

## Refutation of two modern modal logics: JYB4 and follow-on AR4

© Copyright 2018 by Colin James III All rights reserved.

We assume the method and apparatus of Meth8/VL4 with  $\tau$ autology as the designated *proof* value,  $F$  as contradiction,  $N$  as truthity (non-contingency), and  $C$  as falsity (contingency). The 16-valued truth table is row-major and horizontal.

LET:  $\sim$  Not;  $+$  Or;  $\&$  And;  $>$  Imply, greater than;  
 $\%$  possibility, possibly, for one or some;  $\#$  necessity, necessarily, for every or all.

See: J.-Y. Béziau. (2011). "A new four-valued approach to modal logic". *Logique & Analyse*, Vol. 54.  
 J.-Y. Béziau. (2005). "Paraconsistent logic from a modal viewpoint". *Journal of Applied Logic*.

We name this system JYB4, after its writer Jean-Yves Béziau. It is less a logic system and more of a model checking system based on 13 axioms for which  $p$  and  $q$  are assigned  $\pm 1$  to evaluate models by arithmetic.

$(\%p\&\%q)>\%(p\&q)$ ;	TTTT TTTT TTTT TTTT	( 1.2)
$\#p>p$ ;	TTTT TTTT TTTT TTTT	( 2.2)
$\sim(p\>\#p)=(p=p)$ ;	FCFC FCFC FCFC FCFC	( 3.2) x
$p>\%p$ ;	TTTT TTTT TTTT TTTT	( 4.2)
$\sim(\%p>p)=(p=p)$ ;	CFCF CFCF CFCF CFCF	( 5.2) x
$\#p>\%p$ ;	TTTT TTTT TTTT TTTT	( 6.2)
$\sim(\%p>\#p)=(p=p)$ ;	CCCC CCCC CCCC CCCC	( 7.2) x
$(\#p\&\#q)=\#(p\&q)$ ;	TTTT TTTT TTTT TTTT	( 8.2)
$\sim(\#(p+q)>(\#p+\#q))=(p=p)$ ;	FFFF FFFF FFFF FFFF	( 9.2) x
$(\#p+\#q)>\#(p+q)$ ;	TTTT TTTT TTTT TTTT	(10.2)
$(\%p+\%q)=\%(p+q)$ ;	TTTT TTTT TTTT TTTT	(11.2)
$\sim((\%p\&\%q)>\%(p\&q))=(p=p)$ ;	FFFF FFFF FFFF FFFF	(12.2) x
$\%(p\&q)>(\%p\&\%q)$ ;	TTTT TTTT TTTT TTTT	(13.2)

From: [academia.edu/27012333/A\\_Doxastic\\_Interpretation\\_of\\_4-Valued\\_Modal\\_Logic](http://academia.edu/27012333/A_Doxastic_Interpretation_of_4-Valued_Modal_Logic)

We name the extension below as doxistic "deviant" logic system AR4, after its writer Fabian Schang.

$\#p=\sim\%p$ ;	TTTT TTTT TTTT TTTT	(14.2)
$\%p=\sim\#p$ ;	TTTT TTTT TTTT TTTT	(15.2)
Paracomplete negation: $\sim p=\#p$ ;	NTNT NTNT NTNT NTNT ;	(16.0.1) x
Paraconsistent negation $\sim p=\sim\#p$ ;	TNTN TNTN TNTN TNTN ;	(17.0.1) x
$\sim p=\%p$ ;	TNTN TNTN TNTN TNTN	(17.0.2) x
$\sim\#p=\%p$ ;	TTTT TTTT TTTT TTTT	(17.0.3)

For JYB4 Eqs. 1.2-13.2 as rendered, 5 of 13 or about 38% are *not* tautologous. For AR4 Eqs. 14.2-17.0.3, 3 of 6 or 50% are *not* tautologous. We conclude that those statistics remove JYB4 and AR4 from further serious consideration as viable modern modal four-valued logics.