CM0832 Elements of Set Theory 3. Relations and Functions

Andrés Sicard-Ramírez

Universidad EAFIT

Semester 2017-2

Preliminaries

Convention

The number assigned to chapters, examples, exercises, figures, sections, and theorems on these slides correspond to the numbers assigned in the textbook [Enderton 1977].

Remark

Let a and b be sets. An ordered pair $\langle a, b \rangle$ should be a set such that

 $\langle a,b\rangle = \langle c,d\rangle \quad \text{iff} \quad a=c\wedge b=d.$

Definition

We define an ordered pair using Kuratowski's definition, that is,

 $\langle a,b\rangle:=\{\{a\},\{a,b\}\}.$

Example

We show that $\langle \emptyset, \{\emptyset\} \rangle \neq \langle \{\emptyset\}, \emptyset \rangle$.

$$\begin{split} \langle \emptyset, \{\emptyset\} \rangle &= \{\{\emptyset\}, \{\emptyset, \{\emptyset\}\}\} \\ &= \{\{\emptyset\}, \{\{\emptyset\}, \emptyset\}\} \\ &\neq \{\{\{\emptyset\}\}, \{\{\emptyset\}, \emptyset\}\} \\ &= \langle\{\emptyset\}, \emptyset\rangle. \end{split}$$

Example

Let a be a set. Then

 $\langle a, a \rangle = \{\{a\}, \{a, a\}\}$ = $\{\{a\}, \{a\}\}$ = $\{\{a\}\}.$

Example

Let a be a set. Then

```
\langle a, a \rangle = \{\{a\}, \{a, a\}\}
= \{\{a\}, \{a\}\}
= \{\{a\}\}.
```

Exercise

To give a different definition of ordered pair.

Cartesian Product

Definition

Let A and B be sets. The **Cartesian product** of A and B is defined by

 $A \times B := \{ \langle x, y \rangle \mid x \in A \land y \in B \}.$

Cartesian Product

Definition

Let A and B be sets. The **Cartesian product** of A and B is defined by

 $A \times B := \{ \langle x, y \rangle \mid x \in A \land y \in B \}.$

Remark

Let A and B be sets. Note that $A \times B$ is a set because we can define it via the subset axiom scheme.

 $A \times B := \{ \langle x, y \rangle \in \mathcal{PP}(A \cup B) \mid x \in A \land y \in B \}.$

Definition

A relation is a set of ordered pairs.

Definition

A relation is a set of ordered pairs.

Notation

Let R be a relation. We can write $\langle a, b \rangle \in R$ or aRb.

Definition

A relation is a set of ordered pairs.

Notation

Let R be a relation. We can write $\langle a, b \rangle \in R$ or aRb.

Example

Let R the relation defined by $R = \{\langle a, b \rangle, \langle b, b \rangle, \langle c, b \rangle\}$. Diagram: whiteboard.

Definition

A relation is a set of ordered pairs.

Notation

Let R be a relation. We can write $\langle a, b \rangle \in R$ or aRb.

Example

Let R the relation defined by $R = \{ \langle a, b \rangle, \langle b, b \rangle, \langle c, b \rangle \}$. Diagram: whiteboard.

Example

Let $\omega = \{0, 1, 2, ... \}$. The identity relation on ω is defined by

$$\begin{split} \mathbf{I}_{\omega} &:= \{ \langle n, n \rangle \mid n \in \omega \} \\ &= \{ \langle 0, 0 \rangle, \langle 1, 1 \rangle, \langle 2, 2 \rangle, \dots \} \end{split}$$

Definition

Let R be a relation. We define the **domain**, the **range** and the **field** of R by

```
dom R := \{ x \mid \exists y(\langle x, y \rangle \in R) \},
ran R := \{ y \mid \exists x(\langle x, y \rangle \in R) \},
fld R := \text{dom } R \cup \text{ran } R.
```

Definition

Let R be a relation. We define the **domain**, the **range** and the **field** of R by

```
dom R := \{ x \mid \exists y(\langle x, y \rangle \in R) \},
ran R := \{ y \mid \exists x(\langle x, y \rangle \in R) \},
fld R := \text{dom } R \cup \text{ran } R.
```

