Muthayammal Engineering College (Autonomous) -Rasipuram

Department of Mathematics

Mathematical Foundation for Computer Science

Prepared By

Dr. T.Radhika
Assistant Professor
Department of Mathematics
Muthayammal Engineering College
(Autonomous)-Rasipuram

Topics to be covered today

- Propositional Equivalences
- Predicates
- Quantifier

Propositional Equivalences

Tautology

A compound proposition that is always true

No matter what the truth values of the propositions are

Contradiction

A compound proposition that is always false

Contingency

A compound proposition that is neither a tautology nor a contradiction

Logical Equivalences

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

Are called Logically Equivalent

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

Solution: The truth tables for these compound propositions are displayed in Table 3. Becau the truth values of the compound propositions $\neg(p \vee q)$ and $\neg p \wedge \neg q$ agree for all possib combinations of the truth values of p and q, it follows that $\neg(p \vee q) \leftrightarrow (\neg p \wedge \neg q)$ is a tautolo and that these compound propositions are logically equivalent.

Logical Equivalences

Show that $p \to q$ and $\neg p \vee q$ are logically equivalent.

Solution: We construct the truth table for these compound propositions in Table 4. Because the truth values of $\neg p \vee q$ and $p \to q$ agree, they are logically equivalent.

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

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

Logical Equivalences

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.

Solution: We construct the truth table for these compound propositions in Table 5. Because the truth values of $p \vee (q \wedge r)$ and $(p \vee q) \wedge (p \vee r)$ agree, these compound propositions are logically equivalent. ◀

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

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

Logical Equivalences

TABLE 6 Logical Equivalences.

Equivalence	*Name*
$p \wedge \mathbf{T} \equiv p$ $p \vee \mathbf{F} \equiv p$	Identity laws
$p \vee \mathbf{T} \equiv \mathbf{T}$ $p \wedge \mathbf{F} \equiv \mathbf{F}$	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

De Morgan's Law

Using De Morgan's Laws

The two logical equivalences known as De Morgan's laws are particularly important. They tell us how to negate conjunctions and how to negate disjunctions. In particular, the equivalence $\neg(p \vee q) \equiv \neg p \wedge \neg q$ tells us that the negation of a disjunction is formed by taking the conjunction of the negations of the component propositions. Similarly, the equivalence $\neg(p \wedge q) \equiv \neg p \vee \neg q$ tells us that the negation of a conjunction is formed by taking the disjunction of the negations of the component propositions. Example 5 illustrates the use of De Morgan's laws.

TABLE 2 De Morgan's Laws

Logical Equivalences

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

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

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.

$$\begin{aligned} \neg(p \vee (\neg p \wedge q)) &\equiv \neg p \wedge \neg(\neg p \wedge q) && \text{by the second De Morgan law} \\ &\equiv \neg p \wedge [\neg(\neg p) \vee \neg q] && \text{by the first De Morgan law} \end{aligned}$$

Logical Equivalences

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 **T**. (*Note:* This could also be done using a truth table.)

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

Predicates

Statements involving variables, such as

$$\text{“}x > 3,\text{”} \quad \text{“}x = y + 3,\text{”} \quad \text{“}x + y = z,\text{”}$$

The statement “x is greater than 3” has two parts. The first part, the variable x, is the subject of the statement. The second part—the **predicate,** “is greater than 3”—refers to a property that the subject of the statement can have. We can denote the statement “x is greater than 3” by $P(x)$, where P denotes the predicate “is greater than 3” and x is the variable. The statement $P(x)$ is also said to be the value of the **propositional function** P at x. Once a value has been assigned to the variable x, the statement $P(x)$ becomes a proposition and has a truth value. Consider Examples 1 and 2.

Predicates

Similarly, we can let $R(x, y, z)$ denote the statement "$x + y = z$." When values are assigned to the variables x, y, and z, this statement has a truth value.

What are the truth values of the propositions $R(1, 2, 3)$ and $R(0, 0, 1)$?

Solution: The proposition $R(1, 2, 3)$ is obtained by setting $x = 1$, $y = 2$, and $z = 3$ in the statement $R(x, y, z)$. We see that $R(1, 2, 3)$ is the statement "$1 + 2 = 3$," which is true. Also note that $R(0, 0, 1)$, which is the statement "$0 + 0 = 1$," is false.

In general, a statement involving the n variables $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n$ can be denoted by

Quantifiers

Universal Quantifier

The *universal quantification* of $P(x)$ is the statement

"$P(x)$ for all values of x in the domain."

The notation $\forall x P(x)$ denotes the universal quantification of $P(x)$. Here $\forall$ is called the **universal quantifier.** We read $\forall x P(x)$ as "for all $x P(x)$" or "for every $x P(x)$." An element for which $P(x)$ is false is called a **counterexample** of $\forall x P(x)$.

Let $P(x)$ be the statement "$x + 1 > x$." What is the truth value of the quantification $\forall x P(x)$,

Universal Quantifier

Let $Q(x)$ be the statement "$x < 2$." What is the truth value of the quantification $\forall x\, Q(x)$, where the domain consists of all real numbers?

