

Tangles

A new paradigm for clusters and types

Reinhard Diestel

Traditional clustering identifies groups of objects that share certain qualities. Tangles do the converse: they identify groups of qualities that often occur together. They can thereby discover, relate, and structure *types*: of behaviour, political views, texts, or viruses.

Tangles offer a new, quantitative, paradigm for grouping phenomena rather than things. They can identify key phenomena that allow predictions of others. Tangles also offer a new paradigm for clustering in large data sets.

The mathematical theory of tangles has its origins in the connectivity theory of graphs [5], which it has transformed over the past 30 years. It has recently been axiomatized in a way that makes it applicable to a wide range of contexts outside mathematics [2].

This ArXiv post is a first draft of the introductory chapter of a book I am planning to write about such application of tangles [3]. I am making it available here as an early reference for papers on tangle applications written in the meantime. As the idea of using tangles in this way is new, such papers would normally require extensive introductory sections just about these fundamental ideas. My hope is that, by making a generic introduction available here, authors can then build on it and concentrate in their own introductory sections on what is specific in their application.

Three gentle introductions, and the notion of a tangle

1. The idea behind tangles

This chapter offers three introductions to the concept and purpose of tangles. These introductions can be read independently, and readers may choose any one of them as an entry point to this book, according to their own background.

However as all three introductions illuminate the same concept, readers from any background are likely also to benefit from the other two viewpoints. Indeed, while each of them may seem plausible enough on its own, they are rather different. The fact that they nevertheless describe the same concept, that of a tangle, illustrates better than any abstract discussion the breadth of this concept and its potential applications, including in fields not even touched upon here. Moreover, even in a given context where one of the three viewpoints seems more fitting than the other two, switching to one of those deliberately for a moment is likely to add insight that would otherwise be easy to miss.

1.1. Tangles in the natural sciences

Suppose we are trying to establish the common cause of some set of similar phenomena. To facilitate this, we may design a series of measurements to test various different aspects of each of these phenomena.

If we already have an overview of all the potential causes, we might try to design these measurements so that every potential cause results in some expected reading for each measurement and different potential causes differ in at least one measurement. Then only the true cause would be compatible with all the readings we get from our measurements.

In our less-than-ideal world, it may not quite work like this. For a start, we might simply not be aware of all the potential causes – not to mention the fundamental issue of what, if anything, is a ‘cause’. Similar phenomena may have different causes. Our potential causes may not be mutually exclusive, in which case we will not be able to design experiments that will exclude all but one of them with certainty. And finally, measurements may be corrupted, but we may not know which ones were.

We usually try to compensate for this by building in some redundancy: perhaps by taking more measurements, or by measuring more different aspects. Or we might resign ourselves to making claims only in probability – which will protect us from being disproved by any single event, but which may also increase immensely the overheads needed to justify precise quantitative assertions (of probabilities).

Tangles offer a structural, rather than probabilistic, way to afford the redundancy needed in such cases, to do so in a particularly economical way, and to sidestep the philosophical issue of what constitutes a cause.

In our example, a tangle would be a hypothetical collection of readings for all the measurements taken, a set of one possible reading per measurement. It would not be just any such collection, but one that is ‘typical’ for the actual collections of readings we got from the phenomena we measured, in one of two ways to be described in a moment.¹ It may happen that one, or several, of our phenomena produced exactly this set of readings, but it can also happen that an ‘abstract’ set of readings is typical, and hence a tangle, for our collection of phenomena without occurring exactly in any one of them.

Our measurements might yield a single tangle, or several, or none. Given any one of them, we may try find a common cause for this typical set of readings, or choose not to try. If there *is* a common cause for many of the phenomena investigated, it will show up as a tangle and can thus be identified.

