CS70 Countability

Kelvin Lee

UC Berkeley

March 11, 2021

3 $1 \, / \, 12$ March 11, 2021

→ ∃ →

▲ 伊 ▶ ▲ 三

Overview





- 3 Cantor-Bernstein's Theorem
- 4 Cantor's Diagonalization

э



How do we determine if two sets have the same cardinality, or size?

э

(日) (四) (日) (日) (日)

How do we determine if two sets have the same cardinality, or size?

• This is obvious for finite sets, but trickier for infinite sets.

• • = • •

How do we determine if two sets have the same cardinality, or size?

- This is obvious for finite sets, but trickier for infinite sets.
- Two finite sets have the same size if and only if their elements can be paired up, so that each element of one set has a unique partner in the other set, and vice versa.

How do we determine if two sets have the same cardinality, or size?

- This is obvious for finite sets, but trickier for infinite sets.
- Two finite sets have the same size if and only if their elements can be paired up, so that each element of one set has a unique partner in the other set, and vice versa.
- We formalize this through the concept of a **bijection**, which you should have already learned about.

How do we determine if two sets have the same cardinality, or size?

- This is obvious for finite sets, but trickier for infinite sets.
- Two finite sets have the same size if and only if their elements can be paired up, so that each element of one set has a unique partner in the other set, and vice versa.
- We formalize this through the concept of a **bijection**, which you should have already learned about.
- To show that two infinite sets have the same **cardinality**, we need to establish a bijection (one-to-one correspondence) between the two sets.

Are there more natural numbers $\mathbb N$ than there are positive integers $\mathbb Z^+$?

э

(日) (四) (日) (日) (日)

Are there more natural numbers $\mathbb N$ than there are positive integers $\mathbb Z^+?$

• We can actually define a mapping between the natural numbers and the positive integers.

Are there more natural numbers $\mathbb N$ than there are positive integers $\mathbb Z^+$?

- We can actually define a mapping between the natural numbers and the positive integers.
- Define f : N → Z⁺ such that f(n) = n + 1. We can see there's a one-to-one correspondence (why?).

Are there more natural numbers $\mathbb N$ than there are positive integers $\mathbb Z^+$?

- We can actually define a mapping between the natural numbers and the positive integers.
- Define f : N → Z⁺ such that f(n) = n + 1. We can see there's a one-to-one correspondence (why?).

Are there more natural numbers $\mathbb N$ than there are positive integers $\mathbb Z^+$?

- We can actually define a mapping between the natural numbers and the positive integers.
- Define f : N → Z⁺ such that f(n) = n + 1. We can see there's a one-to-one correspondence (why?).

• This tells us that $|\mathbb{N}| = |\mathbb{Z}^+|$.

Are there more natural numbers $\mathbb N$ than there are positive integers $\mathbb Z^+$?

- We can actually define a mapping between the natural numbers and the positive integers.
- Define f : N → Z⁺ such that f(n) = n + 1. We can see there's a one-to-one correspondence (why?).

- This tells us that $|\mathbb{N}| = |\mathbb{Z}^+|$.
- We have just shown that $\infty + 1 = \infty!$



What about \mathbb{N} and \mathbb{Z} ?

イロト イヨト イヨト イヨト

What about \mathbb{N} and \mathbb{Z} ?

• They both actually have the same size! Let's see why, consider the following function *f*:

What about \mathbb{N} and \mathbb{Z} ?

• They both actually have the same size! Let's see why, consider the following function *f*:

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{x}{2}, & \text{if } x \text{ is even} \\ \frac{-(x+1)}{2}, & \text{if } x \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

What about \mathbb{N} and \mathbb{Z} ?

• They both actually have the same size! Let's see why, consider the following function *f*:

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{x}{2}, & \text{if } x \text{ is even} \\ \frac{-(x+1)}{2}, & \text{if } x \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

This function is in fact a bijection. Thus, the two sets have the same size.

Countable Sets

Kelvin Lee (UC Berkeley)

Discrete Math and Probability Theory

March 11, 2021 6 / 12

2

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ >



• A set *S* is **countable** if there is a bijection between *S* and ℕ or some subset of ℕ.

э

▲ 伊 ▶ ▲ 三

Countable Sets

- A set *S* is **countable** if there is a bijection between *S* and ℕ or some subset of ℕ.
- Intuitively, any finite set *S* is clearly **countable**.

Countable Sets

- A set S is countable if there is a bijection between S and N or some subset of N.
- Intuitively, any finite set *S* is clearly **countable**.
- The examples we did earlier are countable because they are subsets of \mathbb{N} , which is a **countable** set.

Now consider the set of rational numbers \mathbb{Q} , is it larger than \mathbb{N} ? Recall that $\mathbb{Q} = \left\{ \frac{x}{y} \mid x, y \in \mathbb{Z}, y \neq 0 \right\}$.

