Discrete Mathematics

Daniel Gonzalez Cedre

University of Notre Dame
Spring of 2023

Chapter 1

Propositional Logic

1.1 Propositions & Connectives

Definition 1.1 (Proposition).

A *proposition* is a sentence (in our language) that has one (and only one) definite, consistent truth value.

Definition 1.2 (Negation).

Given a proposition p, the *negation* of p is denoted $\neg p$ and is defined by the following truth table:

p	$\neg p$
$\top$	$\bot$
$\bot$	$\top$

Some possible readings of $\neg p$:

- Not p.
- p does not hold.
- It is not the case that p.
- We do not have that p.

Definition 1.3 (Conjunction).

Given two propositions p and q, the *conjunction* of p with q is denoted $p \wedge q$ and is defined by the following truth table:

p	q	$p \wedge q$
$\top$	$\top$	$\top$
$\top$	$\bot$	$\bot$
$\bot$	$\top$	$\bot$
$\bot$	$\bot$	$\bot$

Some possible readings of $p \wedge q$:

- p, and q.
- p, but q.
- p; also, q.
- p; further, q.
- In addition to p, we also have q.

Definition 1.4 (Disjunction).

Given two propositions p and q, the *disjunction* of p with q is denoted $p \vee q$ and is defined by the following truth table:

p	q	$p \vee q$
$\top$	$\top$	$\top$
$\top$	$\bot$	$\top$
$\bot$	$\top$	$\top$
$\bot$	$\bot$	$\bot$

Some possible readings of $p \vee q$:

- p, or q.
- Either p, or q.

Definition 1.5 (Material Implication)**.**

Given two propositions p and q, the *conditional* formed by assuming p and concluding q is denoted $p \to q$ and is defined by the following truth table:

p	q	$p \to q$
$\top$	$\top$	$\top$
$\top$	$\bot$	$\bot$
$\bot$	$\top$	$\top$
$\bot$	$\bot$	$\top$

Some possible readings of $p \to q$:

- If p, then q.
- p implies q.
- q is conditioned on p.
- q only if p.
- p is sufficient for q.
- q is necessary for p.
- q unless not p.
- q or not p.

Definition 1.6 (Biconditional)**.**

Given two propositions p and q, the *biconditional* formed by p and q is denoted $p \leftrightarrow q$ and is defined by the following truth table:

p	q	$p \leftrightarrow q$
$\top$	$\top$	$\top$
$\top$	$\bot$	$\bot$
$\bot$	$\top$	$\bot$
$\bot$	$\bot$	$\top$

Some possible readings of $p \leftrightarrow q$:

- p if and only if q.
- p is necessary and sufficient for q.
- q is necessary and sufficient for p.

Definition 1.7 (Equivalence)**.**

If we have two expressions φ and ψ in our formal language, consisting of some number of (possibly shared) propositional variables, connected together by logical connectives, then with the notation $\varphi \Leftrightarrow \psi$ we say that φ is equivalent to ψ :$\Leftrightarrow$ every assignment of truth values to the propositional variables of φ and ψ results in the same truth value for the two expressions.

Example 1.1.

Consider the two expressions $\varphi \coloneqq p \to q$ and $\psi \coloneqq \neg p \lor q$. We can see that φ has two propositional variables: p and q. ψ also has two propositional variables: the same p and the same q. If we construct the truth table for these two expressions, we will see that every assignment of truth values to p and q will result in $p \to q$ and $\neg p \lor q$ having the same truth value.

p	q	$p \to q$	$\neg p \lor q$
$\top$	$\top$	$\top$	$\top$
$\top$	$\bot$	$\bot$	$\bot$
$\bot$	$\top$	$\top$	$\top$
$\bot$	$\bot$	$\top$	$\top$

Definition 1.8 (Tautology & Contradiction)**.**

Let φ be a propositional expression consisting of the propositional variables $p_1, \dots p_n$.
We say φ is a *tautology* :$\Leftrightarrow$ every assignment of truth values to $p_1, \dots p_n$ such that $\varphi \Leftrightarrow \top$.
We say φ is a *contradiction* :$\Leftrightarrow$ there exists an assignment of truth values to $p_1, \dots p_n$ such that $\varphi \Leftrightarrow \bot$.

