

## Neutrosophic logic as a five-valued vector space

© Copyright 2018 by Colin James III All rights reserved.

Neutrosophic logic  $s$  is defined as a five-valued logic on  $\{-0, 0, 0 < p < 1, 1, 1+\}$ . (1.0)

Meth8/VL4 maps Eq. 1.0 as  $s = \{ F, C, C < p < N, N, T \}$ . (1.1)

LET:

$\%$  possibility, for one or some;  $\#$  necessity, for all ;

Values of  $s$  are:  $\#(\%p>\#p) 1+$ ;  $\#((\%p>\#p)-(\%p>\#p)) 0-$ ;  $\%(\%p>\#p) 1$ ;  $\%((\%p>\#p)-(\%p>\#p)) 0$ ;

and other values in between 0 to 1 as  $((s < \%(\%p>\#p)) \& (s > \%((\%p>\#p)-(\%p>\#p))))$ ;

$(p=p) \top$  tautology;  $\sim(p=p) \text{ F}$  contradiction;  $(\%p < \#p) \text{ C}$  falsity;  $(\%p > \#p) \text{ N}$  truthity.

$\top$  is the designated proof value; proof tables are row-major and horizontal.

$$((s = (\#(\%p > \#p) + \#((\%p > \#p) - (\%p > \#p)))) + (s = (\%(\%p > \#p) + \%((\%p > \#p) - (\%p > \#p)))) + ((s < \%(\%p > \#p)) \& (s > \%((\%p > \#p) - (\%p > \#p))))); \quad \text{CCCC CCCC TTTT TTTT} \quad (1.2)$$

Eq. 1.2 as rendered is *not* tautologous.

We now map the sub-indeterminacies  $I_1$ - $I_6$  as given in Florentin Smarandache (2015) "Symbolic neutrosophic theory".

$I_1$ :	$(p=p)$	$\&$	$\sim(p=p)$	;	FFFF
$I_2$ :	$(p=p)$	$+$	$\sim(p=p)$	;	TTTT
$I_3$ :	$(p=p)$	$-$	$\sim(p=p)$	;	FFFF
$I_4$ :	$\sim(p=p)$	$\&$	$\sim\sim(p=p)$	;	FFFF
$I_5$ :	$\sim(p=p)$	$+$	$\sim\sim(p=p)$	;	TTTT
$I_6$ :	$\sim(p=p)$	$\&$	$\sim\sim(p=p)$	;	FFFF

We replicate the look up truth table of the values above as published in Table 2: Sub-Indeterminacies Multiplication Law. We mark corrections in brackets to show the table as if it were bivalent.

* &	$I_1 \text{ F}$	$I_2 \text{ T}$	$I_3 \text{ F}$	$I_4 \text{ F}$	$I_5 \text{ T}$	$I_6 \text{ F}$
$I_1 \text{ F}$	F	F	F	F	F	F
$I_2 \text{ T}$	F	T	F	F	F [T]	F
$I_3 \text{ F}$	F	F	F	F	F	F
$I_4 \text{ F}$	F	F	F	F	F	F
$I_5 \text{ T}$	F	F [T]	F	F	T	F
$I_6 \text{ F}$	F	F	F	F	F	F

Table 2 as rendered is not bivalent on its face. Consequently we abandon neutrosophic logic because it is a vector space (not *necessarily* bivalent). Hence neutrosophic logic may not be adopted as the universal logic to map and confirm all other logics.