

Preliminaries from Set Theory and Logic

Part 1

Rafael Reno S. Cantuba, PhD
MTH541M - Bridging Course for Real Analysis / Advanced Calculus

Recall: Logical Connectives

p	$\neg p$
T	F
F	T

p	q	$p \wedge q$	$p \vee q$	$p \Rightarrow q$	$p \Leftrightarrow q$	$p \oplus q$
T	T	T	T	T	T	F
T	F	F	T	F	F	T
F	T	F	T	T	F	T
F	F	F	F	T	T	F

The most important logical connective in Pure Math: The Mathematicians Arrow " \Rightarrow "

① The Conditional

① Usage: $p \Rightarrow q$ means any of the following:

- ① If p , then q .
- ② p implies q .
- ③ q if p .
- ④ p only if q .
- ⑤ q follows from p .
- ⑥ p entails q .
- ⑦ A sufficient condition for q is p .
- ⑧ A necessary condition for p is q .

② Defining property: $p \Rightarrow q$ is false in one and only one combination of values: $p \equiv T$ and $q \equiv F$.

③ Terminology: Given $p \Rightarrow q$, we have the following names:

- ① for p : *hypothesis, antecedent, premise*
- ② for q : *conclusion, consequent, consequence*

The Disjunctive Form of the Conditional

Theorem 1

For any propositions p , q , we have

$$p \Rightarrow q \equiv \neg p \vee q.$$

[For the proof, truth tables may be used.]

Negation of a Conditional: Use De Morgan's Laws on the Disjunctive Form

Theorem 2

For any propositions p, q , we have

$$\neg(p \Rightarrow q) \equiv p \wedge \neg q.$$

The Converse and the Contrapositive

Definition 3

- 1 The *converse* of the conditional statement $p \Rightarrow q$ is the statement

$$q \Rightarrow p.$$

- 2 The *contrapositive* of the conditional statement $p \Rightarrow q$ is the statement

$$\neg q \Rightarrow \neg p.$$

- 1 A conditional statement is NOT logically equivalent to its converse.
- 2 A conditional statement is logically equivalent to its contrapositive.

Tautologies and Contradictions

Definition 4

A statement that is always true is called *tautology*.

Corollary: Two propositions are logically equivalent iff their biconditional is a tautology.

Definition 5

A statement that is always false is called a *contradiction*.

Definition 6

A statement that is neither a tautology nor a contradiction is a *contingency*.

Arguments

Definition 7

An *argument* is a compound proposition of the form

$$(p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge p_n) \Rightarrow q$$

where the propositions p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n are called the *premises* of the argument and the proposition q is called the *conclusion* of the argument.

Notation

We write an argument $(p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge p_n) \Rightarrow q$ as

$$\begin{array}{c} p_1 \\ p_2 \\ \vdots \\ p_n \\ \hline \therefore q \end{array}$$

Notation

We write an argument $(p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge p_n) \Rightarrow q$ as

$$p_1$$
$$p_2$$
$$\vdots$$
$$p_n$$
$$\hline \therefore q$$

The original expression $(p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge p_n) \Rightarrow q$ is called the *propositional form* of the argument.

Arguments

Given the argument:

$$\begin{array}{c} p_1 \\ p_2 \\ p_3 \\ p_4 \\ \hline \therefore q \end{array}$$

Are the following arguments different?

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & p_1 & \\ & p_2 & \\ p_2 & & p_2 \\ p_1 & p_1 & p_2 \\ p_3 & p_2 \wedge p_3 & p_3 \\ p_4 & p_4 & p_4 \\ \hline \therefore q & \therefore q & \therefore q \end{array}$$

Valid and Invalid Arguments

Definition 8

An argument is *valid* if its propositional form is a tautology. Otherwise, [if the propositional form is a contingency *or* a contradiction], the argument is said to be *invalid*, or to be a *fallacy*.

