

# Minimal Axiomatization of Boolean Algebras

Eugene Zhang

October 31, 2023

## Abstract

In this paper, we present a new axiomatic system that is a minimal axiomatization of Boolean algebras. Furthermore, the symmetric difference is shown to be algebraically analogous to the modular difference of two numbers. Finally, a new method to prove equivalent relations in a Boolean algebra is also given.

*Key Word:* Boolean algebra; Modular difference; Equivalence method

*MSC Class:* 03G05; 03G25

## 1 Introduction

In 1933, Huntington showed that a Boolean algebra can be axiomatized by three axioms ([4] and [5]) as follows:

$$\text{H1.} \quad a + b = b + a$$

$$\text{H2.} \quad (a + b) + c = a + (b + c)$$

$$\text{H3.} \quad (a' + b)' + (a' + b')' = a$$

However, this claim is incorrect because there are also three definitions assumed in the above Huntington system as  $ab = (a' + b')'$ ,  $1 = a + a'$  and  $0 = (a + a)'$  (definition 4.7, 4.12 and 4.13 in [4]), which should be considered as axioms. This is because the above three definitions are provable in an axiomatic system in which they are not axioms (such as a standard Boolean algebra). Thus the Huntington system actually assumes six axioms and should be seven in total including an axiom for the difference operator ( $a - b = ab'$ ).

Since  $ab = a - b'$  and  $a + b = (a' - b)'$ , a Boolean algebra (with the difference operator) can be expressed in terms of the difference only which is known as a difference algebra. In 1914, Bernstein presented the first version of difference algebras ([1] and [6, p100]) as:

$$\text{B1.} \quad a - (b - 1) = a$$

$$\text{B2.} \quad (a - a) - c = (b - b) - d$$

$$\text{B3.} \quad a - b = b - a \implies a = b$$

$$\text{B4.} \quad (a - b) - (c - d) = (((a - b) - d')' - ((c' - a') - b))'$$

In 1920, Taylor improved the above Bernstein system ([7] and [6, p100]) as:

$$\text{T1.} \quad a - (b - b) = a$$

$$\text{T2.} \quad a - b' = b - a'$$

$$\text{T3.} \quad a - (b - c) = ((a - b)' - (a - c'))'$$

However, both systems are problematic because a good axiomatic system should not contain reducible axioms.<sup>1</sup> For examples, in the Bernstein system, B1 should be  $a - 0 = a$  and B2 is actually  $0 = 0$ ; in the Taylor system, T1 should be  $a - 0 = a$ . In both systems,  $a - a = 0$  is a definition that should be an axiom.

In the first part of this paper, we will introduce a new axiomatic system with only three (solid) axioms that is a minimal axiomatization of difference algebras and overcomes the problems of previous models. Furthermore, with two additional axioms for addition and multiplication, it becomes a minimal axiomatization of Boolean algebras, reducing the seven axioms of the Huntington system by two. Our model is complete itself and thus can realize Huntington's claim that a Boolean algebra can be axiomatized by three axioms in another sense.

In the second part of this paper, we will show that the symmetric difference in a Boolean algebra is algebraically analogous to the modular (absolute) difference of two numbers. This analogy is better than the well-known Boolean sum in the algebraic sense. Furthermore, we will present a new method that can prove equivalent relations of a Boolean algebra in a single step and easily find new relations.

## 2 The Difference Algebra

In this section, we will introduce a new axiomatic system (the difference algebra) that is a minimal axiomatization of Boolean algebras.

### 2.1 Definitions

We begin with the following definitions.

**Definition 2.1** *The **difference algebra** is a structure  $\mathfrak{D}(0, 1, -)$  (or  $\mathfrak{D}$ ) that consists of two constants 0 and 1, and a binary operator “ $-$ ” known as the difference operator under which any two elements of  $\mathfrak{D}$  are closed. There are two additional operators “ $+$ ” and “ $\cdot$ ”, each of which can be solely defined by “ $-$ ”. The **difference algebra with three operators** is denoted as  $\mathfrak{S}(0, 1, +, \cdot, -)$  (or  $\mathfrak{S}$ ).*

**Definition 2.2** *A well-formed formula in  $\mathfrak{D}(0, 1, -)$  is known as a **difference polynomial**.*

---

<sup>1</sup>As a result, both were published in the University of California Publications and so less well-known.

