

§ 1.3 Propositional Equivalence (命题等价)

1. Introduction

Example 1 (page 21)

$p \vee \neg p$ is always true. It is a tautology. (永真公式)

$p \wedge \neg p$ is always false. It is a contradiction. (永假公式)

Definition 1 (see page 21)

- (1) A compound proposition that is always *true*, no matter what the truth values of the propositions that occur in it, is called a tautology.
- (2) A compound proposition that is always *false*, no matter what the truth values of the propositions that occur in it, is called a contradiction.
- (3) A proposition that is neither a tautology nor a contradiction is called a contingency (中性公式).

2. Logical Equivalence

(1) Example 2 (page 22)

Show that $\neg(p \vee q)$ and $\neg p \wedge \neg q$ are logically equivalent.

Truth Table

p	q	$p \vee q$	$\neg(p \vee q)$	$\neg p$	$\neg q$	$\neg p \wedge \neg q$
T	T	T	F	F	F	F
T	F	T	F	F	T	F
F	T	T	F	T	F	F
F	F	F	T	T	T	T

(2) Definition 2 (logical equivalence)

The propositions p and q are called logically equivalent if $p \equiv q$ is a tautology.

The notation $p \equiv q$ denotes that p and q are logically equivalent.

$p \equiv T$ denotes that p is a tautology.

(3) More Examples

Example 3 (page 23)

Show that $p \rightarrow q$ and $\neg p \vee q$ are logically equivalent.

Solution:

We construct the truth table for these propositions in the table below. Since the truth values of $p \rightarrow q$ and $\neg p \vee q$ agree, these propositions are logically equivalent.

p	q	$\neg p$	$\neg p \vee q$	$p \rightarrow q$
T	T	F	T	T
T	F	F	F	F
F	T	T	T	T
F	F	T	T	T

Example 4

Show that the propositions $p \vee (q \wedge r)$ and $(p \vee q) \wedge (p \vee r)$ are logically equivalent.

Solution: By constructing truth table (page 27).

p	q	r	$q \wedge r$	$p \vee (q \wedge r)$	$p \vee q$	$p \vee r$	$(p \vee q) \wedge (p \vee r)$
T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T
T	T	F	F	T	T	T	T
T	F	T	F	T	T	T	T
T	F	F	F	T	T	T	T
F	T	T	T	T	T	T	T
F	T	F	F	T	T	F	F
F	F	T	F	F	F	T	F
F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F

(4) Some Important Equivalences

(a) Table 5 (Logical Equivalence)

$p \wedge T \equiv p$ $p \vee F \equiv p$	Identity laws (同一律)
$p \vee T \equiv T$ $p \wedge F \equiv F$	Domination laws (零律)
$p \vee p \equiv p$ $p \wedge p \equiv p$	Idempotent laws (幂等律)
$\neg(\neg p) \equiv p$	Double negation law (双重否定律)

$p \vee q \equiv q \vee p$ Commutative laws
 $p \wedge q \equiv q \wedge p$ (交换律)

$(p \vee q) \vee r \equiv p \vee (q \vee r)$ Associative laws
 $(p \wedge q) \wedge r \equiv p \wedge (q \wedge r)$ (结合律)

$p \vee (q \wedge r) \equiv (p \vee q) \wedge (p \vee r)$ Distributive laws
 $p \wedge (q \vee r) \equiv (p \wedge q) \vee (p \wedge r)$ (分配律)

$\neg(p \wedge q) \equiv \neg p \vee \neg q$ De Morgan's laws
 $\neg(p \vee q) \equiv \neg p \wedge \neg q$ (德摩根律)

$p \vee (p \wedge q) \equiv p$ Absorption laws
 $p \wedge (p \vee q) \equiv p$ (吸收律)

$p \vee \neg p \equiv T$ (排中律) Negation laws
 $p \wedge \neg p \equiv F$ (矛盾律)

