

Re: Sets question (maybe)

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-10/msg04211.html>

- *From:* "cbrown@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx" <cbrown@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 23 Oct 2007 10:44:55 -0700
-

On Oct 23, 7:22 am, Name And Address Supplied
<name_and_address_suppl...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Dear all,

I wonder if you can help with the following problem. I'm not a mathematician, so please bear with me.

Informally speaking: I have a set of, say, 5 entities, and I wish to give each a unique index j . In particular, I want to pick one entity -- it doesn't matter which -- and I want to designate that $j = 1$. Then I want to pick another, and index that one $j = 2$. And so on until I have five individuals indexed 1 to 5.

Note that this is the same thing as assigning some element of the 5 entities to each of 1,2,3,4,5.

And that's the same thing as defining a function S with $S(1) =$ (the element of from the 5 entities you picked first), $S(2) =$ (the element of J you picked second), etc.

So in a way, you are talking about a /function/: a special sort of function with domain $\{1,2,3,4,5\}$ and range the 5 entities.

Now I want to order this list,
so that it runs from 1 through to 5.

Isn't it /already/ ordered by observing that, for example, $1 < 2$, $2 < 3$, etc.?

Q1: What do I call this list?

In mathematics, it's usually referred to as a finite sequence (or just

Re: Sets question (maybe)

a list).

If J is a sequence, whose elements are taken from the set S , we will usually write $J = (j_1, j_2, j_3, \dots, j_n)$, where n is the "number of entities"; and where " j_1 " is how we write " j with subscript 1" in sci.math. Each j_i is some member of S .

Thinking of J as a function, $J(1) = j_1, J(2) = j_2$, etc.

Note that in mathematics, a list can also refer to an /infinite/ sequence $(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n, \dots)$.

I think it is not a set in the strict sense, as a set is not ordered, and also a set with repeated elements is equal to the same set with the repeated elements removed.

That is correct. The standard way to approach this issues is as follows:

$\{x, y\} = \{y, x\}$ as sets: two sets are th same if, and only if, they have the same members.

So we instead /define/ (x, y) to be the /set/ $\{x, \{x, y\}\}$. This is "the ordered pair (x,y) ". A little thought (well, plus the fact that it is forbidden for a set to have itself as a member) should convince you that $(x, y) = (y, x)$ if, and only if, $x = y$.

So we can then think of the finite /sequence/ $J = (j_1, j_2, \dots, j_5)$ as the /set/ of ordered pairs $S = \{(1, j_1), (2, j_2), \dots, (5, j_5)\}$.

This is exactly the same (in set theory) as defining J to be a /function/ which takes the naturals $\{1,2,3,4,5\}$ (often just written as "the set 5") to the set J . So we can also write " $J : 5 \rightarrow S$ ", and talk about $J(3)$ being the third element of the sequence J , etc.

But I want to describe the object $J = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$...

Careful! Is J the set of /entities/ (whatever they might be)? The above sort of confuses J with the set of /indexes/...

, and say things like " $j \in J$ " (j is a member of J).

We might loosely say " j is a member of the sequence $J = (j_1, j_2,$

Re: Sets question (maybe)

j_3, \dots, j_n)" to mean the more rigorously correct "there exists i in $(1, 2, \dots, n)$ such that $j = j_i$ ", or equivalently (given the above definitions) "... such that (i, j) in J " or "... such that $j = J(i)$ ".

I also want to say that the j th element of J is j ...

Careful – you're again confusing your /indexes/ with your /entities/!
It is also possible that j is /not/ the j th element of J .

-- this of course would not be true if J wasn't ordered / had repeated elements. So, what is J ? A set, a list, a group, what?

It's a sequence or list, which is a special sort of function (it has a range which is from 1 to some natural), which is a special sort of set.

Q2: I don't know that there are actually 5 entities, but I do know there is a finite number of them. I want to index them as above, and I want to say in a mathematically compact way that the indices are the natural numbers running from 1 to the maximum index value (which is equal to the number of entities I want to index). In particular, I don't want to have to assign a symbol to denote the total number of entities.

If S is the set of entities, one often writes $|S|$ (which is spoken as "the cardinality of J " or "card of J ") to refer to the number of (distinct!) elements in S . Then you can talk about the finite sequence $J = \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_{|S|}\}$; or equivalently consider J as a function $J : |S| \rightarrow S$, with $j_i = J(i)$.

Q3: If J were a set, and $K = \{1, 2\}$ were some other set, I could define a Cartesian product $J \times K = \{\{1, 1\}, \{1, 2\}\}, \{\{2, 1\}, \{2, 2\}\}, \{\{3, 1\}, \{3, 2\}\}, \{\{4, 1\}, \{4, 2\}\}, \{\{5, 1\}, \{5, 2\}\}\}$.

That's /not/ the Cartesian product $J \times K$. The Cartesian product is the /set/ of all /ordered pairs/ of the form (j, k) , j in J , k in K . It has $|J| \cdot |K| = 10$ elements. What you have written above has elements of the form $\{\{j, 1\}, \{j, 2\}\}$ for j in J . It has only $|J| = 5$ elements; each such element having $|K| = 2$ elements.

Re: Sets question (maybe)

But if J and K are not sets, but are the type of objects I've described above, can I still make this operation?

Without a bit more context, it's not clear exactly /what/ it is you're trying to invoke with this operation. My guess is that, given natural numbers a, b, you want to be able to talk about the ordered pair (j_a, k_b) , where j_a is the "a'th" element in the sequence J, and k_b is the "b'th" element of the sequence K.

You could express that as a function T which maps each possible pair (a,b) to the corresponding pair (j_a, k_b) . In that case (recalling that J and K are functions in the set theory sense) you can just define the function $T(a,b) = (J(a), K(b))$.

As a /set/, T would then have elements of the form $((a,b), (J(a), K(b)))$; an ordered pair of ordered pairs.

Is that what you're trying to formalize?

Or is there an analogous operation, and if so, what is it called?

Q4: Is the "curly bracket" notation okay for what I am doing, i.e. "{" and "}"?

No. You want to use "(" and ")" to indicate that you are talking about a finite sequence. Sometimes people alternatively use "<" and ">" if there are lots of other parentheses kicking around already; for example $J = \langle j_1, j_2, j_3, \dots, j_n \rangle$.

Cheers – Chas

.