

# Chapter udf

## The Size of Sets

This chapter discusses enumerations, countability and uncountability. Several sections come in two versions: a more elementary one, that takes enumerations to be lists, or surjections from  $\mathbb{Z}^+$ ; and a more abstract one that defines enumerations as bijections with  $\mathbb{N}$ .

### siz.1 Introduction

sfr:siz:int:  
sec When Georg Cantor developed set theory in the 1870s, one of his aims was to make palatable the idea of an infinite collection—an actual infinity, as the medievals would say. A key part of this was his treatment of the *size* of different sets. If  $a$ ,  $b$  and  $c$  are all distinct, then the set  $\{a, b, c\}$  is intuitively *larger* than  $\{a, b\}$ . But what about infinite sets? Are they all as large as each other? It turns out that they are not.

The first important idea here is that of an enumeration. We can list every finite set by listing all its **elements**. For some infinite sets, we can also list all their **elements** if we allow the list itself to be infinite. Such sets are called **enumerable**. Cantor’s surprising result, which we will fully understand by the end of this chapter, was that some infinite sets are not **enumerable**.

### siz.2 Enumerations and Enumerable Sets

sfr:siz:enm:  
sec

This section discusses enumerations of sets, defining them as surjections from  $\mathbb{Z}^+$ . It does things slowly, for readers with little mathematical background. An alternative, terser version is given in **section siz.11**, which defines enumerations differently: as bijections with  $\mathbb{N}$  (or an initial segment).

**explanation** We've already given examples of sets by listing their **elements**. Let's discuss in more general terms how and when we can list the **elements** of a set, even if that set is infinite.

**Definition siz.1 (Enumeration, informally).** Informally, an *enumeration* of a set  $A$  is a list (possibly infinite) of **elements** of  $A$  such that every **element** of  $A$  appears on the list at some finite position. If  $A$  has an enumeration, then  $A$  is said to be *enumerable*.

**explanation** A couple of points about enumerations:

1. We count as enumerations only lists which have a beginning and in which every **element** other than the first has a single **element** immediately preceding it. In other words, there are only finitely many elements between the first **element** of the list and any other **element**. In particular, this means that every **element** of an enumeration has a finite position: the first **element** has position 1, the second position 2, etc.
2. We can have different enumerations of the same set  $A$  which differ by the order in which the **elements** appear: 4, 1, 25, 16, 9 enumerates the (set of the) first five square numbers just as well as 1, 4, 9, 16, 25 does.
3. Redundant enumerations are still enumerations: 1, 1, 2, 2, 3, 3, ... enumerates the same set as 1, 2, 3, ... does.
4. Order and redundancy *do* matter when we specify an enumeration: we can enumerate the positive integers beginning with 1, 2, 3, 1, ..., but the pattern is easier to see when enumerated in the standard way as 1, 2, 3, 4, ...
5. Enumerations must have a beginning: ..., 3, 2, 1 is not an enumeration of the positive integers because it has no first **element**. To see how this follows from the informal definition, ask yourself, "at what position in the list does the number 76 appear?"
6. The following is not an enumeration of the positive integers: 1, 3, 5, ..., 2, 4, 6, ... The problem is that the even numbers occur at places  $\infty + 1$ ,  $\infty + 2$ ,  $\infty + 3$ , rather than at finite positions.
7. The empty set is enumerable: it is enumerated by the empty list!

**Proposition siz.2.** *If  $A$  has an enumeration, it has an enumeration without repetitions.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $A$  has an enumeration  $x_1, x_2, \dots$  in which each  $x_i$  is an **element** of  $A$ . We can remove repetitions from an enumeration by removing repeated **elements**. For instance, we can turn the enumeration into a new one in which we list  $x_i$  if it is an **element** of  $A$  that is not among  $x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}$  or remove  $x_i$  from the list if it already appears among  $x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}$ .  $\square$

The last argument shows that in order to get a good handle on enumerations and **enumerable** sets and to prove things about them, we need a more precise definition. The following provides it.

**Definition siz.3 (Enumeration, formally).** An *enumeration* of a set  $A \neq \emptyset$  is any **surjective** function  $f: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow A$ .

Let's convince ourselves that the formal definition and the informal definition using a possibly infinite list are equivalent. First, any **surjective** function from  $\mathbb{Z}^+$  to a set  $A$  enumerates  $A$ . Such a function determines an enumeration as defined informally above: the list  $f(1), f(2), f(3), \dots$ . Since  $f$  is **surjective**, every **element** of  $A$  is guaranteed to be the value of  $f(n)$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ . Hence, every **element** of  $A$  appears at some finite position in the list. Since the function may not be **injective**, the list may be redundant, but that is acceptable (as noted above). explanation

On the other hand, given a list that enumerates all **elements** of  $A$ , we can define a **surjective** function  $f: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow A$  by letting  $f(n)$  be the  $n$ th **element** of the list, or the final **element** of the list if there is no  $n$ th **element**. The only case where this does not produce a **surjective** function is when  $A$  is empty, and hence the list is empty. So, every non-empty list determines a **surjective** function  $f: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow A$ .

**Definition siz.4.** A set  $A$  is **enumerable** iff it is empty or has an enumeration. sfr:siz:enm:  
defn:enumerable

**Example siz.5.** A function enumerating the positive integers ( $\mathbb{Z}^+$ ) is simply the identity function given by  $f(n) = n$ . A function enumerating the natural numbers  $\mathbb{N}$  is the function  $g(n) = n - 1$ .

**Example siz.6.** The functions  $f: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$  and  $g: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} f(n) &= 2n \text{ and} \\ g(n) &= 2n - 1 \end{aligned}$$

enumerate the even positive integers and the odd positive integers, respectively. However, neither function is an enumeration of  $\mathbb{Z}^+$ , since neither is **surjective**.

**Problem siz.1.** Define an enumeration of the positive squares 1, 4, 9, 16, ...

**Example siz.7.** The function  $f(n) = (-1)^n \lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil$  (where  $\lceil x \rceil$  denotes the *ceiling* function, which rounds  $x$  up to the nearest integer) enumerates the set of integers  $\mathbb{Z}$ . Notice how  $f$  generates the values of  $\mathbb{Z}$  by “hopping” back and forth between positive and negative integers:

$$\begin{array}{cccccccc} f(1) & f(2) & f(3) & f(4) & f(5) & f(6) & f(7) & \dots \\ -\lceil \frac{0}{2} \rceil & \lceil \frac{1}{2} \rceil & -\lceil \frac{2}{2} \rceil & \lceil \frac{3}{2} \rceil & -\lceil \frac{4}{2} \rceil & \lceil \frac{5}{2} \rceil & -\lceil \frac{6}{2} \rceil & \dots \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 2 & -2 & 3 & \dots & \end{array}$$

You can also think of  $f$  as defined by cases as follows:

$$f(n) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n = 1 \\ n/2 & \text{if } n \text{ is even} \\ -(n-1)/2 & \text{if } n \text{ is odd and } > 1 \end{cases}$$

**Problem siz.2.** Show that if  $A$  and  $B$  are **enumerable**, so is  $A \cup B$ . To do this, suppose there are **surjective** functions  $f: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow A$  and  $g: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow B$ , and define a **surjective** function  $h: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow A \cup B$  and prove that it is **surjective**. Also consider the cases where  $A$  or  $B = \emptyset$ .

**Problem siz.3.** Show that if  $B \subseteq A$  and  $A$  is **enumerable**, so is  $B$ . To do this, suppose there is a **surjective** function  $f: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow A$ . Define a **surjective** function  $g: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow B$  and prove that it is **surjective**. What happens if  $B = \emptyset$ ?

**Problem siz.4.** Show by induction on  $n$  that if  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n$  are all **enumerable**, so is  $A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_n$ . You may assume the fact that if two sets  $A$  and  $B$  are **enumerable**, so is  $A \cup B$ .

Although it is perhaps more natural when listing the **elements** of a set to start counting from the 1st **element**, mathematicians like to use the natural numbers  $\mathbb{N}$  for counting things. They talk about the 0th, 1st, 2nd, and so on, **elements** of a list. Correspondingly, we can define an enumeration as a **surjective** function from  $\mathbb{N}$  to  $A$ . Of course, the two definitions are equivalent.

