## Lassonde School of Engineering

Dept. of EECS

Professor G. Tourlakis EECS 1028 Z. Problem Set No3 —SOLUTIONS Posted: Mar. 22, 2024

**1.** (4 MARKS) Show that if  $\mathbb{F}$  is a function and dom( $\mathbb{F}$ ) is a set then  $\mathbb{F}$  is a set.

**Proof.** The function is  $\mathbb{F} : \operatorname{dom}(\mathbb{F}) \to \operatorname{ran}(\mathbb{F})$ .

In particular it is onto  $\operatorname{ran}(\mathbb{F})$  —<u>every</u> function  $\mathbb{G} : \mathbb{A} \to \mathbb{B}$  is onto its range: Any  $b \in \operatorname{ran}(\mathbb{G})$  implies that b is one of the <u>generated outputs</u>, meaning  $(\exists x \in \operatorname{dom}(\mathbb{G}))\mathbb{G}(x) = b$ .

Thus  $\mathbb{F}[\operatorname{dom}(\mathbb{F})] = \operatorname{ran}(\mathbb{F})$  (Because:  $\mathbb{F}[\operatorname{dom}(\mathbb{F})] \subseteq \operatorname{ran}(\mathbb{F})$  is trivial —all the outputs of a function go in its range; by definition of range. The " $\supseteq$ " is by the argument above.

By a theorem in the Notes (5.1.9), ran $(\mathbb{F})$  is a set since dom $(\mathbb{F})$  is.

Hence so is  $\mathbb{F} \subseteq \operatorname{dom}(\mathbb{F}) \times \operatorname{ran}(\mathbb{F})$  by the subclass theorem.

2. (3 MARKS) True or False and WHY? (without the <u>correct</u> "WHY" this maxes out to 0 (zero) Marks). If P is a <u>function</u> and ran(P) is a set, IS then P a set?

**Answer**. False. Consider the function below  $\mathbb{P}$  (trivially single-valued: thus a function). It has  $ran(\mathbb{P}) = \{0\}$ , a <u>set</u>.

$$\mathbb{P} = \Big\{ (x,0) : x = x \Big\}$$

If this function is a set then so is its domain by a known theorem from class (4.1.5).

However dom( $\mathbb{P}$ ) = {x : x = x} =  $\mathbb{U}$  that we know is a **proper** class.  $\Box$ 

G. Tourlakis

Page 1

**3.** (3 MARKS) Prove that if the <u>function</u> f is 1-1, then  $f^{-1}$  —the converse of the <u>relation</u> f— is also a function.

**Caution**! The ONLY assumptions here are

- 1) f is a function and
- 2) it is 1-1.

*f* MAY be <u>nontotal</u>, <u>non onto</u> and have a lot of other "non" properties that you may <u>HOWEVER NEITHER</u> assume, NOR negate! Either way they are <u>IRRELEVANT</u> to the question!! **You MAY ONLY ASSUME WHAT I GAVE YOU HERE!!** 

**Proof.** Given that f is 1-1, hence for all x, y, z we have

$$xfz \wedge yfz \to x = y \tag{1}$$

Let me write the above in terms of " $f^{-1}$ ", the converse RELATION.

$$zf^{-1}x \wedge zf^{-1}y \to x = y \tag{2}$$

(2) says that the RELATION " $f^{-1}$ " is SINGLE-VALUED; A **FUNC-TION**.

- **4.** Given a relation  $R: A \to A$ . Prove
  - (a) (2 MARKS)  $\Delta_A \circ R = R$ **Proof**.
    - Do  $\Delta_A \circ R \subseteq R$ : Let  $x\Delta_A \circ Ry$ . Then  $x\Delta_A z$  and zRy for some z. But x = z by def. of  $\Delta_A$ . Thus the red part becomes xRy.
    - Do  $R \subseteq \Delta_A \circ R$ : Let xRy. Then also

$$\underbrace{x\Delta_A x}_{Def. of \Delta_A} Ry$$

Therefore  $x\Delta_A \circ Ry$ .

(b) (2 MARKS)  $R \circ \Delta_A = R$ .

Proof.

• Do  $R \circ \Delta_A \subseteq R$ : Let  $xR \circ \Delta_A y$ . This says xRz and  $z\Delta_A y$  for some z. By  $\Delta$ -definition, z = y and the red part becomes xRy. Done.

