# B1.2 Set Theory

Martin Bays

HT23 Oxford

## Contents



### 0.1 Acknowledgements

These notes follow the outline of Jonathan Pila's notes for this course, which were themselves originally based on notes of Robin Knight. Other sources include the books of Hils-Loeser, Goldrei, Jech, and Kunen, (see references below), and lecture notes of Itay Kaplan.

# 1 Introduction

What is a set? One standard informal answer might be: "A set is an unordered collection of objects, called its elements". We can formalise this intuitive idea of the data given by a set as a test for equality:

**Principle of Extensionality:** Two sets $A$ and $B$ are equal if and only if they have the same elements,

$$A = B \iff \forall x \, (x \in A \leftrightarrow x \in B).$$

But this leaves a trickier question: What sets are there? If we want to say something holds "for all sets $A$", which $A$ must we consider? It is tempting to give a broad definition, such as:

> *By a "set" we understand any collection $M$ of specific well-separated objects $m$ of our intuition or thought (called the "elements" of $M$) to a whole.*[1] – (Cantor 1895)

But too broad a conception of set results in **paradox**.

## 1.1 Russell's paradox

We might expect:

**Unrestricted Comprehension:** For any well-defined property $P(x)$, there is a set whose elements are precisely those $x$ which satisfy $P(x)$.

But take $P(x)$ to be the property: $x$ is a set which is not an element of itself. Suppose $R$ is the set whose elements are precisely the $x$ satisfying $P(x)$. Then for any set $x$,

$$x \in R \Leftrightarrow x \notin x.$$

In particular,

$$R \in R \Leftrightarrow R \notin R.$$

This contradiction shows that Unrestricted Comprehension is **inconsistent**.

## 1.2 Zermelo-Fraenkel Set Theory

Around the start of the 20th century, Zermelo and (later) Fraenkel developed a version of set theory which avoids Russell's paradox and similar paradoxes.

This **Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory** is the subject of this course. One key feature of this theory is its adoption of the *axiomatic method*: it consists of **axioms**, statements about the universe of sets, intended to suffice to derive all the theorems of ordinary mathematics.

Another key feature is that it is a "pure" set theory: it considers a universe in which the only objects are sets. Surprisingly, arbitrary mathematics can

[1] "Unter einer ‚Menge' verstehen wir jede Zusammenfassung $M$ von bestimmten wohlunterscheidenen Objekten $m$ unsrer Anschauung oder unseres Denkens (welche die ‚Elementen' von $M$ genannt werden) zu einem Ganzen."

be seen as taking place in such a universe, by encoding the usual objects of mathematics as sets.

This axiom system is denoted by "ZFC", where $C$ denotes one axiom known as the Axiom of Choice; we also consider the system "ZF" which omits this axiom.

## 1.3 Foundations

It has become common (though not universal) practice to consider ZFC as forming the *foundations* of mathematics.

Such a position gives in particular a clear answer to the question: what is a proof of a mathematical statement? This proceeds as follows.

Given a mathematical statement $S$ (perhaps in real analysis, linear algebra, measure theory, Riemannian geometry, mathematical logic, or any other domain of mathematics), we first encode it into a formal (first-order) statement $\sigma$ which talks only about sets – it is not immediately obvious how to do this, but we will see something of how it goes. We then identify the notion of a "proof of $S$" with the notion of a formal proof of $\sigma$ from ZFC; the latter has a clear unambiguous definition (presented in B1.1 Logic).

## 1.4 Consistency

Is ZFC consistent? Could there be some paradox which it fails to avoid?

Sadly, Gödel's 2nd Incompleteness Theorem shows that if ZFC is consistent, then we can not prove (in the above sense, i.e. from ZFC) that it is consistent. Mathematicians and set theorists vary in the extent to which they "believe" that it is consistent.

What we can say for sure is that the mathematics humanity has developed so far has not revealed any inconsistency in ZFC.

## 1.5 Why study set theory?

(1) Sets are natural primitive mathematical structures, so are of intrinsic mathematical interest.

(2) As natural mathematical objects, sets arise in many areas of mathematics, so we need to be ready to deal with them.

(3) Since set theory can form a foundation for mathematics, studying foundational issues in set theory suffices for addressing such questions in mathematics as a whole. For example, it can be proven that ZFC is consistent if ZF is, and this shows that the use of the axiom of choice in everyday mathematics does not increase the risk of proving a contradiction.

This course concentrates on (1) and (2), but also introduces the necessary preliminaries for the Part C course Axiomatic Set Theory, which concentrates on (3).

### 1.6 Cardinality

One key concern in the study of sets is the size ("cardinality") of a set. Sets can be finite, countable, or uncountable – but there is much more to say than that.

We will define sets $X$ and $Y$ to have the same cardinality if there is a bijection $X \to Y$, and we will see that the ZFC axioms suffice to make this a rich and useful concept, answering in particular questions like:

- Is there a real number which is not the zero of any integer polynomial?
- How many lines does it take to cover the real plane?
- Can the subsets of $\mathbb{R}$ be exhaustively indexed by real numbers?

### 1.7 Structure of the course

We will study:

- The axioms of ZFC, introducing them gradually throughout the course.
- The first steps towards formalising mathematics in set theory.
- Cardinalities.
- Ordinals: These measures of the "length of an infinite process" are important in particular for "transfinite" inductive arguments.
- Axiom of Choice: We study this important axiom in detail, giving a number of equivalent formulations, and examining its consequences for cardinality.

## 2 The first axioms

We begin to present the axiom system ZF.

### 2.1 Extensionality

**ZF1 (Extensionality):** For all $x$ and $y$, $x$ is equal to $y$ if and only if $x$ and $y$ have the same elements:

$$\forall x \, \forall y \, (x = y \leftrightarrow \forall z \, (z \in x \leftrightarrow z \in y)).$$

To make sense of such axioms, we adopt the following way of thinking.

We work in a mathematical *universe* $\mathcal{V}$ consisting of objects, which we call **sets**. When we say "for all $x$" (written $\forall x$) we mean "for all sets $x$ in the universe $\mathcal{V}$"; similarly $\exists x$ refers to existence in $\mathcal{V}$. Given two sets $x$ and $y$ of $\mathcal{V}$, it may or may not be that $x \in y$ holds; we say that $x$ is an **element of** $y$ when it does. Our axioms are statements using these concepts, and we assume that $\mathcal{V}$ is such that the axioms are true in $\mathcal{V}$. This gives us information about the universe $\mathcal{V}$.[2]

This is how we will discuss the axioms. At first, we know nothing about the universe. As we introduce the axioms, we find out more and more about it.

Thus, the Extensionality axiom ZF1 tells us that an object $a$ of $\mathcal{V}$ is determined by the information of which objects $b$ of $\mathcal{V}$ satisfy $b \in a$. Hence our terminology of "sets" and "elements" is reasonable.

Thinking this way, the objects of $\mathcal{V}$ are sets, whose elements are themselves sets, whose elements are also sets, and so on. There are no cows in our universe $\mathcal{V}$, there are only sets. Nor are there sets of cows in $\mathcal{V}$, there are only sets of sets – which are actually sets of sets of sets, and so on.

From now on, we reserve the word **set** to mean: an object in $\mathcal{V}$.

## 2.2 Empty set

We now begin to "populate" our universe $\mathcal{V}$ by giving axioms which guarantee the existence of sets. First off:

**ZF2 (Empty Set):** There is a set with no elements:

$$\exists x\ \forall y\ y \notin x.$$

We can already deduce that this empty set is unique:

**Theorem 2.1.** *There is a unique set with no elements.*

*Proof.* Existence is by the axiom Empty Set. Suppose $x$ and $y$ each have no elements, i.e. $\forall z\ z \notin x$ and $\forall z\ z \notin y$. Then $x$ and $y$ have the same elements, i.e. $\forall z\ (z \in x \leftrightarrow z \in y)$, since both sides of "$\leftrightarrow$" are false for all $z$. So $x = y$ by Extensionality. □

We denote this unique empty set by $\emptyset$, as usual.

## 2.3 Pairing

**ZF3 (Pairing):** For any $x$ and $y$ (not necessarily distinct), there is a set whose elements are precisely $x$ and $y$:

$$\forall x\ \forall y\ \exists z\ \forall w\ (w \in z \leftrightarrow (w = x \vee w = y)).$$

(Here, $\vee$ means "(inclusive) or"; $P \vee Q$ is true iff at least one of $P$ and $Q$ is.)

Again, we have uniqueness by Extensionality:

**Theorem 2.2.** *For any $x$ and $y$ there is a unique set whose elements are precisely $x$ and $y$.*

*Proof.* Exercise (Sheet 1). □

[2] Those with B1.1 Logic will recognise this as the notion we formalised there of $\mathcal{V}$ being a *model* of the axioms – but note that we are not considering $\mathcal{V}$ itself to be a set.

We denote this unique set by $\{x, y\}$, and by $\{x\}$ in the case that $y = x$.

This is already enough to build up a rich collection of sets: we have the existence of $\emptyset$, $\{\emptyset\}$, $\{\emptyset, \{\emptyset\}\}$, $\{\emptyset, \{\emptyset, \{\emptyset\}\}\}$, and so on. But we don't yet know that any sets with more than two elements exist!

## 2.4 Union

**ZF4 (Union):** For any set $x$, there is a set whose elements are precisely the elements of the elements of $x$:

$$\forall x\, \exists y\, \forall z\, (z \in y \leftrightarrow \exists w\, (z \in w \wedge w \in x)).$$

(Here, $\wedge$ means "and".)

By Extensionality again, this set is unique, and we denote it by $\bigcup x$. Note $\bigcup \emptyset = \emptyset$.

We can now define some familiar notation.

Given sets $x$ and $y$, define $x \cup y := \bigcup\{x, y\}$. This notation is justified by the following easy exercise.

**Exercise 2.3.** *For any sets $x, y, z$, we have $z \in x \cup y$ iff $z \in x$ or $z \in y$.*

Given sets $x, y, z$, define $\{x, y, z\} := \{x, y\} \cup \{z\}$. Then

$$\forall w\, (w \in \{x, y, z\} \leftrightarrow (w = x \vee w = y \vee w = z)).$$

Similarly, define $\{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\} := \{x_1, x_2, x_3\} \cup \{x_4\}$, and so on.

*End of lecture 1*

## 2.5 Powerset

A set $x$ is a **subset** of a set $y$, written $x \subseteq y$, if every element of $x$ is an element of $y$.

$$x \subseteq y \;\Leftrightarrow\; \forall z\, (z \in x \rightarrow z \in y).$$

**ZF5 (Powerset):** For any set $x$, there exists a set whose elements are precisely the subsets of $x$:

$$\forall x\, \exists y\, \forall z\, (z \in y \leftrightarrow z \subseteq x).$$

By Extensionality, this set of all subsets of $x$ is unique. We denote it by $\mathcal{P}(x)$, and call it the **powerset** (or **power set**) of $x$.

*Example* 2.4.

- $\mathcal{P}(\emptyset) = \{\emptyset\}$.
- $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\emptyset)) = \mathcal{P}(\{\emptyset\}) = \{\emptyset, \{\emptyset\}\}$.
- $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\emptyset))) = \mathcal{P}(\{\emptyset, \{\emptyset\}\}) = \{\emptyset, \{\emptyset\}, \{\{\emptyset\}\}, \{\emptyset, \{\emptyset\}\}\}$.

# 3 Formulas and comprehension

## 3.1 Discussion

Russell's paradox showed that the unrestricted comprehension principle, the existence of $\{x : P(x)\}$ for any property $P(x)$, is inconsistent.

In ZF, we weaken this principle to comprehension restricted to a set: given a set $y$, we want the existence of $\{x \in y : P(x)\}$.

However, before we can state this as an axiom, we must precisely specify what we mean by a "property" $P(x)$. To see the problem, consider trying to make sense of:

$$\{n \in \mathbb{N} : n \text{ has no English definition less than a thousand letters long }\}.$$

This would be a non-empty set of natural numbers, since there are only finitely many definitions less than a thousand letters long, so it would have a least element, which would be *the least natural number which has no English definition less than a thousand letters long* – but that is an English definition less than a thousand letters long of this natural number, which is meant to have no such definition; contradiction[3].

To avoid such paradoxes, and to facilitate reasoning about the axioms, we will require $P$ to be expressible in the following formal language of set theory, which B1.1 students will recognise as *first-order logic with a binary relation* $\in$.

## 3.2 The formal language $\mathcal{L}$

The **formulas** of $\mathcal{L}$ are built up as follows:

- An expression of the form $x = y$ or $x \in y$ is a formula (with $x, y$ any variables).
- If $\phi$ and $\psi$ are formulas then so are $\neg\phi$, $(\phi \wedge \psi)$, $(\phi \vee \psi)$, $(\phi \rightarrow \psi)$, and $(\phi \leftrightarrow \psi)$.
- If $\phi$ is a formula then so are $\forall x\ \phi$ and $\exists x\ \phi$.

Nothing else is a formula.

To clarify some of this notation:

- $\neg\phi$, read "not $\phi$", is the logical negation of $\phi$, true precisely when $\phi$ is false.
- $(\phi \rightarrow \psi)$, read "$\phi$ implies $\psi$", means "$\psi$ holds if $\phi$ does", so it is equivalent to $\neg(\phi \wedge \neg\psi)$, and also to $(\neg\phi \vee \psi)$.
- $(\phi \leftrightarrow \psi)$ is equivalent to $((\phi \rightarrow \psi) \wedge (\psi \rightarrow \phi))$.

We define some useful abbreviations:

- $x \notin y$ abbreviates $\neg x \in y$, and $x \neq y$ abbreviates $\neg x = y$.
- $x \subseteq y$ abbreviates $\forall z\ (z \in x \rightarrow z \in y)$.

[3] This is a version of the "Berry paradox".

- $\forall x \in y\ \phi$ abbreviates $\forall x\ (x \in y \to \phi)$.
- $\exists x \in y\ \phi$ abbreviates $\exists x\ (x \in y \land \phi)$.

(For example, Union (ZF4) can be written: $\forall x\ \exists y\ \forall z\ (z \in y \leftrightarrow \exists w \in x\ z \in w$.)

An occurrence of a variable in a formula is **free** if it is not in the scope of a quantifier, like the first $x$ in $\exists y\ (y \in x \land \forall x\ x \notin y)$. The **free variables** of a formula $\phi$ are the variables which occur free in $\phi$. We often write e.g. $\phi(x, y)$ to denote a formula whose free variables are $x$ and $y$.

A **sentence** is a formula with no free variables. So a sentence is either true or false in our universe $\mathcal{V}$ of sets.

A formula $\phi(x)$ with one free variable $x$ can be viewed as a property: for a given value of $x$, it is either true or false.

We have already seen that each of ZF1-4 can be expressed by a single sentence of $\mathcal{L}$. The whole ZFC axiom system will be expressible by (infinitely many) sentences of $\mathcal{L}$. This isn't actually important in this course, but it will be crucial in the Part C Axiomatic Set Theory course.

A **formula with parameters** is the result of replacing some of the variables in a formula with sets. For example, if $a$ is a set, $\phi(x) := a \in x$ is a formula with parameter $a$ and free variable $x$, expressing the property of having the set $a$ as an element.

If $\phi(x)$ is a formula with parameters and $b$ is a set, we write $\phi(b)$ for the result of replacing each free occurrence of $x$ in $\phi(x)$ with $b$, so $\phi(b)$ asserts that $b$ satisfies the property $\phi$. Similarly, if $y$ is a variable not appearing in $\phi(x)$, then $\phi(y)$ is the result of replacing each free occurrence of $x$ with $y$ (which in B1.1 was denoted $\phi[y/x]$.)

