

158. An Algebraic Formulation of *K-N* Propositional Calculus. III

By Shôtarô TANAKA

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

In his paper [1], K. Iséki defined the *KN-algebra*. For the details of the *KN-algebra*, see [1]. The conditions of the *KN-algebra* are as follows:

- 1) $\sim(p*p)*p=0$.
- 2) $\sim p*(q*p)=0$.
- 3) $\sim\sim(\sim\sim(p*r)*\sim(r*q))*\sim(\sim q*p)=0$.

4) Let α, β be expressions in this system, then $\alpha=0$ and $\sim\sim\beta*\sim\alpha=0$ imply $\beta=0$. For the details of *K-N* propositional calculus, see [2]-[4].

In my paper [5], having shown that the *KN-algebra* is characterized by 1), 3), 4), and $p*(\sim p*q)=0$, I do not prove that $p*(\sim p*q)=0$ holds in the *KN-algebra*.

In this paper, we shall show that the *KN-algebra* implies the following theses:

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

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

A) $\sim\alpha*\beta=0$ implies $\sim\sim(\beta*\gamma)*\sim(\gamma*\alpha)=0$. Then we have the following:

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

In B), put $\alpha=p*p, \beta=p, \gamma=\sim p$, then by 1) and 2) we have

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

In A), put $\alpha=p, \beta=q*p, \gamma=r$, then by 2) we have

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

On the other hand, the *KN-algebra* contains the following (For the details, see [1]).

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

In 3), put $p=\alpha, q=\alpha, r=\beta$, then by 7) we have

8) $\sim\sim(\alpha*\beta)*\sim(\beta*\alpha)=0$, i.e., $\beta*\alpha=0$ implies $\alpha*\beta=0$.

In 6), put $p=\sim p, r=p$, then by 5) we have

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

In 8), put $\beta=q*\sim p, \alpha=p$, then by 9) we have

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

We shall use the following thesis which has been obtained in his paper [1].

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

In 3), put $p = \sim p*q$, $q = q*\sim p$, $r = p$, then by 11) and 10) we have

$$12) \quad (\sim p*q)*p=0.$$

In 8), put $\alpha = p$, $\beta = \sim p*q$, then we have

$$13) \quad p*(\sim p*q)=0.$$

The theses 10) and 13) are 2') and 2''). 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).
- [5] S. Tanaka: An algebraic formulation of $K-N$ propositional calculus. II. Proc. Japan Acad., **43**, 129-131 (1967).