

Discrete Math for Computer Science

Peter Schaefer

Freshman Fall

Contents

1	Logic	2
1.1	Propositions and Logical Operations	2
1.2	Evaluating Compound Propositions	2
1.3	Conditional Statements	2
1.4	Logical Equivalence	2
1.5	Laws of Propositional Logic	3
1.6	Predicates and Quantifiers	3
1.7	Quantified Statements	3
1.8	DeMorgan's law for Quantified Statements	4
1.9	Nested Quantifiers	4
1.10	More Nested Quantifiers	4
1.10.1	Expressing Uniqueness in Quantified Statements	4
1.10.2	Moving Quantifiers in Logical Statements	5
1.11	Logical Reasoning	5
1.12	Rules of Inference with Propositions	5
1.13	Rules of Inference with Quantifiers	5

1 Logic

1.1 Propositions and Logical Operations

Proposition: a statement that is either true or false.

Some examples include "It is raining today" and " $3 \cdot 8 = 20$ ".

However, not all statements are propositions, such as "open the door"

Name	Symbol	alternate name	p	q	$\neg p$	$p \wedge q$	$p \vee q$	$p \oplus q$
NOT	\neg	negation	T	T	F	T	T	F
AND	\wedge	conjunction	T	F	F	F	T	T
OR	\vee	disjunction	F	T	T	F	T	T
XOR	\oplus	exclusive or	F	F	T	F	F	F

XOR is very useful for encryption and binary arithmetic.

1.2 Evaluating Compound Propositions

p : The weather is bad.

$p \wedge q$: The weather is bad *and* the trip is cancelled

q : The trip is cancelled.

$p \vee q$: The weather is bad *or* the trip is cancelled

r : The trip is delayed.

$p \wedge (q \oplus r)$: The weather is bad *and* either the trip is cancelled *or* delayed

Order of Evaluation \neg , then \wedge , then \vee , but parenthesis always help for clarity.

Example Truth Table:

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

1.3 Conditional Statements

$p \rightarrow q$ where p is the hypothesis and q is the conclusion

Format	Terminology	
$p \rightarrow q$	given	given
$\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$	contrapositive	$p \rightarrow q \equiv \neg q \rightarrow \neg p$ contrapositive
$q \rightarrow p$	converse	inverse
$\neg p \rightarrow \neg q$	inverse	$\neg p \rightarrow \neg q \equiv q \rightarrow p$ converse

p	q	$p \rightarrow q$		Phrase	Logic
T	T	T	p is a <u>sufficient</u> condition for q	q if p	$p \rightarrow q$
T	F	F	q is a <u>necessary</u> condition for p	q only if p	$q \rightarrow p$
F	T	T		q if and only if p	$p \leftrightarrow q$
F	F	T			

Order of Operations: $p \wedge q \rightarrow r \equiv (p \wedge q) \rightarrow r$

1.4 Logical Equivalence

Tautology: a proposition that is always true

Contradiction: a proposition that is always false

Logically equivalent: same truth value regardless of the truth values of their individual propositions

DeMorgan's Laws:

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

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

Verbally,

It is not true that the patient has migraines *or* high blood pressure \equiv
 \equiv The patient does not have migraines *and* does not have high blood pressure

It is not true that the patient has migraines *and* high blood pressure \equiv
 \equiv The patient does not have migraines *or* does not have high blood pressure

1.5 Laws of Propositional Logic

You can use **substitution** on logically equivalent propositions.

Law Name	\vee or	\wedge and
Idempotent	$p \vee p \equiv p$	$p \wedge p \equiv p$
Associative	$(p \vee q) \vee r \equiv p \vee (q \vee r)$	$(p \wedge q) \wedge r \equiv p \wedge (q \wedge r)$
Commutative	$p \vee q \equiv q \vee p$	$p \wedge q \equiv q \wedge p$
Distributive	$p \vee (q \wedge r) \equiv (p \vee q) \wedge (p \vee r)$	$p \wedge (q \vee r) \equiv (p \wedge q) \vee (p \wedge r)$
Identity	$p \vee F \equiv p$	$p \wedge T \equiv p$
Domination	$p \vee T \equiv T$	$p \wedge F \equiv F$
Double Negation	$\neg \neg p \equiv p$	
Complement	$p \vee \neg p \equiv T$	$p \wedge \neg p \equiv F$
DeMorgan	$\neg(p \vee q) \equiv \neg p \wedge \neg q$	$\neg(p \wedge q) \equiv \neg p \vee \neg q$
Absorption	$p \vee (p \wedge q) \equiv p$	$p \wedge (p \vee q) \equiv p$
Conditional	$p \rightarrow q \equiv \neg p \vee q$	$p \leftrightarrow q \equiv (p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow p)$

1.6 Predicates and Quantifiers

Predicate: a logical statement where truth value is a function of a variable.

$P(x)$: x is an even number. $P(5)$: false $P(2)$: true

Domain: the set of all possible values for a variable in a predicate.

Ex. \mathbb{Z}^+ is the set of all positive integers.

*If domain is not clear from context, it should be given as part of the definition of the predicate.

Quantifier	Symbol	Meaning
Universal	\forall	"for all"
Existential	\exists	"there exists"

Quantifier: converts a predicate to a proposition.

$\exists x(x + 1 < x)$ is false.