## 3.3 Comprehension

**ZF6 (Comprehension):** For any formula $\phi(x)$ with parameters and any set $y$, there is a set $z$ whose elements are precisely those elements $x$ of $y$ which satisfy $\phi(x)$:

$$\forall y\ \exists z\ \forall x\ (x \in z \leftrightarrow (x \in y \land \phi(x))).$$

By Extensionality, this set is unique, and we denote it by $\{x \in y : \phi(x)\}$.

With this restricted version of comprehension, the argument of Russell's paradox does not lead to inconsistency; instead, it proves something interesting.

**Theorem 3.1.** *There is no set of all sets: there is no set $\Omega$ such that $\forall x\ x \in \Omega$.*

*Proof.* Suppose $\Omega$ is such. By Comprehension, consider $R := \{x \in \Omega : x \notin x\}$. Then $R \in \Omega$, so $R \in R$ iff $R \notin R$, contradiction. □

*End of lecture 2*

Comprehension allows us to implement some more of the usual constructions of set theory.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let $a$ be a non-empty set. Then there is a unique set $\bigcap a$ such that for all $x$,*

$$x \in \bigcap a \Leftrightarrow \forall y \in a\ x \in y.$$

*Proof.* Uniqueness is by Extensionality. Let

$$\bigcap a := \{x \in \bigcup a : \forall y \in a \; x \in y\},$$

which exists by Comprehension (and Union).

Then this has the desired property: if $x$ is in every element of $a$ then, since $a \neq \emptyset$, $x$ is in some element of $a$, so $x \in \bigcup a$; so then $x \in \bigcap a$. The converse is immediate. □

We leave $\bigcap \emptyset$ undefined, since it has no sensible definition.

**Definition 3.3.** For any sets $a$ and $b$, define:

$$a \cap b := \bigcap \{a, b\}$$
$$a \setminus b := \{x \in a : x \notin b\}.$$

*Remark* 3.4. ZF6 can be expressed by $\mathcal{L}$-sentences, as follows.

For each formula $\phi(x, w_1, \ldots, w_n)$,

$$\forall w_1 \; \ldots \forall w_n \; \forall y \; \exists z \; \forall x \; (x \in z \leftrightarrow (x \in y \wedge \phi(x)))$$

is an $\mathcal{L}$-sentence expressing the instances of ZF6 for those formulas with parameters which result from substituting sets for the variables $w_1, \ldots, w_n$. So we can express ZF6 by the *axiom scheme* consisting of one such sentence for each such formula.

*Remark* 3.5. Note that $\mathcal{L}$-formulas are external to our set theoretic universe $\mathcal{V}$; they are tools we use to describe the universe, not objects of the universe. Keeping this distinction in mind can prevent some potential confusion.

In particular, one can formalise first-order logic within set theory (just as one can formalise any other domain of mathematics), and you might worry that this could lead to some sort of circularity. However, our $\mathcal{L}$-formulas "live outside" the universe of set theory, and are distinct from the "internal" formulas we obtain by formalising within $\mathcal{V}$ the notion of a first-order formula in one binary relation, so there is no circularity.

# 4 Products and relations

In this section, we start to see how some of the usual notions of mathematics can be handled in the set theory we have established so far.

## 4.1 Cartesian products

If $X$ and $Y$ are sets, we want to be able to consider their Cartesian product $X \times Y$. Its elements should be *ordered* pairs of elements of $X$ and $Y$, so the first problem is how to encode this notion when all we have are (unordered) sets. For this, we use the following standard coding trick.

**Definition 4.1.** Given sets $x$ and $y$, the (Kuratowski) **ordered pair** with **first co-ordinate** $x$ and **second co-ordinate** $y$ is the set

$$\langle x, y \rangle := \{\{x\}, \{x, y\}\}.$$

The following theorem justifies the terminology.

**Theorem 4.2.** *For any $x, y, x', y'$, we have $\langle x, y\rangle = \langle x', y'\rangle$ if and only if $x = x'$ and $y = y'$.*

*Proof.* $\Leftarrow$: Immediate.

$\Rightarrow$: Suppose
$$\{\{x\}, \{x, y\}\} = \{\{x'\}, \{x', y'\}\}.$$

First, suppose $y = x$. Then $\{x', y'\} \in \{\{x\}, \{x, y\}\} = \{\{x\}\}$, so $\{x', y'\} = \{x\}$, so $x' = x = y'$, and in particular $x = x'$ and $y = y'$, as required.

So we may assume $y \neq x$, and symmetrically $y' \neq x'$.

In particular, $\{x\} \neq \{x', y'\}$ and $\{x, y\} \neq \{x'\}$.

But $\{x\} \in \{\{x'\}, \{x', y'\}\}$, so $\{x\} = \{x'\}$ and hence $x = x'$. Similarly, $\{x, y\} \in \{\{x'\}, \{x', y'\}\}$ so $\{x, y\} = \{x', y'\} = \{x, y'\}$, so $y = y'$.

□

We can now define the Cartesian product using Powerset and Comprehension.

**Proposition 4.3.** *Let $X$ and $Y$ be sets. There is a unique set $X \times Y$, called the* ***Cartesian product*** *of $X$ and $Y$, with the property that the elements of $X \times Y$ are precisely the ordered pairs $\langle x, y\rangle$ where $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$.*

*Proof.* Uniqueness is by Extensionality. If $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$, then $\langle x, y\rangle = \{\{x\}, \{x, y\}\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X \cup Y)$, so $\langle x, y\rangle \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(X \cup Y))$. So

$$X \times Y := \{z \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(X \cup Y)) : \exists x \in X\ \exists y \in Y\ z = \langle x, y\rangle\}$$

has the desired property – this set exists by Comprehension, since $z = \langle x, y\rangle$ can be expressed in $\mathcal{L}$, namely by

$$\forall w\ (w \in z \leftrightarrow (\forall u\ (u \in w \leftrightarrow u = x) \vee \forall u\ (u \in w \leftrightarrow (u = x \vee u = y)))).$$

□

**Notation 4.4.** From now on we will allow ourselves to use the $\langle x, y\rangle$ notation in the formulas used in Comprehension, as well as our other defined terms $\{x, y\}$, $\bigcup x$, $\{x \in y : \phi(x)\}$, $\mathcal{P}(x)$, $x \times y$, $\emptyset$, and so on. As in the previous proof, it is always possible to eliminate these expressions to write an equivalent formula directly in $\mathcal{L}$. The following example illustrates the general technique (and how much paper we will save with it!):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\forall x\ \left\{x, \bigcup y\right\} \in z \\
&\quad\Leftrightarrow\ \forall x\ \exists w\ \left(w = \left\{x, \bigcup y\right\} \wedge w \in z\right) \\
&\quad\Leftrightarrow\ \forall x\ \exists w\ \left(\forall u\ \left(u \in w \leftrightarrow \left(u = x \vee u = \bigcup y\right)\right) \wedge w \in z\right) \\
&\quad\Leftrightarrow\ \forall x\ \exists w\ (\forall u\ (u \in w \leftrightarrow (u = x \vee \forall v\ (v \in u \leftrightarrow \exists t\ (v \in t \wedge t \in y)))) \wedge w \in z)
\end{aligned}$$

## 4.2 Relations

**Definition 4.5.** A **binary relation** is a set $R$ of ordered pairs; we then write $xRy$ to mean $\langle x, y\rangle \in R$ (and we use this as an abbreviation in formulas).

*Remark* 4.6. If $\langle x, y\rangle \in R$ then $x, y \in \bigcup\bigcup R$, since $x, y \in \{x, y\} \in \langle x, y\rangle \in R$ (from which we obtain $x, y \in \{x, y\} \in \bigcup R$ and hence $x, y \in \bigcup\bigcup R$).

**Definition 4.7.** The **domain** of a binary relation $R$ is the set

$$\mathrm{dom}(R) := \{x : \exists y\ xRy\},$$

and the **range** of $R$ is the set

$$\mathrm{ran}(R) := \{y : \exists x\ xRy\};$$

using Remark 4.6, these sets exist by Comprehension within $\bigcup\bigcup R$. So $R \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(R) \times \mathrm{ran}(R)$.

A binary relation **on** a set $X$ is a binary relation $R$ with $R \subseteq X \times X$, i.e. with $\mathrm{dom}(R) \subseteq X$ and $\mathrm{ran}(R) \subseteq X$.

Note that with this definition, $=$ and $\in$ and $\subseteq$ are *not* relations, since the domain would be a set of all sets. Later we will define *classes*, and call these *class relations*.

*End of lecture 3*

### 4.2.1 Functions

**Definition 4.8.** A **function** is a binary relation $f$ with the property that for all $x$, there is at most one $y$ such that $\langle x, y\rangle \in f$.

We write $f(x) = y$ to mean $\langle x, y\rangle \in f$ (and we use this as an abbreviation in formulas).

The **restriction** of $f$ to a set $a \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(f)$ is the function

$$f|_a := f \cap (a \times \mathrm{ran}(f)) = \{\langle x, y\rangle \in f : x \in a\}.$$

The **image** of a set $a \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(f)$ under $f$ is the set

$$f[a] := \mathrm{ran}(f|_a) = \{y : \exists x \in a\ f(x) = y\}.$$

**Definition 4.9.** Given sets $X$ and $Y$, a **function from** $X$ **to** $Y$ is a function $f$ with $\mathrm{dom}(f) = X$ and $\mathrm{ran}(f) \subseteq Y$. We write $f : X \to Y$ for such a function.

So any function $f$ is a function from $\mathrm{dom}(f)$ to $\mathrm{ran}(f)$.

**Proposition 4.10.** *Given sets $X$ and $Y$, there is a set $Y^X$ whose elements are precisely the functions from $X$ to $Y$.*

*Proof.* Any $f : X \to Y$ is an element of $\mathcal{P}(X \times Y)$, so by Comprehension it suffices to see that the property of a subset $f \subseteq X \times Y$ being a function $X \to Y$ is expressible in $\mathcal{L}$. We can express it as follows:

$$\phi(f) := \forall x \in X\ (\exists y \in Y\ \ \langle x, y\rangle \in f \wedge \forall y'\ (\langle x, y'\rangle \in f \to y' = y)).$$

□

*Remark* 4.11. The empty set is a function, called the *empty function*, $\emptyset : \emptyset \to \emptyset$. So $Y^{\emptyset} = \{\emptyset\}$ for any set $Y$.

#### 4.2.2 Order relations

**Definition 4.12.**

- A **strict partial order** (or just **strict order**) on a set $X$ is a relation $< \subseteq X \times X$ satisfying for all $x, y, z \in X$:

  **Irreflexivity:** $\neg x < x$;

  **Transitivity:** if $x < y$ and $y < z$ then $x < z$.

  It is a strict **total** order if also we have for all $x, y \in X$ that $x < y$ or $y < x$ or $x = y$.

- A **(totally) ordered set** is a set $X$ equipped with a (total) order on $X$.
- If an order is denoted by $<$, we write $x \leq y$ as an abbreviation for $(x < y \vee x = y)$, and $x > y$ for $y < x$.
- A **least** element of a subset $Y \subseteq X$ of an ordered set is a $y \in Y$ such that $y \leq y'$ for all $y' \in Y$ (so $y$ is unique if it exists).
- A **minimal** element of a subset $Y \subseteq X$ of an ordered set is a $y \in Y$ such that $y' < y$ for no $y' \in Y$.
- We define **greatest** and **maximal** analogously.

Total orders are also known as *linear* orders.

#### 4.2.3 Equivalence relations

**Definition 4.13.** An **equivalence relation** on a set $X$ is a binary relation $\sim \subseteq X \times X$ satisfying for all $x, y, z \in X$:

**Reflexivity:** $x \sim x$;

**Symmetry:** if $x \sim y$ then $y \sim x$;

**Transitivity:** if $x \sim y$ and $y \sim z$ then $x \sim z$.

The set of **equivalence classes** of $\sim$ is then

$$\begin{aligned} X/\sim &:= \{S \in \mathcal{P}(X) : \exists x \in X\ S = \{y \in X : y \sim x\}\} \\ &= \{\{y \in X : y \sim x\} : x \in X\}. \end{aligned}$$

# 5 The axiom of infinity and the natural numbers

## 5.1 Natural numbers – discussion

Informally, we can encode each natural number as a set by defining $n := \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$:

$$0 := \emptyset;\ 1 := \{0\};\ 2 := \{0, 1\};\ 3 := \{0, 1, 2\} \ldots$$

$$0 = \emptyset;\ 1 = \{\emptyset\};\ 2 = \{\emptyset, \{\emptyset\}\};\ 3 = \{\emptyset, \{\emptyset\}, \{\emptyset, \{\emptyset\}\}\} \ldots$$

(recall that these sets exist by Pairing and Union). So

$$n + 1 = \{0, \ldots, n\} = \{0, \ldots, n-1\} \cup \{n\} = n \cup \{n\}.$$

It would be tempting to then define $\mathbb{N} := \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$. However, we can not directly write an axiom which asserts the existence of such a set ($\exists x \ \forall y \ (y \in x \leftrightarrow (y = 0 \vee y = 1 \vee y = 2 \ldots))$ is an infinite expression, so not an $\mathcal{L}$-sentence).

Instead, we proceed as follows.

## 5.2 Inductive sets and the axiom of infinity

**Definition 5.1.** The **successor** of a set $x$ is $x^+ := x \cup \{x\}$.

**Definition 5.2.** A set $x$ is **inductive** if $\emptyset \in x$ and $x$ is closed under the successor operation, i.e. $\forall y \ (y \in x \to y^+ \in x)$.

**ZF7 (Infinity):** An inductive set exists:

$$\exists x \ (\emptyset \in x \wedge \forall y \ (y \in x \to y \cup \{y\} \in x)).$$

**Proposition 5.3.** *There exists a unique least inductive set; we denote it by* $\mathbb{N}$.

*That is, there is a unique set* $\mathbb{N}$ *which is inductive and which is a subset of every inductive set.*

*Proof.* Uniqueness is immediate: if $\mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbb{N}'$ are least inductive sets, then $\mathbb{N} \subseteq \mathbb{N}'$ and $\mathbb{N}' \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, so $\mathbb{N} = \mathbb{N}'$ (by Extensionality).

By Infinity (ZF7), there is an inductive set $I$. Consider

$$\mathbb{N} := \bigcap \{I' \subseteq I : I' \text{ is inductive}\};$$

this is a set by Comprehension (inductivity can be expressed in $\mathcal{L}$ as in the statement of ZF7).

Note that the intersection of inductive sets is inductive. So $\mathbb{N}$ is inductive, and if $J$ is inductive then $J \cap I \subseteq I$ is inductive, so $\mathbb{N} \subseteq J \cap I \subseteq J$. So $\mathbb{N}$ is least inductive. □

Later, we will also use $\omega$ to denote this set $\mathbb{N}$.

We want to build up mathematics within our universe of sets, so we define:

**Definition 5.4.** A **natural number** is an element of $\mathbb{N}$.

*End of lecture 4*

**Notation 5.5.** We use numerals $0, 1, 2, \ldots$ to denote the corresponding elements of $\mathbb{N}$: $0 = \emptyset$, $1 = 0^+$, $2 = 1^+$ and so on.

