JOURNAL OF FORMALIZED MATHEMATICS
Volume 1, Released 1989, Published 2003
Inst. of Computer Science, Univ. of Białystok

Families of Sets

Beata Padlewska
Warsaw University
Białystok

Summary. The article contains definitions of the following concepts: family of sets, family of subsets of a set, the intersection of a family of sets. Functors $\cup$, $\cap$, and $\setminus$ are redefined for families of subsets of a set. Some properties of these notions are presented.

MML Identifier: SETFAM_1.

WWW: http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/setfam_1.html

The articles [2], [1], and [3] provide the notation and terminology for this paper.

In this paper X, Y, Z, Z_1, D, x denote sets.

Let us consider X. The functor $\bigcap X$ is defined by:

(Def. 1)(i) For every x holds $x \in \bigcap X$ iff for every Y such that $Y \in X$ holds $x \in Y$ if $X \neq \emptyset$,

(ii) $\bigcap X = \emptyset$, otherwise.

Next we state a number of propositions:

(2)[1] $\bigcap \emptyset = \emptyset$.

(3) $\bigcap X \subseteq \bigcup X$.

(4) If $Z \in X$, then $\bigcap X \subseteq Z$.

(5) If $\emptyset \in X$, then $\bigcap X = \emptyset$.

(6) If $X \neq \emptyset$ and for every Z_1 such that $Z_1 \in X$ holds $Z \subseteq Z_1$, then $Z \subseteq \bigcap X$.

(7) If $X \neq \emptyset$ and $X \subseteq Y$, then $\bigcap Y \subseteq \bigcap X$.

(8) If $X \in Y$ and $X \subseteq Z$, then $\bigcap Y \subseteq Z$.

(9) If $X \in Y$ and X misses Z, then $\bigcap Y$ misses Z.

(10) If $X \neq \emptyset$ and $Y \neq \emptyset$, then $\bigcap (X \cup Y) = \bigcap X \cap \bigcap Y$.

(11) $\bigcap \{x\} = x$.

(12) $\bigcap \{X, Y\} = X \cap Y$.

In the sequel S_1, S_2, S_3 denote sets.

Let us consider S_1, S_2. We say that S_1 is finer than S_2 if and only if:

(Def. 2) For every X such that $X \in S_1$ there exists Y such that $Y \in S_2$ and $X \subseteq Y$.

[1] The proposition (1) has been removed.

Let us note that the predicate S_1 is finer than S_2 is reflexive. We say that S_2 is coarser than S_1 if and only if:

(Def. 3) For every Y such that $Y \in S_2$ there exists X such that $X \in S_1$ and $X \subseteq Y$.

Let us note that the predicate S_2 is coarser than S_1 is reflexive.

We now state several propositions:

(17)[2] If $S_1 \subseteq S_2$, then S_1 is finer than S_2.

(18) If S_1 is finer than S_2, then $\bigcup S_1 \subseteq \bigcup S_2$.

(19) If $S_2 \neq \emptyset$ and S_2 is coarser than S_1, then $\bigcap S_1 \subseteq \bigcap S_2$.

(20) $\emptyset$ is finer than S_1.

(21) If S_1 is finer than $\emptyset$, then $S_1 = \emptyset$.

(23)[3] If S_1 is finer than S_2 and S_2 is finer than S_3, then S_1 is finer than S_3.

(24) If S_1 is finer than $\{Y\}$, then for every X such that $X \in S_1$ holds $X \subseteq Y$.

(25) If S_1 is finer than $\{X, Y\}$, then for every Z such that $Z \in S_1$ holds $Z \subseteq X$ or $Z \subseteq Y$.

Let us consider S_1, S_2. The functor $S_1 \Cup S_2$ is defined as follows:

(Def. 4) $Z \in S_1 \Cup S_2$ iff there exist X, Y such that $X \in S_1$ and $Y \in S_2$ and $Z = X \cup Y$.

Let us note that the functor $S_1 \Cup S_2$ is commutative. The functor $S_1 \Cap S_2$ is defined as follows:

(Def. 5) $Z \in S_1 \Cap S_2$ iff there exist X, Y such that $X \in S_1$ and $Y \in S_2$ and $Z = X \cap Y$.