Definition 1.9 (Satisfiability)**.**

A propositional expression φ consisting the propositional variables $p_1, \dots p_n$ is *satisfiable* :$\Leftrightarrow$ there exists an assignment of truth values to $p_1, \dots p_n$ that results in φ being equivalent to $\top$.

1.2 Boolean Algebras

Definition 1.10 (Boolean Algebra)**.**

A *Boolean algebra* is a collection of *terms* B with two distinguished (and distinct) terms called $\top$ and $\bot$, along with a unary operation called $\neg$ and two binary operations called $\wedge$ and $\vee$, such that the following statements are true for any terms p, q, r in B:

Axioms of a Boolean Algebra	
Identity	$p \wedge \top \Leftrightarrow p$ $p \vee \bot \Leftrightarrow p$
Complement (*a.k.a.* Negation)	$p \wedge \neg p \Leftrightarrow \bot$ $p \vee \neg p \Leftrightarrow \top$
Commutativity	$p \wedge q \Leftrightarrow q \wedge p$ $p \vee q \Leftrightarrow q \vee p$
Associativity	$p \wedge (q \wedge r) \Leftrightarrow (p \wedge q) \wedge r$ $p \vee (q \vee r) \Leftrightarrow (p \vee q) \vee r$
Distributive Laws	$p \wedge (q \vee r) \Leftrightarrow (p \wedge q) \vee (p \wedge r)$ $p \vee (q \wedge r) \Leftrightarrow (p \vee q) \wedge (p \vee r)$

This kind of structure is also referred to as a *complemented, distributive lattice*. Since we are establishing the algebra of *propositions*, our terms consist only of $\top$ and $\bot$.

However, since none of these axioms tell us how to use the (very useful) symbols $\rightarrow$ and $\leftrightarrow$, we need two additional axioms that will turn our Boolean algebra into an example of a *Heyting algebra*:

Heyting Axioms	
Conditional Disintegration	$p \rightarrow q \Leftrightarrow \neg p \vee q$
Biconditional Disintegration	$p \leftrightarrow q \Leftrightarrow (p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow p)$

By referring to the truth tables, it should be easy to see that these axioms are *truth preserving* transformations, meaning that taking an expression like $p \wedge (q \rightarrow r)$ and applying an axiom like Identity to it does not change the truth value of the resulting expression $(p \wedge \top) \wedge (q \rightarrow r)$. For this reason, these are sometimes referred to as *equivalence laws* and many treatments of this subject *prove* these laws by referring to the truth tables.

For our purposes, we don't need to refer to the truth tables at all. The truth tables were a nice, intuitive, and compact way of defining the logical connectives, but we could just as easily have defined them by assuming that all of the axioms are true, without ever writing down a truth table. This provides a more *algebraic* approach to the study of logic, which is more in-line with the way logic is used to actually prove theorems in mathematics.

As such, while the while the truth tables provided a nice way of defining the logical connectives, we will be taking the algebraic approach by *assuming the axioms* of a Boolean algebra are true about our propositional logic and using them to prove theorems about our logical system.

Theorem 1.1 (Uniqueness of Complements)**.**

Let p be a term in a Boolean algebra $(B, \neg, \wedge, \vee)$. Suppose there were two terms x and y in the Boolean algebra such that

$$\begin{aligned} p \wedge x &\Leftrightarrow \bot, & p \wedge y &\Leftrightarrow \bot, \\ p \vee x &\Leftrightarrow \top, & p \vee y &\Leftrightarrow \top, \end{aligned}$$

meaning that x and y act like negations for p. Then, we have $x \Leftrightarrow y$.

Proof.

Let $(B, \neg, \wedge, \vee)$ be a Boolean algebra and consider an arbitrary term p in the algebra. Suppose we have x and y satisfying the conditions given in the statement of the theorem above. Then, we can observe

$$\begin{aligned} x &\Leftrightarrow \top \wedge x && \text{by Identity} \\ &\Leftrightarrow (p \vee y) \wedge x && \text{by the assumption } p \vee y \Leftrightarrow \top \\ &\Leftrightarrow (p \wedge x) \vee (y \wedge x) && \text{by Distributivity} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \bot \vee (y \wedge x) && \text{by the assumption } p \wedge x \Leftrightarrow \bot \\ &\Leftrightarrow y \wedge x && \text{by Identity.} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can see that

$$\begin{aligned} y &\Leftrightarrow \top \wedge y && \text{by Identity} \\ &\Leftrightarrow (p \vee x) \wedge y && \text{by the assumption } p \vee x \Leftrightarrow \top \\ &\Leftrightarrow (p \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge y) && \text{by Distributivity} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \bot \vee (x \wedge y) && \text{by the assumption } p \wedge y \Leftrightarrow \bot \\ &\Leftrightarrow x \wedge y && \text{by Identity.} \end{aligned}$$

