

# Foundations of Mathematics

---

Instructor:

Uday Jabbar Quaez and Ruqaya Ibrahim

Academic Year: 2024-2025

Department of Mathematics, College of Education, Al-Mustansiriyah University

## Lecture 10.: Mathematical Foundations: Anti-symmetric relations , Equivalence Relations and Partitioning of sets

### Introduction

Relations are a key concept in mathematics, used to describe connections between elements within a set. This lecture focuses on anti-symmetric relations, which limit mutual connections, and equivalence relations, which classify elements into distinct groups based on shared properties. These classifications naturally lead to partitioning sets, dividing a set into non-overlapping subsets. Together, these concepts provide a foundation for understanding mathematical structures and their applications.

### Anti-Symmetric Relation:

A relation  $\mathcal{R}$  on a set  $A$  is called anti-symmetric if for any  $a, b \in A$  then  $\mathcal{R}$  satisfies the statements

$$a \sim b \wedge b \sim a \Rightarrow a = b$$

**Examples: 3.15.** let  $A = \{1,2,3\}$ . Are the following relations on a set  $A$  anti symmetric?

$$R_1 = \{(1,1), (1,2), (2,1), (2,2), (3,3)\} \quad \text{not anti symmetric}$$

$$R_2 = \{(1,1)\} \quad \text{anti symmetric}$$

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

$$R_4 = \emptyset$$

$$R_5 = \{(1,1), (1,3), (3,2), (2,2), (3,3)\}$$

**Examples: 3.16.** let  $A = Z$ . Are the following relations on a set A reflexive? Symmetric? Anti-symmetric?

$$1) a \sim b \Leftrightarrow a = b + 1$$

Reflexive since for any  $a \in Z$ ,  $a \sim a \Leftrightarrow a = a + 1$  then the relation is not reflexive.

Symmetric since  $\forall a, b \in Z$ ,  $a \sim b \Leftrightarrow a = b + 1$  but  $b \neq a + 1$  then  $(b, a) \notin R$  then the relation is not symmetric.

Anti-symmetric Since  $\forall a, b \in Z$  If  $a \sim b \wedge b \sim a \Rightarrow a = b + 1 \wedge b = a + 1 \Rightarrow a = b$  then the relation is not anti-symmetric.

$$2) a \sim b \Leftrightarrow a|b$$

Reflexive since for any  $a \in Z$ ,  $a \sim a \Leftrightarrow a|a$  ( $a = 1 \times a$ ) then the relation is reflexive.

Symmetric since  $\forall a, b \in Z$ ,  $a \sim b \Leftrightarrow a|b$  but not necessary  $b|a$

For example  $2|4$  but  $4 \nmid 2$  then the relation is not symmetric.

Anti-symmetric Since  $\forall a, b \in Z$  If  $a \sim b \wedge b \sim a \Rightarrow a|b \wedge b|a \Rightarrow \exists k_1, k_2 \in Z$  such that  $b = k_1 a$  and  $a = k_2 b \Rightarrow k_1, k_2 = 1$

$$\Rightarrow \text{either } k_1 = k_2 = 1 \text{ or } k_1 = k_2 = -1$$

$\Rightarrow a = b$  or  $a = -b$  then the relation is not anti-symmetric.

$$3) a \sim b \Leftrightarrow a - b = 2k, k \in Z \quad (\text{H.W.})$$

$$4) a \sim b \Leftrightarrow a = 2b$$

**Theorem 3.6. :** A relation  $\mathcal{R}$  on a set A is anti-symmetric iff  $\mathcal{R} \cap \mathcal{R}^{-1} \subseteq I_A$ .

**Proof:** ( $\Rightarrow$ ) Suppose that  $\mathcal{R}$  is anti-symmetric T.P.  $\mathcal{R} \cap \mathcal{R}^{-1} \subseteq I_A$

Let  $(a, b) \in \mathcal{R} \cap \mathcal{R}^{-1} \Rightarrow (a, b) \in \mathcal{R} \wedge (a, b) \in \mathcal{R}^{-1}$  (Def. of  $\cap$ )

$$\Rightarrow (a, b) \in \mathcal{R} \wedge (b, a) \in \mathcal{R} \quad (\text{Def. of } \mathcal{R}^{-1})$$

$$\Rightarrow a = b \quad (\mathcal{R} \text{ is anti-symmetric})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\Rightarrow (a, b) \in I_A \\ \Rightarrow (a, b) \in R \wedge (b, a) \in R \\ &\Rightarrow a = b \quad (\mathcal{R} \text{ is anti symmetric}) \\ &\Rightarrow (a, b) \in I_A \end{aligned}$$

