

- Last time :
- relations : def and notation (a relation on a set $A \leftrightarrow$ a subset $R \subseteq A \times A$)
 - def of equivalence relations : relations that are reflexive, symmetric, and transitive.

Today : More on equivalence relations :

- Verifying a relation is an equivalence relation
- partitions from equivalence classes.

1. Verifying a relation is an equivalence relation

E.g. 1. (Congruence, e.g. 11.13) Let $A = \mathbb{Z}$ and let n be an arbitrary pos. int.

Define xRy for $x, y \in A$ if $x \equiv y \pmod{n}$.

Claim: R is an equivalence relation.

E.g. if $n=5$, then $27R12$ since $27 \equiv 12 \pmod{5}$, and similarly $18R3$.

Pf of the claim: We check that R is reflexive, symm, and transitive.

Ref: We need to show $xRx \forall x \in \mathbb{Z}$, i.e., that $x \equiv x \pmod{n} \forall x \in \mathbb{Z}$.

This is true since $n \mid 0 = x - x \forall x \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Symm: We need to show that if xRy for some $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$, then yRx . So suppose

xRy . then $x \equiv y \pmod{n}$, i.e., $n \mid x - y$. But then $n \mid -(x - y) = y - x$, therefore $y \equiv x \pmod{n}$
and yRx .

Tran. We need to show that if xRy and yRz for some $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}$, then xRz .

Suppose xRy and yRz . Then $n|x-y$ and $m|y-z$. So

$n|(x-y) + (y-z) = x-z$, therefore $x \equiv z \pmod{n}$, i.e., xRz .

It follows that R is an equivalence relation.

E.g. 2. (fractions, P. 213) Let $A = \left\{ \frac{m}{n} \mid m, n \in \mathbb{Z}, n \neq 0 \right\}$. Consider the relation R on A defined by " $\frac{a}{b} R \frac{c}{d}$ if $ad = bc \ \forall \frac{a}{b}, \frac{c}{d} \in A$ ".

Prove that R is an equivalence rel.

E.g. $\frac{2}{5} R \frac{6}{15}$ since $2 \cdot 15 = 5 \cdot 6$, $\frac{1}{3} R \frac{7}{21}$ since $1 \cdot 21 = 3 \cdot 7$.

$\frac{0}{4} R \frac{0}{17}$ since $0 \cdot 17 = 0 \cdot 4$. ("R is just 'being equal'")

Pf.: We check that R is reflexive, symm. and transitive.

(1). Take $x \in A$. Then $x = \frac{a}{b}$ for some $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$, $b \neq 0$.

We need to show that xRx , i.e., $\frac{a}{b} R \frac{a}{b}$. This holds since $\underline{ab} = \underline{ab}$.

a) Suppose xRy for some $x, y \in A$, say $x = \frac{a}{b}$ and $y = \frac{c}{d}$ for some $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}$ ($b \neq 0, d \neq 0$). Since $\frac{a}{b} R \frac{c}{d}$, we have $ad = bc$.⁽¹⁾

To prove yRx , we need $\frac{c}{d} R \frac{a}{b}$, i.e. we need $cb = da$,⁽²⁾ which holds by (1),

so yRx .

(3). Suppose xRy and yRz for some $x, y, z \in A$, say w/ $x = \frac{a}{b}$, $y = \frac{c}{d}$, $z = \frac{e}{f}$ for some $a, b, c, d, e, f \in \mathbb{Z}$ with b, d, f nonzero. Since xRy , we have $ad = bc$;⁽³⁾ since yRz , we have $cf = de$.⁽⁴⁾ Equations (3), (4) imply $adcf = bcde$.⁽⁵⁾

We need to show that $\times \mathbb{R} \mathbb{Z}$, i.e., $af = be$. (Know: $adcf \stackrel{(5)}{=} bcde$)

We discuss cases:

(i) If $dc \neq 0$, then we can divide both sides of (5) by dc to get $af = be$.

(ii) If $dc = 0$, then $c = 0$ since $d \neq 0$.

Since $ad = bc = b \cdot 0 = 0$ and $0 = 0 \cdot f = cf = de$ and $d \neq 0$.

It follows that $a = 0$ and $e = 0$, so we have $af = be = 0$.

By (1), (2), and (3), R is an equivalence relation. \square

Point: The equivalence classes of R in $A = \mathbb{Z}$ are exactly the rational numbers,

$$\text{e.g., } \frac{3}{5} \leftrightarrow \left[\frac{3}{5} \right] = \left\{ \frac{6}{10}, \frac{-6}{-10}, \frac{30}{50}, \dots \dots \right\}$$

so R gives us a way of "constructing the rational numbers from integers".

2. HW discussion

induction vs. strong induction:

difference \rightarrow inductive step.

\swarrow
induction.

assume S_k and prove S_{k+1}
using S_k alone

\searrow
strong induction

assume all of S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k have all
been proved and prove S_{k+1} using all
of S_1, \dots, S_k .