So, from Commutativity, we can conclude that $x \Leftrightarrow (y \wedge x) \Leftrightarrow (x \wedge y) \Leftrightarrow y$.

Q.E.D.

Theorem 1.2 (Double Negation)**.**

For any Boolean algebra $(B, \neg, \wedge, \vee)$ *and any term* p *in the algebra, we have* $\neg\neg p \Leftrightarrow p$.

Proof.

Let $(B, \neg, \wedge, \vee)$ be a Boolean algebra and consider an arbitrary term p in the algebra. We want to show that $\neg\neg p \Leftrightarrow p$.

By the Complement axiom, we know $p \wedge \neg p \Leftrightarrow \bot$ and $p \vee \neg p \Leftrightarrow \top$, meaning that p is the complement of $\neg p$. Similarly, we can see that $\neg p \wedge \neg(\neg p) \Leftrightarrow \bot$ and $\neg p \vee \neg(\neg p) \Leftrightarrow \top$, showing us that $\neg\neg p$ is the complement of $\neg p$.

Since complements are unique, as seen in Theorem 1.1, and both p and $\neg\neg p$ are complements of $\neg p$, we must have that $p \Leftrightarrow \neg\neg p$.

Q.E.D.

Theorem 1.3 (Idempotency)**.**

For every Boolean algebra $(B, \neg, \wedge, \vee)$ *and every term* p *in the algebra, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} p \wedge p &\Leftrightarrow p \\ p \vee p &\Leftrightarrow p. \end{aligned}$$

Proof.

Let p be a term in an arbitrary Boolean algebra $(B, \neg, \wedge, \vee)$. Observe

$$\begin{aligned} p \wedge p &\Leftrightarrow (p \wedge p) \vee \bot && \text{by Identity} \\ &\Leftrightarrow (p \wedge p) \vee (p \wedge \neg p) && \text{by Complement} \\ &\Leftrightarrow p \wedge (p \vee \neg p) && \text{by Distributivity} \\ &\Leftrightarrow p \wedge \top && \text{by Complement} \\ &\Leftrightarrow p && \text{by Identity,} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} p \vee p &\Leftrightarrow (p \vee p) \wedge \top && \text{by Identity} \\ &\Leftrightarrow (p \vee p) \wedge (p \vee \neg p) && \text{by Complement} \\ &\Leftrightarrow p \vee (p \wedge \neg p) && \text{by Distributivity} \\ &\Leftrightarrow p \vee \bot && \text{by Complement} \\ &\Leftrightarrow p && \text{by Identity.} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $p \wedge p \Leftrightarrow p$ and $p \vee p \Leftrightarrow p$, as desired.

Q.E.D.

Theorem 1.4 (Domination)**.**

For every Boolean algebra $(B, \neg, \wedge, \vee)$ *and every term* p *in the algebra, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} p \wedge \bot &\Leftrightarrow \bot \\ p \vee \top &\Leftrightarrow \top. \end{aligned}$$

Proof.

Let p be a term in an arbitrary Boolean algebra $(B, \neg, \wedge, \vee)$. Observe

$$\begin{aligned} p \wedge \bot &\Leftrightarrow p \wedge (p \wedge \neg p) && \text{by Complement} \\ &\Leftrightarrow (p \wedge p) \wedge \neg p && \text{by Associativity} \\ &\Leftrightarrow p \wedge \neg p && \text{by Idempotency} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \bot && \text{by Complement,} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} p \vee \top &\Leftrightarrow p \vee (p \vee \neg p) && \text{by Complement} \\ &\Leftrightarrow (p \vee p) \vee \neg p && \text{by Associativity} \\ &\Leftrightarrow p \vee \neg p && \text{by Idempotency} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \top && \text{by Complement.} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $p \wedge \bot \Leftrightarrow \bot$ and $p \vee \top \Leftrightarrow \top$.

