

CS201

MATHEMATICS FOR COMPUTER SCIENCE I

LECTURE 4

WHY SETS IN A DISCRETE MATHEMATICS COURSE?

- Study of sets captures all of mathematics, whether discrete or continuous.
- Arguments used are, therefore, applicable everywhere.
- Discrete mathematics is study of discrete sets: all finite sets, \mathbb{Z} etc.
- Arguments from set theory find many applications.

RELATIONS

- **Structure** of a set is captured by relationships between its elements.
- A **k -ary relation** on set A is typically viewed as a **predicate** taking **true** or **false** value on any collection of k -elements of A .
- Examples:
 - ▶ \subseteq is a **2-ary** relation (also called **binary**) on $\mathcal{P}(A)$ for any set A :
 $\subseteq(X, Y)$ is true iff $X \subseteq Y$ for $X, Y \subseteq A$.
 - ▶ \leq is a binary relation on set of numbers: $\leq(a, b)$ is true iff $a \leq b$.
 - ▶ For any function $f : A \mapsto A$, f defines a binary relation on A : $R_f(a, b)$ is true iff $f(a) = b$.
 - ▶ $+$ is a **3-ary** relation on set of numbers: $+(a, b, c)$ is true iff $a + b = c$.
 - ▶ **Set membership** is a **unary** relation: given $A \subseteq B$, $R_A(b)$ is true for $b \in B$ iff $b \in A$.

RELATIONS

- A relation can be represented as a set: if R is a k -ary relation on set A , then the set

$$\{(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) \mid a_1, \dots, a_k \in A \text{ and } R(a_1, \dots, a_k) \text{ is true}\}$$

is set representation of R . It is also denoted by R .

- We will focus on special kind binary relations as these are easier to analyze and still capture interesting structures.

TRANSITIVE RELATIONS

- Let R be a binary relation on set A .
- Instead of $R(a, b)$, we write aRb .
- R is a **transitive** relation if the following condition is satisfied:
For every $a, b, c \in A$, if aRb and bRc then aRc .
- Examples:
 - ▶ \subseteq is transitive
 - ▶ \leq is transitive
 - ▶ Relation induced by function f is not transitive

TRANSITIVE RELATIONS

- Transitive relations give an **ordering** to elements of the set:
 - ▶ Say a is "below" or "less than equal to" b iff aRb for a transitive relation R .
 - ▶ transitivity of R ensures that the intuitive expectation from an ordering is satisfied.
- There are two special classes of transitive relations. These are defined using **reflexive** and **symmetric** properties.

REFLEXIVE RELATIONS

- Relation R on set A is **reflexive** if aRa for every $a \in A$.
- Examples:
 - ▶ \subseteq and \leq are reflexive.
 - ▶ If elements of A are sets, define **Equal cardinality** relation \equiv on A as:
 $a \equiv b$ iff $|a| = |b|$.
 - ▶ \equiv is reflexive.
 - ▶ Relation $<$ is not reflexive.

SYMMETRIC AND ANTISYMMETRIC RELATIONS

- Relation R on set A is **symmetric** if aRb implies bRa for every $a, b \in A$.
- Relation R on set A is **antisymmetric** if aRb and bRa implies $a = b$ for every $a, b \in A$.
- Examples:
 - ▶ \subseteq and \leq are antisymmetric.
 - ▶ \equiv is symmetric.

EQUIVALENCE RELATIONS

DEFINITION

Relation R on set A is an **equivalence** relation if R is transitive, reflexive and symmetric.

- \equiv is an equivalence relation.

STRUCTURE INDUCED BY EQUIVALENCE RELATIONS

DEFINITION

If R is an equivalence relation on A then an **equivalence class** of (A, R) is a subset X of A such that aRb for every $a, b \in X$, and aRb is false for every $a \in X$ and $b \in A \setminus X$.

- All subsets of cardinality 1 of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z})$ form an equivalence class of $(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z}), \equiv)$.

STRUCTURE INDUCED BY EQUIVALENCE RELATIONS

THEOREM

An equivalence relation R on set A splits it into disjoint equivalent classes.

PROOF.

- Let $a \in A$. Consider subset X_a of A such that

$$X_a = \{b \mid b \in A \text{ and } aRb\}.$$

- X_a is an equivalence class of (A, R) .

PARTIAL ORDERS

DEFINITION

Relation R on set A is a **partial order** if R is transitive, reflexive, and anti-symmetric.

- \subseteq and \leq are partial orders.

TOTAL ORDERS

DEFINITION

Relation R on set A is a **total order** if R is a partial order on A and for every $a, b \in A$, either aRb or bRa .

- \leq is a total order but \subseteq is not.

STRUCTURE INDUCED BY PARTIAL ORDERS

- Let R be a partial order on set A .
- A **chain** of (A, R) is a subset C of A such that aRb or bRa for any two $a, b \in C$.
- Clearly, R is a total order on C since R remains a partial order on any subset of A .
- A **maximal** element of (A, R) is an element $a \in A$ such that there is no $b \in A$ with aRb .
- A **minimal** element of (A, R) is an element $a \in A$ such that there is no $b \in A$ with bRa .

TOTAL ORDERS ON SETS

- Every set admits a partial order trivially: define an empty relation on the set.
- Is it possible to define a total ordering on all sets?
- Yes if set is finite:
 - ▶ Let

$$A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k\}.$$

- ▶ Define relation R such that $a_i R a_j$ for $i \leq j$.
- What about infinite sets?
- Leads to **Axiom of Choice**, **Well-ordering Principle**, and **Zorn's Lemma**!