

CONTENTS

Introduction	xxiii
CHAPTER 1 MOLECULAR PROPOSITIONS	1
Kinds of molecular proposition	1
Quality and quantity of temporal and other categorical propositions	2
Four impossible theses with arguments, said to follow from the foregoing	4
Replies to arguments	5
CHAPTER 2 TEMPORAL PROPOSITIONS	8
Description of temporal propositions	8
Six theses with arguments	12
1 From every temporal proposition, whether affirmative or negative, whose sign does not negate the temporal connective, there follows a conjunctive proposition with equiform parts, perhaps along with some kind of determination	
1.1 Examples of, and argument for 1	
2. You can have a true negative temporal proposition whose connective is not negated, of which one part is false	
2.1 Examples of, and argument for 2	
3. You can have an affirmative temporal proposition without a negation sign negating 'while' or 'when' which is true and one part of it is false	
3.1 Examples of 3	
4. A temporal proposition, so called because of the occurrence of 'while' or 'when', affirmative both in itself and in respect of each part of itself, is false and each part is true	
4.1 Examples of, and argument for 4	
5. Of such temporal propositions which are absolutely affirmative there are	

some which are impossible though each part is necessary

5.1 Example of 5

6. Just as from a temporal proposition of the first order there does not follow a temporal proposition of the second order so also the reverse inference frequently does not hold

6.1 Proof of the first part of 6

6.2 Proof of the second part of 6

CHAPTER 3 LOCAL PROPOSITIONS	19
Description of local propositions	19
Arguments against an earlier statement	22
Ob1 Against the statement that 'Where you are I am' and 'When Socrates is running Plato is disputing' have no quantity	
Ob2 Temporal propositions can occur in syllogisms. Propositions occurring in syllogisms have a quantity. Therefore temporal propositions have a quantity	
Ob3 A further syllogistic argument for the claim that temporal propositions have a quantity	
Replies to arguments	23
Ob1.R 'Where' and 'when' are not categorematic when they make a proposition local or temporal	
Ob2.R A proposition with no quantity can occur in a syllogism	
Ob3.R The major premiss of the syllogism is false for it is false that every proposition whose subject is a common term, with every other syncategorematic term removed, has a quantity	
CHAPTER 4 CAUSAL PROPOSITIONS	25
Description of causal propositions	25
1. For the truth of a causal proposition it is not sufficient that the antecedent proposition be an illative cause of the consequent	

- 1.1 Argument for 1
2. For the truth of a causal proposition it is not sufficient that the antecedent proposition be an illative cause of the consequent where both propositions are true
- 2.1 Argument for 2
3. For the truth of a causal proposition it is not necessary that the antecedent proposition be the cause of the following one or that the significate of the antecedent be the cause of the significate of the consequent
- 3.1 Argument for 3
4. For the truth of a causal proposition it is not necessary that the antecedent proposition be the illative cause of the following one
- 4.1 Argument for 4
5. For the truth of a causal proposition we cannot say universally what is sufficient and necessary
- 5.1 Argument for 5, based on distinction between three kinds of cause viz. (i) efficient and cognitive cause, (ii) efficient and non-cognitive cause, (iii) cognitive and non-efficient but illative cause
- Five theses based on discussion in 5.1 28
- 5.1.1 No universal rule giving the sufficient and necessary conditions for their truth can be given for every causal proposition
- 5.1.2 A causal proposition taken in the ways 5.1(i) and 5.1(iii) implies a conditional proposition but not vice versa
- 5.1.3 A causal proposition taken in the way 5.1(ii) does not imply a conditional proposition with equiform terms, though the reverse argument holds where the antecedent is strictly impossible
- 5.1.4 In a causal proposition taken in the way 5.1(i) or 5.1(ii) the priority of the significate of the first proposition is required but not the inferiority or superiority of the propositions or the terms themselves
- 5.1.5 For a causal proposition taken in the way 5.1(iii) to be true such priority (see

