

**ARISTOTLE ON  
FALLACIES; OR, THE  
SOPHISTICI ELENCHI**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649062201

Aristotle on Fallacies; Or, The Sophistici Elenchi by Edward Poste

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.  
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

[www.triestepublishing.com](http://www.triestepublishing.com)

**EDWARD POSTE**

**ARISTOTLE ON  
FALLACIES; OR, THE  
SOPHISTICI ELENCHI**



# ARISTOTLE ON FALLACIES

OR THE

## SOPHISTICI ELENCHI

WITH A

*TRANSLATION AND NOTES*

BY

EDWARD POSTE, M. A.

FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE, OXFORD

London

MACMILLAN AND CO.

1866

20036. d. 1.



OXFORD:

BY T. COMBE, M.A., E. PICKARD HALL, AND H. LATHAM, M.A.

PRINTERS TO THE UNIVERSITY.

## P R E F A C E.

ARISTOTLE'S explanation of the nature of Fallacies, if not satisfactory, seems to be as complete and intelligible as any that has since been offered. As his doctrines, indeed, are the source and substance of those of his successors, it appeared to the translator that the student of this theory would prefer to resort for instruction to the fountain-head, if it were made more easy of access.

"Is not, however, the whole subject of Fallacies somewhat trumpery, and one that may be suffered, without much regret, to sink into oblivion?"

Possibly: but besides the doctrine of Fallacies, Aristotle offers either in this treatise, or in other passages quoted in the commentary, various glances over the world of science and opinion, various suggestions on problems which are still agitated, and a vivid picture of the ancient system of dialectic, which it is hoped may be found both interesting and instructive.

The text adopted is that of Bekker, except where emendation was absolutely necessary to the sense. Attention is called in the Notes to all changes except mere changes of punctuation.





## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAP.	PAGE
1. Conception and existence of sophistry . . . . .	2
2. Classification of reasoning . . . . .	4
3. Five branches of sophistry . . . . .	6
4. First branch of sophistry. Fallacies dependent on diction . . . . .	6
5. Fallacies not dependent on diction . . . . .	10
6. All the fallacies may be deduced from the definition of con- futation . . . . .	18
7. All the fallacies arise from confusion, and must be solved by distinction . . . . .	22
8. Difference of paralogism and sophistic proof . . . . .	24
9. Difference of pseudographema and sophistic proof . . . . .	28
10. Examination of a division of proofs into proofs addressed to the word and proofs addressed to the thought. Distinction of dialectic and didactic . . . . .	30
11. Sophistic proof is simulated pirastic, or simulated scientific, proof. Distinction of sophistic and eristic, sophistic and pseudo- graphic, scientific and pirastic, proof . . . . .	34
12. Second and third branches of sophistry. Reduction to falsehood and paradox . . . . .	40
13. Fourth branch of sophistry. Reduction to tautology or pleonasm . . . . .	42
14. Fifth branch of sophistry. Reduction to solecism . . . . .	44

CHAP.	PAGE
15. Arrangement and tactics of the questioner . . . . .	46
16. Utility of the study of sophistry . . . . .	50
17. Rules of answering. The answerer must distinguish in all cases of ambiguity . . . . .	52
18. Three kinds of solution. The solution of inconclusive reasoning is distinction : the solution of conclusive reasoning is objection or counter- proof . . . . .	58
19. Solution of the fallacies of homonymia and amphibolia . . . . .	60
20. Solution of the fallacies of composition and division . . . . .	62
21. Solution of the fallacies of prosody . . . . .	64
22. Solution of the fallacies of figura dictionis . . . . .	64
23. The solution of all fallacies dependent on diction contains an antithesis . . . . .	70
24. Solution of the fallacies of accidens. Examination and rejection of other solutions which refer the same examples to ignoratio elenchi or homonymia . . . . .	72
25. Solution of the fallacies a dicto secundum quid ad dictum simpliciter . . . . .	76
26. Solution of the fallacies of ignoratio elenchi . . . . .	80
27. Solution of the fallacies of petitio principii . . . . .	80
28. Solution of the fallacies of consequens . . . . .	80
29. Solution of the fallacies of non causa pro causa . . . . .	82
30. Solution of the fallacies of plures interrogationes . . . . .	82
31. Solution of reduction to tautology . . . . .	84
32. Solution of reduction to solecism . . . . .	84
33. Degrees of ingenuity and difficulty of solution of fallacies . . . . .	88
34. Recapitulation . . . . .	90
NOTES . . . . .	97

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

vii

	Pages
APPENDIX A.	
Petitio principii . . . . .	176
APPENDIX B.	
Non causa pro causa . . . . .	186
APPENDIX C.	
Enstasis when a premiss is false . . . . .	192
APPENDIX D.	
<i>Kesal 'Apxai</i> , or method-founding principles . . . . .	203
§ 1. The dialectic maxims or loci are premisses of universal application . . . . .	203
§ 2. How far do the maxims of dialectic coincide with the axioms of science? The axioms are indispensable to all reasoning, necessary, and self-evident truths: the maxims have not these characters . . . . .	207
§ 3. Peculiar principles of science and dialectic. Examination of Mill's theory of definition . . . . .	209
§ 4. The maxims are instrumental or auxiliary truths. When dialectic is purely logical, the loci or topical conceptions are the materials as well as the instruments of proof . . . . .	210
§ 5. Examination of Whately's distinction of logical and extra-logical fallacies . . . . .	211
§ 6. The maxims are metaphysical or ontological propositions . . . . .	212
§ 7. The loci or maxims may all be grouped under the category of relation, or deduced from the definitions of the predicables or from the definition of definition . . . . .	214
§ 8. Dialectic is based on two definitions: the definition of proof supplies the loci of solution; the definition of definition supplies the loci of invention . . . . .	217
§ 9. An earlier system attempted to obtain the loci of invention as well as the loci of solution from the definition of proof . . . . .	219