

# Math 135: Homework 2

Michael Pham

Spring 2024

## Problems

Problem 3.1	.....	3
Problem 3.2a	.....	3
Problem 3.2b	.....	3
Problem 3.4	.....	4
Problem 3.5a	.....	4
Problem 3.5b	.....	4
Problem 3.6	.....	5
Problem 3.7	.....	5
Problem 3.8	.....	6

### 3 Relations and Functions

**Problem 3.1.** Suppose that we attempted to generalize the Kuratowski definitions of ordered pairs to ordered triples with the following definition:

$$\langle x, y, z \rangle^* = \{\{x\}, \{x, y\}, \{x, y, z\}\}.$$

Show that the definition is unsuccessful by giving examples of objects  $u, v, w, x, y, z$  with  $\langle x, y, z \rangle^* = \langle u, v, w \rangle^*$  but with either  $y \neq v$  or  $z \neq w$  (or both)

*Solution.* We observe that if we let  $x = x, y = y, z = x$  and  $u = x, v = y, w = y$ , we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x, y, z \rangle^* &= \{\{x\}, \{x, y\}, \{x, y, x\}\} \\ &= \{\{x\}, \{x, y\}, \{x, y\}\} \\ &= \{\{x\}, \{x, y\}\} \\ \langle u, v, w \rangle^* &= \{\{x\}, \{x, y\}, \{x, y, y\}\} \\ &= \{\{x\}, \{x, y\}, \{x, y\}\} \\ &= \{\{x\}, \{x, y\}\} \end{aligned}$$

So, we see that  $\langle x, y, z \rangle^* = \langle u, v, w \rangle^*$ , but that  $z \neq w$ . Thus, the definition is unsuccessful. ■

**Problem 3.2a.** Show that  $A \times (B \cup C) = (A \times B) \cup (A \times C)$ .

*Solution.* We shall proceed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x, y \rangle \in A \times (B \cup C) &\iff (x \in A) \wedge (y \in (B \cup C)) \\ &\iff (x \in A) \wedge ((y \in B) \vee (y \in C)) \\ &\iff ((x \in A) \wedge (y \in B)) \vee ((x \in A) \wedge (y \in C)) \\ &\iff (\langle x, y \rangle \in A \times B) \vee (\langle x, y \rangle \in A \times C) \\ &\iff \langle x, y \rangle \in (A \times B) \cup (A \times C) \end{aligned}$$

**Problem 3.2b.** Show that if  $A \times B = A \times C$ , and  $A \neq \emptyset$ , then  $B = C$ .

*Solution.* We observe that  $A \times B = A \times C$  means that we have the following:

$$\langle x, y \rangle \in A \times B \iff \langle x, y \rangle \in A \times C$$

Then, since  $A \neq \emptyset$ , we observe that for all  $y \in B$ , there exists some  $x \in A$  such that:

$$x \in A \wedge y \in B \iff \langle x, y \rangle \in A \times B \iff \langle x, y \rangle \in A \times C \iff x \in A \wedge y \in C$$

Then, we see that  $y \in C$  as well by going forward in the implications above. Similarly, if  $y \in C$ , then we can go backwards and thus get that  $y \in B$ .

Since this holds for all  $y$ , we see that, indeed,  $B = C$  as desired. ■

**Problem 3.4.** Show that there exists no set to which every ordered pair belongs.

*Solution.* We first recall the definition of an ordered pair:

$$\langle x, y \rangle := \{\{x\}, \{x, y\}\}.$$

Now, let us suppose for the sake of contradiction that the set to which every ordered pair belongs does exist. We denote this set by  $S$ .

Then, with this in mind, we can have the following ordered pair:

$$\langle x, x \rangle = \{\{x\}, \{x, x\}\} = \{\{x\}, \{x\}\} = \{\{x\}\}.$$

We note that this is a subset of  $S$ . From here, we note then that this means then that the set of all singletons  $S'$  is also be a subset of  $S$ .

However, recall from a previous homework problem that  $S'$  cannot exist.

