

# Discrete Structures (Monsoon 2021)

**Ashok Kumar Das**

**Associate Professor**  
**IEEE Senior Member**

Center for Security, Theory and Algorithmic Research  
International Institute of Information Technology, Hyderabad (IIIT Hyderabad)

E-mail: *ashok.das@iiit.ac.in*

URL: <http://www.iiit.ac.in/people/faculty/ashokkdas>  
<https://sites.google.com/view/iitkgpakdas/>

# The Language of Logic

- A declarative sentence that is either true or false, but not both, is a proposition (or a statement), which we will denote by the lowercase letter  $p$ ,  $q$ ,  $r$ ,  $s$ , or  $t$ .
- The variable  $p$ ,  $q$ ,  $r$ ,  $s$ , or  $t$  are boolean variable (or logic variable).

**Example 1:**  $3 + 5 = 8$ .

**Example 2:** Socrates was a Greek philosopher.

**Example 3:** If  $1 = 2$ , then roses are red.

**Example \*:** Is  $x + 5 = 8$  proposition? (NO, because  $x$  can take any value)

# Conjunction

The conjunction of two arbitrary propositions  $p$  and  $q$ , denoted by  $p \wedge q$ , is the proposition  $p$  and  $q$ . It is formed by combining the propositions using the word *and*, called a connective.

**Example 1:** Consider the statements

$p$ : Socrates was a Greek philosopher

and

$q$ : Euclid was a Chinese musician

Their conjunction is given by

$p \wedge q$ : Socrates was a Greek philosopher *and* Euclid was a Chinese musician.

| $p$ | $q$ | $p \wedge q$ |
|-----|-----|--------------|
| T   | T   | T            |
| T   | F   | F            |
| F   | T   | F            |
| F   | F   | F            |

Table: Truth table for  $p \wedge q$

# Disjunctions

A second way of combining two propositions  $p$  and  $q$  is by using the connective *or*. The resulting proposition  $p$  or  $q$  is the disjunction of  $p$  and  $q$  and is denoted by  $p \vee q$ .

**Example 1:** Consider the statements

$p$ : Harry likes pepperoni pizza for lunch

and

$q$ : Harry likes mushroom pizza for lunch

Their conjunction is given by

$p \vee q$ : Harry likes pepperoni pizza for lunch or Harry likes mushroom pizza for lunch.

| $p$ | $q$ | $p \vee q$ |
|-----|-----|------------|
| T   | T   | T          |
| T   | F   | T          |
| F   | T   | T          |
| F   | F   | F          |

Table: Truth table for  $p \vee q$

- The negation of a proposition  $p$  is *It is not the case that  $p$* , denoted by  $\neg p$ .
- Read  $\neg p$  as the *negation* of  $p$  or simply *not  $p$* .

**Example 1:** Consider the statement

$p$ : Apollo is a Hindu god.

The negation of  $p$  is

$\neg p$ : Apollo is not Hindu god.

| $p$ | $\neg p$ |
|-----|----------|
| T   | F        |
| F   | T        |

Table: Truth table for  $\neg p$

Two propositions  $p$  and  $q$  can be combined to form statements of the form: *If  $p$ , then  $q$ .*

Such a statement is an implication, denoted by  $p \rightarrow q$ . Since it involves a condition, it is also called a conditional statement. The component  $p$  is the hypothesis (or premise) of the implication and  $q$  the conclusion.

**Example :** Let

$p$ :  $\triangle ABC$  is equilateral and  $q$ :  $\triangle ABC$  is isosceles.

Then

$p \rightarrow q$ : If  $\triangle ABC$  is equilateral, then it is isosceles.

| $p$ | $q$ | $p \rightarrow q$ |
|-----|-----|-------------------|
| T   | T   | T                 |
| T   | F   | F                 |
| F   | T   | T                 |
| F   | F   | T                 |

Table: Truth table for  $p \rightarrow q$

The converse of the implication  $p \rightarrow q$  is  $q \rightarrow p$ . The inverse of  $p \rightarrow q$  is  $\neg p \rightarrow \neg q$  (negate the premise and the conclusion).

The contrapositive of  $p \rightarrow q$  is  $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$  (negate the premise and the conclusion, and then switch them).