**Proposition siz.8.** *There is a **surjection**  $f: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow A$  iff there is a **surjection**  $g: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow A$ .*

sfr:siz:enm:  
prop:enum-shift

*Proof.* Given a **surjection**  $f: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow A$ , we can define  $g(n) = f(n+1)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . It is easy to see that  $g: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow A$  is **surjective**. Conversely, given a **surjection**  $g: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow A$ , define  $f(n) = g(n-1)$ .  $\square$

This gives us the following result:

**Corollary siz.9.** *A set  $A$  is **enumerable** iff it is empty or there is a **surjective** function  $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow A$ .*

sfr:siz:enm:  
cor:enum-nat

We discussed above than an list of **elements** of a set  $A$  can be turned into a list without repetitions. This is also true for enumerations, but a bit harder to formulate and prove rigorously. Any function  $f: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow A$  must be defined for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ . If there are only finitely many **elements** in  $A$  then we clearly cannot have a function defined on the infinitely many **elements** of  $\mathbb{Z}^+$  that takes as values all the **elements** of  $A$  but never takes the same value twice. In that case, i.e., in the case where the list without repetitions is finite, we must choose a different domain for  $f$ , one with only finitely many **elements**. Not having repetitions means that  $f$  must be **injective**. Since it is also **surjective**, we are looking for a **bijection** between some finite set  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  or  $\mathbb{Z}^+$  and  $A$ .

sfr:siz:enm:  
prop:enum-bij **Proposition siz.10.** If  $f: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow A$  is *surjective* (i.e., an enumeration of  $A$ ), there is a *bijection*  $g: Z \rightarrow A$  where  $Z$  is either  $\mathbb{Z}^+$  or  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ .

*Proof.* We define the function  $g$  recursively: Let  $g(1) = f(1)$ . If  $g(i)$  has already been defined, let  $g(i+1)$  be the first value of  $f(1), f(2), \dots$  not already among  $g(1), \dots, g(i)$ , if there is one. If  $A$  has just  $n$  elements, then  $g(1), \dots, g(n)$  are all defined, and so we have defined a function  $g: \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow A$ . If  $A$  has infinitely many elements, then for any  $i$  there must be an element of  $A$  in the enumeration  $f(1), f(2), \dots$ , which is not already among  $g(1), \dots, g(i)$ . In this case we have defined a function  $g: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow A$ .

The function  $g$  is *surjective*, since any element of  $A$  is among  $f(1), f(2), \dots$  (since  $f$  is *surjective*) and so will eventually be a value of  $g(i)$  for some  $i$ . It is also *injective*, since if there were  $j < i$  such that  $g(j) = g(i)$ , then  $g(i)$  would already be among  $g(1), \dots, g(i-1)$ , contrary to how we defined  $g$ .  $\square$

sfr:siz:enm:  
cor:enum-nat-bij **Corollary siz.11.** A set  $A$  is *enumerable* iff it is empty or there is a *bijection*  $f: N \rightarrow A$  where either  $N = \mathbb{N}$  or  $N = \{0, \dots, n\}$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Proof.*  $A$  is *enumerable* iff  $A$  is empty or there is a *surjective*  $f: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow A$ . By **Proposition siz.10**, the latter holds iff there is a *bijective* function  $f: Z \rightarrow A$  where  $Z = \mathbb{Z}^+$  or  $Z = \{1, \dots, n\}$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ . By the same argument as in the proof of **Proposition siz.8**, that in turn is the case iff there is a *bijection*  $g: N \rightarrow A$  where either  $N = \mathbb{N}$  or  $N = \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ .  $\square$

**Problem siz.5.** According to **Definition siz.4**, a set  $A$  is enumerable iff  $A = \emptyset$  or there is a *surjective*  $f: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow A$ . It is also possible to define “*enumerable set*” precisely by: a set is enumerable iff there is an *injective* function  $g: A \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$ . Show that the definitions are equivalent, i.e., show that there is an *injective* function  $g: A \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$  iff either  $A = \emptyset$  or there is a *surjective*  $f: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow A$ .

### siz.3 Cantor’s Zig-Zag Method

sfr:siz:zigzag:  
sec We’ve already considered some “easy” enumerations. Now we will consider something a bit harder. Consider the set of pairs of natural numbers defined by: explanation

$$\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} = \{\langle n, m \rangle : n, m \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

We can organize these ordered pairs into an *array*, like so:

	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	...
<b>0</b>	$\langle 0, 0 \rangle$	$\langle 0, 1 \rangle$	$\langle 0, 2 \rangle$	$\langle 0, 3 \rangle$	...
<b>1</b>	$\langle 1, 0 \rangle$	$\langle 1, 1 \rangle$	$\langle 1, 2 \rangle$	$\langle 1, 3 \rangle$	...
<b>2</b>	$\langle 2, 0 \rangle$	$\langle 2, 1 \rangle$	$\langle 2, 2 \rangle$	$\langle 2, 3 \rangle$	...
<b>3</b>	$\langle 3, 0 \rangle$	$\langle 3, 1 \rangle$	$\langle 3, 2 \rangle$	$\langle 3, 3 \rangle$	...
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\ddots$

Clearly, every ordered pair in  $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$  will appear exactly once in the array. In particular,  $\langle n, m \rangle$  will appear in the  $n$ th row and  $m$ th column. But how do we organize the elements of such an array into a “one-dimensional” list? The pattern in the array below demonstrates one way to do this (although of course there are many other options):

	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	...
<b>0</b>	0	1	3	6	10	...
<b>1</b>	2	4	7	11	...	...
<b>2</b>	5	8	12	...	...	...
<b>3</b>	9	13	...	...	...	...
<b>4</b>	14	...	...	...	...	...
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	...	$\ddots$

This pattern is called *Cantor’s zig-zag method*. It enumerates  $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$  as follows:

$$\langle 0, 0 \rangle, \langle 0, 1 \rangle, \langle 1, 0 \rangle, \langle 0, 2 \rangle, \langle 1, 1 \rangle, \langle 2, 0 \rangle, \langle 0, 3 \rangle, \langle 1, 2 \rangle, \langle 2, 1 \rangle, \langle 3, 0 \rangle, \dots$$

And this establishes the following:

**Proposition siz.12.**  $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$  is *enumerable*.

*sfr:siz:zigzag:  
natsquaredenumerable*

*Proof.* Let  $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$  take each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  to the tuple  $\langle n, m \rangle \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$  such that  $k$  is the value of the  $n$ th row and  $m$ th column in Cantor’s zig-zag array.  $\square$

*explanation*

This technique also generalises rather nicely. For example, we can use it to enumerate the set of ordered triples of natural numbers, i.e.:

$$\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} = \{ \langle n, m, k \rangle : n, m, k \in \mathbb{N} \}$$

We think of  $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$  as the Cartesian product of  $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$  with  $\mathbb{N}$ , that is,

$$\mathbb{N}^3 = (\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}) \times \mathbb{N} = \{ \langle \langle n, m \rangle, k \rangle : n, m, k \in \mathbb{N} \}$$

and thus we can enumerate  $\mathbb{N}^3$  with an array by labelling one axis with the enumeration of  $\mathbb{N}$ , and the other axis with the enumeration of  $\mathbb{N}^2$ :

	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	...
<b><math>\langle 0, 0 \rangle</math></b>	$\langle 0, 0, 0 \rangle$	$\langle 0, 0, 1 \rangle$	$\langle 0, 0, 2 \rangle$	$\langle 0, 0, 3 \rangle$	...
<b><math>\langle 0, 1 \rangle</math></b>	$\langle 0, 1, 0 \rangle$	$\langle 0, 1, 1 \rangle$	$\langle 0, 1, 2 \rangle$	$\langle 0, 1, 3 \rangle$	...
<b><math>\langle 1, 0 \rangle</math></b>	$\langle 1, 0, 0 \rangle$	$\langle 1, 0, 1 \rangle$	$\langle 1, 0, 2 \rangle$	$\langle 1, 0, 3 \rangle$	...
<b><math>\langle 0, 2 \rangle</math></b>	$\langle 0, 2, 0 \rangle$	$\langle 0, 2, 1 \rangle$	$\langle 0, 2, 2 \rangle$	$\langle 0, 2, 3 \rangle$	...
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\ddots$

Thus, by using a method like Cantor’s zig-zag method, we may similarly obtain an enumeration of  $\mathbb{N}^3$ . And we can keep going, obtaining enumerations of  $\mathbb{N}^n$  for any natural number  $n$ . So, we have:

**Proposition siz.13.**  $\mathbb{N}^n$  is *enumerable*, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Problem siz.6.** Show that  $(\mathbb{Z}^+)^n$  is *enumerable*, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Problem siz.7.** Show that  $(\mathbb{Z}^+)^*$  is *enumerable*. You may assume [Problem siz.6](#).