Since any pair of elements in  $\mathfrak{S}$  is closed under “ $-$ ”, we can adopt a new approach known as the zero law (axiom 2.3) to define equality. First, equal to 0 and not equal to 0 are considered primitive operations. Then the equality of any pair of elements can be decided by whether their difference is equal to 0 or not. Consequently, the three laws of equality<sup>2</sup> can also be deduced (proposition 2.11).

**Axiom 2.3 (Zero Law)**

- (i)  $a = 0$  and  $a \neq 0$  are considered self-evident.<sup>3</sup>
- (ii) The **equality** “ $=$ ” and **inequality** “ $\neq$ ” are defined as:

$$a = b \iff (a - b = 0 \wedge b - a = 0)$$

$$a \neq b \iff (a - b \neq 0 \vee b - a \neq 0)$$

**Remark 2.4** *The consistency of axiom 2.3(ii) is obvious for  $a - 0 = a$  and  $0 - a = 0$  (proved in proposition 2.14 and 2.19).*

**Definition 2.5** *The **inclusion** “ $\leq$ ” and **non-inclusion** “ $\not\leq$ ” are defined as:*

$$a \leq b \iff a - b = 0$$

$$a \not\leq b \iff a - b \neq 0$$

In addition, there are two sets (preliminary and main) of axioms held by  $\mathfrak{S}$  ( $\mathfrak{D}$ ).

**Definition 2.6** *I’...IV’ are known as the **preliminary axioms** for  $\mathfrak{S}$ .*

- I’. Closure.** For any  $a, b \in \mathfrak{S}$ ,  $a - b \in \mathfrak{S}$ .
- II’. Exclusive Principle.** Either  $a = 0$  or  $a \neq 0$ , but not both.
- III’. Transitivity of Zero.**  $(a = b \wedge b = 0) \implies a = 0$ .
- IV’. Replacement Principle.** Suppose  $f$  is a wff in  $\mathfrak{S}$ ,  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are terms in  $f$ .

$$S_1 = S_2 \implies f(S_1) = f(S_2)$$

**Definition 2.7** *I...III are known as the **main axioms** for  $\mathfrak{D}$ . IV and V define the two additional operators “ $+$ ” and “ $\cdot$ ” for  $\mathfrak{S}$ , and I...V are the **main axioms** for  $\mathfrak{S}$ .*

- I. Annihilation.**  $a - a = 0$
- II. Involution.**  $1 - (1 - a) = a$
- III. Termination.**  $(1 - (c - (a - b))) - d = ((1 - (c - a)) - d) - (c - (1 - b))$

---

<sup>2</sup>It seems that Huntington was the first to formalize the three laws of equality [4, p276–277].

<sup>3</sup>In the rest discussion, we assume  $a, b, c, d, \dots$  are in  $\mathfrak{S}$  unless further specified.

**IV. Addition.**  $a + b = 1 - ((1 - a) - b)$

**V. Multiplication.**  $a \cdot b = a - (1 - b)$

**Remark 2.8** In  $V$ , we can omit  $\cdot$  and  $a \cdot b = ab$ .

**Definition 2.9** The **complement** of  $a$  is defined as:  $a' = 1 - a$ .

**Remark 2.10** Note that the complement is binary in  $\mathfrak{S}$ . Unlike “+” and “ $\cdot$ ”, the complement is not an operator with new meanings but an abbreviation of symbols. So it is introduced in a definition rather than an axiom like IV or V.

## 2.2 More Properties

In this section, we will prove more theorems in the difference algebra and show that  $\mathfrak{S}$  is a minimal axiomatization of Boolean algebras. First, we prove the three laws of equality from preliminary and main axioms.

**Proposition 2.11**

(i)  $a = a$

(ii)  $a = b \implies b = a$

(iii)  $(a = b \wedge b = c) \implies a = c$

**Proof.** (i) By axiom 2.3(ii) and I.

(ii) By axiom 2.3(ii).

