

Appendix A

Set theory and functions

A.1 Sets

We assume you have a working knowledge of (informal) set theory. Here, we only give a brief review.

Notation and definitions

A *set* S is a collection of *elements*. If x is an element of the set S , we write $x \in S$. Otherwise, we write $x \notin S$. An element of S may also be called a *member* or a *point* of S (or in S), and we may write that S *contains* x .

The set with no elements is called the *empty set* and is denoted \emptyset . A set with at least one element is *nonempty*. Other sets with standard names are:

- \mathbb{R} the set of all real numbers
- \mathbb{Z} the set of all integers
- \mathbb{N} the set of all positive integers
- \mathbb{Q} the set of all rational numbers
- \emptyset the set of all irrational numbers

A set can be described by listing its elements, as in $A := \{1, 3, 5, 7, 9\}$. (We use the symbol $:=$ when we define a mathematical object as equal to an already known or defined object, as in “ $A := \{1, 3, 5, 7, 9\}$ ” above. Occasionally we also use it as a reminder that an equality is by definition, and that no computations or deep thinking are needed to justify it.)

More often, a set is described by a rule, for example,

$$B := \{ k \in \mathbb{N} \mid k \text{ leaves a remainder of } 3 \text{ when divided by } 5 \}, \quad (\text{A.1.1})$$

where the vertical line means “such that” (some authors use a colon rather than vertical line).

If a, b are real numbers and $a \leq b$, we define $[a, b] := \{ x \in \mathbb{R} \mid a \leq x \leq b \}$ and $[a, b) := \{ x \in \mathbb{R} \mid a \leq x < b \}$. Similar definitions apply to $(a, b]$ and (a, b) .

Let A, B be sets. The notation $A \subset B$ means that whenever $x \in A$, then $x \in B$. In this case, A is said to be a *subset* of B . Thus, $\emptyset \subset A$ for all A . If $A \subset B$ and $B \subset A$, we write $A = B$ and say that A and B are *equal* (or “the same”). Of course, $A = B$ if and only if $B = A$. If A and B are not equal, we write $A \neq B$. If $A \subset B$ but $A \neq B$, then A is a *proper subset* of B , denoted by $A \subsetneq B$. The *complement of B in A* , denoted $A \setminus B$, is the set of all elements in A that are not in B . Thus $\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{Q}$. Some authors denote the complement of B in A by $A - B$.

Operations on sets

If A and B are sets, then their *union* $A \cup B$ and their *intersection* $A \cap B$ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} A \cup B &:= \{x \mid x \text{ is in } A \text{ or } B \text{ or both}\} \\ A \cap B &:= \{x \mid x \text{ is in both } A \text{ and } B\} \end{aligned} \tag{A.1.2}$$

(In the definition of \cup , we could omit “or both”, since in mathematics, “or” is always inclusive; in mathematical usage, “would you like tea or coffee?” could be answered, “I’d like both tea and coffee”.)

The sets A and B are *disjoint* if $A \cap B = \emptyset$. Let \mathcal{F} be a collection of sets. Then the elements in \mathcal{F} are *pairwise disjoint* if any two distinct elements in \mathcal{F} are disjoint.

If \mathcal{F} is a collection of sets, then $\bigcup_{F \in \mathcal{F}} F$ denotes the union of all sets in \mathcal{F} and $\bigcap_{F \in \mathcal{F}} F$ denotes the intersection of all sets in \mathcal{F} :

$$\bigcup_{F \in \mathcal{F}} F := \{x \mid x \in G \text{ for some } G \in \mathcal{F}\}, \tag{A.1.3}$$

$$\bigcap_{F \in \mathcal{F}} F := \{x \mid x \in G \text{ for each } G \in \mathcal{F}\}. \tag{A.1.4}$$

When \mathcal{F} has only finitely many sets F_1, \dots, F_n , then $\bigcup_{F \in \mathcal{F}} F$ is often written as $F_1 \cup \dots \cup F_n$ or $\bigcup_{k=1}^n F_k$; similarly, $\bigcap_{F \in \mathcal{F}} F$ is often written as $F_1 \cap \dots \cap F_n$ or $\bigcap_{k=1}^n F_k$.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. An *ordered n -tuple* is an expression of the form (a_1, \dots, a_n) . Two ordered n -tuples (a_1, \dots, a_n) and (b_1, \dots, b_n) are *equal* if and only if $a_k = b_k$ for all $1 \leq k \leq n$. When $n = 2$, an ordered n -tuple is called an *ordered pair*. If

A_1, \dots, A_n are nonempty sets, the *Cartesian product*

$A_1 \times \dots \times A_n$ is

$$A_1 \times \dots \times A_n := \{(a_1, \dots, a_n) \mid a_k \in A_k \text{ for all } 1 \leq k \leq n\}.$$

When A_1, \dots, A_n are all equal to the same set A , then $A_1 \times \dots \times A_n$ is often written A^n . Thus, $A^2 := A \times A$, $A^3 := A \times A \times A$, and so on.

A.2 Relations

Definition A.2.1 (Binary relation). Let A be a nonempty set. A *binary relation* \mathcal{R} on A is any subset of $A^2 := A \times A$. If $(a, b) \in \mathcal{R}$, we write

$$a \mathcal{R} b.$$

We need to impose some properties on \mathcal{R} for it to be of interest. One possibility is that \mathcal{R} encodes some kind of order. In this case, it is usually denoted by \preceq .

