November 6, 2023

The candidate key meets two conditions

- It is unique: Each key value uniquely identifies one record within the table, different tuples must not have identical keys
- It is minimal: if the key is a combination of attributes nothing from that combination can be removed without eliminating unique identification

- ALL candidate keys are superkeys (we are going to do some set theory today, candidate keys are a SUBSET of candidate keys)
- Any candidate key could be a primary key but we might choose to not use it

StudentID	SocialSecurityNumber	FirstName	LastName
1	123-45-6789	John	Smith
2	987-65-4321	Alice	Johnson
3	123-45-6788	Bob	Brown
4	555-12-3456	Carol	Davis

Table 1: Example of a "Students" Table

• We learned yesterday that database management - specifically the relational model - were able to revolutionize how databases were managed in the 1980s after innovations from IBM

- We learned yesterday that database management specifically the relational model were able to revolutionize how databases were managed in the 1980s after innovations from IBM
- The programming languages they used were based on Codds Relational model

- We learned yesterday that database management specifically the relational model were able to revolutionize how databases were managed in the 1980s after innovations from IBM
- The programming languages they used were based on Codds Relational model
- Of course, the relational model was born out of set theory

• Why learn about set theory?

- Why learn about set theory?
 - Would it make sense to learn to comprehend a spoken language without knowing grammar?

- Why learn about set theory?
 - Would it make sense to learn to comprehend a spoken language without knowing grammar?
 - It is the method to the madness

- Why learn about set theory?
 - Would it make sense to learn to comprehend a spoken language without knowing grammar?
 - It is the method to the madness
 - The logical arguments have direct implications how data is stored, queried, and joined

- Why learn about set theory?
 - Would it make sense to learn to comprehend a spoken language without knowing grammar?
 - It is the method to the madness
 - The logical arguments have direct implications how data is stored, queried, and joined
 - Cartesian products, unions, differences, the inclusion exclusion principle, and more are all the basis for how data is joined in a way that is efficient and accurate

• Why learn about set theory?

- Why learn about set theory?
 - Yesterday, we learned that rows of datasets are called tuples
 - Each tuple is a collection of information, and may be considered a set

- Why learn about set theory?
 - Yesterday, we learned that rows of datasets are called tuples
 - Each tuple is a collection of information, and may be considered a set
 - Each arbitrary cell in a database can be thought of as an element in a set

• Our goal is to understand the logical and mathematical principals that underpin the rest of the class

- Our goal is to understand the logical and mathematical principals that underpin the rest of the class
- If the logical rules of set theory are comprehensible and easy to understand, much of the rest of the course follows

- Our goal is to understand the logical and mathematical principals that underpin the rest of the class
- If the logical rules of set theory are comprehensible and easy to understand, much of the rest of the course follows
- Feeling comfortable working with sets, and thinking about them in the abstract, is the same task as working with large datasets that you can't observe

- Our goal is to understand the logical and mathematical principals that underpin the rest of the class
- If the logical rules of set theory are comprehensible and easy to understand, much of the rest of the course follows
- Feeling comfortable working with sets, and thinking about them in the abstract, is the same task as working with large datasets that you can't observe
- Efficiently reading the notation will also allow you to feel more comfortable reading academic texts to stay up to date on your own time during your work life to keep pace with new innovations or teach yourself on the fly when needed

- Our goal is to understand the logical and mathematical principals that underpin the rest of the class
- If the logical rules of set theory are comprehensible and easy to understand, much of the rest of the course follows
- Feeling comfortable working with sets, and thinking about them in the abstract, is the same task as working with large datasets that you can't observe
- Efficiently reading the notation will also allow you to feel more comfortable reading academic texts to stay up to date on your own time during your work life to keep pace with new innovations or teach yourself on the fly when needed
- Will help you feel trained to be a chef, rather than a cook.

- You will have the slides to work with, but taking notes will help
- You'll remember things better if you have something hand written
- Feel free to verbally interrupt of something doesn't make sense or if I am speaking too quickly

• Conjunction \wedge (1 and 2 = 1 \wedge 2)

- Conjunction \wedge (1 and 2 = 1 \wedge 2)
- Disjunction \lor (1 or 2 = 1 \lor 2)

- Conjunction \land (1 and 2 = 1 \land 2)
- Disjunction \lor (1 or 2 = 1 \lor 2)
- Negation \neg (not 1 is \neg 1)

- Conjunction \land (1 and 2 = 1 \land 2)
- Disjunction \lor (1 or 2 = 1 \lor 2)
- Negation \neg (not 1 is \neg 1)
- Existential quantification (\exists)

- Conjunction \wedge (1 and 2 = 1 \wedge 2)
- Disjunction \lor (1 or 2 = 1 \lor 2)
- Negation \neg (not 1 is \neg 1)
- Existential quantification (\exists)
- Logical equivalence \Leftrightarrow

- Conjunction \wedge (1 and 2 = 1 \wedge 2)
- Disjunction \lor (1 or 2 = 1 \lor 2)
- Negation \neg (not 1 is \neg 1)
- Existential quantification (∃)
- Logical equivalence \Leftrightarrow
- Such that :

- Conjunction \wedge (1 and 2 = 1 \wedge 2)
- Disjunction \lor (1 or 2 = 1 \lor 2)
- Negation \neg (not 1 is \neg 1)
- Existential quantification (\exists)
- Logical equivalence \Leftrightarrow
- Such that :
- $\bullet \ \, \text{For all} \ \, \forall$

• Set theory is the study of the relationship between sets

- Set theory is the study of the relationship between sets
- A set is a structure, representing an unordered collection (group, plurality) of zero or more distinct (different) objects.

