CS 207 Discrete Mathematics – 2012-2013

Nutan Limaye

Indian Institute of Technology, Bombay nutan@cse.iitb.ac.in

Mathematical Reasoning and Mathematical Objects Lecture 3: Mathematical structures Aug 01, 2012

THE 1 1

Last time

990

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶

Recap

• The principle of induction: we proved that $\forall i, j \in \mathbb{N}, f(i, j) < i + 1$, where $f(i, j) = \sqrt{i\sqrt{i + 1 \dots \sqrt{j - 1\sqrt{j}}}}$.

Recap

- The principle of induction: we proved that $\forall i, j \in \mathbb{N}, f(i, j) < i + 1$, where $f(i, j) = \sqrt{i\sqrt{i + 1 \dots \sqrt{j - 1\sqrt{j}}}}$.
- Take back message: be careful when proving statements by induction.

Mathematical Structures

sets, functions, relations, graphs ...

A set can be vaguely defined as a collection of objects.

A set can be vaguely defined as a collection of objects. But vague definitions can lead to problems.

A set can be vaguely defined as a collection of objects. But vague definitions can lead to problems.

The barber's dilema

nac

A set can be vaguely defined as a collection of objects. But vague definitions can lead to problems.

The barber's dilema

Once upon a time there was a kingdom in which the king ordered the barber to shave only those who do not shave themselves!

A set can be vaguely defined as a collection of objects. But vague definitions can lead to problems.

The barber's dilema

Once upon a time there was a kingdom in which the king ordered the barber to shave only those who do not shave themselves! Of course, barber could neither shave himself and nor could he not shave himself!

A set can be vaguely defined as a collection of objects. But vague definitions can lead to problems.

The barber's dilema

Once upon a time there was a kingdom in which the king ordered the barber to shave only those who do not shave themselves!

Of course, barber could neither shave himself and nor could he not shave himself!

This is called a paradox.

A set can be vaguely defined as a collection of objects. But vague definitions can lead to problems.

Cantor was the first person to define sets formally – finite sets as well as infinite sets, and prove important properties related to sets. Let P be a property then he said any collection of objects which satisfy property P is a set, i.e. $S = \{x \mid P(x)\}.$

A set can be vaguely defined as a collection of objects. But vague definitions can lead to problems.

Cantor was the first person to define sets formally – finite sets as well as infinite sets, and prove important properties related to sets. Let P be a property then he said any collection of objects which satisfy property P is a set, i.e. $S = \{x \mid P(x)\}.$

A set can be vaguely defined as a collection of objects. But vague definitions can lead to problems.

Russell's paradox:

 $A = \{X \mid X \notin X\}$ Now if $A \in A$ then $A \notin A$ and if $A \notin A$ then $A \in A$!

A set can be vaguely defined as a collection of objects. But vague definitions can lead to problems.

Russell's paradox:

 $A = \{X \mid X \notin X\}$ Now if $A \in A$ then $A \notin A$ and if $A \notin A$ then $A \in A$!

A set can be vaguely defined as a collection of objects. But vague definitions can lead to problems.

(CW) Can you come up with a set that contains itself?

A set can be vaguely defined as a collection of objects. But vague definitions can lead to problems.

How to get around this paradox?

Definition

Start with a few objects *defined* as sets. Now if A is a set and P is a property, then $S = \{x \in A \mid P(x)\}$ is also a set.

A set can be vaguely defined as a collection of objects. But vague definitions can lead to problems.

How to get around this paradox?

Definition

Start with a few objects *defined* as sets. Now if A is a set and P is a property, then $S = \{x \in A \mid P(x)\}$ is also a set.

Why does this definition get rid of Russell's paradox?

• Let $P(x) = x \notin x$. Suppose A is a set and let $S = \{x \in A \mid x \notin x\}$.

A set can be vaguely defined as a collection of objects. But vague definitions can lead to problems.

How to get around this paradox?

Definition

Start with a few objects *defined* as sets. Now if A is a set and P is a property, then $S = \{x \in A \mid P(x)\}$ is also a set.

Why does this definition get rid of Russell's paradox?

- Let $P(x) = x \notin x$. Suppose A is a set and let $S = \{x \in A \mid x \notin x\}$.
 - (S ∈ S:) from the definition of S, S ∈ A and S ∉ S, which is a contradiction.
 - (S ∉ S:) from the definition, either S ∉ A or S ∈ S. But we have assumed that S ∉ S, therefore it must mean S ∉ A. There is no contradiction!

A set can be vaguely defined as a collection of objects. But vague definitions can lead to problems.

How to get around this paradox?

