities between cases.

Inductive Logic

Part 1 - Analogical Reasoning

I. Analogical Arguments -

A. *Structure* of an Analogy:

1. Case *A* has a set of properties $\{p, q, r, s, \text{ and } t\}$.
2. Case *B* has a set of properties $\{p, q, r, \text{ and } s\}$.
3. *Therefore*, because of the similarities between *A* and *B*, *B* will (*probably*) also have property *t*.

B. *Elements* of an Analogy:

1. **Analogate(s)** - the individual properties or characteristics being compared
2. **Analogue(s)** - the set of analogates shared between two cases.

Inductive Logic

Part 1 - Analogical Reasoning

I. Analogical Arguments -

A. *Structure* of an Analogy

B. *Elements* of an Analogy:

1. **Analogate(s)** - the individual properties or characteristics being compared
2. **Analogue(s)** - the set of analogates shared between two cases:
 - a. **Primary Analogue** - the set of analogates *identical* between cases.
 - b. **Secondary Analogues** - the analogate *supposed* to be shared based on the primary analogue(s).

Inductive Logic

Part 1 - Analogical Reasoning

II. **Evaluation** of Analogical Arguments:

- A. the *number* of primary analogates
- B. the *relevance* of the analogates
- C. the *degree* of *disanalogy*
- D. the *specificity* of the conclusion

III. **Applications** of Analogical Arguments:

- A. Law
- B. Morality
- C. Personal Choice