

**Exercise 5.4 Properties of Relations (★) — GRADED (8 points)***Please upload your solution by 23/10/2025*

Prove or disprove the following claims:

1. Let  $\rho$  be a relation on a set  $A$ . Then, the relation  $\gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \rho \circ \hat{\rho}$  is symmetric.

**Solution:**

The claim is true. If  $\gamma$  is symmetric, this means that  $(a, b) \in \gamma \iff (b, a) \in \gamma$ . The proof is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (a, b) \in \gamma &\implies (a, b) \in \rho \circ \hat{\rho} && \text{(Def. } \gamma) \\
 &\implies (a, x) \in \rho \text{ und } (x, b) \in \hat{\rho} \text{ für ein } x \in A && \text{(Def. } \circ) \\
 &\implies (x, a) \in \hat{\rho} \text{ und } (b, x) \in \rho \text{ für ein } x \in A && \text{(Def. } \hat{\rho}) \\
 &\implies (b, a) \in \rho \circ \hat{\rho} && \text{(Def. } \circ) \\
 &\implies (b, a) \in \gamma && \text{(Def. } \gamma)
 \end{aligned}$$

□

2. Let  $A$  be a set and let  $\sigma$  be a symmetric relation on  $A$  and  $\pi$  be an antisymmetric relation on  $A$ . Then, the relation  $\gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma \circ \hat{\pi}$  is symmetric.

**Solution:**

The claim is false. A clear counterexample will be outlined.

Let  $A = \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\sigma = \{(1, 2), (2, 1)\}$ ,  $\pi = \{(3, 2), (4, 5)\}$ . It is clear that  $\sigma$  and  $\pi$  are respectively symmetric and antisymmetric. We also have

$$\pi = \{(3, 2), (4, 5)\} \implies \hat{\pi} = \{(2, 3), (5, 4)\} \quad \text{(Def. } \hat{\pi})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sigma \circ \hat{\pi} &= \{(1, 3)\} && \text{(Def. } \circ) \\
 \gamma &= \{(1, 3)\} && \text{(Def. } \gamma)
 \end{aligned}$$

Since  $(3, 1)$  is not in  $\gamma$ , it is not symmetric. This concludes the counterexample.

3. The intersection of two equivalence relations on the same set is an equivalence relation.

**Solution:**

The claim is true. It is stated in Lemma 3.10. It will be proven directly through implications.

Let  $A$  be a set and  $\rho, \sigma$  equivalence relations on  $A$ . This means that both relations are reflexive, symmetric and transitive. We will use these properties to prove that  $\rho \cap \sigma$  is also an equivalent relation.

Reflexivity:

Let  $a \in A$  be arbitrary. Since  $\rho$  and  $\sigma$  are reflexive, it follows that

$$a \in A \implies (a, a) \in \rho \quad (1)$$

$$a \in A \implies (a, a) \in \sigma \quad (2)$$

and these two implications allow us to demonstrate the reflexivity of the intersection

$$\begin{aligned} (1)(2) &\implies (a, a) \in \rho \text{ and } (a, a) \in \sigma \\ &\implies (a, a) \in \rho \cap \sigma \quad (\text{Def. } \cap) \end{aligned}$$

Symmetry:

Let  $a, b \in A$  be arbitrary with  $(a, b) \in \rho \cap \sigma$

$$\begin{aligned} (a, b) \in \rho \cap \sigma &\implies (a, b) \in \rho \text{ and } (a, b) \in \sigma && (\text{Def. } \cap) \\ &\implies (b, a) \in \rho \text{ and } (b, a) \in \sigma && (\text{Symm. of } \rho, \sigma) \\ &\implies (b, a) \in \rho \cap \sigma \end{aligned}$$

This proves that  $\rho \cap \sigma$  is symmetrical.

Transitivity:

Let  $a, b, c \in A$  arbitrary with  $(a, b) \in \rho \cap \sigma$  and  $(b, c) \in \rho \cap \sigma$ . To start we have

$$(a, b) \in \rho \cap \sigma \quad (1)$$

$$(b, c) \in \rho \cap \sigma \quad (2)$$

$$\begin{aligned}(1),(2) &\implies (a,b) \in \rho \text{ and } (a,b) \in \sigma \text{ and } (b,c) \in \rho \text{ and } (b,c) \in \sigma && \text{(Def. } \cap) \\ &\implies (a,b) \in \rho \text{ and } (b,c) \in \rho \text{ and } (a,b) \in \sigma \text{ and } (b,c) \in \sigma && \text{(Comm.)} \\ &\implies (a,c) \in \rho \text{ and } (a,c) \in \sigma && \text{(Trans. of } \rho, \sigma) \\ &\implies (a,c) \in \rho \cap \sigma\end{aligned}$$

This proves that  $\rho \cap \sigma$  is transitive.

Since  $\rho \cap \sigma$  is reflexive, symmetric and transitive, it is an equivalence relation. This concludes the proof.