

**Landesbibliothek Oldenburg**

**Digitalisierung von Drucken**

**Sketches Of The History Of Man**

In Two Volumes

**Home, Henry**

**Edinburgh, 1774**

Sect. 3. On Examples used to illustrate this Theory.

**urn:nbn:de:gbv:45:1-697**

fyllogifm of the fecond or third figure to one of the firft. So that the four modes of the firft figure being directly proved to be conclufive, all the modes of the other two are proved at the fame time, by means of this operation of reduction. For the rules and manner of this reduction, and the different fpecies of it, called *offenfive* and *per impoffibile*, I refer to the logicians, that I may not difclofe all their myfteries.

The invention contained in thefe verfes is fo ingenious, and fo great an adminicle to the dextrous management of fyllogifms, that I think it very probable that Aristotle had fome contrivance of this kind, which was kept as one of the feeret doctrines of his fchool, and handed down by tradition, until fome body brought it to light. This is offered only as a conjecture, leaving it to thofe who are better acquainted with the moft ancient commentators on the Analytics, either to refute or to confirm it.

### SECT. 3. *On Examples ufed to illuftrate this Theory.*

We may obferve, that Aristotle hardly ever gives examples of real fyllogifms to illuftrate his rules. In demonftrating the legitimate modes, he takes A, B, C, for the terms of the fyllogifm. Thus, the firft mode of the firft figure is demonftrated by him in this manner. "For," fays he, "if A is attributed to every B, and B to every C, it follows neceffarily, that A may be attributed to every C." For difproving the illegitimate modes, he ufes the fame manner; with this difference, that he commonly for an example gives three real terms, fuch as, *bonum, habitus, prudentia*; of which three terms you are to make up a fyllogifm of the figure and mode in queftion, which will appear to be inconclufive.

The commentators, and fystematical writers in logic, have fupplied

plied this defect; and given us real examples of every legitimate mode in all the figures. This we must acknowledge to be charitably done, to assist the imagination in the conception of matters so very abstract; but whether it was prudently done for the honour of the art, may be doubted. I am afraid this was to uncover the nakedness of the theory; and has contributed much to bring it into contempt: for when one considers the silly and un-instructive reasonings that have been brought forth by this grand organ of science, he can hardly forbear crying out, *Parturiunt montes, et nascitur ridiculus mus*. Many of the writers of logic are acute and ingenious, and much practised in the syllogistical art; and there must be some reason why the examples they have given of syllogisms are so lean.

We shall speak of the reason afterwards; and shall now give a syllogism in each figure as an example.

No work of God is bad;

The natural passions and appetites of men are the work of God;

Therefore none of them is bad.

In this syllogism, the middle term, *work of God*, is the subject of the major and the predicate of the minor; so that the syllogism is of the first figure. The mode is that called *Celarent*; the major and conclusion being both universal negatives, and the minor an universal affirmative. It agrees to the rules of the figure, as the major is universal, and the minor affirmative; it is also agreeable to all the general rules; so that it maintains its character in every trial. And to show of what ductile materials syllogisms are made, we may, by converting simply the major proposition, reduce it to a good syllogism of the second figure, and of the mode *Cesare*, thus:

Whatever is bad is not the work of God;

All the natural passions and appetites of men are the work of God;

Therefore they are not bad.

Another



Another example :

Every thing virtuous is praise-worthy ;

Some pleasures are not praise-worthy ;

Therefore some pleasures are not virtuous.

Here the middle term *praise-worthy* being the predicate of both premises, the syllogism is of the second figure ; and seeing it is made up of the propositions, A, O, O, the mode is *Baroco*. It will be found to agree both with the general and special rules : and it may be reduced into a good syllogism of the first figure upon converting the major by contraposition, thus :

What is not praise-worthy is not virtuous ;

Some pleasures are not praise-worthy ;

Therefore some pleasures are not virtuous.

That this syllogism is conclusive, common sense pronounces, and all logicians must allow ; but it is somewhat unpliant to rules, and requires a little straining to make it tally with them.

That it is of the first figure is beyond dispute ; but to what mode of that figure shall we refer it ? This is a question of some difficulty. For, in the first place, the premises seem to be both negative, which contradicts the third general rule ; and moreover, it is contrary to a special rule of the first figure, That the minor should be negative. These are the difficulties to be removed.

Some logicians think, that the two negative particles in the major are equivalent to an affirmative ; and that therefore the major proposition, *What is not praise-worthy, is not virtuous*, is to be accounted an affirmative proposition. This, if granted, solves one difficulty ; but the other remains. The most ingenious solution, therefore, is this : Let the middle term be *not praise-worthy*. Thus, making the negative particle a part of the middle term, the syllogism stands thus :

Whatever is *not praise-worthy* is not virtuous ;

Some pleasures are *not praise-worthy* ;

Therefore some pleasures are not virtuous.

By