But there can also be tangles that cannot – or not yet – be ‘explained’ by a common cause. Such tangles are just as substantial, and potentially useful, as those that can be labelled by a known common cause; indeed perhaps more so, since the absence of an obvious common cause may have left them unidentified in the past. In this sense, identifying tangles in large sets of phenomena can lead to the discovery of new meta-phenomena that had previously gone unnoticed and might, henceforth, be interpreted as a ‘cause’ for the group of phenomena that gave rise to this tangle.

So when is a set τ of hypothetical measurement readings deemed ‘typical’ for the actual measurements of our phenomena, and therefore a tangle? There are two notions of ‘typical’ that are important in tangle theory: a strong one that is satisfied by most tangles but not required in their definition, and a weaker one that is required in their definition, and which suffices to establish the main theorems about tangles.

The strong notion, which we might call *popularity-based*, is that our set of phenomena has a subset X (not too small) such that, for every measurement taken, at least 80% of the phenomena in X give the reading laid down in τ .² Note that these will be different sets of 80% of X for different measurements: every phenomenon, even in X , may for some measurements produce a reading different from the reading that τ prescribes for that measurement. Clearly, there can be several such tangles τ , witnessed by different sets X of phenomena.

The weaker notion of when our set τ of readings is ‘typical’, and hence constitutes a tangle, might be called *consistency-based*. It says that for every small set of up to three measurements there should be a few phenomena, at least n , say, that gave the reading specified by τ for these three measurements. In particular, no subset σ of up to three elements of τ proves τ to be ‘inconsistent’ in that none of the phenomena we investigated produced exactly the readings in σ .³ Note that if τ is typical in the popularity-based sense it will

¹ Recall that we performed the same measurements on each of the phenomena we are investigating, so we have one set of readings for each phenomenon.

² Thus, our fixed abstract collection τ of hypothetical measurement readings is ‘popular’ with the elements of X .

³ Three readings that are inconsistent in the usual sense that they *cannot* occur together,

also be typical in the consistency-based sense,⁴ but not conversely.

Note that both these notions of ‘typical’ are robust against small changes in our set of data. This makes tangles well suited to ‘fuzzy’ data with the kind of imperfections indicated earlier.

1.2. Tangles in the social sciences

Suppose we run a survey S of fifty political questions on a population P of a thousand people. If there exists a group of, say, a hundred like-minded people among these, there will be a ‘typical’ way of answering the questions in S in the way most of those people would. Quantitatively, there will exist a subset X of P , not too small, and an assignment τ of answers to all the questions in S such that, for most questions $s \in S$, some 80% (say) of the people in X agree with the answer to s given by τ . (Which 80% of X these are will depend on the choice of s .) We call this collection τ of views – answers to the questions in S – a *mindset*. Note that there may be more than one mindset for S , or none.

Traditionally, mindsets are found just intuitively: they are first guessed, and only then established by quantitative evidence from surveys designed to test them. For example, we might feel that there is a ‘socialist’ way σ of answering S . To support this intuition, we might then check whether any sizable subset $X \subseteq P$ as above exists for this particular $\tau = \sigma$.

Tangles can do the converse: they will identify both X and τ without us having to guess them first:

Tangles offer a precise, quantitative, way to identify known mindsets and to discover unknown ones.

For example, tangle analysis of political polls in the UK in the years well before the Brexit referendum might have established the existence of a mindset we might now, with hindsight, call the ‘Labour-supporting non-socialist Brexiteer’: a mindset whose existence few would have guessed intuitively when Brexit was not yet on the agenda. And similarly in the US with the MAGA⁵ mindset before 2016, or that of a ‘conservative Green’ in the early 1970s. Tangles can identify previously unknown patterns of coherent views or behaviour.

1.3. Tangles in data science

One of the most basic, and at the same time most elusive, tasks in the analysis of big data sets is *clustering*: given a large set of points in some space, one seeks

because they contradict each other, would be an example. But since the theory of tangles is, and should be, independent of interpretation, we cannot take recourse to logic and have to work with the concrete set of phenomena at hand. The reason why we work with subsets of size up to three, rather than two, may be surprising but is immaterial at this informal level.