(iii) By IV'

$$a = b \implies (a - c = b - c \wedge c - a = c - b)$$

So by axiom 2.3(ii) and III',  $a - c = 0$  and  $c - a = 0$ . Thus (iii) follows by axiom 2.3(ii). ■

**Proposition 2.12**  $(a - b) - d = (a - d) - b$

**Proof.**

$$\begin{aligned} (a - b) - d &= (1 - (1 - (a - b))) - d && \text{(by II)} \\ &= ((1 - (1 - a)) - d) - (1 - (1 - b)) && \text{(by III)} \\ &= (a - d) - b \end{aligned}$$

■

**Proposition 2.13**  $a - b = b' - a'$

**Proof.**

$$\begin{aligned} a - b &= (1 - (1 - a)) - b && \text{(by II)} \\ &= (1 - b) - (1 - a) && \text{(by proposition 2.12)} \\ &= b' - a' \end{aligned}$$

■

**Proposition 2.14**  $a - 0 = a$

**Proof.**

$$\begin{aligned} a - 0 &= (1 - 0) - (1 - a) && \text{(by proposition 2.13)} \\ &= (1 - (1 - 1)) - (1 - a) && \text{(by I)} \\ &= 1 - (1 - a) && \text{(by II)} \\ &= a \end{aligned}$$

■

**Proposition 2.15**  $(c - a) - b = c - (a' - b)'$

**Proof.**

$$\begin{aligned} c - (a' - b)' &= (a' - b) - c' && \text{(by proposition 2.13)} \\ &= (a' - c') - b && \text{(by proposition 2.12)} \\ &= (c - a) - b \end{aligned}$$

■

**Proposition 2.16**  $c - (a - b) = ((c - a)' - (c - b'))'$

**Proof.**

$$\begin{aligned} c - (a - b) &= ((c - (a - b))' - 0)' && \text{(by proposition 2.14)} \\ &= (((1 - (c - a)) - 0) - (c - (1 - b)))' && \text{(by III)} \\ &= ((c - a)' - (c - b'))' \end{aligned}$$

■

**Proposition 2.17**  $(a' - b)' - c = ((a - c)' - (b - c))'$

**Proof.**

$$\begin{aligned} (a' - b)' - c &= c' - (a' - b) \\ &= ((c' - a')' - (c' - b'))' && \text{(by proposition 2.16)} \\ &= ((a - c)' - (b - c))' \end{aligned}$$

■

**Proposition 2.18**

(i)  $(a' - a)' = a$

(ii)  $a - a' = a$

**Proof.** (i)

$$\begin{aligned} (a' - a)' &= (a' - a)' - (a - a) \\ &= ((a - a)' - a)' && \text{(by proposition 2.17)} \\ &= a \end{aligned}$$

(ii) By II and (i)

$$a - a' = (a')' - a' = (a')' = a$$

■

**Proposition 2.19**

(i)  $0 - a = 0$

(ii)  $a - 1 = 0$

**Proof.** (i) By proposition 2.15 and 2.18

$$0 - a = (a - a) - a = a - (a' - a)' = 0$$

(ii) By proposition 2.13 and (i). ■**Proposition 2.20**  $(a - b) - c = (a - c) - (b - c)$ **Proof.**

$$(a - c) - (b - c) = (((a - c) - b)' - ((a - c) - c'))' \quad (\text{by proposition 2.16})$$

$$= (((a - c) - b)' - ((c' - c') - a'))' \quad (\text{by proposition 2.12})$$

$$= (a - b) - c \quad (\text{by proposition 2.19(i)})$$
 ■

**Proposition 2.21**  $(a - b) - (c - d) = (((a - b) - d')' - ((c' - a') - b))'$ **Proof.**

$$(a - b) - (c - d) = (a - b) - (d' - c')$$

$$= (((a - b) - d')' - ((a - b) - c))' \quad (\text{by proposition 2.16})$$

$$= (((a - b) - d')' - ((c' - a') - b))' \quad (\text{by proposition 2.12})$$
 ■

Next, we will prove theorems involving “+” and “·”.

