





COSC 2300

Discrete Structures

Book I



Bertrand Russell (1872-1970)

In a particular village there is a gentleman barber who shaves every gentleman who does not shave himself.

Does the barber shave himself?

No true/false answer can be given that is consistent.
This is an example of Russell's Paradox.

Other forms:

P: The statement P (ie. this statement) is false.

Avoiding self-referential statements:

A: The statement B is true.

B: The statement A is false.

Propositional Logic (Propositional Calculus)

R: Bertrand Russell was born in 1872. (True)

M: Mars is the second planet from the sun. (False)

J: January is the first month of the calendar year. (True)

T: A triangle has four sides. (False)

Syntactic vs. Semantic features language
syntax (symbolic) meaning (semantics)
true/false

R: Bertrand Russell was born in 1872.

(True)

M: Mars is the second planet from the sun.

(False)

J: January is the first month of the calendar year.

(True)

T: A triangle has four sides. (False)

"Exclusive or" of T and T is F. Avoid!

$R \vee M$ is True

↑
"or"
"join"
"disjunction"

$R \wedge M$ is False

↑
"and"
"meet"
"conjunction"

Truth Table: for two statements P, Q
(atomic propositions)

P	$\neg P$
T	F
F	T

Conditional Statements $P \rightarrow Q$ ("P implies Q")
(implication) ("If P then Q")

$R \rightarrow M$ is false
 $J \rightarrow R$ is true.
 $T \rightarrow M$ is true.

$$(P \wedge Q) \wedge R \equiv P \wedge (Q \wedge R)$$

↑
equivalence of propositions

$$P \wedge Q \equiv Q \wedge P$$

$$P \rightarrow Q \equiv (\neg P) \vee Q$$

P	Q	$P \rightarrow Q$	$\neg P$	$(\neg P) \vee Q$
T	T	T	F	T
T	F	F	F	F
F	T	T	T	T
F	F	T	T	T

"inclusive" or

P	Q	$P \vee Q$	$P \wedge Q$
T	T	T	T
T	F	T	F
F	T	T	F
F	F	F	F

P	Q	$P \rightarrow Q$
T	T	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	F	T

$$(P \vee Q) \vee R \equiv P \vee (Q \vee R)$$







$$a(b+c) = ab+ac$$

$$a+bc \neq (a+b)(a+c)$$

$$P \vee (Q \wedge R) \equiv (P \vee Q) \wedge (P \vee R)$$

$$P \wedge (Q \vee R) \equiv (P \wedge Q) \vee (P \wedge R)$$

This can be verified using a truth table (with eight rows)
or using Venn diagram




$$\neg(P \wedge Q) \equiv (\neg P) \vee (\neg Q)$$

"P and Q are not both true, i.e. at least one of 'P and Q' fails"



$$\neg(P \vee Q) \equiv (\neg P) \wedge (\neg Q)$$

"Neither P nor Q is true; both are false"



De Morgan's Rules

$$\neg(P_1 \wedge P_2 \wedge P_3 \wedge \dots \wedge P_k) \equiv (\neg P_1) \vee (\neg P_2) \vee \dots \vee (\neg P_k)$$

P_i : the i th student is wearing red
 $P_1 \wedge P_2 \wedge \dots \wedge P_k$: all k students are wearing red
 $\neg(P_1 \wedge P_2 \wedge \dots \wedge P_k)$: not all k students are wearing red
 i.e. at least one of the k students

$$\neg(P_1 \vee P_2 \vee \dots \vee P_k) \equiv (\neg P_1) \wedge (\neg P_2) \wedge \dots \wedge (\neg P_k)$$

is not wearing red.
 none of the k students are wearing red.

"All the students are not wearing red." Ambiguous! Which of the above does the person mean?

$$P \vee (\neg P)$$

P	$\neg P$	$P \vee (\neg P)$
T	F	T
F	T	T



$P \vee (\neg P)$ is a tautology: its truth value is always true regardless of P.

P: "There exist integers x, y, z such that $x^3 + y^3 + z^3 = 42$."

$P \vee (\neg P)$ says that P is either true or false.

$P \wedge (\neg P)$ is a contradiction

P	$\neg P$	$P \wedge (\neg P)$
T	F	F
F	T	F

$P \wedge (Q \vee R)$ is neither a tautology nor a contradiction: it depends on P, Q, R (it is a contingent proposition).

$P \rightarrow (Q \wedge (\neg Q))$ cannot be true unless P is false.

$$P \rightarrow (Q \wedge (\neg Q)) \equiv \neg P$$

$P \rightarrow (Q \vee (\neg Q))$ is a tautology.

