

Lecture 3

Equivalence Relations

Since relations are defined as sets operations, this topic is directly connected to sets, also.

Definition. A relation $R \subset A^2$ is an equivalence relation if it is

- 1) reflective,
- 2) symmetric,
- 3) transitive.

Example 1. The identity relation I_A is an equivalence relation in set A .

Proof. a) R is reflective iff

$\forall a \in A \Rightarrow (a, a) \in R$. Definition:

$$\boxed{I_A = \{(a, a) : a \in A\}}$$

$\Rightarrow I_A$ is reflective.

b) R is symmetric iff $\forall a, b \in A$ such that
 $(a, b) \in R \Rightarrow (b, a) \in R$.

$(a, b) \in I_A \Leftrightarrow b = a$ thus

$$(b, a) = (a, a) \in R.$$

c) R is transitive iff $\forall a, b, c \in A$

$(a, b) \in R$ and $(b, c) \in R \Rightarrow (a, c) \in R$.

$(a, b) \in I_A \Rightarrow a = b \Rightarrow a = c$

$(b, c) \in I_A \Rightarrow b = c$

and $(a, c) = (a, a) \in I_A$.

Example 2 .

$$R_2 \subseteq A^2, \quad A = \{1, 2, 3\}$$

$$R_2 = \{(1, 1), (1, 2), (2, 1), (2, 2), (3, 3)\}$$

~~a)~~ a) $(1, 1) \in R_2, (2, 2) \in R_2, (3, 3) \in R_2$

$\Rightarrow R_2$ is *reflective*.

b) $(1, 2) \in R_2$ and $(2, 1) \in R_2$

R_2 is *symmetric*

c) $(1, 2) \in R_2, (2, 1) \in R_2$

and $(1, 1) \in R_2$

R_2 is *transitive*.

Equivalence Classes

Let $R \subset A^2$ is an equivalence relation.

Definition. Subset $[a]_R \subset A$

$[a]_R = \{ b \in A : (a, b) \in R \}$
is called an equivalence class
of element $a \in A$.

Lemma. The following statements
are valid:

1.) $\forall a \in A : [a]_R \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. $a \in [a]_R$.

2.) $\forall (a, b) \in R \Rightarrow [a]_R = [b]_R$.

Proof. $b \in [a]_R \Rightarrow (a, b) \in R$

symmetry $(b, a) \in R \Rightarrow a \in [b]_R$.

Let's consider $c \in [a]_R$.

$$\Rightarrow (a, c) \in R \xrightarrow{\text{transit}} (b, c) \in R$$

Since $(b, a) \in R \Rightarrow (b, c) \in R$

$$\Rightarrow \cancel{c} \quad c \in [b]_R.$$

$$\Rightarrow [a]_R \subseteq [b]_R.$$

In a similar way it can be proved that

$$[b]_R \subseteq [a]_R \Rightarrow [a]_R = [b]_R$$

3. $\nexists (a, b) \in R \Rightarrow [a]_R \cap [b]_R = \emptyset$

Proof. Suppose $c \in [a]_R, c \in [b]_R$

$$\Rightarrow (a, c) \in R, (b, c) \in R$$

$$\xrightarrow{\text{symmetry}} (c, b) \in R \xrightarrow{\text{transit}} (a, b) \in R$$

We got a contradiction to the assumption of Lemma p. 3.

Definition. The set of all equivalence classes of A with respect to relation R is called the quotient set of A by R and denoted A/R

$$[A/R = \{[a]_R\}_{a \in A}]$$

Example: We say that a is congruent to b modulo m , and write $a \equiv b \pmod{m}$ if m divides the $b-a$.

$$-2 \equiv 19 \pmod{21}, \quad 9 \equiv 1 \pmod{2}, \\ 10 \equiv 0 \pmod{2}.$$

Verify that congruence modulo m is an equivalence relation on the integers

- 1) reflexivity,
- 2) symmetry,
- 3) transitivity.

The equivalence class of a, i.e.

$$[a]_R = a + m\mathbb{Z}$$

consists of all integers that are obtained from a by adding integer multiples of m

$$a + m\mathbb{Z} = \{ b : b \equiv a \pmod{m} \}.$$

Example

$$2 + 5\mathbb{Z} = \{ 2, 2+5, 2+10, 2+15, \dots \}.$$

The quotient set of residue classes mod m is denoted $\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$. It has m elements, since 0, 1, 2, ..., m-1 are the possible remainders of the division by m.

$$\mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z} = \{ 5\mathbb{Z}, 1+5\mathbb{Z}, 2+5\mathbb{Z}, 3+5\mathbb{Z}, 4+5\mathbb{Z} \}.$$

Order Relations

In our day-to-jobs in general, and in mathematics, in particular, we compare various elements, sort them in some order :

- numbers can be sorted (compared)

$$3 < 7, \quad -1 \leq 8, \quad 10 > 4.$$

- lexicographic order
in dictionary 'apple' comes before 'orange' (or 'orange' comes after 'apple').

Now we define a general property of order relations.