Remark

Let R be a relation. Note that dom R and ran R are sets because we can define them via the subset axiom scheme.

dom
$$R := \left\{ x \in \bigcup \bigcup R \mid \exists y(\langle x, y \rangle \in R) \right\},$$

ran $R := \left\{ y \in \bigcup \bigcup R \mid \exists x(\langle x, y \rangle \in R) \right\}.$

Definition

We define an ordered *n*-tuple, for $n \ge 3$, by

$$\langle x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \rangle := \langle \langle x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n-1} \rangle, x_n \rangle$$

Definition

We define an **ordered** n-tuple, for $n \ge 3$, by

$$\langle x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \rangle := \langle \langle x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n-1} \rangle, x_n \rangle$$

Example

Ordered triple (3-tuple) and ordered quadruple (4-tuple).

$$\langle x_1, x_2, x_3 \rangle := \langle \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle, x_3 \rangle, \langle x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 \rangle := \langle \langle x_1, x_2, x_3 \rangle, x_4 \rangle.$$

Definition

We define an **ordered** n-tuple, for $n \ge 3$, by

$$\langle x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \rangle := \langle \langle x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n-1} \rangle, x_n \rangle$$

Example

Ordered triple (3-tuple) and ordered quadruple (4-tuple).

$$\langle x_1, x_2, x_3 \rangle := \langle \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle, x_3 \rangle, \langle x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 \rangle := \langle \langle x_1, x_2, x_3 \rangle, x_4 \rangle.$$

Definition

We define an 1-tuple by

$$\langle x \rangle := x.$$

n-Ary Relations

Definition

Let A be a set. We define an n-ary relation on A to be a set of ordered n-tuples with all components in A.

Definition

Let A be a set. We define an n-ary relation on A to be a set of ordered n-tuples with all components in A.

Example

Whiteboard.

Remark

Let A be a set. Note that an 1-ary relation on A is just a subset of A but it is not a relation.

Definition

A function (mapping or correspondence) is a relation F such that for each x in dom F there is only one y such that xFy.

Definition

A function (mapping or correspondence) is a relation F such that for each x in dom F there is only one y such that xFy.

Notation

We write $F: A \to B$ iff F is a function, dom F = A and ran $F \subseteq B$.

Definition

A function (mapping or correspondence) is a relation F such that for each x in dom F there is only one y such that xFy.

Notation

```
We write F : A \to B iff F is a function, dom F = A and ran F \subseteq B.
```

Definition

Let F be a function and A and B sets.

- (i) F is a function **on** (from) A iff dom F = A.
- (ii) F is a function into (to) B iff ran $F \subseteq B$.
- (iii) F is a function **onto** B iff ran F = B.

Exercise 3.11

Prove the following version (for functions) of the extensionality principle: Assume that F and G are functions, dom F = dom G, and F(x) = G(x) for all x in the common domain. Then F = G.

Definition

A function F is **one-to-one** (or **injective**) iff for each $y \in \operatorname{ran} F$ there is only one x such that xFy. In other words, if $x_1, x_2 \in \operatorname{dom} F$ and $x_1 \neq x_2$ implies $f(x_1) \neq f(x_2)$.

Definition

A function F is **one-to-one** (or **injective**) iff for each $y \in \operatorname{ran} F$ there is only one x such that xFy. In other words, if $x_1, x_2 \in \operatorname{dom} F$ and $x_1 \neq x_2$ implies $f(x_1) \neq f(x_2)$.

Example

Whiteboard.

Definition

A function F is **one-to-one** (or **injective**) iff for each $y \in \operatorname{ran} F$ there is only one x such that xFy. In other words, if $x_1, x_2 \in \operatorname{dom} F$ and $x_1 \neq x_2$ implies $f(x_1) \neq f(x_2)$.

Example

Whiteboard.

Definition

A function F is an **one-to-one correspondence** between A and B iff F is an one-to-one function from A onto B.

Definition

A function F is **one-to-one** (or **injective**) iff for each $y \in \operatorname{ran} F$ there is only one x such that xFy. In other words, if $x_1, x_2 \in \operatorname{dom} F$ and $x_1 \neq x_2$ implies $f(x_1) \neq f(x_2)$.