5.1.4) is not necessary though it is possible	
Three arguments against certain of the foregoing claims	33
5.1.0b1 It would follow that a true causal proposition in the way 5.1(i) or 5.1(ii) could not be formed where one part was negative. Yet such a proposition could in fact be formed	
5.1.0b2 It can be proved that this is false: 'Because a man is a risible thing is'	
5.1.0b3 A proof that what was said to be a sufficient condition for the truth of a causal proposition in the way 5.1(ii) is not a sufficient condition	
Replies to arguments	35
5.1.0b1.R Objection is based on misunderstanding of Aristotle	
5.1.0b2.R Objection fails to recognise that the connective of causality gives merely confused supposition to the common term which follows it	
5.1.0b3.R The inference from a first order causal proposition to a second order causal proposition composed of equiform propositions is invalid.	
 CHAPTER 5 CONCESSIVE PROPOSITIONS	 39
Description of concessive propositions	39
Three theses	40
Arguments against the foregoing	42
Ob1 Concessives must be molecular because they are like conjunctive propositions	
Ob2 Where the concessive connective precedes the whole proposition it is not part of the subject	
Ob3 Concessives must be molecular since they are not categorical	
Replies to arguments	44
Ob1.R Concessive connectives cannot connect propositions which are intelligible in themselves	
Ob2.R In first order concessives the connective is part of the subject and it is not true that it should never be part of the subject when it precedes the whole proposition	

Ob3.R The objection is based on a misunderstanding over what is negated	
Arguments against Ob1.R	48
Ob1.R.Ob1 The reply has the false implication that some categorical propositions do not have a contradictory	
Ob1.R.Ob2 The reply has the false implications (i) that you can have a true conditional whose consequent does not follow from its antecedent; (ii) that you can have a conditional which contains a contradiction where the consequent of the conditional follows from the antecedent; and (iii) that there are some conditionals whose antecedents are interchangeable, and whose consequents are related likewise, and yet one of the conditionals is necessary and the other outright impossible	
Replies to arguments	50
Ob1.R.Ob1.R The inference in which the false conclusion is drawn is invalid	
Ob1.R.Ob2.R All the counter-examples are of categorical, not molecular propositions	
 CHAPTER 6 CONJOINT TERMS	 53
Kinds of conjunction	
Three rules concerning 'and' taken divisively	54
1d First rule: Whenever a conjoint term, or a plural demonstrative pronoun, is the subject in relation to a verb which does not have a term in apposition, that conjoint term or demonstrative pronoun has divisive supposition, whether the verb be adjectival or substantival	
Three theses based on 1d	54
1d.1 This is impossible: A and B are, yet neither A is nor B is	
1d.2 This is impossible: Matter and form are laughing, yet neither form is laughing nor matter is laughing	
1d.3 This is impossible: A and B increase, yet A decreases	
2d Second rule: A conjoint term, or a plural demonstrative pronoun, which is the	

subject in relation to a substantival verb with a plural term in apposition, whether simple or conjoint, and without any determination of the appositive term, has divisive supposition	55
Three theses based on 2d	57
2d.1 This is impossible: A and B are men, yet neither A is a man or men nor B is a man or men	
2d.2 This is impossible: A and B are two squares, yet neither of them is a square	
2d.3 This is impossible: A and B are between them two equal things, yet A is not equal to B nor is B equal to A	
3d Third rule: A conjoint term or a plural demonstrative pronoun which has supposition in relation to an adjectival verb which determines a verbal composite, has divisive supposition. And the proposition should be proved just in respect of that conjoint term or that pronoun	60
Three rules concerning 'and' taken collectively, with arguments	61
1c First rule: Whenever a conjoint term or a plural demonstrative pronoun has supposition in relation to a substantival verb which has a singular subject or object, that term has collective supposition	
1c.1 Example of 1c	
2c Second rule: A conjoint term, or a plural demonstrative pronoun, with supposition in relation to a substantival verb which has a subject or object and has a determinant of that subject or object, has collective supposition, and is provable with terms in addition to its own or in addition to terms equiform with its own	
2c.1 Examples of 2c	
3c Third rule: A conjoint term, or a demonstrative pronoun, with supposition in relation to an adjectival verb which has a subject or object distinct from the conjoint term or the demonstrative pronoun, should have collective supposition	
3c.1 Examples of 3c	

