

Mathematical Proof

John Shea

February 16, 2019

Assignment #6

Question 1

Theorem 1. *If A is a set and $\{B_i | i \in I\}$ is an indexed family of sets. $A \times (\cup_{i \in I} B_i) = \cup_{i \in I} (A \times B_i)$.*

Proof. Suppose $(a, b) \in A \times (\cup_{i \in I} B_i)$. Then $a \in A$ and $b \in \cup_{i \in I} B_i$. so $A \times (\cup_{i \in I} B_i) \subseteq \cup_{i \in I} (A \times B_i)$.

Suppose $(x, y) \in \cup_{i \in I} (A \times B_i)$. Then $x \in A$ and $y \in B_i$ for some $i \in I$. So $(x, y) \in A \times B_i \subseteq A \times (\cup_{i \in I} B_i)$. Therefore $\cup_{i \in I} (A \times B_i) \subseteq A \times (\cup_{i \in I} B_i)$. \square

Question 2

Theorem 2.

Proof.

\square

a $S^{-1} \circ R$

$S = \{(4, a), (4, d), (5, b), (5, c)\}$, and is a relation from B to C , so $S^{-1} = \{(a, 4), (d, 4), (b, 5), (c, 5)\}$ and is a relation from C to B . $R = \{(1, b), (2, a), (2, b), (2, c), (3, d)\}$ and is a relation from A to C . Therefore $S^{-1} \circ R = \{(1, 5), (2, 4), (2, 5)\}$ and is a relation from A to B . This results because we now have a relation that begins in A , connects through C and arrives at B . The final relation $S^{-1} \circ R$ becomes a set of ordered pairs that have elements of A as the first coordinate and elements of B as the second.

b $R^{-1} \circ S$

$R = \{(1, b), (2, a), (2, b), (2, c), (3, d)\}$ and is a relation from A to C , $R^{-1} = \{(b, 1), (a, 2), (b, 2), (c, 2), (d, 3)\}$ and is a relation from C to A . $S = \{(4, a), (4, d), (5, b), (5, c)\}$ and is a relation from B to C . Therefore $R^{-1} \circ S$ is a relation from B to A . This results because we now have a relation that begins in B , connects through C and arrives at A . The final relation $R^{-1} \circ S$ becomes a set of ordered pairs that have elements of B as the first coordinate and elements of A as the second.

Question 3

Theorem 3.

Proof.

□

a $R = \text{Dom}(R) \times \text{Ran}(R)$

Suppose $A = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $B = \{a, b, c\}$ and $R = \{(1, a), (2, b), (3, c)\}$. Then R is a relation from A to B . In this scenario, $\text{Dom}(R) = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $\text{Ran}(R) = \{a, b, c\}$. The Cartesian product of $\text{Dom}(R)$ and $\text{Ran}(R)$ would feature all possible combinations of the two sets. Hence, $\text{Dom}(R) \times \text{Ran}(R) = \{(1, a), (1, b), (1, c), (2, a), (2, b), (2, c), (3, a), (3, b), (3, c)\}$. Therefore, R does not necessarily equal $\text{Dom}(R) \times \text{Ran}(R)$, and the statement $R = \text{Dom}(R) \times \text{Ran}(R)$ is untrue. It would be true to state that $R \subseteq \text{Dom}(R) \times \text{Ran}(R)$.

b $(R \cap S)^{-1} = R^{-1} \cap S^{-1}$

Suppose $(b, a) \in (R \cap S)^{-1}$. Then $(a, b) \in R \cap S$. For any $(a, b) \in R$, $(b, a) \in R^{-1}$ and for any $(a, b) \in S$, $(b, a) \in S^{-1}$. Hence, $(b, a) \in R^{-1}$ and S^{-1} , and consequently $(b, a) \in R^{-1} \cap S^{-1}$. Therefore, $(R \cap S)^{-1} \subseteq R^{-1} \cap S^{-1}$.

Suppose $(b, a) \in R^{-1} \cap S^{-1}$. Then $(b, a) \in R^{-1}$ and $(b, a) \in S^{-1}$. Hence, $(a, b) \in R$ and $(a, b) \in S$, which means $(a, b) \in (R \cap S)$. Hence, $(b, a) \in (R \cap S)^{-1}$. Therefore, $R^{-1} \cap S^{-1} \subseteq (R \cap S)^{-1}$. Taken together this proves that $(R \cap S)^{-1} = R^{-1} \cap S^{-1}$.

Question 4

Question 5

The graph depicts the following relation: $\{(a, a), (a, b), (a, c), (b, d), (d, b), (d, a)\}$.

That the relation is not reflexive is proved by the fact that there is no (b, b) , (c, c) , or (d, d) in the relation. The only example of a reflexive relationship is (a, a) . But the definition of reflexive relation requires reflexivity for all elements of the relation.

That the relation is not symmetric is proved by the fact that there is an (a, c) yet no (c, a) , an (a, b) and no (b, a) , and a (d, a) , but no (a, d) . There are examples of symmetric relationships (b, d) , (d, b) and reflexive relationships (i.e. (a, a)) are always symmetric. But once again, symmetry calls for all relations to be reciprocated, and the counter-examples clearly belie symmetry.

Finally, that the relation is not transitive is proved by the fact that there is an (a, b) and a (b, d) , but no (a, d) . There is, however, an (d, a) and (a, c) , yet there is not a (d, c) . There is a (a, b) and a (d, b) , but again, all pairs need to be transitive, for the relation to meet the definition of a transitive relation.

Question 6