Mathematical and Logical Foundations of Computer Science

Lecture 8 - Propositional Logic (Equivalences & Normal Forms)

Vincent Rahli

(some slides were adapted from Rajesh Chitnis' slides)

University of Birmingham

Where are we?

- Symbolic logic
- ► Propositional logic
- Predicate logic
- ► Constructive vs. Classical logic
- Type theory

Today

- Logical Equivalences
- Proving logical Equivalences in Natural Deduction
- Proving logical Equivalences using truth tables
- Normal forms

Today

- Logical Equivalences
- Proving logical Equivalences in Natural Deduction
- Proving logical Equivalences using truth tables
- Normal forms

Further reading:

Chapter 3 of http://leanprover.github.io/logic_and_proof/

Syntax:

$$P ::= a \mid P \wedge P \mid P \vee P \mid P \to P \mid \neg P$$

Syntax:

$$P ::= a \mid P \land P \mid P \lor P \mid P \to P \mid \neg P$$

Lower-case letters are atoms: p, q, r, etc.

Upper-case letters stand for any proposition: P, Q, R, etc.

Syntax:

$$P ::= a \mid P \land P \mid P \lor P \mid P \to P \mid \neg P$$

Lower-case letters are atoms: p, q, r, etc.

Upper-case letters stand for any proposition: P, Q, R, etc.

Two special atoms:

- ▶ T which stands for True
- which stands for False

Syntax:

$$P ::= a \mid P \land P \mid P \lor P \mid P \to P \mid \neg P$$

Lower-case letters are atoms: p, q, r, etc.

Upper-case letters stand for any proposition: P, Q, R, etc.

Two special atoms:

- ▶ T which stands for True
- which stands for False

We also introduced four connectives:

- ▶ $P \land Q$: we have a proof of both P and Q
- $P \vee Q$: we have a proof of at least one of P and Q
- ▶ $P \rightarrow Q$: if we have a proof of P then we have a proof of Q
- ▶ $\neg P$: stands for $P \rightarrow \bot$

Natural Deduction

Sequent Calculus

Natural Deduction

introduction/elimination rules

Sequent Calculus

right/left rules

Natural Deduction

introduction/elimination rules

natural proofs

Sequent Calculus

right/left rules

amenable to automation

Natural Deduction

introduction/elimination rules

natural proofs

$$\frac{A}{A}$$

$$\vdots$$

$$B$$

$$A \to B$$

$$1 [\to I]$$

Sequent Calculus

right/left rules

amenable to automation

$$\frac{\Gamma, A \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash A \to B} \quad [\to R]$$

Two (equivalent) classical rules

Two (equivalent) classical rules

Law of Excluded Middle (LEM)

Two (equivalent) classical rules

Law of Excluded Middle (LEM)

$$ightharpoonup \vdash A \lor \neg A$$

Two (equivalent) classical rules

Law of Excluded Middle (LEM)

- $\vdash A \lor \neg A$
- We will write LEM for $A \vee \neg A$

Two (equivalent) classical rules

Law of Excluded Middle (LEM)

- $\vdash A \lor \neg A$
- We will write LEM for $A \vee \neg A$

Two (equivalent) classical rules

Law of Excluded Middle (LEM)

- $\blacktriangleright \vdash A \lor \neg A$
- We will write LEM for $A \vee \neg A$

Double Negation Elimination (DNE)

"proof by contradiction"

Two (equivalent) classical rules

Law of Excluded Middle (LEM)

- $\blacktriangleright \vdash A \lor \neg A$
- We will write LEM for $A \vee \neg A$

- "proof by contradiction"
- $ightharpoonup \neg \neg A \vdash A$

Two (equivalent) classical rules

Law of Excluded Middle (LEM)

- $\blacktriangleright \vdash A \lor \neg A$
- We will write LEM for $A \vee \neg A$

- "proof by contradiction"
- $ightharpoonup \neg \neg A \vdash A$
- ▶ Equivalently, $(\neg A) \rightarrow \bot \vdash A$

Two (equivalent) classical rules

Law of Excluded Middle (LEM)

- $\blacktriangleright \vdash A \lor \neg A$
- We will write LEM for $A \vee \neg A$

- "proof by contradiction"
- $ightharpoonup \neg \neg A \vdash A$
- ▶ Equivalently, $(\neg A) \rightarrow \bot \vdash A$
- Equivalently, $\vdash (\neg \neg A) \rightarrow A$

Two (equivalent) classical rules

Law of Excluded Middle (LEM)

- $\blacktriangleright \vdash A \lor \neg A$
- We will write LEM for $A \vee \neg A$

- "proof by contradiction"
- $ightharpoonup \neg \neg A \vdash A$
- ▶ Equivalently, $(\neg A) \rightarrow \bot \vdash A$
- Equivalently, $\vdash (\neg \neg A) \rightarrow A$
- ▶ We will write DNE for $(\neg \neg A) \rightarrow A$

Two (equivalent) classical rules

Law of Excluded Middle (LEM)

- $\blacktriangleright \vdash A \lor \neg A$
- We will write LEM for $A \vee \neg A$

Double Negation Elimination (DNE)

- "proof by contradiction"
- $ightharpoonup \neg \neg A \vdash A$
- Equivalently, $(\neg A) \rightarrow \bot \vdash A$
- Equivalently, $\vdash (\neg \neg A) \rightarrow A$
- ▶ We will write DNE for $(\neg \neg A) \rightarrow A$

3 classical systems

- Classical Natural Deduction with LEM and DNE rules
- Classical Sequent Calculus with LEM and DNE rules
- Classical Sequent Calculus with classical sequents

Recap: Semantics

Semantics for "implies"

$$\phi(A \to B) = \mathbf{T} \text{ iff } \phi(B) = \mathbf{T} \text{ whenever } \phi(A) = \mathbf{T}$$

Recap: Semantics

Semantics for "implies"

$$\phi(A \to B) = \mathbf{T} \text{ iff } \phi(B) = \mathbf{T} \text{ whenever } \phi(A) = \mathbf{T}$$

Truth table for "implies"

P	Q	$P \to Q$
Т	Т	Т
Т	F	F
F	Т	Т
F	F	Т

Let $A \leftrightarrow B$ be defined as $(A \to B) \land (B \to A)$

- ▶ it means that A and B are logically equivalent
- A and B have the same semantics
- $\phi(A) = \mathbf{T}$ if and only if $\phi(B) = \mathbf{T}$
- ightharpoonup A is provable if and only if B is provable
- this is called a "bi-implication"
- read as "A if and only if B"

Let $A \leftrightarrow B$ be defined as $(A \to B) \land (B \to A)$

- ▶ it means that A and B are logically equivalent
- A and B have the same semantics
- $\phi(A) = \mathbf{T}$ if and only if $\phi(B) = \mathbf{T}$
- ightharpoonup A is provable if and only if B is provable
- this is called a "bi-implication"
- read as "A if and only if B"

Example: we showed that DNE and LEM are equivalent

Let $A \leftrightarrow B$ be defined as $(A \to B) \land (B \to A)$

- ▶ it means that A and B are logically equivalent
- A and B have the same semantics
- $\phi(A) = \mathbf{T}$ if and only if $\phi(B) = \mathbf{T}$
- ▶ *A* is provable if and only if *B* is provable
- this is called a "bi-implication"
- read as "A if and only if B"

Example: we showed that DNE and LEM are equivalent

We have already proved:

Let $A \leftrightarrow B$ be defined as $(A \to B) \land (B \to A)$

- ▶ it means that A and B are logically equivalent
- A and B have the same semantics
- $\phi(A) = \mathbf{T}$ if and only if $\phi(B) = \mathbf{T}$
- ightharpoonup A is provable if and only if B is provable
- this is called a "bi-implication"
- read as "A if and only if B"

Example: we showed that DNE and LEM are equivalent

We have already proved:

► DNE → LEM

Let
$$A \leftrightarrow B$$
 be defined as $(A \to B) \land (B \to A)$

- ▶ it means that A and B are logically equivalent
- A and B have the same semantics
- $\phi(A) = \mathbf{T}$ if and only if $\phi(B) = \mathbf{T}$
- ightharpoonup A is provable if and only if B is provable
- this is called a "bi-implication"
- ▶ read as "A if and only if B"

Example: we showed that DNE and LEM are equivalent

We have already proved:

- ► DNE → LEM
- ► LEM → DNE

Let
$$A \leftrightarrow B$$
 be defined as $(A \to B) \land (B \to A)$

- ▶ it means that A and B are logically equivalent
- A and B have the same semantics
- $\phi(A) = \mathbf{T}$ if and only if $\phi(B) = \mathbf{T}$
- ightharpoonup A is provable if and only if B is provable
- this is called a "bi-implication"
- read as "A if and only if B"

Example: we showed that DNE and LEM are equivalent

We have already proved:

