

— premium — 0 — 1 — 52 —

# An Introduction

T O T H E

A R T

O F

# Logick:

Composed for the use of English Schools, and all such who having no opportunity of being instructed in the Latine Tongue, do however desire to be instructed in this liberal Science.

---

By *John Newton*. D. D.

---

L O N D O N,

Printed by *E. T.* and *R. H.* for *Thomas Passenger* at the Three Bibles on *London Bridge*, and *Ben. Hurlock* over against *St. Magnus Church*. 1671.

Since these *two moods*, two things must be observed.

1. If *Baroco* be to be reduced, the *Minor* proposition must be contradictory to the *Conclusion*: if *Bocardo*, the *Major* proposition must be contradictory to the *Conclusion*.

2. If *Baroco* be to be reduced, the *Major* shall still be the same; but if *Bocardo* the *Minor*: according to these disticks.

The *Major* keep *Baroco* to reduce,  
And keep the *Minor* for *Bocardo's* use.

## CHAP. V.

### *Of an imperfect Syllogism.*

**A**N imperfect Syllogism is a Syllogism that hath some defect, either in the number of the premisses, in the disposing them, or in the inference from them; and is fourfold; 1. Enthymem. 2. Induction. 3. Example. 4. Sorites.

1. An Enthymem is an imperfect Syllogism, inferring the conclusion from some one proposition only; as, a man is a living creature, therefore he hath a soul.

In which these three things are to be observed.

1. In an *Enthymem* the first proposition called the *Antecedent*, the other the *Consequen*.

2. If the *Predicate* be in the *Antecedent* and *conclusion*, the *Minor* is wanting; If the *subject* be in the *antecedent* and *conclusion* the *Major* is wanting.

3. An *Enthymem* is a perfect *Syllogism* in respect of the *firm proof*, and imperfect in respect of the *evidence* of the *conclusion*, one of the *premisses* being understood, but not expressed.

2. An induction is an imperfect *Syllogism* in which from many singulars some universal conclusion is inferred; as, this man is a living creature, and that man is a living creature, and so of the rest, therefore every man is a living creature.

In an *Induction*, four things are to be observed.

1. By *singulars* we are not only to understand *Individuals*, but less *universals*, *Specials* in respect of *Generals*, and all *integral parts* in respect of the *whole*.

2. If the enumeration of all the singulars be not full, the *conclusion* will be false.

3. *Induction* is the most convenient instrument to find out *arts*.

4. An

4. An *induction* may be reduced to an *Hypothetical Syllogism*. If Peter be rational, If Socrates, &c. then every man is rational; but Peter & Socrates, &c. are rational, therefore. &c.

3. Example is an *imperfect Syllogism*, in which from one or more singulars, we infer another particular; as, Catiline was punished for making sedition, therefore this seditious fellow should be punished.

In an *Exemplary Syllogism*, four things are to be observed.

1. An *Exemplary Syllogism* is an *imperfect induction*.

2. In every *Exemplary Syllogism* there are four terms, and therefore cannot be immediately reduced to a *perfect Syllogism*.

3. An *Exemplary Syllogism* is but of little force to prove a thing, but of great force to persuade.

4. In an *exemplary Syllogism* this general rule is much observed in the inference; that, like doth agree with like.

4. *Sorites* is an *imperfect Syllogism*, in which, from four or more premisses, we infer a conclusion, in which the first subject is joyned with the last predicate; as, Socrates is a man, a man is a living creature, a living creature is a body, a body is a substance, therefore Socrates is a substance.

F a

And

And in this kind of *Syllogism*, three things are to be observed.

1. A *Sorites* containeth as many *Syllogisms*, as there are *terms* between the *subject* of the first proposition and the *predicate* of the last.

2. A *Sorites* may be resolved into *Syllogisms* of the first figure.

3. A *Sorites* is in use only, in such *terms* as are necessarily subordinate, in a *causal* or a *predicamental subordination*. This way of arguing, is grounded upon the first *Antepredicamental rule*.

And thus much concerning a *Syllogism* in the General, and the several kinds, or forms thereof.

CHAP.