Resolution Matrix Semantics for Modal Logic: Philosophical Implications of Indeterminacy and Poly-Logic Thinking

Andrey Kuznetsov
andreyk@telus.net

The Resolution Matrix Semantics (RMS) framework introduces a transformative approach to modal logic by prioritizing truth values over relational structures, using "blinking" indeterminate truth values (e.g., t for "either necessary truth or contingent truth") and sub-interpretations to resolve them (Kuznetsov[1]). This framework resonates with the poly-logic nature of human cognition, where thinking is not confined to a single logical pathway but involves multiple, concurrent streams of reasoning guided by what Vladimir Bibler terms "poly-logic substantive control" (Bibler[2]). This essay explores the philosophical implications of RMS, particularly its sub-interpretation mechanism, and argues that it mirrors the inherently poly-logic structure of human thought. By drawing parallels with Bibler's philosophy, incorporating insights from quantum cognitive models, and extending these ideas to computational paradigms like parallel computing, RMS offers a model for a pluralistic, precise, and rapid approach to thinking and decision-making.

Indeterminate Truth Values: Capturing Cognitive Ambiguity

Classical logic, with its bivalent true/false framework, often fails to reflect the nuanced, ambiguous nature of human reasoning. In daily life, we navigate uncertainty—truths that are context-dependent or partially determined. RMS's indeterminate truth values, such as t (either tn or tc), f (either fc or fn), or t/f (fully indeterminate), formalize this ambiguity. For example, in ethical reasoning, a proposition like "this action is permissible" might be t—necessarily true (tn) under strict moral codes or contingently true (tc) in specific contexts. This "blinking" quality of truth values aligns with how humans hold provisional beliefs, adjusting them as new information emerges.

Philosophically, this echoes non-classical logics like fuzzy logic or Graham Priest's paraconsistent Logic of Paradox, which accommodate truth value gaps and gluts (Zadeh[9]; Priest[3]). RMS's indeterminate values provide a formal structure for epistemic states where certainty is elusive, such as in scientific inquiry (e.g., a hypothesis with partial evidence) or personal decision-making (e.g., trusting an uncertain source). By embracing ambiguity, RMS offers a logical framework that is closer to the fluid, adaptive nature of human cognition than the rigid possible-worlds semantics of Kripke (Kripke[8]).

Reinterpreting Modal Logic: Changing the Observer, Not the World

Traditionally, modal logic has been understood through the lens of classical logic operating across multiple "possible worlds." In this view, the rules of classical logic hold absolutely within each world, and modality arises from the relational structure between them. However, Resolution Matrix Semantics suggests a profound shift in perspective: instead of multiplying worlds, we multiply interpretations within a single world, embracing uncertain or indeterminate truth values. Modal logic, on this view, does not reflect a proliferation of realities but a diversification of perspectives. We modify not the world itself, but the observer—who now applies multiple, interacting logics ("poly-logics") to the same reality. Modal truths thus emerge as balanced, common outcomes across diverse interpretative logics, mediated by a form of poly-logic substantive control. This reorientation mirrors a fundamental philosophical move: from an ontology of many worlds to an epistemology of complex observers, emphasizing that modal reasoning is less about external multiplicity and more about the internal richness and flexibility of cognitive perspectives.

The sub-interpretation mechanism in RMS is its most philosophically striking feature. Instead of a singular interpretation function, RMS evaluates formulas across multiple sub-interpretations, each resolving indeterminate values (e.g., t into tn or tc) consistently across subformulas. A formula is valid only if it takes tn or tc in every sub-interpretation. This process mirrors the poly-logic structure of human thought, as articulated by Vladimir Bibler in his philosophy of dialogic logic (Bibler[2]). Bibler argues that human thinking is inherently poly-logic, guided by a "substantive control" that integrates pre-reflective ideas, intuitions, and feelings with multiple logical frameworks. This control is not a fixed rule but a dynamic, unifying principle that shapes how we apply diverse logics concurrently to make sense of the world.

For Bibler, poly-logic substantive control emerges from the dialogue between different cultural, historical, and personal perspectives, each embodying its own logic. In reasoning, we don't follow a single deductive path; we entertain multiple interpretive threads—logical, emotional, and intuitive—guided by an overarching sense of meaning. For instance, when resolving a moral dilemma, we might simultaneously apply deontic logic (duty-based reasoning), utilitarian logic (outcome-based reasoning), and emotional intuition (empathy-driven reasoning), with our substantive control ensuring coherence across these perspectives. RMS's sub-interpretations formalize this process: each sub-interpretation represents a distinct logical thread, and validity requires convergence across all threads, reflecting the robustness of conclusions under poly-logic scrutiny.