- ► DNE → LEM
- ► LEM → DNE

It is then straightforward to derive a proof of DNE ↔ LEM

Another example: we showed that implications are classically equivalent to their contrapositives (in classical logic)

Another example: we showed that implications are classically equivalent to their contrapositives (in classical logic)

We have proved:

Another example: we showed that implications are classically equivalent to their contrapositives (in classical logic)

We have proved:

•
$$(A \to B) \to (\neg B \to \neg A)$$
 in intuitionistic logic

Another example: we showed that implications are classically equivalent to their contrapositives (in classical logic)

We have proved:

- $(A \to B) \to (\neg B \to \neg A)$ in intuitionistic logic
- $(\neg B \to \neg A) \to (A \to B)$ in classical logic

Another example: we showed that implications are classically equivalent to their contrapositives (in classical logic)

We have proved:

- $(A \to B) \to (\neg B \to \neg A)$ in intuitionistic logic
- $(\neg B \rightarrow \neg A) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B)$ in classical logic

It is then straightforward to derive a proof of $(A\to B) \leftrightarrow (\neg B\to \neg A)$ in classical Natural Deduction

Another example: we showed that implications are classically equivalent to their contrapositives (in classical logic)

We have proved:

- $(A \to B) \to (\neg B \to \neg A)$ in intuitionistic logic
- $(\neg B \rightarrow \neg A) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B)$ in classical logic

It is then straightforward to derive a proof of $(A\to B) \leftrightarrow (\neg B\to \neg A)$ in classical Natural Deduction

Equivalences are for example useful in proofs to "replace" a formula by another equivalent formula

Another example: we showed that implications are classically equivalent to their contrapositives (in classical logic)

We have proved:

- $(A \to B) \to (\neg B \to \neg A)$ in intuitionistic logic
- $(\neg B \to \neg A) \to (A \to B)$ in classical logic

It is then straightforward to derive a proof of $(A\to B) \leftrightarrow (\neg B\to \neg A)$ in classical Natural Deduction

Equivalences are for example useful in proofs to "replace" a formula by another equivalent formula

We will now present some standard ones

We are going to prove:

We are going to prove:

▶ De Morgan's law (I): $\neg(A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$

We are going to prove:

- ▶ De Morgan's law (I): $\neg (A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$
- ▶ De Morgan's law (II): $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor \neg B)$

We are going to prove:

- ▶ De Morgan's law (I): $\neg (A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$
- ▶ De Morgan's law (II): $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor \neg B)$
- ▶ implication elimination: $(A \to B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor B)$

We are going to prove:

- ▶ De Morgan's law (I): $\neg (A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$
- ▶ De Morgan's law (II): $\neg (A \land B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor \neg B)$
- ▶ implication elimination: $(A \rightarrow B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor B)$

Some of these proofs are intuitionistic, while some are classical

We are going to prove:

- ▶ De Morgan's law (I): $\neg (A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$
- ▶ De Morgan's law (II): $\neg (A \land B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor \neg B)$
- ▶ implication elimination: $(A \rightarrow B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor B)$

Some of these proofs are **intuitionistic**, while some are **classical** In addition you can try to prove:

We are going to prove:

- ▶ De Morgan's law (I): $\neg (A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$
- ▶ De Morgan's law (II): $\neg (A \land B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor \neg B)$
- ▶ implication elimination: $(A \rightarrow B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor B)$

Some of these proofs are intuitionistic, while some are classical

- ▶ Commutativity of \wedge : $(A \wedge B) \leftrightarrow (B \wedge A)$
- ▶ Commutativity of \vee : $(A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (B \lor A)$

We are going to prove:

- ▶ De Morgan's law (I): $\neg (A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$
- ▶ De Morgan's law (II): $\neg (A \land B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor \neg B)$
- ▶ implication elimination: $(A \rightarrow B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor B)$

Some of these proofs are intuitionistic, while some are classical

- ▶ Commutativity of \wedge : $(A \wedge B) \leftrightarrow (B \wedge A)$
- ▶ Commutativity of \vee : $(A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (B \lor A)$
- ▶ Associativity of \wedge : $((A \wedge B) \wedge C) \leftrightarrow (A \wedge (B \wedge C))$
- ▶ Associativity of \vee : $((A \lor B) \lor C) \leftrightarrow (A \lor (B \lor C))$

We are going to prove:

- ▶ De Morgan's law (I): $\neg (A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$
- ▶ De Morgan's law (II): $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor \neg B)$
- ▶ implication elimination: $(A \rightarrow B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor B)$

Some of these proofs are intuitionistic, while some are classical

- ▶ Commutativity of \wedge : $(A \wedge B) \leftrightarrow (B \wedge A)$
- ▶ Commutativity of \vee : $(A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (B \lor A)$
- ▶ Associativity of \wedge : $((A \wedge B) \wedge C) \leftrightarrow (A \wedge (B \wedge C))$
- ▶ Associativity of \vee : $((A \lor B) \lor C) \leftrightarrow (A \lor (B \lor C))$
- ▶ Distributivity of \land over \lor : $(A \land (B \lor C)) \leftrightarrow ((A \land B) \lor (A \land C))$
- ▶ Distributivity of \lor over \land : $(A \lor (B \land C)) \leftrightarrow ((A \lor B) \land (A \lor C))$

We are going to prove:

- ▶ De Morgan's law (I): $\neg (A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$
- ▶ De Morgan's law (II): $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor \neg B)$
- ▶ implication elimination: $(A \rightarrow B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor B)$

Some of these proofs are intuitionistic, while some are classical

- ▶ Commutativity of \wedge : $(A \wedge B) \leftrightarrow (B \wedge A)$
- ▶ Commutativity of \vee : $(A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (B \lor A)$
- ▶ Associativity of \wedge : $((A \wedge B) \wedge C) \leftrightarrow (A \wedge (B \wedge C))$
- ▶ Associativity of \vee : $((A \lor B) \lor C) \leftrightarrow (A \lor (B \lor C))$
- ▶ Distributivity of \land over \lor : $(A \land (B \lor C)) \leftrightarrow ((A \land B) \lor (A \land C))$
- ▶ Distributivity of \lor over \land : $(A \lor (B \land C)) \leftrightarrow ((A \lor B) \land (A \lor C))$
- ▶ Double negation elimination: $(\neg \neg A) \leftrightarrow A$

We are going to prove:

- ▶ De Morgan's law (I): $\neg (A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$
- ▶ De Morgan's law (II): $\neg (A \land B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor \neg B)$
- ▶ implication elimination: $(A \rightarrow B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor B)$

Some of these proofs are intuitionistic, while some are classical

- ▶ Commutativity of \wedge : $(A \wedge B) \leftrightarrow (B \wedge A)$
- Commutativity of \vee : $(A \vee B) \leftrightarrow (B \vee A)$
- ▶ Associativity of \wedge : $((A \wedge B) \wedge C) \leftrightarrow (A \wedge (B \wedge C))$
- ▶ Associativity of \vee : $((A \lor B) \lor C) \leftrightarrow (A \lor (B \lor C))$
- ▶ Distributivity of \land over \lor : $(A \land (B \lor C)) \leftrightarrow ((A \land B) \lor (A \land C))$
- ▶ Distributivity of \lor over \land : $(A \lor (B \land C)) \leftrightarrow ((A \lor B) \land (A \lor C))$
- ▶ Double negation elimination: $(\neg \neg A) \leftrightarrow A$
- ▶ Idempotence: $(A \land A) \leftrightarrow A$ and $(A \lor A) \leftrightarrow A$

As our Natural Deduction equivalence proofs will all be as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} - & - & - \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \\ \overline{A \to B} & \overline{B \to A} & \\ \hline A \leftrightarrow B & & [\land I] \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{cccc} \overline{A} & \overline{B} & 2 \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \overline{B} & 1 & A \\ \hline A \to B & A & A \end{array} \stackrel{1}{\longrightarrow} \begin{array}{ccccc} A & A & A \\ A \to B & A & A \end{array} \stackrel{1}{\longrightarrow} \begin{array}{ccccc} A & A & A & A \\ \hline A \to B & A & A & A \end{array}$$

As our Natural Deduction equivalence proofs will all be as follows:

$$\begin{array}{cccc} \overline{A} & & \overline{B} & ^{2} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \underline{B} & & & A & \\ \underline{A \rightarrow B} & ^{1} [\rightarrow I] & \underline{A} & ^{2} [\rightarrow I] \\ \hline & & & & A \leftrightarrow B & \\ \end{array}$$

then, we will focus on proving

- ▶ $A \vdash B$ (left-to-right implication)
- ▶ $B \vdash A$ (right-to-left implication)

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$ in Natural Deduction

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$ in Natural Deduction

We first prove the left-to-right implication:

$$\neg (A \lor B) \vdash (\neg A \land \neg B)$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$ in Natural Deduction

We first prove the left-to-right implication:

$$\neg (A \lor B) \vdash (\neg A \land \neg B)$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$ in Natural Deduction