- Set theory is the study of the relationship between sets
- A set is a structure, representing an unordered collection (group, plurality) of zero or more distinct (different) objects.
- All sets are made from elements

- Set theory is the study of the relationship between sets
- A set is a structure, representing an unordered collection (group, plurality) of zero or more distinct (different) objects.
- All sets are made from elements
- Understanding how sets behave boils down to a focus on how their elements act

• $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, ...\}$ (set of natural numbers)

- $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, ...\}$ (set of natural numbers)
- $\mathbb{Z} = \{..., -3, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, 3, ...\}$ (set of integers)

- $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, ...\}$ (set of natural numbers)
- $\mathbb{Z} = \{..., -3, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, 3, ...\}$ (set of integers)
- $\mathbb{R} = \{x : x \text{ is a real number}\}$ (set of real numbers)

• We denote a set S by defining its elements
- We denote a set S by defining its elements
 - We can place these in $\{\}$

- We denote a set S by defining its elements
 - We can place these in $\{\}$
 - We may index elements of a set with subscripts

- We denote a set S by defining its elements
 - We can place these in $\{\}$
 - We may index elements of a set with subscripts
 - $\{s_1, s_2, s_3\}$

• Sets are unordered

- Sets are unordered
- Is $\{s_1, s_2, s_3\}$ the same as $\{s_3, s_2, s_1\}$?

- Sets are unordered
- Is $\{s_1, s_2, s_3\}$ the same as $\{s_3, s_2, s_1\}$?
- Yes!

• Capital letters name sets *A*, *B*, *C*. Conventionally, we would not name a set *c* or *larry*.

- Capital letters name sets *A*, *B*, *C*. Conventionally, we would not name a set *c* or *larry*.
- Commas separate elements of a set

- Capital letters name sets *A*, *B*, *C*. Conventionally, we would not name a set *c* or *larry*.
- Commas separate elements of a set
- {} designate that the enclosed elements form a set

- Capital letters name sets *A*, *B*, *C*. Conventionally, we would not name a set *c* or *larry*.
- Commas separate elements of a set
- $\{\}$ designate that the enclosed elements form a set
- $A = \{Cow, Sheep, \{Chicken, Turkey\}, Goat\}$

- Capital letters name sets *A*, *B*, *C*. Conventionally, we would not name a set *c* or *larry*.
- Commas separate elements of a set
- $\{\}$ designate that the enclosed elements form a set
- $A = \{Cow, Sheep, \{Chicken, Turkey\}, Goat\}$
- We call this the roster method

• We use ∈ to indicate that an element is an object of a set. It means something is an element of a set.

- We use ∈ to indicate that an element is an object of a set. It means something is an element of a set.
- \notin means the object is not an element of the set

- We use ∈ to indicate that an element is an object of a set. It means something is an element of a set.
- \notin means the object is not an element of the set
- True or false

- We use ∈ to indicate that an element is an object of a set. It means something is an element of a set.
- \notin means the object is not an element of the set
- True or false
- $3 \in \{1, 2, 3\}$

- We use ∈ to indicate that an element is an object of a set. It means something is an element of a set.
- \notin means the object is not an element of the set
- True or false
- $3 \in \{1, 2, 3\}$
- $\{z\} \in \{z, y, x, w\}$

• $W = \{x | x \text{ is a day of the week}\}$

- $W = \{x | x \text{ is a day of the week}\}$
- W is the set

- $W = \{x | x \text{ is a day of the week}\}$
- W is the set
- x is the element

- $W = \{x | x \text{ is a day of the week}\}$
- W is the set
- x is the element
- is a day of the week is the condition x must meet

- $W = \{x | x \text{ is a day of the week}\}$
- W is the set
- x is the element
- is a day of the week is the condition x must meet
- | means such that

- $W = \{x | x \text{ is a day of the week}\}$
- W is the set
- x is the element
- is a day of the week is the condition x must meet
- means such that
- {} denote set membership (elements in the set)

- $W = \{x | x \text{ is a day of the week}\}$
- W is the set
- x is the element
- is a day of the week is the condition x must meet
- means such that
- {} denote set membership (elements in the set)
- We call this set builder notation

• Two sets are equal **if and only if** they contain the exact same elements

• Two sets are equal **if and only if** they contain the exact same elements

•
$$\{x|x=2\} = \{x \in \mathbb{N} \mid x < 3 \land x > 1\}$$

 $\bullet\,$ We can denote that an element is inside of a set with $\in\,$

- $\bullet\,$ We can denote that an element is inside of a set with $\in\,$
 - $s_1 \in S$

- $\bullet\,$ We can denote that an element is inside of a set with $\in\,$
 - $s_1 \in S$
 - Some sets are empty

- $\bullet\,$ We can denote that an element is inside of a set with $\in\,$
 - $s_1 \in S$
 - Some sets are empty
 - Ø

