

## 4. The Laws of Logical Equivalences & DNF

**Example 4.1.** Using a truth table, verify each of the following laws from The Table of Logical Equivalences:

- ◇  $p \wedge \mathbf{T} \equiv p$  (Identity Law)
- ◇  $p \vee \mathbf{F} \equiv p$  (Identity Law)
- ◇  $p \vee \mathbf{T} \equiv \mathbf{T}$  (Domination Law)
- ◇  $p \wedge \mathbf{F} \equiv \mathbf{F}$  (Domination Law)
- ◇  $p \vee \neg p \equiv \mathbf{T}$  (Negation Law)
- ◇  $p \wedge \neg p \equiv \mathbf{F}$  (Negation Law)

Identity Laws:	$p$	$p \wedge \mathbf{T}$	$p \wedge \mathbf{T} \leftrightarrow p$	$p \wedge \mathbf{T} \equiv p$ because $p \wedge \mathbf{T} \leftrightarrow p$ is a tautology.
	T	T	T	
	F	F	T	
	$p$	$p \vee \mathbf{F}$	$p \vee \mathbf{F} \leftrightarrow p$	$p \vee \mathbf{F} \equiv p$ because $p \vee \mathbf{F} \leftrightarrow p$ is a tautology.
	T	T	T	
	F	F	T	
Domination Laws:	$p$	$p \vee \mathbf{T}$	$p \vee \mathbf{T} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{T}$	$p \vee \mathbf{T} \equiv \mathbf{T}$ because $p \vee \mathbf{T} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{T}$ is a tautology.
	T	T	T	
	F	T	T	
	$p$	$p \wedge \mathbf{F}$	$p \wedge \mathbf{F} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{F}$	$p \wedge \mathbf{F} \equiv \mathbf{F}$ because $p \wedge \mathbf{F} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{F}$ is a tautology.
	T	F	F	
	F	F	F	
Negation Laws:	$p$	$p \vee \neg p$	$p \vee \neg p \leftrightarrow \mathbf{T}$	$p \vee \neg p \equiv \mathbf{T}$ because $p \vee \neg p \leftrightarrow \mathbf{T}$ is a tautology.
	T	T	T	
	F	T	T	
	$p$	$p \wedge \neg p$	$p \wedge \neg p \leftrightarrow \mathbf{F}$	$p \wedge \neg p \equiv \mathbf{F}$ because $p \wedge \neg p \leftrightarrow \mathbf{F}$ is a tautology.
	T	F	F	
	F	F	F	

# THE TABLE OF LOGICAL EQUIVALENCES

$P \rightarrow Q$  is T when  
P is F or Q is T

2 ways to think about  
 $\leftrightarrow$

out of P/ $\neg P$   
exactly one is T  
and other is F.

a bit like factoring

a way to  
switch  $\wedge/\vee$   
with  $\neg$

1.	$P \rightarrow Q \equiv \neg P \vee Q$	Implication Law
2.	$P \leftrightarrow Q \equiv (P \wedge Q) \vee (\neg P \wedge \neg Q)$	Biconditional Laws
3.	$P \leftrightarrow Q \equiv (P \rightarrow Q) \wedge (Q \rightarrow P)$	
4.	$P \vee \neg P \equiv \mathbf{T}$	Negation Laws
5.	$P \wedge \neg P \equiv \mathbf{F}$	
6.	$P \vee \mathbf{F} \equiv P$	Identity Laws
7.	$P \wedge \mathbf{T} \equiv P$	
8.	$P \vee \mathbf{T} \equiv \mathbf{T}$	Domination Laws
9.	$P \wedge \mathbf{F} \equiv \mathbf{F}$	
10.	$P \vee P \equiv P$	Idempotent Laws
11.	$P \wedge P \equiv P$	
12.	$\neg \neg P \equiv P$	Double Negation Law
13.	$P \vee Q \equiv Q \vee P$	Commutative Laws
14.	$P \wedge Q \equiv Q \wedge P$	
15.	$(P \vee Q) \vee R \equiv P \vee (Q \vee R)$	Associative Laws
16.	$(P \wedge Q) \wedge R \equiv P \wedge (Q \wedge R)$	
17.	$P \vee (Q \wedge R) \equiv (P \vee Q) \wedge (P \vee R)$	Distributive Laws
18.	$P \wedge (Q \vee R) \equiv (P \wedge Q) \vee (P \wedge R)$	
19.	$\neg(P \wedge Q) \equiv \neg P \vee \neg Q$	De Morgan's Laws
20.	$\neg(P \vee Q) \equiv \neg P \wedge \neg Q$	
21.	$P \vee (P \wedge Q) \equiv P$	Absorption Laws
22.	$P \wedge (P \vee Q) \equiv P$	