## siz.4 Pairing Functions and Codes

sfr:siz:pai:  
sec Cantor's zig-zag method makes the enumerability of  $\mathbb{N}^n$  visually evident. But explanation let us focus on our array depicting  $\mathbb{N}^2$ . Following the zig-zag line in the array and counting the places, we can check that  $\langle 1, 2 \rangle$  is associated with the number 7. However, it would be nice if we could compute this more directly. That is, it would be nice to have to hand the *inverse* of the zig-zag enumeration,  $g: \mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ , such that

$$g(\langle 0, 0 \rangle) = 0, \quad g(\langle 0, 1 \rangle) = 1, \quad g(\langle 1, 0 \rangle) = 2, \quad \dots, \quad g(\langle 1, 2 \rangle) = 7, \quad \dots$$

This would enable us to calculate exactly where  $\langle n, m \rangle$  will occur in our enumeration.

In fact, we can define  $g$  directly by making two observations. First: if the  $n$ th row and  $m$ th column contains value  $v$ , then the  $(n+1)$ st row and  $(m-1)$ st column contains value  $v+1$ . Second: the first row of our enumeration consists of the triangular numbers, starting with 0, 1, 3, 6, etc. The  $k$ th triangular number is the sum of the natural numbers  $< k$ , which can be computed as  $k(k+1)/2$ . Putting these two observations together, consider this function:

$$g(n, m) = \frac{(n+m+1)(n+m)}{2} + n$$

We often just write  $g(n, m)$  rather than  $g(\langle n, m \rangle)$ , since it is easier on the eyes. This tells you first to determine the  $(n+m)$ <sup>th</sup> triangle number, and then add  $n$  to it. And it populates the array in exactly the way we would like. So in particular, the pair  $\langle 1, 2 \rangle$  is sent to  $\frac{4 \times 3}{2} + 1 = 7$ .

This function  $g$  is the *inverse* of an enumeration of a set of pairs. Such functions are called *pairing functions*.

**Definition siz.14 (Pairing function).** A function  $f: A \times B \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  is an arithmetical *pairing function* if  $f$  is injective. We also say that  $f$  *encodes*  $A \times B$ , and that  $f(x, y)$  is the *code* for  $\langle x, y \rangle$ .

We can use pairing functions to encode, e.g., pairs of natural numbers; or, explanation in other words, we can represent each *pair* of elements using a *single* number. Using the inverse of the pairing function, we can *decode* the number, i.e., find out which pair it represents.

**Problem siz.8.** Give an enumeration of the set of all non-negative rational numbers.

**Problem siz.9.** Show that  $\mathbb{Q}$  is **enumerable**. Recall that any rational number can be written as a fraction  $z/m$  with  $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$ .

**Problem siz.10.** Define an enumeration of  $\mathbb{B}^*$ .

**Problem siz.11.** Recall from your introductory logic course that each possible truth table expresses a truth function. In other words, the truth functions are all functions from  $\mathbb{B}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$  for some  $k$ . Prove that the set of all truth functions is enumerable.

**Problem siz.12.** Show that the set of all finite subsets of an arbitrary infinite **enumerable** set is **enumerable**.

**Problem siz.13.** A subset of  $\mathbb{N}$  is said to be *cofinite* iff it is the complement of a finite set  $\mathbb{N}$ ; that is,  $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  is cofinite iff  $\mathbb{N} \setminus A$  is finite. Let  $I$  be the set whose **elements** are exactly the finite and cofinite subsets of  $\mathbb{N}$ . Show that  $I$  is **enumerable**.

**Problem siz.14.** Show that the **enumerable** union of **enumerable** sets is **enumerable**. That is, whenever  $A_1, A_2, \dots$  are sets, and each  $A_i$  is **enumerable**, then the union  $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i$  of all of them is also **enumerable**. [NB: this is hard!]

**Problem siz.15.** Let  $f: A \times B \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  be an arbitrary pairing function. Show that the inverse of  $f$  is an enumeration of  $A \times B$ .

**Problem siz.16.** Specify a function that encodes  $\mathbb{N}^3$ .

## siz.5 An Alternative Pairing Function

explanation There are other enumerations of  $\mathbb{N}^2$  that make it easier to figure out what their inverses are. Here is one. Instead of visualizing the enumeration in an array, start with the list of positive integers associated with (initially) empty spaces. Imagine filling these spaces successively with pairs  $\langle n, m \rangle$  as follows. Starting with the pairs that have 0 in the first place (i.e., pairs  $\langle 0, m \rangle$ ), put the first (i.e.,  $\langle 0, 0 \rangle$ ) in the first empty place, then skip an empty space, put the second (i.e.,  $\langle 0, 2 \rangle$ ) in the next empty place, skip one again, and so forth. The (incomplete) beginning of our enumeration now looks like this sfr:siz:pai-alt:sec

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	...
$\langle 0, 1 \rangle$	$\langle 0, 2 \rangle$	$\langle 0, 3 \rangle$	$\langle 0, 4 \rangle$	$\langle 0, 5 \rangle$	$\dots$					

Repeat this with pairs  $\langle 1, m \rangle$  for the place that still remain empty, again skipping every other empty place:

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	...
$\langle 0, 0 \rangle$	$\langle 1, 0 \rangle$	$\langle 0, 1 \rangle$	$\langle 0, 2 \rangle$	$\langle 1, 1 \rangle$	$\langle 0, 3 \rangle$	$\langle 0, 4 \rangle$	$\langle 1, 2 \rangle$	$\dots$		

Enter pairs  $\langle 2, m \rangle$ ,  $\langle 2, m \rangle$ , etc., in the same way. Our completed enumeration thus starts like this:

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	...
$\langle 0, 0 \rangle$	$\langle 1, 0 \rangle$	$\langle 0, 1 \rangle$	$\langle 2, 0 \rangle$	$\langle 0, 2 \rangle$	$\langle 1, 1 \rangle$	$\langle 0, 3 \rangle$	$\langle 3, 0 \rangle$	$\langle 0, 4 \rangle$	$\langle 1, 2 \rangle$	...

If we number the cells in the array above according to this enumeration, we will not find a neat zig-zag line, but this arrangement:

	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	...
<b>0</b>	1	3	5	7	9	11	...
<b>1</b>	2	6	10	14	18	...	...
<b>2</b>	4	12	20	28	...	...	...
<b>3</b>	8	24	40	...	...	...	...
<b>4</b>	16	48	...	...	...	...	...
<b>5</b>	32	...	...	...	...	...	...
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮

We can see that the pairs in row 0 are in the odd numbered places of our enumeration, i.e., pair  $\langle 0, m \rangle$  is in place  $2m + 1$ ; pairs in the second row,  $\langle 1, m \rangle$ , are in places whose number is the double of an odd number, specifically,  $2 \cdot (2m + 1)$ ; pairs in the third row,  $\langle 2, m \rangle$ , are in places whose number is four times an odd number,  $4 \cdot (2m + 1)$ ; and so on. The factors of  $(2m + 1)$  for each row, 1, 2, 4, 8, ..., are exactly the powers of 2:  $1 = 2^0$ ,  $2 = 2^1$ ,  $4 = 2^2$ ,  $8 = 2^3$ , ... In fact, the relevant exponent is always the first member of the pair in question. Thus, for pair  $\langle n, m \rangle$  the factor is  $2^n$ . This gives us the general formula:  $2^n \cdot (2m + 1)$ . However, this is a mapping of pairs to *positive* integers, i.e.,  $\langle 0, 0 \rangle$  has position 1. If we want to begin at position 0 we must subtract 1 from the result. This gives us:

**Example siz.15.** The function  $h: \mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  given by

$$h(n, m) = 2^n(2m + 1) - 1$$

is a pairing function for the set of pairs of natural numbers  $\mathbb{N}^2$ .

Accordingly, in our second enumeration of  $\mathbb{N}^2$ , the pair  $\langle 0, 0 \rangle$  has code [explanation](#)  $h(0, 0) = 2^0(2 \cdot 0 + 1) - 1 = 0$ ;  $\langle 1, 2 \rangle$  has code  $2^1 \cdot (2 \cdot 2 + 1) - 1 = 2 \cdot 5 - 1 = 9$ ;  $\langle 2, 6 \rangle$  has code  $2^2 \cdot (2 \cdot 6 + 1) - 1 = 51$ .

Sometimes it is enough to encode pairs of natural numbers  $\mathbb{N}^2$  without requiring that the encoding is surjective. Such encodings have inverses that are only partial functions.