( $\Leftarrow$ ) Suppose that  $\mathcal{R} \cap \mathcal{R}^{-1} \subseteq I_A$  T.P.  $\mathcal{R}$  is anti-symmetric

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Let } (a, b) \in \mathcal{R} \wedge (b, a) \in \mathcal{R} &\Rightarrow (a, b) \in \mathcal{R} \wedge (a, b) \in \mathcal{R}^{-1} \quad (\text{Def. of } \mathcal{R}^{-1}) \\ &\Rightarrow (a, b) \in \mathcal{R} \cap \mathcal{R}^{-1} \quad (\text{Def. of } \cap) \\ &\Rightarrow (a, b) \in I_A \quad (\text{By hyp.}) \\ &\Rightarrow a = b \end{aligned}$$

$\mathcal{R}$  is anti-symmetric.

### Equivalence Relation:

A relation  $\mathcal{R}$  on a set  $A$  is called equivalence relation if and only if it satisfies reflexive, symmetric and transitive properties.

**Examples: 3.16.** let  $A = Z$ . Are the following relations on a set  $A$  Equivalence?

1)  $a \sim b \Leftrightarrow a + b = 2k, k \in Z$

2)  $a \sim b \Leftrightarrow a|b$

**Solution:** (H.W.)

### Partition of a Set:

A collection of subsets  $\{A_i : i \in J \subseteq N\}$  of  $A$  is called partition of  $A$  iff it satisfies the following conditions :

1.  $A_i \neq \emptyset \quad \forall i \in J$
2.  $A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset \quad \forall i \neq j$
3.  $\bigcup_{i \in J} A_i = A$

**Examples: 3.17.** 1) let  $A = Z$  and  $E$  and  $O$  are even and odd numbers respectively,

$$1. E \neq \emptyset \text{ and } O \neq \emptyset$$

$$2. E \cap O = \emptyset$$

$$3. E \cup O = Z$$

then  $p = \{E, O\}$  is a partition of  $A$

2)  $A = (0,4)$  find Partition of  $A$ ?

Let  $A_1 = (0,1), A_2 = (1,2), A_3 = (2,3), A_4 = (3,4), A_5 = \{1,2,3\}$ . Then

$$1. A_i \neq \emptyset \quad \forall i \in J = \{1,2,3,4,5\}$$

$$2. A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset \quad \forall i \neq j$$

$$3. \bigcup_{i \in J} A_i = A$$

3) find the another partition of  $A$  in 2) (H.W.)

4)  $A = [-1,5)$  find three different Partitions of  $A$ ?

### Exercises

**Exercise 1:** Let  $A = Z$  and define  $a \mathcal{R} b \Leftrightarrow |a| = |b|, \forall a, b \in Z$

Is  $\mathcal{R}$  symmetric? Anti-symmetric?

**Exercise 2:** Let  $A = Z$  and define  $a \mathcal{R} b \Leftrightarrow a = 1, \forall a \in Z$

$\mathcal{R} = \{(1, b); b \in Z\}$ . Is  $\mathcal{R}$  equivalence?

**Exercise 3:** Let  $R = \{(a, b) \in Z \times Z: b = 1 - a\}$ . Is  $R$  symmetric? Anti-symmetric? .

**Exercise 4:** Let  $A = R$  and define  $a \sim b \Leftrightarrow ab \leq 0 \quad \forall a, b \in R$

Is the relation equivalence?

**Exercise 5:** Let  $A = Z$  and  $R = \{(a, b) \in Z \times Z : a - b = 5k, k \in Z\}$ . Show that  $R$  is an equivalence relation?

### ***References***

1. Smith, P. (2003). *\*Introduction to Mathematical Logic\**. Cambridge University Press. ISBN: 9780521008044.
2. Enderton, H. B. (1977). *Elements of set theory*. Academic press.
3. Shoenfield, J. R. (2000). *\*Mathematical Logic\**. A K Peters. ISBN: 9781568811352.
4. Levy, A. (2012). *Basic set theory*. Courier Corporation..
5. Fraenkel, A. (1973). *Foundations of Set Theory*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.