

Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-09/msg00224.html>

- *From:* "futurist" <adamgolding@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 6 Sep 2005 11:07:22 -0700
-

Torkel Franzen wrote:

> "futurist" <adamgolding@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> writes:
>
>> these two modes of reasoning seem fundamentally different to me, and
>> thus seem to deserve separate names in ND, which is supposed to model
>> natural reasoning, after all.
>
> But we use exactly the same rules in proving results of the form
> $G \Rightarrow \sim A$ and in proving results of the form $\Rightarrow \sim A$.

indeed—I suppose i'm objecting more the appropriateness of the english and latin names in the way they are currently mapped onto the logical rules.

when i hear 'contradiction' i tend to assume 'self-contradiction' .. i.e. the 'statment' which is sometimes represented by 'F' is said to be a 'contradiction' meaning that it is a 'self-contradiction'—similarly with more specific contradictions, i.e. $P \& \sim P$, and so on. thus, it would seem, for consistency's sake, that 'proof by contradiction' should be sort for 'proof by self-contradiction'—furthermore 'reduction ad absurdum' is suppose to be 'poof by contradiction' and thus RAA should be 'proof by self-contradiction'.

if there is a rule in ND which covers both what RAA and RAF should mean in english latin, that rule should be given a more general name which does not make it seem more specific than it is.

also, the result $G \Rightarrow \sim A$ could concievably be proven in either way—by a self-contradiction in A, or by a contradiction between A and G—so i suppose what i said earlier about the essential differenc—what matters is not so much whether there **are** premises, but whether the premises are required to generate the contradiction.

.

Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum

- *Follow-Ups:*
 - ◆ **Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum**
 - ◇ *From:* Torkel Franzen

- *References:*
 - ◆ **Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum**
 - ◇ *From:* adamgolding
 - ◆ **Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum**
 - ◇ *From:* Torkel Franzen
 - ◆ **Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum**
 - ◇ *From:* futurist
 - ◆ **Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum**
 - ◇ *From:* Torkel Franzen
 - ◆ **Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum**
 - ◇ *From:* futurist
 - ◆ **Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum**
 - ◇ *From:* Torkel Franzen

- Prev by Date: **Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum**
- Next by Date: **Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum**
- Previous by thread: **Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum**
- Next by thread: **Re: reductio ad falsum versus reductio ad absurdum**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**