**Proposition 2.22**

(i)  $a + 0 = a$

(ii)  $a \cdot 1 = a$

**Proof.** (i) By IV and proposition 2.14

$$a + 0 = (a' - 0)' = (a')' = a$$

(ii) By V and proposition 2.14. ■**Proposition 2.23**

(i)  $a + a = a$

(ii)  $a \cdot a = a$

**Proof.** (i) By IV and proposition 2.18(i).(ii) By V and proposition 2.18(ii). ■

**Proposition 2.24**

(i)  $(a + b)' = a' \cdot b'$

(ii)  $(a \cdot b)' = a' + b'$

**Proof.** (i) By IV and V.

(ii) By IV and V. ■

**Proposition 2.25**  $(c - a) - b = c - (a + b)$ **Proof.** By proposition 2.15 and IV. ■**Proposition 2.26**

(i)  $c - (a - b) = (c - a) + (c - b)'$

(ii)  $(a + b) - c = (a - c) + (b - c)$

(iii)  $(a + b) \cdot c = (a \cdot c) + (b \cdot c)$

(iv)  $(a \cdot b) + c = (a + c) \cdot (b + c)$

**Proof.** (i) By proposition 2.16 and IV.

(ii) By proposition 2.17 and IV.

(iii) By V and (ii).

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{(iv)} \quad (a \cdot b) + c &= ((a - b)' - c)' \\
 &= (c' - (a - b)')' \\
 &= (a' - c)' - (b' - c) && \text{(by proposition 2.16)} \\
 &= (a' - c)' \cdot (b' - c)' \\
 &= (a + c) \cdot (b + c)
 \end{aligned}$$

■

**Proposition 2.27**

(i)  $a + b = b + a$

(ii)  $a \cdot b = b \cdot a$

**Proof.** (i) By IV and proposition 2.13

$$a + b = (a' - b)' = (b' - a)' = b + a$$

(ii) By V and proposition 2.13. ■

**Proposition 2.28**

$$(i) (a + b) + c = a + (b + c)$$

$$(ii) (a \cdot b) \cdot c = a \cdot (b \cdot c)$$

**Proof.** (i)

$$\begin{aligned} (a + b) + c &= 1 - (1 - ((a + b) + c)) \\ &= 1 - ((1 - (a + b)) - c) && \text{(by proposition 2.25)} \\ &= 1 - (((1 - a) - b) - c) && \text{(by proposition 2.25)} \\ &= 1 - ((1 - a) - (b + c)) \\ &= 1 - (1 - (a + (b + c))) \\ &= a + (b + c) \end{aligned}$$

(ii) By V and proposition 2.15

$$(a \cdot b) \cdot c = (a - b') - c' = a - (b - c)' = a \cdot (b \cdot c)$$

■

### Proposition 2.29

$$(i) a \cdot 0 = 0$$

$$(ii) a + 1 = 1$$

**Proof.** (i) By V and proposition 2.19(ii).

(ii) By IV and proposition 2.19(ii).

■

### Proposition 2.30

$$(i) a \cdot a' = 0$$

$$(ii) a + a' = 1$$

**Proof.** (i) By V and I.

(ii) By IV and I.

■

### Proposition 2.31

$$a \leq b \wedge b \leq c \implies a \leq c$$

**Proof.** By definition 2.5 and proposition 2.20

$$a - c = (a - c) - 0 = (a - c) - (b - c) = (a - b) - c = 0$$

So it follows by definition 2.5.

■

### Proposition 2.32

$$(i) a - b \leq a$$

$$(ii) a \leq a + b$$





**Theorem 2.36**

- (i)  $\mathfrak{D}$  is complete itself and is a minimal axiomatization of difference algebras.
- (ii)  $\mathfrak{S}$  is a minimal axiomatization of Boolean algebras.

**Proof.** (i) Any difference polynomial in  $\mathfrak{D}$  can be converted to a Boolean polynomial in  $\mathfrak{S}$  and vice versa. Since Boolean polynomials are complete in a Boolean algebra, so is  $\mathfrak{D}$ .

In the Bernstein system, B1 is proved by proposition 2.14 and 2.19(i), B2 is trivial, B3 is in proposition 2.34 and B4 in proposition 2.21. In the Taylor system, T1 is in proposition 2.14, T2 is in proposition 2.13 and T3 in proposition 2.16. Since  $a - a = 0$  is a definition in both systems which should be an axiom, each of them assumes more than three axioms. Thus  $\mathfrak{D}$  is a minimal axiomatization of difference algebras.

