

### 3.2 Applications-Reading

**Notebook:** Discrete Mathematics [CM1020]

**Created:** 2019-10-07 2:31 PM

**Updated:** 2019-11-09 12:23 PM

**Author:** SUKHJIT MANN

**Tags:** Biconditional, Conditional, Contingency, Contradiction, DeMorgan, Equivalence, law, Tau...

<b>Cornell Notes</b>	<b>Topic:</b> 3.2 Applications-Reading	Course: BSc Computer Science
		Class: Discrete Mathematics-Reading
		Date: November 09, 2019

#### Essential Question:

What are laws of propositional logic and logical equivalences?

#### Questions/Cues:

- What is a tautology and/or contradiction?
- What does it mean when two compound propositions are logically equivalent?
- What are DeMorgan's laws in terms of propositional logic?
- What are laws of propositional logic to prove equivalency?
- What are the logical equivalences involving conditional statements?
- What are the logical equivalences involving Biconditional statements?

#### Notes

A compound proposition that is always true, no matter what the truth values of the propositional variables that occur in it, is called a *tautology*. A compound proposition that is always false is called a *contradiction*. A compound proposition that is neither a tautology nor a contradiction is called a *contingency*.

**TABLE 1** Examples of a Tautology and a Contradiction.

$p$	$\neg p$	$p \vee \neg p$	$p \wedge \neg p$
T	F	T	F
F	T	T	F

- Compound proposition that have same truth values in all possible cases called logically equivalent

The compound propositions  $p$  and  $q$  are called *logically equivalent* if  $p \leftrightarrow q$  is a tautology. The notation  $p \equiv q$  denotes that  $p$  and  $q$  are logically equivalent.

- $\equiv$  not a logical connective &  $p \equiv q$  not compound proposition but rather is statement that  $p \leftrightarrow q$  is a tautology. Symbol  $\Leftrightarrow$  is sometimes used instead of

$\equiv$  to denote logical equivalence

**TABLE 2** De Morgan's Laws.

$$\neg(p \wedge q) \equiv \neg p \vee \neg q$$

$$\neg(p \vee q) \equiv \neg p \wedge \neg q$$

**TABLE 3** Truth Tables for  $\neg(p \vee q)$  and  $\neg p \wedge \neg q$ .

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

**TABLE 4** Truth Tables for  $\neg p \vee q$  and  $p \rightarrow q$ .

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

- In general,  $2^n$  rows required if a compound proposition involves  $n$  propositional variables

**TABLE 5** A Demonstration That  $p \vee (q \wedge r)$  and  $(p \vee q) \wedge (p \vee r)$  Are Logically Equivalent.

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

**TABLE 6** Logical Equivalences.

<i>Equivalence</i>	<i>Name</i>
$p \wedge T \equiv p$ $p \vee F \equiv p$	Identity laws
$p \vee T \equiv T$ $p \wedge F \equiv F$	Domination laws
$p \vee p \equiv p$ $p \wedge p \equiv p$	Idempotent laws
$\neg(\neg p) \equiv p$	Double negation law
$p \vee q \equiv q \vee p$ $p \wedge q \equiv q \wedge p$	Commutative laws
$(p \vee q) \vee r \equiv p \vee (q \vee r)$ $(p \wedge q) \wedge r \equiv p \wedge (q \wedge r)$	Associative laws
$p \vee (q \wedge r) \equiv (p \vee q) \wedge (p \vee r)$ $p \wedge (q \vee r) \equiv (p \wedge q) \vee (p \wedge r)$	Distributive laws
$\neg(p \wedge q) \equiv \neg p \vee \neg q$ $\neg(p \vee q) \equiv \neg p \wedge \neg q$	De Morgan's laws
$p \vee (p \wedge q) \equiv p$ $p \wedge (p \vee q) \equiv p$	Absorption laws
$p \vee \neg p \equiv T$ $p \wedge \neg p \equiv F$	Negation laws

**TABLE 7** Logical Equivalences Involving Conditional Statements.

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

**TABLE 8** Logical Equivalences Involving Biconditional Statements.

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

- When using DeMorgan's laws, remember to change logical connective after you negate

Use De Morgan's laws to express the negations of "Miguel has a cellphone and he has a laptop computer" and "Heather will go to the concert or Steve will go to the concert."

*Solution:* Let  $p$  be "Miguel has a cellphone" and  $q$  be "Miguel has a laptop computer." Then "Miguel has a cellphone and he has a laptop computer" can be represented by  $p \wedge q$ . By the first of De Morgan's laws,  $\neg(p \wedge q)$  is equivalent to  $\neg p \vee \neg q$ . Consequently, we can express the negation of our original statement as "Miguel does not have a cellphone or he does not have a laptop computer."

Let  $r$  be "Heather will go to the concert" and  $s$  be "Steve will go to the concert." Then "Heather will go to the concert or Steve will go to the concert" can be represented by  $r \vee s$ . By the second of De Morgan's laws,  $\neg(r \vee s)$  is equivalent to  $\neg r \wedge \neg s$ . Consequently, we can express the negation of our original statement as "Heather will not go to the concert and Steve will not go to the concert." ◀

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

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

Show that  $\neg(p \vee (\neg p \wedge q))$  and  $\neg p \wedge \neg q$  are logically equivalent by developing a series of logical equivalences.

*Solution:* We will use one of the equivalences in Table 6 at a time, starting with  $\neg(p \vee (\neg p \wedge q))$  and ending with  $\neg p \wedge \neg q$ . (Note: we could also easily establish this equivalence using a truth table.) We have the following equivalences.

$$\begin{aligned}\neg(p \vee (\neg p \wedge q)) &\equiv \neg p \wedge \neg(\neg p \wedge q) && \text{by the second De Morgan law} \\ &\equiv \neg p \wedge [\neg(\neg p) \vee \neg q] && \text{by the first De Morgan law} \\ &\equiv \neg p \wedge (p \vee \neg q) && \text{by the double negation law} \\ &\equiv (\neg p \wedge p) \vee (\neg p \wedge \neg q) && \text{by the second distributive law} \\ &\equiv \mathbf{F} \vee (\neg p \wedge \neg q) && \text{because } \neg p \wedge p \equiv \mathbf{F} \\ &\equiv (\neg p \wedge \neg q) \vee \mathbf{F} && \text{by the commutative law for disjunction} \\ &\equiv \neg p \wedge \neg q && \text{by the identity law for } \mathbf{F}\end{aligned}$$

Consequently  $\neg(p \vee (\neg p \wedge q))$  and  $\neg p \wedge \neg q$  are logically equivalent. ◀

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

*Solution:* To show that this statement is a tautology, we will use logical equivalences to demonstrate that it is logically equivalent to  $\mathbf{T}$ . (Note: This could also be done using a truth table.)

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

## Summary

In this week, we learned what the laws of propositional logic and what logical equivalences are. Alongside this we looked at specific examples of logical equivalences involving tautologies, conditional and Biconditional statements.