Page 2

G. Tourlakis

- Do  $R \subseteq R \circ \Delta_A$ : Let xRy. We also have  $y\Delta_A y$  by  $\Delta_A$ -definition. Thus  $xRy\Delta_A y$ , hence  $xR \circ \Delta_A y$ . Done.
- **5.** Let  $f : A \to B$  be a 1-1 correspondence. <u>Then Prove</u>:
  - (3 MARKS)  $f^{-1}: B \to A$  is also a 1-1 correspondence. **Proof**.
    - (a)  $f^{-1}$  is a function by Exercise 3. above.
    - (b)  $f^{-1}$  is 1-1. Indeed, Let  $xf^{-1}y$  and  $zf^{-1}y$ . This means the same as (definition of " $f^{-1}$ ") yfx and yfz. Since f is a function (single-valued) x = z. This conclusion and the red "Let" assumption establish that  $f^{-1}$  is 1-1.
    - (c) By assumption, f is total on A and onto B. From Notes/Class (4.4.15) we have

$$A = \operatorname{dom}(f) = \operatorname{ran}(f^{-1}) \tag{1}$$

and

$$\operatorname{dom}(f^{-1}) = \operatorname{ran}(f) = B \tag{2}$$

(1) and (2) prove that  $f^{-1}$  is total on B and onto A.

• (2 MARKS) If  $gf = \mathbf{1}_A$ , then we have  $g = f^{-1}$  where  $f^{-1}$  is the <u>converse</u> of f.

**Proof.** Note that our f is the same as above, a 1-1 correspondence  $A \stackrel{f}{\sim} B$ .

Now apply  $f^{-1}$  to the right side of the given equality:

$$(gf)f^{-1} = \mathbf{1}_A f^{-1} \stackrel{exerc. 4}{=} f^{-1}$$
 (3)

On the other hand,

$$(gf)f^{-1 \text{ composition is assoc.}} g(ff^{-1}) = g\mathbf{1}_B \stackrel{4}{=} g \tag{4}$$

We are done by (3) and (4).

**Wait!** Why is  $ff^{-1} = \mathbf{1}_B$ ? Because by Exercise 5c above, for **ANY**  $x \in B$ , it is  $f^{-1}(x) = y$  for a unique  $y \in A$ . Thus, f(y) = x by definition of converse.

Substituting y by  $f^{-1}(x)$  we obtain  $ff^{-1}(x) = f(f^{-1}(x)) = f(y) = x \in B$ . That is, is  $ff^{-1} = \mathbf{1}_B$ .

G. Tourlakis

Page 3

- (2 MARKS) If  $fh = \mathbf{1}_B$ , then we have h = f
- (2 MARKS) If  $fh = \mathbf{1}_B$ , then we have  $h = f^{-1}$  where  $f^{-1}$  is the <u>converse</u> of f.

**Proof**. Similar to the proof of the previous bullet:

Note that our f is the same as above, a 1-1 correspondence  $A \stackrel{f}{\sim} B$ . Now apply  $f^{-1}$  to the LEFT side (this time) of the given equality:

$$f^{-1}(fh) = f^{-1} \mathbf{1}_B \stackrel{exerc. \ 4}{=} f^{-1} \tag{5}$$

On the other hand,

$$f^{-1}(fh) \stackrel{composition \ is \ assoc.}{=} (f^{-1}f)h = \mathbf{1}_A h \stackrel{4}{=} h \tag{6}$$

We are done by (5) and (6).

**Wait!** Why is  $f^{-1}f = \mathbf{1}_A$ ? Because by Exercise 5c above, for **ANY**  $x \in A$ , it is f(x) = y for a unique  $y \in B$ . Thus,  $f^{-1}(y) = x$  by definition of converse.

Substituting y by f(x) we obtain  $f^{-1}f(x) = f^{-1}(f(x)) = f^{-1}(y) = x \in A$ . That is, is  $f^{-1}f = \mathbf{1}_A$ .

6. (4 MARKS) Let < be an abstract (strict) order and  $\mathbb{B}$  be any class.

Prove that  $< |\mathbb{B}$  is an order <u>on</u>  $\mathbb{B}$ .

*Hint.* The notation "< |B" is given in the online Notes (where this Exercise is suggested for practice).

**Proof.** The notation  $< |\mathbb{B} \text{ means} < \cap (\mathbb{B} \times \mathbb{B}).$ 

First off, for the "<u>on</u>  $\mathbb{B}$ " part, whatever kind of <u>relation</u> " $< \cap (\mathbb{B} \times \mathbb{B})$ " proves to be it is a relation (a class of pairs) that is  $\subseteq \mathbb{B} \times \mathbb{B}$ . So the relation  $< \cap (\mathbb{B} \times \mathbb{B})$  is "on  $\mathbb{B}$ ".

So I prove that the latter is an order:

• Irreflexive:  $(x, y) \notin <$ , for all x = y since < is an order. But then such a pair (x, y) cannot be in the intersection  $< \cap (\mathbb{B} \times \mathbb{B})$  either. This proves that  $< \cap (\mathbb{B} \times \mathbb{B})$  is irreflexive.