Example

Whiteboard.

Definition

A function F is an **one-to-one correspondence** between A and B iff F is an one-to-one function from A onto B.

Example

Whiteboard.

Definition

Let A, F and G be sets. We define, the **inverse** of F, the **composition** of F and G, the **restriction** of F to A and the **image** of A under F by

 $F^{-1} := \{ \langle y, x \rangle \mid xFy \}$ (inverse of F)

 $F \circ G := \{ \langle x, y \rangle \mid \exists t (xGt \land tFy) \}$ (composition of F and G)

 $F \upharpoonright A := \{ \langle x, y \rangle \mid x \in A \land xFy \}$

(restriction of F to A)

 $F\llbracket A \rrbracket := \operatorname{ran} (F \upharpoonright A)$ $= \{ y \mid \exists x (x \in A \land xFy) \}$

(image of A under F)

Example

Let

 $F = \{ \langle \emptyset, a \rangle, \langle \{ \emptyset \}, b \rangle \}.$

Then

 $\operatorname{dom} F = \{\emptyset, \{\emptyset\}\}$ ran $F = \{a, b\},$ $F^{-1} = \{\langle a, \emptyset \rangle, \langle b, \{\emptyset\} \rangle\},$ $F \upharpoonright \emptyset = \emptyset,$ $F \upharpoonright \{\emptyset\} = \{\langle \emptyset, a \rangle\},$ $F[\![\{\emptyset\}]\!] = \{a\},$ $F(\{\emptyset\}) = b.$

F is a function, $F^{-1} \text{ is function iff } a \neq b,$

Exercise 3.18

Let R be the set

 $\{\langle 0,1\rangle, \langle 0,2\rangle, \langle 0,3\rangle, \langle 1,2\rangle, \langle 1,3\rangle, \langle 2,3\rangle\}.$

To find $R \circ R$, $R \upharpoonright \{1\}$, $R^{-1} \upharpoonright \{1\}$, $R[[\{1\}]]$ and $R^{-1}[[\{1\}]]$.

Exercise 3.18

Let R be the set

```
\{\langle 0,1\rangle, \langle 0,2\rangle, \langle 0,3\rangle, \langle 1,2\rangle, \langle 1,3\rangle, \langle 2,3\rangle\}.
```

To find $R \circ R$, $R \upharpoonright \{1\}$, $R^{-1} \upharpoonright \{1\}$, $R[[\{1\}]]$ and $R^{-1}[[\{1\}]]$.

Exercise (p. 44)

Let A, F and G be sets. Show that F^{-1} , $F \circ G$, $F \upharpoonright A$ and $F\llbracket A \rrbracket$ are sets.

Theorem 3E

Let F be a set. Then

dom
$$F^{-1} = \operatorname{ran} F$$
 and $\operatorname{ran} F^{-1} = \operatorname{dom} F$.

If additionally F is a relation, then

$$(F^{-1})^{-1} = F.$$

Theorem 3G

Let F be an one-to-one function.

• If $x \in \operatorname{dom} F$, then

 $F^{-1}(F(x)) = x.$

• If $y \in \operatorname{ran} F$, then

 $F(F^{-1}(y)) = y.$

Theorem 3H

Let F and G be functions. Then

- $F \circ G$ is a function,
- dom $(F \circ G) = \{ x \in \operatorname{dom} G \mid G(x) \in \operatorname{dom} F \}$ and
- if $x \in \text{dom}(F \circ G)$, then $(F \circ G)(x) = F(G(x))$.

Theorem 3I

Let F and G be sets. Then

$$(F \circ G)^{-1} = G^{-1} \circ F^{-1}.$$

Theorem 3J

- Let F be a function $F : A \to B$ and $A \neq \emptyset$.
- (i) There exists a function $G: B \to A$ (a "left inverse") such that $G \circ F$ is the identity function I_A on A iff the function F is one-to-one.
- (ii) There exists a function $H : B \to A$ (a "right inverse") such that $F \circ H$ is the identity function I_B on B iff the function F maps A onto B.
Axiom of choice (first form)

For any relation R there is a function $H \subseteq R$ with dom $H = \operatorname{dom} R$.

