Refutation of Tarski's undefinability of truth theorem

From: Salehji, S. Theorems of Tarski's undefinability and Gödel's second incompleteness--computationally". 2017. arxiv.org/pdf/1509.00164.pdf

"Gödel's first incompleteness theorem is usually stated as "*no sound and R*[ecursively] *E*[numerable] *extension of P*[eano's] *A*[rithmetic] *can be complete*"; in notation $\mathrm{PA} \subseteq T \;\&\; T \in \Sigma_1 \;\&\; T \subseteq \mathrm{Th}(N) \Rightarrow T \neq \mathrm{Th}(N)$." (2.2.1)

"So, Tarski's theorem states that for any n, $\mathrm{Th}(N) \notin \Sigma_n$. For the sake of unifying it with Gödel's theorem let us present this theorem as
$(*)_n$ $\mathrm{PA} \subseteq T \;\&\; T \in \Sigma_n \;\&\; T \subseteq \mathrm{Th}(N) \Rightarrow \mathrm{Th}(N) \not\subseteq T$ stating that "no definable and sound extension of PA can be complete"." (2.2.2)

We rewrite Eq. 2.2.2 because "for any n, $\mathrm{Th}(N) \notin \Sigma_n$" is not expressed correctly.

$$\mathrm{PA} \subseteq T \;\&\; \mathrm{T} \in \Sigma_n \;\&\; T \subseteq \mathrm{Th}(N) \Rightarrow \mathrm{Th}(N) \not\subseteq \forall n \Sigma_n. \quad (2.2.3)$$

We assume the apparatus and method of Meth8/VŁ4 to evaluate Eq. 2.2.3.

The designated proof value is `T` for tautology; `F` is for contradiction.
The 16-valued truth table is presented row-major and horizontally.

LET: ~ Not; & And; + Or; > Imply, greater than; < Not Imply, less than;
necessity, all; % possibility, some;
pqrs: "PA"; T; *n*; *N*
#r $\forall n \Sigma_n$; (%s>#s) non-contingency truth value for Th(N); ~(q<p) (p ⊆q).

(~(q<p) & ((q<r)&~((%s>#s)<q))) > (#r<(%s>#s)) ; `TTTF TTTT TTTF TTTT` (2.2.4)

Eqs. 2.2.4 as rendered for Eq. 2.2.3 is *not* tautologous.