Definition

Start with a few objects *defined* as sets. Now if A is a set and P is a property, then $S = \{x \in A \mid P(x)\}$ is also a set.

Why does this definition get rid of Russell's paradox?

- Let $P(x) = x \notin x$. Suppose A is a set and let $S = \{x \in A \mid x \notin x\}$.
 - ▶ $(S \in S$:) from the definition of *S*, $S \in A$ and $S \notin S$, which is a contradiction.
 - (S ∉ S:) from the definition, either S ∉ A or S ∈ S. But we have assumed that S ∉ S, therefore it must mean S ∉ A. There is no contradiction!

How to get around Barber's paradox? (CW)

Sac

A D F A D F A D F A D F

• We have already seen sets such as $\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}$ etc.

- We have already seen sets such as $\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}$ etc.
- Let A, B be two sets. Their cartesian product, $A \times B$, is defined as $A \times B = \{(a, b) \mid a \in A, b \in B\}$
- Similarly, union, intersection, symmetric difference are defined as:
 A ∪ B = {x | a ∈ A or x ∈ B}
 A ∩ B = {x | a ∈ A and x ∈ B}
 A ⊕ B = {x | (x ∈ A ∧ x ∉ B) ∨ (x ∈ B ∧ x ∉ A)}

- We have already seen sets such as $\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}$ etc.
- Let A, B be two sets. Their cartesian product, $A \times B$, is defined as $A \times B = \{(a, b) \mid a \in A, b \in B\}$
- Similarly, union, intersection, symmetric difference are defined as: $A \cup B = \{x \mid a \in A \text{ or } x \in B\}$ $A \cap B = \{x \mid a \in A \text{ and } x \in B\}$ $A \oplus B = \{x \mid (x \in A \land x \notin B) \lor (x \in B \land x \notin A)\}$ $\land : \text{ and}$ $\lor : \text{ or}$

- We have already seen sets such as $\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}$ etc.
- Let A, B be two sets. Their cartesian product, $A \times B$, is defined as $A \times B = \{(a, b) \mid a \in A, b \in B\}$
- Similarly, union, intersection, symmetric difference are defined as: $A \cup B = \{x \mid a \in A \text{ or } x \in B\}$ $A \cap B = \{x \mid a \in A \text{ and } x \in B\}$ $A \oplus B = \{x \mid (x \in A \land x \notin B) \lor (x \in B \land x \notin A)\}$
- Let U be the universe. The complement of a set A with respect to the universe U, denoted as Ā or A^c = {x ∈ U | x ∉ A}.

- We have already seen sets such as $\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}$ etc.
- Let A, B be two sets. Their cartesian product, $A \times B$, is defined as $A \times B = \{(a, b) \mid a \in A, b \in B\}$
- Similarly, union, intersection, symmetric difference are defined as: $A \cup B = \{x \mid a \in A \text{ or } x \in B\}$ $A \cap B = \{x \mid a \in A \text{ and } x \in B\}$ $A \oplus B = \{x \mid (x \in A \land x \notin B) \lor (x \in B \land x \notin A)\}$
- Let U be the universe. The complement of a set A with respect to the universe U, denoted as Ā or A^c = {x ∈ U | x ∉ A}.
- The powerset, $\mathcal{P}(A)$, of a set A is defined to be a collection of all subsets of A.

- We have already seen sets such as $\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}$ etc.
- Let A, B be two sets. Their cartesian product, $A \times B$, is defined as $A \times B = \{(a, b) \mid a \in A, b \in B\}$
- Similarly, union, intersection, symmetric difference are defined as: $A \cup B = \{x \mid a \in A \text{ or } x \in B\}$ $A \cap B = \{x \mid a \in A \text{ and } x \in B\}$ $A \oplus B = \{x \mid (x \in A \land x \notin B) \lor (x \in B \land x \notin A)\}$
- Let U be the universe. The complement of a set A with respect to the universe U, denoted as Ā or A^c = {x ∈ U | x ∉ A}.
- The powerset, $\mathcal{P}(A)$, of a set A is defined to be a collection of all subsets of A.

Example: Let $A = \{a, b\}$ then $\mathcal{P}(A) = \{\emptyset, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{a, b\}\}$

 We have already seen infinite sets: Examples: N, Z, R, Q.

∃ >

- We have already seen infinite sets: Examples: N, Z, R, Q.
- How do we measure the size of any set? For a set S, finite or infinite,
 |S| denotes the size of that set. It is also called the *cardinality* of the set.

- We have already seen infinite sets: Examples: N, Z, R, Q.
- How do we measure the size of any set? For a set S, finite or infinite,
 |S| denotes the size of that set. It is also called the *cardinality* of the set.
- For a finite set, |S| equals the number of elements in S.