**Theorem 5.6** (Induction on natural numbers)**.** *Suppose* $\phi(x)$ *is an* $\mathcal{L}$*-formula with parameters such that:*

- $\phi(0)$ *holds, and*
- *if* $n \in \mathbb{N}$ *and* $\phi(n)$ *holds, then* $\phi(n^+)$ *holds.*

*Then $\phi(n)$ holds for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

*In other words,*

$$\Big(\big(\phi(\emptyset) \wedge \forall n \in \mathbb{N}\ (\phi(n) \to \phi(n^+))\big) \to \forall n \in \mathbb{N}\ \phi(n)\Big).$$

*Proof.* The assumption on $\phi$ precisely means that the set $X := \{n \in \mathbb{N} : \phi(n)\} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ (which exists by Comprehension) is inductive, hence $X = \mathbb{N}$ by definition of $\mathbb{N}$. □

## 5.3 First properties of $\mathbb{N}$

We use the induction principle to build up "from scratch" the structure we expect to find on $\mathbb{N}$. First we consider successor, then the order, then we move on to defining the arithmetic operations.

**Definition 5.7.** A set $b$ is **transitive** if every element of $b$ is a subset of $b$, i.e. $x \in y \in b \Rightarrow x \in b$.

**Exercise 5.8.**

*(i)* $0$ *is transitive.*

*(ii) If a set $b$ is transitive, then $b^+$ is transitive.*

**Lemma 5.9.**

*(i) Each natural number is transitive.*

*(ii)* $\mathbb{N}$ *is transitive.*

*Proof.* (i) Let $\phi(x)$ be the formula $\forall y \in x\ y \subseteq x$ expressing that $x$ is transitive. By Exercise 5.8, $\phi(0)$ holds, and if $\phi(n)$ holds then $\phi(n^+)$ holds, so by induction (Theorem 5.6), we deduce $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}\ \phi(n)$ as required.

(ii) We prove by induction on $n$:

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}\ n \subseteq \mathbb{N}.$$

We have $0 = \emptyset \subseteq \mathbb{N}$. Suppose $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, and let $x \in n^+$. Then either $x \in n$, in which case $x \in \mathbb{N}$ by the inductive hypothesis, or $x = n \in \mathbb{N}$. So $n^+ \subseteq \mathbb{N}$.

We conclude by Theorem 5.6 with $\phi(x) = x \subseteq \mathbb{N}$.

□

**Lemma 5.10.** *For all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$:*

*(i)* $n^+ \neq 0$.

*(ii) If $n \in m$ then $n^+ \in m^+$.*

*(iii)* $n \notin n$.

*(iv) If $n \neq 0$, then $n = k^+$ for a unique $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

*Proof.* (i) $n \in n^+$, so $n^+ \neq \emptyset = 0$.

(ii) We prove by induction on $m$ that $\forall m \in \mathbb{N}\ \forall n \in m\ n^+ \in m^+$. This is trivial for $m = 0$. Suppose $\forall n \in m\ n^+ \in m^+$, and let $n \in m^+ = m \cup \{m\}$; we conclude by showing $n^+ \in m^{++}$.

If $n = m$, then $n^+ = m^+ \in m^{++}$. Otherwise, $n \in m$, so $n^+ \in m^+ \subseteq m^{++}$ by the inductive hypothesis.

(iii) We prove $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}\ n \notin n$ by induction. Clearly $0 \notin 0$.

Suppose $n \notin n$, but $n^+ \in n^+$. Then $n^+ \neq n$, so $n^+ \in n$. But then $n \in n^+ \in n$, so $n \in n$ by transitivity of $n$, contradicting $n \notin n$.

(iv) Existence: $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}\ (n = 0 \vee \exists k \in \mathbb{N}\ n = k^+)$ holds by a trivial induction (at the successor step, just use $n^+ = n^+$).

Uniqueness: Suppose $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k^+ = l^+$ but $k \neq l$. Then $k \in k^+ = l^+ = l \cup \{l\}$ but $k \neq l$, so $k \in l$. Then by (ii), $k^+ \in l^+ = k^+$, contradicting (iii).

□

## 5.4 Finiteness

**Definition 5.11.** A set $X$ is **finite** if it is in bijection with a natural number, i.e. if there exists a bijective function $f : X \to n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Otherwise, $X$ is **infinite**.

**Exercise 5.12.** *Any subset of a finite set is finite.*

The Pigeonhole Principle holds for finite sets in the following form:

**Exercise 5.13.** *If $X$ is finite, then any injective function $f : X \to X$ is surjective.*

**Proposition 5.14.** $\mathbb{N}$ *is infinite.*

*Proof.* The successor function $n \mapsto n^+$ on $\mathbb{N}$ is injective but not surjective by Lemma 5.10(iv) and (i) respectively. We conclude by Exercise 5.13. □

## 5.5 The order on $\mathbb{N}$

**Definition 5.15.** Define a binary relation $<$ on $\mathbb{N}$ by: $x < y \iff x \in y$.

Note that this is indeed a relation, i.e. $\{\langle x, y\rangle \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} : x \in y\}$ is a set. Note also that, by transitivity of $\mathbb{N}$, if $n \in \mathbb{N}$ then $n = \{m \in \mathbb{N} : m < n\}$.

**Theorem 5.16.** $<$ *is a strict total order on* $\mathbb{N}$.

*Proof.*

**Transitivity:** This is precisely transitivity of natural numbers, Lemma 5.9(i).

**Irreflexivity:** Lemma 5.10(iii)

**Totality:** We show $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}\, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}\, \phi(n,m)$ where

$$\phi(n,m) := (m \in n \vee m = n \vee n \in m).$$

We first prove by induction on $n$ that $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}\ (0 \in n \vee 0 = n)$. This is immediate for $n = 0$, and if it holds for $n$, then $0 \in n^+ = n \cup \{n\}$ since either $0 = n \in n^+$ or $0 \in n \subseteq n^+$.

Now let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We conclude by proving $\forall m \in \mathbb{N}\, \phi(n,m)$ by induction on $m$. We have $\phi(n,0)$ by what we proved above.

Now suppose $\phi(n,m)$; we conclude by proving $\phi(n,m^+)$. If $m = n$ then $n \in m^+$, and if $n \in m$ then $n \in m \in m^+$, and then $n \in m^+$ by transitivity.

Otherwise, $m \in n$. In particular, $n \neq 0$. By Lemma 5.10(iv), $n = k^+ = k \cup \{k\}$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. So either $m = k$, in which case $m^+ = k^+ = n$, or $m \in k$, in which case $m^+ \in k^+ = n$ by Lemma 5.10(ii).

□

We consider $\mathbb{N}$ as a totally ordered set with this order.

——————— *End of lecture 5*

**Theorem 5.17.** *Any non-empty subset $X$ of $\mathbb{N}$ has a unique least element, denoted* $\min X$.

*Proof.* Uniqueness given existence: If $n$ and $n'$ are each least, then $n \leq n' \leq n$, so $n = n'$.

Existence: Suppose $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ has no least element. We show $X = \emptyset$ by proving $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}\, \forall m \in n\ m \notin X$ by induction. For $n = 0$ this is trivial, and if it holds for $n$ then it holds for $n^+$, since otherwise $n$ would be a least element of $X$. □

## 5.6 Recursion on $\mathbb{N}$

**Theorem 5.18** (Definition by recursion on $\mathbb{N}$)**.** *Let $X$ be a set and $g : X \to X$ a function, and let $x_0 \in X$. Then there exists a unique function $f : \mathbb{N} \to X$ such that*

- $f(0) = x_0$;
- $f(n^+) = g(f(n))$ *for all* $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

*Proof.* For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, say $h : n^+ \to X$ is an *$n$-approximation* if $h(0) = x_0$ and $h(m^+) = g(h(m))$ for all $m \in n$.

*Claim.* For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a unique $n$-approximation.

*Proof.* By induction on $n$. $\{\langle 0, x_0\rangle\}$ is the unique 0-approximation.

If $h$ is the unique $n$-approximation, then $h' := h \cup \{\langle n^+, g(h(n))\rangle\}$ is an $n^+$-approximation. To show uniqueness, suppose $h''$ is another $n^+$-approximation. Then $h''|_{n^+}$ and $h'|_{n^+}$ are $n$-approximations, so $h''|_{n^+} = h = h'|_{n^+}$, and $h''(n^+) = g(h''(n)) = g(h(n)) = g(h'(n)) = h'(n^+)$, so $h'' = h'$. $\square_{Claim}$

Denote the unique $n$-approximation by $h_n$.

We conclude by proving that there exists a unique $f$ as in the statement.

**Uniqueness:** Suppose $f : \mathbb{N} \to X$ is as in the statement, and let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $f|_{n^+}$ is an $n$-approximation, so $f|_{n^+} = h_n$, and so $f(n) = h_n(n)$.

**Existence:** Each $n$-approximation $h_n : n^+ \to X$ is a subset of $\mathbb{N} \times X$, so we can define by Comprehension:

$$\begin{aligned} H :&= \bigcup\{h_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \\ &= \{h : \exists n \in \mathbb{N}\ [h \text{ is an } n\text{-approximation}]\} \\ &= \{h \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N} \times X) : \exists n \in \mathbb{N}\ (h \in X^{(n^+)} \wedge h(0) = x_0 \\ &\qquad\qquad \wedge \forall m \in n\ h(m^+) = g(h(m))\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $f := \bigcup H$.

If $n < m \in \mathbb{N}$, then $h_m|_{n^+}$ is an $n$-approximation, so $h_m(n) = h_n(n)$. Hence $f$ is a function $f : \mathbb{N} \to X$, and $f(n) = h_n(n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

In particular, $f(0) = h_0(0) = x_0$, and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$f(n^+) = h_{n^+}(n^+) = g(h_{n^+}(n)) = g(h_n(n)) = g(f(n)),$$

as required.

□

## 5.7 Arithmetic on $\mathbb{N}$

*Example* 5.19. We can define addition on $\mathbb{N}$ by requiring for all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$:

- $n + 0 = n$,
- $n + m^+ = (n + m)^+$.

For each $n$, Theorem 5.18 shows existence of a unique unary function $m \mapsto n + m$ satisfying these equations. This then yields a unique binary function $+ : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ satisfying these equations; explicitly,

$$\begin{aligned} + = \{\langle\langle n, m\rangle, k\rangle \in (\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}) \times \mathbb{N} : \exists f \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}\ (f(m) = k \wedge f(0) = n \\ \wedge \forall l \in \mathbb{N}\ f(l^+) = f(l)^+\}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we define multiplication and exponentiation as the unique functions such that for all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$:

- 
  - $n \cdot 0 = 0$
  - $n \cdot m^+ = n \cdot m + n$
- 
  - $n^0 = 1$
  - $n^{m^+} = n^m \cdot n$

(We use the usual operator precedence rules, so $n + m \cdot k$ means $n + (m \cdot k)$ rather than $(n + m) \cdot k$.)

One can then verify by induction the usual algebraic properties. For example, to prove associativity of $+$, fix arbitrary $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, and prove

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N}\ (n + m) + k = n + (m + k)$$

by induction:

- Base case: $(n+m)+0 = n+m = n+(m+0)$.
- Inductive step: $(n+m)+k^+ = ((n+m)+k)^+ = (n+(m+k))^+ = n+(m+k)^+ = n+(m+k^+)$.

We will find another way to prove this and the other standard properties in Proposition 6.20 below.

### 5.8 Defining $\mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{Q}$, $\mathbb{R}$ (not on syllabus)

Although it is not on the course syllabus, we briefly indicate how we can use $\mathbb{N}$ and its arithmetic structure to construct within our universe of sets more of the familiar structures of mathematics.

First, we define $\mathbb{Z}$ as $(\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N})/\sim$ where $(n,m) \sim (n',m') \Leftrightarrow n+m' = m+n'$; we identify $(n,m)/\sim$ with $n-m$ and define addition and multiplication correspondingly.

Then we can define $\mathbb{Q}$ as $(\mathbb{Z} \times (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}))/\sim'$ where $(n,m) \sim' (n',m') \Leftrightarrow n \cdot m' = m \cdot n'$; then identify $(n,m)/\sim'$ with $\frac{n}{m} \in \mathbb{Q}$ and define addition and multiplication accordingly.

Now $\mathbb{R}$ can be defined as the set of *Dedekind cuts* in $\mathbb{Q}$: that is, we identify $r \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\{q \in \mathbb{Q} : q < r\} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$ – the point being that we can define the set of such subsets of $\mathbb{Q}$ as the downwards-closed proper non-empty subsets with no greatest element (so this is a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Q})$ by Comprehension). We define addition and multiplication accordingly, and can then verify that this defines a complete ordered field.

We can then proceed to develop real and complex analysis based on this definition of $\mathbb{R}$, defining in particular $\mathbb{C} = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$, identifying $(a,b)$ with $a+ib$ and defining addition and multiplication accordingly. You may like to think how we could continue in this vein to define your favourite objects of mathematics (including those of logic!).

——————————— *End of lecture 6*

## 6 Cardinality

One key contribution of set theory is to give a rigorous mathematical development of the notion of the "size" of an infinite object, which we call its *cardinality*. We first explore what we can understand of this with the axioms we have so far. Then we add another axiom, Replacement, which will let us reach larger cardinalities. Later, we will add the Axiom of Choice, and see that this significantly clarifies the structure of cardinalities (while still leaving some natural questions undecided).

### 6.1 Classes

If $\phi(x)$ is a formula, it may or may not be that there is a set $\{x : \phi(x)\}$, that is, a set whose elements are precisely the sets which satisfy $\phi$. We have $\{x : x \neq x\} = \emptyset$, but there is no set $\{x : x = x\}$.

Nonetheless, it is convenient to reuse some of the notation and terminology we use for sets to talk about $\{x : \phi(x)\}$.

**Definition 6.1.**

- If $\phi(x)$ is a formula with parameters, we call $\{x : \phi(x)\}$ a **class**. We denote classes with boldface characters.
- If $\mathbf{X} = \{x : \phi(x)\}$ and $\mathbf{Y} = \{x : \psi(x)\}$ are classes:
  - $a \in \mathbf{X}$ means $\phi(a)$;
  - $\mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{Y}$ are **equal** if $\forall x\ (\psi(x) \leftrightarrow \phi(x))$.
  - $\mathbf{X}$ is a **subclass** of $\mathbf{Y}$, denoted $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbf{Y}$, if $\forall x\ (\phi(x) \to \psi(x))$.
  - $\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}$ denotes the class $\{\langle x, y\rangle : x \in \mathbf{X},\ y \in \mathbf{Y}\}$.
  - A **class relation** on a class $\mathbf{X}$ is a subclass $\mathbf{R} \subseteq \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{X}$.
- $\mathbf{V} := \{x : x = x\}$, the class of all sets.
- Sets are classes: a set $a$ is identified with the class $\{x : x \in a\}$.
- A **proper class** is a class which is not a set.

*Remark* 6.2.

- By Theorem 3.1, $\mathbf{V}$ is a proper class.
- The elements of a class are always sets, not proper classes.
- Comprehension says that a subclass of a set is a set.

## 6.2 Cardinalities

**Definition 6.3.** Sets $X$ and $Y$ **have the same cardinality** (or are **equinumerous**), written $X \sim Y$, if there exists a bijection $X \to Y$.

So $\sim$ is a class relation on $\mathbf{V}$:

$$\sim\, = \{\langle X, Y\rangle : \exists f\ [f \text{ is a bijection } X \to Y]\};$$

moreover, it is a class equivalence relation:

**Lemma 6.4.** *For any sets $X, Y, Z$:*

- $X \sim X$.
- *If $X \sim Y$ then $Y \sim X$.*
- *If $X \sim Y$ and $Y \sim Z$ then $X \sim Z$.*

*Proof.* Straightforward by considering identity functions, inverses, and compositions respectively. □

**Provisional Definition 6.5.** The **cardinality** $|X|$ of a set $X$ is the equivalence class of $X$ under $\sim$:

$$|X| := \{Y : Y \sim X\}.$$

(This is a proper class, unless $X = \emptyset$.)