**Example siz.16.** The function  $j: \mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^+$  given by

$$j(n, m) = 2^n 3^m$$

is an [injective](#) function  $\mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ .

## siz.6 Non-enumerable Sets

sfr:siz:nen:  
sec

This section proves the non-enumerability of  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$  and  $\wp(\mathbb{Z}^+)$  using the definition in [section siz.2](#). It is designed to be a little more elementary and a little more detailed than the version in [section siz.11](#)

Some sets, such as the set  $\mathbb{Z}^+$  of positive integers, are infinite. So far we've seen examples of infinite sets which were all **enumerable**. However, there are also infinite sets which do not have this property. Such sets are called **non-enumerable**.

First of all, it is perhaps already surprising that there are **non-enumerable** sets. For any **enumerable** set  $A$  there is a **surjective** function  $f: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow A$ . If a set is **non-enumerable** there is no such function. That is, no function mapping the infinitely many **elements** of  $\mathbb{Z}^+$  to  $A$  can exhaust all of  $A$ . So there are "more" **elements** of  $A$  than the infinitely many positive integers.

How would one prove that a set is **non-enumerable**? You have to show that no such surjective function can exist. Equivalently, you have to show that the elements of  $A$  cannot be enumerated in a one way infinite list. The best way to do this is to show that every list of **elements** of  $A$  must leave at least one element out; or that no function  $f: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow A$  can be **surjective**. We can do this using Cantor's *diagonal method*. Given a list of **elements** of  $A$ , say,  $x_1, x_2, \dots$ , we construct another element of  $A$  which, by its construction, cannot possibly be on that list.

Our first example is the set  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$  of all infinite, non-gappy sequences of 0's and 1's.

**Theorem siz.17.**  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$  is **non-enumerable**.

sfr:siz:nen:  
thm:nonenum-bin-omega

*Proof.* Suppose, by way of contradiction, that  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$  is **enumerable**, i.e., suppose that there is a list  $s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4, \dots$  of all **elements** of  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$ . Each of these  $s_i$  is itself an infinite sequence of 0's and 1's. Let's call the  $j$ -th element of the  $i$ -th sequence in this list  $s_i(j)$ . Then the  $i$ -th sequence  $s_i$  is

$$s_i(1), s_i(2), s_i(3), \dots$$

We may arrange this list, and the elements of each sequence  $s_i$  in it, in an array:

	1	2	3	4	...
1	<b><math>s_1(1)</math></b>	$s_1(2)$	$s_1(3)$	$s_1(4)$	...
2	$s_2(1)$	<b><math>s_2(2)</math></b>	$s_2(3)$	$s_2(4)$	...
3	$s_3(1)$	$s_3(2)$	<b><math>s_3(3)</math></b>	$s_3(4)$	...
4	$s_4(1)$	$s_4(2)$	$s_4(3)$	<b><math>s_4(4)</math></b>	...
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\ddots$

The labels down the side give the number of the sequence in the list  $s_1, s_2, \dots$ ; the numbers across the top label the **elements** of the individual sequences. For instance,  $s_1(1)$  is a name for whatever number, a 0 or a 1, is the first **element** in the sequence  $s_1$ , and so on.

Now we construct an infinite sequence,  $\bar{s}$ , of 0's and 1's which cannot possibly be on this list. The definition of  $\bar{s}$  will depend on the list  $s_1, s_2, \dots$ . Any infinite list of infinite sequences of 0's and 1's gives rise to an infinite sequence  $\bar{s}$  which is guaranteed to not appear on the list.

To define  $\bar{s}$ , we specify what all its **elements** are, i.e., we specify  $\bar{s}(n)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ . We do this by reading down the diagonal of the array above (hence the name “diagonal method”) and then changing every 1 to a 0 and every 0 to a 1. More abstractly, we define  $\bar{s}(n)$  to be 0 or 1 according to whether the  $n$ -th **element** of the diagonal,  $s_n(n)$ , is 1 or 0.

$$\bar{s}(n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s_n(n) = 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } s_n(n) = 1. \end{cases}$$

If you like formulas better than definitions by cases, you could also define  $\bar{s}(n) = 1 - s_n(n)$ .

Clearly  $\bar{s}$  is an infinite sequence of 0's and 1's, since it is just the mirror sequence to the sequence of 0's and 1's that appear on the diagonal of our array. So  $\bar{s}$  is **an element** of  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$ . But it cannot be on the list  $s_1, s_2, \dots$ . Why not?

It can't be the first sequence in the list,  $s_1$ , because it differs from  $s_1$  in the first **element**. Whatever  $s_1(1)$  is, we defined  $\bar{s}(1)$  to be the opposite. It can't be the second sequence in the list, because  $\bar{s}$  differs from  $s_2$  in the second element: if  $s_2(2)$  is 0,  $\bar{s}(2)$  is 1, and vice versa. And so on.

More precisely: if  $\bar{s}$  were on the list, there would be some  $k$  so that  $\bar{s} = s_k$ . Two sequences are identical iff they agree at every place, i.e., for any  $n$ ,  $\bar{s}(n) = s_k(n)$ . So in particular, taking  $n = k$  as a special case,  $\bar{s}(k) = s_k(k)$  would have to hold.  $s_k(k)$  is either 0 or 1. If it is 0 then  $\bar{s}(k)$  must be 1—that's how we defined  $\bar{s}$ . But if  $s_k(k) = 1$  then, again because of the way we defined  $\bar{s}$ ,  $\bar{s}(k) = 0$ . In either case  $\bar{s}(k) \neq s_k(k)$ .

We started by assuming that there is a list of **elements** of  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$ ,  $s_1, s_2, \dots$ . From this list we constructed a sequence  $\bar{s}$  which we proved cannot be on the list. But it definitely is a sequence of 0's and 1's if all the  $s_i$  are sequences of 0's and 1's, i.e.,  $\bar{s} \in \mathbb{B}^\omega$ . This shows in particular that there can be no list of **all elements** of  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$ , since for any such list we could also construct a sequence  $\bar{s}$  guaranteed to not be on the list, so the assumption that there is a list of all sequences in  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$  leads to a contradiction.  $\square$

This proof method is called “diagonalization” because it uses the diagonal of the array to define  $\bar{s}$ . Diagonalization need not involve the presence of an array: we can show that sets are not **enumerable** by using a similar idea even when no array and no actual diagonal is involved. explanation

**Theorem siz.18.**  $\wp(\mathbb{Z}^+)$  is not **enumerable**.

*sfr:siz:nen:  
thm:nonenum-pownat*

*Proof.* We proceed in the same way, by showing that for every list of subsets of  $\mathbb{Z}^+$  there is a subset of  $\mathbb{Z}^+$  which cannot be on the list. Suppose the following is a given list of subsets of  $\mathbb{Z}^+$ :

$$Z_1, Z_2, Z_3, \dots$$

We now define a set  $\bar{Z}$  such that for any  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ ,  $n \in \bar{Z}$  iff  $n \notin Z_n$ :

$$\bar{Z} = \{n \in \mathbb{Z}^+ : n \notin Z_n\} \quad \square$$

$\bar{Z}$  is clearly a set of positive integers, since by assumption each  $Z_n$  is, and thus  $\bar{Z} \in \wp(\mathbb{Z}^+)$ . But  $\bar{Z}$  cannot be on the list. To show this, we'll establish that for each  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ ,  $\bar{Z} \neq Z_k$ .

So let  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  be arbitrary. We've defined  $\bar{Z}$  so that for any  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ ,  $n \in \bar{Z}$  iff  $n \notin Z_n$ . In particular, taking  $n = k$ ,  $k \in \bar{Z}$  iff  $k \notin Z_k$ . But this shows that  $\bar{Z} \neq Z_k$ , since  $k$  is an element of one but not the other, and so  $\bar{Z}$  and  $Z_k$  have different elements. Since  $k$  was arbitrary,  $\bar{Z}$  is not on the list  $Z_1, Z_2, \dots$

explanation

The preceding proof did not mention a diagonal, but you can think of it as involving a diagonal if you picture it this way: Imagine the sets  $Z_1, Z_2, \dots$ , written in an array, where each element  $j \in Z_i$  is listed in the  $j$ -th column. Say the first four sets on that list are  $\{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ ,  $\{2, 4, 6, \dots\}$ ,  $\{1, 2, 5\}$ , and  $\{3, 4, 5, \dots\}$ . Then the array would begin with

$$\begin{array}{l} Z_1 = \{ \mathbf{1}, \quad 2, \quad 3, \quad 4, \quad 5, \quad 6, \quad \dots \} \\ Z_2 = \{ \quad \mathbf{2}, \quad \quad 4, \quad \quad 6, \quad \dots \} \\ Z_3 = \{ \mathbf{1}, \quad 2, \quad \quad \quad 5 \quad \quad \quad \} \\ Z_4 = \{ \quad \quad \quad \mathbf{3}, \quad \mathbf{4}, \quad 5, \quad 6, \quad \dots \} \\ \quad \quad \quad \vdots \quad \quad \quad \ddots \end{array}$$

Then  $\bar{Z}$  is the set obtained by going down the diagonal, leaving out any numbers that appear along the diagonal and include those  $j$  where the array has a gap in the  $j$ -th row/column. In the above case, we would leave out 1 and 2, include 3, leave out 4, etc.

