

## 9. An Algebraic Formulation of $K-N$ Propositional Calculus. II

By Shôtarô TANAKA

(Comm. by Kinjirô KUNUGI, M.J.A., Jan. 12, 1967)

In his paper [1], K. Iséki has defined  $K-N$  algebra as follows: Let  $X$  be an abstract algebra consisting of  $0, p, q, \dots$ , with a binary operation  $*$  and a unary operation  $\sim$  satisfying the following conditions:

- a)  $\sim(p*p)*p=0$ ,
- b)  $\sim p*(q*p)=0$ ,
- c)  $\sim\sim(\sim\sim(p*r)*\sim(r*q))*\sim(\sim q*p)=0$ ,
- d)  $\sim\sim\beta*\sim\alpha=0$  and  $\alpha=0$  imply  $\beta=0$ , where  $\alpha, \beta$  are expressions in  $X$ .

In this paper, we shall show that the  $NK$ -algebra is characterized by the following conditions:

- 1)  $\sim(p*p)*p=0$ ,
- 2)  $\sim q*(q*p)=0$ ,
- 3)  $\sim\sim(\sim\sim(p*r)*\sim(r*q))*\sim(\sim q*p)=0$ ,
- 4)  $\sim\sim\beta*\sim\alpha=0$  and  $\alpha=0$  imply  $\beta=0$ , where  $\alpha, \beta$  are expressions (For the details on  $N-K$  propositional calculus, see [2], [3], [4].)

K. Iséki has proved that the  $NK$ -algebra implies  $\sim q*(q*p)=0$ . Therefore we shall prove that 1), 2), 3), and 4) imply b).

A)  $\sim\alpha*\beta=0$  implies  $\sim\sim(\beta*\gamma)*\sim(\gamma*\alpha)=0$ .

Proof. In 3), put  $p=\beta, q=\alpha, r=\gamma$ , then by 4) we have A). Then we have

B)  $\sim\alpha*\beta=0, \sim\gamma*\alpha=0$  imply  $\beta*\sim\gamma=0$ .

In A), put  $\alpha=p*p, \beta=p, \gamma=\sim p$ , then  $\sim(p*p)*p=0$  implies  $\sim\sim(p*\sim p)*\sim(\sim p*(p*p))=0$ .

By 2), we have

5)  $p*\sim p=0$ .

In 3), put  $p=\sim\sim q, r=\sim r$ , then

$$\sim\sim(\sim\sim(\sim\sim q*\sim r)*\sim(\sim r*q))*\sim(\sim q*\sim\sim q)=0.$$

And In 3), put  $p=\sim\sim q$ , then

$$\sim\sim(\sim\sim(\sim\sim q*r)*\sim(r*q))*\sim(\sim q*\sim\sim q)=0.$$

By 5),  $\sim q*\sim\sim q=0$ , hence we have

$$6_1) \quad \sim\sim(\sim\sim q*\sim r)*\sim(\sim r*q)=0,$$

and

$$6_2) \quad \sim\sim(\sim\sim q*r)*\sim(r*q)=0.$$

These expressions mean

C)  $\alpha * \beta = 0$  implies  $\sim \sim \beta * \alpha = 0$  and  $\sim \sim \alpha * \sim \sim \beta = 0$ .

In 6<sub>2</sub>), put  $r = p, q = \sim \sim p$ , then

$$\sim \sim (\sim \sim \sim p * p) * \sim (p * \sim p) = 0.$$

By 5), we have

7)  $\sim \sim \sim p * p = 0$ .

In 3), put  $p = \sim \beta, q = \sim \alpha, r = \alpha$ ,

$$\sim \sim (\sim \sim (\sim \beta * \alpha) * \sim (\alpha * \sim \alpha)) * \sim (\sim \sim \alpha * \sim \beta) = 0.$$

By 5),  $\alpha * \sim \alpha = 0$ , hence we have

D)  $\sim \sim \alpha * \sim \beta = 0$  implies  $\sim \beta * \alpha = 0$ .

In 3), put  $p = \alpha, q = \beta, r = \gamma$ , then

$$\sim \sim (\sim \sim (\alpha * \gamma) * (\gamma * \beta)) * \sim (\sim \beta * \alpha) = 0.$$

And by D)  $\sim \sim (\alpha * \gamma) * \sim (\gamma * \beta) = 0$  implies  $\sim (\gamma * \beta) * (\alpha * \gamma) = 0$ . Therefore, let  $\sim \beta * \alpha = 0$ , then we have

E)  $\sim \beta * \alpha = 0$  implies  $\sim (\gamma * \beta) * (\alpha * \gamma) = 0$ .