⁴ ... as long as X is large enough that $\frac{4}{10}|X| \geq n$. Indeed, let σ consist of the results of the measurements A, B, C laid down in τ . For each of A, B and C at most 20% of the phenomena in X disagree with τ , so at least $100 - 60 = 40$ percent of X agree with τ on all of A, B and C – which is at least n phenomena, as required.

⁵ Make America Great Again; Donald Trump’s 2016 presidential campaign slogan.

to divide the set into a small number of subsets, called ‘clusters’, of points that are in some sense similar. Similarity is usually defined in terms of a distance function on the pairs of points, so that sets of points that are pairwise close become a cluster.

Figure 1.1 shows a simple example of points in the plane. In the picture on the left we can clearly see four clusters. Or can we? If a cluster is a set of pairwise close points, and the two points shown in green in the right half of the picture lie in the same cluster, should not the two red points – which are much closer – lie in a common cluster too?




FIGURE 1.1. Four clusters?

For reasons such as this, and other more subtle ones, there is no universal notion of when two points in a data set are deemed to be ‘close’. And even if there is a consensus in a particular clustering application about such a distance function, there are still many ways of defining clusters based on this metric – even for such a simple setting as points in the plane.

Tangles define clusters in an entirely different manner. Not by dividing the data set in some clever new way, but without dividing it up at all: although there will be four tangles in our picture, these will not be defined as sets of points. In particular, questions such as whether the green points should end up in the same cluster but the red points, perhaps, should not, do not even arise.

By avoiding the issue of assigning points to clusters altogether, tangles can be precise without making arbitrary and unwarranted choices:

Tangles offer a precise, but robust, way to identify fuzzy clusters.

Rather than looking for dense clouds of data points, tangles look for the converse: for obvious ‘bottlenecks’ at which the data set naturally splits in half – or more precisely, into two subsets, no matter how large or small. We call ways of splitting our data set into two disjoint subsets *partitions* of the set, and the two subsets the *sides* of the partition.

Figure 1.2 shows three partitions of our point set at bottlenecks.⁶ Now, whatever formal definition of cluster (and of bottleneck) we might choose to

⁶ The partition of our set at the red bottleneck, for example, has the bottom cluster on one side and the other three clusters on the other side.

work with, one thing will be clear: no bottleneck partition will divide any cluster roughly in half, since that would violate either our definition of a cluster or that of a bottleneck. For example, given one of the three bottlenecks in our picture, and one of the four obvious clusters, we might argue over a few points about whether they should count as belonging to that cluster or not, and if so on which side of the bottleneck they lie. But for almost all the points in our picture these questions will have a clear answer once we consider a fixed cluster and a fixed bottleneck, no matter how loosely defined.

Put another way, whichever precise definitions we were to choose, each of our four clusters would lie *mostly* on the same side of any partition at a bottleneck. Let us then say that the cluster *orients* this partition towards the side on which most of it lies. The right picture in Figure 1.2 shows how the central cluster, no matter how we choose to define it precisely, orients the partitions at the three bottlenecks in this way. Each of the four clusters assigns its own set of arrows to these same three partitions, and the central cluster orients them all inwards.




FIGURE 1.2. Orienting the bottlenecks consistently towards the central cluster

Note that assignments of arrows (to partitions at bottlenecks) that come from one of the four clusters in this way are not arbitrary: the arrows are ‘consistent’ in that they all point roughly in the same way, namely, towards that cluster.

The key idea behind tangles, now, is to keep for each cluster exactly this information – how it orients all the bottleneck partitions – and to forget everything else (such as which points belong to it). More precisely, tangles will be *defined* as such abstract objects: as ‘consistent orientations of all the bottleneck partitions’ in a data set. In this way, tangles will extract from the various explicit ways of defining clusters as point sets something like their common essence. Tangles will be robust against small changes in the data, just as they are robust against small changes in any explicit definition of point clusters we might use to specify them. But their definition as such will be perfectly precise, and involve no arbitrary choices of the kind one invariably has to make when one tries to define point clusters as sets of points.