- $\bullet\,$ We can denote that an element is inside of a set with $\in\,$
 - $s_1 \in S$
 - Some sets are empty
 - Ø
 - {*x*|?}

- $\bullet\,$ We can denote that an element is inside of a set with $\in\,$
 - $s_1 \in S$
 - Some sets are empty
 - Ø
 - {*x*|?}
 - A more formal statement is $\neg \exists x : x \in \emptyset$

- How big is a set? How many elements?
- We call that cardinality
- It is denoted as $\mid\mid$
- Cardinality of the empty set $|\emptyset| = 0$
- Cardinality counts unique elements nothing is counted twice
- $\bullet \ |\{1,1,2,3\}|=3$
- Today we deal with finite sets cardinality being either 0 or a natural number

• *U*, or a Universal Set, is a set which has elements of all the related sets, without any repetition of elements

• Sets also have compliments

- Sets also have compliments
- Many ways to notate compliment of A

- Sets also have compliments
- Many ways to notate compliment of A
 - *A^c*
 - *A*′
 - C(A)
 - <u>A</u>
- Sets also have compliments
- Many ways to notate compliment of A
 - *A^c*
 - A'
 - C(A)
 - <u>A</u>
- $A^c = \{x \in U : x \notin A\}$



Two sets A and B are considered equal if and only if they have the same elements. In mathematical notation, we write this as:

$$A = B \iff (\forall x)(x \in A \iff x \in B)$$

• $A \subseteq B$

- $A \subseteq B$
- $A \supseteq B$ means $B \subseteq A$

- $A \subseteq B$
- $A \supseteq B$ means $B \subseteq A$
- Note $S = T \Leftrightarrow (S \subseteq T \land S \supseteq T)$

- $A \subseteq B$
- $A \supseteq B$ means $B \subseteq A$
- Note $S = T \Leftrightarrow (S \subseteq T \land S \supseteq T)$
- $\neg(S \subseteq T)$, means., $\exists x (x \in S \land x \notin T)$

$A \subset B$ (A is a proper subset of B) means that $A \subseteq B$ but $B \not\subseteq A$

 $A \subset B$ (A is a proper subset of B) means that $A \subseteq B$ but $B \not\subseteq A$

• For example: $\{a_1, a_2\} \subset \{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$

- $\bullet~\in$ is not the same as \subseteq
- $\bullet~\in$ refers to elements, whereas \subseteq refers to sets
- Recall the example about $\{4\}$

The objects that are elements of a set may themselves be sets. For example, let $S = \{x \mid x \subseteq \{1, 2, 3\}\}$, then

 $S = \{ \emptyset, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{3\}, \{1,2\}, \{1,3\}, \{2,3\}, \{1,2,3\} \}$

The power set P(S) of a set S is the set of all subsets of S, denoted as P(S) = {x | x ⊆ S}.

- The power set P(S) of a set S is the set of all subsets of S, denoted as P(S) = {x | x ⊆ S}.
- For example, if $S = \{a, b\}$, then $P(S) = \{\emptyset, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{a, b\}\}$.

 Let S be a finite set with N elements. Then the powerset of P(S) (that is the set of all subsets of S) contains 2^N elements • \cup • $X \cup Y = \{a : a \in X \lor a \in Y\}$

Set Operations



- \cap
- $A \cap B := x : x \in S \land x \in T$

Set Operations



- \setminus OR –
- $S \setminus T = x : x \in S \land x \notin T$

Set Operations



For sets A and B, their Cartesian product $A \times B$ is defined as:

 $A imes B \coloneqq \{(a, b) \mid a \in A \land b \in B\}$

For sets A and B, their Cartesian product $A \times B$ is defined as:

• $A \times B \coloneqq \{(a, b) \mid a \in A \land b \in B\}$

• For example, if $A = \{a, b\}$ and $B = \{1, 2\}$, then $A \times B = \{(a, 1), (a, 2), (b, 1), (b, 2)\}.$

• It is important to take an element focused perspective

- It is important to take an element focused perspective
- Holistic perspective: $A \cup B$ is everything in A and everything in B

- It is important to take an element focused perspective
- Holistic perspective: $A \cup B$ is everything in A and everything in B
- Elemental perspective: $x \in A \cup B$ iff $x \in A$ or $x \in B$.

• The slide title is our claim that we will prove

- The slide title is our claim that we will prove
- First step: translate it. Put it into words

- The slide title is our claim that we will prove
- First step: translate it. Put it into words
- Who wants to try?

• Next step: make it concrete! Abstractions are hard to work with at first

- Next step: make it concrete! Abstractions are hard to work with at first
- How can we do that?