- We have already seen infinite sets: Examples: N, Z, R, Q.
- How do we measure the size of any set? For a set S, finite or infinite,
 |S| denotes the size of that set. It is also called the *cardinality* of the set.
- For a finite set, |S| equals the number of elements in S.
- What about infinite sets?

- We have already seen infinite sets: Examples: N, Z, R, Q.
- How do we measure the size of any set? For a set S, finite or infinite,
 |S| denotes the size of that set. It is also called the *cardinality* of the set.
- For a finite set, |S| equals the number of elements in S.
- What about infinite sets?
- Given two infinite sets, can we talk about one being *bigger* than the other? If so, how?

Definition

Let A, B be two sets. A function from A to $B, f : A \rightarrow B$, is a set defined as follows:

Definition

Let A, B be two sets. A function from A to $B, f : A \rightarrow B$, is a set defined as follows:

 $f = \{(a, b) \mid a \in A, b \in B\}$ with an additional property that if $(a, b) \in f$ and $(a, c) \in f$ then b = c.

• Here, b is called an image of a, denoted as f(a) = b.

Definition

Let A, B be two sets. A function from A to $B, f : A \rightarrow B$, is a set defined as follows:

- Here, b is called an image of a, denoted as f(a) = b.
- $Range(f) = \{b \in B \mid \exists a \in A \text{ s.t. } f(a) = b\}$

Definition

Let A, B be two sets. A function from A to $B, f : A \rightarrow B$, is a set defined as follows:

- Here, b is called an image of a, denoted as f(a) = b.
- $Range(f) = \{b \in B \mid \exists a \in A \text{ s.t. } f(a) = b\} \subseteq B$

Definition

Let A, B be two sets. A function from A to $B, f : A \rightarrow B$, is a set defined as follows:

- Here, b is called an image of a, denoted as f(a) = b.
- $Range(f) = \{b \in B \mid \exists a \in A \text{ s.t. } f(a) = b\} \subseteq B$ \subseteq : Subset of

Definition

Let A, B be two sets. A function from A to $B, f : A \rightarrow B$, is a set defined as follows:

- Here, b is called an image of a, denoted as f(a) = b.
- $Range(f) = \{b \in B \mid \exists a \in A \text{ s.t. } f(a) = b\} \subseteq B$
- Domain(f) = A

Definition

Let A, B be two sets. A function from A to $B, f : A \rightarrow B$, is a set defined as follows:

- Here, b is called an image of a, denoted as f(a) = b.
- $Range(f) = \{b \in B \mid \exists a \in A \text{ s.t. } f(a) = b\} \subseteq B$
- Domain(f) = A

Injective function, one-to-one: A function f : A → B is said to be injective if ∀x, y ∈ A if f(x) = f(y) then x = y.

Injective function, one-to-one: A function f : A → B is said to be injective if ∀x, y ∈ A if f(x) = f(y) then x = y.

▶ Is $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$, defined as f(n) = n + 1 injective?

- Injective function, one-to-one: A function f : A → B is said to be injective if ∀x, y ∈ A if f(x) = f(y) then x = y.
 - ▶ Is $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$, defined as f(n) = n + 1 injective?
 - ▶ Is $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$, defined as $f(n) = n^2$ injective?

- Injective function, one-to-one: A function f : A → B is said to be injective if ∀x, y ∈ A if f(x) = f(y) then x = y.
 - ▶ Is $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$, defined as f(n) = n + 1 injective?
 - ▶ Is $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$, defined as $f(n) = n^2$ injective?
 - What about $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$, defined as $f(n) = \sqrt{n}$?

- Injective function, one-to-one: A function f : A → B is said to be injective if ∀x, y ∈ A if f(x) = f(y) then x = y.
- Surjective function, onto: A function f : A → B is said to be surjective if ∀x ∈ B ∃a ∈ A such that f(a) = x.
- Bijective function: A function is said to be bijective if it is surjective and injective.

- Injective function, one-to-one: A function f : A → B is said to be injective if ∀x, y ∈ A if f(x) = f(y) then x = y.
- Surjective function, onto: A function f : A → B is said to be surjective if ∀x ∈ B ∃a ∈ A such that f(a) = x.
 - ▶ Is $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$, defined as f(n) = n + 1 surjective?
 - ▶ Is $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$, defined as $f(n) = n^2$ surjective?
 - What about $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, defined as f(x) = 10x 7?