Q.E.D.

Theorem 1.5 (Absorption)**.**

For every Boolean algebra $(B, \neg, \wedge, \vee)$ *and any two terms* p *and* q *in the algebra, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} p \wedge (p \vee q) &\Leftrightarrow p \\ p \vee (p \wedge q) &\Leftrightarrow q. \end{aligned}$$

Proof.

Let p and q be terms in an arbitrary Boolean algebra $(B, \neg, \wedge, \vee)$. Observe

$$\begin{aligned} p \wedge (p \vee q) &\Leftrightarrow (p \vee \bot) \wedge (p \vee q) && \text{by Identity} \\ &\Leftrightarrow p \vee (\bot \wedge q) && \text{by Distributivity} \\ &\Leftrightarrow p \vee \bot && \text{by Domination} \\ &\Leftrightarrow p && \text{by Identity,} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} p \vee (p \wedge q) &\Leftrightarrow (p \wedge \top) \vee (p \wedge q) && \text{by Identity} \\ &\Leftrightarrow p \wedge (\top \vee q) && \text{by Distributivity} \\ &\Leftrightarrow p \wedge \top && \text{by Domination} \\ &\Leftrightarrow p && \text{by Identity.} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $p \wedge (p \vee q) \Leftrightarrow p$ and $p \vee (p \wedge q) \Leftrightarrow q$.

Q.E.D.

Theorem 1.6 (De Morgan's Laws)**.**

For every Boolean algebra $(B, \neg, \wedge, \vee)$ *and any two terms* p *and* q *in the algebra, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \neg(p \wedge q) &\Leftrightarrow \neg p \vee \neg q \\ \neg(p \vee q) &\Leftrightarrow \neg p \wedge \neg q. \end{aligned}$$

Proof.

Let p and q be terms in an arbitrary Boolean algebra $(B, \neg, \wedge, \vee)$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} (p \wedge q) \wedge (\neg p \vee \neg q) &\Leftrightarrow (q \wedge p) \wedge (\neg p \vee \neg q) && \text{by Commutativity} \\ &\Leftrightarrow q \wedge (p \wedge (\neg p \vee \neg q)) && \text{by Associativity} \\ &\Leftrightarrow q \wedge \big((p \wedge \neg p) \vee (p \wedge \neg q)\big) && \text{by Distributivity} \\ &\Leftrightarrow q \wedge (\bot \vee (p \wedge \neg q)) && \text{by Complement} \\ &\Leftrightarrow q \wedge (p \wedge \neg q) && \text{by Identity} \\ &\Leftrightarrow q \wedge (\neg q \wedge p) && \text{by Commutativity} \\ &\Leftrightarrow (q \wedge \neg q) \wedge p && \text{by Associativity} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \bot \wedge p && \text{by Complement} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \bot && \text{by Domination.} \end{aligned}$$

Further, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
(p \wedge q) \vee (\neg p \vee \neg q) &\Leftrightarrow (p \wedge q) \wedge (\neg q \vee \neg p) && \text{by Commutativity} \\
&\Leftrightarrow \big((p \wedge q) \vee \neg q\big) \vee \neg p && \text{by Associativity} \\
&\Leftrightarrow \big((p \vee \neg q) \wedge (q \vee \neg q)\big) \vee \neg p && \text{by Distributivity} \\
&\Leftrightarrow \big((p \vee \neg q) \wedge \top\big) \vee \neg p && \text{by Complement} \\
&\Leftrightarrow (p \vee \neg q) \vee \neg p && \text{by Identity} \\
&\Leftrightarrow (\neg q \vee p) \vee \neg p && \text{by Commutativity} \\
&\Leftrightarrow \neg q \vee (p \vee \neg p) && \text{by Associativity} \\
&\Leftrightarrow \neg q \vee \top && \text{by Complement} \\
&\Leftrightarrow \top && \text{by Domination.}
\end{aligned}
$$

So, we can see that $\neg p \vee \neg q$ is a complement for $p \wedge q$. Since complements are unique by Theorem 1.1, we can conclude that $\neg(p \wedge q) \Leftrightarrow \neg p \vee \neg q$.

Showing $\neg(p \vee q) \Leftrightarrow \neg p \wedge \neg q$ is left as an exercise to the reader.

Q.E.D.