So $|X| = |Y| \Leftrightarrow X \sim Y$.

Later, using the axiom of choice, we will redefine $|X|$ to be a particular canonical element of this class, which we will call a *cardinal number*.

## 6.3 Comparing cardinalities

**Definition 6.6.**

- $|X| \leq |Y|$ if there exists an injection $X \to Y$.
- $|X| < |Y|$ if $|X| \leq |Y|$ and $|X| \neq |Y|$.

**Lemma 6.7.** *These are well-defined: if $|X| = |X'|$ and $|Y| = |Y'|$ and there exists an injection $X \to Y$, then there exists an injection $X' \to Y'$.*

*Proof.* Immediate by composing with bijections. $\square$

**Lemma 6.8** (Tarski's Fixed Point Theorem)**.** *Let $X$ be a set. Then any monotone function $H : \mathcal{P}(X) \to \mathcal{P}(X)$ has a fixed point, where:*

- *$H : \mathcal{P}(X) \to \mathcal{P}(X)$ is* monotone *if $A \subseteq B$ implies $H(A) \subseteq H(B)$ (for $A, B \subseteq X$).*
- *A* fixed point *of $H$ is a $C \subseteq X$ with $H(C) = C$.*

*Proof.* Let $\mathcal{D} := \{A \subseteq X : A \subseteq H(A)\}$, and let $C := \bigcup \mathcal{D}$.

- $C \subseteq H(C)$: Let $A \in \mathcal{D}$; we conclude by showing $A \subseteq H(C)$. We have $A \subseteq H(A)$. Also $A \subseteq C$, so $H(A) \subseteq H(C)$ by monotonicity. So $A \subseteq H(C)$.
- $H(C) \subseteq C$: Since $C \subseteq H(C)$, by monotonicity $H(C) \subseteq H(H(C))$, so $H(C) \in \mathcal{D}$. Hence $H(C) \subseteq C$.

So $H(C) = C$, as required. $\square$

**Theorem 6.9** (Cantor-Schröder-Bernstein Theorem)**.** *If $|X| \leq |Y| \leq |X|$ then $|X| = |Y|$.*

*Proof.* Say $f : X \to Y$ and $g : Y \to X$ are injections.

Define $H : \mathcal{P}(X) \to \mathcal{P}(X)$ by

$$H(A) := g[f[A]^{\mathsf{c}'}]^{\mathsf{c}} := X \setminus g[Y \setminus f[A]]$$

where we define for this proof the complement operations $Z^{\mathsf{c}} := X \setminus Z$ and $Z^{\mathsf{c}'} := Y \setminus Z$.

Then $H$ is monotone, since $f[\cdot]$ and $g[\cdot]$ are inclusion-preserving while complement is inclusion-reversing; explicitly:

$$\begin{aligned} A \subseteq B \subseteq X &\Rightarrow f[A] \subseteq f[B] \\ &\Rightarrow f[A]^{\mathsf{c}'} \supseteq f[B]^{\mathsf{c}'} \\ &\Rightarrow g[f[A]^{\mathsf{c}'}] \supseteq g[f[B]^{\mathsf{c}'}] \\ &\Rightarrow H(A) = g[f[A]^{\mathsf{c}'}]^{\mathsf{c}} \subseteq g[f[B]^{\mathsf{c}'}]^{\mathsf{c}} = H(B). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 6.8, there is $A \subseteq X$ with $H(A) = A$. Then $A^{\mathsf{c}} = H(A)^{\mathsf{c}} = g[f[A]^{\mathsf{c}'}]$.

So we have bijections $f|_A : A \to f[A]$ and $g|_{f[A]^{\mathsf{c}'}} : f[A]^{\mathsf{c}'} \to A^{\mathsf{c}}$, and putting them together yields a bijection $f|_A \cup (g|_{f[A]^{\mathsf{c}'}})^{-1} : X \to Y$. $\square$

**Corollary 6.10.** *$<$ is a strict partial class order on $\mathbf{V}/\sim$, i.e. for all $X, Y, Z$:*

*(i)* $|X| \not< |X|$.

*(ii) If* $|X| < |Y|$ *and* $|Y| < |Z|$ *then* $|X| < |Z|$.

*Proof.* (i) Immediate from the definition.

(ii) We have $|X| \leq |Z|$ by composing injections witnessing $|X| \leq |Y| \leq |Z|$. If $|X| = |Z|$, then $|X| \leq |Y| \leq |X|$ so $|X| = |Y|$ by Cantor-Schröder-Bernstein, contrary to assumption.

□

It is perhaps natural to expect this order to be total, so that we can really think of cardinality as a linear scale of largeness. However, this does not follow from ZF, and we will see later that, modulo ZF, this order is total if and only if the Axiom of Choice holds.

*End of lecture 7*

## 6.4 Finite cardinalities

**Lemma 6.11.** *Let $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $n < m \Leftrightarrow |n| < |m|$.*

*Proof.* First note that if $n \leq m$, then $n \subseteq m$ (by transitivity of $m$), so $|n| \leq |m|$ since the inclusion $n \to m$ is injective.

Suppose $n < m$, so in particular $n \leq m$ and so $|n| \leq |m|$. If $|n| = |m|$, then there is a bijection $f : m \to n$, but then $f$ is also a function $f : m \to m$ which is injective but not surjective, contradicting Exercise 5.13. So $|n| < |m|$.

Conversely, if $|n| < |m|$ then $|n| \not\geq |m|$ so $n \not\geq m$, so $n < m$. □

So the order on the natural numbers agrees with the order on their cardinalities, which partially justifies:

**Notation 6.12.** If $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we usually write the cardinality $|n|$ as $n$.[4] e.g. $|\emptyset| = 0$, $|\{3\}| = 1$. So a set $X$ is finite if and only if $|X| = n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

## 6.5 Countable sets

**Notation 6.13.** We write $\aleph_0$ ("aleph null") for the cardinality $|\mathbb{N}|$.[5]

**Definition 6.14.** A set $X$ is

- **countable** if $|X| \leq \aleph_0$.
- **countably infinite** if it is countable and infinite.
- **uncountable** if it is not countable.

**Theorem 6.15.** *A set $X$ is countably infinite if and only if $|X| = \aleph_0$.*

*In other words, there is no infinite cardinality below $\aleph_0$.*

[4] For now this is an abuse of notation, since the set $n$ is not actually equal to the proper class $|n|$, but this will be fixed when we eventually redefine $|\cdot|$.

[5] Later we will redefine $\aleph_0$ along with $|\mathbb{N}|$, such that $\aleph_0 = |\mathbb{N}|$ will remain true.

*Proof.* $\mathbb{N}$ is infinite by Proposition 5.14. So if $|X| = \aleph_0$, then $X$ is countably infinite.

Conversely, suppose $|X| \leq |\mathbb{N}|$ and $X$ is infinite; we show that $|X| = |\mathbb{N}|$. We may assume $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, since $X$ is in bijection with its image under an injection $X \to \mathbb{N}$.

Recall that by Theorem 5.17, any non-empty subset $\emptyset \neq Y \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ has a unique least element $\min Y$. Now $X$ is infinite, and subsets of finite sets are finite by Exercise 5.12, so $X \setminus n \neq \emptyset$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

So define by recursion $f : \mathbb{N} \to X$ by $f(0) := \min X$ and $f(n^+) := \min(X \setminus f(n)^+)$ (the "first element of $X$ after $f(n)$").

Then $f$ is injective because $n > m \Rightarrow f(n) > f(m)$ by induction on $n$. (This is trivial for $n = 0$. Suppose for $n$ and suppose $m < n^+$; then $f(n) \geq f(m)$ by the IH, and $f(n^+) = \min(X \setminus f(n)^+) > f(n)$, so $f(n^+) > f(m)$ as required.)

This shows that $|\mathbb{N}| \leq |X|$, and we conclude $|X| = |\mathbb{N}|$ (by Cantor-Schröder-Bernstein) as required.

□

**Corollary 6.16.** *A non-empty set $X$ is countable if and only if there exists a surjection $\mathbb{N} \to X$.*

*Proof.* $\Leftarrow$: If $f : \mathbb{N} \to X$ is surjective, then $g(x) := \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} : f(n) = x\}$ defines an injection $g : X \to \mathbb{N}$ (which exists by Comprehension within $X \times \mathbb{N}$).

$\Rightarrow$: By Theorem 6.15, by composing with a bijection we may suppose that either $X = \mathbb{N}$, in which case the result is immediate, or $X = n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $n > 0$ since $X \neq \emptyset$, and we can define a surjection $f : \mathbb{N} \to n$ by

$$f(i) = \begin{cases} i & \text{if } i < n \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

□

*Remark* 6.17. A natural generalisation would be: $|X| \leq |Y|$ if and only if a surjection $Y \to X$ exists. We can not prove this "Partition Principle" from ZF for uncountable $Y$, but we will deduce it from ZFC in Lemma 9.10. It is an open problem whether it is equivalent modulo ZF to AC.

## 6.6 Cardinal arithmetic

**Definition 6.18.** Define addition, multiplication, and exponentiation of cardinalities by:

- $|X| + |Y| = |X \cup Y|$ if $X \cap Y = \emptyset$.
- $|X| \cdot |Y| = |X \times Y|$.
- $|X|^{|Y|} = |X^Y|$.

**Exercise 6.19.** *These equations yield well-defined operations on cardinalities (consider bijections). (To see that $|X| + |Y|$ is always defined, note that $|X| = |\{0\} \times X|$ and $|Y| = |\{1\} \times Y|$, and $(\{0\} \times X) \cap (\{1\} \times Y) = \emptyset$.)*

*End of lecture 8*

**Proposition 6.20.**

*(a) For all cardinalities* $\kappa, \lambda, \mu$*:*

*(i)* $\kappa + \lambda = \lambda + \kappa$

*(ii)* $\kappa + (\lambda + \mu) = (\kappa + \lambda) + \mu$

*(iii)* $\kappa + 0 = \kappa$

*(iv)* $\kappa \cdot \lambda = \lambda \cdot \kappa$

*(v)* $\kappa \cdot (\lambda \cdot \mu) = (\kappa \cdot \lambda) \cdot \mu$

*(vi)* $\kappa \cdot 1 = \kappa$

*(vii)* $\kappa \cdot 0 = 0$

*(viii)* $\kappa \cdot (\lambda + \mu) = \kappa \cdot \lambda + \kappa \cdot \mu$

*(ix)* $\kappa^{\lambda+\mu} = \kappa^{\lambda} \cdot \kappa^{\mu}$

*(x)* $\kappa^{\lambda \cdot \mu} = (\kappa^{\lambda})^{\mu}$.

*(b) These operations agree on finite cardinalities with the operations on* $\mathbb{N}$ *defined by recursion in Example 5.19.*

*(c) If* $\kappa \leq \kappa'$ *and* $\lambda \leq \lambda'$ *then:*

- $\kappa + \lambda \leq \kappa' + \lambda'$
- $\kappa \cdot \lambda \leq \kappa' \cdot \lambda'$
- $\kappa^{\lambda} \leq (\kappa')^{\lambda'}$ *if* $\kappa \neq 0$.

*Proof.*

(a) (i) Say $\kappa = |X|$ and $\lambda = |Y|$ and $X \cap Y = \emptyset$. Then $X \cup Y = Y \cup X$, so $|X| + |Y| = |Y| + |X|$.

(ii),(iii) Similar equalities of sets show these.

(iv) $\langle x, y\rangle \mapsto \langle y, x\rangle$ defines a bijection $X \times Y \to Y \times X$, so $|X| \cdot |Y| = |X \times Y| = |Y \times X| = |Y| \cdot |X|$.

(v)-(x) Similar bijections show these (see Sheet 3).

(b) Exercise (Sheet 3).

(c) Exercise (Sheet 3).

□

**Proposition 6.21.** $|\mathcal{P}(X)| = 2^{|X|}$ *for any set* $X$*.*

*Proof.* The function $F : \mathcal{P}(X) \to 2^X$ defined by

$$F(Y)(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \notin Y \\ 1 & \text{if } x \in Y \end{cases}$$

(i.e. $F(Y)$ is the *indicator function* of $Y$ in $X$) is a bijection. □

**Theorem 6.22** (Cantor)**.** *Let $X$ be a set. Then there is no surjection $X \to \mathcal{P}(X)$.*

*Proof.* Suppose $f : X \to \mathcal{P}(X)$ is a surjection. Let

$$D := \{x \in X : x \notin f(x)\} \subseteq X.$$

Then $D = f(a)$ for some $a \in X$. But then $a \in D$ iff $a \notin f(a) = D$, contradiction. □

**Corollary 6.23.** *$\kappa < 2^\kappa$ for any cardinality $\kappa$.*

*Proof.* Say $\kappa = |X|$. Then $x \mapsto \{x\}$ is an injection $X \to \mathcal{P}(X)$, but by (Theorem 6.22 there is no bijection $X \to \mathcal{P}(X)$, so $\kappa = |X| < |\mathcal{P}(X)| = 2^\kappa$. □

**Lemma 6.24.**

*(i)* $\aleph_0 \cdot \aleph_0 = \aleph_0$.

*(ii)* $\aleph_0 + \aleph_0 = \aleph_0$

*Proof.*

(i)
- $\underline{\aleph_0 \leq \aleph_0 \cdot \aleph_0}$: $n \mapsto \langle n, 0\rangle$ is an injection $\mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$.
- $\underline{\aleph_0 \cdot \aleph_0 \leq \aleph_0}$: $\langle n, m\rangle \mapsto 2^n \cdot 3^m$ is an injection $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$. This follows from the Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic (unique prime factorisation), whose proof we omit.

Alternatively, $\langle n, m\rangle \mapsto \binom{n+m+1}{2} + m$ is a bijection $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ (again, we omit details).

(ii) $\aleph_0 \leq \aleph_0 + \aleph_0 = \aleph_0 \cdot (1 + 1) = \aleph_0 \cdot 2 \leq \aleph_0 \cdot \aleph_0 = \aleph_0$.

Alternatively: $\mathbb{N}$ is the disjoint union of the even and the odd natural numbers (exercise), each of which is in bijection with $\mathbb{N}$.

□

**Exercise 6.25.**

*(i)* $|\mathbb{Q}| = \aleph_0$.

*(ii)* $|\mathbb{R}| = |\mathbb{C}| = 2^{\aleph_0}$. *In particular, $\mathbb{R}$ is uncountable.*

# 7 Well-ordered sets, and ordinals

One way the natural numbers arise is as a measure of size, and we have now generalised this to infinite cardinalities. Another way natural numbers arise is in enumerating elements of an ordered set in which "the $n$th element" makes sense. We now generalise this *ordinal* sense of a natural number to infinite (*transfinite*) ordinal numbers. First we define the orders which can be enumerated in this sense, then we define and study a notion of *ordinal number* with which we can enumerate such orders, so that each element is "the $\alpha$th element" for some ordinal number $\alpha$.

## 7.1 Well-ordered sets

**Definition 7.1.** A **well-order** on a set $X$ is a total order $<$ which also satisfies:

**Well-foundedness:** Every non-empty subset $\emptyset \neq Y \subseteq X$ has a least element;

this least element is denoted by $\min Y$, or $\min_< Y$.

