## Name and student number: Solutions

- 1. Let  $A = \{a, b, c\}$  and let  $R = \{(a, a), (a, c), (b, b), (b, c), (c, a), (c, b)\}$  define a relation on A. Determine whether the following statements are true or false. Explain your answer.
- [1] (a) For each  $x \in A$ , x R x.

This is false, since  $c \in A$  but  $(c, c) \notin R$ .

[2] (b) For every  $x, y \in A$ , if x R y, then y R x.

This is true: we have both (a, c) and (c, a) as well as (b, c) and (c, b). The other two elements of R are (a, a) and (b, b), which are unchanged if we swap the the order. (If a R a, then a R a, etc. which is trivially true. It was enough to take note of the pairs where the two terms were different.)

[2] (c) For every  $x, y, z \in A$ , if x R y and y R z, then x R z.

This is false, since (a, c) and (c, b) belong to R, but  $(a, b) \notin R$ .

[1] (d) The relation R defines a function from A to A.

This is false, since for example both (a, a) and (a, c) are elements of R, and for a function, a cannot be related to two different elements.

2. Let  $A = \{a, b\}$ , and consider the relations  $R_1 = \{(a, a), (b, b)\}$  and  $R_2 = \{(a, a), (a, b)\}$ . [4] Show that  $R_1$  is an equivalence relation but  $R_2$  is not. Is  $R_2$  transitive?

 $R_1$  is clearly reflexive, and it's trivially symmetric and transitive: there are no ordered pairs containing different elements of A, and it's a tautology that if  $a R_1 a$  then  $a R_1 a$ , etc.

 $R_2$  is not a equivalence relation since it's neither reflexive  $(b \in A \text{ but } (b,b) \notin R)$  nor symmetric  $((a,b) \in R_2 \text{ but } (b,a) \notin R_2)$ . It's enough to point out just one of these two.

However,  $R_2$  is transitive: we need to show that for all  $x, y, z \in A$ , if  $(x, y) \in R_2$  and  $(y, z) \in R_2$ , then  $(x, z) \in R_2$ . The only possibility here for the "if" part is x = a, y = a, z = b (since we need the second coordinate of the first pair to match the first coordinate of the second pair), and it's certainly true that if  $(a, a) \in R_2$  and  $(a, b) \in R_2$ , then  $(a, b) \in R_2$ .

(Note that transitivity for  $R_1$  follows by taking x = y = z = a or x = y = z = b.)