

---

# LECTURE 1

---

**Author**

Tom Jeong

August 19, 2024

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Relations</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>equivalence and partial order relations</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Partial orders</b>	<b>5</b>

# 1 Relations

Let  $S$  be a set (e.g.  $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ ), integers:  $\mathbb{Z} = \{\dots, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$   
rational numbers  $\mathbb{Q}$  i should know these ..

RECALL: cartesian product:  $A \times B = \{(a, b) | a \in A, b \in B\}$

**Definition 1.1.** A relation  $R$  on a set  $S$  is a subset  $R \subseteq S \times S$ . we write  $xRy$  (read "x is related to y") to denote an element  $(x, y) \in R$

some examples of relations: "is orthogonal to" is a relation on the set of vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^3$   
another example "is congruent to" is a relation on the set of polygons  
"divides" is a relation on the set of integers

We say the relation  $R$  is

1. reflexive if  $xRx$  for all  $x \in S$
2. symmetric if  $xRy$  implies  $yRx$  for all  $x, y \in S$
3. antisymmetric if  $xRy$  and  $yRx$  implies  $x = y$  for all  $x, y \in S$
4. transitive if  $xRy$  and  $yRz$  implies  $xRz$  for all  $x, y, z \in S$

(sometimes we note  $\sim$  for the relation  $R$ )

going back to examples: "is congruent to" is reflexive, symmetric, and transitive

## 2 equivalence and partial order relations

**Definition 2.1.** two very important types of relations are:

1. equivalence relations

- (a) reflexive
- (b) symmetric
- (c) transitive

2. partial order relations

- (a) reflexive
- (b) antisymmetric
- (c) transitive

e.g.  $R = \{(a, b) | b - a \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$

is  $R$  an equivalence relation? a partial ordering ?

1. reflexive:  $aRa$ ? yes since  $a - a = 0 \in \mathbb{N}$
2. antisymmetric:  $aRb$  and  $bRa$  implies  $a = b$ ? if  $aRb$  then  $b - a \in \mathbb{N}$  and if  $bRa$  then  $a - b \in \mathbb{N}$  so  $a$  and  $b$  are the same

3. transitive:  $aRb$  and  $bRc$  implies  $aRc$ ? if  $aRb$  then  $b - a \in \mathbb{N}$  and if  $bRc$  then  $c - b \in \mathbb{N}$   
so  $c - a = (c - b) + (b - a) \in \mathbb{N}$

Exercise: check that  $aRb$  iff  $a \leq b$

e.g. fix  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$   $R = \{(a, b) | a - b \in n\mathbb{Z}\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$

Exercise this is an equivalence relation

$aRb$  if  $a - b = nk$  for some  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$

we call this relation congruence module  $n$

notation: if  $R$  is an equivalence relation, we often denote it by  $\sim$

**Definition 2.2** (equivalence class). If  $\sim$  is an equivalence relation on  $S$  we can fix an element  $x \in S$  and consider all elements of  $S$  that is equivalent to  $x$ :

$$[x] = \{s \in S | s \sim x\} \subseteq S$$

and  $x$  is a representative of this equivalence class

e.g.  $S = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$  and  $\sim = \{(a, a), (b, b), (c, c), (d, d), (e, e), (a, b), (b, a), (c, d), (d, c), (d, e), (e, d), (c, e), (e, c)\}$   
 $[a] = \{a, b\} = [b]$  and  $[c] = \{c, d, e\} = [d] = [e]$

Q: are equivalence classes always disjoint?

A: yes, if  $[x] \cap [y] \neq \emptyset$  then  $[x] = [y]$

**Lemma 2.1.** Let  $\sim$  be an equivalence relation on  $S$  and  $x, y \in S$ . Then  $[x] = [y]$  iff  $x \sim y$

*proof of lemma 2.1.* iff

$\rightarrow$ : suppose  $[x] = [y]$  then  $x \in [x]$ , since  $\sim$  is reflexive and so  $x \in [y]$  Thus,  $x \sim y$

$\leftarrow$ : Let  $s \in [x]$  since  $x \sim x$  and  $x \sim y$  (by assumption) then  $s \sim y$  since it is transitive.  
hence  $s \in [y]$  and so  $[x] \subseteq [y]$

similarly, if  $s \in [y]$ , then  $s \sim y$  and  $x \sim y$  so since  $\sim$  is symmetric and transitive  $s \sim x$  and so  $s \in [x]$  hence  $[y] \subseteq [x]$   $\square$

