

# Relations

**Aritra Hazra**

Department of Computer Science and Engineering,  
Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur,  
Paschim Medinipur, West Bengal, India - 721302.

Email: [aritrah@cse.iitkgp.ac.in](mailto:aritrah@cse.iitkgp.ac.in)

Autumn 2020

# Cartesian Product

**Definition:** Cartesian Product or Cross Product of two sets,  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$ , denoted as  $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ , is defined by,  $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} = \{(a, b) \mid a \in \mathcal{A}, b \in \mathcal{B}\}$

Generically,  $\mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{A}_k = \{(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) \mid \forall i, x_i \in \mathcal{A}_i\}$

**Ordered Pairs:** The elements of  $(\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B})$  are called ordered pairs.

Generically, the elements,  $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) \in \mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{A}_k$  ( $k$ -fold Cartesian product), are called ordered  $k$ -tuples.

**Cardinality:** Let,  $|\mathcal{A}_1| = n_1, |\mathcal{A}_2| = n_2, \dots, |\mathcal{A}_k| = n_k$ . Then,  
 $|\mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{A}_k| = |\mathcal{A}_1| |\mathcal{A}_2| \cdots |\mathcal{A}_k| = n_1 n_2 \cdots n_k$ .

**Properties:** For  $(a, b), (c, d) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ , we have  $(a, b) = (c, d)$  if and only if  $a = c$  and  $b = d$ .

Note that,  $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \neq \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{A}$ , but  $|\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}| = |\mathcal{A}| |\mathcal{B}| = |\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{A}|$ .

**Other Properties:** Let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{U}$

(ii)  $\mathcal{A} \times (\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{C}) = (\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}) \cap (\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{C})$

(iv)  $(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}) \times \mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{C}) \cap (\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{C})$

(vi)  $(\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{B}) \times \mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{C}) - (\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{C})$

(i)  $\mathcal{A} \times \phi = \phi \times \mathcal{A} = \phi$

(iii)  $\mathcal{A} \times (\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C}) = (\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}) \cup (\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{C})$

(v)  $(\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}) \times \mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{C}) \cup (\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{C})$

(vii)  $\mathcal{A} \times (\mathcal{B} - \mathcal{C}) = (\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}) - (\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{C})$

# Relations and Examples

## (Binary) Relation

**Definition:** A (binary) relation,  $\rho$ , between two sets,  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$ , is defined as,  $\rho \subseteq \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ . If an ordered pair,  $(a, b) \in \rho$  (or  $a \rho b$ ), then the element,  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ , is said to be *related* to the element,  $b \in \mathcal{B}$ .

- Any subset of  $(\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A})$  (or  $\mathcal{A}^2$ ) is called a relation on  $\mathcal{A}$ .
- The relation,  $\rho = \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ , is called the *universal relation*.

**Count:** Total number of (binary) relations between two sets,  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  (where,  $|\mathcal{A}| = m$  and  $|\mathcal{B}| = n$ ), is the number of possible subsets of  $(\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B})$ , i.e.  $2^{mn}$ .

## Example

Let  $\mathcal{A} = \{1, 2, 3\}$  and  $\mathcal{B} = \{a, b\}$ . So, the Cartesian products are defined as,

$$\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} = \{(1, a), (2, a), (3, a), (1, b), (2, b), (3, b)\} \text{ and}$$

$$\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{A} = \{(a, 1), (a, 2), (a, 3), (b, 1), (b, 2), (b, 3)\}$$

Clearly,  $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \neq \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{A}$ , however  $|\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}| = 6 = |\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{A}|$ .

There can be a total of  $2^6 = 64$  different (binary) relations possible. Some are:

$$\rho_1 = \{(1, a), (1, b), (1, c)\} \quad \text{or} \quad \rho_2 = \{(2, a), (3, a), (1, b), (3, b)\}.$$

# Types and Properties of Relations

Let a relation,  $\rho$ , is defined over the set,  $\mathcal{A}$  with  $|\mathcal{A}| = n$ , as  $\rho \subseteq \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}$ . (Count:  $2^{n^2}$ )

**Reflexive:**  $\rho$  is reflexive if  $\forall x \in \mathcal{A}, (x, x) \in \rho$

**Count:**  $2^{n^2-n}$  (after choosing all  $n$  number of  $(x, x)$  pairs, any subset from  $(n^2 - n)$  pairs can be taken as relation keeping reflexivity)