Four corollaries	67
Cor1 First corollary: Just as a connective of conjunction taken collectively does not give confused supposition so also when taken divisively it does not give confused supposition	
Cor2 Second corollary: In 'Every man is an animal' 'animal' does not have merely confused supposition because of the conjunction implicit in the sign taken divisively	
Three arguments for Cor2	
Cor3 Third corollary: Just as 'A stone is being carried by both of these men' is false, so also 'These men are carrying a stone' is false, given that A is being carried by one and B by the other, and neither is being carried by both	
Cor4 Fourth corollary: These are impossible: 'Socrates and Plato are a man', 'Two men are one man'	
Three arguments against rules 1d, 2d, 3d	71
1d.Ob 'A and B are a man. Therefore A and B are' is valid. 'And' is collective in the antecedent, and therefore it is also collective in the consequent, contrary to 1d	
2d.Ob In 'Two and three are five' 'and' is collective, yet it would not be if the rule were correct	
Replies to arguments	72
1d.0b.R The alleged counter-example accords with the rule	
2d.0b.R1 One reply is to deny that 'five' is a plural term, and to say that it is neither singular nor plural	
2d.0b.R2 A better reply is that 'five' is not simply a plural term, because it is equivalent to a singular term	
3d.0b.R The conjunction in the alleged counter-example is, after all, divisive, as the rule requires	

Three arguments against rules 1c, 2c, 3c	77
1c.0b In 'Matter and form are the number two' 'and', contrary to the rule, is divisive	
2c.0b In 'Socrates and Plato are lords of some person or of some persons' 'and', contrary to the rule, is divisive	
3c.0b It follows that two people know a conjunctive proposition though neither of them knows it	
Replies to arguments	78
1c.0b.R In the alleged counter-example 'and' is, after all, collective	
2c.0b.R Again, in the alleged counter-example 'and' is collective	
3c.0b.R The absurd conclusion does not follow from the premiss	
 CHAPTER 7 CONJUNCTIVE PROPOSITIONS	 84
Description of conjunctive propositions	84
Three arguments against the Description	87
Ob1 Molecular propositions lack a quality	
Ob2 Molecular propositions have quantity	
Ob3 No negative conjunctive proposition is conjunctive	
Replies to arguments	88
Ob1.R Proof that molecular propositions have a quality just as much as do categoricals, though they have it in a different way	
Ob2.R Molecular propositions are not universal, particular, indefinite or singular. Therefore they lack a quantity	
Ob3.R The alleged counter-argument does not establish what it is intended to	
Twelve rules concerning conjunctive propositions	89
Two rules to be disputed concerning conjunctive propositions	98
1d First rule to be disputed: From a conjunctive proposition signifying in accordance with the composition of its parts, to one or other of its parts, is a formal argument	

First set of arguments against rule 1d	99
1d.Ob1 'It is not the case that you are a man and you are a donkey. Therefore you are a donkey' is invalid, and yet is in accord with 1d	
1d.Ob2 'Some quantity Socrates sees and so much Plato sees. Therefore so much Plato sees' is invalid, and yet is in accord with 1d	
1d.Ob3 'Some animal is and if you are that you are a donkey. Therefore if you are that you are a donkey' is invalid, and yet is in accord with 1d	
Replies to arguments: based on clarification of 1d, viz. 'From an affirmative conjunctive proposition, signifying in accordance with the composition of its principal parts, to propositions equiform with, or interchangeable with those parts, is a valid argument'	100
1d.Ob1.R The antecedent of the counter-example is negative, and therefore the rule is not relevant to it	
1d.Ob2.R The objection ignores the phrase 'or interchangeable' which occurs in the clarification of 1d	
1d.Ob3.R Same as for the preceding reply	
Second set of arguments against rule 1d	103
1d.Ob1 'You are not a goat and no more are you a donkey. Therefore you are a donkey' is invalid, and yet is in accord with 1d	
1d.Ob2 'A is and you are a donkey. Therefore you are a donkey' is invalid, and yet is in accord with 1d (A = 'and you are a donkey')	
1d.Ob3 'Every man is an animal and vice versa. Therefore every animal is a man' is invalid, and yet is in accord with 1d	
Replies to arguments	105
1d.Ob1.R The alleged counter-example is not in accord with 1d	
1d.Ob2.R1 Might concede the counter-example while saying that the antecedent is impossible	
1d.Ob2.R2 Preferably reply that whether 'and' in the antecedent of the counter-example is syncategorematic or has material supposition, the counter-	