Corollary:

$$[x] \cap [y] = \emptyset \text{ if } [x] \neq [y]$$

*Proof.* suppose  $[x] \cap [y] \neq \emptyset$  then there exists  $s \in [x] \cap [y]$  then  $s \sim x$  and  $s \sim y$  by lemma 2.1  $x \sim y$  and so  $[x] = [y]$   $\square$

**Definition 2.3.** a partition on a set  $S$  is a collection  $(S_i)_{i \in I}$  of nonempty subsets of  $S$  such that

1.  $S = \bigcup_{i \in I} S_i$
2.  $S_i \cap S_j = \emptyset$  for all  $i, j \in I$  with  $i \neq j$

e.g.  $S = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$  and  $S_1 = \{a, b\}$ ,  $S_2 = \{c, d, e\}$  is a partition of  $S$

**Theorem 2.2.** Let  $S$  be a set with an equivalence relation  $\sim$ : Then the set of equivalence classes  $S/\sim = \{[x] | x \in S\}$  is a partition of  $S$   
 conversely, if  $(S_i)_{i \in I}$  is a partition of  $S$  then there exists an equivalence relation  $\sim$  on  $S$  such that  $S/\sim = (S_i)_{i \in I}$

*Proof.*  $\rightarrow$  we will first show that the set of equivalence classes is a partition, we already showed  $[x] \cap [y] = \emptyset$  if  $[x] \neq [y]$  so we need to show that  $S = \bigcup_{x \in S} [x]$

let  $s \in S$  then  $s \in [s]$  so  $s \in \bigcup_{x \in S} [x]$  and so  $S \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in S} [x]$

For each  $x \in S$ ,  $[x] \subseteq S$  so  $\bigcup_{x \in S} [x] \subseteq S$  and so  $S = \bigcup_{x \in S} [x]$

$\leftarrow$  now suppose  $(S_i)_{i \in I}$  is a partition of  $S$ . Define  $x \sim y$  iff  $x, y \in S_i$  for some  $i$ . We have  $\sim$  is reflexive since each  $x \in S_i$  for some  $i \in I$ . As  $\bigcup_{i \in I} S_i = S$ .

$\sim$  is symmetric since containment in a set has an order

$\sim$  is transitive since if  $x, y \in S_i$  and  $y, z \in S_j$  then  $x, y, z \in S_i \cap S_j = \emptyset$  so  $x \sim z$   $\square$

e.g.  $S = \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\sim$  is  $\equiv \pmod{n}$

$S/\sim = \{[0], [1], \dots, [n-1]\}$  is a partition of  $\mathbb{Z}$

$$[0] = \{\dots, -2n, -n, 0, n, 2n, \dots\} \quad (1)$$

$$[1] = \{\dots, -2n+1, -n+1, 1, n+1, 2n+1, \dots\} \quad (2)$$

$$\vdots \quad (3)$$

$$[n-1] = \{\dots, -2n+n-1, -n+n-1, n-1, 2n+n-1, \dots\} \quad (4)$$

### 3 Partial orders

notation: when a relation  $R$  is a partial order, we often denote it by  $\leq$

e.g.  $\leq$  is a partial order on  $\mathbb{R}$

Let  $S$  be a set and  $\mathbb{P}(S)$  its power set.  $\leq$  is a partial order on  $\mathbb{P}(S)$

ex: "Divides" is a partial order on  $\mathbb{N}$  (but not on  $\mathbb{Z}$ )

**Definition 3.1** (minimal and first element). let  $\leq$  be a partial order on a set  $S$ .  
 An element  $s \in S$  is minimal if  $x \leq s \rightarrow x = s \forall x \in S$ .  
 An element  $t \in S$  is called a first element if  $t \leq x \forall x \in S$  .. (Warning: not every minimal element is a first element)

e.g.  $S = \{2, 3, 4, 5, 6, \dots\}$  divides is a partial order on  $S$

2 is a minimal element. 3 is a minimal element. 5 is a minimal element. every prime number is a minimal element But they are not first elements

**Proposition 3.1.** 1. A first element is unique

2. a first element is a minimal element

3. a minimal element needs not to be a first element\*\*\*