This parallelism resonates with real-world decision-making. Consider a juror evaluating evidence in a trial: lacking complete information, they explore multiple scenarios (e.g., the defendant's guilt as tn under strong evidence or tc under circumstantial clues), testing inferences that hold across all plausible interpretations. This mirrors RMS's mechanism, where sub-interpretations run in parallel, ensuring that only robust truths survive. Philosophically, this aligns with phenomenological accounts, such as Maurice Merleau-Ponty's emphasis on the multiplicity of perceptual perspectives, and pragmatist views, like William James's, which prioritize truths that work across contexts (Merleau-Ponty[4]; James[5]). RMS thus offers a formal model for poly-logic thinking, where substantive control—whether Bibler's dialogic unity or RMS's validity criterion—guides the integration of diverse logical streams.

Quantum Cognition: Indeterminacy as a Foundational Principle

Recent studies suggest that human cognition may operate on principles akin to quantum physics, where uncertainty and superposition are not mere constructs but fundamental to how the brain processes information. This perspective strengthens the case for RMS's poly-logic framework as a natural model for human thought. For instance, research by Jerome Busemeyer and Peter Bruza in *Quantum Models of Cognition and Decision* (2012) proposes that cognitive processes, such as decision-making under uncertainty, exhibit quantum-like properties, including superposition (holding multiple conflicting states simultaneously) and entanglement (correlated judgments across contexts). Their work demonstrates that quantum probability models better predict human behavior in ambiguous scenarios, such as the conjunction fallacy, than classical probability models (Busemeyer & Bruza[13]).

Similarly, Alexander Wendt's *Quantum Mind and Social Science* (2015) argues that the brain's neural networks may exploit quantum coherence, enabling parallel processing of indeterminate states akin to RMS's sub-interpretations. Wendt suggests that this quantum foundation allows humans to navigate ambiguity by simultaneously evaluating multiple possibilities, much like RMS's parallel evaluation of truth values. These findings imply that poly-logic thinking, with its embrace of indeterminate values and concurrent reasoning, is not an artificial construction but a reflection of the brain's intrinsic quantum-like operations (Wendt[14]). In this light, RMS's indeterminate truth values (e.g., t/f mirroring a qubit's superposition) and sub-interpretations (akin to resolving quantum states) appear as organic extensions of cognitive processes, grounding poly-logic systems in the fundamental mechanics of the mind.

This quantum cognitive perspective has profound implications for philosophy and technology. If indeterminacy and poly-logic thinking are foundational to cognition, RMS provides a logical framework that aligns with these principles, making it a natural fit for modeling human reasoning. Moreover, polylogics and indeterminate values emerge as critical foundations for future investigations in philosophy, computer science, artificial intelligence, and natural language processing (NLP). For example, in NLP, RMS-inspired models could handle ambiguous language by processing multiple semantic interpretations in parallel, improving machine understanding of context-dependent meanings. In AI, poly-logic systems could enhance decision-making under uncertainty, enabling more human-like reasoning in complex, real-world environments.

From Everett to Kripke, From Copenhagen to RMS: Two Paths Through Indeterminacy

In quantum physics, the behavior of micro-particles is governed not by deterministic trajectories, but by waves of probability, predicting outcomes in terms of likelihoods rather than certainties. Two main interpretations attempt to explain this fundamental indeterminacy. The Copenhagen interpretation, championed by Niels Bohr and others, posits that probabilities are intrinsic to the micro-world itself: particles exist in a superposed, probabilistic state until measured (Bohr[6]). In contrast, Everett's Many-Worlds interpretation suggests that every possible outcome actually occurs in a branching multiverse, with each branch obeying classical deterministic laws within its own isolated universe (Everett[7]). Despite their profound philosophical differences, both interpretations offer adequate, empirically equivalent accounts of quantum phenomena, with no decisive experimental evidence favoring one over the other.

A striking parallel exists between these interpretations of quantum physics and the foundations of modal logic. Kripkean possible worlds models resemble Everett's multiverse: each possible world represents a classical logical structure, and modality arises from accessibility relations between these distinct, fully determined worlds. But what, then, is the analogue of the Copenhagen interpretation within modal logic? Here, Resolution Matrix Semantics provides an answer. Instead of positing multiple worlds, RMS embraces indeterminate (uncertain) truth values as a fundamental feature of logical systems themselves, treating "blinking" truth assignments as natural states of logical propositions prior to resolution. Modal logic under RMS thus emerges as a system of poly-logics, where a proposition's status reflects the convergence of multiple interpretative streams rather than a singular, classical verdict in each isolated world. In this way, RMS offers a vision of modality that is epistemologically richer and arguably more aligned with human cognitive processes, as will be explored further throughout this paper.

