

# FUNCTIONS AND RELATIONS

FRANK TSAI

## CONTENTS

1. Relations	1
2. Functions	3
3. Countable Sets and Uncountable Sets	3

## 1. RELATIONS

**Definition 1.1.** An  $n$ -ary *relation*  $R$  on a set  $S$  can be encoded as a subset:

$$R \subseteq S^n$$

We write  $R(a, \dots, z)$  whenever  $(a, \dots, z) \in R$ . Binary relations will be the main focus of this class. For these relations, it is customary to use infix notations. That is, we write  $aRb$  instead of  $R(a, b)$ .

*Example 1.2.* The substring relation  $\sqsubseteq$  on  $\{a, b\}^*$  is the subset

$$\{(\varepsilon, \varepsilon), (\varepsilon, a), \dots, (a, a), (a, ab), (a, ba), \dots\}$$

*Example 1.3.* The divisibility relation  $|$  on  $\mathbb{Z}$  is defined by

$$a | b \iff \exists c. b = ac$$

It is the subset

$$\{(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \mid \exists c. b = ac\}$$

*Example 1.4.* The adjacency relation on a simple graph: two vertices  $u$  and  $v$  are adjacent if they are connected by an edge. It is the subset

$$\{(u, v) \in V \times V \mid (u, v) \in E \vee (v, u) \in E\}$$

**Definition 1.5** (Reflexivity). A binary relation  $R$  on a set  $S$  is *reflexive* if every element of  $S$  is related to itself by  $R$ .

$$\forall a. aRa$$

*Example 1.6.* The divisibility relation on  $\mathbb{Z}$  is reflexive because every integer divides into itself once.

**Definition 1.7** (Symmetry). A binary relation  $R$  on a set  $S$  is *symmetric* if whenever  $a$  is related to  $b$  by  $R$ , then  $b$  is also related to  $a$  by  $R$ .

$$\forall a. \forall b. (aRb \Rightarrow bRa)$$

*Example 1.8.* The adjacency relation on a simple graph is symmetric. If a vertex  $u$  is adjacent to another vertex  $v$ , then  $v$  is also adjacent to  $u$ .

**Definition 1.9** (Transitivity). A binary relation  $R$  on a set  $S$  is *transitive* if for any three elements  $a, b, c$  of  $S$ , if  $aRb$  and  $bRc$  then  $aRc$ .

$$\forall a. \forall b. \forall c. (aRb \wedge bRc \Rightarrow aRc)$$

*Example 1.10.* The substring relation on  $\{a, b\}^*$  is transitive. In fact, it is also reflexive, but it is not symmetric.

**Definition 1.11** (Equivalence Relation). A binary relation  $R$  on a set  $S$  is an *equivalence relation* if it is

- (i) reflexive,
- (ii) symmetric, and
- (iii) transitive.

**Proposition 1.12.** The congruence-modulo-2 relation on  $\mathbb{Z}$  is defined by

$$a \equiv b \pmod{2} \iff 2 \mid (a - b)$$

It is an equivalence relation.

*Proof.* (Reflexivity). Let  $a$  be any integer. We need to prove that  $a \equiv a \pmod{2}$ . By definition, this is equivalent to proving  $2 \mid (a - a)$ , or equivalently,  $2 \mid 0$ . By definition again, this is equivalent to  $\exists c. 0 = 2c$ . Setting  $c := 0$  yields  $0 = 2 \cdot 0 = 0$  as desired.

(Symmetry). Let  $a, b$  be any integers. Assume that  $a \equiv b \pmod{2}$ . By definition, this hypothesis asserts that there's an integer  $c$  so that  $a - b = 2c$ . We need to prove  $\exists k. b - a = 2k$ . Setting  $k := -c$  yields  $b - a = -(a - b) = -2c = 2(-c)$  as desired.

(Transitivity). Let  $a, b, c$  be any integers. Assume that  $a \equiv b \pmod{2}$  and that  $b \equiv c \pmod{2}$ . By definition, these two hypotheses assert that there are integers  $n, m$  so that  $a - b = 2n$  and  $c - b = 2m$ . We need to show that  $\exists c. a - c = 2c$ . Setting  $c := n - m$  yields  $2(n - m) = 2n - 2m = a - b - (c - b) = a - b - c + b = a - c$  as desired.  $\square$

**Definition 1.13** (Antisymmetry). A binary relation  $R$  on a set  $S$  is *antisymmetric* if for any two elements  $a, b$  of  $S$ , if  $aRb$  and  $bRa$  then  $a = b$ .

*Example 1.14.* The subset relation  $\subseteq$  on  $\mathcal{P}(S)$  is antisymmetric. Recall that two sets  $A$  and  $B$  are equal precisely when  $A \subseteq B$  and  $B \subseteq A$ .

*Remark 1.15.* Antisymmetry does **not** imply **asymmetry**. For example, the indiscrete relation  $I$  on the singleton set  $\{a\}$ , defined as

$$I = \{(a, a)\}$$

is both antisymmetric and symmetric.

**Definition 1.16** (Preorder). A binary relation is a *preorder* if it is

- (i) reflexive, and
- (ii) transitive.

**Definition 1.17** (Partial Order). A *partial order* is a preorder that additionally satisfies antisymmetry.

**Proposition 1.18.** *The divisibility relation on  $\mathbb{N}$  is a partial order.*

*Proof.* (Reflexivity): Exercise.

(Transitivity): Exercise. Hint: See Proposition 1.12.

(Antisymmetry): Let  $a, b$  be natural numbers so that  $a \mid b$  and  $b \mid a$ . These hypotheses assert that there are natural numbers  $n, m$  so that  $b = an$  and that  $a = bm$ . Thus,  $b = (bm)n$ . If  $b = 0$ , then since  $a = bm = 0m = 0$ ,  $a = b$  as desired. However, if  $b \neq 0$ , then  $mn = 1$ . Since  $n, m$  are natural numbers,  $n = m = 1$ . Thus,  $a = b$  as desired.  $\square$

*Remark 1.19.* Proposition 1.18 does not hold if we replace  $\mathbb{N}$  with  $\mathbb{Z}$  because  $2 \mid -2$  and  $-2 \mid 2$ , but  $2 \neq -2$ . Although the divisibility relation on  $\mathbb{Z}$  is not a partial order, it is a preorder.

## 2. FUNCTIONS

### 3. COUNTABLE SETS AND UNCOUNTABLE SETS

**Theorem 3.1.**  $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  is uncountable.

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$  is countable, i.e.,  $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \cong \mathbb{N}$ . A possible interpretation of this hypothesis is that every function  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  can be given a unique natural-number code. That is, there are functions

$$\text{decode} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$$

$$\text{encode} : \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$$

that are mutual inverses. Consider the function

$$k : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$$

$$k : n \mapsto \text{decode}(n)(n) + 1$$

Given a code  $n$ , the function  $k$  decodes  $n$ , yielding a function  $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ , then evaluates that function at  $n$ , and finally adds 1 to the result.

The function  $k$  has a unique code given by  $\text{encode}(k)$ . Now, let's evaluate  $k$  at its own code:

$$\begin{aligned} k(\text{encode}(k)) &= \text{decode}(\text{encode}(k))(\text{encode}(k)) + 1 \\ &= k(\text{encode}(k)) + 1 \end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction.  $\square$

Theorem 3.1 tells us that some functions  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  are uncomputable: there are only countably many programs that one can write, but there are uncountably many endofunctions on  $\mathbb{N}$ . Thus, some of those functions do not have a corresponding program that computes it.