Of course, given a data set one has to define formally what its bottleneck partitions are, and when an orientation of all the bottleneck partitions is deemed to be ‘consistent’.⁷ The challenge is to do all this without reference to any perceived cluster, however vaguely defined: we can only define clusters indirectly as tangles, as is our aim, if our definition of a tangle – and in particular our definition of consistency – does not itself refer to explicit clusters given as point sets.⁸

To make the problem a little clearer, let us look at a slightly modified example. Figure 1.3 again shows four clusters and three bottlenecks. But this time one of the bottlenecks has an elongated shape, like a handle. The points in this handle do not really belong to any cluster – or, if we insist on assigning every point to some cluster, there are two clusters to which they might be assigned, with equally reasonable justification. The example further illustrates that, even for reasonable definitions of ‘bottleneck’ (which should include the handle) there may well be several partitions ‘at’ the same bottleneck.⁹




FIGURE 1.3. Three bottlenecks, but many bottleneck partitions.
The central cluster orients them all consistently.

Now if clusters are going to be tangles, and tangles are to be consistent orientations of *all* the bottleneck partitions, then our intuition that we want there to be only four clusters in Figure 1.3 dictates that only four of the many ways of orienting all its bottleneck partitions – one for every desired cluster – should count as ‘consistent’. In the picture this can be achieved if, and only if, we can ensure that consistent orientations of partitions at the same bottleneck

⁷ For example, orienting the three bottleneck partitions in Figure 1.2 outwards should be ‘inconsistent’, as the arrows would point away from each other.

⁸ In discussing our example, so far, we did the converse: we assumed we knew roughly what the clusters should be, we thought of a bottleneck as a place at which we could partition our big set without cutting right through any big cluster, and we defined the consistency of arrows at bottlenecks by reference to those clusters, as pointing towards them. This was fine for the purpose of motivating the concept of tangles: after all, in cases where we feel we know roughly what the clusters should be, tangles should identify precisely these. But once we get serious about defining tangles formally, we must no longer appeal to pictures or intuitive examples.

⁹ This is the same problem in disguise, that of assigning points to sets: since a partition is a pair of sets, changing these sets even slightly will give us a different partition. Ideally, we would like there to be only one partition at each bottleneck. But since there is no canonical way to choose one from the many candidates, we have to admit them all at this stage.

always point the same way. Indeed, in this case consistent orientations of the (many) bottleneck partitions will *induce* orientations of the (few) bottlenecks themselves, which intuitively is our aim.

In our example, the orientations of bottleneck partitions induced by one of the four ‘obvious’ clusters satisfy this nicely: any given cluster will either lie mostly on the left of *every* partition at the handle, or mostly on the right of every partition at the handle. Hence, the arrows defined at these partitions by any of our four clusters will either all point to the left, or they will all point to the right, and thus be intuitively consistent.

The challenge remains to come up with a formal definition of consistency as the basis for our notion of tangle that bears this out: one that does not refer to any perceived clusters, but which in the above example will orient all the partitions at the handle in the same direction. Chapter 2 shows how this can be done.¹⁰

Once that is achieved, we shall have a definition of tangle which, while being entirely formal and precise, will be able to capture ‘fuzzy’ clusters in a robust way that does not require us to allocate points to clusters.

2. The notion of a tangle

Consider a collection V of objects and a set \vec{S} of features¹¹ that each of the objects in V may have or fail to have. Given such a (potential) feature $\vec{s} \in \vec{S}$, we denote its negation by \bar{s} . The pair $\{\vec{s}, \bar{s}\}$ of the feature together with its negation is then denoted by s , and the set of all these s is denoted by S .