- Next step: make it concrete! Abstractions are hard to work with at first
- How can we do that?
- Pictures
- Examples

- $A = \{1, 2, 3\}$
- $B = \{1, 4, 5\}$
- $C = \{2, 3, 6\}$
- $D = \{1, 4, 5, 7\}$
- $E = \{2, 3, 6, 9\}$

- $A = \{1, 2, 3\}$
- $B = \{1, 4, 5\}$
- $C = \{2, 3, 6\}$
- $D = \{1, 4, 5, 7\}$
- $E = \{2, 3, 6, 9\}$
- $D \cup E = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9\}$

- $A = \{1, 2, 3\}$
- $B = \{1, 4, 5\}$
- $C = \{2, 3, 6\}$
- $D = \{1, 4, 5, 7\}$
- $E = \{2, 3, 6, 9\}$
- $D \cup E = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9\}$
- $A \subseteq D \cup E$
• This should give us some confidence that what we are seeking to prove may be true

- This should give us some confidence that what we are seeking to prove may be true
- Of course, this isn't a general proof because it is just one instance

- This should give us some confidence that what we are seeking to prove may be true
- Of course, this isn't a general proof because it is just one instance
- We may be wrong!

- This should give us some confidence that what we are seeking to prove may be true
- Of course, this isn't a general proof because it is just one instance
- We may be wrong!
- But we at least have some intuition now about where to start

• Start writing: We will prove for any sets A, B, C, D, E where $A \subseteq B \cup C, B \subseteq D$, and $C \subseteq E$, we have $A \subseteq D \cup E$

- Start writing: We will prove for any sets A, B, C, D, E where $A \subseteq B \cup C, B \subseteq D$, and $C \subseteq E$, we have $A \subseteq D \cup E$
- We have made our goal clear

- Start writing: We will prove for any sets A, B, C, D, E where $A \subseteq B \cup C, B \subseteq D$, and $C \subseteq E$, we have $A \subseteq D \cup E$
- We have made our goal clear
- We have also told the reader what to consider/our assumptions (these objects are sets, ect).

• $A \subseteq B$ means that every element in A is also inside of B.

- $A \subseteq B$ means that every element in A is also inside of B.
- We can prove A ⊆ B by selecting an arbitrary x ∈ A and then proving x ∈ B.

• Let $x \in A$

- Let $x \in A$
- We will prove $x \in D \cup E$

- Let $x \in A$
- We will prove $x \in D \cup E$
- We introduced a new variable x

- Let $x \in A$
- We will prove $x \in D \cup E$
- We introduced a new variable x
- It is arbitrary, so it is general, we didn't say imagine a prime number in A

• We know that if A is a subset of B then every element in A is in B

- We know that if A is a subset of B then every element in A is in B
- So by declaring that x ∈ A, we know that x ∈ B ∪ C by definition of subset

- We know that if A is a subset of B then every element in A is in B
- So by declaring that x ∈ A, we know that x ∈ B ∪ C by definition of subset
- Notice here we are using a given fact rather than defining a new variable

• So we know $x \in B \cup C$ by definition of subset

- So we know $x \in B \cup C$ by definition of subset
- The Union of B and C is all the elements in both

- So we know $x \in B \cup C$ by definition of subset
- The Union of B and C is all the elements in both
- So either $x \in B$ or $x \in C$

- So we know $x \in B \cup C$ by definition of subset
- The Union of B and C is all the elements in both
- So either $x \in B$ or $x \in C$
- We cannot say for sure which is the case! So we consider both cases, and show our proof holds for either one

• Case 1: $x \in B$

- Case 1: $x \in B$
- $B \subseteq D$ given in the problem

- Case 1: $x \in B$
- $B \subseteq D$ given in the problem
- Then $x \in D$ by definition of subset

- Case 1: $x \in B$
- $B \subseteq D$ given in the problem
- Then $x \in D$ by definition of subset
- Case 2: *x* ∈ *C*

- Case 1: $x \in B$
- $B \subseteq D$ given in the problem
- Then $x \in D$ by definition of subset
- Case 2: *x* ∈ *C*
- $C \subseteq E$

- Case 1: $x \in B$
- $B \subseteq D$ given in the problem
- Then $x \in D$ by definition of subset
- Case 2: *x* ∈ *C*
- $C \subseteq E$
- Then $x \in E$ by definition of subset

• Don't lose sight of the prize!

- Don't lose sight of the prize!
- If $x \in D$, then $x \in D \cup E$
- If $x \in E$, then $x \in D \cup E$

- Don't lose sight of the prize!
- If $x \in D$, then $x \in D \cup E$
- If $x \in E$, then $x \in D \cup E$
- In either case, $x \in D \cup E$, so $x \in A$ and $x \in D \cup E$

- Don't lose sight of the prize!
- If $x \in D$, then $x \in D \cup E$
- If $x \in E$, then $x \in D \cup E$
- In either case, $x \in D \cup E$, so $x \in A$ and $x \in D \cup E$
- By definition of subset, $A \subseteq D \cup E$

- Don't lose sight of the prize!
- If $x \in D$, then $x \in D \cup E$
- If $x \in E$, then $x \in D \cup E$
- In either case, $x \in D \cup E$, so $x \in A$ and $x \in D \cup E$
- By definition of subset, $A \subseteq D \cup E$
- We are done!

• If you want to prove set equality (A=B) you need to establish $A \subseteq B$ and $B \subseteq A$.

