

NUMBER SYSTEM FOR THE IMMEDIATE INFERENCES  
AND THE SYLLOGISM IN ARISTOTELIAN LOGIC<sup>1</sup>

EDWARD A. HACKER

A. Determining the relation between categorical propositions: The numbers 1 and 2 are substituted for the positive terms of the propositions and -1 and -2 for the negative terms. The algebraic value of each proposition is determined as follows: (S = subject term, P = predicate).

A propositions: +S -P  
E propositions: +S +P  
I propositions: -S -P  
O propositions: -S +P

If the term is distributed, it is preceded by a plus; if the term is undistributed, it is preceded by a minus. For example, if 1, 2 are substituted for X, Y respectively, the algebraic value of "All X and Y" is  $1 - 2 = -1$ ; the algebraic value of "Some Y are not non-X" is  $-2 + (-1) = -3$ .

The following rules determine the relationship between any two categorical propositions involving two terms or their negatives:

Categorical propositions that *agree* in quantity are:

1. *Equivalent* iff they agree in quantity and algebraic value (i.e. numerical value and sign).
2. *Independent* iff they have the same numerical value with opposite signs.
3. *Contrary* iff universal with different numerical value. *Subcontrary* iff particular with different numerical value.

Categorical propositions that *differ* in quantity are:

---

1. The idea for this paper was given to me by the following article: Gerald B. Standley, "Two Arithmetical Techniques with Numbered Classes", *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, vol. 27 (1962), 437-438. I would also like to express my indebtedness to Dr. William T. Parry for his invaluable assistance in the preparation of this paper.

- 4. *Independent* iff they agree in algebraic value.
- 5. *Contradictories* iff they have the same numerical value with opposite signs.
- 6. *Sub-implicants* iff they have different numerical values. It should be noted that a universal proposition has four sub-implicants equivalent to its subaltern, and four equivalent to its inverse (quantity reduced, both terms negated). The value of a sub-implicant is obtained by reversing the sign for just one of the terms of the super-implicant and adding to the number for the other term.

Rules of deducibility:

- 7. A categorical proposition is deducible from a categorical proposition of like quantity iff they are equivalent.
- 8. A categorical proposition is deducible from a categorical proposition of unlike quantity iff the former proposition is sub-implicant to the latter.

B. Testing syllogisms involving three terms or their negatives: The numbers 1, 2 and 4 are substituted for the positive terms in the propositions, and -1, -2, and -4 for the negative terms. The numbers 4 and -4 are used for the middle term (the term or the complementary terms which occur solely in the premisses). The algebraic value of each proposition is determined as in Section A. A categorical syllogism is valid iff it satisfies the following rules:

- 1. At most one premiss is particular.
- 2. If a premiss is particular, so is the conclusion.
- 3. A categorical syllogism having three universal propositions or one particular premiss and a particular conclusion is valid iff the algebraic sum of the premisses equals the value of the conclusion.

Examples:

All non- <i>X</i> are non- <i>Y</i>	-1 - (-4) = +3
<u>No <i>Z</i> are non-<i>Y</i></u>	2 + (-4) = -2
All <i>Z</i> are <i>X</i>	2 - 1 = +1 Valid syllogism

No <i>X</i> are <i>Y</i>	4 + 1 = +5
<u>Some <i>Z</i> are not non-<i>X</i></u>	-2 + (-4) = -6
Some non- <i>Y</i> are not non- <i>Z</i>	-(-1) + (-2) = -1 Valid syllogism.

4. A categorical syllogism having two universal premisses and a particular conclusion is valid iff the algebraic sum of the value of either premiss and the value of any sub-implicant of the other premiss equals the value of the conclusion. (Rule A, 6. gives the procedure for obtaining the values of the sub-implicants of universal categorical propositions.)

Example:

All <i>X</i> are <i>Y</i>	4 - 1 = (+3)		} Values of the sub-implicants.
<u>All <i>X</i> are <i>Z</i></u>	4 - 2 = (+2)		
Some <i>Z</i> are <i>Y</i>	-2 - 1 = -3		

This syllogism is valid because there is a case (in this particular example two cases) where the value of a premiss plus the value of a sub-implicant of the other equals -3, the value of the conclusion. Only one case is necessary to establish validity when the other rules have been obeyed.

*Northeastern University*  
*Boston, Massachusetts*