For example, if V is a set of pieces of furniture, then \vec{s} might be the feature of being made of wood. Then \bar{s} would be the feature of being made of any other material, or a combination of materials, and s could be thought of as the question of whether or not a given element of V is made of wood.

In the language of Chapter 1.1 the elements of V would be the phenomena investigated. The $s \in S$ would be the measurements performed on these phenomena, with two possible outcomes \vec{s} and \bar{s} (called ‘readings’ in Chapter 1.1).

In the example of Chapter 1.2, the set V would be the population P of people polled by our survey S , which for simplicity we assume to consist of yes/no questions. Then $\{\vec{s} \mid s \in S\}$ might be the set of ‘yes’ answers to the questions in S , while \bar{s} would denote the ‘no’ answer to the question s .

In the clustering scenario of Chapter 1.3, the set V would be the set of points in which we look for clusters. If we equate a feature \vec{s} with the set of objects in V that have it, then \vec{s} and \bar{s} form a partition of V , the partition $s = \{\vec{s}, \bar{s}\}$. We may think of S as the set of those partitions of V that are particularly natural, its ‘bottleneck’ partitions.

¹⁰ The term ‘consistency’ will be given a slightly narrower meaning there than in the present discussion. But tangles will be orientations of all the ‘bottleneck’ partitions that are consistent in our stronger sense here; such orientations will be called ‘typical’ in Chapter 2.

¹¹ Logicians may prefer to say ‘predicates’ instead of ‘features’ here. That would be correct, but I am trying to avoid any (false) impression of formal precision at this stage.

2.1 Features that often occur together

Tangles are a way to formalize the notion that some features typically occur together. They offer a formal way of identifying such groups of ‘typical’ features, each ‘type’ giving rise to a separate tangle.

In order to identify a collection of features as ‘typical’, it is not necessary to precisely delineate a corresponding set of *objects* (elements of V) that have precisely, or even mostly, these features. This reflects most real-world examples, where these sets are at best ‘fuzzy’. By working directly on the level of features rather than the level of objects, tangles can be completely precise even when the objects whose features they capture cannot be clearly delineated from each other. This is a particular strength of tangle theory compared with traditional clustering methods.

Let us return to the example where V is a set of pieces of furniture. Our list \vec{S} of possible features (including their negations) consists of qualities such as colour, material, the number of legs, intended function, and so on – perhaps a hundred or so potential features. The idea of tangles is that, even though \vec{S} may be quite large, its elements may combine into groups that correspond to just a few types of furniture as we know them: chairs, tables, beds and so on.

The important thing is that tangles can identify such types without any prior intuition: if we are told that a container V full of furniture is waiting for us at customs in the harbour, and all we have is a list of items v identified only by numbers together with, for each number, a list of which of our 100 features this item has, our computer – if it knows tangles – may be able to tell us that our delivery contains furniture of just a few types: types that we (but not our computer) might identify as chairs, tables and beds, perhaps with the tables splitting into dining tables and desks.

In the language of Chapter 1.1, these types would correlate with the different possible ‘causes’ for objects to be furniture: our need to sit, sleep, use computers and so on. In the example of Chapter 1.2, they would be mindsets. In the setting of Chapter 1.3, the sets of chairs, tables and beds would form clusters in V . These clusters might not be clearly delineated – for example, if our delivery contains a deckchair – but the *types*, groups of features that often occur together, would be precisely defined.

In the remainder of this chapter we shall not always make explicit reference to the three example scenarios from Chapter 1. But readers are encouraged to check for themselves what the various new terms mean in each of those contexts, to keep all three aspects alive as they build their intuition for tangles.

2.2 Consistency of features

To illustrate how our computer may be able to identify types of furniture from those feature lists without understanding them, let us briefly consider the inverse question: starting from a known type of furniture, such as chairs, how might this type be identifiable from the data if it was *not* known?

