

brief and clear and anyway are unnecessary. However, the suppression of ^{an} obvious implication is both easily illustrated and of some importance. It has led to the view that there is an argument from analogy distinct from other inference; also, it made Newman say that the mind proceeds from fact to fact. Both may be disposed of in a single example:

Border war between Sparta and Messene was disastrous;

Therefore, border war between Athens and Thebes will be disastrous. Now either the premise implies the conclusion or it does not; if it does not, then the inference is invalid; if it does imply, then the inference is informal; to make it formal the implication must be stated. Such a statement in this and all similar cases is had by constructing a conditional sentence with the premise as protasis and the conclusion as apodosis. The conversion of categorical propositions has been erected into a special type of inference called immediate inference; in fact it is informal inference for the same reason as the preceding. Serious logicians have been worried for some time by what are called concrete inferences; examples are:

$A = B; A = C; \text{ therefore } B=C.$

A is ~~to the~~ ten miles to the north of B;
B is ten miles to the east of C;
Therefore, A is north-east of C.

John is Mary's uncle;
Edward is John's son;
Therefore, Edward and Mary are first cousins.

Now these are simply informal inferences because the implication of the premises is too obvious to be mentioned; they differ from the ~~preceding~~ preceding in that the implication here is in ^{the premises} ~~both propositions~~ taken conjointly. The formal expression of the first would be:

If A equals both B and C, then B equals C;

A equals both B and C;

Therefore, B equals C.

It is worth noting that the intellect in an inference from a principle is not bound to use the principle in its greatest generality. That ~~is~~ would merely an impression that arises from studying Euclid, where we are taught to make acknowledgement to the axiom every time we find A equal to B and B equal to C. But ~~is~~ clearly the mind that recognises the truth of the axiom can also recognise ^{the} truth relating to A, B and C without referring to the axiom. The same is true in syllogism; the mind may for example recognise that pedantry implies some mental kink and may aver consequently that "All pedants are mentally unbalanced". But when it