The Non-Uniqueness of the Superposition Axioms

Modal 7 — Explained in the Style of a Chess Journalist

Paul Koop

Preliminary Note: How to Read This File

This file explains **Modal 7**: the question of whether the superposition axioms are the **only** way to derive the Trinity — or whether there are **other** extensions of S5 that also derive the Trinity.

It is written in the **same style** as the previous files: move by move, with symbol explanation at every step, with plain language for every statement.

What is presupposed: The files on Modal 5 and Modal 6 should have been read. In particular, the tableau rules, the superposition axioms ASP1–ASP5, and the minimality analysis are presupposed as known.

What this file achieves: It shows three things:

1. There are **at least four** systematically different extensions of S5 that derive the Trinity: superposition, topology, temporality, mereology.
2. The Trinity is **axiom-invariant** — it is not bound to a particular metaphysical language.
3. The choice of extension is a **metaphysical, physical, or hermeneutic** question — not a metalogical one.

Part I — The Question

1. What Does "Systematically Different" Mean?

Two extensions of S5 are **systematically different** if:

```
(1)  They use different non-logical symbols.       (linguistic)
(2)  They rest on different metaphysical basic concepts. (structural)
(3)  They are not equivalent in S5.                (semantic)
```

Symbol explanation:

- `S5`: the modal-logical system S5.
- `non-logical symbols`: signs that do not belong to the basic equipment of logic (e.g. `w_super`, `L`, `P`, `F`, $\preccurlyeq$).
- `equivalent in S5`: two extensions are equivalent if they have the same models in S5.

In plain language: Two extensions are systematically different if they **speak different languages**, use **different basic concepts**, and **do not** have the same models.

Important: Systematic difference is **stronger** than mere syntactic difference. Two extensions can be syntactically different but semantically equivalent (e.g., if they only permute the order of the axioms). Systematic difference requires **structural** difference.

2. The Four Extensions

Modal 7 constructs **four** extensions:

```
1.  Superposition (ASP1–ASP5)    – the previous way
2.  Topology (TOP1–TOP5)        – limit axioms
3.  Temporality (T1–T4)         – time modes
4.  Mereology (MER1–MER5)       – part-whole axioms
```

The question: Do all four derive the Trinity? And are they systematically different?

The answer (preview): Yes. All four derive `□∀x Tr(x)`. They are systematically different. The Trinity is **axiom-invariant**.

Part II — The Topological Extension (TOP)

1. The Basic Idea

The basic idea: Instead of superposition (of a primordial state), the topological extension uses the concept of the **limit**. The Trinity is understood as the **limes** of a sequence of worlds.

Metaphysical basic concepts: Limit, convergence, neighborhood, topology.

The new symbol: The **limit operator** `L` (read: “limes”). `L p` means: “p holds in the limit of a sequence of worlds.”

2. The Axioms TOP1–TOP5

```
TOP1   □(N p → p)
TOP2   □(L p → ◇p)
TOP3   □(L(p → q) → (L p → L q))
TOP4   □(N(U ∧ T ∧ S) → L(U ∧ T ∧ S))
TOP5   □(L(U ∧ T ∧ S) → □(U ∧ T ∧ S))
```

Symbol explanation:

- `N`: neighborhood operator. `N p` = “p holds in a neighborhood of the current world.”
- `L`: limit operator. `L p` = “p holds in the limit of a sequence of worlds.”
- `□`: necessity.
- `◇`: possibility.

- →: implication.
- ∧: conjunction.
- U, T, S: the three limit values of the Trinity.

In plain language:

- **TOP1:** What holds in a neighborhood also holds currently.
- **TOP2:** What holds in the limit is at least possible.
- **TOP3:** The limit operator distributes over implication.
- **TOP4:** If a neighborhood contains the Trinity, then so does the limit.
- **TOP5:** What holds in the limit holds necessarily.

3. The Proof in Plain Language

Goal: Show that in S5+TOP the Trinity is derivable.

The proof in five steps:

```
Step 1:  From A4: ◇∃w World(w).
Step 2:  From A1, A11, A12: ◇C (consciousness is possible).
Step 3:  From A13, A14, A15 and the equivalence of T, U, S: In every
         world with consciousness, a neighborhood holds in which the
         Trinity holds locally.
Step 4:  From TOP4: L(U ∧ T ∧ S).
Step 5:  From TOP5: □(U ∧ T ∧ S), i.e. □∀x Tr(x).
```

In plain language: If there is a neighborhood in which the Trinity holds, then it also holds in the limit (TOP4). And what holds in the limit holds necessarily (TOP5). So the Trinity holds necessarily.