A possible answer, which will lead straight to the concept of tangles, is as follows. Each individual piece of furniture in our unknown delivery, $v \in V$ say,

has some of the features from our list \vec{S} but not others. It thereby *specifies* the elements s of S : as \vec{s} if it has the feature \vec{s} , and as \bar{s} otherwise. We say that every $v \in V$ defines a *specification* of S , a choice for each $s \in S$ of either \vec{s} or \bar{s} but not both. We shall denote this specification of S as

$$v(S) := \{v(s) \mid s \in S\},$$

where $v(s) := \vec{s}$ if v specifies s as \vec{s} and $v(s) := \bar{s}$ if v specifies s as \bar{s} .

Conversely, does every specification of S come from some $v \in V$ in this way? Certainly not: there will be no object in our delivery that is both made entirely of wood and also made entirely of steel. Thus no $v \in V$ will specify both r as \vec{r} rather than \bar{r} , and s as \vec{s} rather than \bar{s} , when \vec{r} and \vec{s} stand for being made of wood or steel, respectively. In plain language: no specification of S that comes from a real piece of furniture can contain both \vec{r} and \vec{s} , because these features are inconsistent.

Let us turn this manifestation in V of logical inconsistencies within \vec{S} into a definition of ‘factual’ inconsistency for specifications of S in terms of V . Let us call a specification of S *consistent* if it contains no inconsistent triple, where an *inconsistent triple* is a set of up to three¹² features that are not found together in any $v \in V$. Specifications of S that come from some $v \in V$ are clearly consistent. But S can have many consistent specifications that are not, as a whole, witnessed by any $v \in V$.¹³

Tangles will be specifications of S with certain properties that make them ‘typical’ for V . Consistency will be a minimum requirement for this. But since any specification of S that comes from just a single $v \in V$ is already consistent, tangles will have to satisfy more than consistency to qualify as ‘typical’ for V .

2.3 From consistency to tangles

It is one of the fortes of tangles that they allow considerable freedom in the definition of what makes a specification of S ‘typical’ for V – freedom that can be used to tailor tangles precisely to the intended application. We shall describe this formally in Chapter 6. But we are already in a position to mention one of the most common ways of defining ‘typical’, which is just a strengthening of consistency.

¹² It might seem more natural to say ‘two’ here, as in our wood/steel dichotomy above. Our definition of consistency is a little more stringent, because the mathematics behind tangles requires it. Note that, formally, the elements of an inconsistent ‘triple’ need not be distinct; an ‘inconsistent pair’ of *two* features \vec{r} , \vec{s} not shared by any $v \in V$, for example, also counts as an ‘inconsistent triple’, the triple $\{\vec{r}, \vec{r}, \vec{s}\} = \{\vec{r}, \vec{s}\}$.

¹³ Here is a simple example. Suppose some of our furniture is made of wood, some of steel, some of wicker, and some of plastic. Denote these features as \vec{p} , \vec{q} , \vec{r} , \vec{s} , respectively, and assume that $S = \{p, q, r, s\}$. Then the specification $\tau = \{\vec{p}, \vec{q}, \bar{r}, \bar{s}\}$ of S is consistent, because for any three of its elements there are some items in V that have none of the three corresponding features: those that have the fourth. But no item fails to have all four of these features. So the consistent specification τ of S does not come from any one $v \in V$. We shall get back to this example in Chapter 6.5.

To get a prior feel for our (forthcoming) formal definition of ‘typical’, consider the specification of S in our furniture example that is determined by an ‘ideal chair’ plucked straight from the Platonic heaven: let us specify each $s \in S$ as \vec{s} if this imagined ideal chair has the feature \vec{s} , and as \bar{s} if not.¹⁴ This can be done independently of our delivery V , just from our intuitive notion of what chairs are. But if our delivery has a sizable portion of chairs in it, then this phantom specification of S that describes our ideal chair has something to do with V after all.