example must be rejected

1d.Ob3.R The antecedent of the counter-example should be rejected

Seven theses

110

1d.T1 You can have a simply necessary proposition which will become simply impossible without a new imposition on it or on its significate

1d.T2 You can have a simply impossible proposition which becomes simply necessary without a new imposition on it or on its significate

1d.T3 You can have two propositions which are true and possible and yet cannot be true together nor are they compossible

1d.T4 The significates of some propositions are true together and are compossible and yet the propositions themselves are not true together and neither are they compossible

1d.T5 You can have two propositions which are simply interchangeable with each other and tomorrow one will be true and necessary and the other false and impossible, without any new imposition on them

1d.T6 You can have an affirmative proposition which tomorrow will be negative, without any new imposition on it or on its significate and without the addition of anything to it

1d.T7 You can have a categorical proposition which will become molecular without the addition of anything to it

2d Second rule to be disputed: From a part of an affirmative or negative conjunctive proposition to the conjunctive proposition itself, is not a valid argument

Three arguments against rule 2d

114

2d.Ob1 'You are a man. Therefore you are a man and you are an animal' is valid and yet is contrary to 2d

2d.Ob2 'You are a donkey. Therefore you are a donkey and you are running' is valid, and yet is contrary to 2d

Corollaries and resolutions of arguments

116

- 2d.Cor1 If there is an affirmative conjunctive proposition with two affirmative parts of which one is inferior to the other because of a term or terms, then the argument from that inferior part to the whole conjunctive proposition is sound
- 2d.Cor2 If there is a conjunctive proposition made up of an impossible part, or of several such, and another possible part, then the argument from the impossible part to the whole conjunctive proposition is sound
- 2d.Cor3 If there is an affirmative conjunctive proposition made up of parts which are exactly interchangeable and are in themselves intelligible, then from each of those parts to the conjunctive proposition itself is a sound argument
- 2d.Cor4 If there is an affirmative conjunctive proposition made up of a necessary proposition and a contingent proposition, then the argument from the contingent part to the conjunctive proposition itself is sound
-
- CHAPTER 8 DISJUNCTIVE PROPOSITIONS 118
- Kinds of disjunctive proposition 118
- Twelve rules concerning disjunctive propositions 121
- Seven arguments against rule 3, viz.: For the necessity of an affirmative disjunctive proposition it is sufficient (i) that one or other of its principal parts be necessary, or (ii) that one part be incompatible with the other, or (iii) that its mediate contradictory imply a contradiction 124
- 3.0b1 Some disjunctive propositions made out of mutually contradictory contingent propositions are contingent
- 3.0b2 Every truth of 'You are or you are not' is a truth of 'You are' and vice versa. But 'You are' is a contingent truth. Therefore 'You are or you are not' is contingent also
- 3.0b3 'You are or you are not' would be contingent if the second disjunct signified that you are white. Therefore the disjunction is certainly contingent if the second disjunct signifies as it customarily does