$P \rightarrow Q$ Conditional statement "If P then Q" or "P implies Q" "Q whenever P"	P	Q	$P \rightarrow Q$	Biconditional statement $P \leftrightarrow Q$ $P \leftrightarrow Q \equiv (P \rightarrow Q) \wedge (Q \rightarrow P)$	P	Q	$P \leftrightarrow Q$
	T	T	T		T	T	T
	T	F	F		T	F	F
	F	T	T		F	T	F
	F	F	T		F	F	T

$P \rightarrow Q$ is equivalent to

$$(\neg P) \vee Q$$

$$P \rightarrow Q \equiv (\neg P) \vee Q$$

"x is even" $\leftrightarrow$ " x^2 is even"
 "P if and only if Q"
 "P iff Q"

This is a true statement for integers.
 The conditional statement
 $Q \rightarrow P$
 is the converse of $P \rightarrow Q$.

In order to prove $P \rightarrow Q$, one typically does so by assuming P and then proceeding to prove Q as a consequence.

In order to prove $P \leftrightarrow Q$, one typically proves $P \rightarrow Q$ and then also prove $Q \rightarrow P$.

Sets e.g. the set $A = \{1, 2, 5\}$ contains three ^(members) elements 1, 2, 5:

Lin

$$2 \in A$$

ε epsilon

$$1 \in A$$

$$2 \in A$$

$$5 \in A$$

$$7 \notin A \equiv \neg (7 \in A)$$

$$\mathbb{Z} = \{\dots, -3, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, \dots\}$$

$$\{\} = \emptyset$$

the empty set

nothing

$B = \{1, 4, \{1, 7\}, \{1, 2, 4\}, \{2\}\}$ has 5 elements

$$1 \in B$$

$$2 \notin B$$

$$\{2\} \in B$$

$$7 \notin B$$

$$13 \notin B$$

$$1 \in \{1, 7\} \in B$$

$$\{1, 1, 3\} = \{1, 3\} \\ = \{3, 1\}$$

A set is completely specified by its elements.

Discrete vs. Continuous

$$\mathbb{Z} = \{\dots, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, \dots\} \quad \mathbb{R} \quad [5, 8] = \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid 5 \leq x \leq 8\}$$



If A and B are sets then their ⁵union is $A \cup B = \{x \mid x \in A \text{ or } x \in B\}$

$A \subseteq B$ means $x \in B$ for all $x \in A$. (Every element of A is an element of B .) ⁸intersection: $A \cap B = \{x \mid x \in A \text{ and } x \in B\}$

" A is a subset of B "

If $A = B$ then $A \subseteq B$. (Not conversely!)

$A = B$ is equivalent to $A \subseteq B$ and $B \subseteq A$.

$$\subsetneq \subsetneq \subsetneq \bigcirc_A^B$$

inclusive



Warning: $A \subset B$ can mean " A is a proper subset of B " but some people use it to just mean " A is a subset of B ".

(A is a subset of B but not equal to B) Is there any confusion between $x < y$ and $x \leq y$?

$$\{\} = \emptyset$$

The power set of a set A is the set of all subsets of A :

$$\mathcal{P}(A) = \{B \mid B \subseteq A\}$$

$$\mathcal{P}(\{2, 5\}) = \{\emptyset, \{2\}, \{5\}, \{2, 5\}\}$$

$$\{2\} \subseteq \{2, 5\}$$

$$\{2\} \neq \{2, 5\}$$

$$2 \in \{2, 5\}$$

$$\{2\} \in \mathcal{P}(\{2, 5\})$$


Can a set be an element of itself?

Let $S = \{x \mid x \text{ is a set, } x \notin x\}$

Does $S \in S$? If $S \in S$ then $S \notin S$.
If $S \notin S$ then $S \in S$.

Russell's Paradox

$\mathcal{P}(A)$



If S has n elements then $\mathcal{P}(S)$ has 2^n elements


$\emptyset = \{\}$ has no elements

$$\mathcal{P}(\emptyset) = \{\emptyset\} = \{\{\}\} \quad \text{" 1 element"}$$

$A = \{\emptyset\}$ has one element

$$\Rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A) = \{\emptyset, A\} = \{\emptyset, \{\emptyset\}\} = \{\{\}, \{\{\}\}\}$$

A
|
 $\emptyset$



An alphabet is a (usually finite) set of symbols

eg. $\{a, b, c, \dots, z\}$ (lower case Roman letters)

$\{0, 1\}$ (binary alphabet)

$\{0, 1, 2, \dots, 9, A, B, C, D, E, F\}$ (hexadecimal alphabet)

ASCII

$$A = \{a, b, c, \dots, z\} \quad |A| = 26$$

A word of length n over A is a string of letters, eg. 'dqqjl' is a word (string) of length 5.