**Problem siz.17.** Show that  $\wp(\mathbb{N})$  is non-enumerable by a diagonal argument.

**Problem siz.18.** Show that the set of functions  $f: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$  is non-enumerable by an explicit diagonal argument. That is, show that if  $f_1, f_2, \dots$ , is a list of functions and each  $f_i: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$ , then there is some  $\bar{f}: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$  not on this list.

## siz.7 Reduction

sfr:siz:red:  
sec

This section proves non-enumerability by reduction, matching the results in [section siz.6](#). An alternative, slightly more condensed version matching the results in [section siz.12](#) is provided in [section siz.13](#).

We showed  $\wp(\mathbb{Z}^+)$  to be **non-enumerable** by a diagonalization argument. We already had a proof that  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$ , the set of all infinite sequences of 0s and 1s, is **non-enumerable**. Here's another way we can prove that  $\wp(\mathbb{Z}^+)$  is **non-enumerable**: Show that *if  $\wp(\mathbb{Z}^+)$  is enumerable then  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$  is also enumerable*. Since we know  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$  is not **enumerable**,  $\wp(\mathbb{Z}^+)$  can't be either. This is called *reducing* one problem to another—in this case, we reduce the problem of enumerating  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$  to the problem of enumerating  $\wp(\mathbb{Z}^+)$ . A solution to the latter—an enumeration of  $\wp(\mathbb{Z}^+)$ —would yield a solution to the former—an enumeration of  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$ .

How do we reduce the problem of enumerating a set  $B$  to that of enumerating a set  $A$ ? We provide a way of turning an enumeration of  $A$  into an enumeration of  $B$ . The easiest way to do that is to define a **surjective** function  $f: A \rightarrow B$ . If  $x_1, x_2, \dots$  enumerates  $A$ , then  $f(x_1), f(x_2), \dots$  would enumerate  $B$ . In our case, we are looking for a surjective function  $f: \wp(\mathbb{Z}^+) \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^\omega$ .

**Problem siz.19.** Show that if there is an **injective** function  $g: B \rightarrow A$ , and  $B$  is **non-enumerable**, then so is  $A$ . Do this by showing how you can use  $g$  to turn an enumeration of  $A$  into one of  $B$ .

*Proof of [Theorem siz.18](#) by reduction.* Suppose that  $\wp(\mathbb{Z}^+)$  were **enumerable**, and thus that there is an enumeration of it,  $Z_1, Z_2, Z_3, \dots$

Define the function  $f: \wp(\mathbb{Z}^+) \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^\omega$  by letting  $f(Z)$  be the sequence  $s_k$  such that  $s_k(n) = 1$  iff  $n \in Z$ , and  $s_k(n) = 0$  otherwise. This clearly defines a function, since whenever  $Z \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^+$ , any  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  either is **an element** of  $Z$  or isn't. For instance, the set  $2\mathbb{Z}^+ = \{2, 4, 6, \dots\}$  of positive even numbers gets mapped to the sequence 010101..., the empty set gets mapped to 0000... and the set  $\mathbb{Z}^+$  itself to 1111....

It also is **surjective**: Every sequence of 0s and 1s corresponds to some set of positive integers, namely the one which has as its members those integers corresponding to the places where the sequence has 1s. More precisely, suppose  $s \in \mathbb{B}^\omega$ . Define  $Z \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^+$  by:

$$Z = \{n \in \mathbb{Z}^+ : s(n) = 1\}$$

Then  $f(Z) = s$ , as can be verified by consulting the definition of  $f$ .

Now consider the list

$$f(Z_1), f(Z_2), f(Z_3), \dots$$

Since  $f$  is **surjective**, every member of  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$  must appear as a value of  $f$  for some argument, and so must appear on the list. This list must therefore enumerate all of  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$ .

So if  $\wp(\mathbb{Z}^+)$  were **enumerable**,  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$  would be **enumerable**. But  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$  is **non-enumerable** ([Theorem siz.17](#)). Hence  $\wp(\mathbb{Z}^+)$  is **non-enumerable**.  $\square$

explanation

It is easy to be confused about the direction the reduction goes in. For instance, a **surjective** function  $g: \mathbb{B}^\omega \rightarrow B$  does *not* establish that  $B$  is **non-enumerable**. (Consider  $g: \mathbb{B}^\omega \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$  defined by  $g(s) = s(1)$ , the function that maps a sequence of 0's and 1's to its first **element**. It is **surjective**, because some sequences start with 0 and some start with 1. But  $\mathbb{B}$  is finite.) Note also that the function  $f$  must be **surjective**, or otherwise the argument does not go through:  $f(x_1), f(x_2), \dots$  would then not be guaranteed to include all the **elements** of  $B$ . For instance,

$$h(n) = \underbrace{000\dots 0}_n$$

defines a function  $h: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^\omega$ , but  $\mathbb{Z}^+$  is **enumerable**.

**Problem siz.20.** Show that the set of all *sets of* pairs of positive integers is **non-enumerable** by a reduction argument.

**Problem siz.21.** Show that the set  $X$  of all functions  $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  is **non-enumerable** by a reduction argument (Hint: give a surjective function from  $X$  to  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$ .)

**Problem siz.22.** Show that  $\mathbb{N}^\omega$ , the set of infinite sequences of natural numbers, is **non-enumerable** by a reduction argument.

**Problem siz.23.** Let  $P$  be the set of functions from the set of positive integers to the set  $\{0\}$ , and let  $Q$  be the set of *partial* functions from the set of positive integers to the set  $\{0\}$ . Show that  $P$  is **enumerable** and  $Q$  is not. (Hint: reduce the problem of enumerating  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$  to enumerating  $Q$ .)

**Problem siz.24.** Let  $S$  be the set of all **surjective** functions from the set of positive integers to the set  $\{0,1\}$ , i.e.,  $S$  consists of all **surjective**  $f: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ . Show that  $S$  is **non-enumerable**.

**Problem siz.25.** Show that the set  $\mathbb{R}$  of all real numbers is **non-enumerable**.

## siz.8 Equinumerosity

We have an intuitive notion of “size” of sets, which works fine for finite sets. But what about infinite sets? If we want to come up with a formal way of comparing the sizes of two sets of *any* size, it is a good idea to start by defining when sets are the same size. Here is Frege:

sfr:siz:equ:  
sec

If a waiter wants to be sure that he has laid exactly as many knives as plates on the table, he does not need to count either of them, if he simply lays a knife to the right of each plate, so that every knife on the table lies to the right of some plate. The plates and knives are thus uniquely correlated to each other, and indeed through that same spatial relationship. (Frege, 1884, §70)

The insight of this passage can be brought out through a formal definition:

sfr:siz:equ: comparisondef **Definition siz.19.**  $A$  is *equinumerous* with  $B$ , written  $A \approx B$ , iff there is a **bijection**  $f: A \rightarrow B$ .

sfr:siz:equ: equinumerosityisequi **Proposition siz.20.** *Equinumerosity is an equivalence relation.*

*Proof.* We must show that equinumerosity is reflexive, symmetric, and transitive. Let  $A, B$ , and  $C$  be sets.

*Reflexivity.* The identity map  $\text{Id}_A: A \rightarrow A$ , where  $\text{Id}_A(x) = x$  for all  $x \in A$ , is a **bijection**. So  $A \approx A$ .

*Symmetry.* Suppose  $A \approx B$ , i.e., there is a **bijection**  $f: A \rightarrow B$ . Since  $f$  is **bijective**, its inverse  $f^{-1}$  exists and is also **bijective**. Hence,  $f^{-1}: B \rightarrow A$  is a **bijection**, so  $B \approx A$ .

