

*Exercise 19* 1) Is  $R \circ R^{-1}$  reflexive for all binary relations on  $A$ ?

2) Is a reflexive relation always symmetric?

3) Is a symmetric relation always reflexive?

4) Is the union of two symmetric relations always symmetric?

5) Is the intersection of two transitive relations always a transitive relation?

6) Is the union of two transitive relations always a transitive relation?

7) Is the complement of a transitive relation a transitive relation?

8) Is the complement of a non-symmetric relation a symmetric relation?

*Answer 2.19* PMT two We use  $A = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$  when constructing counter examples.

1) No. Take  $R = \{\langle 1, 3 \rangle\}$ , then  $R^{-1} = \{\langle 3, 1 \rangle\}$  and  $R \circ R^{-1} = \{\langle 1, 1 \rangle\}$ . Since  $\langle 2, 2 \rangle \notin R \circ R^{-1}$ , this relation is not reflexive.

2) No. Take  $R = \{\langle 1, 1 \rangle, \langle 1, 3 \rangle, \langle 2, 2 \rangle, \langle 3, 3 \rangle, \langle 4, 4 \rangle\}$ , then  $R$  is reflexive, but  $\langle 3, 1 \rangle \notin R$ , so  $R$  is not symmetric.

3) No. Take  $R = \{\langle 1, 3 \rangle, \langle 3, 1 \rangle\}$ , then  $R$  is symmetric, but  $\langle 1, 1 \rangle \notin R$ , so  $R$  is not reflexive.

4) Yes. Let  $R$  and  $S$  be both symmetric. Assume  $\langle x, y \rangle \in A^2$  such that  $x R \cup S y$ . Then by definition,  $x R y$  or  $x S y$ .

$(x R y)$ : Then also  $y R x$ , since  $R$  is symmetric.

$(x S y)$ : Then also  $y S x$ , since  $S$  is symmetric.

So we have  $y R x$  or  $y S x$ , so  $y R \cup S x$ . So  $R \cup S$  is symmetric when  $R$  and  $S$  are.

5) Yes. Let  $R$  and  $S$  be both transitive. Assume  $x R \cap S y$  and  $y R \cap S z$ ; to show:  $x R \cap S z$ . If  $x R \cap S y$  and  $y R \cap S z$  then  $x R y$  and  $x S y$ , as well as  $y R z$  and  $y S z$ . Since  $R$  and  $S$  are both transitive, we also have  $x R z$  and  $x S z$ ; but then  $x R \cap S z$ .

6) No. Take  $R = \{\langle 1, 2 \rangle, \langle 2, 3 \rangle, \langle 1, 3 \rangle\}$  and  $S = \{\langle 2, 3 \rangle, \langle 3, 4 \rangle, \langle 2, 4 \rangle\}$ .

Then  $R \cup S = \{\langle 1, 2 \rangle, \langle 2, 3 \rangle, \langle 1, 3 \rangle, \langle 2, 3 \rangle, \langle 3, 4 \rangle, \langle 2, 4 \rangle\}$ , which is not transitive: for example,  $\langle 1, 3 \rangle, \langle 3, 4 \rangle \in R \cup S$ , but  $\langle 1, 4 \rangle \notin R \cup S$ .

7) No. Take  $R = \{\langle 1, 2 \rangle, \langle 2, 3 \rangle, \langle 1, 3 \rangle\}$ , then  $R$  is transitive.

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{R} = \{ & \langle 1, 1 \rangle, & & \langle 1, 4 \rangle, \\ & \langle 2, 1 \rangle, \langle 2, 2 \rangle, & & \langle 2, 4 \rangle, \\ & \langle 3, 1 \rangle, \langle 3, 2 \rangle, \langle 3, 3 \rangle, & & \langle 3, 4 \rangle, \\ & \langle 4, 1 \rangle, \langle 4, 2 \rangle, \langle 4, 3 \rangle, & & \langle 4, 4 \rangle \} \end{aligned}$$

Observe that  $\langle 1, 4 \rangle, \langle 4, 2 \rangle \in \bar{R}$ , but  $\langle 1, 2 \rangle \notin \bar{R}$ .

8) No. Take  $R = \{\langle 1, 1 \rangle\}$ . This relation lacks, for example  $\langle 2, 2 \rangle$ , so is not symmetric. Its complement lacks  $\langle 1, 1 \rangle$ , so is also not symmetric.