

## siz.1 Sets of Different Sizes, and Cantor’s Theorem

sfr:siz:car: We have offered a precise statement of the idea that two sets have the same size. explanation  
sec

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.

**Definition siz.1.**  $A$  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.2.**  $A$  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 ?? as the observation that  $\mathbb{Z}^+ \prec \wp(\mathbb{Z}^+)$ . In fact, **Cantor (1892)** proved that this last point is *perfectly general*:

sfr:siz:car: **Theorem siz.3 (Cantor).**  $A \prec \wp(A)$ , for any set  $A$ .  
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 ?? is present, otherwise a faster proof matching ??.

It remains to show that  $A \not\approx \wp(A)$ . For reductio, suppose  $A \approx \wp(A)$ , i.e., there is some **bijection**  $g: A \rightarrow \wp(A)$ . Now consider:

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

Note that  $D \subseteq A$ , so that  $D \in \wp(A)$ . Since  $g$  is a **bijection**, there is some  $y \in A$  such that  $g(y) = D$ . But now we have:

$$y \in g(y) \text{ iff } y \in D \text{ iff } y \notin g(y).$$

This is a contradiction; so  $A \not\approx \wp(A)$ . □

[explanation](#) 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.1.** 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.

## Photo Credits

## Bibliography

Cantor, Georg. 1892. Über eine elementare Frage der Mannigfaltigkeitslehre.  
*Jahresbericht der deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung* 1: 75–8.