Thus, we have a contradiction and conclude that such a set  $S$  cannot exist. ■

**Problem 3.5a.** Assume that  $A$  and  $B$  are given sets, and show that there exists a set  $C$  such that for any  $y$ ,

$$y \in C \iff y = \{x\} \times B \text{ for some } x \text{ in } A.$$

In other words, show that  $\{\{x\} \times B : x \in A\}$  is a set.

*Solution.* To begin with, we observe that  $\{x\} \subseteq A \implies \{x\} \times B \subseteq A \times B$ , for some  $x \in A$ .

Then, we see that  $\{x\} \times A \in \mathcal{P}(A \times B)$ . Now, we know that  $A \times B$  is a set, and by the Power Set Axiom, so is  $\mathcal{P}(A \times B)$ . Furthermore, by definition of  $A \times B$ , we note then that any  $t \in \mathcal{P}(A \times B)$  is in  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}(A \cup B)$ .

Then, that means that by the Subset Axiom, we can construct the following set:

$$C := \{t \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}(A \cup B) : \exists x(t = \{x\} \times B) \wedge (x \in A)\}$$

■

**Problem 3.5b.** With  $A, B, C$  as above, show that  $A \times B = \bigcup C$ .

*Solution.* We will show that  $A \times B = \bigcup C$  by first showing that  $A \times B \subseteq \bigcup C$ , then we will show that  $\bigcup C \subseteq A \times B$ .

To begin with, we will show that  $A \times B \subseteq \bigcup C$ . Let us denote  $z = \langle x, y \rangle$ . Then, we see that if  $z = \langle x, y \rangle \in A \times B$ , then by definition we have that  $x \in A$  and  $y \in B$ .

More specifically, we note that  $\langle x, y \rangle \in \{x\} \times B$ . Then, by definition of the union, this means that  $\langle x, y \rangle = z \in \bigcup \{\{x\} \times B : x \in A\} = \bigcup C$  as desired. Thus, we have shown that  $A \times B \subseteq \bigcup C$ .

On the other hand, let  $z \in \bigcup C = \bigcup \{\{x\} \times B : x \in A\}$ . Then, we note that, by definition of union, we have that  $z \in \{x\} \times B$ . Then, note that  $\{x\} \times B \subseteq A \times B$ , meaning that  $z \in A \times B$ . Thus,  $\bigcup C \subseteq A \times B$  as desired.

Therefore, we conclude that  $A \times B = \bigcup C$ . ■

**Problem 3.6.** Show that a set  $A$  is a relation iff  $A \subseteq \text{dom } A \times \text{ran } A$ .

*Solution.* We will first show the forward direction.

*Proof.* ( $\implies$ ) Let us suppose that  $A$  is a relation. Then, by definition of a relation, any  $a \in A$  is an ordered pair.

Then, let us take  $a = \langle x, y \rangle \in A$ . We note then that since  $\langle x, y \rangle \in A$ , then we know that:

1. There exists some  $y$  such that  $\langle x, y \rangle \in A$ . Thus, we see that  $x \in \text{dom } A$ .
2. There exists some  $x$  such that  $\langle x, y \rangle \in A$ . Thus, we see that  $y \in \text{ran } A$ .

Therefore,  $a = \langle x, y \rangle \in \text{dom } A \times \text{ran } A$ , and thus we see that  $A \subseteq \text{dom } A \times \text{ran } A$ . □

For the backwards direction, we proceed as follows:

*Proof.* ( $\impliedby$ ) Let us suppose that  $A \subseteq \text{dom } A \times \text{ran } A$ . Then, we note that every element in  $\text{dom } A \times \text{ran } A$  is an ordered pair by definition, and thus, since  $A \subseteq \text{dom } A \times \text{ran } A$ , every element in  $A$  must also be an ordered pair.

Thus, we see that  $A$  is a relation by definition. □

Thus, indeed, a set  $A$  is a relation iff  $A \subseteq \text{dom } A \times \text{ran } A$ . ■

**Problem 3.7.** Show that if  $R$  is a relation, then  $\text{fld } R = \bigcup \bigcup R$ .

*Solution.* Suppose that  $R$  is a relation.

Note that, by definition,  $\text{fld } R = \text{dom } R \cup \text{ran } R$ .

