

Tom's Dating Life

Tom Reddington
19 November 2022

Action (optionally) required!

1. Go to Wikipedia on your phone.
2. Open the article of a person satisfying the following:
 - a. They're dead.
 - b. Their birth and death years are well defined (no "circa").
 - c. You're **confident** that $\geq 90\%$ of the audience recognise their name.*
3. Raise your hand.

*They can't be known solely through family relation or regnal number interpolation.

Unnecessarily pretentious maths to justify the talk

Let X be the set of sufficiently notable dead people. Then I'm:

$$f : \{(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0} : a < b\} \rightarrow X$$

Note: Western Christian calendars annoyingly don't have a year 0.

Unnecessarily pretentious maths to justify the talk

Let X be the set of sufficiently notable dead people. Then I'm:

$$f : \{(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0} : a < b\} \rightarrow X$$

✗ Not surjective. I don't have everyone stored (as probably demonstrated).

Note: Western Christian calendars annoyingly don't have a year 0.

Unnecessarily pretentious maths to justify the talk

Let X be the set of sufficiently notable dead people. Then I'm:

$$f : \{(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0} : a < b\} \rightarrow X$$

✗ Not surjective. I don't have everyone stored (as probably demonstrated).

✗ Not injective. (1642, 1726) and (1643, 1727) both map to Isaac Newton.

Note: Western Christian calendars annoyingly don't have a year 0.

Unnecessarily pretentious maths to justify the talk

Let X be the set of sufficiently notable dead people. Then I'm:

$$f : \{(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0} : a < b\} \rightarrow X$$

- ✗ **Not surjective.** I don't have everyone stored (as probably demonstrated).
- ✗ **Not injective.** (1642, 1726) and (1643, 1727) both map to Isaac Newton.
- ✗ **Not actually a function.** Not all year pairs yield results.

Note: Western Christian calendars annoyingly don't have a year 0.

Unnecessarily pretentious maths to justify the talk

Let X be the set of sufficiently notable dead people. Then I'm:

$$f : \{(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0} : a < b\} \rightarrow X \cup \{\emptyset\}$$

- ✗ Not surjective.** I don't have everyone stored (as probably demonstrated).
- ✗ Not injective.** (1642, 1726) and (1643, 1727) both map to Isaac Newton.
- ~~**✗ Not actually a function.** Not all year pairs yield results.~~

Note: Western Christian calendars annoyingly don't have a year 0.

Unnecessarily pretentious maths to justify the talk

Let X be the set of sufficiently notable dead people. Then I'm:

$$f : \{(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0} : a < b\} \rightarrow X \cup \{\emptyset\}$$

✗ Not surjective. I don't have everyone stored (as probably demonstrated).

✗ Not injective. (1642, 1726) and (1643, 1727) both map to Isaac Newton.

~~**✗ Not actually a function.** Not all year pairs yield results.~~

✗ Not actually a function. Is $f((1926, 2016))$ Harper Lee or Fidel Castro or...?

Note: Western Christian calendars annoyingly don't have a year 0.

Unnecessarily pretentious maths to justify the talk

Let X be the set of sufficiently notable dead people. Then I'm:

$$f : \{(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0} : a < b\} \rightarrow \cancel{X} \text{ ~~many~~ } P(X)$$

✗ Not surjective. I don't have everyone stored (as probably demonstrated).

✗ Not injective. (1642, 1726) and (1643, 1727) both map to Isaac Newton.

~~**✗ Not actually a function.** Not all year pairs yield results.~~

~~**✗ Not actually a function.** Is $f((1926, 2016))$ Harper Lee or Fidel Castro or...?~~

Note: Western Christian calendars annoyingly don't have a year 0.

Collisions: back-of-the-envelope calculation

Collisions happen less than you think.* Let's assume:

1. There are **500 people** of sufficient notability.
2. All sufficiently notable people died within the last **400 years**.
3. Their lifespans are uniformly distributed with a **60 year range**.

Then there are $400 \times 60 = \mathbf{24,000}$ combinations of valid year pairs.

$500 \div 24,000 \approx 0.0208$ (or **2.08% collision rate**)

This is within Government guidelines.

*Unless you think they don't happen very often.

Closing comments

1. I predict Ada Lovelace (1815–1852) will have come up.
2. I'm happy to play this evening.
3. The NDA pile is by the entrance.