Definition A.2.2 (Partial order). A *partial order* \preceq on A is a binary relation on A satisfying the following properties:

1. $a \preceq b$ and $b \preceq c$ imply $a \preceq c$.
2. $a \preceq a$ for all $a \in A$.
3. If $a \preceq b$ and $b \preceq a$, then $a = b$.

Examples A.2.3. (Partial order).

1. Let $\preceq := \{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x \leq y \}$. Then \preceq is a partial order on \mathbb{R} .
2. Let S be any set and let $\mathcal{P}(S)$ be the collection of all subsets of S . Then

$$\preceq := \{ (E, F) \mid E \text{ and } F \text{ are subsets of } S, E \subset F \}$$

is a partial order on $\mathcal{P}(S)$. \triangle

If \preceq is a partial order on A , then A is *partially ordered* by \preceq . Thus part 2 above says that the collection of all subsets of a given set is partially ordered by *set inclusion*.

Definition A.2.4 (Total order). Let A be partially ordered by \preceq . A subset B of A is *totally ordered* (by \preceq) if for every x and y in B , either $x \preceq y$ or $y \preceq x$.

Examples A.2.5. (Total order).

1. If $\preceq := \{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x \leq y \}$, any subset of \mathbb{R} is totally ordered by \preceq .
2. Let $S := \{a, b\}$ and let $\mathcal{P}(S)$ and \preceq be as in part 2 of Examples A.2.3. Then $\{\{a\}, \{b\}\}$ is not totally ordered by \preceq . \triangle

Definition A.2.6 (Upper bound). Let A be partially ordered by \preceq and let $B \subset A$. An *upper bound* for B is an element $a \in A$ such that $b \preceq a$ for all $b \in B$.

Example A.2.7. Let $\mathcal{P}(S)$ and \preceq be as in part 2 of Examples A.2.3. Then $\{a, b\}$ is an upper bound for $\{\{a\}, \emptyset\}$ and $\{\{a\}, \{b\}\}$. \triangle

Definition A.2.8 (Maximal element). Let A be partially ordered by \preceq and let $B \subset A$. A *maximal element* of B is an element x_0 in B such that whenever $b \in B$ and $x_0 \preceq b$, then $b = x_0$.

Example A.2.9. Let $\preceq := \{(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}^2 \mid a \text{ is a factor of } b\}$. Then \mathbb{N} is partially ordered by \preceq . Let $A := \{3, 5, 7, 11, 14, 42\}$. Then 5, 11, and 42 are maximal elements of A . But 3, 7, and 14 are not maximal elements of A since $3 \preceq 42$, $7 \preceq 14$, and $14 \preceq 42$. If each member of a set B is a prime number, then every member of B is a maximal element of B . The set $C := \{2, 4, 6, 8, \dots\}$ has no maximal elements and no element of \mathbb{N} is an upper bound for C . \triangle

Equivalence relations

A binary relation may also encode a notion of “sameness”. It is often simpler to recognize the main features of a set X by grouping together similar elements of X . For example, the set \mathbb{Z} of integers can be partitioned into three groups:

$$\begin{aligned} A &:= \{n \in \mathbb{Z} \mid n \text{ is divisible by } 3\}, \\ B &:= \{n \in \mathbb{Z} \mid n \text{ leaves a remainder of } 1 \text{ when divided by } 3\}, \\ C &:= \{n \in \mathbb{Z} \mid n \text{ leaves a remainder of } 2 \text{ when divided by } 3\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2.1})$$

This idea of partitioning a set into groups consisting of similar objects is useful because then we are no longer distracted by the individual differences between elements of X but can focus on the main features of X as a whole. This is the idea behind “equivalence relations”.

Definition A.2.10 (Equivalence relation). An *equivalence relation* on X is a binary relation \sim on X such that the following properties are satisfied:

1. Reflexivity: $x \sim x$ for all $x \in X$.
2. Symmetry: $x \sim y$ if and only if $y \sim x$.
3. Transitivity: If $x \sim y$ and $y \sim z$, then $x \sim z$.

Examples A.2.11. 1. Define a binary relation \mathcal{R} on \mathbb{Z} by $a \mathcal{R} b$ if and only if $a - b$ is divisible by 3. Then it is easy to see that \mathcal{R} satisfies properties 1 and 2 in Definition A.2.10. If $x \mathcal{R} y$ and $y \mathcal{R} z$, then $x - y = 3k$ and $y - z = 3\ell$ for some integers k, ℓ . Thus, $x - z = 3(k + \ell)$, so that $x - z$ is divisible by 3 also. Hence, $x \mathcal{R} z$. So \mathcal{R} is an equivalence relation on \mathbb{Z} . Thus we could write $a \sim b$, but in number theory this relation is usually denoted $a \equiv b \pmod{3}$.

2. Let L be the line in \mathbb{R}^2 given by the equation $y = x$. Define $\mathbf{a} \mathcal{R} \mathbf{b}$ to mean that $\mathbf{a} := \begin{pmatrix} a_1 \\ a_2 \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{b} := \begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^2$ are points such that $\begin{pmatrix} a_1 - b_1 \\ a_2 - b_2 \end{pmatrix}$ lies on L . Then \mathcal{R} satisfies property 1 because $\mathbf{0}$ lies on L . Of course,

$$\mathbf{a} \mathcal{R} \mathbf{b} \iff a_2 - b_2 = a_1 - b_1 \iff b_2 - a_2 = b_1 - a_1 \iff \mathbf{b} \mathcal{R} \mathbf{a}.$$