Lecture 06: Discrete Mathematics

Course Title: Discrete Mathematics

Course Code: MTH211

Class: BSM-II

Objectives

The main aim of the lecture is to discuss about

• *Propositional functions with more than one variable*

References:

- S. Lipschutz and M. Lipson, Schaum's Outlines Discrete Mathematics, Third Edition, McGraw-Hil, 2007.
- K.H. Rosen, Discrete Mathematics and its Application, MeGraw-Hill, 6th edition. 2007.
- K.A. Ross, C.R.B. Wright, Discrete Mathematics, Prentice Hall. New Jersey, 2003.

Propositional Functions with more than One Variable

A propositional function (of *n* variables) defined over a product set $A = A_1 \times A_2 \times ... \times A_n$ is an expression $p(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n)$, which has the property that $p(a_1, a_2, ..., a_n)$ is true or false for any *n*-tuple $(a_1, a_2, ..., a_n)$ in *A*. For example,

$$x + 2y + 3z < 18$$

is a propositional function on $N^3 = N \times N \times N$. Such a propositional function has no truth value. However, we do have the following:

Basic Principle: A propositional function preceded by a quantifier for each variable, for example,

 $\forall x \exists y, p(x, y)$ or $\exists x \forall y \exists z, p(x, y, z)$

denotes a statement and has a truth value.

Examples

Let $B = \{1, 2, 3, ..., 9\}$ and let p(x, y) denote "x + y = 10." Then p(x, y) is a propositional function on $A = B^2 = B \times B$.

(a) The following is a statement since there is a quantifier for each variable:

 $\forall x \exists y, p(x, y)$, that is, "For every *x*, there exists a *y* such that x + y = 10" This statement is true. For example, if x = 1, let y = 9; if x = 2, let y = 8, and so on. (b) The following is also a statement:

 $\exists y \forall x, p(x, y)$, that is, "There exists a *y* such that, for every *x*, we have x + y = 10" No such *y* exists; hence this statement is false.

Negating Quantified Statements with more than One Variable

Quantified statements with more than one variable may be negated by successively applying following theorem:

Theorem (DeMorgan):

(a) $\neg (\forall x \in A)p(x) \equiv (\exists x \in A) \neg p(x)$ (b) $\neg (\exists x \in A)p(x) \equiv (\forall x \in A) \neg p(x)$.

Thus each \forall is changed to \exists and each \exists is changed to \forall as the negation symbol \neg passes through the statement from left to right. For example,

$$\neg [\forall x \exists y \exists z, p(x, y, z)]$$

$$\equiv \exists x \neg [\exists y \exists z, p(x, y, z)]$$

$$\equiv \exists x \forall y \neg [\exists z, p(x, y, z)]$$

$$\equiv \exists x \forall y \forall z, \neg p(x, y, z).$$

Naturally, we do not put in all the steps when negating such quantified statements.

Example

(a) Consider the quantified statement:

"Every student has at least one course where the lecturer is a teaching assistant." Its negation is the statement:

"There is a student such that in every course the lecturer is not a teaching assistant."

(b) The formal definition that L is the limit of a sequence a_1, a_2, \ldots follows:

 $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists n_0 \in \mathbb{N}, \forall n > n_0 \text{ we have } |a_n - L| < \varepsilon.$

Thus *L* is not the limit of the sequence $a1, a2, \ldots$ when:

 $\exists \varepsilon > 0, \forall n_0 \in \mathbb{N}, \exists n > n_0 \text{ such that } | a_n - L | \ge \varepsilon.$