**Symmetric:**  $\rho$  is symmetric if  $\forall x, y \in \mathcal{A}, (x, y) \in \rho \Rightarrow (y, x) \in \rho$

**Count:**  $2^{\frac{n^2+n}{2}}$  (selecting an  $(x, y) + (x, x)$  pair in  $\binom{n}{2} + n$  ways, any subset from  $\binom{n}{2} + n$  pairs can be taken as relation keeping symmetry)

**Transitive:**  $\rho$  is transitive if  $\forall x, y, z \in \mathcal{A}, (x, y), (y, z) \in \rho \Rightarrow (x, z) \in \rho$

**Count:** *Unknown* (still an open-problem!)

**Antisymmetric:**  $\rho$  is antisymmetric if  $\forall x, y \in \mathcal{A}, (x, y), (y, x) \in \rho \Rightarrow (x = y)$

**Count:**  $2^n 3^{\frac{n^2-n}{2}}$  (element  $(x, x)$  can either be included or excluded; element  $(x, y)$  have three options – (i) take only  $(x, y)$ , (ii) take only  $(y, x)$ , or (iii) take neither  $(x, y)$  nor  $(y, x)$ . *What if take both?*)

---

**Irreflexive:**  $\rho$  is irreflexive if  $\exists x \in \mathcal{A}, (x, x) \notin \rho$

**Asymmetric:**  $\rho$  is asymmetric if  $\exists x, y \in \mathcal{A}, (x, y) \in \rho \wedge (y, x) \notin \rho$

**Non-Transitive:**  $\rho$  is non-transitive if  $\exists x, y, z \in \mathcal{A}, (x, y), (y, z) \in \rho \wedge (x, z) \notin \rho$

**Not Antisymmetric:**  $\rho$  is not antisymmetric if  $\exists x, y \in \mathcal{A}, (x, y), (y, x) \in \rho \wedge (x \neq y)$

# Examples of Relations

## 1 Reflexive and Symmetric, but NOT Transitive:

$\rho$  is defined over  $\mathbb{Z}$  as,  $\rho = \{(x, y) \mid xy \geq 0 \text{ and } x, y \in \mathbb{Z}\}$

(Reflexive as  $x^2 \geq 0$ , Symmetric as  $xy = yx$ , NOT Transitive for  $x = 2, y = 0, z = -1$ )

## 2 Symmetric and Transitive, but NOT Reflexive:

$\rho$  is defined over  $\mathbb{R}$  as,  $\rho = \{(x, y) \mid xy > 0 \text{ and } x, y \in \mathbb{R}\}$

(NOT Reflexive for  $x = 0$ , Symmetric as  $xy = yx$ , Transitive as  $xz = \frac{(xy) \cdot (yz)}{y^2} > 0$  since  $xy > 0, yz > 0, y^2 > 0$ )

## 3 Reflexive and Transitive, but NOT Symmetric (Antisymmetric):

$\rho$  is defined over  $\mathbb{R}$  as,  $\rho = \{(x, y) \mid x \leq y \text{ and } x, y \in \mathbb{R}\}$

(Reflexive as  $x \leq x$ , NOT Symmetric for  $x = 0.1, y = 1.0$ , Transitive as  $x \leq y \leq z$ )

## 4 NOT Reflexive, NOT Symmetric, NOT Transitive, BUT Antisymmetric:

$\rho$  is defined over  $\mathbb{Z}$  as,  $\rho = \{(x, y) \mid y = x + 1 \text{ and } x, y \in \mathbb{Z}\}$

(NOT Reflexive as  $x \neq x + 1$ , NOT Symmetric as  $y = x + 1 \Rightarrow x = y - 1$ , NOT Transitive as  $z = y + 1 = x + 2$ )

## 5 Only Reflexive: Relation $\rho = \{(A, B) \mid \text{Person-A knows Person-B}\}$

## 6 Only Symmetric: Relation $\rho = \{(A, B) \mid A + B = 5 \text{ and } A, B \in \mathbb{Z}\}$

## 7 Only Transitive: Relation $\rho = \{(A, B) \mid A \subset B \text{ and } A, B \in \mathcal{U}\}$

## 8 Only Antisymmetric: Left for You to find as an Exercise!

# Equivalence Relation and Equivalence Classes

**Equivalence Relation:** A relation  $\rho \subseteq \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}$  on set  $\mathcal{A}$  is called an equivalence relation if it is reflexive, symmetric and transitive.