We say $X$ is well-ordered by $<$, and often write $(X, <)$ to refer to $X$ as a well-ordered set and indicate the corresponding well-order.

*Example* 7.2.

- $\mathbb{N}$ is well-ordered by $\in$, by Theorem 5.17.
- $\mathbb{Z}$ is not well-ordered by its usual order $<$, since $\mathbb{Z}$ has no least element. Same for $\mathbb{R}$.
- $[0, 1] \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is not well-ordered by $<$, since $(0, 1]$ lacks a least element.
- $\{-\frac{1}{n} : n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}\} \cup \mathbb{N} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is well-ordered by $<$.
- Any subset $Y$ of a well-ordered set $(X, <)$ is well-ordered by the restriction of $<$, and we write this as $(Y, <)$.

**Definition 7.3.** Let $(X, <)$ be a well-ordered set.

- An **initial segment** of $X$ is a subset $S \subseteq X$ which is downwards closed in $X$, i.e. $\forall y \in S\ \forall x \in X\ (x < y \to x \in S)$. We consider it as a well-ordered set $(S, <)$. It is a **proper** initial segment if $S \neq X$.

*Remark* 7.4. Let $(X, <)$ be a well-ordered set. For $a \in X$, define $X_{<a} := \{x \in X : x < a\}$. Then these are precisely the proper initial segments: each $X_{<a}$ is a proper initial segment, and conversely, if $S \subsetneq X$ is a proper initial segment then $S = X_{<\min(X \setminus S)}$.

*End of lecture 9*

**Definition 7.5.** An **embedding** $\theta : (X, <) \to (Y, <')$ of a totally ordered set $(X, <)$ in a totally ordered set $(Y, <')$ is a function $\theta : X \to Y$ which is strictly monotone, i.e. $x < x' \Rightarrow \theta(x) <' \theta(x')$ for all $x, x' \in X$.

An **isomorphism** is a surjective embedding, and we write $(X, <) \cong (Y, <')$ and say the ordered sets are **isomorphic** if an isomorphism exists.

Well-ordered sets are highly rigid:

**Lemma 7.6.** *If $(X, <)$ is a well-ordered set and $\theta : (X, <) \to (X, <)$ is an embedding, then $\theta(x) \geq x$ for all $x \in X$.*

*Proof.* Suppose not. Then $a := \min\{x \in X : \theta(x) < x\}$ exists. But then $\theta(a) < a$, so $\theta(\theta(a)) < \theta(a)$ since $\theta$ is an embedding, contradicting minimality of $a$. □

**Lemma 7.7.** *A well-ordered set is not isomorphic to any of its proper initial segments.*

*Proof.* If $\sigma : (X, <) \to (X_{<x}, <)$ is an isomorphism, then $\sigma(x) < x$, contradicting Lemma 7.6. □

**Lemma 7.8.** *Let $(X, <)$ be a well-ordered set.*

*(i) The only isomorphism $(X, <) \to (X, <)$ is the identity.*

*(ii) If $(Y, <)$ is a well-ordered set isomorphic to $(X, <)$, then there is a unique isomorphism $(X, <) \to (Y, <)$.*

*Proof.* (i) If $\sigma : (X, <) \to (X, <)$ is an isomorphism, then so is $\sigma^{-1}$, so by Lemma 7.6, for all $x \in X$ we have $\sigma(x) \leq x$ and $\sigma^{-1}(x) \leq x$, hence $x \leq \sigma(x) \leq x$, hence $\sigma(x) = x$.

(ii) If $\sigma, \tau : (X, <) \to (Y, <)$ are isomorphisms then $\tau^{-1}(\sigma(x)) = x$ for all $x \in X$ by (i), so $\sigma = \tau$.

□

Any two well-ordered sets are comparable:

**Theorem 7.9.** *Let $(X, <)$ and $(Y, <')$ be well-ordered sets. Then either $(X, <)$ is isomorphic to an initial segment of $(Y, <')$, or $(Y, <')$ is isomorphic to an initial segment of $(X, <)$.*

*Proof.* Define

$$\sigma := \{\langle x, y\rangle \in X \times Y : (X_{<x}, <) \cong (Y_{<'y}, <')\}.$$

Then $\sigma$ is a function, since if $\langle x, y\rangle, \langle x, y'\rangle \in \sigma$, then $(Y_{<y}, <) \cong (Y_{<y'}, <)$, so $y = y'$ by Lemma 7.7. Symmetrically, $\sigma$ is injective.

Let $X' := \mathrm{dom}(\sigma)$ and $Y' := \mathrm{ran}(\sigma)$, so $\sigma : X' \to Y'$ is a bijection. Let $x \in X'$, so say $\tau : (X_{<x}, <) \to (Y_{<'\sigma(x)}, <')$ is an isomorphism. Then if $x' < x$, then $\tau|_{X_{<x'}} : (X_{<x'}, <) \to (Y_{<'\tau(x')}, <')$ is an isomorphism, so $\langle x', \tau(x')\rangle \in \sigma$, so $x' \in \mathrm{dom}(\sigma) = X'$ and $\sigma(x') = \tau(x') <' \sigma(x)$. Hence $X'$ is an initial segment of $X$, and $\sigma : (X', <) \to (Y', <')$ is an isomorphism. Symmetrically, $Y'$ is an initial segment of $Y$.

If $X'$ and $Y'$ are proper initial segments, say $X' = X_{<x}$ and $Y' = Y_{<'y}$, then $\langle x, y\rangle \in \sigma$, contradicting $X' = \mathrm{dom}(\sigma)$. So either $X' = X$ or $Y' = Y$, hence either $(X, <) \cong (Y', <')$ or $(X', <) \cong (Y, <')$, as required. □

## 7.2 Ordinals

**Definition 7.10.** An **ordinal** is a transitive set which is well-ordered by $\in$.

That is, an ordinal is a transitive set $\alpha$ such that $(\alpha, <)$ is a well-ordered set, where $< := \{\langle \beta, \gamma\rangle \in \alpha \times \alpha : \beta \in \gamma\}$.

We use $<$ and $\in$ interchangeably to denote the order on an ordinal.

We denote the class of ordinals by **ON**.

By Theorem 5.17 and Lemma 5.9, $\mathbb{N}$ is an ordinal.

**Notation 7.11.** We use $\omega$ to denote $\mathbb{N}$ when we consider it as an ordinal.

**Lemma 7.12.** *Any element of an ordinal is an ordinal.*

*Proof.* Let $\beta \in \alpha \in \mathbf{ON}$. Then $\beta \subseteq \alpha$ by transitivity of $\alpha$, so the restriction $(\beta, \in)$ is well-ordered. But $\beta$ is transitive, since if $x \in y \in \beta$ then $y \in \alpha$ and $x \in \alpha$ by transitivity of $\alpha$, so then $x \in \beta$ by the transitivity property of the order $\in$ on $\alpha$. So $\beta$ is an ordinal. □

——— *End of lecture 10*

**Lemma 7.13.** *Let $\beta \in \mathbf{ON}$.*

*(i) The elements of $\beta$ are precisely the proper initial segments of $\beta$.*

*(ii) If $\alpha$ is transitive (in particular, if $\alpha \in \mathbf{ON}$), then $\alpha \subsetneq \beta$ iff $\alpha \in \beta$.*

*Proof.* (i) If $\alpha \in \beta$ then $\beta_{<\alpha} = \{\gamma \in \beta : \gamma \in \alpha\} = \beta \cap \alpha = \alpha$, since $\alpha \subseteq \beta$ by transitivity of $\beta$.

(ii) If $\alpha \subseteq \beta$ then $\alpha$ is an initial segment of $\beta$ by transitivity of $\alpha$.
So $\alpha \subsetneq \beta$ iff $\alpha$ is a proper initial segment of $\beta$, and we conclude by (i).

□

**Theorem 7.14.** *The class relation $\in$ on $\mathbf{ON}$ is a class well-order: for all $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbf{ON}$,*

*(i) $\alpha \notin \alpha$ (Irreflexivity)*

*(ii) $\alpha \in \beta \in \gamma \Rightarrow \alpha \in \gamma$ (Transitivity)*

*(iii) $\alpha \in \beta$ or $\alpha = \beta$ or $\beta \in \alpha$ (Totality)*

*(iv) Any non-empty class of ordinals $\mathbf{\Gamma} \subseteq \mathbf{ON}$ has an $\in$-least element, which we denote by $\min \mathbf{\Gamma}$. (Well-foundedness)*

*Proof.* (i) By Lemma 7.13(ii).

(ii) By transitivity of $\gamma$.

(iii) By Lemma 7.13(ii), it suffices to show that $\alpha \subseteq \beta$ or $\beta \subseteq \alpha$. Suppose not. Then $\gamma := \alpha \cap \beta$ is a proper subset of $\alpha$ and of $\beta$. But $\gamma$ is transitive since $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are, so by Lemma 7.13(ii) $\gamma \in \alpha$ and $\gamma \in \beta$, so $\gamma \in \gamma$, which contradicts (i) since $\gamma$ is an ordinal by Lemma 7.12.

(iv) Let $\gamma \in \mathbf{\Gamma}$. If $\mathbf{\Gamma} \cap \gamma = \emptyset$ then $\min \mathbf{\Gamma} = \gamma$, and otherwise $\min \mathbf{\Gamma} = \min(\mathbf{\Gamma} \cap \gamma)$, which exists since $\gamma$ is an ordinal.

□

**Corollary 7.15** (Transfinite Induction)**.** *Let $\phi(x)$ be a formula with parameters. Suppose that $\phi(\beta)$ holds for every $\beta \in \mathbf{ON}$ for which $\phi(\gamma)$ holds for all $\gamma \in \beta$. Then $\phi(\alpha)$ holds for all $\alpha \in \mathbf{ON}$.*

*Proof.* Otherwise, let $\beta := \min\{\beta \in \mathbf{ON} : \neg\phi(\beta)\}$. Then $\phi(\gamma)$ holds for all $\gamma \in \beta$ by the minimality of $\beta$, so $\phi(\beta)$ holds, contradiction. □

**Corollary 7.16.** *Any transitive set of ordinals is an ordinal.*

*Proof.* Theorem 7.14 shows that $\in$ defines a well-order on any set of ordinals. □

**Theorem 7.17.** $\mathbf{ON}$ *is a proper class.*[6]

[6] This is known as the *Burali-Forti paradox*.

*Proof.* Suppose **ON** is a set. Then **ON** is transitive by Lemma 7.12, so **ON** is an ordinal by Corollary 7.16. But then $\mathbf{ON} \in \mathbf{ON}$, contradicting Theorem 7.14(i). □

**Lemma 7.18.** *Isomorphic ordinals are equal.*

*Proof.* By Theorem 7.14(iii) and Lemma 7.13(i), if $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbf{ON}$ are not equal then one is a proper initial segment of the other, so by Lemma 7.7 they are not isomorphic. □

**Lemma 7.19.**

*(a)* *(i)* $0 = \emptyset$ *is an ordinal.*

*(ii)* *If* $\alpha$ *is an ordinal, then so is its successor* $\alpha^+ = \alpha \cup \{\alpha\}$*.*

*(iii)* *If* $\Gamma$ *is a set of ordinals, then* $\bigcup \Gamma$ *is an ordinal.*

*(b)* *Every* $\beta \in \mathbf{ON}$ *is of precisely one of the following three types:*

*(i)* *Zero ordinal:* $\beta = 0$*.*

*(ii)* *Successor ordinal:* $\beta = \alpha^+$ *for some* $\alpha \in \mathbf{ON}$*.*

*(iii)* *Limit ordinal:* $\beta = \bigcup \beta$ *and* $\beta \neq 0$*.*

*Proof.* Exercise. □

*Example* 7.20.

- $\omega = \mathbb{N}$ is the first limit ordinal, since $\omega = \bigcup \omega$ and every $n \in \omega$ is either zero or a successor.
- Taking successors, we obtain ordinals $\omega^+, \omega^{++}, \ldots$. We write these as $\omega + 1$, $\omega + 2$, etc.

*Remark* 7.21. We would like to say that there is an ordinal $\omega + \omega := \bigcup_{n \in \omega}(\omega + n) = \bigcup\{\omega, \omega^+, \omega^{++}, \ldots\}$, but we can not yet prove the existence of the set $\{\omega + n : n \in \omega\}$. We fix this presently.

## 7.3 Replacement

The axiom system we have established so far, ZF1-7, is more or less the system originally proposed by Zermelo. It is limited in some ways, and in particular it does not prove the existence of any ordinals beyond those listed in Example 7.20. Before we continue our discussion of the ordinals, we remedy this by introducing a new axiom, Replacement.

**Definition 7.22.** If **X** and **Y** are classes, a formula with parameters $\phi(x, y)$ defines a **class function** $\mathbf{F} : \mathbf{X} \to \mathbf{Y}$ if:

- $\phi(x, y)$ implies $x \in \mathbf{X}$ and $y \in \mathbf{Y}$, and
- for all $x \in \mathbf{X}$ there is a unique $y$ such that $\phi(x, y)$ holds.

We then write $\mathbf{F}(x) = y$ to mean $\phi(x, y)$.

*Example* 7.23. $\mathcal{P} : \mathbf{V} \to \mathbf{V}$ is the class function defined by

$$\psi(x, y) := \forall w\ (w \in y \leftrightarrow w \subseteq x).$$

**ZF8 (Replacement):** If $a$ is a set and $\mathbf{F} : a \to \mathbf{V}$ is a class function, then its range $\mathbf{F}[a] := \{\mathbf{F}(x) : x \in a\}$ is a set.

*Remark* 7.24. As with Comprehension, we can formalise Replacement by an axiom scheme consisting of, for each $\mathcal{L}$-formula $\phi(x, y, z_1, \ldots, z_n)$, the sentence

$$\forall z_1 \ \ldots \forall z_n\ \forall w\ (\forall x \in w\ \exists y\ (\phi(x, y, z_1, \ldots, z_n) \wedge \forall y'\ (\phi(x, y', z_1, \ldots, z_n) \to y' = y)) \\ \to \exists v\ \forall u\ (u \in v \leftrightarrow \exists x \in w\ \phi(x, u, z_1, \ldots, z_n))).$$

One immediate application of Replacement is to strengthen our recursion principle on $\omega$.

**Theorem 7.25** (Recursion on $\omega$, class form)**.** *If $x_0$ is a set and $\mathbf{G} : \mathbf{V} \to \mathbf{V}$ is a class function, then there exists a unique function $f$ with* $\mathrm{dom}(f) = \omega$ *such that*

- $f(0) = x_0$*;*
- $f(n^+) = G(f(n))$ *for all* $n \in \omega$*.*

*Proof.* Exactly as in the proof of Theorem 5.18, for each $n$ there is a unique $n$-approximation. Then $\mathbf{F}(n) :=$ [the unique $n$-approximation] is a class function $\mathbf{F} : \omega \to \mathbf{V}$, so by Replacement, $H := \mathbf{F}[\omega] = \{h : \exists n \in \omega\ [h \text{ is an } n\text{-approximation}]\}$ is a set. Set $f := \bigcup H$, and conclude exactly as in Theorem 5.18. □

*Example* 7.26. Taking $x_0 := \omega$ and $\mathbf{G}(x) = x^+$, we obtain $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbf{ON}$ with $f(n) = \omega + n$. Then $\bigcup \mathrm{ran}(f) = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (\omega + n) =: \omega + \omega$ is the ordinal we were looking for in Remark 7.21.

*End of lecture 11*

*Example* 7.27. There is a cardinality greater than any of $\aleph_0, 2^{\aleph_0}, 2^{2^{\aleph_0}}, \ldots$, in the following sense.