We first prove the left-to-right implication:

$$\neg (A \lor B) \vdash (\neg A \land \neg B)$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$ in Natural Deduction

We first prove the left-to-right implication:

$$\neg (A \lor B) \vdash (\neg A \land \neg B)$$

$$\frac{\neg (A \lor B)}{\frac{\bot}{\neg A} \stackrel{1}{} \stackrel{\neg (A \lor B)}{}} \qquad \frac{\neg (A \lor B)}{\neg B} \qquad \frac{\neg (A \lor B)}{\neg B}$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg (A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$ in Natural Deduction

We first prove the left-to-right implication:

$$\neg (A \lor B) \vdash (\neg A \land \neg B)$$

e is a proof:
$$\frac{A}{A \lor B} = A \lor B$$

$$A \lor B$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$ in Natural Deduction

We first prove the left-to-right implication:

$$\neg (A \lor B) \vdash (\neg A \land \neg B)$$

$$\frac{\neg (A \lor B) \quad \overline{A}^{1} \quad [\lor I_{L}]}{A \lor B} \quad \overline{[\lnot E]} \quad \overline{\neg (A \lor B)} \quad \overline{\qquad}$$

$$\frac{\bot}{\neg A} \quad 1 \quad [\lnot I] \quad \overline{\neg B} \quad [\land I]$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$ in Natural Deduction

We first prove the left-to-right implication:

$$\neg (A \lor B) \vdash (\neg A \land \neg B)$$

$$\frac{A - 1}{A \lor B} \stackrel{[\lor I_L]}{=} - (A \lor B) \stackrel{\overline{B}^2}{=} \\
\frac{\bot}{\neg A} \stackrel{1}{} \stackrel{[\lnot I]}{=} \stackrel{[\lnot E]}{=} \frac{\neg (A \lor B)}{\xrightarrow{-A \land \neg B}} \stackrel{[\land I]}{=} \\$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$ in Natural Deduction

We first prove the left-to-right implication:

$$\neg (A \lor B) \vdash (\neg A \land \neg B)$$

$$\frac{\neg (A \lor B) \quad \frac{\overline{A}^{1}}{A \lor B} \quad [\lor I_{L}]}{\frac{\bot}{\neg A} \quad 1 \quad [\lnot E]} \quad \frac{\neg (A \lor B) \quad \frac{\overline{B}^{2}}{A \lor B}}{\frac{\bot}{\neg B} \quad 2 \quad [\lnot E]} \quad [\lnot E]}$$

$$\frac{\bot}{\neg A \land \neg B} \quad [\land I]$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$ in Natural Deduction

We first prove the left-to-right implication:

$$\neg (A \lor B) \vdash (\neg A \land \neg B)$$

$$\frac{\neg (A \lor B) \quad \frac{\overline{A}^{1}}{A \lor B} \quad [\lor I_{L}]}{\frac{\bot}{\neg A} \quad 1 \quad [\lnot E]} \quad \frac{\neg (A \lor B) \quad \frac{\overline{B}^{2}}{A \lor B} \quad [\lor I_{R}]}{\frac{\bot}{\neg B} \quad 2 \quad [\lnot E]}$$

$$\frac{\bot}{\neg A \land \neg B} \quad [\land I]$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$ in Natural Deduction

We first prove the left-to-right implication:

$$\neg (A \lor B) \vdash (\neg A \land \neg B)$$

Here is a proof:

$$\frac{\neg (A \lor B) \quad \frac{\overline{A}^{1}}{A \lor B}}{\stackrel{[\lor I_{L}]}{-\underline{A}^{1}} \quad [\lnot E]} \quad \frac{\neg (A \lor B) \quad \frac{\overline{B}^{2}}{A \lor B}}{\stackrel{[\lor I_{R}]}{-\underline{B}^{2}}} \quad [\lnot E]}$$

$$\frac{\bot}{\neg A \land \neg B} \quad [\land I]$$

Proof only uses intuitionistic rules!

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$ in Natural Deduction

We first prove the left-to-right implication:

$$\neg (A \lor B) \vdash (\neg A \land \neg B)$$

Here is a proof:

$$\frac{\neg (A \lor B) \quad \overline{A}^{1}}{A \lor B} \stackrel{[\lor I_{L}]}{[\neg E]} \quad \frac{\neg (A \lor B)}{A \lor B} \stackrel{\overline{B}^{2}}{A \lor B} \stackrel{[\lor I_{R}]}{[\neg E]} \\
\frac{\bot}{\neg A} \stackrel{1}{1} \stackrel{[\lnot I]}{[} \qquad \frac{\bot}{\neg B} \stackrel{2}{2} \stackrel{[\lnot I]}{[} \\
\neg A \land \neg B$$

Proof only uses intuitionistic rules!

Other direction on the next slide

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$ in Natural Deduction

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$ in Natural Deduction

We now prove the right-to-left implication:

$$(\neg A \land \neg B) \vdash \neg (A \lor B)$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$ in Natural Deduction

We now	nrove	the	right-to-left	implication:
AAC HOAM	prove	LIIC	rigiit-to-leit	implication.

$$(\neg A \land \neg B) \vdash \neg (A \lor B)$$

Here is a proof:

 $\neg (A \lor B)$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$ in Natural Deduction

We now prove the right-to-left implication:

$$(\neg A \land \neg B) \vdash \neg (A \lor B)$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$ in Natural Deduction

We now prove the right-to-left implication:

$$(\neg A \land \neg B) \vdash \neg (A \lor B)$$

$$\frac{\overline{A \vee B}}{A \vee B} \stackrel{1}{\longrightarrow} \frac{\overline{A \rightarrow \bot}}{\overline{A \rightarrow \bot}} \qquad \overline{B \rightarrow \bot} \qquad [\vee E]$$

$$\frac{\bot}{\neg (A \vee B)} \stackrel{1}{\longrightarrow} [\neg I]$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$ in Natural Deduction

We now prove the right-to-left implication:

$$(\neg A \land \neg B) \vdash \neg (A \lor B)$$

$$\frac{\overline{A} \stackrel{2}{\longrightarrow} \frac{\overline{A}}{A \longrightarrow \bot} \stackrel{2}{\longrightarrow} [\lor E]}{\xrightarrow{\overline{A} \searrow B}} \stackrel{1}{\longrightarrow} \frac{\overline{A} \stackrel{2}{\longrightarrow} 1}{\longrightarrow} [\lor E]$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$ in Natural Deduction

We now prove the right-to-left implication:

$$(\neg A \land \neg B) \vdash \neg (A \lor B)$$

$$\frac{A \stackrel{?}{-} \stackrel{?}{-} A}{\stackrel{[\neg E]}{-}} \stackrel{[\neg E]}{-} \frac{}{\stackrel{A}{-} A} \stackrel{[\neg E]}{\stackrel{[\neg E]}{-}} \frac{}{\stackrel{[\nabla E]}{-}} \frac{}{\stackrel{[\nabla E]}{-}}$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$ in Natural Deduction

We now prove the right-to-left implication:

$$(\neg A \land \neg B) \vdash \neg (A \lor B)$$

$$\frac{A}{A} \stackrel{2}{\xrightarrow{\neg A}} \stackrel{\neg A}{\xrightarrow{\neg A}} \stackrel{[\land E]}{\xrightarrow{\neg E}} \stackrel{-}{\xrightarrow{\neg A}} \frac{\bot}{A \to \bot} \stackrel{[\lnot E]}{\xrightarrow{\neg A}} \stackrel{[\lor E]}{\xrightarrow{\neg A}} \frac{\bot}{A \to \bot} \stackrel{[\lor E]}{\xrightarrow{\neg A}} \frac{\bot}{\neg (A \lor B)} \stackrel{1}{\xrightarrow{\neg A}} \stackrel{[\lnot I]}{\xrightarrow{\neg A}}$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$ in Natural Deduction

We now prove the right-to-left implication:

$$(\neg A \land \neg B) \vdash \neg (A \lor B)$$

$$\frac{A^{2} \frac{\neg A \land \neg B}{\neg A}}{\bot} [\land E] \frac{B^{3}}{\bot} \frac{\bot}{A \to \bot} [\land E] \frac{\bot}{B \to \bot} [\land E]$$

$$\frac{A \lor B}{\bot} [\lnot E] \frac{\bot}{A \to \bot} [\lor E]$$

$$\frac{\bot}{\neg (A \lor B)} [\lnot E]$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$ in Natural Deduction

We now prove the right-to-left implication:

$$(\neg A \land \neg B) \vdash \neg (A \lor B)$$

$$\frac{A^{2} \frac{\neg A \land \neg B}{\neg A}}{\bot} [\land E] \frac{B}{B} \frac{3}{\neg B} [\neg E]}$$

$$\frac{A \lor B}{A \lor B} \stackrel{1}{\longrightarrow} \frac{\bot}{A \to \bot} 2 [\to I] \frac{\bot}{B \to \bot} 3 [\to I]$$

$$\frac{\bot}{\neg (A \lor B)} 1 [\neg I]$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$ in Natural Deduction

