Exercise 1.2. Let $\sim$ be an equivalence relation on a set S. We need to show that $\mathcal{P}_\sim$ is a set of non-empty disjoint sets whose union is S. Non-emptiness is easy: since $\sim$ is an equivalence relation, $a \sim a$ for all $a \in S$ and we conclude $a \in [a]_\sim$ by the definition of $[a]_\sim$.

Disjointness takes a bit more work. If $S = \varnothing$, then $P_\sim = \{\}$ is trivially disjoint. Similarly, if $S = \{a\}$, then $P = \{[a]_\sim\} = \{\{a\}\}$ is disjoint.

So, we now assume $|S| \geq 2$ and let $r, s \in S$ be distinct. For a contradiction, suppose that there exists $c \in S$ and distinct $[r]_\sim, [s]_\sim \in \mathcal{P}_\sim$ such that $c \in [r]_\sim$ and $c \in [s]_\sim$. Hence, $c \sim r$ and $c \sim s$. By the symmetry and transitivity of $\sim$, $r \sim s$ and $s \sim r$. But this means that for any $x \in [r]_\sim$ and any $y \in [s]_\sim$, we have $x \sim r$ from which it follows by transitivity that $x \sim s$ and, similarly, $y \sim s$, from which it follows that $y \sim r$. We conclude that $[r]_\sim = [s]_\sim$; by contradiction, $[r]_\sim, [s]_\sim$ must be disjoint.

Finally, suppose there exists $c \in S$ such that $c \notin \mathcal{P}_\sim$. But $[c]_\sim \in \bigcup_{x \in S} [x]_\sim$ and $c \in [c]_\sim$ so it must be the case that $\bigcup_{x \in S} [x]_\sim \subseteq S$. Now suppose that there exists $c \in \bigcup_{x \in S} [x]_\sim$ with $c \notin S$. There then exists a $r \in S$ such that $c \in [r]_\sim$. But

$$[r]_\sim = \{s \in S | s \sim r\}$$

so $c \in S$ and $S \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in S} [x]_\sim$. We conclude $S = \bigcup_{x \in S} [x]_\sim = \bigcup_{T \in P_\sim} T$ as required.

Exercise 1.3. Let $a, b \in S$. Define $\sim$ by

$$a \sim b \iff (\exists T \in \mathcal{P}_\sim)\ a, b \in T$$

All that's left is to show $\sim$ satisfies the required properties.

- reflexivity: Let $a \in S$. Since the union of the sets of $\mathcal{P}_\sim$ is equal to S, there exists $T \in \mathcal{P}_\sim$ with $a \in T$. Hence, $a \sim a$.
- symmetry: Let $a, b \in S$ and suppose $a \sim b$. Then $(\exists T \in \mathcal{P}_\sim)\ a, b \in T$ from which we conclude $b \sim a$.
- transitivity: Let $a, b, c \in S$ and suppose $a \sim b, b \sim c$. Then, $(\exists T \in \mathcal{P}_\sim)\ a, b \in T$ and $(\exists U \in \mathcal{P}_\sim)\ b, c \in U$. But since $\mathcal{P}_\sim$ consists of disjoint sets, $T = U$ since b is in both of them. Hence, $c \in T$ and we conclude $a \sim c$.

Exercise 1.5. Let $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$. Define $a\ R\ b$ by

$$a\ R\ b \iff |a - b| \leq 1$$

R is clearly reflexive: for all $a \in \mathbb{N}$, $|a - a| = 0 \leq 1$. R is symmetric since $|x| = |-x|$ for any x. However, R is *not* transitive: let distinct $a, b, c \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a\ R\ b$ and $b\ R\ c$. Then, $|a - b| = 1$ (since $a \neq b$) and similarly $|b - c| = 1$. Hence, either $a - b = 1$ or $b - a = 1$. In the former case, $b - c = 1$ (since $c \neq a$) from which we conclude that $a - c = 2$ and in the later case, $c - b = 1$, and we have $c - a = 2$ again. Hence, $|a - c| = 2$ and thus $a\ R\ c$ does not hold.

Exercise 1.6. Showing $\sim$ satisfies the required properties:

- reflexivity: For all $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $a - a = 0 \in \mathbb{Z}$.
- symmetry: Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. If $b - a \in \mathbb{Z}$, clearly $-(b - a) = a - b \in \mathbb{Z}$.
- transitivity: Let $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}$ and suppose $a \sim b$ and $b \sim c$. Then $b - a \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $c - b \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $\mathbb{Z}$ is closed under addition, $c - a = (c - b) + (b - a) \in \mathbb{Z}$.

  $\sim$ relates $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ if they have the same post-decimal representation.

Exercise 2.1. A bijection $f : S \to S$ can be constructed iteratively as follows. Set $D = T = S$. Choose $s_1 \in D, s_1' \in T$ and set $f(s_1) = s_1'$. Next, choose $s_2 \in D \setminus \{s_1\}, s_2' \in T \setminus \{s_1'\}$ and set $f(s_2) = s_2'$. Next, choose $s_3 \in D \setminus \{s_1, s_2\}, s_3' \in T \setminus \{s_1', s_2'\}$ and set $f(s_3) = s_3'$. Continue in this manner for n steps (until $D = T = \varnothing$).

Clearly, f is a bijection. If $s, s' \in S$, then $f(s) = f(s') \Rightarrow s = s'$ by construction. Similarly, since the algorithm continues until $T = \varnothing$, f must also be surjective. The algorithm allows for $n!$ different constructions of f. The only question that remains is if there exists a bijection $g : S \to S$ which cannot be constructed in such a fashion. But g *can* be constructed in such a fashion: for each $s \in S$, simply choose the target of f as $g(s)$. This is always possible because g is a bijection: for each $s' \in T$, there is an $s \in D$ such that $g(s)$ uniquely maps to it. (And hence if is available in D after m iterations of element removal, $g(s)$ will be available in T.) But such a construction means that $f = g$, which is a contradiction.

We conclude that there are exactly $n!$ bijections from S to S.