*Transitivity.* Suppose that  $A \approx B$  and  $B \approx C$ , i.e., there are **bijections**  $f: A \rightarrow B$  and  $g: B \rightarrow C$ . Then the composition  $g \circ f: A \rightarrow C$  is **bijective**, so that  $A \approx C$ .  $\square$

**Proposition siz.21.** *If  $A \approx B$ , then  $A$  is **enumerable** if and only if  $B$  is.*

The following proof uses **Definition siz.4** if **section siz.2** is included and **Definition siz.27** otherwise.

*Proof.* Suppose  $A \approx B$ , so there is some **bijection**  $f: A \rightarrow B$ , and suppose that  $A$  is **enumerable**. Then either  $A = \emptyset$  or there is a **surjective** function  $g: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow A$ . If  $A = \emptyset$ , then  $B = \emptyset$  also (otherwise there would be an **element**  $y \in B$  but no  $x \in A$  with  $g(x) = y$ ). If, on the other hand,  $g: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow A$  is **surjective**, then  $f \circ g: \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow B$  is **surjective**. To see this, let  $y \in B$ . Since  $f$  is **surjective**, there is an  $x \in A$  such that  $f(x) = y$ . Since  $g$  is **surjective**, there is an  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  such that  $g(n) = x$ . Hence,

$$(f \circ g)(n) = f(g(n)) = f(x) = y$$

and thus  $f \circ g$  is **surjective**. We have that  $f \circ g$  is an enumeration of  $B$ , and so  $B$  is **enumerable**.

If  $B$  is **enumerable**, we obtain that  $A$  is **enumerable** by repeating the argument with the **bijection**  $f^{-1}: B \rightarrow A$  instead of  $f$ .  $\square$

**Problem siz.26.** Show that if  $A \approx C$  and  $B \approx D$ , and  $A \cap B = C \cap D = \emptyset$ , then  $A \cup B \approx C \cup D$ .

**Problem siz.27.** Show that if  $A$  is infinite and **enumerable**, then  $A \approx \mathbb{N}$ .

## siz.9 Sets of Different Sizes, and Cantor's Theorem

explanation

We have offered a precise statement of the idea that two sets have the same size. We can also offer a precise statement of the idea that one set is smaller than another. Our definition of “is smaller than (or equinumerous)” will require, instead of a **bijection** between the sets, an **injection** from the first set to the second. If such a function exists, the size of the first set is less than or equal to the size of the second. Intuitively, an **injection** from one set to another guarantees that the range of the function has at least as many **elements** as the domain, since no two **elements** of the domain map to the same **element** of the range.

sfr:siz:car:  
sec

**Definition siz.22.**  $A$  is *no larger than*  $B$ , written  $A \preceq B$ , iff there is an **injection**  $f: A \rightarrow B$ .

It is clear that this is a reflexive and transitive relation, but that it is not symmetric (this is left as an exercise). We can also introduce a notion, which states that one set is (strictly) smaller than another.

**Definition siz.23.**  $A$  is *smaller than*  $B$ , written  $A \prec B$ , iff there is an **injection**  $f: A \rightarrow B$  but no **bijection**  $g: A \rightarrow B$ , i.e.,  $A \preceq B$  and  $A \not\approx B$ .

It is clear that this relation is irreflexive and transitive. (This is left as an exercise.) Using this notation, we can say that a set  $A$  is **enumerable** iff  $A \preceq \mathbb{N}$ , and that  $A$  is **non-enumerable** iff  $\mathbb{N} \prec A$ . This allows us to restate **Theorem siz.32** as the observation that  $\mathbb{N} \prec \wp(\mathbb{N})$ . In fact, **Cantor (1892)** proved that this last point is *perfectly general*:

**Theorem siz.24 (Cantor).**  $A \prec \wp(A)$ , for any set  $A$ .

sfr:siz:car:  
thm:cantor

*Proof.* The map  $f(x) = \{x\}$  is an **injection**  $f: A \rightarrow \wp(A)$ , since if  $x \neq y$ , then also  $\{x\} \neq \{y\}$  by extensionality, and so  $f(x) \neq f(y)$ . So we have that  $A \preceq \wp(A)$ .

We present the slow proof if **section siz.6** is present, otherwise a faster proof matching **section siz.12**.

We will now show that there cannot be a **surjective** function  $g: A \rightarrow \wp(A)$ , let alone a **bijjective** one, and hence that  $A \not\approx \wp(A)$ . For suppose that  $g: A \rightarrow \wp(A)$ . Since  $g$  is total, every  $x \in A$  is mapped to a subset  $g(x) \subseteq A$ . We can show that  $g$  cannot be surjective. To do this, we define a subset  $\bar{A} \subseteq A$  which by definition cannot be in the range of  $g$ . Let

$$\bar{A} = \{x \in A : x \notin g(x)\}.$$

Since  $g(x)$  is defined for all  $x \in A$ ,  $\bar{A}$  is clearly a well-defined subset of  $A$ . But, it cannot be in the range of  $g$ . Let  $x \in A$  be arbitrary, we will show

that  $\bar{A} \neq g(x)$ . If  $x \in g(x)$ , then it does not satisfy  $x \notin g(x)$ , and so by the definition of  $\bar{A}$ , we have  $x \notin \bar{A}$ . If  $x \in \bar{A}$ , it must satisfy the defining property of  $\bar{A}$ , i.e.,  $x \in A$  and  $x \notin g(x)$ . Since  $x$  was arbitrary, this shows that for each  $x \in \bar{A}$ ,  $x \in g(x)$  iff  $x \notin \bar{A}$ , and so  $g(x) \neq \bar{A}$ . In other words,  $\bar{A}$  cannot be in the range of  $g$ , contradicting the assumption that  $g$  is surjective.  $\square$

It's instructive to compare the proof of [Theorem siz.24](#) to that of [Theorem siz.18](#). There we showed that for any list  $Z_1, Z_2, \dots$ , of subsets of  $\mathbb{Z}^+$  one can construct a set  $\bar{Z}$  of numbers guaranteed not to be on the list. It was guaranteed not to be on the list because, for every  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ ,  $n \in Z_n$  iff  $n \notin \bar{Z}$ . This way, there is always some number that is [an element](#) of one of  $Z_n$  or  $\bar{Z}$  but not the other. We follow the same idea here, except the indices  $n$  are now [elements](#) of  $A$  instead of  $\mathbb{Z}^+$ . The set  $\bar{B}$  is defined so that it is different from  $g(x)$  for each  $x \in A$ , because  $x \in g(x)$  iff  $x \notin \bar{B}$ . Again, there is always [an element](#) of  $A$  which is [an element](#) of one of  $g(x)$  and  $\bar{B}$  but not the other. And just as  $\bar{Z}$  therefore cannot be on the list  $Z_1, Z_2, \dots$ ,  $\bar{B}$  cannot be in the range of  $g$ . explanation

It's instructive to compare the proof of [Theorem siz.24](#) to that of [Theorem siz.32](#). There we showed that for any list  $N_0, N_1, N_2, \dots$ , of subsets of  $\mathbb{N}$  we can construct a set  $D$  of numbers guaranteed not to be on the list. It was guaranteed not to be on the list because  $n \in N_n$  iff  $n \notin D$ , for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . We follow the same idea here, except the indices  $n$  are now [elements](#) of  $A$  rather than of  $\mathbb{N}$ . The set  $D$  is defined so that it is different from  $g(x)$  for each  $x \in A$ , because  $x \in g(x)$  iff  $x \notin D$ .

The proof is also worth comparing with the proof of Russell's Paradox, ???. Indeed, Cantor's Theorem was the inspiration for Russell's own paradox.

**Problem siz.28.** Show that there cannot be [an injection](#)  $g: \wp(A) \rightarrow A$ , for any set  $A$ . Hint: Suppose  $g: \wp(A) \rightarrow A$  is [injective](#). Consider  $D = \{g(B) : B \subseteq A \text{ and } g(B) \notin B\}$ . Let  $x = g(D)$ . Use the fact that  $g$  is [injective](#) to derive a contradiction.

## siz.10 The Notion of Size, and Schröder-Bernstein

sfr:siz:sb: sec Here is an intuitive thought: if  $A$  is no larger than  $B$  and  $B$  is no larger than  $A$ , then  $A$  and  $B$  are equinumerous. To be honest, if this thought were *wrong*, then we could scarcely justify the thought that our defined notion of equinumerosity has anything to do with comparisons of "sizes" between sets! Fortunately, though, the intuitive thought is correct. This is justified by the Schröder-Bernstein Theorem. explanation

sfr:siz:sb: thm:schroder-bernstein **Theorem siz.25 (Schröder-Bernstein).** *If  $A \preceq B$  and  $B \preceq A$ , then  $A \approx B$ .*

In other words, if there is [an injection](#) from  $A$  to  $B$ , and [an injection](#) from  $B$  to  $A$ , then there is [a bijection](#) from  $A$  to  $B$ . explanation

This result, however, is really rather *difficult* to prove. Indeed, although Cantor stated the result, others proved it.<sup>1</sup> For now, you can (and must) take it on trust.

