

## Refutation of coalgebraic geometric modal logic

© Copyright 2018 by Colin James III All rights reserved.

**Abstract:** Two definitions are *not* tautologous, hence denying the monotone functor on KHaus. What follows is that the use of coalgebra to manufacture a geometric modal logic is refuted. Therefore the conjecture is a *non* tautologous fragment of the universal logic  $V\mathbb{L}4$ .

We assume the method and apparatus of Meth8/ $V\mathbb{L}4$  with Tautology as the designated proof value,  $\mathbf{F}$  as contradiction,  $\mathbf{N}$  as truthity (non-contingency), and  $\mathbf{C}$  as falsity (contingency). The 16-valued truth table is row-major and horizontal, or repeating fragments of 128-tables, sometimes with table counts, for more variables. (See ersatz-systems.com.)

LET  $\sim$  Not,  $\neg$ ;  $+$  Or,  $\vee, \cup$ ;  $-$  Not Or;  $\&$  And,  $\wedge, \cap, \cdot$ ;  $\setminus$  Not And;  
 $>$  Imply, greater than,  $\rightarrow, \Rightarrow, \mapsto, \succ, \supset, \rightrightarrows$ ;  
 $<$  Not Imply, less than,  $\in, \prec, \subset, \not\subset, \neq, \leftarrow, \preceq$ ;  
 $=$  Equivalent,  $\equiv, :=, \Leftrightarrow, \leftrightarrow, \triangleq, \approx, \cong$ ;  $@$  Not Equivalent,  $\neq$ ;  
 $\%$  possibility, for one or some,  $\exists, \diamond, \mathbf{M}$ ;  $\#$  necessity, for every or all,  $\forall, \square, \mathbf{L}$ ;  
 $(z=z)$   $\mathbf{T}$  as tautology,  $\mathbf{T}$ , ordinal 3;  $(z@z)$   $\mathbf{F}$  as contradiction,  $\emptyset, \text{Null}, \perp, \text{zero}$ ;  
 $(\%z\>\#z)$   $\mathbf{N}$  as non-contingency,  $\Delta$ , ordinal 1;  
 $(\%z<\#z)$   $\mathbf{C}$  as contingency,  $\nabla$ , ordinal 2;  
 $\sim(y < x)$  ( $x \leq y$ ), ( $x \subseteq y$ );  $(A=B)$  ( $A \sim B$ );  $(B > A)$  ( $A \vdash B$ );  $(B > A)$  ( $A \neq B$ ).  
 Note for clarity, we usually distribute quantifiers onto each designated variable.

From: Bezhnashvili, N.; de Groot, J.; Venema, Y. (2019).  
 Coalgebraic geometric logic. [arxiv.org/pdf/1903.08837.pdf](https://arxiv.org/pdf/1903.08837.pdf)  
[n.bezhanishvili@uva.nl](mailto:n.bezhanishvili@uva.nl) [y.venema@uva.nl](mailto:y.venema@uva.nl) [jim.degroot@anu.edu.au](mailto:jim.degroot@anu.edu.au)

Abstract: Using the theory of coalgebra, we introduce a uniform framework for adding modalities to the language of propositional geometric logic.

4 The monotone functor on KHaus: Definition 4.4. Let  $F$  be a frame. Let  $MF$  be the frame generated by  $\square a, \diamond a$ , where  $a$  ranges over  $F$ , subject to the relations [ ... where  $a, b \in F$  and  $A$  is a directed subset of  $F$ .] (4.4.0)

**Remark 4.4.0:** The clauses invoking  $F$  above are ignored because the equations below as consequents do not contain  $F$ .

$$\square(a \wedge b) \leq \square a \quad (\text{M1}) \quad (4.4.1.1)$$

LET  $p, q: a, b$

$$\sim(\#p \leq \#(p \& q)) = (p = p); \quad \text{TCTT TCTT TCTT TCTT} \quad (4.4.1.2)$$

$$\diamond a \leq \diamond(a \vee b) \quad (\text{M4}) \quad (4.4.4.1)$$

$$\sim(\% (p+q) < \% p) = (p=p) ; \quad \text{TTCT TTCT TTCT TTCT} \quad (4.4.4.2)$$

Eqs. 4.4.1.2 and 4.4.4.2 as rendered are *not* tautologous, hence denying the monotone functor on KHaus. What follows is that the use of coalgebra to manufacture a geometric modal logic is refuted.