3.0b4	In 'The Antichrist will be or you are not' 'You are not' makes no contribution to the truth or necessity of the disjunction. Therefore it makes no contribution to the truth or necessity of 'You are or you are not'	
3.0b5	'You are or you are not' cannot be necessary because the first disjunct is not necessary and the second is not even true	
3.0b6	Neither disjunct in 'You are or you are not' causes the necessity of the disjunction, and since the connective is less real than the disjuncts the disjuncts plus connective cannot cause the necessity either. Therefore the disjunction is not necessary	
3.0b7	That you are or that you are not is contingent and 'You are or you are not' adequately signifies that you are or that you are not. Therefore the disjunctive proposition is contingent	
Replies to arguments		127
3.0b1.R	The objection mistakenly assumes that necessity is a degree of truth	
3.0b2.R	The truth of 'You are or you are not' is not the truth of 'You are'	
3.0b3.R	The objection is irrelevant. It is the customary signification that matters here	
3.0b4.R	The objection fails to note the distinction between a proposition being disjoined to an irrelevant proposition and being disjoined to an incompatible one	
3.0b5.R	The two disjuncts plus the connective form the logical necessity of the disjunction	
3.0b6.R	That the connective has little reality does not prevent it, along with the two disjuncts, making for necessity	
3.0b7.R	It is false that that you are or that you are not is contingent	
Four rules to be disputed		132
1d	First rule to be disputed: From a principal part of an affirmative disjunctive proposition to the disjunctive proposition itself, is a formal argument	
First set of arguments against rule 1d		134

- 1d.Ob1 Where A = 'Socrates is running or Plato is disputing' and the first disjunct is B, then 'A is, therefore B is' is not valid, contrary to rule 1d
- 1d.Ob2 'This A is "God is", therefore this A is "God is or a man is a donkey", is not valid, contrary to rule 1d
- 1d.Ob3 'This proposition "Socrates is running" exists, therefore this proposition "Socrates is running or no Socrates is running" exists' is invalid, contrary to rule 1d
- Replies to arguments 135
- 1d.Ob1.R The apparent counter-example does not have the form specified in 1d
- 1d.Ob2.R The objection is vitiated by the ambiguity of 'this'
- 1d.Ob3.R This objection is vitiated by the same ambiguity
- Second set of arguments against rule 1d 138
- 1d.Ob1 'This disjunctive proposition is false, therefore a man is a donkey or this disjunctive proposition is false' is invalid, yet is in accord with 1d
- 1d.Ob2 'Every man is running, therefore every man is running or God is not' is invalid, yet is in accord with 1d
- 1d.Ob3 You can have a proposition which is both conjunctive and disjunctive. But an argument from a part of a conjunctive proposition, where that part is irrelevant to the other part, to the conjunctive proposition itself, is not valid. Therefore neither is it valid to argue from a part of a disjunctive proposition to the disjunctive proposition
- Replies to arguments 141
- 1d.Ob1.R1 A part cannot stand for that of which it is a part
- 1d.Ob1.R2 The argument is not from a part of the disjunctive proposition to the disjunctive proposition
- 1d.Ob1.R3 The inference should be conceded but it is not sound
- 1d.Ob1.R4 The disjunctive proposition ought to signify in accordance with the composition of its parts, but because it is an insoluble proposition it does not signify in that way

1d.Ob2.R	If 'follows' is taken modally then from the fact that every man is running it does not follow that every man is running or God is not	
1d.Ob3.R1	Perhaps the proposition which is supposed to be conjunctive and disjunctive is merely conjunctive	
1d.Ob3.R2	Perhaps the proposition is merely disjunctive	
1d.Ob3.R3	The proposition in question can be either conjunctive or disjunctive, but not both together	
2d	Second rule to be disputed: An argument from an affirmative disjunctive proposition, along with the denial of one of its parts, to the other part, is a sound formal argument	147
	First set of arguments against rule 2d	147
2d.Ob1	'You are a donkey or you are not a donkey, but you are not a donkey. Therefore you are a donkey' is invalid, yet is in accord with 2d	
2d.Ob2	'A signifies that every man is running or you are a donkey. But A signifies that a man is not running. Therefore you are a donkey' is invalid, yet is in accord with 2d	
2d.Ob3	'Socrates is running or you are a donkey. But Socrates is not running. Therefore you are a donkey' is invalid, yet is in accord with 2d	
	Replies to arguments	148
2d.Ob1.R	The counter-example is not in accord with 2d	
2d.Ob2.R	The counter-example is not in accord with 2d	
2d.Ob3.R	The counter-example is not in accord with 2d	
	Second set of arguments against rule 2d	151
2dOb1	'You are a man or you are a donkey and you are not a man. Therefore you are a donkey' is invalid, yet is in accord with 2d	
2d.Ob2	'Socrates sees an animal or you are a donkey. But no Socrates sees an animal. Therefore you are a donkey' is invalid, yet is in accord with 2d	
2d.Ob3	'You are a donkey or you are replying to A otherwise than affirmatively.	