We now prove the right-to-left implication:

$$(\neg A \land \neg B) \vdash \neg (A \lor B)$$

$$\frac{A^{2} \frac{\neg A \land \neg B}{\neg A}}{A \downarrow} [\land E] \frac{B}{A} \frac{\neg A \land \neg B}{\neg B} [\land E]$$

$$\frac{A \lor B}{A \lor B} \stackrel{1}{\longrightarrow} \frac{A \lor B}{A \to \bot} \stackrel{2}{\longrightarrow} [\neg E] \stackrel{1}{\longrightarrow} \frac{A \lor B}{A \to \bot} \stackrel{3}{\longrightarrow} [\lor E]$$

$$\frac{A \lor B}{A \lor B} \stackrel{1}{\longrightarrow} \frac{A \lor B}{A \lor B} \stackrel{1}{\longrightarrow} [\lor E]$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \lor B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)$ in Natural Deduction

We now prove the right-to-left implication:

$$(\neg A \land \neg B) \vdash \neg (A \lor B)$$

Here is a proof:

$$\frac{A}{A} \stackrel{2}{\overset{\neg A}{\xrightarrow{\neg A}}} \stackrel{[\land E]}{\overset{}{\xrightarrow{\neg A}}} \stackrel{B}{\overset{}{\xrightarrow{\neg A}}} \stackrel{[\land E]}{\overset{}{\xrightarrow{\neg A}}} \stackrel{A}{\xrightarrow{\neg B}} \stackrel{[\land E]}{\overset{}{\xrightarrow{\neg A}}} \stackrel{A}{\xrightarrow{\rightarrow}} \stackrel{A$$

Again, we only used intuitionistic rules!

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor \neg B$ in Natural Deduction

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor \neg B$ in Natural Deduction

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor \neg B$ in Natural Deduction

$$\neg(A \land B)$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor \neg B$ in Natural Deduction

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor \neg B$ in Natural Deduction

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor \neg B$ in Natural Deduction

$$\frac{\neg A}{\neg A} \stackrel{2}{\longrightarrow} \frac{\overline{A} \wedge B}{\neg A \rightarrow \bot} \stackrel{1}{\longrightarrow} \frac{\overline{A} \wedge B}{\neg B \rightarrow \bot} \stackrel{1}{\longrightarrow} \frac{\bot}{\neg (A \wedge B)} \stackrel{1}{\longrightarrow} \stackrel{[\vee E]}{\longrightarrow} \frac{\bot}{\neg (A \wedge B)} \stackrel{1}{\longrightarrow} \frac{\Box}{\neg B \rightarrow \bot} \stackrel{[\vee E]}{\longrightarrow} \stackrel{[\vee$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor \neg B$ in Natural Deduction

$$\frac{\neg A}{\neg A} \stackrel{2}{\xrightarrow{A \land B}} \stackrel{1}{\xrightarrow{A \land B}} \stackrel{1}{\xrightarrow$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor \neg B$ in Natural Deduction

$$\frac{A \wedge B}{A} \stackrel{[\wedge E_L]}{=} \frac{\overline{A \wedge B}}{A} \stackrel{[\wedge E_L]}{=} \frac{\overline{A \wedge B}}{A} \stackrel{1}{=} \frac{\overline{A \wedge B}}{A \wedge B} \stackrel{1}{=} \frac{\overline{A \wedge B}$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor \neg B$ in Natural Deduction

$$\frac{A \wedge B}{A} \stackrel{[\wedge E_L]}{=} \frac{A \wedge B}{A} \stackrel{[\neg E]}{=} \frac{A \wedge B}{A} \stackrel{[\neg E]}{=} \frac{A \wedge B}{A} \stackrel{[\neg E]}{=} \frac{A \wedge B}{A \wedge B} \stackrel{[\neg E]}{=} \frac{A \wedge B}{A \wedge$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor \neg B$ in Natural Deduction

$$\frac{\neg A}{\neg A} \stackrel{2}{\xrightarrow{A \land B}} \stackrel{1}{\stackrel{[\land E_L]}{=}} \stackrel{}{\xrightarrow{\neg B}} \stackrel{3}{\xrightarrow{A \land B}} \stackrel{1}{\xrightarrow{B}} \\
\frac{\bot}{\neg A \lor \neg B} \stackrel{2}{\xrightarrow{\neg A \to \bot}} \stackrel{2}{\xrightarrow{[\vdash E]}} \stackrel{1}{\xrightarrow{\neg B \to \bot}} \stackrel{3}{\xrightarrow{[\vdash E]}} \\
\frac{\bot}{\neg (A \land B)} \stackrel{1}{\xrightarrow{1}} \stackrel{[\vdash I]}{\xrightarrow{\neg B \to \bot}} \stackrel{1}{\xrightarrow{[\vdash E]}}$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor \neg B$ in Natural Deduction

$$\frac{-A}{A} \stackrel{2}{=} \frac{\overline{A \wedge B}}{A} \stackrel{[\wedge E_L]}{[\neg E]} \stackrel{-B}{=} \stackrel{3}{=} \frac{\overline{A \wedge B}}{B} \stackrel{[\wedge E_R]}{[\wedge E_R]}$$

$$\frac{\bot}{\neg A \vee \neg B} \stackrel{2}{=} \stackrel{[\to I]}{=} \frac{\bot}{\neg B \to \bot} \stackrel{3}{=} \stackrel{[\to I]}{[\vee E]}$$

$$\frac{\bot}{\neg (A \wedge B)} \stackrel{1}{=} \stackrel{[\to I]}{=} \frac{\bot}{\neg (A \wedge B)} \stackrel{1}{=} \frac{\bot}{\neg (A \wedge B)} \stackrel{1}{=}$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor \neg B$ in Natural Deduction

We first prove the right-to-left implication: $\neg A \lor \neg B \vdash \neg (A \land B)$ Here is a proof:

$$\frac{A \wedge B}{A} \stackrel{[\wedge E_L]}{=} \frac{A \wedge B}{B} \stackrel{[\wedge E_R]}{=} \frac{A \wedge B}{B} \stackrel{[\neg E]}{=} \frac{A \wedge B}{B} \stackrel{[\neg$$

Proof uses intuitionistic rules!

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor \neg B$ in Natural Deduction

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor \neg B$ in Natural Deduction

We now prove the left-to-right implication: $\neg(A \land B) \vdash \neg A \lor \neg B$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor \neg B$ in Natural Deduction

We now prove the left-to-right implication: $\neg(A \land B) \vdash \neg A \lor \neg B$
Here is a proof (classical—we use DNE thrice):
<u> </u>

 $\neg A \lor \neg B$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor \neg B$ in Natural Deduction

$$\frac{\neg \neg (\neg A \lor \neg B)}{\neg A \lor \neg B} \quad [DNE]$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor \neg B$ in Natural Deduction

$$\frac{\bot}{\neg \neg (\neg A \lor \neg B)} \stackrel{1 \ [\neg I]}{-A \lor \neg B}$$

$$[DNE]$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor \neg B$ in Natural Deduction

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor \neg B$ in Natural Deduction

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor \neg B$ in Natural Deduction

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor \neg B$ in Natural Deduction

$$\frac{-A}{-A} \stackrel{2}{=} \frac{-A}{-(\neg A \lor \neg B)} \stackrel{1}{=} \frac{-A}{-(\neg$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor \neg B$ in Natural Deduction

$$\frac{\overline{A}^{2}}{A \vee B} \qquad \frac{\overline{A}^{2}}{A \vee B} \qquad \frac{\overline{A}^{2}}{B} \qquad \frac{\overline{A}^{2}}{B$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor \neg B$ in Natural Deduction

$$\frac{-A}{\neg A} \stackrel{?}{=} [\lor I_L] \stackrel{}{=} \frac{-}{\neg (\neg A \lor \neg B)} \stackrel{1}{=} \frac{-}{\neg (\neg A \lor \neg B)} \stackrel{[\neg E]}{=} \frac{-}{\neg (\neg A \lor \neg B)} \stackrel{1}{=} [\neg E] \stackrel{}{=} \frac{\bot}{\neg \neg (\neg A \lor \neg B)} \stackrel{1}{=} [DNE] \stackrel{}{=} \frac{-}{\neg A \lor \neg B} \stackrel{[DNE]}{=} \frac{-}{\neg A \lor \neg B} \stackrel{[DNE]}{=} \frac{-}{\neg A \lor \neg B} \stackrel{[DNE]}{=} \frac{-}{\neg A \lor \neg B} \stackrel{}{=} \stackrel{}{=} \frac{-}{\neg A \lor \neg B} \stackrel{}{=} \stackrel{}$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor \neg B$ in Natural Deduction

