

Set Theory vs Boolean Functions

by Sven Nilsen, 2019

Using Higher Order Operator Overloading^[1] (HOOO), one can compare operations in Set Theory^[2] with their equivalent operations using Boolean Functions^[3]:

	Set Theory	HOOO
Set membership	$a \ni b$	$b(a)$
Union	$a \cup b$	$a \vee b$
Intersect	$a \cap b$	$a \wedge b$
Exclude	$a \setminus b$	$a \wedge \neg b$
Subset	$a \subseteq b$	$\forall x \{ (a \Rightarrow b)(x) \}$
Strict subset	$a \subset b$	$\forall x \{ (a \Rightarrow b)(x) \} \wedge \neg \forall x \{ (b \Rightarrow a)(x) \}$

Notation:

\vee	Logical gate OR
\wedge	Logical gate AND
\neg	Logical gate NOT
\Rightarrow	Logical gate IMPLY (material implication)
\forall	For-all loop

From this overview, it is easy to see that “subset” and “strict subset” are computationally expensive.

The strict subset property can be proven from another definition:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\forall x \{ (a \Rightarrow b)(x) \} \wedge \exists x \{ (b \wedge \neg a)(x) \} \\
 &\forall x \{ (a \Rightarrow b)(x) \} \wedge \neg \forall x \{ \neg(b \wedge \neg a)(x) \} \\
 &\forall x \{ (a \Rightarrow b)(x) \} \wedge \neg \forall x \{ (\neg b \vee a)(x) \} \\
 &\forall x \{ (a \Rightarrow b)(x) \} \wedge \neg \forall x \{ (b \Rightarrow a)(x) \}
 \end{aligned}$$

References:

- [1] “Higher Order Operator Overloading”
Sven Nilsen, 2018
https://github.com/advancedresearch/path_semantics/blob/master/papers-wip/higher-order-operator-overloading.pdf

- [2] “Set theory”
Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Set_theory

- [3] “Boolean function”
Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Boolean_function