Example 9

Fallacy of the Converse [Fallacy of Affirming the Conclusion]

$$\begin{array}{r} q \\ p \Rightarrow q \\ \hline \therefore p \end{array}$$

Some Standard Valid Arguments: The Rules of Inference

$$\begin{array}{lcl} \text{Modus ponens:} & \frac{p}{p \Rightarrow q} & \text{Modus tollens:} \quad \frac{\neg q}{p \Rightarrow q} \\ & \therefore q & \therefore \neg p \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{lcl} \text{Hypothetical syllogism:} & \frac{p \Rightarrow q}{q \Rightarrow r} & \text{Disjunctive syllogism:} \quad \frac{\neg p}{p \vee q} \\ & \therefore p \Rightarrow r & \therefore q \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{lcl} \text{Addition:} & \frac{p}{\therefore p \vee q} & \text{Simplification:} \quad \frac{p \wedge q}{\therefore p} \\ & & \text{Conjunction:} \quad \frac{p}{\therefore p \wedge q} \end{array}$$

$$\text{Rule of Conditional Proof (RCP): The arguments } \frac{p_1}{\therefore p \Rightarrow q} \text{ and } \frac{p}{\therefore q} \text{ are the same.}$$

Proving Techniques [based on the properties of the conditional connective]

Standard theorem format: $p \Rightarrow q$.

- ① **Direct proof:** Assume p is TRUE. Show that q is TRUE.
- ② **Proof by contraposition:** Assume the falsehood of q . Prove the falsehood of p .

$$\textcircled{1} \quad p \Rightarrow q \quad \equiv \quad \neg q \Rightarrow \neg p.$$

- ③ **Proof by contradiction:** Assume the truth of p , and the falsehood of q .
Produce a contradiction.

$$\textcircled{1} \quad p \Rightarrow q \quad \equiv \quad (p \wedge \neg q) \Rightarrow F.$$

- ④ **Proof by cases:** If $p \equiv p_1 \vee p_2$ for some propositions p_1, p_2 , then prove both $p_1 \Rightarrow q$ and $p_2 \Rightarrow q$.

$$\textcircled{1} \quad (p_1 \vee p_2) \Rightarrow q \quad \equiv \quad (p_1 \Rightarrow q) \wedge (p_2 \Rightarrow q).$$

- ⑤ **Proof of a biconditional:** There are actually two theorems in $p \Leftrightarrow q$, which are *necessity* $p \Rightarrow q$, and *sufficiency* $q \Rightarrow p$. Both are to be proven.

$$\textcircled{1} \quad p \Leftrightarrow q \quad \equiv \quad (p \Rightarrow q) \wedge (q \Rightarrow p).$$

- ⑥ **Technique for disjunction in a conclusion:** The negation of one of the statements may be used as a hypothesis. Prove the other.

$$\textcircled{1} \quad p \Rightarrow (q_1 \vee q_2) \quad \equiv \quad (p \wedge \neg q_1) \Rightarrow q_2 \quad \equiv \quad (p \wedge \neg q_2) \Rightarrow q_1.$$

- ① *Universal Quantifier*: All, each, any, arbitrary, etc.
- ② *Existential Quantifier*: Some, “There exists...”

Example 10

Recall that a sentence of the following form is NOT a proposition:

$$(x + y)^2 = x^2 + y^2,$$

but becomes a proposition when a quantifier is attached:

- ① For all real numbers x and y , we find that $(x + y)^2 = x^2 + y^2$.
- ② There exist real numbers x and y such that $(x + y)^2 = x^2 + y^2$.

Rule

To negate a quantified statement, “reverse” the quantifier first before negating the actual statement.

Example 11 (The *Square of Opposition* in Classical Logic)

- ① All women are mortal.
- ② There exists a woman who is mortal.
- ③ All women are not mortal.
- ④ There exists a woman who is not mortal.

In Mathematics, logic statements are about collections of objects

Some notions from Set Theory: Class vs. Set

Undefined terms in [one formulation of] Set Theory: *class*, *element*, and the membership relation \in

Definition 12

A *set* is a class that is also an element.

Proposition 13 (Russell's Paradox)

The Russell Class $\{S : S \notin S\}$ is not a set.

Proof.

Suppose otherwise. Then the Russell Class \mathcal{R} is either an element of itself or not.