Axiom of choice (first form)

For any relation R there is a function $H \subseteq R$ with dom $H = \operatorname{dom} R$.

Example

Whiteboard.

Axiom of choice (first form)

For any relation R there is a function $H \subseteq R$ with dom $H = \operatorname{dom} R$.

Example

Whiteboard.

Remark

Is the axiom of choice accepted in constructive mathematics? (See, e.g. Martin-Löf [2006]).

Definition

Let A and B be sets. We define the set of functions from A into B by

 $B^A := \{ F \mid F : A \to B \} =: {}^A B.$

Definition

Let A and B be sets. We define the set of functions from A into B by

```
B^A := \{ F \mid F : A \to B \} =: {}^A B.
```

Example

• $\{0,1\}^{\omega}$: The set of infinity binary sequences.

Definition

Let A and B be sets. We define the set of functions from A into B by

```
B^A := \{ F \mid F : A \to B \} =: {}^A B.
```

Example

- $\{0,1\}^{\omega}$: The set of infinity binary sequences.
- $\emptyset^A = \emptyset$ for $A \neq \emptyset$ (no function can have a non-empty domain and an empty range).

Definition

Let A and B be sets. We define the set of functions from A into B by

 $B^A := \{ F \mid F : A \to B \} =: {}^A B.$

Example

- $\{0,1\}^{\omega}$: The set of infinity binary sequences.
- $\emptyset^A = \emptyset$ for $A \neq \emptyset$ (no function can have a non-empty domain and an empty range).
- $A^{\emptyset} = \{\emptyset\}$ for any set A (\emptyset is the only function with an empty domain).

Remark

Let A and B be sets. Note that B^A is a set because we can define it via the subset axiom scheme.

 $B^A := \{ F \in \mathcal{P}(A \times B) \mid F : A \to B \}.$

Remark

Families is another way to express functions when the range of a function is more important than the function itself. We write functions as families when we want to put the emphasis on the values of the function rather in the function.*

*Enderton [1977] do not use families, but 'only' functions.

Remark

Families is another way to express functions when the range of a function is more important than the function itself. We write functions as families when we want to put the emphasis on the values of the function rather in the function.*

Remark

The terminology and notation on families is not established.

^{*}Enderton [1977] do not use families, but 'only' functions.

Definition

Let I and X be sets. A family in X indexed by I is a function

```
A: I \to XA = \{ \langle i, A_i \rangle \mid i \in I \text{ and } A_i \in X \},\
```

where $A_i := A(i)$, for all $i \in I$.* The set I is the **index set** of the family.

^{*}See, e.g. Halmos [1960], Drake [1974] and Hamilton [(1982) 1992].

Definition

Let I and X be sets. A family in X indexed by I is a function

```
\begin{split} A: I \to X \\ A &= \{ \left< i, A_i \right> \mid i \in I \text{ and } A_i \in X \}, \end{split}
```

where $A_i := A(i)$, for all $i \in I$.* The set I is the **index set** of the family.

Notation

The above family A is denoted by $\langle A_i | i \in I \rangle$ following to [Hrbacek and Jech (1978) 1999].

^{*}See, e.g. Halmos [1960], Drake [1974] and Hamilton [(1982) 1992].

Definition

The **union** of a family $\langle A_i \mid i \in I \rangle$ is defined by

$$\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i := \bigcup \{ A_i \mid i \in I \}$$
$$= \{ x \mid x \in A_i \text{ for some } i \text{ in } I \}.$$

Definition

The **union** of a family $\langle A_i \mid i \in I \rangle$ is defined by

$$\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i := \bigcup \{ A_i \mid i \in I \}$$
$$= \{ x \mid x \in A_i \text{ for some } i \text{ in } I \}.$$

Example

Whiteboard.

Definition

The intersection of a family $\langle A_i \mid i \in I \rangle$ is defined by

$$\bigcap_{i \in I} A_i := \bigcap \{ A_i \mid i \in I \}$$
$$= \{ x \mid x \in A_i \text{ for every } i \text{ in } I \}.$$

Definition

The **intersection** of a family $\langle A_i \mid i \in I \rangle$ is defined by

$$\bigcap_{i \in I} A_i := \bigcap \{ A_i \mid i \in I \}$$
$$= \{ x \mid x \in A_i \text{ for every } i \text{ in } I \}.$$

Example

Whiteboard.