From E), we have the following variations:

$$\sim \alpha * \beta = 0 \text{ implies } \sim (\delta * \alpha) * (\beta * \delta) = 0,$$

$$\sim \gamma * \delta = 0 \text{ implies } \sim (\alpha * \gamma) * (\delta * \alpha) = 0.$$

By B) and the above variations, we have

F)  $\sim \alpha * \beta = 0, \sim \gamma * \delta = 0$  imply  $(\beta * \delta) * \sim (\alpha * \gamma) = 0$ .

In E), put  $\alpha = \sim \sim p, \beta = p, \gamma = r$ , then

$$\sim p * \sim \sim p \text{ implies } \sim (r * p) * (\sim \sim p * r) = 0.$$

By 5),  $\sim p * \sim \sim p = 0$ , hence we have

8)  $\sim (r * p) * (\sim \sim p * r) = 0$ .

In 7),  $p = \sim \alpha$ , then  $\sim \sim \sim \sim \alpha * \sim \alpha = 0$ . Therefore, let  $\alpha = 0$ , then we have  $\sim \sim = 0$ , that is,

G)  $\alpha = 0$  implies  $\sim \sim \alpha = 0$ .

In G), put  $\alpha = \sim \gamma * \beta$ , then we have

(1)  $\sim \gamma * \beta = 0$  implies  $\sim \sim (\sim \gamma * \beta) = 0$ .

In 6<sub>1</sub>), put  $r = \delta, q = \gamma$ , then we have

(2)  $\sim \sim (\sim \sim \gamma * \sim \delta) * \sim (\sim \delta * \gamma) = 0$  implies  $\sim \sim \gamma * \sim \delta = 0$ .

In F), put  $\alpha = \sim \gamma, \beta = \sim \delta, \gamma = \beta, \delta = \alpha$ , then

(3)  $\sim \sim \gamma * \sim \delta = 0, \sim \beta * \alpha = 0$  imply  $(\sim \delta * \alpha) * \sim (\sim \gamma * \beta) = 0$ .

In C), put  $\alpha = \sim \delta * \alpha, \beta = \sim (\sim \gamma * \beta)$ , then we have

(4)  $(\sim \delta * \alpha) * \sim (\sim \gamma * \beta) = 0$  implies

$$\sim \sim (\sim \delta * \alpha) * \sim \sim (\sim \gamma * \beta) = 0.$$

From (4), if we let  $\sim \sim (\sim \gamma * \beta) = 0$ , then by 4), we have  $\sim \delta * \alpha = 0$ .

Therefore, from (1), (2), (3), and (4) we have

H)  $\sim \beta * \alpha = 0, \sim \gamma * \beta = 0, \sim \delta * \gamma = 0$  imply  $\sim \delta * \alpha = 0$ .

Put  $p = \sim \sim p$  in 1),  $r = \sim \sim p$ , and  $r = p$  in 8), then we have respectively

$$\sim (\sim \sim p * \sim \sim p) * \sim \sim p = 0,$$

$$\sim (\sim \sim p * p) * (\sim \sim p * \sim \sim p) = 0,$$

$$\sim(p * p) * (\sim \sim p * p) = 0.$$

By H), we have  $\sim(p * p) * \sim \sim p = 0$ .

On the other hand, putting  $q = p$  in 2), we have  $\sim p * (p * p) = 0$ .

By B), we have  $\sim \sim p * \sim p = 0$ , further by D) we have

$$9) \quad \sim p * p = 0.$$

In E), put  $\beta = p, \alpha = p, \gamma = r$ , then by 9), we have

$$10) \quad \sim(r * p) * (p * r) = 0.$$

In H), put  $\delta = \gamma$ , then by 9) we have

$$1) \quad \sim \beta * \alpha = 0, \sim \gamma * \beta = 0 \text{ imply } \sim \gamma * \alpha = 0.$$

Put  $r = p, p = q$  in 10) and  $q = p, p = q$  in 2), then we have

$$\sim(p * q) * (q * p) = 0, \sim p * (p * q) = 0.$$

Hence by I), we have

$$11) \quad \sim p * (q * p) = 0.$$

Therefore the proof is complete.

### References

- [ 1 ] K. Iséki: An algebraic formulation of *K-N* propositional calculus. Proc. Japan. Acad., **42**, 1164-1167 (1966).
- [ 2 ] C. A. Meredith and A. N. Prior: Notes on the axiomatics of the propositional calculus. Notre Dame Jour. Formal Logic, **4**, 171-187 (1963).
- [ 3 ] J. B. Rosser: Logic for Mathematicians. New York (1953).
- [ 4 ] B. Sobocinski: Axiomatization of a conjunctive-negative calculus of propositions. Jour. Computing Systems, **1**, 229-242 (1954).