## 4 Page 32

- **4.1** (a) transitive.
  - (b) reflexive, transitive.
  - (c) symmetric.
  - (d)  $\subseteq$ : reflexive, transitive.  $\subset$ : transitive.
  - (e) reflexive, transitive, symmetric.
  - (f) symmetric and transitive.
- **4.2** (a) for every  $a \in A$ , f(a) = f(a) since f is a function, thus aEa and E is reflexive. Let aEb, then for some  $a, b \in A$  we have f(a) = f(b) but also f(b) = f(a), thus bEa, therefore E is symmetric. Suppose that aEb and bEc, then we get f(a) = f(b) and f(b) = f(c), since f is a function we have f(a) = f(c), thus aEc, E is transitive.
- (b) We define  $\phi: A/E \to B$  such that  $\phi([a]_E) = f(a)$  for every  $[a]_E \in A/E$ , if  $[a]_E = [a']_E$  then aEa', by definition we get f(a) = f(a') which means that  $\phi([a]_E) = \phi([a']_E)$ .
- (c) for every  $a \in A$  we have  $\phi \circ j(x) = \phi(j(a)) = \phi([a]_E) = f(a)$ , because f and j have the same domain we can conclude  $\phi \circ j = f$ .
- **4.3** Because for every  $(r, \gamma) \in P$  we have r = r and  $\gamma \gamma = 0 = 2\pi \times 0$  which 0 is an integer multiple of  $2\pi$ , we get  $(r, \gamma) \sim (r, \gamma)$ . Now let  $(r, \gamma) \sim (r', \gamma')$ , then r = r' and  $\gamma \gamma' = 2\pi k$  is an integer, because  $\gamma' \gamma = -(\gamma \gamma') = 2\pi (-k)$  is also an integer, together with symmetricity of = we get r' = r, so we conclude that  $(r', \gamma') \sim (r, \gamma)$ , thus  $\sim$  is symmetric.

Let  $(r, \gamma) \sim (r', \gamma')$  and  $(r', \gamma') \sim (r'', \gamma'')$ , by transitivity of identity we simply get r = r'', also  $\gamma - \gamma' = 2\pi k$  and  $\gamma' - \gamma'' = 2\pi k'$  such that k, k' are both integer, but then  $\gamma - \gamma'' = (\gamma - \gamma') + (\gamma' - \gamma'') = 2\pi k + 2\pi k' = 2\pi (k + k')$  clearly is an integer, thus  $(r, \gamma) \sim (r'', \gamma'')$ .

Consider  $(r, \gamma)$ , then there is some  $(r, \gamma')$  such that  $\gamma - \gamma' = 2\pi k$  and is an integer. then  $\gamma' = \gamma - 2\pi k$ , we argue that for some integer k' we have  $0 \le \gamma - 2\pi k' \le 2\pi$ , if there is no such k' that satisfies last inequality then we also do not have  $-\gamma \le -2\pi k' \le 2\pi - \gamma$  and also  $\gamma - 2\pi \le 2\pi k' \le \gamma$ , dividing by  $2\pi$  yields that there is no  $\gamma/2\pi - 1 \le k' \le \gamma/2\pi$ , but it contradicts the fact tht for any real number X there is an integer  $X - 1 \le k' \le X$ , so we can take  $(r, \gamma - 2\pi k')$ .