

Refutation of abductive reasoning

© Copyright 2018 by Colin James III All rights reserved.

Abductive reasoning is defined from C.S. Peirce as:

The universal fact p is a truthity. But if q was a tautology, then p would necessarily follow.
Therefore possibly q exists as a truthity. (1.1)

Using Meth8/VL4,

LET # necessity, for all; % possibility, for one or some; > Imply; \ Not And
T is the designated proof value; N is truthity as (%p>#p); C is falsity as (%p<#p).

$((\#p=(\%p>\#p))\backslash((q=(q=q))>\#p)) > (\%q=(\%p>\#p)) ; \quad \text{CTNN CTNN CTNN CTNN} \quad (1.2)$

Eq 1.2 as rendered is *not* tautologous. This means abductive reasoning is refuted.