Poly-Logic Thinking: A Natural Human Process

Human cognition is rarely mono-logic; it is a tapestry of overlapping logics shaped by pre-reflective ideas and feelings. Bibler's concept of poly-logic substantive control suggests that before we apply formal logic, we are guided by an intuitive, pre-logical framework—a blend of cultural norms, emotions, and tacit knowledge—that constrains and directs our reasoning (Bibler[2]). For example, when deciding whether to invest in a project, one might weigh logical analysis (financial projections), intuitive trust in the team, and emotional enthusiasm for the vision. These elements form a substantive control that shapes how we deploy deductive, inductive, or abductive logics in parallel, selecting conclusions that align with this guiding framework.

RMS's sub-interpretation mechanism captures this natural poly-logic process. Each sub-interpretation can be seen as a distinct logical perspective, akin to the different logics (e.g., epistemic, deontic, or practical) we apply in thinking. The requirement that a formula be valid across all sub-interpretations reflects the human tendency to seek conclusions that are robust under multiple lenses, guided by an implicit substantive control. In AI ethics, for instance, a developer might evaluate an algorithm's fairness using formal criteria (tn for universal fairness), contextual factors (tc for situation-specific fairness), and ethical intuitions, with RMS modeling this as parallel sub-interpretations unified by a validity check.

This poly-logic view challenges the traditional philosophical ideal of rationality as a singular, deductive process. Instead, it aligns with feminist and postcolonial critiques of monolithic reason, which advocate for pluralistic epistemologies that incorporate diverse ways of knowing (Gilligan[11]; Harding[12]). By formalizing poly-logic thinking, RMS not only mirrors human cognition but also elevates it as a normative model for rational inquiry, emphasizing resilience and adaptability in the face of uncertainty.

The Resolution Matrix Semantics (RMS) framework reveals a profound analogy to the traditional logic of concepts, where a concept's volume (its scope of applicability) inversely correlates with its content (the specificity of its attributes). In RMS, systems like Km, defined by minimal axioms such as propositional tautologies and the Distribution Axiom, exhibit maximal indeterminacy in their truth values (e.g., t, f, t/f), reflecting a broad volume that encompasses a wide array of modal logics with minimal constraints. In contrast, S5m, enriched with axioms K, D, T, 4, and 5, restricts truth values to determinate outcomes (tn or fn), narrowing its volume to highly specific contexts while maximizing content through precise semantic assignments. This dynamic mirrors human cognition, which begins in a state of near-total indeterminacy—most evident at birth, when experience is minimal and possibilities are vast. From this initial vagueness, the mind constructs concurrent logical pathways, each solidifying into more determinate frameworks as experience provides new details, transforming broad potential into specific understanding. Cognitive science supports this view: Edelman's theory of neuronal group selection describes how the brain's early plasticity enables dynamic pattern formation, starting from indeterminacy and refining into structured representations through experience (Edelman, 1987). Similarly, Friston's free energy principle posits that the brain resolves ambiguity by updating predictive models as sensory data accrue, aligning with the emergence of specific logical frameworks (Friston, 2010). Carey's work on conceptual development further illustrates how children's underspecified concepts evolve into precise categories as new information integrates, reflecting a poly-logical progression from indeterminacy to clarity (Carey, 2009).

Poly-Logic and Parallel Computing: A Computational Revolution

The poly-logic structure of RMS has profound implications for computational philosophy, particularly in parallel computing. As computing shifts from sequential to parallel architectures to handle complex tasks like AI and big data, RMS's sub-interpretation mechanism offers a theoretical foundation for a poly-logic computational model. By processing multiple logical scenarios simultaneously, this model could deliver decisions that are both precise and rapid, mirroring the efficiency of human poly-logic thinking.

Imagine an autonomous vehicle navigating a busy intersection. A sensor detects a potential obstacle with indeterminate status (t). A mono-logic system might resolve this sequentially, causing delays. An RMS-inspired system, however, could evaluate sub-interpretations in parallel—treating the obstacle as tn (definite) in one thread and tc (possible) in another—computing actions (e.g., braking) that are valid across both. This ensures safety and speed, as the system doesn't wait for full resolution. Such a model could transform real-time applications, from medical diagnostics to financial trading, where poly-logic reasoning under uncertainty is critical.