Applying recursion with $x_0 := \mathbb{N}$ and $G := \mathcal{P}$, we obtain a function $f$ with $\mathrm{dom}(f) = \mathbb{N}$ and $f(0) = \mathbb{N}$, $f(1) = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$, $f(2) = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}))$, ....

Then $\mathrm{ran}(f) = f[\mathbb{N}]$ is a set which we could write as $\{\mathbb{N}, \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}), \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})), \ldots\}$.

Let $X := \bigcup f[\mathbb{N}]$. Then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $f(n) \subseteq X$ and hence $|X| \geq f(n)$.

One can show that ZF1-7 do not suffice to prove the existence of such a cardinality.

## 7.4 Hartog's theorem and enumeration by ordinals

**Theorem 7.28** (Hartogs' Theorem)**.** *If $X$ is a set, then there exists $\alpha \in \mathbf{ON}$ with $|\alpha| \not\leq |X|$.*

*Proof.* Suppose for a contradiction that $|\alpha| \leq |X|$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbf{ON}$. Then for every $\alpha \in \mathbf{ON}$, there is an injection $f : \alpha \to X$, and then $f(x) < f(y) \Leftrightarrow x \in y$ defines a well-order on $f[X] \subseteq X$ with $(f[X], <) \cong (\alpha, \in)$.

Consider the set $W$ of well-orders on subsets of $X$ which are isomorphic to ordinals,

$$W := \{< \in \mathcal{P}(X \times X) : \mathrm{dom}(<) = \mathrm{ran}(<) \wedge \exists \alpha \in \mathbf{ON}\ (\mathrm{dom}(<), <) \cong (\alpha, \in)\}.$$

Let $\mathbf{F} : W \to \mathbf{ON}$ be the class function such that $\mathbf{F}(<)$ is the ordinal $\alpha$ isomorphic to $(\mathrm{dom}(<), <)$, which is unique by Lemma 7.18. Then $\mathbf{F}[W] = \mathbf{ON}$ by the first paragraph, so $\mathbf{ON}$ is a set by Replacement, contradicting Theorem 7.17. □

So arbitrarily large ordinals exist. This result (which relies crucially on Replacement) allows us to reduce arbitrary well-ordered sets to ordinals, in the following sense:

**Theorem 7.29.** *Every well-ordered set $(X, <)$ is isomorphic to a unique ordinal by a unique isomorphism.*

*Proof.* Uniqueness of the ordinal is by Lemma 7.18, and uniqueness of the isomorphism is by Lemma 7.8.

For existence, by Theorem 7.28 say $\alpha \in \mathbf{ON}$ with $|\alpha| \not\leq |X|$. Then $\alpha$ is not isomorphic to an initial segment of $X$, so by Theorem 7.9, $X$ is isomorphic to an initial segment of $\alpha$, which is an ordinal by Lemma 7.13. □

In this way, an arbitrary well-ordered set is enumerated by ordinals, namely the elements of the ordinal isomorphic to it.

## 7.5 Transfinite recursion

**Theorem 7.30** (Transfinite Recursion)**.** *Let $\mathbf{G} : \mathbf{V} \to \mathbf{V}$ be a class function. Then there exists a unique class function $\mathbf{F} : \mathbf{ON} \to \mathbf{V}$ such that for all $\alpha \in \mathbf{ON}$*

$$\mathbf{F}(\alpha) = \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{F}|_{\alpha}).$$

(Note that evaluating $\mathbf{G}$ at $\mathbf{F}|_{\alpha}$ does make sense, because $\mathbf{F}|_{\alpha} : \alpha \to \mathbf{F}[\alpha]$ is a set, since $\mathbf{F}[\alpha]$ is by Replacement.)

*Sketch proof (not examinable).* Analogous to the proof of Theorem 5.18.

For $\alpha \in \mathbf{ON}$, define an *$\alpha$-approximation* to be a function $f_\alpha : \alpha^+ \to \mathbf{V}$ such that $f_\alpha(\beta) = \mathbf{G}(f_\alpha|_\beta)$ for all $\beta \in \alpha^+$.

We show by transfinite induction that a unique $\alpha$-approximation $f_\alpha$ exists for each $\alpha \in \mathbf{ON}$. Indeed, let $\alpha \in \mathbf{ON}$ and suppose $f_\beta$ is the unique $\beta$-approximation for each $\beta \in \alpha$. Note then that $f_\beta|_{\gamma^+} = f_\gamma$ whenever $\gamma \in \beta \in \alpha$, since it is a $\gamma$-approximation. So $g_\alpha := \bigcup\{f_\beta : \beta \in \alpha\}$ is a function (using Replacement), with domain $\bigcup\{\beta^+ : \beta \in \alpha\} = \alpha$. If $f_\alpha$ is an $\alpha$-approximation and $\beta \in \alpha$, then again $f_\alpha|_{\beta^+} = f_\beta$, so $f_\alpha := g_\alpha \cup \{(\alpha, \mathbf{G}(g_\alpha))\}$ is the unique $\alpha$-approximation.

Now $\mathbf{F}(\alpha) := f_\alpha(\alpha)$ is the unique class function in the statement – unique because again the restriction of $\mathbf{F}$ to any $\alpha^+$ is an $\alpha$-approximation. □

We typically apply this in the following form.

**Corollary 7.31.** *Let $x_0$ be a set and let $\mathbf{S} : \mathbf{V} \to \mathbf{V}$ be a class function. Then there is a unique class function $\mathbf{F} : \mathbf{ON} \to \mathbf{V}$ such that:*

- $\mathbf{F}(0) = x_0$.
- $\mathbf{F}(\alpha^+) = \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{F}(\alpha))$ *for all* $\alpha \in \mathbf{ON}$.
- *If* $\eta \in \mathbf{ON}$ *is a limit ordinal, then* $\mathbf{F}(\eta) = \bigcup\{\mathbf{F}(\alpha) : \alpha \in \eta\} = \bigcup \mathbf{F}[\eta]$.

*Proof.* Define $\mathbf{G}(f)$ as follows. If $f$ is a function with domain an ordinal $\beta$, define

$$\mathbf{G}(f) := \begin{cases} x_0 & \text{if } \beta = 0 \\ \mathbf{S}(f(\alpha)) & \text{if } \beta = \alpha^+ \\ \bigcup f[\beta] & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Otherwise, set $\mathbf{G}(f) := \emptyset$ (say).

Now apply Theorem 7.30 to obtain $\mathbf{F}$ with $\mathbf{F}(\beta) = \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{F}|_\beta)$, and observe (using the classification of ordinals in Lemma 7.19) that it is as required. □

## 7.6 Ordinal arithmetic

We now extend our recursive definitions of the arithmetic operations from $\omega$ to $\mathbf{ON}$:

**Definition 7.32.** For each $\alpha \in \mathbf{ON}$, define by Corollary 7.31 class functions $\mathbf{ON} \to \mathbf{ON}$, denoted by $\beta \mapsto \alpha + \beta$, $\beta \mapsto \alpha \cdot \beta$, and $\beta \mapsto \alpha^\beta$, such that:

- 
  - $\alpha + 0 = \alpha$
  - $\alpha + \beta^+ = (\alpha + \beta)^+$
  - $\alpha + \eta = \bigcup\{\alpha + \beta : \beta \in \eta\}$ for $\eta$ a limit ordinal.
- 
  - $\alpha \cdot 0 = 0$
  - $\alpha \cdot \beta^+ = \alpha \cdot \beta + \alpha$
  - $\alpha \cdot \eta = \bigcup\{\alpha \cdot \beta : \beta \in \eta\}$ for $\eta$ a limit ordinal.
- 
  - $\alpha^0 = 1$
  - $\alpha^{\beta^+} = (\alpha^\beta) \cdot \alpha$
  - $\alpha^\eta = \bigcup\{\alpha^\beta : \beta \in \eta\}$ for $\eta$ a limit ordinal.

(As in the case of $\mathbb{N}$, we could also consider these as binary class functions $\mathbf{ON} \times \mathbf{ON} \to \mathbf{ON}$.)

*Example* 7.33.

- $1 + \omega = \bigcup_{n\in\omega} 1 + n = \omega \neq \omega^+ = \omega + 1$.
- $\alpha \cdot 1 = \alpha \cdot 0 + \alpha = 0 + \alpha = \alpha$, where the last equality holds by transfinite induction on $\alpha$.
- $2 \cdot \omega = \bigcup_{n\in\omega} 2 \cdot n = \omega \neq \omega + \omega = \omega \cdot 2$.
- $2^\omega = \bigcup_{n\in\omega} 2^n = \omega \neq \omega \cdot \omega = \omega^2$.
- $2^\omega = \omega$ is countable, so it is not in bijection with the set of functions $\omega \to 2$ – beware this conflict in notation!

**Fact 7.34.** *The set of countable ordinals is closed under these arithmetic operations. Uncountable ordinals do nonetheless exist, by Hartogs' theorem.*

——————————— *End of lecture 12*

**Definition 7.35.** Let $(A, <_A)$ and $(B, <_B)$ be linear orders.

- The **sum order** is the linear order $(A, <_A) + (B, <_B) := ((A \times \{0\}) \cup (B \times \{1\}), <_+)$ where for all $a, a' \in A$ and $b, b' \in B$:

$$(a, 0) <_+ (a', 0) \Leftrightarrow a <_A a'$$
$$(b, 1) <_+ (b', 1) \Leftrightarrow b <_B b'$$
$$(a, 0) <_+ (b, 1).$$

- The **reverse lexicographic product order** (or just **product order**) is the linear order $(A, <_A) \times (B, <_B) := (A \times B, <_\times)$ where

$$(a, b) <_\times (a', b') \Leftrightarrow (b <_B b' \vee (b = b' \wedge a <_A a')).$$

**Theorem 7.36.** *Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbf{ON}$.*

*(a)* $(\alpha + \beta, \in) \cong (\alpha, \in) + (\beta, \in)$.

*(b)* $(\alpha \cdot \beta, \in) \cong (\alpha, \in) \times (\beta, \in)$.

*Proof.* (a) By transfinite induction on $\beta$ for a fixed $\alpha$:

- $\beta = 0$: Immediate.
- $\beta = \gamma^+$: $\alpha + \beta = (\alpha + \gamma)^+$, which inductively is isomorphic to the extension of $(\alpha, \in) + (\gamma, \in)$ by a new greatest element, which is isomorphic to $(\alpha, \in) + (\gamma^+, \in)$.
- $\beta$ limit: $\alpha + \beta = \bigcup_{\gamma \in \beta} (\alpha + \gamma)$, and inductively $(\alpha + \gamma, \in) \cong (\alpha, \in) + (\gamma, \in)$ for each $\gamma \in \beta$.

  Let $\sigma_\gamma : (\alpha, \in) + (\gamma, \in) \to (\alpha + \gamma, \in)$ be the unique (by Lemma 7.8) isomorphisms. They form a chain: if $\delta \in \gamma$ then $\sigma_\gamma$ restricts to an isomorphism of $(\alpha, \in) + (\delta, \in)$ with an initial segment of $\alpha + \gamma$, which is also an ordinal; hence, by the uniqueness in Theorem 7.29, this restriction of $\sigma_\gamma$ is $\sigma_\delta$.

  The union $\sigma := \bigcup_{\gamma \in \beta} \sigma_\gamma$ is an isomorphism of $\bigcup_{\gamma \in \beta} ((\alpha, \in) + (\gamma, \in)) = (\alpha, \in) + (\beta, \in)$ with $\bigcup_{\gamma \in \beta} (\alpha + \gamma) = \alpha + \beta$.

(b) Similar; exercise.

□

**Lemma 7.37.** *If $B \subseteq \alpha \in \mathbf{ON}$ is a subset of an ordinal $\alpha$, then the induced order $(B, \in)$ is isomorphic to some $\beta \leq \alpha$.*

*Proof.* Let $\beta$ be the ordinal isomorphic to $(B, \in)$. If $\beta \not\leq \alpha$, then $\alpha < \beta$, so $\alpha$ is isomorphic to a proper initial segment of $B$, say $\theta : (\alpha, \in) \to (B_{<b}, \in)$ is an isomorphism. But then $\theta(b) < b$, and $\theta$ is an embedding of $(\alpha, \in)$ into itself, contradicting Lemma 7.6. □

**Theorem 7.38.** *For all $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbf{ON}$:*

*(a)* *(i)* $(\alpha + \beta) + \gamma = \alpha + (\beta + \gamma)$.

*(ii)* $\beta < \gamma \Rightarrow \alpha + \beta < \alpha + \gamma$.

*(iii)* $\alpha \leq \gamma \Rightarrow \alpha + \beta \leq \gamma + \beta$.

*(iv)* $\alpha + \beta = \alpha + \gamma \Rightarrow \beta = \gamma$.

*(v)* $\alpha \leq \beta \Rightarrow \exists \delta \leq \beta\ \alpha + \delta = \beta$.

*(b)* *(i)* $(\alpha \cdot \beta) \cdot \gamma = \alpha \cdot (\beta \cdot \gamma)$.

*(ii)* $\alpha \cdot (\beta + \gamma) = \alpha \cdot \beta + \alpha \cdot \gamma$.

*(iii)* *For* $\alpha \neq 0$, $\beta < \gamma \Rightarrow \alpha \cdot \beta < \alpha \cdot \gamma$.

*(iv)* $\alpha \leq \gamma \Rightarrow \alpha \cdot \beta \leq \gamma \cdot \beta$.

*Proof.* (a) (i) By the corresponding associativity of the sum of orders.

(ii) If $\beta < \gamma$ then $(\beta, \in)$ is a proper initial segment of $(\gamma, \in)$, and it follows that $(\alpha, \in) + (\beta, \in)$ is a proper initial segment of $(\alpha, \in) + (\gamma, \in)$, so $\alpha + \beta < \alpha + \gamma$.

(iii) $(\alpha + \beta, \in)$ is isomorphic to a suborder of $(\gamma + \beta, \in)$ by considering ordered sums, so $\alpha + \beta \leq \gamma + \beta$ by Lemma 7.37.

(iv) By (ii) and totality.

(v) By Lemma 7.37, $(\beta \setminus \alpha, \in)$ is isomorphic to $(\delta, \in)$ for some $\delta \leq \beta$. Then

$$(\beta, \in) \cong (\alpha, \in) + (\beta \setminus \alpha, \in) \cong (\alpha + \delta, \in),$$

so $\beta = \alpha + \delta$.

(b) Exercise. Consider product orders. For (iv), apply Lemma 7.37. (iii) can also be proven by induction.

□

## 7.7 Foundation

We complete the axiom system ZF by adding one last axiom:

**ZF9 (Foundation):** Every non-empty set $x$ has an $\in$-minimal element, i.e. an element $y \in x$ such that no element of $x$ is an element of $y$:

$$\forall x\ (x \neq \emptyset \rightarrow \exists y \in x\ y \cap x = \emptyset).$$

This axiom forbids certain "pathological" behaviour of sets:

**Theorem 7.39.** *(i) There is no $x$ with $x \in x$.*

*(ii) There are no $x$ and $y$ with $x \in y \in x$.*

*(iii) More generally, there is no infinite descending $\in$-chain, i.e. no $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$ with $f(n^+) \in f(n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

*Proof.* (i) If $x \in x$, then $\{x\}$ violates Foundation: the only element of $\{x\}$ is $x$, but $x \cap \{x\} = \{x\} \neq \emptyset$.

(ii) Similarly, $\{x, y\}$ would violate Foundation.