(b) Table 6 (Logical Equivalence Involving Implication)

$$\begin{aligned} p \rightarrow q &\equiv \neg p \vee q \\ p \rightarrow q &\equiv \neg q \rightarrow \neg p \\ p \vee q &\equiv \neg p \rightarrow q \\ p \wedge q &\equiv \neg(p \rightarrow \neg q) \\ \neg(p \rightarrow q) &\equiv p \wedge \neg q \\ (p \rightarrow q) \wedge (p \rightarrow r) &\equiv p \rightarrow (q \wedge r) \\ (p \rightarrow r) \wedge (q \rightarrow r) &\equiv (p \vee q) \rightarrow r \\ (p \rightarrow q) \vee (p \rightarrow r) &\equiv p \rightarrow (q \vee r) \\ (p \rightarrow r) \vee (q \rightarrow r) &\equiv (p \wedge q) \rightarrow r \end{aligned}$$

(c) Table 6 (Logical Equivalence Involving Biconditionals)

$$\begin{aligned} p \leftrightarrow q &\equiv (p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow p) \\ p \leftrightarrow q &\equiv \neg q \leftrightarrow \neg p \\ p \leftrightarrow q &\equiv (p \wedge q) \vee (\neg p \wedge \neg q) \\ \neg(p \leftrightarrow q) &\equiv p \leftrightarrow \neg q \end{aligned}$$

(d) Questions:

How to verify these equivalences?

Answer: One way is by constructing the truth table.

(5) Extension of De Morgan's Law

$\neg(p \wedge q) \equiv \neg p \vee \neg q$ can be extended to

$$\neg(p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge \dots \wedge p_n) \equiv \neg p_1 \vee \neg p_2 \vee \dots \vee \neg p_n$$

$\neg(p \vee q) \equiv \neg p \wedge \neg q$ can be extended to

$$\neg(p_1 \vee p_2 \vee \dots \vee p_n) \equiv \neg p_1 \wedge \neg p_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \neg p_n$$

(6) Constructing New Logical Equivalence (page 26)

Example 6: Show that $\neg(p \rightarrow q)$ and $p \wedge \neg q$ are logically equivalent.

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned} &\neg(p \rightarrow q) \\ &\equiv \neg(\neg p \vee q) && \text{by Example 3} \\ &\equiv \neg(\neg p) \wedge \neg q && \text{by the second De Morgan law} \\ &\equiv p \wedge \neg q && \text{by the double negation law} \end{aligned}$$

Example 7: Show that $\neg(p \vee (\neg p \wedge q))$ and $\neg p \wedge \neg q$ are logically equivalent.

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned} &\neg(p \vee (\neg p \wedge q)) \\ &\equiv \neg p \wedge \neg(\neg p \wedge q) && \text{by the second De Morgan law} \\ &\equiv \neg p \wedge (\neg(\neg p) \vee \neg q) && \text{by the first De Morgan law} \\ &\equiv \neg p \wedge (p \vee \neg q) && \text{by the double negation law} \\ &\equiv (\neg p \wedge p) \vee (\neg p \wedge \neg q) && \text{by the second distributed law} \\ &\equiv F \vee (\neg p \wedge \neg q) && \text{because } \neg p \wedge p \equiv F \\ &\equiv (\neg p \wedge \neg q) \vee F && \text{by the communicative law for disjunction} \\ &\equiv \neg p \wedge \neg q && \text{by the identify law for F} \end{aligned}$$

Example 8: Show that $(p \wedge q) \rightarrow (p \vee q)$ is a tautology.

Solution:

$$\begin{aligned} &(p \wedge q) \rightarrow (p \vee q) \\ &\equiv \neg(p \wedge q) \vee (p \vee q) && \text{by Example 3} \\ &\equiv (\neg p \vee \neg q) \vee (p \vee q) && \text{by the first De Morgan law} \\ &\equiv (\neg p \vee p) \vee (\neg q \vee q) && \text{by the associative and communicative law for disjunction} \\ &\equiv T \vee T && \text{by example 1 and the communicative law for disjunction} \\ &\equiv T && \text{by domination law} \end{aligned}$$

**Study the equivalences and make sure you can
prove them.**