- Injective function, one-to-one: A function f : A → B is said to be injective if ∀x, y ∈ A if f(x) = f(y) then x = y.
- Surjective function, onto: A function f : A → B is said to be surjective if ∀x ∈ B ∃a ∈ A such that f(a) = x.
 - ▶ Is $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$, defined as f(n) = n + 1 surjective?
 - ▶ Is $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$, defined as $f(n) = n^2$ surjective?
 - What about $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, defined as f(x) = 10x 7?

- Injective function, one-to-one: A function f : A → B is said to be injective if ∀x, y ∈ A if f(x) = f(y) then x = y.
- Surjective function, onto: A function f : A → B is said to be surjective if ∀x ∈ B ∃a ∈ A such that f(a) = x.
 - ▶ Is $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$, defined as f(n) = n + 1 surjective?
 - ▶ Is $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$, defined as $f(n) = n^2$ surjective?
 - What about $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, defined as f(x) = 10x 7?
- Bijective function: A function is said to be bijective if it is surjective and injective.

- Injective function, one-to-one: A function f : A → B is said to be injective if ∀x, y ∈ A if f(x) = f(y) then x = y.
- Surjective function, onto: A function f : A → B is said to be surjective if ∀x ∈ B ∃a ∈ A such that f(a) = x.
- Bijective function: A function is said to be bijective if it is surjective and injective.

- Injective function, one-to-one: A function f : A → B is said to be injective if ∀x, y ∈ A if f(x) = f(y) then x = y.
- Surjective function, onto: A function f : A → B is said to be surjective if ∀x ∈ B ∃a ∈ A such that f(a) = x.
- Bijective function: A function is said to be bijective if it is surjective and injective.
 - ▶ Is $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$, defined as f(n) = n + 1 bijective?
 - ▶ Is $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$, defined as $f(n) = n^2$ bijective?
 - What about $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, defined as f(x) = 10x 7?

- Injective function, one-to-one: A function f : A → B is said to be injective if ∀x, y ∈ A if f(x) = f(y) then x = y.
- Surjective function, onto: A function f : A → B is said to be surjective if ∀x ∈ B ∃a ∈ A such that f(a) = x.
- Bijective function: A function is said to be bijective if it is surjective and injective.
 - ▶ Is $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$, defined as f(n) = n + 1 bijective?
 - ▶ Is $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$, defined as $f(n) = n^2$ bijective?
 - What about $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, defined as f(x) = 10x 7?

- Injective function, one-to-one: A function f : A → B is said to be injective if ∀x, y ∈ A if f(x) = f(y) then x = y.
- Surjective function, onto: A function f : A → B is said to be surjective if ∀x ∈ B ∃a ∈ A such that f(a) = x.
- Bijective function: A function is said to be bijective if it is surjective and injective.
 - ▶ Is $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$, defined as f(n) = n + 1 bijective?
 - ▶ Is $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$, defined as $f(n) = n^2$ bijective?
 - What about $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, defined as f(x) = 10x 7?

We will understand the notion of size of an infinite set in a relative sense.

Definition

We say that two sets A,B have the same size if and only if there is a bijection between A and B

We will understand the notion of size of an infinite set in a relative sense.

Definition

We say that two sets A, B have the same size if and only if there is a bijection between A and B

Examples

• Let E be a set of even numbers. There is a bijection between E and $\mathbb N$

We will understand the notion of size of an infinite set in a relative sense.

Definition

We say that two sets A, B have the same size if and only if there is a bijection between A and B

Examples

• Let *E* be a set of even numbers. There is a bijection between *E* and \mathbb{N} $f(x) = 2x, f : \mathbb{N} \to E$.

We will understand the notion of size of an infinite set in a relative sense.

Definition

We say that two sets A, B have the same size if and only if there is a bijection between A and B

Examples

- Let E be a set of even numbers. There is a bijection between E and $\mathbb N$
- There is a bijection $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{N}$

We will understand the notion of size of an infinite set in a relative sense.

Definition

We say that two sets A, B have the same size if and only if there is a bijection between A and B

Examples

• Let E be a set of even numbers. There is a bijection between E and $\mathbb N$

• There is a bijection
$$f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{N}$$

 $f(x) = \begin{cases} -2x & \text{if } x \leq 0 \\ 2x - 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

We will understand the notion of size of an infinite set in a relative sense.

Definition

We say that two sets A, B have the same size if and only if there is a bijection between A and B

Examples

- Let E be a set of even numbers. There is a bijection between E and $\mathbb N$
- There is a bijection $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{N}$
- There is a bijection $f : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$

We will understand the notion of size of an infinite set in a relative sense.

Definition

We say that two sets A, B have the same size if and only if there is a bijection between A and B

Examples

- Let E be a set of even numbers. There is a bijection between E and $\mathbb N$
- There is a bijection $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{N}$
- There is a bijection $f : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$