**Example:**  $\rho = \{(x, y) \mid (x - y) \text{ is divisible by } 5 \text{ and } x, y \in \mathbb{Z}\}$

- Reflexive since  $(x - x) = 0$  is divisible by 5.
- Symmetric since  $(y - x) = -(x - y)$  is divisible by 5.
- Transitive since  $(x - z) = (x - y) + (y - z)$  is divisible by 5.

**Fallacy:** Does *Symmetric + Transitive*  $\Rightarrow$  *Reflexive*? Why define Reflexivity?

[ from  $(x, y) \in \rho \Rightarrow (y, x) \in \rho$  and  $(x, y), (y, x) \in \rho \Rightarrow (x, x) \in \rho$  ]

**Reason:** NO, since for all  $x$ , an  $y$  may not be found/associated!

---

**Equivalence Class:** Let  $\rho$  be an equivalence relation on  $\mathcal{A}$ . For each  $y \in \mathcal{A}$ , the equivalence class is denoted by  $[y] = \{x \mid (x, y) \in \rho \text{ and } x \in \mathcal{A}\}$ .

**Example:** In the relation,  $\rho = \{(x, y) \mid (x - y) \text{ is divisible by } 3 \text{ and } x, y \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ , the four equivalence classes are defined as:

- $[0] = \{\dots, -6, -3, 0, +3, +6, \dots\} = \{3k \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$
- $[1] = \{\dots, -5, -2, 1, +4, +7, \dots\} = \{3k + 1 \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$
- $[2] = \{\dots, -4, -1, 2, +5, +8, \dots\} = \{3k + 2 \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$

**Note:**  $[0] = [-3] = [+3] = [-6] = [+6] = \dots$  (from definition)  
 $[0] \neq [1] \neq [2]$  and  $\mathbb{Z} = [0] \cup [1] \cup [2]$  (details in next slide)

# Equivalence Classes and Partitions

**Theorem:** If  $\rho$  is an equivalence relation on  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$ , then

(i)  $x \in [x]$ ; (ii)  $(x, y) \in \rho$  iff  $[x] = [y]$ ; and (iii)  $[x] = [y]$  or  $[x] \cap [y] = \phi$

**Proof:**

ⓘ From Reflexive property,  $(x, x) \in \rho$ .

Ⓘ [ If ] Let  $a \in [x] \Rightarrow (a, x) \in \rho$ . As  $(x, y) \in \rho$ , so using transitivity, we get  $(a, y) \in \rho \Rightarrow a \in [y]$ . Hence,  $[x] \subseteq [y]$ . Again, let  $b \in [y] \Rightarrow (b, y) \in \rho$ . By symmetry,  $(x, y) \in \rho \Rightarrow (y, x) \in \rho$ . So, using transitivity,  $(b, x) \in \rho \Rightarrow b \in [x]$ . Hence,  $[y] \subseteq [x]$ .

[ Only-If ]  $x \in [x]$  and  $[x] = [y]$  implies  $x \in [y] \Rightarrow (x, y) \in \rho$ .

ⓓ Assume  $[x] \neq [y]$ , then  $[x] \cap [y] = \phi$  must hold. If otherwise  $[x] \cap [y] \neq \phi$ , then let  $u \in [x]$  and  $u \in [y]$ . Thus,  $(u, x) \in \rho$  and by symmetry,  $(x, u) \in \rho$ . With  $(u, y) \in \rho$ , applying transitivity we get,  $(x, y) \in \rho \Rightarrow [x] = [y]$ , which contradicts the assumption!

## Partitions of a Set (Revisited)

Given set  $\mathcal{A}$  and index set  $\mathcal{I}$ , let  $\forall i, \phi \neq \mathcal{A}_i \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ . Then  $\{\mathcal{A}_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  induces a partition on  $\mathcal{A}$  if:

(i)  $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{A}_i$ , and (ii)  $\mathcal{A}_i \cap \mathcal{A}_j = \phi, \forall i, j \in \mathcal{I} (i \neq j)$ .

**Results:** (i) Any equivalence relation  $\rho$  on set  $\mathcal{A}$  induces a partition of  $\mathcal{A}$ .

*Proof:* Follows from the above theorem.

(ii) Any partition of  $\mathcal{A}$  gives rise to an equivalence relation  $\rho$  on  $\mathcal{A}$ .

*Proof:* Left for You as an Exercise!