The point: The topological extension derives the Trinity — but in a **structurally different way** than superposition. It does not use the concept of the primordial state, but the concept of the limit.

Part III — The Temporal Extension (TEMP)

1. The Basic Idea

The basic idea: Instead of superposition, the temporal extension uses the concept of **time**. The Trinity is understood as a **timeless structure** that manifests itself in the present.

Metaphysical basic concepts: Past, future, present, timelessness.

The new symbols:

```
P   Past:       "It was the case that p."
F   Future:     "It will be the case that p."
```

```
N   Present:    "It is now the case that p."
Z   Timelessness: "It is timelessly the case that p."
```

2. The Axioms T1–T4

```
T1   □(N p → p)
T2   □(P p → ¬N p)
T3   □(Z p → □p)
T4   □(◇p → (P p ∨ N p ∨ F p ∨ Z p))
```

Symbol explanation:

- `P`, `F`, `N`, `Z`: the four time modes.
- □: necessity.
- ◇: possibility.
- →: implication.
- ¬: negation.
- ∨: disjunction.

In plain language:

- **T1:** What is present is real.
- **T2:** What is past is not present.
- **T3:** What is timeless is necessary.
- **T4:** Every possibility is either past, present, future, or timeless.

3. The Proof in Plain Language

Goal: Show that in S5+T1–T4 the Trinity is derivable.

The proof in five steps:

```
Step 1:  From A4 and A1, A11, A12: ◇C.
Step 2:  By T4, ◇C is either P C, N C, F C, or Z C.
Step 3:  In each of these cases, from A13–A15 follows that the
         Trinity holds in a neighborhood of the present.
Step 4:  The Trinity is timeless – i.e. Z(U ∧ T ∧ S).
Step 5:  By T3: □(U ∧ T ∧ S), i.e. □∀x Tr(x).
```

In plain language: Every possibility has a temporal location (past, present, future, timelessness). In each of these locations, from the basic axioms follows that the Trinity holds. And because it holds timelessly, it holds necessarily (T3).

The point: The temporal extension uses **four** instead of five axioms. It is thus **axiomatically more parsimonious** than superposition — another sign of non-uniqueness.

Part IV — The Mereological Extension (MER)

1. The Basic Idea

The basic idea: Instead of superposition, the mereological extension uses the concept of **part-whole**. The Trinity is understood as a **whole** that encompasses its parts.

Metaphysical basic concepts: Part, whole, sum, integration.

The new symbols:

```
⩽       Part relation: "x is part of y."
Σ       Sum operator: "The sum of the x for which p(x) holds."
```

2. The Axioms MER1–MER5

```
MER1   □∀x (x ⩽ x)
MER2   □∀x∀y ((x ⩽ y ∧ y ⩽ x) → x = y)
MER3   □∀x∀y∀z ((x ⩽ y ∧ y ⩽ z) → x ⩽ z)
MER4   □∀p (∃x p(x) → ∃z (z = Σx . p(x)))
MER5   □∀x (x ⩽ Σy . Tr(y))
```

Symbol explanation:

- ⩽: part relation.
- Σ: sum operator.
- □: necessity.
- ∀: universal quantifier.
- ∃: existential quantifier.
- ∧: conjunction.
- →: implication.
- =: identity.

In plain language:

- **MER1:** Every thing is part of itself (reflexivity).
- **MER2:** If x is part of y and y is part of x, then x = y (antisymmetry).
- **MER3:** If x is part of y and y is part of z, then x is part of z (transitivity).
- **MER4:** For every non-empty property there is a sum.
- **MER5:** Every thing is part of the sum of all Trinitarian individuals.

3. The Proof in Plain Language

Goal: Show that in S5+MER the Trinity is derivable.

The proof in five steps:

```
Step 1:  From MER4: There is a sum Σx . Tr(x).
Step 2:  From MER5: Every individual is part of this sum.
Step 3:  From A1 (monism): There are no fundamentally separated
         realms – so the sum is Totality T.
Step 4:  From MER2 (antisymmetry): The sum is unique.
Step 5:  From A13–A15 and the uniqueness of the sum: □∀x Tr(x).
```

In plain language: There is a sum of all Trinitarian individuals. Every individual is part of this sum. Because there are no fundamentally separated realms (A1), the sum is Totality T. And because the sum is unique (MER2), the Trinity holds necessarily.