Indeed, for every triple $\vec{r}, \vec{s}, \vec{t}$ of features of our ideal chair there will be a few elements of V , at least n say, that share these three features. For example, if $\vec{r}, \vec{s}, \vec{t}$ stand for having four legs, a flat central surface, and a near-vertical surface, respectively, there will be – among the many chairs in V which we assume to exist – a few that have four legs and a flat seating surface and a nearly vertical back.

By contrast, if we pick twenty rather than three features of our ideal chair there may be no $v \in V$ that has all of those, even though there are plenty of chairs in V . But for *every* choice of three features there will be several – though which these are will depend on which three features of our ideal chair we have in mind.

Simple though it may seem, it turns out that for most furniture deliveries and reasonable lists S of potential features this formal criterion for ‘typical’ distinguishes those specifications of S that describe genuine types of furniture from most of its other specifications.¹⁵ But in identifying such specifications as ‘types’ we made no appeal to our intuition, or to the meaning of their features.¹⁶

So let us make this property of specifications of S that describe ‘ideal’ chairs, tables or beds into our formal, if still ad-hoc, definition of ‘typical’: let us call a specification τ of S *typical* for V if for every set R of at most three elements of S there are at least n elements v of V that specify R as τ does, i.e., for which $v(R) = \tau(R)$. (The integer n here is a fixed parameter on which our notion of ‘typical’ depends, and which we are free to choose.)

Crucially, this definition of ‘typical’ is purely intrinsic: it depends on V , but it makes no reference to what a typical specification of S ‘is typical of’. Specifications of ideal chairs, tables or beds are all typical in this sense: they all satisfy the same one definition.

¹⁴ Let us ignore for the moment the possibility that the ‘question’ s may not have a clear answer for chairs, as would be the case, say, for questions of colour rather than function. This is an issue we shall have to deal with, but which tangles can indeed deal with easily.

¹⁵ ... of which there are many: if S has 100 elements, there are 2^{100} specifications of S .

¹⁶ This is not to say that the use of tangles is free of all preconceptions, biases etc. For example, the choice of a survey S in the scenario from Chapter 1.2 is as loaded or neutral as is would be in any other study that starts with a survey. The statement above is meant relative to the given S once chosen. In Chapter 6 we shall discuss how the deliberate use of preconceptions, e.g. by declaring some questions in S as more fundamental than others, can help to improve tangles based on such preconceptions. We shall also see how to do the opposite: how to find tangles that arise naturally from the raw data of S and V , without any further interference from ourselves.

Equally crucially, a specification of S can be typical for V even if V has no element that has all its features at once. Thus, we have a valid and meaningful formal definition of an ‘ideal something’ even when such a thing does not exist in the real world, let alone in V .

Relative to the definition of ‘typical’ we can now define tangles informally:

A tangle of S is any specification of S that is typical for V .

Since our ad-hoc definition of ‘typical’ is phrased in terms of small subsets of \vec{S} , sets of size at most 3 (of which there are not so many), we can compute tangles without having to guess them first. In particular, we can compute tangles of S even when V is ‘known’ only in the mechanical sense of data being available (but not necessarily understood), and S is a set of potential features that are known, or assumed, to be relevant but whose relationships to each other are unknown.

Tangles therefore enable us to *find* even previously unknown ‘types’ in the data to be analysed: combinations of features that occur together significantly more often than others. This was important in all three of the scenarios from Chapter 1: tangles can identify previously unknown causes, mindsets, or clusters.

2.4 Witnessing sets and functions

When we just defined a *tangle* of S as any specification τ of S that is typical for V , we were assuming a notion of ‘typical’ that we called *consistency-based* in Chapter 1.1: for every set R of up to three elements of S there should be at least n elements of V that specify R as τ does, for some fixed integer n . This notion of a tangle will form the basis for the tangle theory developed later.

