

**“When we see smoke rising from the chimney of a house we may develop the certainty that a fire has been lit in that house. We cannot see the fire directly, but using the presence of the smoke as a sign, or reason, we know without a doubt that there is (or has been) a fire. Therefore, smoke is a correct sign indicating the existence of fire, and the mind that realizes the existence of fire in dependence upon this sign is an inferential valid cognizer.”**

**— Geshe Kelsang Gyatso,  
*Heart of Wisdom*, p. 27**

# Syllogistic Reasoning Example

Write out the three parts of the syllogism in the labeled spaces below. Of the conclusion (Lat. *probandum*), the subject is the factor or part *already* established and not in question, while the predicate is the factor *to be* established.

**In the house**

*subject*

**there is a fire**

*predicate*

because

**there is smoke.**

*reason*

To see if the probandum is incontrovertibly established by a conclusive reason, contemplate whether the reason is qualified by the three modes. The first mode checks whether the reason given is *relevant* to the subject. The second and third modes check whether the reason applies to the predicate *in general*, and not just with this particular subject.

**In the house**

*subject*

**there is smoke.**

*reason*

1. Property of the subject  
(the subject has the characteristic of the reason)

**Wherever there is smoke**

*If the reason always applies...*

**there is a fire.**

*...then the predicate must apply.*

2. Forward pervasion
- natural relationship
  - causal relationship

**If there is no fire**

*If the predicate does not apply...*

**there is no smoke.**

*...then the reason must also not apply.*

3. Reverse pervasion

# Syllogistic Reasoning Worksheet

Write out the three parts of the syllogism in the labeled spaces below. Of the conclusion (Lat. *probandum*), the subject is the factor or part *already* established and not in question, while the predicate is the factor *to be* established.

_____	_____	because	_____
<i>subject</i>	<i>predicate</i>		<i>reason</i>

To see if the probandum is incontrovertibly established by a conclusive reason, contemplate whether the reason is qualified by the three modes. The first mode checks whether the reason given is *relevant* to the subject. The second and third modes check whether the reason applies to the predicate *in general*, and not just with this particular subject.

_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/> 1. Property of the subject <i>(the subject has the characteristic of the reason)</i>
<i>subject</i>	<i>reason</i>	
_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/> 2. Forward pervasion  <input type="checkbox"/> natural relationship <input type="checkbox"/> causal relationship
<i>If the reason always applies...</i>	<i>...then the predicate must apply.</i>	
_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/> 3. Reverse pervasion
<i>If the predicate does <u>not</u> apply...</i>	<i>...then the reason must also <u>not</u> apply.</i>	