- If you want to prove set equality (A=B) you need to establish $A \subseteq B$ and $B \subseteq A$.
- This makes intuitive sense: imagine these sets -

- If you want to prove set equality (A=B) you need to establish $A \subseteq B$ and $B \subseteq A$.
- This makes intuitive sense: imagine these sets -

•
$$A = {Jeff, Stacy}B = {Jeff, Tom, Stacy}$$

- If you want to prove set equality (A=B) you need to establish $A \subseteq B$ and $B \subseteq A$.
- This makes intuitive sense: imagine these sets -
- $A = {Jeff, Stacy}B = {Jeff, Tom, Stacy}$
- If we stopped our proof at showing A ⊆ B and claimed equality, we would be missing the fact that there is an element in B not in A, implying they are not equal

- If you want to prove set equality (A=B) you need to establish $A \subseteq B$ and $B \subseteq A$.
- This makes intuitive sense: imagine these sets -
- $A = {Jeff, Stacy}B = {Jeff, Tom, Stacy}$
- If we stopped our proof at showing A ⊆ B and claimed equality, we would be missing the fact that there is an element in B not in A, implying they are not equal
- It is therefore important to show both sides of the equality are subsets of one another to do a complete equality proof
• Let's follow our steps again: why, in words, would this logically hold?

- Let's follow our steps again: why, in words, would this logically hold?
- Recall $P(S) = \{T | T \subset S\}$

- Let's follow our steps again: why, in words, would this logically hold?
- Recall $P(S) = \{T | T \subset S\}$
- The Power set is a set made up of other sets

- Let's follow our steps again: why, in words, would this logically hold?
- Recall $P(S) = \{T | T \subset S\}$
- The Power set is a set made up of other sets
- In words then, what are we saying?

- Let's follow our steps again: why, in words, would this logically hold?
- Recall $P(S) = \{T | T \subset S\}$
- The Power set is a set made up of other sets
- In words then, what are we saying?
- If the elements that are in A and B are equal to A, then A is part of the Power Set of B, meaning A is one of the group of all subsets of B

•
$$A = \{q, r\}$$

- $A = \{q, r\}$
- $B = \{q, r, s\}$

- $A = \{q, r\}$
- $B = \{q, r, s\}$
- $P(B) = \{\{\}, \{q\}, \{r\}, \{s\}, \{q, r\}, \{q, s\}, \{r, s\}, \{q, r, s\}\}$

• This is a biconditional statement (if and only if or iff)

- This is a biconditional statement (if and only if or iff)
- This means we need to prove that when $A \cap B = A$ that $A \in P(B)$

- This is a biconditional statement (if and only if or iff)
- This means we need to prove that when $A \cap B = A$ that $A \in P(B)$
- AND that when $A \in P(B)$, $A \cap B = A$

- This is a biconditional statement (if and only if or iff)
- This means we need to prove that when $A \cap B = A$ that $A \in P(B)$
- AND that when $A \in P(B)$, $A \cap B = A$
- First statement implies the second, and vice versa

• First, let's assume that $A \cap B = A$. We will prove $A \in P(B)$

- First, let's assume that $A \cap B = A$. We will prove $A \in P(B)$
- Next, we assume $A \in P(B)$ We will prove $A \cap B = A$.

- First, let's assume that $A \cap B = A$. We will prove $A \in P(B)$
- Next, we assume $A \in P(B)$ We will prove $A \cap B = A$.
- Notice our strategy: we assume part one, and use it to prove part two. Then we assume part two, and use it to prove part one.

- First, let's assume that $A \cap B = A$. We will prove $A \in P(B)$
- Next, we assume $A \in P(B)$ We will prove $A \cap B = A$.
- Notice our strategy: we assume part one, and use it to prove part two. Then we assume part two, and use it to prove part one.
- For the first step we assume A ∩ B = A. We don't need to prove it until step 2.

• First, let's assume that $A \cap B = A$. We will prove $A \in P(B)$

- First, let's assume that $A \cap B = A$. We will prove $A \in P(B)$
- Let $x \in A$, then $x \in A$ and $x \in B$ by definition of set intersection

- First, let's assume that $A \cap B = A$. We will prove $A \in P(B)$
- Let $x \in A$, then $x \in A$ and $x \in B$ by definition of set intersection
- This means $x \in B$, so $x \in P(B)$ by definition of Power Set

- First, let's assume that $A \cap B = A$. We will prove $A \in P(B)$
- Let $x \in A$, then $x \in A$ and $x \in B$ by definition of set intersection
- This means $x \in B$, so $x \in P(B)$ by definition of Power Set
- This completes step 1.

• Next, we assume $A \in P(B)$ We will prove $A \cap B = A$.

- Next, we assume $A \in P(B)$ We will prove $A \cap B = A$.
- We need to show equality

- Next, we assume $A \in P(B)$ We will prove $A \cap B = A$.
- We need to show equality
- $A \subseteq A \cap B$ and $A \cap B \subseteq A$

- Next, we assume $A \in P(B)$ We will prove $A \cap B = A$.
- We need to show equality
- $A \subseteq A \cap B$ and $A \cap B \subseteq A$
- Let any $x \in A$. We will show $x \in A \cap B$.

- Next, we assume $A \in P(B)$ We will prove $A \cap B = A$.
- We need to show equality
- $A \subseteq A \cap B$ and $A \cap B \subseteq A$
- Let any $x \in A$. We will show $x \in A \cap B$.
- We have assumed $A \in P(B)$. By definition of power set, $A \subseteq B$.