3

Now consider the set of rational numbers \mathbb{Q} , is it larger than \mathbb{N} ? Recall that $\mathbb{Q} = \left\{ \frac{x}{y} \mid x, y \in \mathbb{Z}, y \neq 0 \right\}$.

 The two sets actually have the same cardinality! Let's first learn some new definitions and an important theorem.

Now consider the set of rational numbers \mathbb{Q} , is it larger than \mathbb{N} ? Recall that $\mathbb{Q} = \left\{ \frac{x}{y} \mid x, y \in \mathbb{Z}, y \neq 0 \right\}$.

 The two sets actually have the same cardinality! Let's first learn some new definitions and an important theorem.

Definition 1

Now consider the set of rational numbers \mathbb{Q} , is it larger than \mathbb{N} ? Recall that $\mathbb{Q} = \left\{ \frac{x}{y} \mid x, y \in \mathbb{Z}, y \neq 0 \right\}$.

• The two sets actually have the same cardinality! Let's first learn some new definitions and an important theorem.

Definition 1

If there is a injective function $f : A \to B$, then $|A| \leq |B|$.

Now consider the set of rational numbers \mathbb{Q} , is it larger than \mathbb{N} ? Recall that $\mathbb{Q} = \left\{ \frac{x}{y} \mid x, y \in \mathbb{Z}, y \neq 0 \right\}$.

• The two sets actually have the same cardinality! Let's first learn some new definitions and an important theorem.

Definition 1

If there is a injective function $f : A \rightarrow B$, then $|A| \leq |B|$. Definition 2

Now consider the set of rational numbers \mathbb{Q} , is it larger than \mathbb{N} ? Recall that $\mathbb{Q} = \left\{ \frac{x}{y} \mid x, y \in \mathbb{Z}, y \neq 0 \right\}$.

• The two sets actually have the same cardinality! Let's first learn some new definitions and an important theorem.

Definition 1

If there is a injective function $f : A \to B$, then $|A| \le |B|$.

Definition 2

If there is a surjective function $f : A \rightarrow B$, then $|A| \ge |B|$.

Kelvin Lee (UC Berkeley)

Discrete Math and Probability Theory

March 11, 2021 8 / 12

э

э.

Image: A math a math

Theorem (Schröder–Bernstein Theorem (Cantor–Bernstein)) If A and B are sets with $|A| \le |B|$ and $|B| \le |A|$, then |A| = |B|. In other words, if there are injective functions $f : A \to B$ and $g : B \to A$, then there is a bijection h between A and B.

Theorem (Schröder–Bernstein Theorem (Cantor–Bernstein)) If A and B are sets with $|A| \le |B|$ and $|B| \le |A|$, then |A| = |B|. In other words, if there are injective functions $f : A \to B$ and $g : B \to A$, then there is a bijection h between A and B.

Proof:

Theorem (Schröder–Bernstein Theorem (Cantor–Bernstein)) If A and B are sets with $|A| \le |B|$ and $|B| \le |A|$, then |A| = |B|. In other words, if there are injective functions $f : A \to B$ and $g : B \to A$, then there is a bijection h between A and B.

Proof:

The proof of this theorem is out of scope for this class. We'll skip that for now. $\hfill \square$

Theorem (Schröder–Bernstein Theorem (Cantor–Bernstein)) If A and B are sets with $|A| \le |B|$ and $|B| \le |A|$, then |A| = |B|. In other words, if there are injective functions $f : A \to B$ and $g : B \to A$, then there is a bijection h between A and B.

Proof:

The proof of this theorem is out of scope for this class. We'll skip that for now. $\hfill \square$

This theorem will be very useful when showing a set S is countable.
 We can give separate injections f : S → N and g : N → S, instead of designing a bijection (which is trickier).

・ 同 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト

• Now back to our problem. First it is obvious that $|\mathbb{N}| \leq |\mathbb{Q}|$ because $\mathbb{N} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}.$

(日) (四) (日) (日) (日)

- Now back to our problem. First it is obvious that $|\mathbb{N}| \leq |\mathbb{Q}|$ because $\mathbb{N} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}.$
- Now the theorem comes in handy and all we need to do now is to prove $|\mathbb{Q}| \leq |\mathbb{N}|.$

э

- Now back to our problem. First it is obvious that $|\mathbb{N}| \le |\mathbb{Q}|$ because $\mathbb{N} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$.
- Now the theorem comes in handy and all we need to do now is to prove $|\mathbb{Q}| \leq |\mathbb{N}|.$
- Recall the definition, we must exhibit an injection $f : \mathbb{Q} \to \mathbb{N}$.

- Now back to our problem. First it is obvious that $|\mathbb{N}| \le |\mathbb{Q}|$ because $\mathbb{N} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$.
- Now the theorem comes in handy and all we need to do now is to prove $|\mathbb{Q}| \leq |\mathbb{N}|$.
- Recall the definition, we must exhibit an injection $f : \mathbb{Q} \to \mathbb{N}$.
- Notice that each rational number ^a/_b (gcd(a, b) = 1) can be represented by the point (a, b) ∈ ℤ × ℤ (the set of all pairs of integers).

