# Cardinality rationale for functions

**Key idea for cardinality**: Counting distinct elements is a way of labelling elements with natural numbers. This is a function! In general, functions let us associate elements of one set with those of another. If the association is "good", we get a correspondence between the elements of the subsets which can relate the sizes of the sets.

# Musical chairs analogy

Analogy: Musical chairs



People try to sit down when the music stops

Person♥ sits in Chair 1, Person® sits in Chair 2,

Person© is left standing!

What does this say about the number of chairs and the number of people?

# Injective functions visually

Informally, a function being one-to-one means "no duplicate images".

# Cardinality lower bound definition

**Definition**: For nonempty sets A, B, we say that **the cardinality of** A **is no bigger than the cardinality of** B, and write  $|A| \leq |B|$ , to mean there is a one-to-one function with domain A and codomain B. Also, we define  $|\emptyset| \leq |B|$  for all sets B.

# Injective cardinality musical chairs

In the analogy: The function  $sitter: \{Chair1, Chair2\} \rightarrow \{Person \heartsuit, Person \heartsuit, Person \heartsuit\}$  given by  $sitter(Chair1) = Person \heartsuit$ ,  $sitter(Chair2) = Person \heartsuit$ , is one-to-one and witnesses that

$$|\{Chair1, Chair2\}| \le |\{Person \heartsuit, Person \heartsuit, Person \heartsuit\}|$$

# Cardinality upper bound definition

**Definition**: For nonempty sets A, B, we say that **the cardinality of** A **is no smaller than the cardinality of** B, and write  $|A| \ge |B|$ , to mean there is an onto function with domain A and codomain B. Also, we define  $|A| \ge |\emptyset|$  for all sets A.

# Surjective cardinality musical chairs

In the analogy: The function  $triedToSit: \{Person \heartsuit, Person \heartsuit, Person \heartsuit, Person \heartsuit\} \rightarrow \{Chair1, Chair2\}$  given by  $triedToSit(Person \heartsuit) = Chair1, triedToSit(Person \heartsuit) = Chair2, triedToSit(Person \heartsuit) = Chair2,$  is onto and witnesses that

$$|\{Person \heartsuit, Person \heartsuit, Person \heartsuit\}| \ge |\{Chair1, Chair2\}|$$

### Cardinality properties

Properties of cardinality

$$\forall A \ ( \ |A| = |A| \ )$$
 
$$\forall A \ \forall B \ ( \ |A| = |B| \ \rightarrow \ |B| = |A| \ )$$
 
$$\forall A \ \forall B \ \forall C \ ( \ (|A| = |B| \ \land \ |B| = |C|) \ \rightarrow \ |A| = |C| \ )$$

Extra practice with proofs: Use the definitions of bijections to prove these properties.

# Cardinality power sets

*Recall*: When U is a set,  $\mathcal{P}(U) = \{X \mid X \subseteq U\}$ 

Key idea: For finite sets, the power set of a set has strictly greater size than the set itself. Does this extend to infinite sets?

**Definition**: For two sets A, B, we use the notation |A| < |B| to denote  $(|A| \le |B|) \land \neg (|A| = |B|)$ .

 $\mathbb{N}$  and its power set

Example elements of  $\mathbb{N}$ 

Example elements of  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ 

Claim:  $|\mathbb{N}| \leq |\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})|$ 

Claim: There is an uncountable set. Example:

**Proof**: By definition of countable, since is not finite, to show is  $|\mathbb{N}| \neq |\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})|$ .

Rewriting using the definition of cardinality, to show is

Towards a proof by universal generalization, consider an arbitrary function  $f: \mathbb{N} \to \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ .

To show: f is not a bijection. It's enough to show that f is not onto.

Rewriting using the definition of onto, to show:

$$\neg \forall B \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) \ \exists a \in \mathbb{N} \ (f(a) = B)$$

. By logical equivalence, we can write this as an existential statement:

In search of a witness, define the following collection of nonnegative integers:

$$D_f = \{ n \in \mathbb{N} \mid n \notin f(n) \}$$

. By definition of power set, since all elements of  $D_f$  are in  $\mathbb{N}$ ,  $D_f \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ . It's enough to prove the following Lemma:

**Lemma**:  $\forall a \in \mathbb{N} \ (f(a) \neq D_f)$ .

Proof of lemma:

By the Lemma, we have proved that f is not onto, and since f was arbitrary, there are no onto functions from  $\mathbb{N}$  to  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ . QED

Where does  $D_f$  come from? The idea is to build a set that would "disagree" with each of the images of f about some element.

