CHAPTER XIII.

Of the Special Rules of the Four Figures.

Section 606. Our next task must be to determine how far the 11 moods which we arrived at in the last chapter are valid in the four figures. But before this can be done, we must lay down the

Special Rules of the Four Figures.

FIGURE 1.

Rule 1, The minor premiss must be affirmative.

Rule 2. The major premiss must be universal.

FIGURE II.

Rule 1. One or other premiss must be negative.

Rule 2. The conclusion must be negative.

Rule 3. The major premiss must be universal.

FIGURE III.

Rule 1. The minor premiss must be affirmative.

Rule 2. The conclusion must be particular.

FIGURE IV.

Rule 1. When the major premiss is affirmative, the minor must be universal.

Rule 2. When the minor premiss is particular, the major must be negative.

Rule 3, When the minor premiss is affirmative, the conclusion must

be particular.

Rule 4. When the conclusion is negative, the major premiss must be universal.

Rule 5. The conclusion cannot be a universal affirmative.

Rule 6. Neither of the premisses can be a particular negative.

Section 607. The special rules of the first figure are merely a reassertion in another form of the Dictum de Omni et Nullo. For if the major premiss were particular, we should not have anything affirmed or denied of a whole class; and if the minor premiss were negative, we should not have anything declared to be contained in that class. Nevertheless these rules, like the rest, admit of being proved from the position of the terms in the figure, combined with the rules for the distribution of terms (Section 293).

Proof of the Special Rules of the Four Figures.

FIGURE 1.

Section 608. Proof of Rule 1.--The minor premiss must be affirmative.

B--A
C--B
C--A

If possible, let the minor premiss be negative. Then the major must be affirmative (by Rule 5), [Footnote: This refers to the General Rules of Syllogism.] and the conclusion must be negative (by Rule 6). But the major being affirmative, its predicate is undistributed; and the conclusion being negative, its predicate is distributed. Now the major term is in this figure predicate both in the major premiss and in the conclusion. Hence there results illicit process of the major term. Therefore the minor premiss must be affirmative.

Section 609. Proof of Rule 2.--The major premiss must be universal.

Since the minor premiss is affirmative, the middle term, which is its predicate, is undistributed there. Therefore it must be distributed in the major premiss, where it is subject. Therefore the major premiss

must be universal.

FIGURE II.

Section 610. Proof of Rule 1,--One or other premiss must be negative.

A--B
C--B
C--A

The middle term being predicate in both premisses, one or other must be negative; else there would be undistributed middle.

Section 611. Proof of Rule 2.--The conclusion must be negative.

Since one of the premisses is negative, it follows that the conclusion also must be so (by Rule 6).

Section 612. Proof of Rule 3.--The major premiss must be universal.

The conclusion being negative, the major term will there be distributed. But the major term is subject in the major premiss. Therefore the major premiss must be universal (by Rule 4).

FIGURE III.

Section 613. Proof of Rule 1.--The minor premiss must be affirmative.

B--A
B--C
C--A

The proof of this rule is the same as in the first figure, the two figures being alike so far as the major term is concerned.

Section 614. Proof of Rule 2.--The conclusion must be particular.

The minor premiss being affirmative, the minor term, which is its predicate, will be undistributed there. Hence it must be undistributed in the conclusion (by Rule 4). Therefore the conclusion must be particular.

FIGURE IV.

Section 615. Proof of Rule I.--When the major premiss is affirmative, the minor must be universal.

If the minor were particular, there would be undistributed middle. [Footnote: Shorter proofs are employed in this figure, as the student is by this time familiar with the method of procedure.]

Section 616. Proof of Rule 2.--When the minor premiss is particular, the major must be negative.

A--B
B--C
C--A

This rule is the converse of the preceding, and depends upon the same principle.

Section 617. Proof of Rule 3.--When the minor premiss is affirmative, the conclusion must be particular.

If the conclusion were universal, there would be illicit process of the minor.

Section 618. Proof of Rule 4.--When the conclusion is negative, the major premiss must be universal.

If the major premiss were particular, there would be illicit process of the major.

Section 619. Proof of Rule 5.--The conclusion CANNOT be A UNIVERSAL affirmative.

The conclusion being affirmative, the premisses must be so too (by Rule 7). Therefore the minor term is undistributed in the minor premiss, where it is predicate. Hence it cannot be distributed in the conclusion (by Rule 4). Therefore the affirmative conclusion must be particular.

Section 620. Proof of Rule 6.--Neither of the premisses can lie a, PARTICULAR NEGATIVE.

If the major premiss were a particular negative, the conclusion would be negative. Therefore the major term would be distributed in the conclusion. But the major premiss being particular, the major term could not be distributed there. Therefore we should have an illicit

process of the major term.

If the minor premiss were a particular negative, then, since the major must be affirmative (by Rule 5), we should have undistributed middle.