Definition

The **Cartesian product** (or **generalised product**) of a family $\langle A_i | i \in I \rangle$ is defined by

$$\underset{i \in I}{\times} A_i := \{ f \mid f : I \to \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i \text{ and } \forall i (i \in I \to f(i) \in A_i) \} =: \prod_{i \in I} A_i$$

Definition

The **Cartesian product** (or **generalised product**) of a family $\langle A_i | i \in I \rangle$ is defined by

$$\underset{i \in I}{\times} A_i := \{ f \mid f : I \to \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i \text{ and } \forall i (i \in I \to f(i) \in A_i) \} =: \prod_{i \in I} A_i.$$

Example

Let $\langle A_i \mid i \in I \rangle$ be a family. If $A_i = B$ for all $i \in I$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \bigotimes_{i \in I} A_i &= B^I \\ &= \{ f \mid f : I \to B \}. \end{aligned}$$

Example

The following example illustrates the generalisation of the Cartesian product.

Let X and Y be two sets. Recall that the Cartesian product of X and Y was defined by

 $X \times Y := \{ \langle x, y \rangle \mid x \in X \land y \in Y \}.$

(continued on next slide)

Example (continuation)

Let $I = \{a, b\}$ be an index set and let $\langle Z_i \mid i \in I \rangle$ be a family where $Z_a = X$ and $Z_b = Y$. Then

 $\underset{i \in I}{\times} Z_i = \{ f \mid f : I \to X \cup Y, \text{ such that } f(a) \in X \text{ and } f(b) \in Y \}.$

Now, we can define the one-to-one correspondence

 $h: \underset{i \in I}{\times} Z_i \to X \times Y$ $h(f) = \langle f(a), f(b) \rangle.$

Axiom of choice (second form)

Let $\langle H_i \mid i \in I \rangle$ be a family. If $H(i) \neq \emptyset$ for all $i \in I$, then $\bigotimes_{i \in I} H(i) \neq \emptyset$.*



*Figure source: Enderton [1977, Fig. 11].

Definition

Let R be a binary relation on a set A. The relation R is

• reflexive iff xRx for all $x \in A$,

Definition

Let R be a binary relation on a set A. The relation R is

- reflexive iff xRx for all $x \in A$,
- symmetric iff xRy implies yRx for all $x, y \in A$ and

Definition

Let R be a binary relation on a set A. The relation R is

- reflexive iff xRx for all $x \in A$,
- symmetric iff xRy implies yRx for all $x, y \in A$ and
- transitive iff xRy and yRz imply xRz for all $x, y, z \in A$.

Example

Whiteboard.

Introduction

Whiteboard.

Introduction

Whiteboard.

Definition

Let R be a binary relation on a set A. The relation R is an **equivalence relation** iff R is reflexive, symmetric and transitive.

Introduction

Whiteboard.

Definition

Let R be a binary relation on a set A. The relation R is an **equivalence relation** iff R is reflexive, symmetric and transitive.

Example

Whiteboard.

Questions

• Let $A = \{a, e, i, o, u\}$. Is the equality relation on A an equivalence relation?

Questions

- Let $A = \{a, e, i, o, u\}$. Is the equality relation on A an equivalence relation?
- Let $A \neq \emptyset$ be a set. Is the relation \emptyset on A an equivalence relation?

Questions

- Let $A = \{a, e, i, o, u\}$. Is the equality relation on A an equivalence relation?
- Let $A \neq \emptyset$ be a set. Is the relation \emptyset on A an equivalence relation?
- Let A be a set. Is the relation $A \times A$ an equivalence relations?

Questions

- Let $A = \{a, e, i, o, u\}$. Is the equality relation on A an equivalence relation?
- Let $A \neq \emptyset$ be a set. Is the relation \emptyset on A an equivalence relation?
- Let A be a set. Is the relation $A \times A$ an equivalence relations?
- Let A be a singleton. It is possible to define an equivalence relation on A?

