



planetmath.org

Math for the people, by the people.

irreflexive

Canonical name	Irreflexive
Date of creation	2013-03-22 15:41:45
Last modified on	2013-03-22 15:41:45
Owner	CWoo (3771)
Last modified by	CWoo (3771)
Numerical id	14
Author	CWoo (3771)
Entry type	Definition
Classification	msc 03E20
Synonym	antireflexive
Related topic	Reflexive

A binary relation \mathcal{R} on a set A is said to be *irreflexive* (or *antireflexive*) if $\forall a \in A, \neg a\mathcal{R}a$. In other words, “no element is \mathcal{R} -related to itself.”

For example, the relation $<$ (“less than”) is an irreflexive relation on the set of natural numbers.

Note that “irreflexive” is not simply the negation of “<http://planetmath.org/Reflexivereflexive>.” Although it is impossible for a relation (on a nonempty set) to be both <http://planetmath.org/Reflexivereflexive> and irreflexive, there exist relations that are neither. For example, the relation $\{(a, a)\}$ on the two element set $\{a, b\}$ is neither reflexive nor irreflexive.

Here is an example of a non-reflexive, non-irreflexive relation “in nature.” A subgroup in a group is said to be *self-normalizing* if it is equal to its own normalizer. For a group G , define a relation \mathcal{R} on the set of all subgroups of G by declaring $H\mathcal{R}K$ if and only if H is the normalizer of K . Notice that every nontrivial group has a subgroup that is not self-normalizing; namely, the trivial subgroup $\{e\}$ consisting of only the identity. Thus, in any nontrivial group G , there is a subgroup H of G such that $\neg H\mathcal{R}H$. So the relation \mathcal{R} is non-reflexive. Moreover, since the normalizer of a group G in G is G itself, we have $G\mathcal{R}G$. So \mathcal{R} is non-irreflexive.