(iii) Exercise.

□

——————————— *End of lecture 13*

ZF1-9 form the axiom system ZF. One can show that if ZF1-8 are consistent, then so are ZF1-9: adding Foundation can not introduce a contradiction. In particular, any set we prove to exist using ZF1-8 (such as $\mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbb{R}$) does not violate Foundation. So adding Foundation is "harmless", and substantially simplifies the set theoretic universe. However, Foundation will not actually be used in the remainder of these notes.

The role of Foundation can be clarified by considering the cumulative hierarchy:

*Example* 7.40 (Cumulative Hierarchy (not on syllabus)). Apply Corollary 7.31 with $\mathbf{S} = \mathcal{P}$ to obtain a class function $\mathbf{F} : \mathbf{ON} \to \mathbf{V}$ such that, writing $V_\alpha$ for $\mathbf{F}(\alpha)$, we have

- $V_0 = \emptyset$
- $V_{\alpha^+} = \mathcal{P}(V_\alpha)$
- $V_\eta = \bigcup\{V_\beta : \beta \in \eta\}$ if $\eta$ is a limit ordinal.

This is called the *von Neumann cumulative hierarchy.* By a transfinite induction, $V_\alpha \subseteq V_\beta$ for $\alpha \subseteq \beta$. The axiom of Foundation is equivalent, modulo ZF1-8, to the statement that every set is an element of some $V_\alpha$.

# 8 The Axiom of Choice

**Definition 8.1.** The **Axiom of Choice** is the statement:

**AC:** If $X$ is a set of disjoint non-empty sets, then there exists a set $C$ such that $|C \cap a| = 1$ for all $a \in X$.

(So $C$ "chooses" an element of each $a \in X$.)

**Lemma 8.2.** *The following are equivalent:*

- *AC*
- *Every set $X$ has a* ***choice function****, a function $h : \mathcal{P}(X) \setminus \{\emptyset\} \to X$ such that $h(A) \in A$ for all $\emptyset \neq A \subseteq X$.*
- *Every surjection $f : X \to Y$ has a section, i.e. a function $g : Y \to X$ such that $f(g(y)) = y$ for all $y \in Y$.*

*Proof.* Exercise. □

## 8.1 The well-ordering principle

**Definition 8.3.** The **well-ordering principle** is the statement that every set is well-orderable:

**WO:** For every set $X$ there exists a well-order on $X$.

**Lemma 8.4.** *WO holds if and only if every set is equinumerous with an ordinal.*

*Proof.* Let $X$ be a set. If $X$ is well-orderable, it is in bijection with an ordinal by Theorem 7.29. Conversely, if $f : X \to \alpha$ is a bijection with an ordinal $\alpha$, then $x < y \Leftrightarrow f(x) \in f(y)$ defines a well-order on $X$. □

**Theorem 8.5.** *AC* $\Leftrightarrow$ *WO.*

*Proof.*$\Leftarrow$: Let $X$ be a set. By WO, say $<$ is a well-order on $X$. Then

$$\min_{<} : \mathcal{P}(X) \setminus \{\emptyset\} \to X$$

is a choice function.

$\Rightarrow$ (*Zermelo's theorem*): Let $X$ be a set. Let $h : \mathcal{P}(X) \setminus \{\emptyset\} \to X$ be a choice function. Define by Corollary 7.31 a chain of injections $(f_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathbf{ON}}$ from ordinals to $X$ such that

- $f_0 = \emptyset$
- $f_{\alpha^+} = \begin{cases} f_\alpha \cup \{\langle \alpha, h(X \setminus \mathrm{ran}(f_\alpha))\rangle\} & \text{if } X \setminus \mathrm{ran}(f_\alpha) \neq \emptyset \\ f_\alpha & \text{else} \end{cases}$
- $f_\eta = \bigcup_{\beta \in \eta} f_\beta$ for $\eta$ a limit ordinal.

Then by transfinite induction, for all $\alpha \in \mathbf{ON}$:

- Either $\mathrm{dom}(f_\alpha) = \alpha$, or $\mathrm{ran}(f_\beta) = X$ for some $\beta < \alpha$.

By Hartogs' theorem, the second case must occur for some $\alpha \in \mathbf{ON}$, so let $\beta \in \mathbf{ON}$ be least such that $\mathrm{ran}(f_\beta) = X$ (which exists by Theorem 7.14(iv)). Then $\mathrm{dom}(f_\beta) = \beta$, so $f_\beta : \beta \to X$ is a bijection. We conclude by Lemma 8.4.

□

## 8.2 Cardinal comparability

**Definition 8.6. Cardinal comparability** is the statement that the order $<$ on cardinalities is total:

**CC:** For any two sets $X$ and $Y$, either $|X| \leq |Y|$ or $|Y| \leq |X|$.

**Theorem 8.7.** *WO* $\Leftrightarrow$ *CC.*

*Proof.* $\Rightarrow$: By comparability of well-ordered sets (Theorem 7.9), if sets $X$ and $Y$ are well-orderable then one admits an injection to the other.

$\Leftarrow$: Let $X$ be a set. By Hartogs' Theorem, say $|\alpha| \not\leq |X|$. By CC, $|X| \leq |\alpha|$, so there exists an injection $f : X \to \alpha$, and then $x < y \Leftrightarrow f(x) \in f(y)$ defines a well-order on $X$.

□

## 8.3 Zorn's lemma

**Definition 8.8.** A **chain** in a partially ordered set $(X, <)$ is a subset $C \subseteq X$ which is totally ordered by $<$. An **upper bound** for a subset $A \subseteq X$ is an element $u \in X$ such that $u \geq a$ for all $a \in A$.

**Zorn's Lemma** is the statement:

**ZL:** If $(X, <)$ is a partially ordered set in which every chain has an upper bound, then $(X, <)$ has a maximal element.

We also consider the following alternative formulation, which treats only the special case of $(X, \subseteq)$:

**ZL':** If a set $X$ is closed under unions of chains, meaning $\bigcup C \in X$ for any $C \subseteq X$ which is totally ordered by inclusion, then $X$ has a maximal element with respect to inclusion.

*End of lecture 14*

*Remark* 8.9. Slighty adjusting the proof of Corollary 7.31, we can obtain a version which, for a class function $\mathbf{S} : \mathbf{ON} \times \mathbf{V} \to \mathbf{V}$, yields an $\mathbf{F}$ as in Corollary 7.31 but with $\mathbf{F}(\alpha^+) = \mathbf{S}(\alpha, \mathbf{F}(\alpha))$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbf{ON}$.

We use this in the following proof, and it is one way to justify the recursion used in the proof of Theorem 8.5 (though there we can alternatively obtain $\alpha$ as $\mathrm{dom}(f_\alpha)$).

**Theorem 8.10.** *The following are equivalent:*

- *AC*
- *ZL*
- *ZL'*

*Proof.*

- AC $\Rightarrow$ ZL: Let $(X, <)$ be a partial order in which every chain has an upper bound.

  By WO (and Lemma 8.4), there exists a bijection $\theta : \alpha \to X$ for some ordinal $\alpha$.

  Define an increasing sequence of chains by transfinite recursion (Remark 8.9):

  - $C_0 := \emptyset$;
  - $C_{\beta^+} := \begin{cases} C_\beta \cup \{\theta(\beta)\} & \text{if } \beta \in \alpha \text{ and } \theta(\beta) > x \text{ for all } x \in C_\beta \\ C_\beta & \text{else;} \end{cases}$
  - $C_\eta := \bigcup_{\beta \in \eta} C_\beta$ if $\eta$ is a limit ordinal.

  Then, by transfinite induction, $C_\beta \subseteq C_\gamma$ if $\beta \leq \gamma$, and each $C_\beta$ is a chain.

  In particular, $C_\alpha$ is a chain, so say $u \in X$ is an upper bound for $C_\alpha$. Suppose $u$ is not maximal, say $b > u$, so $b > x$ for all $x \in C_\alpha$. Let $\beta = \theta^{-1}(b) \in \alpha$. Then $b = \theta(\beta) \in C_{\beta^+} \subseteq C_\alpha$ by definition of $C_{\beta^+}$, so $b > b$; contradiction. So $u$ is a maximal element.

- ZL ⇒ ZL': Suppose $X$ is closed under unions of chains. Then every chain $C$ in the partial order $(X, \subseteq)$ has $\bigcup C$ as an upper bound, so by ZL there is a maximal element.
- ZL' ⇒ AC: Let $X$ be a set. Let $P' := \mathcal{P}(X) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$. Say $h \subseteq P' \times X$ is a *partial choice function* for $X$ if it is a function such that $h(A) \in A$ for all $A \in \mathrm{dom}(h) \subseteq P'$. Then the set of partial choice functions for $X$ is closed under unions of chains. So by ZL', a maximal partial choice function $h$ exists.

  We conclude by showing that $h$ is a choice function for $X$, i.e. that $\mathrm{dom}(h) = P'$. Suppose not, say $A \in P' \setminus \mathrm{dom}(h)$. Then $A \neq \emptyset$ by definition of $P'$, so say $a \in A$. But then $h \cup \{\langle A, a\rangle\}$ is a partial choice function properly extending $h$, contradicting maximality of $h$.

□

## 8.4 ZFC

From now on, we assume AC. We could take any of the above equivalent forms as the axiom; we use our first formulation.

**AC (Choice):** If $X$ is a set of disjoint non-empty sets, then there exists a set $C$ such that $|C \cap a| = 1$ for all $a \in X$:

$$\forall x\ (\forall y \in x\ (y \neq \emptyset \wedge \forall y' \in x\ (y' = y \vee y \cap y' = \emptyset)) \\ \to \exists z\ \forall y \in x\ \exists u \in z \cap y\ \forall v \in z \cap y\ \ u = v)$$

This completes our axiom system ZFC = ZF + AC.

**Fact 8.11.** *Assume ZF is consistent. Gödel proved (using the* constructible universe*) that ZFC is then also consistent, i.e. that ZF does not prove ¬AC; this is covered in the part C course Axiomatic Set Theory. Paul Cohen later proved (using* forcing*) that ZF doesn't prove AC either.*

*Even the weak form of Choice in which every element of $X$ is of cardinality 2 is not a consequence of ZF (if ZF is consistent). As Russell put it: "To choose one sock from each of infinitely many pairs of socks requires the Axiom of Choice, but for shoes the Axiom is not needed" (the idea being that we can consider the set of left shoes, but the elements of a pair of socks are indistinguishable).*

# 9 Cardinal numbers

By WO, every set is equinumerous with an ordinal (this was Lemma 8.4). Using this, we now redefine our notation $|X|$:

**Definition 9.1.** The **cardinality** $|X|$ of a set $X$ is the smallest ordinal equinumerous with $X$:

$$|X| := \min\{\alpha \in \mathbf{ON} : \alpha \sim X\}.$$

This accords with our previous notation:

**Lemma 9.2.** *Let $X$ and $Y$ be sets.*

*(i)* $|X| = |Y| \Leftrightarrow X \sim Y$.

*(ii)* $|X| \leq |Y|$ *if and only if and only if an injection* $X \to Y$ *exists.*

*Proof.* (i) If $|X| = |Y|$ then $X \sim |X| = |Y| \sim Y$. Conversely, if $X \sim Y$ then $\{\alpha \in \mathbf{ON} : \alpha \sim X\} = \{\alpha \in \mathbf{ON} : \alpha \sim Y\}$, so $|X| = |Y|$.

(ii) Composing with bijections, it suffices to show that $|X| \leq |Y|$ if and only if an injection $|X| \to |Y|$ exists.

If $|X| \leq |Y|$, the inclusion is such an injection.

If an injection $|X| \to |Y|$ exists but $|X| > |Y|$, then $|X| = |Y|$ by Cantor-Schröder-Bernstein; contradiction.

□

**Lemma 9.3.** *For an ordinal* $\alpha$*, the following are equivalent.*

*(i)* $\alpha = |X|$ *for some set* $X$.

*(ii)* $\alpha = |\alpha|$.

*(iii)* $\alpha = \{\beta \in \mathbf{ON} : |\beta| < |\alpha|\}$.

*An ordinal satisfying these properties is called a* ***cardinal****. (The infinite cardinals are sometimes also known as* initial ordinals*.)*

*The class of cardinals is denoted* $\mathbf{CN}$.

*Proof.*

- (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii): If $\alpha = |X|$ then $\alpha \sim X$ so $|\alpha| = |X| = \alpha$.
- (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i): Immediate.
- (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii): Suppose $\alpha = |\alpha|$. If $\beta \in \alpha$, then $|\beta| < |\alpha|$ since otherwise $\beta \sim |\alpha|$ contradicting the minimality of $|\alpha|$. Similarly, if $\beta \in \mathbf{ON} \setminus \alpha$ then $|\alpha| \leq |\beta|$.
- (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (ii): If $\alpha \neq |\alpha|$ then $|\alpha| \in \alpha$ and hence $|\alpha| < |\alpha|$ by definition of $\alpha$; contradiction.

□

So $|X|$ is the cardinal equinumerous to $X$.

**Lemma 9.4.**

*(i)* $\omega$ *is a cardinal.*

*(ii) If* $\kappa$ *is a cardinal, then there exists a cardinal greater than* $\kappa$.

*(iii) If* $K$ *is a set of cardinals, then* $\bigcup K$ *is a cardinal.*

*Proof.* (i) $\omega$ is the least infinite ordinal.

(ii) By Corollary 6.23, $|\mathcal{P}(\kappa)| > |\kappa| = \kappa$. Alternatively: By Hartogs' Theorem and cardinal comparability, there is an ordinal $\alpha$ such that $|\alpha| > |\kappa| = \kappa$.

(iii) $\bigcup K$ is an ordinal by Lemma 7.19(a)(iii). Suppose $|\bigcup K| \in \bigcup K$. Then $|\bigcup K| \in \kappa$ for some $\kappa \in K$. But $\kappa \subseteq \bigcup K$ so $|\kappa| \leq |\bigcup K|$, contradicting $|\bigcup K| \in \kappa = |\kappa|$. So $|\bigcup K| = \bigcup K$.

□

This lemma justifies the following definition:

**Definition 9.5.** Define by transfinite recursion (Corollary 7.31) a class function $\mathbf{ON} \to \mathbf{CN}$; $\alpha \mapsto \aleph_\alpha$ such that:

- $\aleph_0 = \omega$;
- $\aleph_{\alpha^+}$ is the smallest cardinal greater than $\aleph_\alpha$;
- $\aleph_\eta = \bigcup_{\beta \in \eta} \aleph_\beta$ if $\eta$ is a limit ordinal.

In particular, we redefine $\aleph_0 := \omega = |\mathbb{N}|$.

We also write $\aleph_\alpha$ as $\omega_\alpha$ when we think of it as an ordinal rather than a cardinal (see below).

*End of lecture 15*

**Theorem 9.6.**

*(i)* $\aleph_\alpha \geq \alpha$ *for all* $\alpha \in \mathbf{ON}$.

*(ii) If* $\alpha < \beta \in \mathbf{ON}$ *then* $\aleph_\alpha < \aleph_\beta$.

*(iii) Every infinite cardinal is of the form* $\aleph_\alpha$ *for some* $\alpha \in \mathbf{ON}$.

*(iv)* $\mathbf{CN}$ *is a proper class*[7].

*Proof.* (i) By transfinite induction on $\alpha$.

(ii) By transfinite induction on $\beta$.