But you are not replying to A otherwise than affirmatively. Therefore you are a donkey' is invalid, yet is in accord with 2d	
Replies to arguments	152
2d.Ob1.R It has first to be settled whether the antecedent in the alleged counter-example is conjunctive or disjunctive	
2d.Ob2.R Is 'Socrates' nominative singular or accusative plural?	
2d.Ob3.R The inference in question is conceded, but its antecedent is denied as regards its first part	
3d Third rule to be disputed: An argument from a whole disjunctive proposition to either of its parts is not valid	154
Three arguments against rule 3d	156
3d.Ob1 'You are a man or you are an animal. Therefore you are an animal' is valid, yet the argument is contrary to 3d	
3d.Ob2 'You are a donkey or you are running. Therefore you are running' is valid, yet the argument is contrary to 3d	
3d.Ob3 'You are man or you are risible. Therefore you are running' is valid, yet the argument is contrary to 3d	
Replies to arguments	156
3d.Obs1,2,3.R What 3d means is this: From an affirmative disjunctive proposition, composed of parts of which one does not follow from the other, to the part which does not follow from the other, is not a valid argument	
First set of corollaries	157
Cor1 If a disjunctive proposition is composed of two parts neither of which follows from the other then the argument from that disjunctive proposition to either of the parts is not sound	
Cor2 If there is a disjunctive proposition composed of two parts of which one follows from the other and not vice versa, then an argument from the disjunctive proposition to the part which does not follow from the other is invalid	

Second set of corollaries	158
Cor1 If there is an affirmative disjunctive proposition composed of two categorical propositions of which one is related to the other as its superior in virtue of a term of terms placed in it, then an argument from the disjunctive proposition to the superior part is sound	
Cor2 If there is an affirmative disjunctive proposition composed of two categorical propositions of which one is possible and the other impossible, then an argument from the disjunctive proposition to the possible part, is a sound argument	
Cor3 If there is a disjunctive proposition composed of two categorical propositions which are mutually interchangeable, then an argument from the disjunctive proposition to each of the two categorical propositions is sound	
Cor4 If there is an affirmative disjunctive proposition composed of two categorical propositions of which one is necessary and the other contingent, then an argument from the disjunctive proposition to the necessary part, is sound	
4d Fourth rule to be disputed: From an affirmative disjunctive proposition to a negative conjunctive proposition composed of parts which contradict the parts of the disjunctive proposition, is a sound argument	159
4d.Cor From an affirmative conjunctive proposition to a negative disjunctive proposition whose parts are the contradictories of the parts of the conjunctive proposition, is a sound argument	160
Arguments against rule 4d	161
4d.Ob1 It follows from 4d that you can have a necessary conjunctive proposition one principal part of which contains a contradiction	
4d.Ob2 It can be proved that no conjunctive proposition contradicts a disjunctive proposition	
4d.Ob3 It can be proved that a disjunctive proposition does not contradict a conjunctive proposition whose parts are the opposite of the parts of the	

disjunctive proposition	
Replies to arguments	162
4d.Ob1.R You cannot have a necessary affirmative conjunctive proposition one of whose principal parts contains a contradiction	
4d.Ob2.R The objection is resolved on the basis of a distinction between two ways of taking 'one thing contradicts another'	
4d.Ob3.R Same as preceding reply	
Notes	167
Bibliography	197
Glossary	199
Index	211