Definition

The set $[x]_R$ is defined by

 $[x]_R := \{ t \mid xRt \}.$

Definition

The set $[x]_R$ is defined by

$$[x]_R := \{ t \mid xRt \}.$$

Definition

Let R be an equivalence relation on a set A and let $x \in \operatorname{fld} R$. The set $[x]_R$ is the equivalence class of x (modulo R).

Notation

We write [x] if the relation R is clear in the context.

Definition

The set $[x]_R$ is defined by

$$[x]_R := \{ t \mid xRt \}.$$

Definition

Let R be an equivalence relation on a set A and let $x \in \operatorname{fld} R$. The set $[x]_R$ is the equivalence class of x (modulo R).

Notation

We write [x] if the relation R is clear in the context.

Example

Whiteboard.

Theorem 3N

Let R be an equivalence relation on a set A and let $x, y \in A$. Then

 $[x]_R = [y]_R$ iff xRy.

Theorem 3P

Let R be an equivalence relation on a set A. Then the set

 $\{ [x]_R \mid x \in A \}$

of all equivalence classes is a partition of the set A.
Theorem 3P

Let R be an equivalence relation on a set A. Then the set

 $\{ [x]_R \mid x \in A \}$

of all equivalence classes is a partition of the set A.

Exercise 3.37

Assume that Π is a partition of a set A. Define the relation R_{Π} as follows:

 $xR_{\Pi}y$ iff $(\exists B \in \Pi)(x \in B \land y \in B).$

Show that R_{Π} is an equivalence relation on A.

Definition

Let R be an equivalence relation on a set A. The **quotient set** is defined by

 $A/R := \{ [x]_R \mid x \in A \}.$

Definition

Let R be an equivalence relation on a set A. The **quotient set** is defined by

 $A/R := \{ [x]_R \mid x \in A \}.$

Definition

Let R be an equivalence relation on a set A. The **natural map** (or **canonical map**) is the function

 $f: A \to A/R$ $f(x) = [x]_R.$

Definition

Let R be an equivalence relation on a set A. The **quotient set** is defined by

 $A/R := \{ [x]_R \mid x \in A \}.$

Definition

Let R be an equivalence relation on a set A. The **natural map** (or **canonical map**) is the function

 $f: A \to A/R$ $f(x) = [x]_R.$

Remark

Using the λ -notation we could define the natural map by the anonymous function $\lambda x.[x]_R$.

Equivalence Relations

Motivation

What means that R is an ordering relation on a set A?

Motivation

What means that R is an ordering relation on a set A?

Definition

Let R be a binary relation on a set A. The relation R satisfies **trichotomy** if exactly one of the three alternatives

 $xRy, \quad x=y \quad \text{or} \quad yRx$

holds for all $x, y \in A$.

Definition

Let A be a set. A linear ordering (or total ordering) on A is a binary relation R on A such that:

- (i) R is transitive relation and
- (ii) R satisfies trichotomy.

Definition

Let A be a set. A linear ordering (or total ordering) on A is a binary relation R on A such that:

- (i) R is transitive relation and
- (ii) R satisfies trichotomy.

Example



References

- Drake, Frank R. (1974). Set Theory. An Introduction to Large Cardinals. Vol. 76. Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics. North-Holland Publishing Company (cit. on pp. 47, 48).
 - Enderton, Herbert B. (1977). Elements of Set Theory. Academic Press (cit. on pp. 2, 45, 46, 57).
- Halmos, Paul R. (1960), Naive Set Theory, The University Series in Undergradete Mathematics. Van Nostrand Reinhold Company (cit. on pp. 47, 48).
- Hamilton, A. G. [1982] (1992). Numbers, Sets and Axioms. The Apparatus of Mathematics. 2nd impression. Cambridge University Press (cit. on pp. 47, 48).
- Hrbacek. Karel and Jech. Thomas [1978] (1999). Introduction to Set Theory. Third Edition, Revised and Expanded. Marcel Dekker (cit. on pp. 47, 48).
 - Martin-Löf, Per (2006). 100 Years of Zermelo's Axiom of Choice: What was the Problem with It? The Computer Journal 49.3, pp. 345–350. DOI: 10.1093/comjnl/bxh162 (cit. on pp. 37–39).