Let's start from definition of antisymmetric relations.

Definition. A relation R in a set A is called an **antisymmetric** relation if from $(a, b) \in R$ and $(b, a) \in R$ it follows that $a = b$.

$$(a, b) \in R \& (b, a) \in R \Rightarrow a = b.$$

Note If only one of element (a, b) or (b, a) belongs to R then the condition of the definition is not needed. Thus different vertexes a and b can not be connected by both directed edges (a, b) and (b, a) .

Lemma. R is antisymmetric iff

$$R \cap R^{-1} \subset I_A.$$

(Prove this statement)

-10-

Definition. A relation R on A is
irreflexive if

$$\forall a \in A \quad (a, a) \notin R.$$

Note that irreflexivity is different
from non-reflexivity

Every irreflexive relation R on a
non-empty set A is also non-reflexive,
but a non-reflexive relation need
not be irreflexive.

$$A = \{1, 2, 3\}$$

$$R_1 = \{(1, 1), (1, 2), (2, 3)\}$$

$$R_2 = \{(1, 1), (1, 2), (2, 2), (3, 3), (2, 3)\}$$

$$R_3 = \{(1, 2), (1, 3), (2, 3)\}.$$

Definition. Binary relation R on set A is order relation if it is antisymmetric and transitive relation.

If additionally R is ~~anti~~ irreflexive (reflexive) then it is called a strict (weak) order relation.

A relation R is a total (partial) order relation if it is (is not) a complete relation.

Def. R is a complete relation on A if (strongly connected)
 $\forall a, b \in A \quad \& \quad a \neq b \Rightarrow$
 $(a, b) \in R \vee (b, a) \in R.$

- M B -

Example

Relation $R = \{(1, 2), (1, 3), (2, 3)\}$
is complete on $A = \{1, 2, 3\}$.

But R is not complete

on $A = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$.

If it is clear, that if R is not
complete then any $T \subset R$
is also not complete relation
(give a proof!).

Examples

Let's consider sets of numbers

$\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R},$

Relations a) \leq, \geq

b) $<, >$

Proof. a) \leq is a weak order relation

Order relation : $\begin{cases} \text{antisymmetric} \\ \text{and transitive} \\ \text{reflective.} \end{cases}$

$(a, b) \in R : a \leq b \quad a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$
(or \mathbb{N} , or \mathbb{R})

antisymmetric.

If $(a, b) \in R$ then $(b, a) \notin R$

$a \neq b$

$a \leq b \xrightarrow{a \neq b} a < b \Rightarrow b \neq a \Rightarrow (b, a) \notin R.$

-13-

transitive

$a, b, c \in A$ ($A = \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{Z}$ or \mathbb{R})

$(a, b) \in R$ and $(b, c) \in R$

$(a, c) \in R$?

$a \leq b$ & $b \leq c \Rightarrow a \leq c$

$\Rightarrow (a, c) \in R$

reflective

$\forall a \in A \Rightarrow a \leq a \Rightarrow (a, a) \in R.$

Thus $R = ' \leq '$ is a weak order relation.

$R = ' > '$ is a strong order relation.

It is sufficient to prove that R is a irreflexive relation.

-14-

irreflective

$\forall a \in A \quad (a, a) \notin R.$

$a R a = a > a$ is not valid

$(a, a) \notin R.$

Determine the type of relation

$$A = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$$

$$R = \{(1, 2), (1, 5), (1, 4), (2, 5), (3, 2), (3, 5), (4, 2)\}$$

Let's consider a set of subsets of A

$$A = \{a, b, c\}$$

$$2^A = \{\emptyset, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{c\}, \{a, b\}, \{a, c\}, \{b, c\}, A\}.$$

Determine the type of relation ' C '.

see 137 pg.

Ordered Sets

Definition. A set is totally (partially) ordered if some relation of a total (partial) order R is defined on this set.

Notation. Ordered set (A, \preceq) where R is denoted by \preceq .

Definition. $m \in A$ is said to be a minimal element of the ordered set (A, \preceq) if

$$\nexists a \in A : a \preceq m \ \& \ a \neq m.$$

For a partially ordered set (A, \preceq) a minimal element can be not unique.

Theorem

Any nonempty finite partially ordered set has its minimal element.

Any nonempty finite totally ordered set has the unique minimal element

Example 1. Sets of numbers ~~N, Z, R~~ are totally ordered by relations \leq or $<$. Explain why they don't have minimal elements.

Example 2. The power set $P(A) = 2^A$ (the set of all subsets of set A) is a partially ordered set if the order is introduced by relation \subset . Find a minimal element in P .

Example 3. Let's take a set

$$A = \{2, 3, 4, 6\} \subset \mathbb{N}$$

and consider the relation $R \subset A^2$

$$R = \{(x, y) : y = kx \text{ for some } k \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

1. Find all elements of R .

$$R = \{(2, 2), (2, 4), (2, 6), (3, 3), (3, 6), (4, 4), (6, 6)\}$$

2. Determine the type of this relation.

3. Find minimal element /elements.

p. 138.