There is a large class of reasonings which are neither deductive nor inductive. I mean the inference of a cause from its effect or reasoning to a physical hypothesis. I call this reasoning \( \text{à posteriori} \). If I reason that certain conduct is wise because it has a character which belongs only to wise things, I reason \( \text{à priori} \). If I think it is wise because it once turned out to be wise, that is if I infer that is is wise on this occasion because it was wise on that occasion, I reason inductively. But if I think it is wise because a wise man does it, I then make the pure hypothesis that he does it because he is wise, and I reason \( \text{à posteriori} \). The form this reasoning assumes, is that of an inference of a minor premiss in any of the figures. The following is an example.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Light gives certain fringes} & \quad | \quad \text{Ether waves give certain fringes} \\
\text{Ether waves give these fringes} & \quad | \quad \text{Light is ether waves} \\
\therefore \text{Light is ether waves} & \quad | \quad \therefore \text{Light gives these fringes}.
\end{align*}
\]

The difference in their general character between the three kinds of reasoning is strongly marked. A consequent is inferred \( \text{à priori} \), an antecedent \( \text{à posteriori} \), and the nexus between them inductively.