

Mathematical Proof

John Shea

February 15, 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

Question 6