Solution: $Q(x)$ is not true for every real number x, because, for instance, $Q(3)$ is false. That is, $x = 3$ is a counterexample for the statement $\forall x\, Q(x)$. Thus

$$\forall x\, Q(x)$$

Suppose that $P(x)$ is "$x^2 > 0$." To show that the statement $\forall x\, P(x)$ is false where the uni-

Universal Quantifier

What is the truth value of $\forall x P(x)$, where $P(x)$ is the statement "$x^2 < 10$" and the domain consists of the positive integers not exceeding 4?

Solution: The statement $\forall x P(x)$ is the same as the conjunction

$$P(1) \wedge P(2) \wedge P(3) \wedge P(4),$$

because the domain consists of the integers 1, 2, 3, and 4. Because $P(4)$, which is the statement "$4^2 < 10$," is false, it follows that $\forall x P(x)$ is false.

Existential Quantifier

THE EXISTENTIAL QUANTIFIER Many mathematical statements assert that there is an element with a certain property. Such statements are expressed using existential quantification. With existential quantification, we form a proposition that is true if and only if $P(x)$ is true for at least one value of x in the domain.

The *existential quantification* of $P(x)$ is the proposition

"There exists an element x in the domain such that $P(x)$."

We use the notation $\exists x P(x)$ for the existential quantification of $P(x)$. Here $\exists$ is called the *existential quantifier*.

A domain must always be specified when a statement $\exists x P(x)$ is used. Furthermore, the meaning of $\exists x P(x)$ changes when the domain changes. Without specifying the domain, the

Existential Quantifier

Let $P(x)$ denote the statement "$x > 3$." What is the truth value of the quantification $\exists x P(x)$, where the domain consists of all real numbers?

Solution: Because "$x > 3$" is sometimes true—for instance, when $x = 4$—the existential quantification of $P(x)$, which is $\exists x P(x)$, is true. ◀

Observe that the statement $\exists x P(x)$ is false if and only if there is no element x in the domain for which $P(x)$ is true. That is, $\exists x P(x)$ is false if and only $P(x)$ is false for every element of the domain. We illustrate this observation in Example 15.

Let $Q(x)$ denote the statement "$x = x + 1$." What is the truth value of the quantification $\exists x Q(x)$, where the domain consists of all real numbers?

Solution: Because $Q(x)$ is false for every real number x, the existential quantification of $Q(x)$,

Existential Quantifier

What is the truth value of $\exists x\, P(x)$, where $P(x)$ is the statement "$x^2 > 10$" and the universe of discourse consists of the positive integers not exceeding 4?

Solution: Because the domain is $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, the proposition $\exists x\, P(x)$ is the same as the disjunction

$$P(1) \vee P(2) \vee P(3) \vee P(4).$$

Because $P(4)$, which is the statement "$4^2 > 10$," is true, it follows that $\exists x\, P(x)$ is true. ◀

TABLE 1 Quantifiers.

Statement	*When True?*	*When False?*

Binding Variables

Binding Variables

When a quantifier is used on the variable x, we say that this occurrence of the variable is **bound.** An occurrence of a variable that is not bound by a quantifier or set equal to a particular value is said to be **free.** All the variables that occur in a propositional function must be bound or set equal to a particular value to turn it into a proposition. This can be done using a combination of universal quantifiers, existential quantifiers, and value assignments.

The part of a logical expression to which a quantifier is applied is called the **scope** of this quantifier. Consequently, a variable is free if it is outside the scope of all quantifiers in the formula that specifies this variable.

In the statement $\exists x(x + y = 1)$, the variable x is bound by the existential quantification $\exists x$, but

Negative Quantified Expression

We will often want to consider the negation of a quantified expression. For instance, consider the negation of the statement

“Every student in your class has taken a course in calculus.”

This statement is a universal quantification, namely,

$$\forall x\, P(x),$$

where $P(x)$ is the statement “x has taken a course in calculus” and the domain consists of the students in your class. The negation of this statement is “It is not the case that every student in your class has taken a course in calculus.” This is equivalent to “There is a student in your class who has not taken a course in calculus.” And this is simply the existential quantification of the negation of the original propositional function, namely,

$$\exists x\, \neg P(x).$$

Nested Quantifiers

quantifiers are nested if one is within the scope of the other, such as

$$\forall x \exists y(x + y = 0).$$

Note that everything within the scope of a quantifier can be thought of as a propositional function. For example,

$$\forall x \exists y(x + y = 0)$$

is the same thing as $\forall x Q(x)$, where $Q(x)$ is $\exists y P(x, y)$, where $P(x, y)$ is $x + y = 0$. Assume that the domain for the variables x and y consists of all real numbers. The statement

$$\forall x \forall y(x + y = y + x)$$

Nested Quantifiers

TABLE 1 Quantifications of Two Variables.

Statement	*When True?*	*When False?*
$\forall x \forall y P(x, y)$ $\forall y \forall x P(x, y)$	$P(x, y)$ is true for every pair x, y.	There is a pair x, y for which $P(x, y)$ is false.
$\forall x \exists y P(x, y)$	For every x there is a y for which $P(x, y)$ is true.	There is an x such that $P(x, y)$ is false for every y.
$\exists x \forall y P(x, y)$	There is an x for which $P(x, y)$	For every x there is a y for

Thank You