$n \in \mathbb{N}$	$f(n) = X_n$	Is $0 \in X_n$ ?	Is $1 \in X_n$ ?	Is $2 \in X_n$ ?	Is $3 \in X_n$ ?	Is $4 \in X_n$ ?	 Is $n \in D_f$ ?
0	$f(0) = X_0$	Y / N	Y / N	Y / N	Y / N	Y / N	 $\overline{\rm N / Y}$
1	$f(1) = X_1$	Y / N	Y / N	Y / N	Y / N	Y / N	 N / Y
2	$f(2) = X_2$	Y / N	Y / N	Y / N	Y / N	Y / N	 N / Y
3	$f(3) = X_3$	Y / N	Y / N	Y / N	Y / N	Y / N	 N / Y
4	$f(4) = X_4$	Y/N	Y / N	Y / N	Y / N	Y/N	 N/Y
:		,	,	,	,	•	·
•							

# Cardinality rationals reals

### Comparing $\mathbb{Q}$ and $\mathbb{R}$

Both  $\mathbb{Q}$  and  $\mathbb{R}$  have no greatest element.

Both  $\mathbb{Q}$  and  $\mathbb{R}$  have no least element.

The quantified statement

$$\forall x \forall y (x < y \rightarrow \exists z (x < z < y))$$

is true about both  $\mathbb{Q}$  and  $\mathbb{R}$ .

Both  $\mathbb{Q}$  and  $\mathbb{R}$  are infinite. But,  $\mathbb{Q}$  is countably infinite whereas  $\mathbb{R}$  is uncountable.

#### The set of real numbers

 $\mathbb{Z}\subsetneq\mathbb{Q}\subsetneq\mathbb{R}$ 

**Order axioms** (Rosen Appendix 1):

### Completeness axioms (Rosen Appendix 1):

Least upper bound Nested intervals Every nonempty set of real numbers that is bounded above has a least upper bound For each sequence of intervals  $[a_n, b_n]$  where, for each n,  $a_n < a_{n+1} < b_{n+1} < b_n$ , there is at least one real number x such that, for all n,  $a_n \le x \le b_n$ .

Each real number  $r \in \mathbb{R}$  is described by a function to give better and better approximations

$$x_r: \mathbb{Z}^+ \to \{0,1\}$$
 where  $x_r(n) = n^{th}$  bit in binary expansion of r

r	Binary expansion	$x_r$			
0.1	0.00011001	$x_{0.1}(n) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n > 1 \text{ and } (n \text{ mod } 4) = 2\\ 0 & \text{if } n = 1 \text{ or if } n > 1 \text{ and } (n \text{ mod } 4) = 3\\ 1 & \text{if } n > 1 \text{ and } (n \text{ mod } 4) = 0\\ 1 & \text{if } n > 1 \text{ and } (n \text{ mod } 4) = 1 \end{cases}$			
		Use linear approximations (tangent lines from calculus) to get algorithm for bounding error of successive operations. Define $x_{\sqrt{2}-1}(n)$ to be $n^{th}$ bit in approximation that has error less than $2^{-(n+1)}$ .			

Claim:  $\{r \in \mathbb{R} \mid 0 \le r \land r \le 1\}$  is uncountable.

Approach 1: Mimic proof that  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z}^+)$  is uncountable.

**Proof**: By definition of countable, since  $\{r \in \mathbb{R} \mid 0 \le r \land r \le 1\}$  is not finite, **to show** is  $|\mathbb{N}| \ne |\{r \in \mathbb{R} \mid 0 \le r \land r \le 1\}|$ .

**To show** is  $\forall f: \mathbb{Z}^+ \to \{r \in \mathbb{R} \mid 0 \le r \land r \le 1\}$  (f is not a bijection). Towards a proof by universal generalization, consider an arbitrary function  $f: \mathbb{Z}^+ \to \{r \in \mathbb{R} \mid 0 \le r \land r \le 1\}$ . **To show**: f is not a bijection. It's enough to show that f is not onto. Rewriting using the definition of onto, **to show**:

$$\exists x \in \{r \in \mathbb{R} \mid 0 \le r \land r \le 1\} \ \forall a \in \mathbb{N} \ (\ f(a) \ne x\ )$$

In search of a witness, define the following real number by defining its binary expansion

$$d_f = 0.b_1b_2b_3\cdots$$

where  $b_i = 1 - b_{ii}$  where  $b_{jk}$  is the coefficient of  $2^{-k}$  in the binary expansion of f(j). Since  $d_f \neq f(a)$  for any positive integer a, f is not onto.

Approach 2: Nested closed interval property

To show  $f: \mathbb{N} \to \{r \in \mathbb{R} \mid 0 \le r \land r \le 1\}$  is not onto. Strategy: Build a sequence of nested closed intervals that each avoid some f(n). Then the real number that is in all of the intervals can't be f(n) for any n. Hence, f is not onto.

Consider the function  $f: \mathbb{N} \to \{r \in \mathbb{R} \mid 0 \le r \land r \le 1\}$  with  $f(n) = \frac{1+\sin(n)}{2}$ 

$n \mid$	$\int f(n)$	Interval that avoids $f(n)$
0	0.5	
1	0.920735	
2	0.954649	
3	0.570560	
4	0.121599	
:		
•		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>There's a subtle imprecision in this part of the proof as presented, but it can be fixed.