$$\frac{\overline{A}^{2}}{\neg A \vee \neg B} [\vee I_{L}] \xrightarrow{\neg (\neg A \vee \neg B)} 1 \xrightarrow{\neg (\neg A \vee \neg B)} 1$$

$$\frac{\bot}{\neg \neg A} [DNE] \xrightarrow{\neg (B)} [DNE] \xrightarrow{\neg (B)} [DNE]$$

$$\frac{\neg (A \wedge B)}{\neg (A \wedge \neg B)} [DNE] \xrightarrow{\neg (A \vee \neg B)} [DNE]$$

$$\frac{\bot}{\neg \neg (\neg A \vee \neg B)} [DNE] \xrightarrow{\neg (B)} [DNE]$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor \neg B$ in Natural Deduction

$$\frac{\overline{A}^{2}}{\neg A \vee \neg B} [\vee I_{L}] \frac{\overline{A} \vee \neg B}{\neg (\neg A \vee \neg B)} [\neg E] \frac{\overline{A}^{3}}{\neg (\neg A \vee \neg B)} [\neg E] \frac{\overline{A}^{3}}{\neg (\neg A \vee \neg B)} [\neg E] \frac{\overline{A}^{3}}{\neg A \vee \neg B} [\neg E] \frac{\overline{A}^{3}}{\neg (\neg A \vee \neg B)} [\neg E] \frac{\overline{A}^{3}}{\neg A \vee \neg B} [\neg E] \frac{\overline{A}^{3}}{\neg A} [\neg E] \frac{\overline$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor \neg B$ in Natural Deduction

$$\frac{\overline{A}^{2}}{A \vee B} [\vee I_{L}] \frac{\overline{A} \vee B}{\neg (\neg A \vee \neg B)} [\neg E] \frac{\overline{B}^{3}}{\neg A \vee B} \frac{\overline{A} \vee B}{\neg (\neg A \vee \neg B)} [\neg E]$$

$$\frac{\frac{1}{\neg A}^{2}}{\frac{\neg A}{A}} [DNE] \frac{1}{[DNE]} \frac{\overline{B}^{3}}{\frac{\neg B}{B}} [DNE]$$

$$\frac{\neg (A \wedge B)}{\frac{\neg (A \vee B)}{\neg A \vee B}} [DNE] [DNE]$$

$$\frac{\overline{A} \vee B}{\neg A \vee B} [DNE] |DNE]$$

Show the logical equivalence $\neg(A \land B) \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor \neg B$ in Natural Deduction

$$\frac{\overline{A}^{2}}{A \vee B} [\vee I_{L}] \frac{\overline{A} \vee B}{\neg (\neg A \vee \neg B)} [\neg E] \frac{\overline{B}^{3}}{\neg A \vee B} [\vee I_{R}] \frac{\overline{A} \vee B}{\neg (\neg A \vee \neg B)} [\neg E]$$

$$\frac{\frac{\bot}{A} [DNE]}{A | DNE|} \frac{\bot}{B} [DNE]$$

$$\frac{\bot}{A \vee B} [\neg E]$$

$$\frac{\bot}{B} [AI]$$

$$\frac{\bot}{A \vee B} [AI]$$

$$\frac{\bot}{B} [AI]$$

$$\frac{\bot}{B} [AI]$$

$$\frac{\bot}{B} [AI]$$

$$\frac{\bot}{B} [AI]$$

Expressing \rightarrow using \neg and \lor

Show the logical equivalence: $A \rightarrow B \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor B$

Expressing \rightarrow using \neg and \lor

Show the logical equivalence: $A \rightarrow B \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor B$

We first prove the left-to-right implication $A \to B \vdash \neg A \lor B$

Show the logical equivalence: $A \rightarrow B \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor B$

We first prove the left-to-right implication $A o B \vdash \lnot A \lor B$
Here is a proof (classical—it uses LEM):

 $\neg A \lor B$

Show the logical equivalence: $A \rightarrow B \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor B$

We first prove the left-to-right implication $A \to B \vdash \neg A \lor B$ Here is a proof (classical—it uses LEM):

$$\frac{-}{A \vee \neg A} \stackrel{[LEM]}{=} \frac{-}{A \to (\neg A \vee B)} \qquad \frac{-}{\neg A \to (\neg A \vee B)} \qquad [\vee A \to B]$$

 $\neg A \lor B$

Show the logical equivalence: $A \rightarrow B \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor B$

We first prove the left-to-right implication $A \to B \vdash \neg A \lor B$ Here is a proof (classical—it uses LEM):

$$\frac{\overline{A}^{1}}{\overline{A \vee \neg A}} \xrightarrow{[LEM]} \frac{\overline{A \vee B}}{\overline{A \rightarrow (\neg A \vee B)}} \xrightarrow{1 [\rightarrow I]} \frac{\overline{A \rightarrow (\neg A \vee B)}}{\overline{\neg A \rightarrow (\neg A \vee B)}} \xrightarrow{[\vee E]}$$

16/28

Show the logical equivalence: $A \rightarrow B \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor B$

We first prove the left-to-right implication $A \to B \vdash \neg A \lor B$ Here is a proof (classical—it uses LEM):

$$\frac{\overline{A}^{1}}{\frac{B}{\neg A \lor B}} [\lor I_{R}] \qquad --$$

$$\overline{A \lor \neg A} [LEM] \frac{\overline{A} \lor (\neg A \lor B)}{A \to (\neg A \lor B)} 1 [\to I] \frac{\neg A \to (\neg A \lor B)}{\neg A \to (\neg A \lor B)} [\lor E]$$

Show the logical equivalence: $A \rightarrow B \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor B$

We first prove the left-to-right implication $A \to B \vdash \neg A \lor B$ Here is a proof (classical—it uses LEM):

$$\frac{\overline{A} \quad A \to B}{B \quad [\to E]} \qquad ---$$

$$\overline{A \lor \neg A} \quad [LEM] \quad \overline{A \to (\neg A \lor B)} \quad 1 \ [\to I] \quad \overline{-A \to (\neg A \lor B)}$$

$$\neg A \lor B \quad [\lor E]$$

Show the logical equivalence: $A \rightarrow B \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor B$

We first prove the left-to-right implication $A \to B \vdash \neg A \lor B$ Here is a proof (classical—it uses LEM):

$$\frac{\overline{A} \quad A \to B}{B \quad [\lor E]} \quad \frac{\overline{A} \quad A \to B}{\neg A \lor B} \quad [\lor I_R] \quad \frac{\overline{A} \quad 2}{\neg A \lor B} \quad 2 \quad [\lor I]$$

$$\overline{A \lor \neg A} \quad [LEM] \quad \overline{A \to (\neg A \lor B)} \quad 1 \quad [\lor E]$$

$$\neg A \lor B \quad [\lor E]$$

16/28

Show the logical equivalence: $A \rightarrow B \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor B$

We first prove the left-to-right implication $A \to B \vdash \neg A \lor B$ Here is a proof (classical—it uses LEM):

$$\frac{\overline{A} \quad A \to B}{B \quad [\lor E]} \quad \frac{\overline{A} \quad A \to B}{\neg A \lor B} \quad [\lor I_R] \quad \frac{\overline{A} \quad 2}{\neg A \lor B} \quad [\lor I_L] \quad \overline{A} \to (\neg A \lor B) \quad 1 \quad [\lor E]$$

$$\overline{A} \quad A \rightarrow (\neg A \lor B) \quad \overline{A} \quad A \rightarrow (\neg A \lor B) \quad [\lor E]$$

Show the logical equivalence: $A \rightarrow B \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor B$

We first prove the left-to-right implication $A \to B \vdash \neg A \lor B$ Here is a proof (classical—it uses LEM):

The other direction holds intuitionistically (next slide)

Show the logical equivalence: $A \rightarrow B \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor B$

Show the logical equivalence: $A \rightarrow B \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor B$

We now prove the right-to-left implication $\neg A \lor B \vdash A \to B$

Show the logical equivalence: $A \rightarrow B \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor B$

We now prove the right-to-left implication $\neg A \lor B \vdash A \to B$ Here is a proof (intuitionistic):

Show the logical equivalence: $A \rightarrow B \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor B$

$$\frac{A}{A} \stackrel{1}{\longrightarrow} \frac{A}{A} \stackrel{1}{\longrightarrow} \frac{B}{A \longrightarrow B} \stackrel{1}{\longrightarrow} \stackrel{[\rightarrow I]}{\longrightarrow} I$$