The point: The mereological extension uses the concept of part-whole — not that of superposition, not that of the limit, not that of time. It is **structurally different** from the other three.

Part V — The Comparison of the Four Extensions

1. What Do They Have in Common?

All four extensions:

```
(1)  Extend S5 by additional axioms.
(2)  Derive the Trinity: □∀x Tr(x).
(3)  Use monism (A1) as their foundation.
(4)  Are axiomatically non-redundant – every axiom contributes to the
     derivation.
```

2. What Distinguishes Them?

The table in plain language:

Criterion	Superposition	Topology	Temporality	Mereology
Basic concept	Primordial state	Limit	Time	Part-whole
Central operators	C, R	L, N	P, F, N, Z	≼, Σ
Number of axioms	5	5	4	5
Structure of derivation	Transfer	Convergence	Time modes	Sum
Metaphysical tradition	Schelling	Kant	Augustine	Aristotle
Physical analogy	Quantum mechanics	Topology	Arrow of time	Physics

In plain language: The four extensions differ in **basic concept**, **operators**, **number of axioms**, **structure of derivation**, **metaphysical tradition**, and **physical analogy**.

3. The Structural Difference

The four extensions are **structurally different**:

```
Superposition   locates the Trinity in a primordial state.
Topology        locates the Trinity in a limit.
Temporality     locates the Trinity in timelessness.
Mereology       locates the Trinity in the sum of all Trinitarian
                individuals.
```

These locations are **not equivalent**. They are different **perspectives** on the same structure.

Part VI — The Axiom Invariance

1. The Main Result

Theorem SYN: The Trinitarian formula $\Box\forall x\ Tr(x)$ is **axiom-invariant** in the sense that it follows from at least four systematically different extensions of S5.

Proof: Directly from Theorems TOP-A, TEMP-A, MER-A, and the result of Modal 5.

In plain language: The Trinity follows from **at least four** different extensions of S5. It is not bound to a particular metaphysical language.

2. What Follows?

Consequence 1: The Trinitarian structure is **not** bound to a particular metaphysical language. It is formulable in different languages.

Consequence 2: The choice of extension is **not** determined by the target statement alone. It depends on metaphysical, physical, or hermeneutic preferences.

Consequence 3: The question “Which extension is the right one?” is **not** a metalogical question. It is a metaphysical, physical, or hermeneutic question.

3. The Robustness of the Trinity

The fact that the Trinitarian formula follows from at least four systematically different extensions shows: It is **robust** with respect to the choice of metaphysical language. It is not a consequence of a particular axiomatics, but a **structure** that recurs in different axiomatics.

What remains: The **necessity of a supplementary structure at all**. Pure S5 is not sufficient (Modal 5). The supplementary structure is **unavoidable** — but its **form** is not unique.

Part VII — What Remains Open

1. The Question of the Canonical Extension

Question: Is there an extension that is **canonical** — i.e., one that is **distinguished** for metaphysical or physical reasons?

Possible answer: The superposition extension is distinguished by its proximity to quantum mechanics. But this distinction is **physical**, not **metalogical**.

2. The Question of Further Extensions

Question: Are there **further** systematically different extensions?

Possible answers:

```
An information-theoretic extension (information as basic concept).
A process-philosophical extension (process as basic concept).
A phenomenological extension (experience as basic concept).
```

What we have shown: There are **at least four**. Whether there are **exactly four** is open.

3. The Question of the Common Core

Question: All four extensions derive the Trinity. What is the **common core**?

Possible answer: The common core is the **necessity of a supplementary structure at all**. Pure S5 is not sufficient. But the form of the supplementary structure is variable.

Afterword

You have read this file. You have learned about the four extensions of S5: superposition, topology, temporality, mereology. You have seen that all four derive the Trinity — in structurally different ways.

What remains is the insight:

```
The Trinity is axiom-invariant.
It follows from at least four systematically different extensions.
The choice of extension is a metaphysical, physical, or hermeneutic
question – not a metalogical one.
```

The next file (Modal 8) treats the **topological refinement**: the formal version of the informal limit definition from Modal 5 with the operator L and the axioms L1–L7.

This file was written in the spirit of strict modal logic, yet in the language of a chess journalist — for the proof requires both: the precision of the formula and the vividness of the move.