---

## HOW TO USE THE LAWS IN THE TABLE OF LOGICAL EQUIVALENCES

---

**Example 4.2.** Prove  $((x \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge \neg y)) \vee (\neg x \wedge y) \equiv x \vee y$

$$\begin{aligned} ((x \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge \neg y)) \vee (\neg x \wedge y) &\equiv [x \wedge (y \vee \neg y)] \vee (\neg x \wedge y) && \text{(distributive law)} \\ &\equiv [x \wedge \top] \vee (\neg x \wedge y) && \text{(negation law)} \\ &\equiv (x) \vee (\neg x \wedge y) && \text{(identity law)} \\ &\equiv (x \vee \neg x) \wedge (x \vee y) && \text{(distributive law)} \\ &\equiv \top \wedge (x \vee y) && \text{(negation law)} \\ &\equiv x \vee y && \text{(identity law)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\therefore ((x \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge \neg y)) \vee (\neg x \wedge y) \equiv x \vee y$$

---

**Example 4.3.** Prove that  $(a \wedge \neg b) \wedge (\neg a \vee b)$  is a contradiction Note contradiction  $\equiv F$

$$\begin{aligned} (a \wedge \neg b) \wedge (\neg a \vee b) &\equiv a \wedge (\neg b \wedge (\neg a \vee b)) && \text{(associative law)} \\ &\equiv a \wedge [(\neg b \wedge \neg a) \vee (\neg b \wedge b)] && \text{(distributive law)} \\ &\equiv a \wedge [(\neg b \wedge \neg a) \vee F] && \text{(negation law)} \\ &\equiv a \wedge [\neg b \wedge \neg a] && \text{(identity law)} \\ &\equiv a \wedge (\neg a \wedge \neg b) && \text{(commutative law)} \\ &\equiv (a \wedge \neg a) \wedge \neg b && \text{(associative law)} \\ &\equiv F \wedge \neg b && \text{(negation law)} \\ &\equiv F && \text{(domination law)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\therefore (a \wedge \neg b) \wedge (\neg a \vee b) \equiv F \quad \text{so } (a \wedge \neg b) \wedge (\neg a \vee b) \text{ is a contradiction.}$$

**Example 4.4.** Find a compound proposition that is logically equivalent to  $X \wedge Y$  that uses only the logical connectives  $\rightarrow$  and  $\neg$ .

$$X \wedge Y \equiv \neg \neg (X \wedge Y) \quad (\text{double negation law})$$

$$\equiv \neg (\neg X \vee \neg Y) \quad (\text{De Morgan's law})$$

$$\equiv \neg (X \rightarrow \neg Y) \quad (\text{implication law})$$

Thus, we found a proposition  $\neg (X \rightarrow \neg Y)$  such that  $X \wedge Y \equiv \neg (X \rightarrow \neg Y)$  and  $\neg (X \rightarrow \neg Y)$  uses only the logical connectives  $\rightarrow$  and  $\neg$ .

---

**Example 4.5.** Find a compound proposition that is logically equivalent to  $p \rightarrow (q \vee r)$  that uses only the logical connectives  $\neg$  and  $\wedge$ .

$$p \rightarrow (q \vee r) \equiv \neg p \vee (q \vee r) \quad (\text{implication law})$$

$$\equiv \neg \neg [\neg p \vee (q \vee r)] \quad (\text{double negation})$$

$$\equiv \neg [\neg \neg p \wedge \neg (q \vee r)] \quad (\text{De Morgan's law})$$

$$\equiv \neg [p \wedge \neg (q \vee r)] \quad (\text{double negation law})$$

$$\equiv \neg [p \wedge (\neg q \wedge \neg r)] \quad (\text{De Morgan's law})$$

Thus,  $p \rightarrow (q \vee r) \equiv \neg [p \wedge (\neg q \wedge \neg r)]$  and  $\neg [p \wedge (\neg q \wedge \neg r)]$  uses only the logical connectives  $\neg$  and  $\wedge$ .

\*A collection of logical connectives is called functionally complete if every compound proposition is logically equivalent to a compound proposition involving only these logical connectives.