- Now back to our problem. First it is obvious that $|\mathbb{N}| \le |\mathbb{Q}|$ because $\mathbb{N} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$.
- Now the theorem comes in handy and all we need to do now is to prove $|\mathbb{Q}| \leq |\mathbb{N}|$.
- Recall the definition, we must exhibit an injection $f : \mathbb{Q} \to \mathbb{N}$.
- Notice that each rational number ^a/_b (gcd(a, b) = 1) can be represented by the point (a, b) ∈ ℤ × ℤ (the set of all pairs of integers).
- However, not all points are valid.

- Now back to our problem. First it is obvious that $|\mathbb{N}| \leq |\mathbb{Q}|$ because $\mathbb{N} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}.$
- Now the theorem comes in handy and all we need to do now is to prove $|\mathbb{Q}| < |\mathbb{N}|$.
- Recall the definition, we must exhibit an injection $f : \mathbb{Q} \to \mathbb{N}$.
- Notice that each rational number $\frac{a}{b}$ (gcd(a, b) = 1) can be represented by the point $(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ (the set of all pairs of integers).
- However, not all points are valid.
- Thus, we can actually tell that $|\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}| \ge |\mathbb{Q}|$.

<日

<</p>

- Now back to our problem. First it is obvious that $|\mathbb{N}| \le |\mathbb{Q}|$ because $\mathbb{N} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$.
- Now the theorem comes in handy and all we need to do now is to prove $|\mathbb{Q}| \leq |\mathbb{N}|$.
- Recall the definition, we must exhibit an injection $f : \mathbb{Q} \to \mathbb{N}$.
- Notice that each rational number ^a/_b (gcd(a, b) = 1) can be represented by the point (a, b) ∈ ℤ × ℤ (the set of all pairs of integers).
- However, not all points are valid.
- Thus, we can actually tell that $|\mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{Z}|\geq |\mathbb{Q}|.$
- If we are able to come up with an injection from Z × Z to N, then this will also be an injection from Q to N (why?).

< 回 > < 三 > < 三 >

- 2

イロト イヨト イヨト イヨト



March 11, 2021 10 / 12

- 2

<ロト <問ト < 目と < 目と



• Map each pair (*a*, *b*) to its position along the spiral, starting at the origin(indexing through each point starting from index 0).



- Map each pair (*a*, *b*) to its position along the spiral, starting at the origin(indexing through each point starting from index 0).
- This mapping maps every pair of integers injectively to a natural number.



- Map each pair (*a*, *b*) to its position along the spiral, starting at the origin(indexing through each point starting from index 0).
- This mapping maps every pair of integers injectively to a natural number.
- Thus we have $|\mathbb{Q}| \leq |\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}| \leq |\mathbb{N}|$. Remember that $|\mathbb{N}| \leq |\mathbb{Q}|$, then by the Cantor-Bernstein Theorem $|\mathbb{N}| = |\mathbb{Q}|$.

Kelvin Lee (UC Berkeley)

Discrete Math and Probability Theory

March 11, 2021 11 / 12

< ∃⇒

2

• An set *S* is **uncountable** if it is not **countable**, or cannot be enumerated. This introduces the concept of **diagonalization**.

- An set *S* is **uncountable** if it is not **countable**, or cannot be enumerated. This introduces the concept of **diagonalization**.
- The idea of **diagonalization** is that we can always create an element that does not belong to the set, i.e., enumeration is impossible.

- An set *S* is **uncountable** if it is not **countable**, or cannot be enumerated. This introduces the concept of **diagonalization**.
- The idea of **diagonalization** is that we can always create an element that does not belong to the set, i.e., enumeration is impossible.
- One example would be $\mathbb{R}[0,1]$ demonstrated in lecture.

- An set *S* is **uncountable** if it is not **countable**, or cannot be enumerated. This introduces the concept of **diagonalization**.
- The idea of **diagonalization** is that we can always create an element that does not belong to the set, i.e., enumeration is impossible.
- One example would be $\mathbb{R}[0,1]$ demonstrated in lecture.
- We can create a real number where each of its *i*th digit differs from the *i*th digit of the *i*th element.

- An set *S* is **uncountable** if it is not **countable**, or cannot be enumerated. This introduces the concept of **diagonalization**.
- The idea of **diagonalization** is that we can always create an element that does not belong to the set, i.e., enumeration is impossible.
- One example would be $\mathbb{R}[0,1]$ demonstrated in lecture.
- We can create a real number where each of its *i*th digit differs from the *i*th digit of the *i*th element.
- Thus the real interval $\mathbb{R}[0,1]$ is uncountable, so do its supersets.

Problem Time!

Kelvin Lee (UC Berkeley)

Discrete Math and Probability Theory

March 11, 2021 12 / 12

э

A D N A B N A B N A B N