Page 4

G. Tourlakis

- Transitive: Let (x, y) and (y, z) be in  $< \cap (\mathbb{B} \times \mathbb{B})$ . So,
  - (a) the two pairs are in  $\mathbb{B} \times \mathbb{B}$  in particular, and thus, all of x, y, z are in  $\mathbb{B}$ .
  - (b) the two pairs are also in < and since this is an order (hence transitive) we have  $(x, z) \in <$ .

Since x, z are in  $\mathbb{B}$  by item (a), we have  $(x, z) \in (\mathbb{B} \times \mathbb{B})$ . This and the previous sentence imply that  $(x, z) \in \langle \cap (\mathbb{B} \times \mathbb{B}) \rangle$ . Done.

7. Suppose we know that <u>each</u> of  $A_n$ ,  $n \ge 0$ , is <u>countable</u>.

Then do the following:

- (a) (3 MARKS) Prove that  $\{A_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is a set. If you used some of the Principles 0–3 in this subquestion, be explicit! *Hint.* The countability of the  $A_n$  is irrelevant to this subquestion. *Proof.* Each  $A_n$  has a unique label from  $\mathbb{N}$ . Since that qualifies the assignment of these labels/indices as a valid labelling (no two different sets among the  $A_i$  have the same label) and since the label class  $\mathbb{N}$ is a set, then by Principle 3, the family  $F = \{A_0, A_1, A_2, A_3, \ldots\}$  is a set.  $\Box$
- (b) (4 MARKS) Prove that  $\bigcup \{A_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\} = \bigcup_{i \ge 0} A_i$  is countable. **Proof.** Let  $A_n$  be enumerated as

$$A_n = \left\{ a_{n,0}, a_{n,1}, a_{n,2}, a_{n,3}, \dots \right\}$$

Arrange all these enumerations as rows in an infinite  $\times$  infinite Matrix and traverse as shown by the NE arrows to effect an enumeration of  $\bigcup \{A_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}.$ 

G. Tourlakis

Page 5

(c) (2 MARKS) Did you need the Axiom of Choice in any of the two subquestions above?

Explain WHY clearly —in a FEW words— you had to, or did not have to.

Answer. The Axiom of Choice is technically needed in the above subquestion (b) only. Each  $A_n$  has infinitely many enumerations and I need to choose ONE row out of EACH ONE of these infinitely many enumerations. A mathematical "agent" that will do this for me is the Axiom of Choice.

While we must be <u>aware</u> when the Axiom is **needed** (namely, when I am facing in my *PROOF* infinitely many choices that I *CANNOT* describe *FINITELY*), nevertheless in this introductory course we are content with just <u>awareness</u>. We are not asked to, and we do not explicitly, show how exactly we <u>use</u> the Axiom.

- 8. (a) (1 MARK) What does the name V stand for?
  Answer. This is the proper class of <u>all sets</u>. It is U with all atoms removed.
  - (b) (6 MARKS) Prove that the relation  $\sim \underline{\text{on}} \mathbb{V}$  is symmetric, transitive and reflexive.

## Proof.

- **Reflexive** For any  $A \in \mathbb{V}$ , I have  $A \sim A$ . The identity function  $\mathbf{1}_A : A \to A$  is the 1-1 correspondence in this case.
- **Symmetric** Let  $A \sim B$  because  $f : A \to B$  is a 1-1 correspondence. We saw (in Exercise 5) that  $f^{-1} : B \to A$  is also a 1-1 correspondence. Thus  $B \sim A$ .
- **Transitive** Let  $f : A \to B$  and  $g : B \to C$  be 1-1 correspondences. Then so is  $gf : A \to C$ , i.e.,  $A \stackrel{gf}{\sim} C$ . Indeed,  $gf : A \to C$  is total, 1-1, and onto.

Page 6

G. Tourlakis

**Total** Is  $gf(x) \downarrow$  for all  $x \in A$ ? Well, gf(x) = g(f(x)) and  $f(x) \downarrow$ . So f(x) is an object in B. But  $g(b) \downarrow$  for all objects in B. So  $g(f(x)) \downarrow$  for all  $x \in A$ .

Onto We want to show that the equation

$$gf(x) = c \tag{1}$$

has an x-solution for all  $c \in C$ . Well, g(y) = c has solutions for all  $c \in C$  since g is onto C. We can now solve (1):

- First find  $y \in B$  for g(y) = c. I can do that as g is onto.
- As f is onto B, <u>I can find</u>  $x \in A$  so that f(x) = y.

We have g(f(x)) = g(y) = c. We solved (1) —solution is x— since fg(x) = f(g(x)) = c.

**1-1** Prove that gf or  $f \circ g$  is 1-1. Assume, in relational notation that

$$xf \circ g\mathbf{z} \wedge yf \circ g\mathbf{z} \tag{2}$$

and prove x = y. First, (2) implies that xfwgz for some wand yfugz for some u.

Since g is 1-1, we have w = u. Then we have xfw and yfw. Since f is 1-1, it is x = y. Done.