- Next, we assume $A \in P(B)$ We will prove $A \cap B = A$.
- We need to show equality
- $A \subseteq A \cap B$ and $A \cap B \subseteq A$
- Let any $x \in A$. We will show $x \in A \cap B$.
- We have assumed $A \in P(B)$. By definition of power set, $A \subseteq B$.
- If $A \subseteq B$, then $x \in B$ by definition of subset.

- Next, we assume $A \in P(B)$ We will prove $A \cap B = A$.
- We need to show equality
- $A \subseteq A \cap B$ and $A \cap B \subseteq A$
- Let any $x \in A$. We will show $x \in A \cap B$.
- We have assumed $A \in P(B)$. By definition of power set, $A \subseteq B$.
- If $A \subseteq B$, then $x \in B$ by definition of subset.
- As such, $x \in A$ and $x \in B$.

- Next, we assume $A \in P(B)$ We will prove $A \cap B = A$.
- We need to show equality
- $A \subseteq A \cap B$ and $A \cap B \subseteq A$
- Let any $x \in A$. We will show $x \in A \cap B$.
- We have assumed $A \in P(B)$. By definition of power set, $A \subseteq B$.
- If $A \subseteq B$, then $x \in B$ by definition of subset.
- As such, $x \in A$ and $x \in B$.
- Done! This is an easy case, since we only have one set on one side of the equality

• For two finite sets S and T $|S \cup T| = |S| + |T| - |S \cap T|$

- For two finite sets S and T $|S \cup T| = |S| + |T| |S \cap T|$
- Why is this true?

- For two finite sets S and T $|S \cup T| = |S| + |T| |S \cap T|$
- Why is this true?
- Lets say |S| = 2, |T| = 1 and they are disjoint we have $|S \cup T| = 3$.

- For two finite sets S and T $|S \cup T| = |S| + |T| |S \cap T|$
- Why is this true?
- Lets say |S| = 2, |T| = 1 and they are disjoint we have $|S \cup T| = 3$.
- Since they are disjoint, we can express this as

- For two finite sets S and T $|S \cup T| = |S| + |T| |S \cap T|$
- Why is this true?
- Lets say |S| = 2, |T| = 1 and they are disjoint we have $|S \cup T| = 3$.
- Since they are disjoint, we can express this as
- 3 = 2+1-0

• What if they aren't disjoint?

- What if they aren't disjoint?
- $S = \{1, 2, 3\}$

- What if they aren't disjoint?
- $S = \{1, 2, 3\}$
- $T = \{1, 4\}$
- What if they aren't disjoint?
- $S = \{1, 2, 3\}$
- $T = \{1, 4\}$
- $S \cup T = \{1, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$

- What if they aren't disjoint?
- $S = \{1, 2, 3\}$
- $T = \{1, 4\}$
- $S \cup T = \{1, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$
- $S \cap T = \{1\}$

- What if they aren't disjoint?
- $S = \{1, 2, 3\}$
- $T = \{1, 4\}$
- $S \cup T = \{1, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$
- $S \cap T = \{1\}$
- 4 = 3 + 2 1

• We can extend this logic to include a third set

- We can extend this logic to include a third set
- $|A \cup B \cup C| = |A| + |B| + |C| |A \cap B| |A \cap C| |B \cap C| + |A \cap B \cap C|$

There is a party!

- You notice 10 people have white shirts, 8 have red shirts
- 4 people have black shoes and white shirts
- 3 have black shoes and red shirts
- 21 people have red shirts or white shorts or black shoes
- How many have black shoes?

We will use set theory rules to translate the words into an algebraic expression. First, define the sets.

- White shirts: W
- Red shirts: R
- Black shoes: B

Next, define the relationships

- Assume people only wear one shirt to a party, so (R ∩ W) = Ø.
 Then the set of red shirt guests (R) is a complement to the set of white shirt guests (R^c).
- Following this assumption, it implies that there are guests wearing other color shirts because |R ∪ R^c| < |R ∪ R^c ∪ B|
- $|B \cup R \cup R^c| = 21$
- $|R \cap B| = 3$
- $|R^c \cap B| = 4$

•
$$|A \cup B \cup C| = |A| + |B| + |C| - |A \cap B| - |A \cap C| - |B \cap C| + |A \cap B \cap C|$$

- $|A \cup B \cup C| = |A| + |B| + |C| |A \cap B| |A \cap C| |B \cap C| + |A \cap B \cap C|$
- $|B \cup R \cup R^c| = |R| + |R^c| + |B| |R \cap R^c| |R \cap B| |B \cap R^c| + |R \cap R^c \cap B|$

- $|A \cup B \cup C| = |A| + |B| + |C| |A \cap B| |A \cap C| |B \cap C| + |A \cap B \cap C|$
- $|B \cup R \cup R^c| = |R| + |R^c| + |B| |R \cap R^c| |R \cap B| |B \cap R^c| + |R \cap R^c \cap B|$
- 21 = 8 + 10 + |B| 0 3 4 + 0

- $|A \cup B \cup C| = |A| + |B| + |C| |A \cap B| |A \cap C| |B \cap C| + |A \cap B \cap C|$
- $|B \cup R \cup R^c| = |R| + |R^c| + |B| |R \cap R^c| |R \cap B| |B \cap R^c| + |R \cap R^c \cap B|$
- 21 = 8 + 10 + |B| 0 3 4 + 0
- 10 = |B|

- $A = \{a, b\}$ and $B = \{1, 2\}$, then $A \times B = \{(a, 1), (a, 2), (b, 1), (b, 2)\}$
- BUT $B \times A = \{(1, a), (1, b), (2, a), (2, b)\}$
- This is because for non-empty A and B, if A contains an element x, in $A \times B$ there will be an ordered pair leading with x, but this will not be the case in the reverse such ordered pair.