Show the logical equivalence: $A \rightarrow B \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor B$

$$\frac{\overline{A}^{1}}{\overline{A}}$$

$$-\overline{A} \lor B \quad \overline{A} \to B \qquad \overline{B} \to B$$

$$\frac{B}{A \to B} \stackrel{1}{\longrightarrow} [\to I]$$

Show the logical equivalence: $A \rightarrow B \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor B$

$$\frac{\neg A \stackrel{?}{=} \frac{1}{A}}{\neg A \lor B} \stackrel{?}{=} \frac{\neg A \lor B}{\neg A \to B} \stackrel{?}{=} \frac{\neg A \lor B}{\neg A \to B} \stackrel{[\lor E]}{=} \frac{B}{A \to B} \stackrel{1}{=} [\to I]$$

Show the logical equivalence: $A \rightarrow B \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor B$

a proof (intuitionistic):
$$\frac{\overline{A}^{2} \cdot \overline{A}^{1}}{\frac{\overline{A}^{2} \cdot \overline{A}^{1}}{\overline{A}^{2} \cdot \overline{A}^{2}}} = \frac{\overline{A}^{2} \cdot \overline{A}^{1}}{\overline{A}^{2} \cdot \overline{A}^{2}} = \frac{\overline{A}^{2} \cdot \overline{A}^{2}}{\overline{A}^{2} \cdot \overline{A}^{2}} = \frac{\overline{A}^{2} \cdot \overline{A}^{2}}{\overline{A}^{2}} = \frac{\overline{A}^$$

Show the logical equivalence: $A \rightarrow B \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor B$

proof (intuitionistic):
$$\frac{\neg A}{\neg A} \stackrel{2}{\xrightarrow{A}} \stackrel{1}{\xrightarrow{[\neg E]}}$$

$$\frac{\bot}{B} \stackrel{[\bot E]}{\xrightarrow{[\bot E]}} - \frac{\bot}{B \to B} \stackrel{[\bot E]}{\xrightarrow{A \to B}} \stackrel{2}{\xrightarrow{[\to I]}} \stackrel{B}{\xrightarrow{B \to B}} [\lor E]$$

$$\frac{B}{A \to B} \stackrel{1}{\xrightarrow{[\to I]}} \stackrel{[\to I]}{\xrightarrow{A \to B}}$$

Show the logical equivalence: $A \rightarrow B \leftrightarrow \neg A \lor B$

a proof (intuitionistic):
$$\frac{\overline{A}^{2} \quad \overline{A}^{1}}{\overline{A}^{2}} \stackrel{[\neg E]}{=} \\
\frac{\overline{B}^{2} \quad [\bot E]}{\overline{B}^{2}} \stackrel{\overline{B}^{3}}{=} \underbrace{B}^{3} \stackrel{[\rightarrow I]}{=} \\
\frac{B}{A \rightarrow B}^{1} \stackrel{[\rightarrow I]}{=} \\
\frac{B}{A \rightarrow B}^{1} \stackrel{[\rightarrow I]}{=} \\$$

Classically, two formulas are logically equivalent if they have the same semantics.

Classically, two formulas are logically equivalent if they have the same semantics.

I.e., they have the same truth values for all valuations.

Classically, two formulas are logically equivalent if they have the same semantics.

I.e., they have the same truth values for all valuations.

E.g., an implication and its contrapositive are logically equivalent:

Classically, two formulas are logically equivalent if they have the same semantics.

I.e., they have the same truth values for all valuations.

E.g., an implication and its contrapositive are logically equivalent:

Show that $(A \to B) \leftrightarrow (\neg B \to \neg A)$ using a truth table

Classically, two formulas are logically equivalent if they have the same semantics.

I.e., they have the same truth values for all valuations.

E.g., an implication and its contrapositive are logically equivalent:

Show that $(A \to B) \leftrightarrow (\neg B \to \neg A)$ using a truth table

A	B	$A \rightarrow B$	$\neg B$	$\neg A$	$\neg B \to \neg A$
Т	Т	Т	F	F	Т
Т	F	F	Т	F	F
F	Т	Т	F	Т	Т
F	F	Т	T	T	T

Classically, two formulas are logically equivalent if they have the same semantics.

I.e., they have the same truth values for all valuations.

E.g., an implication and its contrapositive are logically equivalent:

Show that
$$(A \to B) \leftrightarrow (\neg B \to \neg A)$$
 using a truth table

A	B	$A \rightarrow B$	$\neg B$	$\neg A$	$\neg B \to \neg A$
Т	Т	Т	F	F	Т
Т	F	F	Т	F	F
F	Т	Т	F	Т	T
F	F	Т	Т	T	Т

The two formulas are equivalent because the two columns for $A \to B$ and $\neg B \to \neg A$ are identical

Among the formulas equivalent to a given formula, some are of particular interest:

► Conjunctive Normal forms (CNF)

- ▶ Conjunctive Normal forms (CNF)
 - $(A \lor B \lor C) \land (D \lor X) \land (\neg A)$

- **▶ Conjunctive Normal forms (CNF)**
 - $(A \lor B \lor C) \land (D \lor X) \land (\neg A)$
 - ANDs of ORs of literals (atoms or negations of atoms)

- **▶ Conjunctive Normal forms (CNF)**
 - $(A \lor B \lor C) \land (D \lor X) \land (\neg A)$
 - ANDs of ORs of literals (atoms or negations of atoms)
 - ▶ A clause in this context is a disjunction of literals

- ► Conjunctive Normal forms (CNF)
 - $(A \lor B \lor C) \land (D \lor X) \land (\neg A)$
 - ANDs of ORs of literals (atoms or negations of atoms)
 - ▶ A clause in this context is a disjunction of literals
- Disjunctive Normal Form (DNF)

- ► Conjunctive Normal forms (CNF)
 - $(A \lor B \lor C) \land (D \lor X) \land (\neg A)$
 - ANDs of ORs of literals (atoms or negations of atoms)
 - ▶ A clause in this context is a disjunction of literals
- Disjunctive Normal Form (DNF)
 - $(P \land Q \land A) \lor (R \land \neg Q) \lor (\neg A)$

- **▶ Conjunctive Normal forms (CNF)**
 - $(A \lor B \lor C) \land (D \lor X) \land (\neg A)$
 - ANDs of ORs of literals (atoms or negations of atoms)
 - ▶ A clause in this context is a disjunction of literals
- Disjunctive Normal Form (DNF)
 - $(P \land Q \land A) \lor (R \land \neg Q) \lor (\neg A)$
 - ORs of ANDs of literals

- Conjunctive Normal forms (CNF)
 - $(A \lor B \lor C) \land (D \lor X) \land (\neg A)$
 - ANDs of ORs of literals (atoms or negations of atoms)
 - ▶ A clause in this context is a disjunction of literals
- Disjunctive Normal Form (DNF)
 - $(P \land Q \land A) \lor (R \land \neg Q) \lor (\neg A)$
 - ORs of ANDs of literals
 - A clause in this context is a conjunction of literals

Among the formulas equivalent to a given formula, some are of particular interest:

- ► Conjunctive Normal forms (CNF)
 - $(A \lor B \lor C) \land (D \lor X) \land (\neg A)$
 - ANDs of ORs of literals (atoms or negations of atoms)
 - ▶ A clause in this context is a disjunction of literals
- Disjunctive Normal Form (DNF)
 - $(P \land Q \land A) \lor (R \land \neg Q) \lor (\neg A)$
 - ORs of ANDs of literals
 - A clause in this context is a conjunction of literals

All the variables above and the ones used in the rest of this lecture stand for atomic propositions

Every formula can be expressed in DNF

Every proposition is equivalent to a formula in DNF (OR of ANDs)!

Every formula can be expressed in DNF

Every proposition is equivalent to a formula in DNF (OR of ANDs)!

Can you find propositions in DNF that are logically equivalent to:

Every proposition is equivalent to a formula in DNF (OR of ANDs)!

Can you find propositions in DNF that are logically equivalent to:

$$(A \land \neg B \land \neg C) \lor X$$

 $\triangleright Z$

 $A \rightarrow B$

 $\blacktriangleright \neg (A \land B)$

Every proposition is equivalent to a formula in DNF (OR of ANDs)!

Can you find propositions in DNF that are logically equivalent to:

- $(A \land \neg B \land \neg C) \lor X$ Already in DNF
- ► Z

 Already in DNF
- ► $A \to B$ Logically equivalent to $\neg A \lor B$
- ▶ $\neg(A \land B)$ Logically equivalent (by De Morgan's law) to $\neg A \lor \neg B$

Every proposition is equivalent to a formula in CNF (AND of ORs)!

Every proposition is equivalent to a formula in CNF (AND of ORs)!

Can you find propositions in CNF that are logically equivalent to:

Every proposition is equivalent to a formula in CNF (AND of ORs)!

Can you find propositions in CNF that are logically equivalent to:

$$(A \vee \neg B \vee \neg C) \wedge X$$

ightharpoonup Z

 $A \rightarrow B$

 $ightharpoonup \neg (A \lor B)$

Every proposition is equivalent to a formula in CNF (AND of ORs)!

