Math 114 Discrete Mathematics<br>First Midterm Anaswers<br>February 2018

Scale. $90-100$ A, $79-89$ B, $67-78$ C. Median 88.

1. Negating propositions. [15; 5 points each part] For each of the following propositions, write the negation of the proposition so that negations only appear immediately preceding predicates; there should be no negations of conjunctions, disjunctions, or quantifiers.

## a. $P(x) \wedge P(y)$

The negation $\neg(P(x) \wedge P(y))$ can be converted using De Morgan's laws to $\neg P(x) \vee \neg P(y)$.
b. $\forall x P(x)$

Passing the negation in $\neg \forall x P(x)$ past the quantifier changes it from a universal quantifier to an existential one: $\exists x \neg P(x)$.

$$
\text { c. } \exists x \forall y(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x, y))
$$

Passing the negation past the quantifiers in $\neg \exists x \forall y(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x, y))$ yields $\forall x \exists y \neg(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x, y))$. Then, the negation of the implication $(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x, y)$ gives $P(x) \wedge \neg Q(x, y)$. So the final answer is $\forall x \exists y(P(x) \wedge \neg Q(x, y))$.
2. On truth tables. [20; 10 points each part]
a. Use a truth table to determine whether $(p \wedge q) \rightarrow r$ is logically equivalent to $(p \rightarrow r) \vee(q \rightarrow r)$. Explain in a sentence why your truth table says whether they are logically equivalent or not.

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

Since the columns for the two propositions are the same in all eight rows, therefore the propositions are logically equivalent.
b. Use a truth table to determine whether $(p \vee q \rightarrow r) \rightarrow$ $((p \rightarrow r) \wedge(q \rightarrow r))$ is a tautology, a contradiction, or a contingent proposition. Explain in a sentence why your truth table shows whether it is a tautology, a contradiction, or a
contingent proposition.

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

This is a tautology since it's true in all eight rows.
3. Interpretation of symbolic expressions. [25; 5 points each part] True/false.
a. $\forall x\left(x^{2}>0\right)$. False. When $x=0$, it is not the case that $x^{2}>0$.
b. $\forall y \exists x(x<y)$. True. Given any number $y$, there is a smaller number $x$, for example, $x=y-1$.
c. $\forall x \exists y\left(y^{2}-x^{2}=1\right)$. True. Take $y= \pm \sqrt{1+x^{2}}$.
d. $\exists y \forall x\left(y^{2}-x^{2}=1\right)$. False. Given $y$, there are at most two values of $x$ that satisfy this equation, $x= \pm \sqrt{y^{2}-1}$.
e. $\exists x \exists y\left(y^{2}-x^{2}=1\right)$. True. For example, $x=0$ and $y=1$.
4. On proofs. [15] Prove that for any positive integer $n$, if 3 divides $n^{2}$, then 3 divides $n$. Here, "divides" means divides without remainder. [Suggestion: one way you can do this is by a proof by contradiction using cases. There are 3 cases. Case a: 3 divides $n$ without remainder (which you're trying to show). Case b : there is a remainder of 1 when 3 divides $n$. Case c: there is a remainder of 2 when 3 divides $n$.

The proof that follows is based on the suggestion. There are various ways it can be written up.
Proof: Suppose that 3 divides $n^{2}$. One of the three cases a, b , and c described in the suggestion holds.

Case b: Suppose there is a remainder of 1 when 3 divides $n$. Then $n=3 k+1$ for some integer $k$. Then $n^{2}=(3 k+$ $1)^{2}=9 k^{2}+6 k+1$. Since 3 divides $9 k^{2}+6 k$, therefore when 3 divides $n^{2}$ there is a remainder of 1 . So case b cannot occur when 3 divides $n^{2}$.

Case c: Suppose there is a remainder of 2 when 3 divides $n$. Then $n=3 k+2$ for some integer $k$. Then $n^{2}=(3 k+$ $2)^{2}=9 k^{2}+12 k+4$. Since 3 divides $9 k^{2}+12 k+3$, therefore when 3 divides $n^{2}$ there is a remainder of 1 again. So case c cannot occur when 3 divides $n^{2}$.

That leaves only case a in which 3 divides $n$.
Therefore, if 3 divides $n^{2}$, then 3 also divides $n$. Q.E.D.
There are also proofs that use other properties of positive integers such as the unique factorization theorem. We'll discuss that later in chapter 3.
5. On sets. [25] True/false.
a. If $A=\{1,3,5,7,9\}$, then $|\wp(A)|=16$. (Recall that $\wp(A)$ is the powerset of A.) False. $|\wp(A)|=2^{|A|}=2^{5}=32$.
b. $A \cap B \subseteq C$ implies $A \cup B \cup C \subseteq A \cup B$. False. One counterexample is given by $A=\{1\}, B=\{2\}, C=\{1,2,3\}$.
c. If $A \cup B=B$, then $A \cap B=A$. True. Both equations are equivalent to $A \subseteq B$.
d. The composition of two onto functions is also an onto function. (Recall that a onto function is also called a surjection.) True.
e. If $A=B$, then $|A|=|B|$. (Recall that $|A|$ is the cardinality of the set $A$.) True. There's only one set here, and it has the same cardinality as itself.