Counter Example: universally quantified statement where an element in the domain for which the predicate is false. Useful to prove a \forall statement false.

1.7 Quantified Statements

Consider the two following two predicates:

$P(x)$: x is prime, $x \in \mathbb{Z}^+$

$O(x)$: x is odd

Proposition made of predicates: $\exists x(P(x) \wedge \neg O(x))$

Verbally: there exists a positive integer that is prime but is not odd.

Free Variable: a variable that is free to be any value in the domain.

Bound Variable: a variable that is bound to a quantifier.

	$P(x)$	$S(x)$	$\neg S(x)$
$P(x)$: x came to the party	Joe	T	F
$S(x)$: x was sick	Theo	F	T
	Gert	T	F
	Sam	F	T

1.8 DeMorgan's law for Quantified Statements

Consider the predicate: $F(x) : "x \text{ can fly}"$, where x is a bird. According to the DeMorgan Identity for Quantified Statements,

$$\neg \forall x F(x) \equiv \exists x \neg F(x)$$

"not every bird can fly \equiv "there exists a bird that cannot fly"

Example using DeMorgan Identities:

$$\begin{aligned} \neg \exists x (P(x) \rightarrow \neg Q(x)) &\equiv \forall x \neg (P(x) \rightarrow \neg Q(x)) \\ &\equiv \forall x (\neg \neg P(x) \wedge \neg \neg Q(x)) \\ &\equiv \forall x (P(x) \wedge Q(x)) \end{aligned}$$

1.9 Nested Quantifiers

A logical expression with more than one quantifier that binds different variables in the same predicate is said to have **Nested Quantifiers**.

Logic	Variable Boundedness	Logic	Meaning
$\forall x \exists y P(x, y)$	x, y bound	$\forall x \forall y M(x, y)$	"everyone sent an email to everyone"
$\forall x P(x, y)$	x bound, y free	$\forall x \exists y M(x, y)$	"everyone sent an email to someone"
$\exists x \exists y T(x, y, z)$	x, y bound, z free	$\exists x \forall y M(x, y)$	"someone sent an email to everyone"
		$\exists x \exists y M(x, y)$	"someone sent an email to someone"

There is a two-player game analogy for how quantifiers work:

Player	Action	Goal
Existential Player \exists	selects value for existentially-bound variables	tries to make expression <u>true</u>
Universal Player \forall	selects value for universally-bound variables	tries to make expression <u>false</u>

Consider the predicate $L(x, y) : "x \text{ likes } y"$.

$\exists x \forall y L(x, y)$ means "there is a student who likes everyone in the school".

$\neg \exists x \forall y L(x, y)$ means "there is no student who likes everyone in the school".

After applying DeMorgan's Laws,

$\forall x \exists y \neg L(x, y)$ means "there is no student who likes everyone in the school".

1.10 More Nested Quantifiers

$M(x, y) : "x \text{ sent an email to } y"$. Consider $\forall x \forall y M(x, y)$. It means that "email sent an email to everyone including themselves". Using $(x \neq y \rightarrow M(x, y))$ can fix this quirk.

$\forall x \forall y (x \neq y \rightarrow M(x, y))$ means "everyone sent an email to everyone else"

1.10.1 Expressing Uniqueness in Quantified Statements

Consider $L(x)$: x was late to the meeting. If someone was late to the meeting, how could you express that that someone was the only person late to the meeting? You want to express that there is someone where everyone else was not late, which can be done with

$$\exists x (L(x) \wedge \forall y (x \neq y \rightarrow \neg L(y)))$$

1.10.2 Moving Quantifiers in Logical Statements

Consider $M(x, y)$: " x is married to y " and $A(x)$: " x is an adult". One way of expressing "For every person x , if x is an adult, then there is a person y to whom x is married to" is by this statement:

$$\forall x(A(x) \rightarrow \exists M(x, y))$$

Since y does not appear in $A(x)$, " $\exists y$ " can be moved so that it appears just after the " \forall ", resulting with

$$\forall x \exists y(A(x) \rightarrow M(x, y))$$

When doing this, keep in mind that $\forall x \exists y \neq \exists y \forall x$:

$$\forall x \exists y(A(x) \rightarrow M(x, y)) \text{ means}$$

for every x , if x is an adult, there exists y who is married to x .

$$\exists y \forall x(A(x) \rightarrow M(x, y)) \text{ means}$$

There exists a y , such that every x who is an adult is also married to y

1.11 Logical Reasoning

Argument: a sequence of propositions, called hypothesis, followed by a final proposition, called the conclusion.

An argument is **valid** if the conclusion is true whenever the hypothesis are all true, otherwise the argument is **invalid**.

$$\begin{array}{c} p_1 \\ p_2 \\ \vdots \\ p_n \\ \hline \therefore c \end{array} \quad \text{where} \quad \begin{array}{c} p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n \\ c \end{array} \begin{array}{l} \text{are hypothesis} \\ \text{is the conclusion} \end{array} \quad \text{The argument is valid}$$

whenever the proposition $(p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge \dots \wedge p_n) \rightarrow c$ is a tautology. Additionally, because of the commutative law, hypothesis can be reordered without changing the argument.

$$\frac{p}{p \rightarrow q} \quad \equiv \quad \frac{p \rightarrow q}{p}$$

1.12 Rules of Inference with Propositions

1.13 Rules of Inference with Quantifiers