**Exercise** Show that  $\{\neg, \rightarrow\}$  is functionally complete.



# DISJUNCTIVE NORMAL FORM

- An **atom** is a proposition containing no logical connectives (just a propositional variable).
- A **literal** is an atom or the negation of an atom.
- A **conjunctive clause** is a compound proposition that contains only literals and (possibly) the connective  $\wedge$ , and no atom appears more than once.
- A compound proposition is said to be in **disjunctive normal form (DNF)** if it is a disjunction of conjunctive clauses.

## Facts about DNF.

- Every compound proposition is logically equivalent to a proposition in DNF.
- DNF is not unique, but all DNF of a given compound proposition  $X$  are logically equivalent to  $X$ , hence logically equivalent to each other.

Ex.  $a \rightarrow b \equiv (a \wedge b) \vee (\neg a \wedge b) \vee (\neg a \wedge \neg b)$   $\leftarrow$  one possible DNF of  $a \rightarrow b$

$a \rightarrow b \equiv (\neg a) \vee (b)$   $\leftarrow$  another possible DNF of  $a \rightarrow b$

## Using a Truth Table to Obtain a DNF for a given Proposition.

- Let  $X$  be a compound proposition consisting of the propositional variables  $p_1, \dots, p_k$ .
- Construct a complete truth table for  $X$ .
- For each row in which  $X$  is **T**, write a conjunctive clause corresponding to the truth value of each of the atoms  $p_1, \dots, p_k$ .
- The disjunction of these conjunctive clauses is a DNF for  $X$ .

**Example 4.6.** Use a truth table to determine a DNF for the compound proposition  $X$ , defined as follows:

$$X : \neg(p \leftrightarrow q) \vee \neg q$$

$p$	$q$	$p \leftrightarrow q$	$\neg(p \leftrightarrow q)$	$\neg q$	$X$	conjunctive clauses for each row where $X$ is T:
T	T	T	F	F	F	
T	F	F	T	T	T	$p \wedge \neg q$
F	T	F	T	F	T	$\neg p \wedge q$
F	F	T	F	T	T	$\neg p \wedge \neg q$

$\therefore$  a DNF for  $X$  is  $(p \wedge \neg q) \vee (\neg p \wedge q) \vee (\neg p \wedge \neg q)$

Thus,  $\neg(p \leftrightarrow q) \vee \neg q \equiv (p \wedge \neg q) \vee (\neg p \wedge q) \vee (\neg p \wedge \neg q)$

**Example 4.7.** The truth table of a *mystery compound proposition*  $X$  consisting of propositional variables  $p, q, r, s$  is given below.

$p$	$q$	$r$	$s$	$X$
T	T	T	T	F
T	T	T	F	F
T	T	F	T	T
T	T	F	F	F
T	F	T	T	T
T	F	T	F	F
T	F	F	T	F
T	F	F	F	F
F	T	T	T	F
F	T	T	F	F
F	T	F	T	F
F	T	F	F	F
F	F	T	T	F
F	F	T	F	F
F	F	F	T	T
F	F	F	F	F

conjunctive clauses  
for each row where  
 $X$  is T:

$$p \wedge q \wedge \neg r \wedge s$$

$$p \wedge \neg q \wedge r \wedge s$$

$$\neg p \wedge \neg q \wedge \neg r \wedge s$$

i. Determine a DNF for  $X$ .

∴ a DNF for  $X$  is

$$(p \wedge q \wedge \neg r \wedge s) \vee (p \wedge \neg q \wedge r \wedge s) \vee (\neg p \wedge \neg q \wedge \neg r \wedge s)$$

ii. Is  $X$  a tautology, contradiction, or contingency? Explain.

$X$  is a contingency because it is not always true nor always false.

**exercise:** Try to find a compound proposition that is logically equivalent to  $X$  that uses only the connectives  $\rightarrow$  and  $\neg$  (and parentheses wherever appropriate).

---

## STUDY GUIDE

---

### Important terms and concepts:

- ◇ The Laws from the Table of Logical Equivalences
- ◇ DNF (atoms, literals, conjunctive clauses)      how to find DNF from a truth table

### Exercises

Sup.Ex. §1 # 1, 2, 3, 7ac (using the Laws), 8

Rosen §1.3 # 7, 8, 15, and using the Laws: # 20–34

\*\*For each of the following, find a compound proposition that uses only the connectives  $\neg$  and  $\rightarrow$

- i.  $p \vee q$    ii.  $p \wedge q$    iii.  $p \oplus q$    iv.  $p \leftrightarrow q$

Rosen §1.3 optional: # 47–56

---