If $\mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{R}$, then \mathcal{R} satisfies the defining condition $S \notin S$ for the Russell class, i.e., $\mathcal{R} \notin \mathcal{R}$. ⚡

If $\mathcal{R} \notin \mathcal{R}$, then \mathcal{R} satisfies the negation $S \in S$ of the defining condition for the Russell class, i.e., $\mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{R}$. ⚡



Some notions from Set Theory: Propositional Functions and Classes

Definition 14

A *propositional function* in n variables x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n is a proposition $P(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ whose truth value depends on the values of the variables x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n . The collection of all objects from which the values of x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n will be taken is called the *domain of discourse*, *universe of discourse*, or simply the *universe*.

Axiom 15 (Axiom of Class Construction)

For any propositional function P , the class $\{x : P(x)\}$ exists.

Definition 16

The *universal quantification* of the statement $P(x)$ is the statement

$\forall x P(x)$: $P(x)$ is true for all x in the universe of discourse.

The *existential quantification* of the statement $P(x)$ is the statement

$\exists x P(x)$: There exists x in the universe of discourse such that $P(x)$ is true.

Symbolic Logic with Quantifiers: Finite Universe of Discourse

Example 17

Let $S = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ denote the universe of discourse.

$P(x)$: x is even.

$$\forall x P(x) \Leftrightarrow P(1) \wedge P(2) \wedge P(3) \wedge P(4)$$

$$\exists x P(x) \Leftrightarrow P(1) \vee P(2) \vee P(3) \vee P(4)$$

In general, if the universe of discourse is a finite set $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$,

$$\forall x P(x) \Leftrightarrow P(x_1) \wedge P(x_2) \wedge \dots \wedge P(x_n)$$

$$\exists x P(x) \Leftrightarrow P(x_1) \vee P(x_2) \vee \dots \vee P(x_n)$$

Theorem 18

$$\neg \forall x P(x) \Leftrightarrow \exists x \neg P(x)$$

$$\neg \exists x P(x) \Leftrightarrow \forall x \neg P(x)$$

In general, if the universe of discourse is a finite set $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$,

$$\forall x P(x) \Leftrightarrow P(x_1) \wedge P(x_2) \wedge \dots \wedge P(x_n)$$

$$\exists x P(x) \Leftrightarrow P(x_1) \vee P(x_2) \vee \dots \vee P(x_n)$$

Theorem 19

$$\neg \forall x P(x) \Leftrightarrow \exists x \neg P(x)$$

$$\neg \exists x P(x) \Leftrightarrow \forall x \neg P(x)$$

In general, if the universe of discourse is a finite set $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$,

$$\neg \forall x P(x) \Leftrightarrow \neg P(x_1) \vee \neg P(x_2) \vee \dots \vee \neg P(x_n)$$

$$\neg \exists x P(x) \Leftrightarrow \neg P(x_1) \wedge \neg P(x_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \neg P(x_n)$$

Non-predicate Clauses

The statement “ $x \in A$ ” (for some x in the universe and some subset A of the universe)

$$\forall x \in A \ P(x) \Leftrightarrow \forall x \ (x \in A \implies P(x))$$

$$\exists x \in A \ P(x) \Leftrightarrow \exists x \ (x \in A \wedge P(x))$$

Rules of Inference for Quantifiers

① Existential Instantiation (EI):

$$\frac{\exists x P(x)}{\therefore P(a)}$$

where the symbol a has no previous appearance in the proof

② Universal Instantiation (UI):

$$\frac{\forall x P(x)}{\therefore P(a)}$$

③ Existential Generalization (EG):

$$\frac{P(a)}{\therefore \exists x P(x)}$$

④ Universal Generalization (UG):

$$\frac{P(a)}{\therefore \forall x P(x)}$$

where the symbol a is not a result of **EI**

Class Containment and Class Equality

Let A and B be classes.

Suppose $x \in A \implies x \in B$.

UG: $\forall x [x \in A \implies x \in B]$.

Rule for non-predicate clauses: $\forall x \in A [x \in B]$.

Conversely:

Suppose $\forall x \in A [x \in B]$.

