Max Shi

I pledge my honor that I have abided by the Stevens Honor System
— Max Shi

CS135 Problem Set 3

1. This proof is invalid because if there exists an element c in set A such that $\forall d\ (c,d) \notin R$, then by the proof, (c,c) does not necessarily exist in R, and R does not meet the reflexive relation definition that states for all elements a in A, (a,a) must be in the relation. Here, because c is in the set but not in the relation, R is not reflexive by this proof.

2. $R: \forall x\,(x \in A \rightarrow (x,x) \in R)$
$S: \forall x\,(x \in A \rightarrow (x,x) \in S)$ } Definition of reflexive relations.

a. Because R and S are reflexive, they both must contain for all elements x in set A $(x,x) \in R$. If they both contain these relations, then the union of R and S contains these relations, therefore $R \cup S$ is reflexive.

b. As stated above, R and S contain for all x in set A the relation (x,x). Because these items are in both sets, it follows that the intersection will also have (x,x) for all x in set A. Therefore, the intersection of R and S is also reflexive.

c. Subtraction is also defined as $R \cap \bar{S}$. Because $\bar{S}$ is defined as all elements in the universal set not in S, and $\forall x\,(x,x) \in S$, then $\forall x\,(x,x) \notin \bar{S}$. Therefore, $\bar{S}$ is anti-reflexive, and the intersection $R \cap \bar{S}$ would remove all reflexive relations in R because $\bar{S}$ is anti-reflexive. Therefore, $R \cap \bar{S}$ is anti-reflexive, and $R - S$ is anti-reflexive.

$\forall a \forall c$

d. $(a,c) \in S \circ R \leftrightarrow \exists b((a,b) \in R) \wedge ((b,c) \in S)$

$\forall x\ (x,x) \in S \circ R \leftrightarrow \exists b\ ((x,b) \in R \wedge (b,x) \in S))$

let $b = x$.

$\forall x\ (x,x) \in S \circ R \leftrightarrow ((x,x) \in R \wedge (x,x) \in S))$

$\forall x\ (x,x) \in S \circ R \leftrightarrow T \wedge T$

$\forall x\ (x,x) \in S \circ R \leftrightarrow T$

Because the right-side is true, it follows that $\forall x\ (x,x) \in S \circ R$, therefore $S \circ R$ is reflexive.

e. By the definition of inverses: $\forall a \forall b\ ((a,b) \in R \leftrightarrow (b,a) \in R^{-1})$

By definition of R: $\forall x\ ((x \in A) \rightarrow ((x,x) \in R))$

Let $a = b = x$: $\forall x\ ((x,x) \in R \leftrightarrow (x,x) \in R^{-1})$

Because both R and R^{-1} are over set A, and $(x,x) \in R$ for all x, line 3 suggests that $(x,x) \in R^{-1}$ for all x, therefore R^{-1} is reflexive.

Scanned by CamScanner

3A. i. $[0]_R$ is the set of all numbers divisible by 7.
$[1]_R$ is the set of all numbers with remainder 1 when divided by 7.

ii. $14 \in [0]_R$

iii. $75 \in [5]_R$

iv. 7, for all possible remainders when divided by 7.

v. Yes, the same number cannot have two different remainders when divided by 7.

B. i. Let a and b be elements in set A. Define the equivalence class as $\forall x(x \in [a] \leftrightarrow (a,x) \in R)$. Given that $(a,b) \in R$, if we let x be all elements s.t. $(a,x) \in R$, and because R is an equivalence relation, then symmetry implies that $(b,a) \in R$. By transitive definition, because $(b,a) \in R \land (a,x) \in R$, then $(b,x) \in R$. Going back to the definition, replacing a for b, $\forall x(x \in [b] \leftrightarrow (b,x) \in R)$. Thus, for all x, because $(a,x) \in R \Leftrightarrow (b,x) \in R$, for all x, $x \in [a] \land x \in [b]$. Therefore, [a] and [b] are equivalent sets, and $[a] = [b]$

ii. Because $[a] = [b]$, we can substitute for either on the right side to make $[a] \cap [a] \neq \emptyset$. This is true if there is at least one element in [a]. Because the problem states "Let a and b be any two elements in set A," we know that $[a] \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, $[a] \cap [a] \neq \emptyset$, proving $[a] = [b] \Rightarrow [a] \cap [b] \neq \emptyset$

iii. $[a] \cap [b] \neq \emptyset$ implies that [a] and [b] share a common element. Let this element be element x, where $x \in [a]$ and $x \in [b]$. Thus, by definition of equivalence class in 3.B.i., this implies that $(a,x) \in R$ and $(b,x) \in R$. By the symmetric element of equivalence relations, $(b,x) \in R \Leftrightarrow (x,b) \in R$. By transitivity of equivalence relations, $(a,x) \in R \land (x,b) \in R \rightarrow (a,b) \in R$. Thus, $[a] \cap [b] \neq \emptyset \rightarrow (a,b) \in R$.

Scanned by CamScanner