• Why the requirement that they are non-empty?

- Why the requirement that they are non-empty?
- Because $A \times \emptyset = \emptyset$

- Why the requirement that they are non-empty?
- Because $A \times \emptyset = \emptyset$
- Let's prove this by contradiction

• Let's assume the opposite: $A \times \emptyset \neq \emptyset$

- Let's assume the opposite: $A \times \emptyset \neq \emptyset$
- Then, the ordered pair $(x, y) \in A \times \emptyset$

- Let's assume the opposite: $A \times \emptyset \neq \emptyset$
- Then, the ordered pair $(x, y) \in A \times \emptyset$
- From the definition of Cartesian product, this would mean $x \in A$ and $y \in \emptyset$

- Let's assume the opposite: $A \times \emptyset \neq \emptyset$
- Then, the ordered pair $(x, y) \in A \times \emptyset$
- From the definition of Cartesian product, this would mean $x \in A$ and $y \in \emptyset$
- However, by definition of empty set $y \notin \emptyset$

- Let's assume the opposite: $A \times \emptyset \neq \emptyset$
- Then, the ordered pair $(x, y) \in A \times \emptyset$
- From the definition of Cartesian product, this would mean x ∈ A and y ∈ Ø
- However, by definition of empty set $y \notin \emptyset$
- It is a contradiction to hold $A \times \emptyset \neq \emptyset$, therefore $A \times \emptyset = \emptyset$

If A, B are sets, $A \times B = B \times A$ if and only if A = B or either A or B are \emptyset .

• For an if and only if proof, we need to prove the claim going in both directions

If A, B are sets, $A \times B = B \times A$ if and only if A = B or either A or B are \emptyset .

- For an if and only if proof, we need to prove the claim going in both directions
- That means we need to show it is the case that if $A \times B = B \times A$, our conditions must hold.

If A, B are sets, $A \times B = B \times A$ if and only if A = B or either A or B are \emptyset .

- For an if and only if proof, we need to prove the claim going in both directions
- That means we need to show it is the case that if $A \times B = B \times A$, our conditions must hold.
- It also means that when our conditions hold, it implies our statement

• First half

- First half
- If A = B then A × B = A × A and B × A = A × A. Then, A × B = B × A because that statement is the same as A × A = A × A which is true by definition of identity

- First half
- If A = B then A × B = A × A and B × A = A × A. Then,
 A × B = B × A because that statement is the same as
 A × A = A × A which is true by definition of identity
- If $A = \emptyset$, then $A \times B = \emptyset$. Same goes for *B*. If that is the case, then $A \times B = B \times A$

• Second half

- Second half
- Let A and B be non-empty sets and let it be the case that $A \times B = B \times A$

- Second half
- Let A and B be non-empty sets and let it be the case that $A \times B = B \times A$
- $\bullet\,$ Now we show if this statement holds, then A=B

- Second half
- Let A and B be non-empty sets and let it be the case that $A \times B = B \times A$
- $\bullet\,$ Now we show if this statement holds, then A=B
- Let $x \in A$. Then there is a $y \in B$ s.t. $(x, y) \in (A \times B)$.

- Second half
- Let A and B be non-empty sets and let it be the case that $A \times B = B \times A$
- $\bullet\,$ Now we show if this statement holds, then A=B
- Let $x \in A$. Then there is a $y \in B$ s.t. $(x, y) \in (A \times B)$.
- Since $A \times B = B \times A$, then $(x, y) \in (B \times A)$

- Second half
- Let A and B be non-empty sets and let it be the case that $A \times B = B \times A$
- Now we show if this statement holds, then $A{=}B$
- Let $x \in A$. Then there is a $y \in B$ s.t. $(x, y) \in (A \times B)$.
- Since $A \times B = B \times A$, then $(x, y) \in (B \times A)$
- By definition of Cartesian product, $x \in B$.

- Second half
- Let A and B be non-empty sets and let it be the case that $A \times B = B \times A$
- Now we show if this statement holds, then $A{=}B$
- Let $x \in A$. Then there is a $y \in B$ s.t. $(x, y) \in (A \times B)$.
- Since $A \times B = B \times A$, then $(x, y) \in (B \times A)$
- By definition of Cartesian product, $x \in B$.
- Since $x \in A$ and $x \in B$, then $A \subseteq B$. Similarly, $B \subseteq A$

- Second half
- Let A and B be non-empty sets and let it be the case that $A \times B = B \times A$
- Now we show if this statement holds, then $A{=}B$
- Let $x \in A$. Then there is a $y \in B$ s.t. $(x, y) \in (A \times B)$.
- Since $A \times B = B \times A$, then $(x, y) \in (B \times A)$
- By definition of Cartesian product, $x \in B$.
- Since $x \in A$ and $x \in B$, then $A \subseteq B$. Similarly, $B \subseteq A$
- B = A
• Let $(x, y) \in A \times (B \cup C)$. Then $x \in A$ and $y \in B$ or $y \in C$.

