EasyChair Preprint

№ 6187

The Mapping of the Logical Structure, Enact to the Engagement Structure of Enact.

Frank Appiah

July 30, 2021

THE MAPPING OF THE LOGICAL STRUCTURE, ENACT TO THE ENGAGEMENT STRUCTURE OF ENACT.

FRANK APPIAH.

KING'S COLLEGE LONDON, ART & SCIENCE RESEARCH OFFICE, WATERLOO, ENGLAND, UNITED KINGDOM.

appiahnsiahfrank@gmail.com. | frank.appiah@kcl.ac.uk

Extended Abstract[+]. This work researches on the fitness of logically mapping an enact structure to an engagement structure. In this mapping, a language of logical(L) engage(E) enactment(E) is described in the context of both logic and structures, LEE. An underscore language is created based on words like implies and is, An is_ language and implies_language of logical engage enactment are made in four sentences.

Keywords. enactment, composites, environment, abbreviation, model, logic, theory, language, sentence.

Year of Study: 2017 **Year of Publication: 2020**

1 ***AFFILIATE. UNIVERSITY OF LONDON, KING'S COLLEGE LONDON, DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATICS, LONDON, UK.**

1 INTRODUCTION

The engagement function[1] of enact has its structure: $enact(a_i, a_j, rank_i)$ where $i, j > 1$. The parameters of this structure takes two interest variables and one rank indicator. The logical structure of enact is represented as:

enact(a, l, t) , where a: action, l:location and t: time.

The exact mapping of engagement, enact to a logical enact is represented as:

enact(a_i , a_j , $rank_i$).

$\downarrow$ $\downarrow$ $\downarrow$

enact(a, l , t).

Here, the interest a_i maps to action a, interest a_j also maps l and $rank_i$ maps to time, t. The physical dimensions of the structures does not work properly. This research looks at ways to addressing the issue by a language[6] in the context of engagement. The language of logical engage enactment describes the context of both logical an engagement structures:

(a) $enact_E \rightarrow enact_L$,

(b) $a_i \rightarrow a$,

(c) $a_j \rightarrow l$,

(d) $rank_i \rightarrow t$.

The language of the logical engage-enactment is:

(i) The enact of business implies the enact of machinery, partonomy, interest, attention and more logic.

(ii) The enact of business interest implies the enact of business action or event.

(iii) The enact of business interest implies the enact of interest in a location.

(iv) The enact rank of business interest implies the enact of the linear/temporal ordering of interest.

The *is_language* of the logical engage enactment(LEE^{is}) is:

(i) The enact of business is the enact of logic.

(ii) The enact of business interest is the implication of business action.

(iii) Th enact of business interest is in a location.

(iv) The enact of business rank is based on temporal dimensions.

The *implies_ language* of LEE($LEE^{\rightarrow}$) is

(i) $Enact_E$ implies $Enact_L$

(ii) Interest a_i implies Action a

(iii) Interest a_j implies Action in location l

(iv) Rank interest $rank_i$ implies Ordering in temporal dimension t.

The linear ordering of the mapping LEE structures is as follows:

$$enact_E \rightarrow enact_L \rightarrow a_i \rightarrow a \rightarrow a_j \rightarrow l \rightarrow rank_i \rightarrow t \quad .$$

Given $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ can be abbreviated to $\neg\alpha \vee \beta$.

The LEE structures (a) to (d) can be abbreviated as:

(a) $enact_E \rightarrow enact_L$ abbreviates to $\neg enact_E \vee enact_L$

(b) $a_i \rightarrow a$ abbreviates to $\neg a_i \vee a$.

(c) $a_j \rightarrow a$ abbreviates to $\neg a_j \vee a$.

(d) $rank_i \rightarrow t$ abbreviates to $\neg rank_i \vee t$.

The LEE structures now becomes:

(a) $enact_E \Leftrightarrow enact_L$

(b) $a_i \Leftrightarrow a$

(c) $a_j \Leftrightarrow l$

(d) $rank_i \Leftrightarrow t$

Given $\alpha \Leftrightarrow \beta$ can be abbreviated to $(\alpha \Leftrightarrow \beta) \vee (\beta \vee \alpha)$.

The double arrow LEE($LEE^{\Leftrightarrow}$) structures now becomes:

(a) $enact_E \Leftrightarrow enact_L$ abbreviates to:

$(enact_E \rightarrow enact_L) \quad \wedge \quad (enact_L \rightarrow enact_E)$.

(b) $(a_i \Leftrightarrow a)$ abbreviates to $(a_i \rightarrow a) \wedge (a \rightarrow a_i)$.

(c). $(a_j \Leftrightarrow a)$ abbreviates to $(a_j \rightarrow a) \wedge (a \rightarrow a_j)$.

(d) $rank_i \Leftrightarrow t$ abbreviates to $(rank_i \rightarrow t) \wedge (t \rightarrow rank_i)$.