Can you find propositions in CNF that are logically equivalent to:

- $(A \lor \neg B \lor \neg C) \land X$ Already in CNF
- ► Z

 Already in CNF
- ► $A \to B$ Logically equivalent to $\neg A \lor B$
- ▶ $\neg(A \lor B)$ Logically equivalent (by De Morgan's law) to $\neg A \land \neg B$

Every proposition can be expressed in DNF (ORs of ANDs)!

Every proposition can be expressed in DNF (ORs of ANDs)!

Express $(P \rightarrow Q) \wedge Q$ in DNF

Every proposition can be expressed in DNF (ORs of ANDs)!

Express $(P \rightarrow Q) \land Q$ in DNF

Every proposition can be expressed in DNF (ORs of ANDs)!

Express
$$(P \rightarrow Q) \land Q$$
 in DNF

P	Q	$(P \to Q)$	$(P \to Q) \land Q$
Т	Т	Т	Т
Т	F	F	F
F	Т	Т	Т
F	F	Т	F

Every proposition can be expressed in DNF (ORs of ANDs)!

Express
$$(P \rightarrow Q) \land Q$$
 in DNF

We do it using a truth table

P	Q	$(P \to Q)$	$(P \to Q) \land Q$
Т	Т	Т	Т
Т	F	F	F
F	Т	Т	Т
F	F	Т	F

▶ Enumerate all the **T** rows from the conclusion column

Every proposition can be expressed in DNF (ORs of ANDs)!

Express
$$(P \rightarrow Q) \land Q$$
 in DNF

P	Q	$(P \to Q)$	$(P \to Q) \land Q$
Т	Т	Т	Т
Т	F	F	F
F	Т	Т	Т
F	F	Т	F

- ▶ Enumerate all the **T** rows from the conclusion column
 - Row 1 gives $P \wedge Q$

Every proposition can be expressed in DNF (ORs of ANDs)!

Express
$$(P \rightarrow Q) \land Q$$
 in DNF

P	Q	$(P \to Q)$	$(P \to Q) \land Q$
Т	Т	Т	Т
Т	F	F	F
F	Т	Т	Т
F	F	Т	F

- Enumerate all the T rows from the conclusion column
 - Row 1 gives $P \wedge Q$
 - ▶ Row 3 gives $\neg P \land Q$

Every proposition can be expressed in DNF (ORs of ANDs)!

Express
$$(P \rightarrow Q) \land Q$$
 in DNF

P	Q	$(P \to Q)$	$(P \to Q) \land Q$
Т	Т	Т	Т
Т	F	F	F
F	Т	Т	Т
F	F	Т	F

- Enumerate all the T rows from the conclusion column
 - ▶ Row 1 gives $P \land Q$
 - ▶ Row 3 gives $\neg P \land Q$
- ► Take **OR** of these formulas

Every proposition can be expressed in DNF (ORs of ANDs)!

Express
$$(P \rightarrow Q) \land Q$$
 in DNF

P	Q	$(P \to Q)$	$(P \to Q) \land Q$
Т	Т	Т	Т
Т	F	F	F
F	Т	Т	Т
F	F	Т	F

- Enumerate all the T rows from the conclusion column
 - Row 1 gives $P \wedge Q$
 - ▶ Row 3 gives $\neg P \land Q$
- ► Take OR of these formulas
- ▶ Final answer is $(P \land Q) \lor (\neg P \land Q)$

Every proposition can be expressed in CNF (ANDs of ORs)!

Every proposition can be expressed in CNF (ANDs of ORs)!

Express $(P \rightarrow Q) \land Q$ in CNF

Every proposition can be expressed in CNF (ANDs of ORs)!

Express $(P \rightarrow Q) \land Q$ in CNF

Every proposition can be expressed in CNF (ANDs of ORs)!

Express
$$(P \rightarrow Q) \land Q$$
 in CNF

P	Q	$(P \to Q)$	$(P \to Q) \land Q$
Т	Т	Т	Т
Т	F	F	F
F	Т	Т	Т
F	F	Т	F

Every proposition can be expressed in CNF (ANDs of ORs)!

Express
$$(P \rightarrow Q) \land Q$$
 in CNF

We do it by using a truth table

P	Q	$(P \to Q)$	$(P \to Q) \land Q$
Т	Т	Т	Т
Т	F	F	F
F	Т	T	Т
F	F	T	F

Enumerate all the F rows from the conclusion column

Every proposition can be expressed in CNF (ANDs of ORs)!

Express
$$(P \rightarrow Q) \land Q$$
 in CNF

P	Q	$(P \to Q)$	$(P \to Q) \land Q$
Т	Т	Т	Т
Т	F	F	F
F	Т	Т	Т
F	F	Т	F

- ▶ Enumerate all the **F** rows from the conclusion column
 - ▶ Row 2 gives $P \land \neg Q$

Every proposition can be expressed in CNF (ANDs of ORs)!

Express
$$(P \rightarrow Q) \land Q$$
 in CNF

P	Q	$(P \to Q)$	$(P \to Q) \land Q$
Т	Т	Т	Т
Т	F	F	F
F	Т	Т	Т
F	F	Т	F

- Enumerate all the F rows from the conclusion column
 - Row 2 gives $P \wedge \neg Q$
 - ▶ Row 4 gives $\neg P \land \neg Q$

Every proposition can be expressed in CNF (ANDs of ORs)!

Express
$$(P \rightarrow Q) \land Q$$
 in CNF

P	Q	$(P \to Q)$	$(P \to Q) \land Q$
Т	Т	Т	Т
Т	F	F	F
F	Т	Т	Т
F	F	Т	F

- Enumerate all the F rows from the conclusion column
 - Row 2 gives $P \wedge \neg Q$
 - Row 4 gives $\neg P \land \neg Q$
- Do AND of negations of each of these formulas

Every proposition can be expressed in CNF (ANDs of ORs)!

Express
$$(P \to Q) \land Q$$
 in CNF

P	Q	$(P \to Q)$	$(P \to Q) \land Q$
Т	Т	Т	Т
Т	F	F	F
F	Т	Т	Т
F	F	Т	F

- Enumerate all the F rows from the conclusion column
 - Row 2 gives $P \wedge \neg Q$
 - ▶ Row 4 gives $\neg P \land \neg Q$
- Do AND of negations of each of these formulas
- We obtain $\neg (P \land \neg Q) \land \neg (\neg P \land \neg Q)$

Every proposition can be expressed in CNF (ANDs of ORs)!

Express
$$(P \rightarrow Q) \land Q$$
 in CNF

P	Q	$(P \to Q)$	$(P \to Q) \land Q$
Т	Т	Т	Т
Т	F	F	F
F	Т	Т	Т
F	F	Т	F

- Enumerate all the F rows from the conclusion column
 - Row 2 gives $P \wedge \neg Q$
 - ▶ Row 4 gives $\neg P \land \neg Q$
- Do AND of negations of each of these formulas
- We obtain $\neg (P \land \neg Q) \land \neg (\neg P \land \neg Q)$
- ▶ Finally: equivalent to $(\neg P \lor Q) \land (P \lor Q)$ by De Morgan

If $P \leftrightarrow Q$ and P occurs in A, then replacing P by Q in A leads to a proposition B, such that $A \leftrightarrow B$

If $P \leftrightarrow Q$ and P occurs in A, then replacing P by Q in A leads to a proposition B, such that $A \leftrightarrow B$

If $P \leftrightarrow Q$ and P occurs in A, then replacing P by Q in A leads to a proposition B, such that $A \leftrightarrow B$

Example:

• consider the formula $P \to Q \to (P \land Q)$

If $P \leftrightarrow Q$ and P occurs in A, then replacing P by Q in A leads to a proposition B, such that $A \leftrightarrow B$

- consider the formula $P \to Q \to (P \land Q)$
- we know that classically $(Q \to (P \land Q)) \leftrightarrow (\neg Q \lor (P \land Q))$

If $P \leftrightarrow Q$ and P occurs in A, then replacing P by Q in A leads to a proposition B, such that $A \leftrightarrow B$

- consider the formula $P \to Q \to (P \land Q)$
- we know that classically $(Q \to (P \land Q)) \leftrightarrow (\neg Q \lor (P \land Q))$
- ▶ this is an instance of $(A \to B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor B)$

If $P \leftrightarrow Q$ and P occurs in A, then replacing P by Q in A leads to a proposition B, such that $A \leftrightarrow B$

- consider the formula $P \to Q \to (P \land Q)$
- we know that classically $(Q \to (P \land Q)) \leftrightarrow (\neg Q \lor (P \land Q))$
- ▶ this is an instance of $(A \rightarrow B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor B)$
- ▶ when replacing $Q \to (P \land Q)$ by $\neg Q \lor (P \land Q)$ in $P \to Q \to (P \land Q)$, we obtain $P \to (\neg Q \lor (P \land Q))$

If $P \leftrightarrow Q$ and P occurs in A, then replacing P by Q in A leads to a proposition B, such that $A \leftrightarrow B$

