1. EQUIVALENCE CLASSES

2. Propertes & equivalence classes

- $(1) \qquad x \in \quad \vec{L} \times \vec{J} \ .$
- (2) of y ∈ [x] then [x] = [y]

 Proof of (1): By reflexivity x~x. Hence,

 from the definition of the equivalence class q x,

 x ∈ [x].

Er.

Proof of (2): (We need to show under some hypohusis that two sets are equal. This involves proving two inclusions separately [x] C [y] and [y] C [x] we first show that [X] ([Y]: Let (E [x]) From the definition of equivalence class this implied that X~ Z. But by hypothes y \(\int \text{[x]}. Hence, y \(\text{x} \). Thus, y~x and x~z. By transitivity of ~, y~ Z. Hence, (Z ∈ [d]) We have promed that Ex7 c [Y]. He next prone that [y] C[x]: het ZE [Y]. Men Zny. But again from hypothes y E (X). Hence y ~ X. zay and yax implies by transitivity of a that ZNX. [Hence, ZE [X] and we have shown that [IY] C [X] Hence, [X] = [Y]. 6

(3). If (y & [x]), then [y] () [x] = \$\phi\$.

Proof. We prove this using contradiction.

Suppose that [y] n [x] + \$.

Then there exists an element ZE X such that

ze [y] a [y].

In other words,

ZE [y] and ZE [x].

But using (2) (proved in the last page) [z] = [y] and [z] = [x].

Hence, [x] = [Y].

But since by (1), $y \in [y] = [x]$ this implies that $y \in [x]$, CONTRADICTING

THE ASSUMPTION THAT $y \notin [x]$.

Thus, the assumption [4] n[x] & leads to a contradiction. Hence, [4] n[x] = \$.

1

Properties (1), (2) and (3) imply together different classes of a fixed like equivalence classes of a give a partition of X into disjoint subsets.

Key examples to remember:

Example 2

X = Z and define equivalence relation

N by man ifand only if m-n is

divisible by 4.

What are the equivalence classes of ~? How many equivalence classes are There?