Rule for non-predicate clauses: $\forall x [x \in A \implies x \in B]$.

UI: $x \in A \implies x \in B$.

Therefore, $x \in A \implies x \in B$ is equivalent to $x \in A \implies x \in B$.

Definition 20

$$A \subseteq B \iff [x \in A \implies x \in B],$$

$$A = B \iff [A \subseteq B] \wedge [B \subseteq A].$$

Relations

Let A and B be sets, and let a and b be elements.

Definition 21

$$\begin{aligned}(a, b) &:= \{a, \{a, b\}\}, \\ A \times B &:= \{(a, b) : a \in A, b \in B\}.\end{aligned}$$

Definition 22

A *relation* on a set A is a subset of $A \times A$.

Notation: If α is a relation on a set A , then we write $a \alpha b$ if [and only if] $(a, b) \in \alpha$.
If $(a, b) \notin \alpha$, then we write $a \not\alpha b$.

If α is a relation on A , then given $a \in A$, by the Axiom of Class Construction, $\{x : x \alpha a\}$ exists, and $b \alpha a$ iff $b \in \{x : x \alpha a\}$.

$$\begin{aligned}\forall x \alpha a \ P(x) &\iff \forall x (x \alpha a \implies P(x)) \\ \exists x \alpha a \ P(x) &\iff \exists x (x \alpha a \wedge P(x))\end{aligned}$$

We say that $f \subseteq X \times Y$ is a *function of X into Y* , or a *function from X to Y* if [and only if] the following two conditions both hold:

$$\begin{aligned} &\forall x \in X \quad \exists y \in Y \quad [(x, y) \in f], \\ &\forall (x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in f \quad [x_1 = x_2 \implies y_1 = y_2]. \end{aligned}$$

Functions: Traditional Notation

We say that f is a *function of X into Y* , or a *function from X to Y* , in symbols $f : X \rightarrow Y$, if [and only if] the following two conditions both hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x \in X \quad \exists y \in Y \quad [y = f(x)], \\ \forall x_1, x_2 \in X \quad [x_1 = x_2 \implies f(x_1) = f(x_2)]. \end{aligned}$$

Surjectivity:

$$\forall y \in Y \quad \exists x \in X \quad [y = f(x)].$$

Injectivity:

$$\forall x_1, x_2 \in X \quad [f(x_1) = f(x_2) \implies x_1 = x_2].$$

Notational Conventions on Functions

- 1 In the symbolic notation $f : X \rightarrow Y$, if the name of a function or functions is not relevant, we often write $X \rightarrow Y$.
e.g. Let \mathbb{R} denote the set of all real numbers, and \mathbb{N} the set of all positive integers. Sequences in \mathbb{R} are functions $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.
- 2 An alternative to the traditional function notation $y = f(x)$ is $x \mapsto f(x)$.
e.g., Complicated function compositions: Given functions $M : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $v : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we shall consider the function $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by the rule

$$t \mapsto M(\varphi(t, t), v(t)).$$

Alternative: define $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $F(t) = M(\varphi(t, t), t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

If the name of a function is still not relevant: e.g., the square root function is $x \mapsto \sqrt{x}$.

Image and Inverse Image

Consider a function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ and let $A \subseteq X$ and $B \subseteq Y$.

The *image* of A under f is $f(A) := \{y : \exists x \in A [y = f(x)]\}$.

The *inverse image* of B under f is $f^{-1}(B) := \{x \in X : f(x) \in B\}$.

WARNING: $f^{-1}(B)$ exists for any $B \subseteq Y$, even if the inverse function f^{-1} does not [i.e, f is not surjective or not injective].

