

Refutation of modal logic with the difference modality of topological T_0 -spaces

© Copyright 2018 by Colin James III All rights reserved.

We assume the method and apparatus of Meth8/VL4 with Tautology as the designated *proof* value, **F** as contradiction, **N** as truthity (non-contingency), and **C** as falsity (contingency). Results are a 16-valued truth table in row-major and horizontal, or repeating fragments of 128-tables for more variables.

LET $p, q, r, s;$
 \sim Not, \neg ; $+$ Or, \vee ; $\&$ And, \wedge ; $=$ Equivalent; $>$ Imply;
 $\#$ necessity, for all or every, \square , \forall ; $\%$ possibility, for one or some, \diamond ;
 $[\neq]$ $\sim\#$; $\langle \neq \rangle$ $\sim\%$; $\diamond A = \neg \square \neg A$; $\langle \neq \rangle A = \neg [\neq] \neg A$; $[\neq] A \wedge A = [\forall] A$.

From: Aghamov, R. (2018). Modal logic with the difference modality of topological T_0 -spaces.
arxiv.org/pdf/1810.02150.pdf agamov@phystech.edu

In this paper we will use the following axioms:

$$(D_{\square}) \quad [\forall]p \rightarrow \square p, \quad (2.4.1)$$

$$(\sim\#p\&p)\>\#p ; \quad \text{TNTN TNTN TNTN TNTN} \quad (2.4.2)$$

$$(B_D) \quad p \rightarrow [\neq]\langle \neq \rangle p, \quad (2.5.1)$$

$$p\>\sim(\#(\sim\#p=(p=p))=(p=p)); \quad \text{TCTC TCTC TCTC TCTC} \quad (2.5.2)$$

$$(AT_0) \quad (p \wedge [\neq]\neg p \wedge \langle \neq \rangle (q \wedge [\neq]\neg q)) \rightarrow (\square \neg q \vee \langle \neq \rangle (q \wedge \square \neg p)) \quad (2.7.1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & ((p\&\sim\#p)\&\sim(\#(\sim(q\&\sim\#q)=(p=p))=(p=p)))\> \\ & (\#q+\sim(\#(\sim(q\&\#p)=(p=p))=(p=p))=(p=p)); \end{aligned} \quad \text{TNTN TNTN TNTN TNTN} \quad (2.7.2)$$

We introduce the notation for the following logics:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{S4D} &= \mathbf{K}_2 + T_{\square} + 4_{\square} + D_{\square} + B_D + 4_D \\ \mathbf{S4DT}_0 &= \mathbf{S4D} + AT_0 \end{aligned}$$

Eqs. 2.4.2, 2.5.2, and 2.7.2 as rendered are *not* tautologous. This means logics **S4D** and **S4DT₀** are also *not* tautologous. Hence, modal logic with the difference modality of topological T_0 -spaces is refuted.