The $LEE^{\rightarrow}$ structure can be read as:

(i) $enact_E \xrightarrow{\vec{r}} enact_L$: A run(r) of an agent in an engaged environment is thus a sequence of inter-logic environment of states and actions.

(ii) $a_i \xrightarrow{\vec{r}} a_j$: A run of an agent by a sequence of inter-logic environment of states and actions in an engaged environment.

(iii) $a_j \xrightarrow{\vec{r}} L$: A run of an agent by sequence of inter-logic states and actions is localized in an engaged environment.

(iv) $rank_i \xrightarrow{\vec{r}} t$: A state is initially ranked in an engaged environment before choosing an action to execute (run in a specific time).

The $LEE^{\Leftrightarrow}$ abbreviation structures can also be read as:

(1) $enact_E \Leftrightarrow enact_L$: An $enact_E$ will exist to be true implies $enact_L$ is true and $enact_L$ existence is true implies $enact_E$ is true.

(2) $(a_i \Leftrightarrow a)$: An interst a_i will exist to be true implies a_i is true and a hold to be true in existence implies a_i is existentially true.

(3) $(a_j \Leftrightarrow a)$: An interest enaction , a_j is existentially true implies location exist to be true and location, l is very true in existence implies interest holding is truly in existence.

(4) $rank_i \Leftrightarrow t$: A rank for interest will exist true implies a chosen priority in time holds to be true.

A run on LEE structure will consequent the following:

(D) $enact_E \rightarrow enact_L \rightarrow a_i$

(DI) $enact_L \rightarrow a_i \rightarrow a$

(DII) $a_i \rightarrow a \rightarrow a_j$

(DIII) $a \rightarrow a_j \rightarrow l$

(DIV) $a_j \rightarrow l \rightarrow rank_i$

(DV) $l \rightarrow rank_i \rightarrow t.$.

2 RESULTS OF WORK

The formulas of propositional enactment[1, 2] consist of:

(1) *propositional constants*; T and F.

(2) *propositional variables*; a , a_i , a_j , l , t , $rank_i$, $enact_E$ and $enact_L$.

(3) *propositional composites*;

Composites	**Propositional**
or-Composites	(i) $\neg enact_E \vee enact_L$ (ii) $\neg a_i \vee a$ (iii) $\neg a_j \vee l$ (iv) $\neg rank_i \vee t$
not-Composites	(i) $\neg enact_E$ (ii) $\neg a_i$ (iii) $\neg a_j$ (iv) $\neg rank_i$
and-composites	(i) $(a_i \rightarrow a) \wedge (a \rightarrow a_i)$ (ii) $(a_j \rightarrow l) \wedge (l \rightarrow a_j)$ (iii) $(enact_E \rightarrow enact_L) \wedge (eanct_L \rightarrow enact_E)$ (iv) $(rank_i \rightarrow t) \wedge (t \rightarrow rank_i)$
implies-composites	(i) $enact_E \rightarrow enact_L$ (ii) $a_i \rightarrow a$ (iii) $a_j \rightarrow l$ (iv) $rank_i \rightarrow t$

$\vee$ -composites are V-clauses of disjunctive literals. $\wedge$ - composites are $\wedge$ clauses of conjunctive literals. The literal is a logical constant or the negation of a constant or variable. Enactment logic[1] is the term for the formulas of the propositional enactment.

4 CONCLUSION

This section concludes work on research done in terms of LEE language. LEE is a logical engage enactment in abbreviation and a coined name[4]. The engagement function[4] is made from inspection of enact function[1] and its structural parameters.

Engagement function is a structure that takes variables of two interests and one rank. An exact mapping of engagement enact to logical enact is represented in this research. A four sentences of *is*_ language is written to bring normal meaning to the whole language process. Again, four sentences of *implies*_ language is also written.

A linear ordering of the LEE structure maps are generated. LEE , $LEE^{\rightarrow}$ and $LEE^{\Leftrightarrow}$ abbreviations are generated with logical implication. A run is carried out on each LEE structures. In concluding remarks, four propositional composites of literal are made from enact and engagement functions.

Compliance with Ethical Standards:

(In case of funding) Funding: This is research is funded by King's Alumni Group, Association of Engineering/research office grant with ISAreference grant number: 204424 20821845.

Conflict of Interest:

Author, Dr. Frank Appiah declares that he has no conflict of interest .

REFERENCES

1. Appiah F. (2009/10), RuleML for Policy Exchange in Agent Commerce, King's College London, Msc Dissertation.
2. Appiah F. (2020). A general position of enactment paradigm; Phenomenon of Procurement Agent. KCL Centre of Doctoral Studies, London, England, UK.
3. Richard Stark W.(1990), Lisp, Lore, Logic, Springer Verlag, New York.
4. Ballard D. (1997), Introduction to Natural Computations, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
5. Andrew P. (1986), An Introduction to Mathematical Logic and Type Theory: To Truth Through Proof, Academic Press, New York.
6. Russell S. J. (1989), The Use of Knowledge in Analog and Induction, San Mateo, CA: Morgan Kauffman.