

## Exercises for Module 2: Set Theory

1 Let  $A = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x < 100\}$ ,  $B = \{x \in \mathbb{Z} : |x| \geq 20\}$ , and  $C = \{y \in \mathbb{N} : y \text{ is prime}\}$  ( $A, B, C \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ ). Find  $A \cap B$ ,  $B^c \cap C$ ,  $B \cup C$ , and  $(A \cup B)^c$ .

$$A \cap B = \{x \in \mathbb{Z} : (x \leq -20) \wedge (20 \leq x < 100)\}$$

$$B^c = (-20, 20) \cup \{x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Z} : |x| \geq 20\}$$

$$B^c \cap C = \{y \in \mathbb{N} : y \text{ is prime and } y < 20\}$$

$$B \cup C = \{x \in \mathbb{Z} : |x| \geq 20\} \cup \{y \in \mathbb{N} : y \text{ is prime and } y < 20\}$$

$$A \cup B = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : (x < 100) \vee (x \in \mathbb{Z} \wedge x \geq 100)\}$$

$$(A \cup B)^c = \{x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Z} : x > 100\}$$

2. Is  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$  with the ordering  $(x_1, y_1) \preceq (x_2, y_2)$  if  $x_1 \leq x_2$  a partially ordered set?

No. Take  $(x_1, y_1) = (2, -1)$  and  $(x_2, y_2) = (2, 8)$ .

Then we have  $(2, -1) \preceq (2, 8)$  and  $(2, 8) \preceq (2, -1)$   
but  $(2, -1) \neq (2, 8)$ .

The ordering is not anti-symmetric  $\Rightarrow$  not  
a partial order.

3. Let  $S$  be a non-empty set. A relation  $R$  on  $S$  is called an equivalence relation if it is

- (i) Reflexive:  $(x, x) \in R$  for all  $x \in S$
- (ii) Symmetric: if  $(x, y) \in R$  then  $(y, x) \in R$  for all  $x, y \in S$
- (iii) Transitive: if  $(x, y), (y, z) \in R$  then  $(x, z) \in R$  for all  $x, y, z \in S$

Given  $x \in S$ , the equivalence class of  $x$  (with respect to a given equivalence relation  $R$ ) is defined to consist of those  $y \in S$  for which  $(x, y) \in R$ . Show that two equivalence classes are either disjoint or identical.

Let  $x_1, x_2 \in S$  such that  $x_1 \neq x_2$ . Let  $E_1$  be the equivalence class of  $x_1$  and  $E_2$  be the equivalence class of  $x_2$ .

Note that any two sets are either disjoint or not disjoint. If  $E_1$  &  $E_2$  are disjoint, we are done. So we assume  $E_1$  and  $E_2$  are not disjoint, with the goal of showing that they are identical.

Since we assumed  $E_1, E_2$  are not disjoint,  $\exists y \in S$  such that  $y \in E_1$  and  $y \in E_2$ , i.e.,  $(x_1, y) \in R$  and  $(x_2, y) \in R$ .

Let  $z \in E_1$ .  $(\Rightarrow) (x_1, z) \in R$  by definition.

$(\Rightarrow) (y, z) \in R$  by symmetry & transitivity  $\left( \begin{matrix} (x_1, y) \in R \\ (x_2, y) \in R \end{matrix} \right)$

$(\Rightarrow) (x_2, z) \in R$  by symmetry & transitivity  $\left( \begin{matrix} (x_1, y) \in R \\ (x_2, y) \in R \end{matrix} \right)$

$(\Rightarrow) z \in E_2$ .

Therefore  $E_1 = E_2$ .

4. Let  $(X, \leq)$  be a partially ordered set and  $S \subseteq X$  be bounded. Show that the infimum and supremum of  $S$  are unique (if they exist).

Proof that the supremum is unique (infimum is similar):

Let  $(X, \leq)$  be a partially ordered set and  $S \subseteq X$  bounded. Suppose in order to derive a contradiction that  $S$  has two suprema:  $r_1$  and  $r_2$ .

By the definition of supremum, since  $r_1$  is the sup and  $r_2$  is another upper bound,  $r_1 \leq r_2$ .

Similarly, since  $r_2$  is the sup and  $r_1$  is an upper bound,  $r_2 \leq r_1$ .

By anti-symmetry of the partial order  $\leq$ ,  $r_1 = r_2$ .  
Thus if a partially ordered set has a supremum, it must be unique.

5. Let  $S, T \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  and suppose both are bounded above. Define  $S + T = \{s + t : s \in S, t \in T\}$ . Show that  $S + T$  is bounded above and  $\sup(S + T) = \sup S + \sup T$ .

Proof. Since both  $S$  &  $T$  are bounded above, they both have a supremum. Let  $x = \sup S$  and  $y = \sup T$ . By definition,  $s \leq x \forall s \in S$  and  $t \leq y \forall t \in T$ . Therefore  $s + t \leq x + y \forall s \in S, \forall t \in T$ , so  $s + t$  is an upper bound for  $S + T$  (i.e.,  $S + T$  is bounded above).

Claim:  $\sup(S + T) = x + y$ . We use the characterization of  $\sup$  from Prop 2.22. We have already shown that  $s + t$  is an upper bound for  $S + T$ , so it remains to show that  $\forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists s + t \in (S + T)$  such that  $x + y - \varepsilon < s + t$ .

Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be arbitrary.

Since  $x = \sup S$ ,  $\exists s \in S$  such that  $x - \varepsilon/2 < s$ . ①

Since  $y = \sup T$ ,  $\exists t \in T$  such that  $y - \varepsilon/2 < t$ . ②

Thus  $\exists s \in S, \exists t \in T$  such that  $x + y - \varepsilon < s + t$ .  $\therefore \sup(S + T) = \sup(S) + \sup(T)$

6. Let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ ,  $X, Y \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , be defined by the map  $x \mapsto \sin(x)$ . For what choices of  $X$  and  $Y$  is  $f$  injective, surjective, bijective, or neither?

Solution is not unique. Here is one solution.

injective:  $X = [-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ ,  $Y = \mathbb{R}$

surjective:  $X = \mathbb{R}$ ,  $Y = [-1, 1]$

bijective:  $X = [-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ ,  $Y = [-1, 1]$

neither:  $X = \mathbb{R}$ ,  $Y = \mathbb{R}$