

Denial of the manipulation of quaternions in bivalent logic

© Copyright 2018 by Colin James III All rights reserved.

We assume the method and apparatus of Meth8/VL4 with Tautology as the designated *proof* value, **F** as contradiction, **N** as truthity (non-contingency), and **C** as falsity (contingency). Results are a 16-valued truth table in row-major and horizontal, or repeating fragments of 128-tables for more variables.

LET p, q, r, s : \hat{H} or 1-circumflex, $\hat{I}, \hat{J}, \hat{K}$;
 \sim Not; $+$ Or; $\&$ And; $=$ Equivalent;
 $z (z\&z), zz$.

From: De Haas, E.P.J. (2018). A biquaternion based generalization of the Dirac current into a Dirac current probability tensor with closed system condition. vixra.org/pdf/1810.0349v1.pdf
 haas2u@gmail.com

For the Pauli spin level, quaternions can be represented by the basis $(\hat{H}, \hat{I}, \hat{J}, \hat{K})$ with these properties:

$$\hat{I}\hat{I}=\hat{J}\hat{J}=\hat{K}\hat{K}=-\hat{H} \text{ and } \hat{H}\hat{H}=\hat{H}; \quad (2.1.1)$$

$$(q=(r=s))=\sim p; \quad \text{FTTF TFFT TFFT FTTF} \quad (2.1.2)$$

$$\hat{H}\hat{K}=\hat{K}\hat{H}=\hat{K} \text{ for } \hat{I}, \hat{J}, \hat{K}; \quad (2.2.1)$$

$$(((p\&s)=s)+((p\&q)=q))+((p\&r)=r); \quad \text{TTTT TTTT TTTT TTFT} \quad (2.2.2)$$

$$\hat{I}\hat{J}=-\hat{J}\hat{I}=\hat{K}; \quad (2.3.1)$$

$$((q\&r)=\sim(r\&q))=s; \quad \text{TTTT TTTT FFFF FFFF} \quad (2.3.2)$$

$$\hat{J}\hat{K}=-\hat{K}\hat{J}=\hat{I}; \quad (2.4.1)$$

$$((r\&s)=\sim(s\&r))=q; \quad \text{TTFE TTFE TTFE TTFE} \quad (2.4.2)$$

$$\hat{K}\hat{I}=-\hat{I}\hat{K}=\hat{J}. \quad (2.5.1)$$

$$((s\&q)=\sim(q\&s))=r; \quad \text{TTTT FFFF TTTT FFFF} \quad (2.5.2)$$

Eqs. 2.1.2-2.5.2 as rendered are *not* tautologous. This means that quaternions cannot be represented in bivalent logic and hence cannot be manipulated in bivalent logic. Therefore to use bivalent logic on quaternions is a contradiction, and not a convenience as universally claimed.