Let us notice that the functor $S_1 \Cap S_2$ is commutative. The functor $S_1 \setminus\setminus S_2$ is defined by:

(Def. 6) $Z \in S_1 \setminus\setminus S_2$ iff there exist X, Y such that $X \in S_1$ and $Y \in S_2$ and $Z = X \setminus Y$.

We now state a number of propositions:

(29)[4] S_1 is finer than $S_1 \Cup S_1$.

(30) $S_1 \Cap S_1$ is finer than S_1.

(31) $S_1 \setminus\setminus S_1$ is finer than S_1.

(34)[5] If S_1 meets S_2, then $\bigcap S_1 \cap \bigcap S_2 = \bigcap (S_1 \Cap S_2)$.

(35) If $S_2 \neq \emptyset$, then $X \cup \bigcap S_2 = \bigcap (\{X\} \Cup S_2)$.

(36) $X \cap \bigcup S_2 = \bigcup (\{X\} \Cap S_2)$.

(37) If $S_2 \neq \emptyset$, then $X \setminus \bigcup S_2 = \bigcap (\{X\} \setminus\setminus S_2)$.

(38) If $S_2 \neq \emptyset$, then $X \setminus \bigcap S_2 = \bigcup (\{X\} \setminus\setminus S_2)$.

(39) $\bigcup (S_1 \Cap S_2) \subseteq \bigcup S_1 \cap \bigcup S_2$.

(40) If $S_1 \neq \emptyset$ and $S_2 \neq \emptyset$, then $\bigcap S_1 \cup \bigcap S_2 \subseteq \bigcap (S_1 \Cup S_2)$.

(41) $\bigcap (S_1 \setminus\setminus S_2) \subseteq \bigcap S_1 \setminus \bigcap S_2$.

Let D be a set. Family of subsets of D is defined by:

[2] The propositions (13)–(16) have been removed.
[3] The proposition (22) has been removed.
[4] The propositions (26)–(28) have been removed.
[5] The propositions (32) and (33) have been removed.

(Def. 7) It $\subseteq 2^D$.

Let D be a set. We see that the family of subsets of D is a subset of 2^D.

Let D be a set. Note that there exists a family of subsets of D which is empty and there exists a family of subsets of D which is non empty.

In the sequel F, G are families of subsets of D and P is a subset of D.

Let us consider D, F. Then $\bigcup F$ is a subset of D.

Let us consider D, F. Then $\bigcap F$ is a subset of D.

We now state the proposition

(44)[6] If for every P holds $P \in F$ iff $P \in G$, then $F = G$.

The scheme *SubFamEx* deals with a set $\mathcal{A}$ and a unary predicate $\mathcal{P}$, and states that:

There exists a family F of subsets of $\mathcal{A}$ such that for every subset B of $\mathcal{A}$ holds $B \in F$ iff $\mathcal{P}[B]$

for all values of the parameters.

Let us consider D, F. The functor $F^{\rm c}$ yielding a family of subsets of D is defined as follows:

(Def. 8) For every subset P of D holds $P \in F^{\rm c}$ iff $P^{\rm c} \in F$.

Let us note that the functor $F^{\rm c}$ is involutive.

The following three propositions are true:

(46)[7] If $F \neq \emptyset$, then $F^{\rm c} \neq \emptyset$.

(47) If $F \neq \emptyset$, then $\Omega_D \setminus \bigcup F = \bigcap (F^{\rm c})$.

(48) If $F \neq \emptyset$, then $\bigcup (F^{\rm c}) = \Omega_D \setminus \bigcap F$.

References

[1] Czesław Byliński. Some basic properties of sets. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/zfmisc_1.html.

[2] Andrzej Trybulec. Tarski Grothendieck set theory. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, Axiomatics, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Axiomatics/tarski.html.

[3] Zinaida Trybulec. Properties of subsets. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/subset_1.html.

Received April 5, 1989

Published January 2, 2004

[6] The propositions (42) and (43) have been removed.

[7] The proposition (45) has been removed.