PLP - 43 TOPIC 43 — MORE INFINITIES

Demirbaş & Rechnitzer

CANTOR'S THEOREM AND MORE INFINITIES

COMPARING DIFFERENT INFINITIES

We know that $\mathbb{N} \subset \mathbb{R}$ and we proved that $|\mathbb{N}| \neq |\mathbb{R}|$. So want to state

$$\aleph_0 = |\mathbb{N}| < |\mathbb{R}| = c$$

We can make this precise by extending ideas from finite sets A, B:

- If f:A
 ightarrow B is an injection then $|A|\leq |B|$
- If h:A
 ightarrow B is an bijection then |A|=|B|

DEFINITION:

Let A, B be sets.

- We write $|A| \leq |B|$ when there is an injection from A to B.
- Further, we write |A| < |B| when there is an injection from A to B but no bijection.

$$|A| < |B| \qquad \Longleftrightarrow \qquad ig(|A| \le |B|ig)$$

 $|) \wedge ig(|A|
eq |B|ig)$

CONTINUUM HYPOTHESIS

• Cantor's diagonal argument proves that

 $leph_0 = |\mathbb{N}| < |\mathbb{R}| = c$

• Is there any infinity between these two? More precisely?

 $\exists A ext{ s.t. } |\mathbb{N}| < |A| < |\mathbb{R}|$

CONJECTURE 2. CONTINUUM HYPOTHESIS (CANTOR 1878).

There is no set A so that $\aleph_0 < |A| < c$.

- Gödel (1940) showed that it cannot be disproved from standard set theory axioms (Zermelo–Fraenkel)
- Cohen (1963) showed that it cannot be proved from standard set theorem axioms
- So (technically) not really correct to call it a conjecture

et theory axioms (Zermelo–Fraenkel) theorem axioms

BIGGER INFINITIES

Are there bigger infinities?

THEOREM: (CANTOR'S THEOREM, 1891).

Let A be a set. Then $\left|A\right| < \left|\mathcal{P}\left(A
ight)
ight|$

Scratch work

• Easy to find an injection from A to $\mathcal{P}(A)$. Here are two examples

$$egin{aligned} f: A &
ightarrow \mathcal{P}\left(A
ight) & f(a) &= \{a \ h: A &
ightarrow \mathcal{P}\left(A
ight) & h(a) &= A \end{aligned}$$

This proves that $|A| \leq |\mathcal{P}(A)|$

• We prove there is no bijection from A to $\mathcal{P}(A)$ by showing there cannot be a surjection



GOOD AND BAD

To explore, let $A=\{1,2,3\}$ and consider f,h from previous slide.

$$egin{array}{ll} f(1) = \{1\} & f(2) = \{2\} & f(1) = \{1,3\} & h(2) & h(2)$$

Notice that

- ullet $\forall x \in A, x \in f(x)$
- ullet $\forall x \in A, x
 ot \in h(x)$

More generally, if we have any function $g:A
ightarrow \mathcal{P}\left(A
ight)$ then

- if $x \in g(x)$ then call x a good point, and
- if $x \notin g(x)$ then call x a bad point Then build sets of all the good and bad points

$$G=\{x\in A ext{ s.t. } x\in g(x)\}$$
 and $B=\{$

Notice that $G,B\subseteq A$ and so $G,B\in\mathcal{P}\left(A
ight)$.

$egin{aligned} f(3) &= \{3\} \ h(3) &= \{1,2\} \end{aligned}$

 $\{x\in A ext{ s.t. } x
ot\in g(x)\}$

THE BAD SET IS MORE INTERESTING

PROOF.

Assume, to the contrary that there is a surjection $g: A \to \mathcal{P}(A)$

- Construct the "bad" set $B = \{x \in A ext{ s.t. } x
 ot\in \overline{g(x)}\} \subseteq A$
- Now since $B \in \mathcal{P}(A)$ and g is surjective, there must be some $b \in A$ so that g(b) = B
- We must have that either $b \in B$ or $b \notin B$? Is it good or bad?

 \circ When $b \in B$, by definition of B must have $b \notin B$ — contradiction \circ When $b
ot\in B$, by definition of B must have $b \in B$ — contradiction

• These contradictions mean there is no b so that g(b) = B, and so g is not surjective Then since we have constructed an injection from $f: A \to \mathcal{P}(A)$, it follows that $|A| < |\mathcal{P}(A)|$.

This immediately gives $|\mathbb{N}| < |\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})|$

With work you can prove that $|\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})| = |\mathbb{R}|$ — see Cantor-Schröder-Bernstein Theorem

KEEP GOING

$\left|A ight|<\left|\mathcal{P}\left(A ight) ight|$ and $\left|\mathbb{N} ight|<\left|\mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{N} ight) ight|$

Do it again $- |\mathbb{N}| < |\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})| < |\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}))|$ And again $- |\mathbb{N}| < |\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})| < |\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}))| < |\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})))|$

COROLLARY:

There are an infinite number of different infinites.

PROOF.

Starting with \mathbb{N} , Cantor's theorem tells us that $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ is a larger infinite set. Then $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}))$ is larger again. By repeatedly taking power sets, you create an infinitely long sequence of larger and larger infinite sets.

START TO FINISH

Remember where we started:

- Basic definitions of sets and subsets
- Statements, logical operators and truth tables

Look where we got to:

- Diagonal argument there are different types of infinity
- Cantor's theorem there are an infinite number of different infinities

Congratulations!