Philosophically, this poly-logic computational paradigm challenges reductionist views of problem-solving as linear decomposition. It resonates with process philosophy, such as Alfred North Whitehead's, which sees reality as a network of interrelated events (Whitehead[6]). RMS's parallel sub-interpretations mirror this interconnectedness, suggesting that computation can emulate the holistic, concurrent nature of human thought (Rescher[10]). By grounding this in Bibler's substantive control, RMS ensures that parallel threads remain unified by a coherent guiding principle, balancing diversity with precision.

Implications for Philosophy and Beyond

RMS's poly-logic framework, inspired by Bibler's philosophy and supported by quantum cognitive models, has far-reaching implications. First, its embrace of indeterminacy and pluralism challenges the Enlightenment ideal of absolute certainty, aligning with postmodern and existentialist views that truth is contextual and provisional. In ethics, RMS could model moral dilemmas with indeterminate obligations, enabling decisions that respect ambiguity rather than forcing clarity, thus enriching deontic reasoning.

Second, by formalizing poly-logic thinking as a natural human process, RMS invites a rethinking of rationality. Educational systems could emphasize training in parallel reasoning, fostering thinkers who can manage multiple perspectives under substantive control. This aligns with Bibler's vision of dialogic education, where learning emerges from the interplay of diverse logics (Bibler[2]).

Finally, RMS's potential in quantum computing—where indeterminate truth values echo quantum superposition—suggests a bridge between logic and physics. A qubit's pre-measurement state, akin to t/f, could be modeled as resolving to tn or fc post-measurement, offering a logical framework for quantum algorithms. Philosophically, this raises questions about whether indeterminacy is a fundamental feature of reality, positioning RMS as a tool for ontological exploration.

Conclusion

Resolution Matrix Semantics, with its indeterminate truth values and sub-interpretation mechanism, offers a philosophically rich framework that mirrors the poly-logic nature of human cognition, as articulated by Vladimir Bibler's concept of poly-logic substantive control (Bibler[2]). By formalizing the parallel, pluralistic structure of thinking—where pre-reflective ideas guide multiple logical threads, and quantum-like indeterminacy underpins cognitive processes—RMS challenges mono-logic assumptions and proposes a model for rational inquiry that is dynamic and adaptive. Its potential to inspire poly-logic parallel computing paradigms and inform fields like AI and NLP promises precise, rapid decision-making, transforming technology and philosophy alike. As we navigate an uncertain world, RMS invites us to embrace indeterminacy, think poly-logically, and redefine rationality as a dialogic, pluralistic process, opening new horizons for understanding thought, computation, and the nature of reality.

Reference List

1. Kuznetsov, Andrey. (2025). Reframing Kripke: Resolution Matrix Semantics with Broad Truth Values. viXra:2504.0161. https://vixra.org/abs/2504.0161
2. Bibler, Vladimir. The Foundations of the Logic of Culture. Translated excerpts available in various collections, originally published in Russian (1980s–1990s).
3. Priest, Graham. (2006). In Contradiction: A Study of the Transconsistent. Oxford University Press.
4. Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. (1962). Phenomenology of Perception. Translated by Colin Smith. Routledge.

5. James, William. (1907). Pragmatism: A New Name for Some Old Ways of Thinking. Longmans, Green, and Co.
6. Bohr, N. (1935). Can Quantum-Mechanical Description of Physical Reality Be Considered Complete? *Physical Review*, 48(7), 696–702.
7. Everett, H. (1957). "Relative State" Formulation of Quantum Mechanics. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 29(3), 454–462.
8. Kripke, Saul. (1963). Semantical Considerations on Modal Logic. Acta Philosophica Fennica.
9. Zadeh, Lotfi A. (1965). Fuzzy Sets. Information and Control, 8(3), 338–353.
10. Rescher, Nicholas. (2000). Process Metaphysics: An Introduction to Process Philosophy. SUNY Press.
11. Gilligan, Carol. (1982). In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development. Harvard University Press.
12. Harding, Sandra. (1986). The Science Question in Feminism. Cornell University Press.
13. Busemeyer, Jerome R., & Bruza, Peter D. (2012). Quantum Models of Cognition and Decision. Cambridge University Press.
14. Wendt, Alexander. (2015). Quantum Mind and Social Science: Unifying Physical and Social Ontology. Cambridge University Press.