- Let $(x, y) \in A \times (B \cup C)$. Then $x \in A$ and $y \in B$ or $y \in C$.
- Case 1: $y \in B$

- Let $(x, y) \in A \times (B \cup C)$. Then $x \in A$ and $y \in B$ or $y \in C$.
- Case 1: $y \in B$
- Then $(x,y) \in (A \times B)$ so $(x,y) \in (A \times B) \cup (A \times C)$

- Let $(x, y) \in A \times (B \cup C)$. Then $x \in A$ and $y \in B$ or $y \in C$.
- Case 1: $y \in B$
- Then $(x, y) \in (A \times B)$ so $(x, y) \in (A \times B) \cup (A \times C)$
- Case 2: (*x*, *y*) ∈ (*A* × *C*)

- Let $(x, y) \in A \times (B \cup C)$. Then $x \in A$ and $y \in B$ or $y \in C$.
- Case 1: $y \in B$
- Then $(x,y) \in (A \times B)$ so $(x,y) \in (A \times B) \cup (A \times C)$
- Case 2: (*x*, *y*) ∈ (*A* × *C*)
- Then $(x,y) \in (A \times C)$ so $(x,y) \in (A \times B) \cup (A \times C)$

- Let $(x, y) \in A \times (B \cup C)$. Then $x \in A$ and $y \in B$ or $y \in C$.
- Case 1: $y \in B$
- Then $(x, y) \in (A \times B)$ so $(x, y) \in (A \times B) \cup (A \times C)$
- Case 2: (*x*, *y*) ∈ (*A* × *C*)
- Then $(x, y) \in (A \times C)$ so $(x, y) \in (A \times B) \cup (A \times C)$
- Therefore $A \times (B \cup C) \subseteq (A \times B) \cup (A \times C)$

• Let $(x, y) \in A \times (B \cup C)$. Then $x \in A$ and $y \in B$ or $y \in C$.

- Let $(x, y) \in A \times (B \cup C)$. Then $x \in A$ and $y \in B$ or $y \in C$.
- Case 1: $y \in B$

- Let $(x, y) \in A \times (B \cup C)$. Then $x \in A$ and $y \in B$ or $y \in C$.
- Case 1: $y \in B$
- Then $(x,y) \in (A \times B)$ so $(x,y) \in (A \times B) \cup (A \times C)$

- Let $(x, y) \in A \times (B \cup C)$. Then $x \in A$ and $y \in B$ or $y \in C$.
- Case 1: $y \in B$
- Then $(x, y) \in (A \times B)$ so $(x, y) \in (A \times B) \cup (A \times C)$
- Case 2: (*x*, *y*) ∈ (*A* × *C*)

- Let $(x, y) \in A \times (B \cup C)$. Then $x \in A$ and $y \in B$ or $y \in C$.
- Case 1: $y \in B$
- Then $(x, y) \in (A \times B)$ so $(x, y) \in (A \times B) \cup (A \times C)$
- Case 2: (*x*, *y*) ∈ (*A* × *C*)
- Then $(x, y) \in (A \times C)$ so $(x, y) \in (A \times B) \cup (A \times C)$

- Let $(x, y) \in A \times (B \cup C)$. Then $x \in A$ and $y \in B$ or $y \in C$.
- Case 1: $y \in B$
- Then $(x, y) \in (A \times B)$ so $(x, y) \in (A \times B) \cup (A \times C)$
- Case 2: (*x*, *y*) ∈ (*A* × *C*)
- Then $(x, y) \in (A \times C)$ so $(x, y) \in (A \times B) \cup (A \times C)$
- Therefore $A \times (B \cup C) \subseteq (A \times B) \cup (A \times C)$

- Let $(x, y) \in A \times (B \cup C)$. Then $x \in A$ and $y \in B$ or $y \in C$.
- Case 1: $y \in B$
- Then $(x, y) \in (A \times B)$ so $(x, y) \in (A \times B) \cup (A \times C)$
- Case 2: (*x*, *y*) ∈ (*A* × *C*)
- Then $(x,y) \in (A \times C)$ so $(x,y) \in (A \times B) \cup (A \times C)$
- Therefore $A \times (B \cup C) \subseteq (A \times B) \cup (A \times C)$
- Recall a complete proof must also show $(A \times B) \cup (A \times C) \subseteq A \times (B \cup C)$ to establish equality

True or false (and provide a proof) Let D, E be two sets $(D \setminus E) \cup E = D$

True or false (and provide a poof) Let D, E be two sets $D \cap (D \cup E) = D$

- Set theory is the formal study of the relationship between collections of objects
- Database management is an application of this theory
- Understanding the abstract rules from set theory will provide us with a guide post to move forward
- The more comfortable you feel with the logical rules from set theory, the easier it will be to think about relationships, entities, and manipulating data to form queries
- We will now turn to practicing these questions in a more guided way