## **Replacement Rules**

The rules we will be looking at today are not so much inference rules (like the last 8 have been) where we go from a set of premises to a conclusion. The rules for today are known as replacement rules because we will be allowed to re-state a given line in our proof with another wff that is logically equivalent to the original line (remember our definition of equivalent).

```
De Morgan's rule (DM):
    ~(p • q) :: (~p ∨ ~q)
    ~(p ∨ q) :: (~p • ~q)
Commutativity (Com):
    (p ∨ q) :: (q ∨ p)
    (p • q) :: (q • p)
Associativity (Assoc):
    [p ∨ (q ∨ r)] :: [(p ∨ q) ∨ r]
    [p • (q • r)] :: [(p • q) • r]
Distribution (Dist):
    [p • (q ∨ r)] :: [(p • q) ∨ (p • r)]
    [p ∨ (q • r)] :: [(p ∨ q) • (p ∨ r)]
Double negation (DN):
    p :: ~~p
```

Some examples of how to use these replacement rules in proofs are provided below:

## Example 1:

## Example 2:

```
  1. D \cdot (E \vee F)

  2. \sim D \vee \sim F
  / D \cdot E

  3. (D \cdot E) \vee (D \cdot F)
  1, Dist

  4. (D \cdot F) \vee (D \cdot E)
  3, Com

  5. \sim (D \cdot F)
  2, DM

  6. D \cdot E
  4, 5, DS
```