

## Christ Church Library, Carroll Collection

Digitised image notes and captions by Edward Wakeling

### Carroll-MS 7 - Further sections of *Symbolic Logic, Part II, Advanced*

#### Introductory notes:

These are other logical manuscripts from the Warner Bequest. They concern standard logical fallacies, as listed by W. S. Jevons *Elementary Lessons in Logic* (1876), Lesson XXI, "Material Fallacies," from page 177. Clearly, Dodgson intended to explain these fallacies in *Symbolic Logic, Part II, Advanced*, but the book was only planned in outline as these headings reveal, and not completed.

Carroll-mss\_0043-ms7\_01\_r

Dodgson indicated that this was to form part of Book XV - Fallacies, in his second volume of *Symbolic Logic*. Bartley does not include Book XV in his reconstruction. The literal translation of the Latin "a dicto secundum quid ad dictum simpliciter" is "from an unqualified statement to a qualified one" and represents the logical fallacy known as "A Fallacy of Converse Accident." For example, "If we allow people with terminal cancer to use medical marijuana, then everyone should be allowed to use medical marijuana" is a fallacious argument based on a generalisation.

Carroll-mss\_0044-ms7\_01\_v

The verso is blank

Carroll-mss\_0045-ms7\_02\_r

Logical heading only for "Argumentum ad hominem" (Argument to the man). This is an argument deriving its power from the situation of one's opponent - for example, advice to a barrister might be "If you have a bad case to defend, abuse the plaintiff's attorney."

Carroll-mss\_0046-ms7\_02\_v

The verso is blank

Carroll-mss\_0047-ms7\_03\_r

The “change of epoch” is Dodgson’s heading for more fallacious arguments – two examples are given. The first example comes from W. S. Jevons’ *Elementary Lessons in Logic* (1876), page 319, number 64. The second example, described as ancient, is probably Aristotelian.

Carroll-mss\_0048-ms7\_03\_v

The verso is blank

Carroll-mss\_0049-ms7\_04\_r

The heading, “Denying what has not been asserted,” is exemplified by an argument of Dodgson’s own invention, as shown by his monogram.

Carroll-mss\_0050-ms7\_04\_v

The verso is blank

Carroll-mss\_0051-ms7\_05\_r

Dodgson provides the heading “Ignoratio Elenchi” (Irrelevant Conclusion) to indicate that he intended to include a section on this form of fallacious argument. It involves arguing to the wrong point or proving one thing in such a manner that it is supposed to be something else that is proved. The literal translation of the Latin is “an ignoring of a refutation.” For example, “I should not pay a fine for reckless driving. There are dangerous criminals on the street and the police should be chasing them instead of me.” This fallacy might be colloquially called “missing the point.”

Carroll-mss\_0052-ms7\_05\_v

The verso is blank

Carroll-mss\_0053-ms7\_06\_r

This heading, "Petitio Principii," is better known as "begging the question." This fallacy takes the conclusion itself as one of the premises of an argument. An example might be "Since I'm not lying, it follows that I am telling the truth."

Carroll-mss\_0054-ms7\_06\_v

The verso is blank

Carroll-mss\_0055-ms7\_07\_r

The phrase "Post hoc ergo propter hoc" (after this and therefore in consequence of this) is used to describe a fallacy based on a false cause. For example, "A cock crows immediately before sunrise, therefore the cock crowing causes the sun to rise."

Carroll-mss\_0056-ms7\_07\_r

[this is a mistake and probably doesn't exist - a second recto! - it's blank!]

Carroll-mss\_0057-ms7\_07\_v

The verso is blank