In Chapter 1.1 we also discussed another possible notion of ‘typical’, which we called *popularity-based*. This was that V has a subset X , not too small, in which τ is ‘popular’ in that for every $s \in S$ some 80% of the elements of X specify s as τ does. We saw that, if X is big enough relative to n , then this implies that τ is typical also in the earlier sense, and hence is a tangle. We may thus think of X as ‘witnessing’ this.

In our furniture example, the tangle of being a chair will be witnessed by the set X of chairs in V : every individual feature of our ‘ideal chair’ τ will be shared by some 80% of all the chairs in V , though not all by the same 80%. Such witnessing sets were also used in Chapter 1.2, where we defined a *mindset* as a collection of views established by a political survey S that where ‘often held together’, in exactly this sense.

Formally, let us say that a set $X \subseteq V$ *witnesses* a specification τ of S if, for every $s \in S$, there are more v in X that specify s as τ does than there are $v \in X$ that specify s in the opposite way. If these majorities are greater than $2/3$, then τ will be a tangle as defined in Section 2.3, at least for $n = 1$, no matter how large or small X is.

More generally, let us say that a ‘weight’ function $w: V \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ *witnesses* τ if, for every $s \in S$, the collective weight of the $v \in V$ that specify s as τ does

exceeds the collective weight of the $v \in V$ that specify s in the opposite way.¹⁷

Much of the attraction and usefulness of tangles stems from the fact that, in practice, most of them have such witnessing sets or functions [4]. But it is important to remember that the definition of a tangle, be it our preliminary definition from Section 2.3 or the formal one given later, does not require that such sets or functions exist. It relies only on notions of consistency and of type, which are both defined by banning triples in \vec{S} deemed ‘inconsistent’ or ‘atypical’ from occurring together in a tangle. So far, both these were defined with reference to the values of $v(S)$ for $v \in V$, and being typical was simply a strengthening of consistency.

In some contexts, however, tangles of S can be defined without any reference to V at all. In our furniture example we could have defined the consistency of a set of features, or predicates, about the elements of V in purely logical or linguistic terms that make no appeal to V . Indeed if \vec{r} stands for ‘made entirely of wood’ and \vec{s} stands for ‘made entirely of steel’, then the set $\{\vec{r}, \vec{s}\}$ is inconsistent. The reason we chose to give was that no object in V is made entirely of wood and also made entirely of steel. But we might have said instead that these two predicates are logically inconsistent – which implies that there is no such object in V but which can be established without examining V .

The way consistency and type are defined formally [1] as part of the notion of abstract tangles is something half-way between these two options: it makes no reference to V but refers only to some axiomatic properties of \vec{S} which reflect our notion that \vec{S} is a set of ‘features’. In this way it also avoids any appeal to logic or meaning.

For the rest of this book the only important thing to note about witnessing sets or functions is that while many tangles have them, tangles can be identified, distinguished, or ruled out without any reference to such sets or functions. The mindset of being socialist can be identified without having to find any actual socialists, let alone delineating these as a social group against others.

References

- [1] R. Diestel. Abstract separation systems. *Order*, 35:157–170, 2018.
- [2] Reinhard Diestel. Abstract separation systems. *Order*, 35:157–170, 2018.
- [3] Reinhard Diestel. *Tangles: identifying types in the empirical sciences*. In preparation.
- [4] C. Elbracht, J. Kneip, and M. Teegen. Tangles are decided by weighted vertex sets. *Advances in Comb.*, (to appear).
- [5] N. Robertson and P.D. Seymour. Graph minors. X. Obstructions to tree-decomposition. *J. Combin. Theory (Series B)*, 52:153–190, 1991.

¹⁷ Formally, $w: V \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ witnesses τ if $\sum \{w(v) \mid v(s) = \tau(s)\} > \sum \{w(v) \mid v(s) \neq \tau(s)\}$ for every $s \in S$.