**Example :** Let

$p \rightarrow q$ : If  $\triangle ABC$  is equilateral, then it is isosceles. Then

- *Converse* ( $q \rightarrow p$ ): If  $\triangle ABC$  is isosceles, then it is equilateral.
- *Inverse* ( $\neg p \rightarrow \neg q$ ): If  $\triangle ABC$  is not equilateral, then it is not isosceles.
- *Contrapositive* ( $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$ ): If  $\triangle ABC$  is not isosceles, then it is not equilateral.



**Example:** Construct a truth table for  $(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow p)$

| $p$ | $q$ | $p \rightarrow q$ | $q \rightarrow p$ | $(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow p)$ |
|-----|-----|-------------------|-------------------|--|
| T   | T   | T                 | T                 | T  |
| T   | F   | F                 | T                 | F  |
| F   | T   | T                 | F                 | F  |
| F   | F   | T                 | T                 | T  |

**Table:** Truth table for  $(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow p)$

**Example:** Construct the truth table of the compound proposition  $(p \vee \neg q) \rightarrow (p \wedge q)$

# Biconditional Statement

Two propositions  $p$  and  $q$  can be combined using the connective *if and only if*. The resulting proposition,  $p$  if and only if  $q$ , is the conjunction of two implications: (1)  $p$  only if  $q$ , and (2)  $p$  if  $q$ , that is,  $p \rightarrow q$  and  $q \rightarrow p$ . Accordingly, it is called biconditional statement, symbolized by  $p \leftrightarrow q$ .

**Example:** Let

$p$ :  $\triangle ABC$  is equilateral and  $q$ :  $\triangle ABC$  is equiangular.

Then the biconditional statement is given by

$p \leftrightarrow q$ :  $\triangle ABC$  is equilateral iff (if and only if) it is equiangular.

**Note:** The statement  $p \leftrightarrow q$  is true if both  $p$  and  $q$  have the same truth value.

| $p$ | $q$ | $p \leftrightarrow q$ |
|-----|-----|-----------------------|
| T   | T   | T                     |
| T   | F   | F                     |
| F   | T   | F                     |
| F   | F   | T                     |

Table: Truth table for  $p \leftrightarrow q$

A tautology is a compound statement which always results are true in Truth value.

**Example:** Construct a truth table for  $(p \rightarrow q) \leftrightarrow (\neg p \vee q)$ .

| $p$ | $q$ | $p \rightarrow q$ | $\neg p$ | $(\neg p \vee q)$ | $(p \rightarrow q) \leftrightarrow (\neg p \vee q)$ |
|-----|-----|-------------------|----------|-------------------|---|
| T   | T   | T                 | F        | T                 | T   |
| T   | F   | F                 | F        | F                 | T   |
| F   | T   | T                 | T        | T                 | T   |
| F   | F   | T                 | T        | T                 | T   |

**Table:** Truth table for  $(p \rightarrow q) \leftrightarrow (\neg p \vee q)$

# Logical Equivalences

Compound propositions that have the same truth values in all possible cases are 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.

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

| $p$ | $q$ | $p \vee q$ | $\neg(p \vee q)$ | $\neg p$ | $\vee q$ | $(\neg p \wedge \neg q)$ |
|-----|-----|------------|------------------|----------|----------|--------------------------|
| 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:** Truth table for  $\neg(p \vee q)$  and  $\neg p \wedge \neg q$

- **Example 1:** Show that  $p \rightarrow q$  and  $\neg p \vee q$  are logically equivalent.
- **Example 2:** Show that  $p \vee (q \wedge r)$  and  $(p \vee q) \wedge (p \vee r)$  are logically equivalent. This is the *distributive law* of disjunction over conjunction.
- **Example 3:** Show that  $\neg(p \rightarrow q)$  and  $p \wedge \neg q$  are logically equivalent.
- **Example 4:** Show that  $p \rightarrow q \equiv \neg q \rightarrow \neg p$ ; that is, an implication is logically equivalent to its contrapositive.

# Some important equivalences

Let  $p$ ,  $q$ , and  $r$  be any three propositions, and  $T$  denotes the compound proposition that is always true and  $F$  denotes the compound proposition that is always false.

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