In some senses of argument, an argument is a system containing a constituent set of propositions called its premises and a constituent single proposition called its conclusion. Typically, texts presenting arguments begin with premise representations and end with conclusion representations—reflecting etymologies of premise and conclusion.

In artificially narrow senses of proposition, a proposition is a system containing a constituent term called its subject and a constituent term called its predicate. The following extended analogy.

As argument is to premise and to conclusion, so proposition is to subject and to predicate, respectively.

Argument and proposition are sortal nouns like term: the other words are relational nouns like constituent. They do not indicate sorts but rather are used to express relations from one sort to another. Calling something a premise (or conclusion) is incomplete—without including of which argument or arguments. In a broader sense, proposition is coextensive but not synonymous with premise (or conclusion) of some argument. Calling something a subject (or predicate) is incomplete—without including of which proposition or propositions. In certain contexts, term is coextensive but not synonymous with subject (or predicate) of some proposition.

The word pro-tasis is etymologically a near equivalent of pre-mise, pro-position, and ante-cedent—all having positional, relational connotations now totally absent in contemporary use of proposition. Taking protasis for premise, Aristotle’s statement (24a16)

A protasis is a sentence affirming or denying something of something….is not a definition of premise—intensionally: the relational feature is absent. Likewise, it is not a general definition of proposition—extensionally: it is too narrow. This paper explores recent literature on these issues.