Fortunately, Schröder-Bernstein is *correct*, and it vindicates our thinking of the relations we defined, i.e.,  $A \approx B$  and  $A \preceq B$ , as having something to do with “size”. Moreover, Schröder-Bernstein is very *useful*. It can be difficult to think of a **bijection** between two equinumerous sets. The Schröder-Bernstein Theorem allows us to break the comparison down into cases so we only have to think of an **injection** from the first to the second, and vice-versa.

The following [section siz.11](#), [section siz.12](#), [section siz.13](#) are alternative versions of [section siz.2](#), [section siz.6](#), [section siz.7](#) due to Tim Button for use in his Open Set Theory text. They are slightly more advanced and use a difference definition of enumerability more suitable in a set theory context (i.e., bijection with  $\mathbb{N}$  or an initial segment, rather than being listable or being the range of a surjective function from  $\mathbb{Z}^+$ ).

## siz.11 Enumerations and Enumerable Sets

[sfr:siz:enm-alt:sec](#)

This section defines enumerations as bijections with (initial segments) of  $\mathbb{N}$ , the way it’s done in set theory. So it conflicts slightly with the definitions in [section siz.2](#), and repeats all the examples there. It is also a bit more terse than that section.

We can specify finite set is by simply enumerating its **elements**. We do this when we define a set like so:

$$A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}.$$

Assuming that the **elements**  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  are all distinct, this gives us a **bijection** between  $A$  and the first  $n$  natural numbers  $0, \dots, n-1$ . Conversely, since every finite set has only finitely many **elements**, every finite set can be put into such a correspondence. In other words, if  $A$  is finite, there is a **bijection** between  $A$  and  $\{0, \dots, n-1\}$ , where  $n$  is the number of **elements** of  $A$ .

If we allow for certain kinds of infinite sets, then we will also allow some infinite sets to be enumerated. We can make this precise by saying that an infinite set is enumerated by a **bijection** between it and all of  $\mathbb{N}$ .

**Definition siz.26 (Enumeration, set-theoretic).** An *enumeration* of a set  $A$  is a **bijection** whose range is  $A$  and whose domain is either an initial set of natural numbers  $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$  or the entire set of natural numbers  $\mathbb{N}$ .

<sup>1</sup>For more on the history, see e.g., [Potter \(2004, pp. 165–6\)](#).

There is an intuitive underpinning to this use of the word *enumeration*. For [explanation](#) to say that we have enumerated a set  $A$  is to say that there is a **bijection**  $f$  which allows us to count out the elements of the set  $A$ . The 0th element is  $f(0)$ , the 1st is  $f(1)$ , ... the  $n$ th is  $f(n)$ ...<sup>2</sup> The rationale for this may be made even clearer by adding the following:

[sfr:siz:enm-alt:](#)  
[defn:enumerable](#)

**Definition siz.27.** A set  $A$  is **enumerable** iff either  $A = \emptyset$  or there is an enumeration of  $A$ . We say that  $A$  is **non-enumerable** iff  $A$  is not **enumerable**.

So a set is **enumerable** iff it is empty or you can use an enumeration to [explanation](#) count out its **elements**.

**Example siz.28.** A function enumerating the natural numbers is simply the identity function  $\text{Id}_{\mathbb{N}}: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  given by  $\text{Id}_{\mathbb{N}}(n) = n$ . A function enumerating the *positive* natural numbers,  $\mathbb{N}^+ = \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ , is the function  $g(n) = n + 1$ , i.e., the successor function.

**Problem siz.29.** Show that a set  $A$  is **enumerable** iff either  $A = \emptyset$  or there is a **surjection**  $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow A$ . Show that  $A$  is **enumerable** iff there is an **injection**  $g: A \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ .

**Example siz.29.** The functions  $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  and  $g: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  given by

$$f(n) = 2n \text{ and}$$

$$g(n) = 2n + 1$$

respectively enumerate the even natural numbers and the odd natural numbers. But neither is **surjective**, so neither is an enumeration of  $\mathbb{N}$ .

**Problem siz.30.** Define an enumeration of the square numbers 1, 4, 9, 16, ...

**Example siz.30.** Let  $\lceil x \rceil$  be the *ceiling* function, which rounds  $x$  up to the nearest integer. Then the function  $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  given by:

$$f(n) = (-1)^n \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$$

enumerates the set of integers  $\mathbb{Z}$  as follows:

$f(0)$	$f(1)$	$f(2)$	$f(3)$	$f(4)$	$f(5)$	$f(6)$	...
$\lceil \frac{0}{2} \rceil$	$-\lceil \frac{1}{2} \rceil$	$\lceil \frac{2}{2} \rceil$	$-\lceil \frac{3}{2} \rceil$	$\lceil \frac{4}{2} \rceil$	$-\lceil \frac{5}{2} \rceil$	$\lceil \frac{6}{2} \rceil$	...
0	-1	1	-2	2	-3	3	...

---

<sup>2</sup>Yes, we count from 0. Of course we could also start with 1. This would make no big difference. We would just have to replace  $\mathbb{N}$  by  $\mathbb{Z}^+$ .

Notice how  $f$  generates the values of  $\mathbb{Z}$  by “hopping” back and forth between positive and negative integers. You can also think of  $f$  as defined by cases as follows:

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

**Problem siz.31.** Show that if  $A$  and  $B$  are **enumerable**, so is  $A \cup B$ .

**Problem siz.32.** Show by induction on  $n$  that if  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n$  are all **enumerable**, so is  $A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_n$ .

## siz.12 Non-enumerable Sets

sfr:siz:nen-alt:  
sec

This section proves the non-enumerability of  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$  and  $\wp(\mathbb{N})$  using the definitions in **section siz.11**, i.e., requiring a bijection with  $\mathbb{N}$  instead of a surjection from  $\mathbb{Z}^+$ .

**explanation** The set  $\mathbb{N}$  of natural numbers is infinite. It is also trivially **enumerable**. But the remarkable fact is that there are **non-enumerable** sets, i.e., sets which are not **enumerable** (see **Definition siz.27**).

This might be surprising. After all, to say that  $A$  is **non-enumerable** is to say that there is *no* **bijection**  $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow A$ ; that is, no function mapping the infinitely many **elements** of  $\mathbb{N}$  to  $A$  exhausts all of  $A$ . So if  $A$  is **non-enumerable**, there are “more” **elements** of  $A$  than there are natural numbers.

To prove that a set is **non-enumerable**, you have to show that no appropriate **bijection** can exist. The best way to do this is to show that every attempt to enumerate **elements** of  $A$  must leave at least one **element** out; this shows that no function  $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow A$  is **surjective**. And a general strategy for establishing this is to use Cantor’s *diagonal method*. Given a list of **elements** of  $A$ , say,  $x_1, x_2, \dots$ , we construct another **element** of  $A$  which, by its construction, cannot possibly be on that list.

But all of this is best understood by example. So, our first example is the set  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$  of all infinite strings of 0’s and 1’s. (The ‘ $\mathbb{B}$ ’ stands for binary, and we can just think of it as the two-element set  $\{0, 1\}$ .)