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 \subseteq A_2 &\implies f(A_1) \subseteq f(A_2), \\ f(A_1 \cup A_2) &= f(A_1) \cup f(A_2), \\ f(A_1 \cap A_2) &\subseteq f(A_1) \cap f(A_2), \text{ injectiveness is required for equality,} \\ (f(A_1))^c &\subseteq f(A_1^c), \text{ surjectiveness is required for equality.} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 \subseteq B_2 &\implies f^{-1}(B_1) \subseteq f^{-1}(B_2), \\ f^{-1}(B_1 \cup B_2) &= f^{-1}(B_1) \cup f^{-1}(B_2), \\ f^{-1}(B_1 \cap B_2) &= f^{-1}(B_1) \cap f^{-1}(B_2), \\ (f^{-1}(B_1))^c &= f^{-1}(B_1^c). \end{aligned}$$

Definition 23

A *partial order* on a set A is a relation α on A that is:

- ① *reflexive*: $\forall a \in A [a \alpha a]$;
- ② *antisymmetric*: $\forall a, b \in A [[a \alpha b \wedge b \alpha a] \implies a = b]$; and
- ③ *transitive*: $\forall a, b, c \in A [[a \alpha b \wedge b \alpha c] \implies a \alpha c]$.

A *partially ordered set* is a set on which a partial order exists. If α is a partial order on A , two elements a and b of A are said to be *comparable* if $a \alpha b$ or $b \alpha a$. A partially ordered set in which any two elements are comparable is said to be *linearly ordered* or *totally ordered*, and the underlying partial order is called a *total order* or *linear order*.

Suprema and Infima

Suppose \triangleleft is a partial order on a set A .

- ① An element a of A is a *largest element* of A if [and only if] $\forall x \in A [a \triangleleft x \implies x = a]$.
 - ① If a is a largest element of A , then $\forall x \in A [x \triangleleft a]$ need not be true. e.g., $\exists c \in A [c \not\triangleleft a]$.
 - ② It is possible for a set to have several or no largest element under a given partial order.
- ② An element a of A is a *least element* of A if $\forall x \in A [x \triangleleft a \implies x = a]$.
- ③ If $\emptyset \neq B \subseteq A$, then $a \in A$ is an *upper bound* of B if $\forall b \in B [b \triangleleft a]$.
 - ① An upper bound of B need not be an element of B .

Suprema and Infima

Basic Uniqueness Proof

To prove that the element x of the universe of discourse is the unique element with property P , prove that

$$[P(x) \wedge P(y)] \implies x = y. \quad (1)$$

Proposition 24

The least upper bound of a subset of a partially ordered set is unique.

Proof.

Let B be a subset of a set A partially ordered by \triangleleft . Let $\mathcal{U}(B)$ be the set of all upper bounds of B . Suppose B has two least upper bounds x and y . Since $y \in \mathcal{U}(B)$ and x is a least element of $\mathcal{U}(B)$, we have $x \triangleleft y$. Since $x \in \mathcal{U}(B)$ and y is a least element of $\mathcal{U}(B)$, we have $y \triangleleft x$. By anti-symmetry, we have $x = y$. \square

Suprema and Infima

- 1 The least upper bound of a set is called the *supremum* of the set.
- 2 We have analogous notions for *lower bound* and *greatest lower bound* or *infimum*.

Order Axioms for the Real Number System

Axiom 25

There exists a total order $<$ on the set \mathbb{R} of all real numbers such that

$$\textcircled{1} \quad a < b \implies a + c < b + c.$$

$$\textcircled{2} \quad [a < b \wedge 0 < c] \implies ac < bc.$$

Other relations $>$, \leq and \geq are defined by

$$a > b \iff b < a,$$

$$a \leq b \iff [a < b \vee a = b],$$

$$a \geq b \iff [b < a \vee a = b].$$

Order Axioms for the Real Number System

Proposition 26

$$\forall a \in \mathbb{R} [a > 0 \iff -a < 0].$$

Proof.

By UG, a, b, c in the condition $a < b \implies a + c < b + c$ is arbitrary. If we make replacements: $a \mapsto 0$, $b \mapsto a$ and $c \mapsto -a$, we have $a > 0 \implies -a < 0$.

If we make the replacements, $a \mapsto -a$, $b \mapsto 0$ and $c \mapsto a$, we have $-a < 0 \implies a > 0$. □

Proposition 27

$$\forall a, b, c \in \mathbb{R} [[a < b \wedge c < 0] \implies ac > bc].$$

Proof.

Exercise. □