(ii) The associativity of a Boolean algebra  $\mathcal{B}$  is proved in proposition 2.28. The commutativity of  $\mathcal{B}$  is in proposition 2.27. The identity of  $\mathcal{B}$  is in proposition 2.22. The distributivity of  $\mathcal{B}$  is in proposition 2.26. The complement of  $\mathcal{B}$  is in proposition 2.30. The absorption of  $\mathcal{B}$  is in proposition 2.35. Since  $\mathfrak{S}$  assumes five axioms which are two less than the Huntington system,  $\mathfrak{S}$  is a minimal axiomatization of Boolean algebras. Since  $\mathfrak{D}$  is complete itself, it can realize Huntington's claim that a Boolean algebra can be axiomatized by three axioms in another sense. ■

## 3 Symmetric Difference and Equivalence Method

### 3.1 Symmetric Difference

Now we show that the symmetric difference in a Boolean algebra is algebraically analogous to the modular difference of two numbers.

**Definition 3.1** The *symmetric difference* in  $\mathfrak{S}$  is known as the *modular (absolute) difference* and denoted as:

$$|a - b| = (a - b) + (b - a)$$

The following can be deduced easily from results in the previous section and we omit the proof.

**Lemma 3.2** Suppose  $a$  and  $b$  are in  $\mathfrak{S}$ . Then

- (i) **Equality.**  $|a - b| = 0 \iff a = b$
- (ii) **Annihilation.**  $|a - a| = 0$
- (iii) **Commutativity.**  $|a - b| = |b - a|$
- (iv) **Associativity.**  $||a - b| - c| = |a - |b - c||$
- (v) **Distributivity.**  $|a - b| \cdot c = |a \cdot c - b \cdot c|$
- (vi) **Identity.**  $|a - 0| = a$
- (vii) **Inclusion.**  $a - b \leq |a - b|$

(viii) **Triangular Inclusion.**  $|a - b| \leq |a - c| + |c - b|$

(ix) **Dual Inclusion.**  $|a - b| \leq c \iff a - b \leq c \wedge b - a \leq c$

**Theorem 3.3** *The symmetric difference in  $\mathfrak{S}$  is algebraically closer to the modular difference of numbers than the Boolean sum.*

**Proof.** If  $a$  and  $b$  are replaced by real numbers (between 0 and 1), all of lemma 3.2 but (iv) remain the same as their numerical counterparts. However, if  $a$  and  $b$  are replaced by numbers in the case of the Boolean sum such as,

- (i)  $a + b = 0 \iff a = b$
- (ii)  $a + a = 0$
- (iii)  $a + b = b + a$
- (iv)  $(a + b) + c = a + (b + c)$
- $\vdots$

Then (iii)  $\dots$  (viii) holds (6 in total), but the rest (3 in total) are different from their numerical counterparts. For examples, in (i),  $a + b = 0$  iff  $a = -b$ , not  $a = b$ ; in (ii),  $a + a = 0$  iff  $a = 0$ , not for any  $a$ ; in (ix),  $a - b \leq c$  and  $b - a \leq c$  do not imply  $a + b \leq c$ . As the result, the symmetric difference in  $\mathfrak{S}$  is algebraically closer to the modular difference of numbers than the Boolean sum, and so is called the modular difference. ■

### 3.2 A New Equivalence Method

In this section, we will present a new way to prove equivalent relations in a Boolean algebra.

**Definition 3.4** *Suppose  $\phi$  is a relation in  $\mathfrak{S}$ . Then  $f_\phi$  is an **equation** of  $\phi$  iff  $\phi \iff f_\phi = 0$ .*

**Axiom 3.5** *Suppose  $\phi$  and  $\varphi$  are relations in  $\mathfrak{S}$  with  $f_\phi$  and  $f_\varphi$  being their equations.*