- consider the formula $P \to Q \to (P \land Q)$
- we know that classically $(Q \to (P \land Q)) \leftrightarrow (\neg Q \lor (P \land Q))$
- ▶ this is an instance of $(A \rightarrow B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor B)$
- ▶ when replacing $Q \to (P \land Q)$ by $\neg Q \lor (P \land Q)$ in $P \to Q \to (P \land Q)$, we obtain $P \to (\neg Q \lor (P \land Q))$
- $P \to Q \to (P \land Q)$ and $P \to (\neg Q \lor (P \land Q))$ are equivalent

We can convert a formula to an equivalent formula in CNF or DNF using the equivalences presented above (slide 10)

We can convert a formula to an equivalent formula in CNF or DNF using the equivalences presented above (slide 10)

Example: express $(P \rightarrow Q) \land Q$ in CNF using known equivalences

We can convert a formula to an equivalent formula in CNF or DNF using the equivalences presented above (slide 10)

Example: express $(P \rightarrow Q) \land Q$ in CNF using known equivalences

$$\bullet \ (P \to Q) \land Q$$

We can convert a formula to an equivalent formula in CNF or DNF using the equivalences presented above (slide 10)

Example: express $(P \rightarrow Q) \land Q$ in CNF using known equivalences

$$\bullet \ (\overline{P \to Q}) \land Q$$

$$\blacktriangleright \leftrightarrow (\neg P \lor Q) \land Q - \mathsf{using}\ (A \to B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor B)$$

We can convert a formula to an equivalent formula in CNF or DNF using the equivalences presented above (slide 10)

Example: express $(P \rightarrow Q) \land Q$ in CNF using known equivalences

$$\bullet \ (\overline{P \to Q}) \land Q$$

$$\blacktriangleright \ \leftrightarrow (\neg P \lor Q) \land Q - \mathsf{using} \ (A \to B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor B)$$

We can convert a formula to an equivalent formula in CNF or DNF using the equivalences presented above (slide 10)

Example: express $(P \rightarrow Q) \land Q$ in CNF using known equivalences

$$\bullet \ (\overline{P \to Q}) \land Q$$

$$\rightarrow (\neg P \lor Q) \land Q - \mathsf{using} \ (A \to B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor B)$$

$$\qquad \qquad \neg (P \land \neg Q) \land \neg (\neg P \land \neg Q)$$

We can convert a formula to an equivalent formula in CNF or DNF using the equivalences presented above (slide 10)

Example: express $(P \rightarrow Q) \land Q$ in CNF using known equivalences

- $\bullet \ (\boxed{P \to Q}) \land Q$
- $\blacktriangleright \leftrightarrow (\neg P \lor Q) \land Q \mathsf{using}\ (A \to B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor B)$

- $\qquad \qquad \bullet \quad \boxed{\neg (P \land \neg Q)} \land \neg (\neg P \land \neg Q)$
- \leftrightarrow $(\neg P \lor \neg \neg Q) \land \neg (\neg P \land \neg Q)$ using de Morgan

We can convert a formula to an equivalent formula in CNF or DNF using the equivalences presented above (slide 10)

Example: express $(P \rightarrow Q) \land Q$ in CNF using known equivalences

- $\qquad \qquad \bullet \quad (P \to Q) \land Q$
- $\blacktriangleright \leftrightarrow (\neg P \lor Q) \land Q \mathsf{using} \ (A \to B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor B)$

- $\qquad \qquad \bullet \quad \boxed{\neg (P \land \neg Q)} \land \neg (\neg P \land \neg Q)$
- $ightharpoonup \leftrightarrow (\neg P \lor \neg \neg Q) \land \boxed{\neg (\neg P \land \neg Q)}$ using de Morgan
- $ightharpoonup \leftrightarrow (\neg P \lor \neg \neg Q) \land (\neg \neg P \lor \neg \neg Q)$ using de Morgan

We can convert a formula to an equivalent formula in CNF or DNF using the equivalences presented above (slide 10)

Example: express $(P \rightarrow Q) \land Q$ in CNF using known equivalences

- $\qquad \qquad \bullet \quad (P \to Q) \land Q$
- $\qquad \longleftrightarrow (\neg P \lor Q) \land Q \mathsf{using} \ (A \to B) \longleftrightarrow (\neg A \lor B)$

- $\qquad \qquad \bullet \quad \boxed{\neg (P \land \neg Q)} \land \neg (\neg P \land \neg Q)$
- $ightharpoonup \leftrightarrow (\neg P \lor \neg \neg Q) \land \boxed{\neg (\neg P \land \neg Q)}$ using de Morgan
- $ightharpoonup \leftrightarrow (\neg P \vee \neg \neg Q) \wedge (\neg \neg P \vee \neg \neg Q)$ using de Morgan
- $ightharpoonup \leftrightarrow (\neg P \lor Q) \land (\neg \neg P \lor \neg \neg Q)$ using double negation elim.

We can convert a formula to an equivalent formula in CNF or DNF using the equivalences presented above (slide 10)

Example: express $(P \rightarrow Q) \land Q$ in CNF using known equivalences

- $\qquad \qquad \bullet \quad (P \to Q) \land Q$
- $\blacktriangleright \ \leftrightarrow (\neg P \lor Q) \land Q \mathsf{using} \ (A \to B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor B)$

- $\qquad \qquad \bullet \quad \boxed{\neg (P \land \neg Q)} \land \neg (\neg P \land \neg Q)$
- $\qquad \longleftrightarrow \quad (\neg P \vee \neg \neg Q) \wedge \boxed{\neg (\neg P \wedge \neg Q)} \text{using de Morgan}$
- $ightharpoonup \leftrightarrow (\neg P \vee \neg \neg Q) \wedge (\neg \neg P \vee \neg \neg Q)$ using de Morgan
- $ightharpoonup \leftrightarrow (\neg P \lor Q) \land (\neg \neg P) \lor \neg \neg Q)$ using double negation elim.
- \leftrightarrow $(\neg P \lor Q) \land (P \lor \neg \neg Q)$ using double negation elim.

We can convert a formula to an equivalent formula in CNF or DNF using the equivalences presented above (slide 10)

Example: express $(P \rightarrow Q) \land Q$ in CNF using known equivalences

$$\bullet \ (P \to Q) \land Q$$

$$\blacktriangleright \ \leftrightarrow (\neg P \lor Q) \land Q - \mathsf{using} \ (A \to B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor B)$$

$$\qquad \qquad \bullet \quad \boxed{\neg (P \land \neg Q)} \land \neg (\neg P \land \neg Q)$$

$$\qquad \longleftrightarrow \quad (\neg P \vee \neg \neg Q) \wedge \boxed{\neg (\neg P \wedge \neg Q)} - \text{using de Morgan}$$

$$ightharpoonup \leftrightarrow (\neg P \vee \neg \neg Q) \wedge (\neg \neg P \vee \neg \neg Q)$$
 – using de Morgan

•
$$\leftarrow$$
 $(\neg P \lor Q) \land (\boxed{\neg \neg P} \lor \neg \neg Q)$ – using double negation elim.

$$ightharpoonup \leftrightarrow (\neg P \lor Q) \land (P \lor \neg \neg Q)$$
 – using double negation elim.

•
$$\leftrightarrow$$
 $(\neg P \lor Q) \land (P \lor Q)$ – using double negation elim.

$$\bullet \ (P \to Q) \land Q$$

- $(P \rightarrow Q) \land Q$
- $ightharpoonup \leftrightarrow (\neg P \lor Q) \land Q using (A \to B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor B)$

- $(P \rightarrow Q) \land Q$
- $ightharpoonup \leftrightarrow (\neg P \lor Q) \land Q using (A \to B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor B)$
- $ightharpoonup \leftrightarrow Q \land (\neg P \lor Q)$ using commutativity of \land

- $(P \to Q) \land Q$
- $ightharpoonup \leftrightarrow (\neg P \lor Q) \land Q using (A \to B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \lor B)$
- $ightharpoonup \leftrightarrow Q \land (\neg P \lor Q)$ using commutativity of \land
- $ightharpoonup \leftrightarrow (Q \land \neg P) \lor (Q \land Q)$ using distributivity of \land over \lor

Conclusion

What did we cover today?

- Logical Equivalences
- Proving logical Equivalences in Natural Deduction
- Proving logical Equivalences using truth tables
- Normal forms

Conclusion

What did we cover today?

- Logical Equivalences
- Proving logical Equivalences in Natural Deduction
- Proving logical Equivalences using truth tables
- Normal forms

Further reading:

Chapter 3 of http://leanprover.github.io/logic_and_proof/

Conclusion

What did we cover today?

- Logical Equivalences
- Proving logical Equivalences in Natural Deduction
- Proving logical Equivalences using truth tables
- Normal forms

Further reading:

Chapter 3 of http://leanprover.github.io/logic_and_proof/

Next time

SAT