Furthermore, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{dom } R &:= \left\{ t \in \bigcup \bigcup R : \exists b (\langle t, b \rangle \in R) \right\} \\ \text{ran } R &:= \left\{ t \in \bigcup \bigcup R : \exists a (\langle a, t \rangle \in R) \right\}\end{aligned}$$

Then, we observe the following:

$$\begin{aligned}x \in \text{fld } R &\iff x \in \text{dom } R \cup \text{ran } R \\ &\iff (x \in \text{dom } R) \vee (x \in \text{ran } R) \\ &\iff \left( x \in \left\{ t \in \bigcup \bigcup R : \exists b (\langle t, b \rangle \in R) \right\} \right) \vee \left( x \in \left\{ t \in \bigcup \bigcup R : \exists a (\langle a, t \rangle \in R) \right\} \right) \\ &\iff x \in \bigcup \bigcup R\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we see that  $\text{fld } R = \bigcup \bigcup R$ . ■

**Problem 3.8.** Show that for any set  $A$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{dom} \bigcup A &= \bigcup \{\text{dom } R : R \in A\} \\ \text{ran} \bigcup A &= \bigcup \{\text{ran } R : R \in A\}.\end{aligned}$$

*Solution.* To begin with, we will prove the first statement.

*Proof.* Suppose that  $x \in \text{dom} \bigcup A$ . Then, by definition of  $\text{dom} \bigcup A$ , there exists some  $b$  such that  $\langle x, b \rangle \in \bigcup A$ . Then, this means that there exists some  $R \in A$  such that  $\langle x, b \rangle \in R$ . By definition then, we see that  $x \in \text{dom } R$ , and thus  $x \in \bigcup \{\text{dom } R : R \in A\}$ . Therefore,  $\text{dom} \bigcup A \subseteq \bigcup \{\text{dom } R : R \in A\}$ .

On the other hand, suppose that  $x \in \bigcup \{\text{dom } R : R \in A\}$ . Then, this means that for some  $R \in A$ , we have that  $x \in \text{dom } R$ . And by definition, this means that there exists some  $b$  such that  $\langle x, b \rangle \in R$ .

From here, we note then that  $R \subseteq \bigcup A$ , so we have that  $\langle x, b \rangle \in \bigcup A$ . This means then that there exists a  $b$  such that  $\langle x, b \rangle \in \bigcup A$ . However, this is precisely the definition of  $x \in \text{dom} \bigcup A$  as desired. Thus, we see that  $\bigcup \{\text{dom } R : R \in A\} \subseteq \text{dom} \bigcup A$ .

Thus, we can conclude that  $\text{dom} \bigcup A = \bigcup \{\text{dom } R : R \in A\}$ . □

Next, we will prove the second statement.

*Proof.* Suppose that  $y \in \text{ran} \bigcup A$ . Then, by definition of  $\text{ran} \bigcup A$ , there exists some  $a$  such that  $\langle a, y \rangle \in \bigcup A$ . Then, this means that there exists some  $R \in A$  such that  $\langle a, y \rangle \in R$ . By definition then, we see that  $y \in \text{ran } R$ , and thus  $y \in \bigcup \{\text{ran } R : R \in A\}$ . Therefore,  $\text{ran} \bigcup A \subseteq \bigcup \{\text{ran } R : R \in A\}$ .

On the other hand, suppose that  $y \in \bigcup \{\text{ran } R : R \in A\}$ . Then, this means that for some  $R \in A$ , we have that  $y \in \text{ran } R$ . And by definition, this means that there exists some  $a$  such that  $\langle a, y \rangle \in R$ .

From here, we note then that  $R \subseteq \bigcup A$ , so we have that  $\langle a, y \rangle \in \bigcup A$ . This means then that there exists a  $a$  such that  $\langle a, y \rangle \in \bigcup A$ . However, this is precisely the definition of  $y \in \text{ran} \bigcup A$  as desired. Thus, we see that  $\bigcup \{\text{ran } R : R \in A\} \subseteq \text{ran} \bigcup A$ .

And thus, we see that  $\text{ran} \bigcup A = \bigcup \{\text{ran } R : R \in A\}$  as desired. □

■