A^n = set of all words of length n over the alphabet A . $|A^n| = |A|^n = 26^n$

There are 26^n words of length n over A .

$$a_0 + a_1 + a_2 + \dots = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n$$

$$A^0 = \{''\}$$

$$A^* = A^0 \cup A^1 \cup A^2 \cup A^3 \cup \dots = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} A^n$$
$$= \underbrace{\{''\}}_{A^0}, \underbrace{\{a, b, c, \dots, z\}}_{A^1}, \underbrace{\{aa, ab, \dots, az, ba, bb, \dots, bz, \dots, za, zb, \dots, zz\}}_{A^2}, \dots$$

The union of three sets A, B, C can be written as $A \cup B \cup C$

If $A \cap B = \emptyset$ and $A \cap C = \emptyset$ and $B \cap C = \emptyset$ then A, B, C are disjoint sets

$$\text{and } |A \cup B \cup C| = |A| + |B| + |C|$$

$|A|$ = size of A = number of elements of A = cardinality of A .

Early 20th century: axioms for set theory (ZFC = Zermelo-Fraenkel + Choice)

$\emptyset$ is a set. From $\emptyset$ we recursively build new sets from old sets

$\mathbb{R}$ is a set. $[5, 8] = \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid 5 \leq x \leq 8\}$

"set-builder notation" for constructing sets

↑ or colon

Example: Truth-table for $(P \wedge Q) \rightarrow R$ and $P \wedge (Q \rightarrow R)$

P	Q	R	$P \wedge Q$	$(P \wedge Q) \rightarrow R$	$Q \rightarrow R$	$P \wedge (Q \rightarrow R)$
T	T	T	T	T	T	T
T	T	F	T	F	F	F
T	F	T	F	T	T	T
T	F	F	F	T	T	T
F	T	T	F	T	T	F
F	T	F	F	T	F	F
F	F	T	F	T	T	F
F	F	F	F	T	T	F

Cardinality of sets:

$|A| = |B|$ means there is a one-to-one correspondence between the two sets.

$|A| \leq |B|$ means there is a one-to-one correspondence between elements of A and elements of a subset of B.

There is no such thing (in ZFC set theory) as the "set of all sets"

as this leads back to a contradiction (one guise of Russell's Paradox)

If $U = \{x \mid x \text{ is a set}\}$ is a set then $S = \{x \in U \mid x \notin x\}$ would be a set.

$\{x \mid x \text{ is a set}\}$ (in ZFC) is a "class" but not a set (a "proper class")

Kurt Gödel

Incompleteness Theorem: Axioms cannot be strong enough to do useful things and be provably free from inconsistency.



Quantifiers in logic: universal and existential quantifiers

For every real number x , $x^2 \geq 0$.

universal quantifier
 $x^2 \geq 0$ whenever $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

If x is a real number then $x^2 \geq 0$.

Here the universal quantifier "for all" or "for every" or "always" or "whenever" or ...
or "for any"

Let x be a real number. Then $x^2 \geq 0$.

$$(\forall x \in \mathbb{R})(x^2 \geq 0)$$

→ $(\forall x)(x^2 \geq 0)$ example of $(\forall x)(P(x))$

There exists a real number x such that $x^2 = 2$.

existential quantifier
 $x^2 = 2$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

There is an $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $x^2 = 2$.

$$(\exists x \in \mathbb{R})(x^2 = 2) \quad \text{or} \quad (\exists x)(P(x))$$

→ $(\exists x)(x^2 = 2)$

$$(x+y)^2 = x^2 + 2xy + y^2$$

(for all x and y in $\mathbb{R}$)

$$(x+y)^2 = x^2 + y^2$$

for some x and y in $\mathbb{R}$

permissible only if $\mathbb{R}$ is understood from context

$\neg (\forall x)(P(x))$ is equivalent to $(\exists x)(\neg P(x))$ de Morgan's rules
 $(\forall x)(\neg P(x)) \quad \neg (\exists x)(P(x))$

eg. $x \in \{\text{students in this room}\}$

Every student in this room is wearing blue. To say this is false (i.e. to negate the statement) is equivalent to saying that there is at least one student in the room not wearing blue.

$(\exists! x)(P(x))$ says there exists one and only one x (in the "universe") for which $P(x)$

P : Every elephant in this room weighs three pounds. This is true. (true in the vacuous sense)

$\neg P$: Not every elephant in this room weighs three pounds.
 i.e. there exists an elephant in this room weighing something other than three pounds.

If $\neg P$ is false (which it certainly is) then P must be true.

$(\forall x \in \emptyset)(x = x+1)$ is true vacuously

de Morgan's laws for set theory:

Let A be a set and $C = \{X_a \mid a \in A\}$ be a collection of sets X_a indexed by $a \in A$.

eg. $A = \mathbb{R}$, $C = \{ \underbrace{[a, \infty)} : a \in \mathbb{R} \}$

$$[a, \infty) = \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid x \geq a\} \quad \xrightarrow{\quad a \quad}$$

$$\bigcup C = \bigcup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} [a, \infty) = \mathbb{R}$$

$$\bigcap C = \bigcap_{a \in \mathbb{R}} [a, \infty) = \emptyset$$