**Theorem siz.31.**  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$  is **non-enumerable**.

sfr:siz:nen-alt:  
thm:nonenum-bin-omega

*Proof.* Consider any enumeration of a subset of  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$ . So we have some list  $s_0, s_1, s_2, \dots$  where every  $s_n$  is an infinite string of 0’s and 1’s. Let  $s_n(m)$  be the  $n$ th digit of the  $m$ th string in this list. So we can now think of our list as an

array, where  $s_n(m)$  is placed at the  $n$ th row and  $m$ th column:

	0	1	2	3	...
0	$\mathbf{s_0(0)}$	$s_0(1)$	$s_0(2)$	$s_0(3)$	...
1	$s_1(0)$	$\mathbf{s_1(1)}$	$s_1(2)$	$s_1(3)$	...
2	$s_2(0)$	$s_2(1)$	$\mathbf{s_2(2)}$	$s_2(3)$	...
3	$s_3(0)$	$s_3(1)$	$s_3(2)$	$\mathbf{s_3(3)}$	...
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\ddots$

We will now construct an infinite string,  $d$ , of 0's and 1's which is not on this list. We will do this by specifying each of its entries, i.e., we specify  $d(n)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Intuitively, we do this by reading down the diagonal of the array above (hence the name “diagonal method”) and then changing every 1 to a 0 and every 0 to a 1. More abstractly, we define  $d(n)$  to be 0 or 1 according to whether the  $n$ -th **element** of the diagonal,  $s_n(n)$ , is 1 or 0, that is:

$$d(n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s_n(n) = 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } s_n(n) = 1 \end{cases}$$

Clearly  $d \in \mathbb{B}^\omega$ , since it is an infinite string of 0's and 1's. But we have constructed  $d$  so that  $d(n) \neq s_n(n)$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . That is,  $d$  differs from  $s_n$  in its  $n$ th entry. So  $d \neq s_n$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . So  $d$  cannot be on the list  $s_0, s_1, s_2, \dots$

We have shown, given an arbitrary enumeration of some subset of  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$ , that it will omit some **element** of  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$ . So there is no enumeration of the set  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$ , i.e.,  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$  is **non-enumerable**.  $\square$

This proof method is called “diagonalization” because it uses the diagonal of the array to define  $d$ . However, diagonalization need not involve the presence of an array. Indeed, we can show that some set is **non-enumerable** by using a similar idea, even when no array and no actual diagonal is involved. The following result illustrates how.

explanation

*sfr:siz:nen-alt:  
thm:nonenum-pownat*

**Theorem siz.32.**  $\wp(\mathbb{N})$  is not **enumerable**.

*Proof.* We proceed in the same way, by showing that every list of subsets of  $\mathbb{N}$  omits some subset of  $\mathbb{N}$ . So, suppose that we have some list  $N_0, N_1, N_2, \dots$  of subsets of  $\mathbb{N}$ . We define a set  $D$  as follows:  $n \in D$  iff  $n \notin N_n$ :

$$D = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : n \notin N_n\}$$

Clearly  $D \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ . But  $D$  cannot be on the list. After all, by construction  $n \in D$  iff  $n \notin N_n$ , so that  $D \neq N_n$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .  $\square$

The preceding proof did not mention a diagonal. Still, you can think of it as involving a diagonal if you picture it this way: Imagine the sets  $N_0, N_1, \dots$ , written in an array, where we write  $N_n$  on the  $n$ th row by writing  $m$  in

explanation

the  $m$ th column iff  $m \in N_n$ . For example, say the first four sets on that list are  $\{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ ,  $\{1, 3, 5, \dots\}$ ,  $\{0, 1, 4\}$ , and  $\{2, 3, 4, \dots\}$ ; then our array would begin with

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} N_0 = \{ & \mathbf{0}, & 1, & 2, & & & \dots \} \\ N_1 = \{ & & \mathbf{1}, & & 3, & & 5, \dots \} \\ N_2 = \{ & 0, & 1, & & & 4 & \} \\ N_3 = \{ & & & 2, & \mathbf{3}, & 4, & \dots \} \\ & & \vdots & & & & \ddots \end{array}$$

Then  $D$  is the set obtained by going down the diagonal, placing  $n \in D$  iff  $n$  is *not* on the diagonal. So in the above case, we would leave out 0 and 1, we would include 2, we would leave out 3, etc.

**Problem siz.33.** Show that the set of all functions  $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  is **non-enumerable** by an explicit diagonal argument. That is, show that if  $f_1, f_2, \dots$ , is a list of functions and each  $f_i: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ , then there is some  $g: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  not on this list.

### siz.13 Reduction

sfr:siz:red-alt:  
sec

This section proves non-enumerability by reduction, matching the results in [section siz.12](#). An alternative, slightly more elaborate version matching the results in [section siz.6](#) is provided in [section siz.7](#).

We proved that  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$  is **non-enumerable** by a diagonalization argument. We used a similar diagonalization argument to show that  $\wp(\mathbb{N})$  is **non-enumerable**. But here's another way we can prove that  $\wp(\mathbb{N})$  is **non-enumerable**: show that *if  $\wp(\mathbb{N})$  is enumerable then  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$  is also enumerable*. Since we know  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$  is **non-enumerable**, it will follow that  $\wp(\mathbb{N})$  is too.

This is called *reducing* one problem to another. In this case, we reduce the problem of enumerating  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$  to the problem of enumerating  $\wp(\mathbb{N})$ . A solution to the latter—an enumeration of  $\wp(\mathbb{N})$ —would yield a solution to the former—an enumeration of  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$ .

To reduce the problem of enumerating a set  $B$  to that of enumerating a set  $A$ , we provide a way of turning an enumeration of  $A$  into an enumeration of  $B$ . The easiest way to do that is to define a **surjection**  $f: A \rightarrow B$ . If  $x_1, x_2, \dots$  enumerates  $A$ , then  $f(x_1), f(x_2), \dots$  would enumerate  $B$ . In our case, we are looking for a **surjection**  $f: \wp(\mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^\omega$ .

**Problem siz.34.** Show that if there is an **injective** function  $g: B \rightarrow A$ , and  $B$  is **non-enumerable**, then so is  $A$ . Do this by showing how you can use  $g$  to turn an enumeration of  $A$  into one of  $B$ .

*Proof of Theorem siz.32 by reduction.* For reductio, suppose that  $\wp(\mathbb{N})$  is **enumerable**, and thus that there is an enumeration of it,  $N_1, N_2, N_3, \dots$

Define the function  $f: \wp(\mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^\omega$  by letting  $f(N)$  be the string  $s_k$  such that  $s_k(n) = 1$  iff  $n \in N$ , and  $s_k(n) = 0$  otherwise.

This clearly defines a function, since whenever  $N \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ , any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  either is an element of  $N$  or isn't. For instance, the set  $2\mathbb{N} = \{2n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} = \{0, 2, 4, 6, \dots\}$  of even naturals gets mapped to the string  $1010101\dots$ ;  $\emptyset$  gets mapped to  $0000\dots$ ;  $\mathbb{N}$  gets mapped to  $1111\dots$ .

It is also **surjective**: every string of 0s and 1s corresponds to some set of natural numbers, namely the one which has as its members those natural numbers corresponding to the places where the string has 1s. More precisely, if  $s \in \mathbb{B}^\omega$ , then define  $N \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  by:

$$N = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : s(n) = 1\}$$

Then  $f(N) = s$ , as can be verified by consulting the definition of  $f$ .

Now consider the list

$$f(N_1), f(N_2), f(N_3), \dots$$

Since  $f$  is **surjective**, every member of  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$  must appear as a value of  $f$  for some argument, and so must appear on the list. This list must therefore enumerate all of  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$ .

So if  $\wp(\mathbb{N})$  were **enumerable**,  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$  would be **enumerable**. But  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$  is **non-enumerable** (**Theorem siz.31**). Hence  $\wp(\mathbb{N})$  is **non-enumerable**.  $\square$

**Problem siz.35.** Show that the set  $X$  of all functions  $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  is **non-enumerable** by a reduction argument (Hint: give a surjective function from  $X$  to  $\mathbb{B}^\omega$ .)

**Problem siz.36.** Show that the set of all *sets of* pairs of natural numbers, i.e.,  $\wp(\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N})$ , is **non-enumerable** by a reduction argument.

**Problem siz.37.** Show that  $\mathbb{N}^\omega$ , the set of infinite sequences of natural numbers, is **non-enumerable** by a reduction argument.

**Problem siz.38.** Let  $S$  be the set of all **surjections** from  $\mathbb{N}$  to the set  $\{0, 1\}$ , i.e.,  $S$  consists of all **surjections**  $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ . Show that  $S$  is **non-enumerable**.

**Problem siz.39.** Show that the set  $\mathbb{R}$  of all real numbers is **non-enumerable**.

## Photo Credits

# Bibliography

- Cantor, Georg. 1892. Über eine elementare Frage der Mannigfaltigkeitslehre. *Jahresbericht der deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung* 1: 75–8.
- Frege, Gottlob. 1884. *Die Grundlagen der Arithmetik: Eine logisch mathematische Untersuchung über den Begriff der Zahl*. Breslau: Wilhelm Koenner. Translation in [Frege \(1953\)](#).
- Frege, Gottlob. 1953. *Foundations of Arithmetic*, ed. J. L. Austin. Oxford: Basil Blackwell & Mott, 2nd ed.
- Potter, Michael. 2004. *Set Theory and its Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.