(i)  $f_{\phi \wedge \varphi} = f_\phi + f_\varphi$

(ii)  $f_{\phi \vee \varphi} = f_\phi \times f_\varphi$

**Theorem 3.6** *Suppose  $\phi$  and  $\varphi$  are relations in  $\mathfrak{S}$  with  $f_\phi$  and  $f_\varphi$  being their equations.*

$$f_\phi = f_\varphi \implies (\phi \iff \varphi)$$

**Proof.** By III'

$$f_\phi = f_\varphi \implies ((f_\phi = 0 \implies f_\varphi = 0) \wedge (f_\varphi = 0 \implies f_\phi = 0))$$

So it follows by definition 3.4. ■

**Remark 3.7** *Theorem 3.6 can prove equivalent relations in a single step.*

**Corollary 3.8**

$$(i) f_{a \leq b} = a - b$$

$$(ii) f_{a=0 \wedge b=0} = a + b$$

$$(iii) f_{a=b} = |a - b|$$

**Proof.** (i) By definition 3.4 and 2.5.

(ii) By axiom 3.5(i).

(iii) By proposition 2.33(ii) and definition 3.1. ■

**Proposition 3.9**

$$(i) a \leq b \iff a = a \cdot b$$

$$(ii) a \leq c \wedge b \leq c \iff a + b \leq c$$

$$(iii) (a + b = a \cdot b) \iff a = b$$

$$(iv) (a + c = b + c \wedge a \cdot c = b \cdot c) \iff a = b$$

$$(v) |a - b| = |a - c| \iff b = c$$

$$(vi) a = |b - c| \iff b = |a - c|$$

**Proof.** We only prove (v). The rest are straightforward.

(v) By corollary 3.8(iii) and lemma 3.2

$$\begin{aligned} ||a - b| - |a - c|| &= ||b - a| - a| - c| \\ &= ||b - |a - a|| - c| \\ &= ||b - 0| - c| \\ &= |b - c| \end{aligned}$$

So (v) follows by theorem 3.6. ■

Theorem 3.6 can also help to find new equivalent relations. Let's take a look at the following examples.

**Problem 3.10** Suppose  $\phi \iff (a \cdot c \leq b \cdot d \wedge a \leq b + c \wedge c \leq a + d)$ . Find an equivalent relation of  $\phi$ .

**Solution.** By corollary 3.8

$$\begin{aligned} f_\phi &= (ac - bd) + (a - (b + c)) + (c - (a + d)) \\ &= ab'c + acd' + ab'c' + a'cd' \\ &= (a - b) + (c - d) \end{aligned}$$

So by theorem 3.6,  $\phi \iff (a \leq b \wedge c \leq d)$ . ■

**Problem 3.11** Suppose  $\varphi \iff ((a + b) \cdot c = c - a \cdot b)$ . Find an equivalent relation of  $\varphi$ .

**Solution.** By corollary 3.8

$$\begin{aligned} f_\varphi &= |(ac + bc) - (c - ab)| \\ &= ((ac + bc) - (a'c + b'c)) + ((a'c + b'c) - (ac + bc)) \\ &= abc + a'b'c \end{aligned}$$

So by theorem 3.6,  $\varphi \iff (c \leq a + b \wedge c \leq a' + b')$ . ■

## References

- [1] Bernstein, B.A. “A complete set of postulates for the logic of classes, expressed in terms of the operation ‘exception’ and a proof of the independence of a set of postulates due to De Morgan”. Univ. Calif. Publ. Math. 1, 87–96, 1914.
- [2] Curry, H. *Foundations of Mathematical Logic*. Dover, New York, 1977.
- [3] Huntington, E.V. “Sets of Independent Postulates for the Algebra of Logic”. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 5, 288–309, 1904.
- [4] Huntington, E.V. “New Sets of Independent Postulates for the Algebra of Logic, with Special Reference to Whitehead and Russell’s Principia Mathematica”. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 35, 274–304, 1933.
- [5] Huntington, E.V. “Boolean Algebra. A Correction”. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 35, 557–558, 1933.
- [6] Padmanabhan, R. and Rudeanu, S. *Axioms for Lattices and Boolean Algebras*. World Scientific, 2008.
- [7] Taylor, J.S. “A set of five postulates for Boolean algebras in terms of the operation ‘exception’”. Univ. Calif. Publ. Math. 1, 241–248, 1920.

*Email Address:* ejz5166@psu.edu and ezhang7337@gmail.com