(iii) Let $\kappa$ be an infinite cardinal. Consider the set

$$\alpha := \{\beta : \aleph_\beta < \kappa\} = \{\beta \in \kappa : \aleph_\beta < \kappa\},$$

where the equality is by (i). Then $\alpha$ is an initial segment of $\kappa$ by (ii), so $\alpha$ is an ordinal. So $\alpha \notin \alpha$, hence $\aleph_\alpha \geq \kappa$. We conclude by showing $\aleph_\alpha \leq \kappa$.

If $\alpha = 0$, this follows from $\kappa$ being infinite.

If $\alpha$ is a limit ordinal, then $\aleph_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta \in \alpha} \aleph_\beta \leq \kappa$ since each $\aleph_\beta < \kappa$.

If $\alpha$ is a successor ordinal, say $\alpha = \gamma^+$, then $\aleph_\gamma < \kappa$, so $\aleph_\alpha = \aleph_{\gamma^+} \leq \kappa$ by definition of $\aleph_{\gamma^+}$.

(iv) By (ii) and (iii), $\aleph_\alpha \mapsto \alpha$ is a well-defined surjective class function $\mathbf{CN} \setminus \omega \to \mathbf{ON}$. So if $\mathbf{CN}$ were a set, then by Replacement so would be $\mathbf{ON}$, contradicting Theorem 7.17.

□

**Lemma 9.7.** *Every infinite cardinal is a limit ordinal.*

[7] This is known as *Cantor's paradox.*

*Proof.* Suppose $\kappa$ is an infinite cardinal but $\kappa = \alpha^+$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbf{ON}$. Then $\alpha \geq \omega$. Define $f : \alpha^+ \to \alpha$ by

$$f(\beta) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if} \beta = \alpha \\ \beta^+ & \text{if} \beta \in \omega \\ \beta & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} .$$

Then $f$ is injective, so $|\alpha| = |\alpha^+| = \kappa$, contradicting leastness of $\alpha^+$. □

## 9.1 Cardinal arithmetic with Choice

**Definition 9.8.** We now consider the cardinal arithmetic operations (addition, multiplication, and exponentiation) defined in Definition 6.18 as operations on cardinals:

$$\kappa + \lambda := |(\kappa \times \{0\}) \cup (\lambda \times \{1\})| \quad \kappa \cdot \lambda := |\kappa \times \lambda| \quad \kappa^\lambda := |\{f : \lambda \to \kappa\}|.$$

*Warning*: This leads to an unfortunate ambiguity, since these cardinal arithmetic operations rarely agree with the ordinal arithmetic operations. In practice, we get around this by notational conventions: we reserve $\kappa, \lambda, \mu, \nu$ and $\aleph_\alpha$ for cardinals, and arithmetic expressions involving these and $|X|$ refer to cardinal arithmetic, while expressions involving $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$ and $\omega_\alpha$ refer to ordinal arithmetic.[8]

In ZFC, cardinal addition and multiplication are very simple:

**Theorem 9.9.** *Let $\kappa$ be an infinite cardinal.*

*(i)* $\kappa \cdot \kappa = \kappa$

*(ii) If $\lambda$ is a cardinal $1 \leq \lambda \leq \kappa$, then $\kappa + \lambda = \kappa = \kappa \cdot \lambda$.*

*(iii) If $\lambda$ is an infinite cardinal, then $\kappa + \lambda = \max(\kappa, \lambda) = \kappa \cdot \lambda$.*

*Proof.* (i) By transfinite induction. Assume $\lambda \cdot \lambda = \lambda$ for all infinite cardinals $\lambda < \kappa$. Then

$$|\alpha| \cdot |\alpha| < \kappa \text{ for all } \alpha \in \kappa; \qquad (*)$$

for infinite $\alpha$, this follows directly from the assumption, and for finite $\alpha$, it holds because $|\alpha| \cdot |\alpha|$ is finite by Proposition 6.20(b).

Define an order $\lhd$ on $\kappa \times \kappa$ by

$$(\alpha, \beta) \lhd (\alpha', \beta') \Leftrightarrow (\alpha, \beta, \max(\alpha, \beta)) <_r (\alpha', \beta', \max(\alpha', \beta'))$$

where $<_r$ is reverse lexicographic order.

This is a well-order, so $(\kappa \times \kappa, \lhd)$ is isomorphic to an ordinal $\gamma$. Let $S$ be a proper initial segment, say $S = (\kappa \times \kappa)_{\lhd(\alpha,\beta)}$. Set $\delta := \max(\alpha, \beta)$. Then $S \subseteq \delta^+ \times \delta^+$, and $\delta^+ \in \kappa$ by Lemma 9.7, so by (*), $|S| \leq |\delta^+| \cdot |\delta^+| < \kappa$. Hence $\gamma \leq \kappa$, since otherwise $\gamma$ would have a proper initial segment $\gamma_{<\kappa}$ of cardinality $\kappa$.

So $\kappa \cdot \kappa \leq \kappa$. Conversely, $\kappa = \kappa \cdot 1 \leq \kappa \cdot \kappa$. So $\kappa \cdot \kappa = \kappa$.

[8] To add to the confusion, $\kappa^+$ is usually defined as the smallest cardinal greater than $\kappa$ (so $\aleph_{\alpha^+} = (\aleph_\alpha)^+$), which is not the ordinal successor unless $\kappa$ is finite.

(ii) By the monotonicity properties of Proposition 6.20(c) and (i),

$$\kappa \leq \kappa + \lambda \leq \kappa + \kappa = \kappa \cdot 2 \leq \kappa \cdot \kappa = \kappa$$
$$\kappa \leq \kappa \cdot \lambda \leq \kappa \cdot \kappa = \kappa$$

(iii) By (ii) and commutativity of cardinal addition and multiplication (Proposition 6.20(a)).

□

**Lemma 9.10.** *If $f : X \to Y$ is a surjection, then $|X| \geq |Y|$.*

*Proof.* Let $h$ be a choice function for $X$. Then $g(y) := h(\{x \in X : f(x) = y\})$ defines an injection $Y \to X$. So $|Y| \leq |X|$. □

**Theorem 9.11.** *A countable union of countable sets is countable.*

*More generally, if $\kappa$ is an infinite cardinal, and $X$ is a set such that $|X| \leq \kappa$ and $|a| \leq \kappa$ for all $a \in X$, then $|\bigcup X| \leq \kappa$.*

*Proof.* For every $a \in X$, there exists an injection $a \to \kappa$. By Choice, we can uniformly choose such injections: let $I_a$ be the set of injections $f : a \to \kappa$, let $h$ be a choice function on $\bigcup\{I_a : a \in X\}$, and let $f_a := h(I_a)$.

Let $g : X \to \kappa$ be an injection.

Then $Z := \{\langle g(a), f_a(x)\rangle : x \in a \in X\}$ is a subset of $\kappa \times \kappa$, so $|Z| \leq \kappa \cdot \kappa = \kappa$.

Finally, $\langle g(a), f_a(x)\rangle \mapsto x$ is a surjection $Z \to \bigcup X$, so by Lemma 9.10, $|\bigcup X| \leq |Z| \leq \kappa$. □

*Remark.* Choice was essential here: ZF does not prove that a countable union of countable sets is countable.

## 9.2 Cardinal exponentation and CH (off-syllabus)

In contrast, very little is determined by ZFC about cardinal exponentiation.

**Definition 9.12.**

- The **Continuum Hypothesis** (**CH**) is the assertion: $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_1$. In other words: every uncountable subset of $\mathbb{R}$ is in bijection with $\mathbb{R}$.
- The **Generalised Continuum Hypothesis** (**GCH**) is the assertion: $2^{\aleph_\alpha} = \aleph_{\alpha^+}$ for all ordinals $\alpha$.

**Fact 9.13.**

- *CH is independent of ZFC. That is, assuming ZFC is consistent, it proves neither CH nor ¬CH, so both ZFC+CH and ZFC+¬CH are consistent. The same goes for GCH. As with AC (Fact 8.11), consistency of ZFC+GCH is due to Kurt Gödel and is covered in Part C, and that of ZFC+¬CH (hence also ZFC+¬GCH) is due to Paul Cohen using forcing.*
- *Any counterexample $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ to CH has to be "complicated": it can not be Borel, nor the projection of a Borel set (an* analytic *set).*
- $2^{\aleph_0} \neq \aleph_\omega$. *More generally, $2^{\aleph_0}$ is not of the form $\bigcup_{i \in \omega} \alpha_i$ for any ordinals $\alpha_i < 2^{\aleph_0}$ (i.e. $2^{\aleph_0}$ does not have* countable cofinality*). This is all ZFC tells us about $2^{\aleph_0}$, in the sense that for any $\aleph_\alpha$ which is not of this form, it is consistent with ZFC that $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_\alpha$.*

*End of lecture 16*

# 10 Example: Infinite dimensional vector spaces

In this section, we illustrate the use of set theory in mathematics by developing some of the basic theory of linear algebra without assuming finite dimensionality. (This material is not on the syllabus, but the set theory techniques we use are.)

We use without proof the finite dimensional results (covered in Prelims).

Let $V$ be a vector space over a field $K$. This implies that $V$ and $K$ are sets, and the associated algebraic operations ($+, \cdot : K \times K \to K$, and $+ : V \times V \to V$, and scalar multiplication $\cdot : K \times V \to V$) are functions.

**Definition 10.1.** A subset $B \subseteq V$ is

- **linearly independent** if no non-trivial finite linear combination of elements of $B$ is 0, i.e. if for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in K$, and $b_1, \ldots, b_n \in V$,

$$a_1 \cdot b_1 + \ldots + a_n \cdot b_n = 0 \;\Rightarrow\; a_1 = \ldots = a_n = 0;$$

- **spanning** if $V = \langle B \rangle$ where

$$\langle B \rangle = \{a_1 \cdot b_1 + \ldots + a_n \cdot b_n : n \in \mathbb{N},\ a_1, \ldots, a_n \in K,\ b_1, \ldots, b_n \in V\}.$$

- a **basis** if $B$ is both linearly independent and spanning.

**Theorem 10.2.** *(i) A basis exists.*

*(ii) Any two bases have the same cardinality. This cardinality is called the* ***dimension*** *of $V$.*

*Proof.* (i) We apply Zorn's Lemma. Consider the set $\mathcal{I}$ of linearly independent subsets of $V$ as a partial order, ordered by inclusion, $\subseteq$. If $C \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ is a chain, then its union is also linearly independent, since any finitely many elements of $\bigcup C$ are already elements of some $I \in C$. So by Zorn's Lemma, there exists a maximal element $B \in \mathcal{I}$. We conclude by showing that $B$ is spanning. Suppose not, say $v \in V \setminus \langle B \rangle$. Then one verifies directly that $B \cup \{v\}$ is linearly independent, and $v \notin B$, contradicting maximality of $B$.

(ii) Let $B$ and $B'$ be bases. The case where $B$ or $B'$ is finite was done in Prelims. So suppose $B$ and $B'$ are infinite.

Let $\mathcal{P}^{<\omega}(B) := \{B_0 \subseteq B : |B_0| < \aleph_0\}$ be the set of finite subsets of $B$. Then $|\mathcal{P}^{<\omega}(B)| = |B|$, since $\mathcal{P}^{<\omega}(B) = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B^{(n)}$ where $B^{(n)} := \{B_0 \subseteq B : |B_0| = n\}$, and $B^n \to B^{(n)}; (b_1, \ldots, b_n) \mapsto \{b_1, \ldots, b_n\}$ is a surjection, so $|B^{(n)}| \leq |B^n| = |B|$ so $|\mathcal{P}^{<\omega}(B)| \leq |B|$ by Theorem 9.11.

If $B_0 \in \mathcal{P}^{<\omega}(B)$, then $\langle B_0 \rangle \cap B'$ is finite by the finite-dimensional case. But $V = \langle B \rangle = \bigcup\{\langle B_0 \rangle : B_0 \in \mathcal{P}^{<\omega}(B)\}$, so $B' = \bigcup\{\langle B_0 \rangle \cap B' : B_0 \in \mathcal{P}^{<\omega}(B)\}$ is a union of $|\mathcal{P}^{<\omega}(B)| = |B|$ finite sets, so by Theorem 9.11 again, $|B'| \leq |B|$.

By symmetry, $|B'| = |B|$.

□

# A References

[Copied directly from Jonathan Pila's notes, with a few amendments]

Text to expand and supplement these notes:


[1] D. Goldrei, *Classic set theory,* Chapman and Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, 1998.

Highly recommended general audience sources:

[2] S. Aaronson, The Busy Beaver Frontier, https://scottaaronson.blog/?p=4916

[3] S. Lavine, *Understanding the infinite,* Harvard, 1994.

[4] R. Rucker, *Infinity and the mind,* Princeton University Press, 1995.

[5] J. Stillwell, *Roads to Infinity*, CRC Press, AK Peters, 2010.

Other textbooks (more advanced) and notes:

[6] P. Aczel, *Non-well founded sets,* CSLI Lecture Notes, 14, Stanford, CA. On web.

[7] M. Hils and F. Loeser, *A First Journey through Logic*, AMS Student Mathematical Library volume 89, 2019.

[8] T. Jech, *Set theory,* Academic Press, 1978.

[9] R. Knight, b1 Set Theory Lecture Notes.

[10] K. Kunen, *Set theory,* North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1980.

[11] A. Levy, *Basic Set Theory,* Springer, Berlin, 1979; reprinted by Dover.

Original texts and interpretations:

[12] G. Cantor, *Contributions to the founding of the theory of transfinite numbers* (translated by P. Jourdain), Dover, 1955. p85.

[13] P. Cohen, *Set theory and the continuum hypothesis,* W. A. Benjamin, 1966.

[14] P. Cohen and R. Hersch, *Non-Cantorian set theory, Scientific American* **217** (1967), 104–116.

[15] R. Dedekind, *Essays on the theory of numbers,* Dover, 1963.

[16] K. Gödel, *The consistency of the axiom of choice and the generalized continuum hypothesis with the axioms of set theory,* Annals of Mathematics Studies 3, Princeton University Press, 1940.

[17] K. Gödel, What is Cantor's continuum problem? *American Mathematical Monthly,* **54** (1964), 515–525. Revised version in Benacerraf and Putnam, *Philosophy of mathematics: selected readings,* Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Modern perspectives, histories, and commentaries:

[18] S. Feferman, *In the Light of Logic,* OUP, Oxford, 1998.

[19] A. Fraenkel, Y. Bar Hillel, A. Levy, *Foundations of set theory,* North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1973.

[20] J. Ferreiros, On the relations between Georg Cantor and Richard Dedekind, *Historia Math.* **20** (1993), 343–363.

[21] M. Hallett, Cantorian set theory and limitation of size, Oxford Logic Guides **10**, OUP, 1984.

[22] J. Hamkins, Is the dream solution of the continuum hypothesis attainable? *Notre Dame J. Symbolic Logic* **56** (2015), 135–145.

[23] P. Maddy, *Defending the Axioms,* OUP, 2011.

[24] Y. Manin, George Cantor and his heritage, http://arxiv.org/abs/math/0209244 (just ignore the stuff about $P \neq NP$)

[25] C. McLarty, What does it take to prove Fermat's Last Theorem? Grothendieck and the logic of number theory, *Bull. Symbolic Logic* **16** (2010), 359–377.

[26] G. H. Moore, *Zermelo's axiom of choice,* Springer, 1982.

[27] U. Rehmann (Editor-in-Chief), *Encylopedia of Mathematics*, entry on "Antinomy", https://www.encyclopediaofmath.org/index.php/Antinomy

[28] S. Shelah, Logical dreams, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **40** (2003), 203–228.

[29] J. Stillwell, The continuum problem, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **109** (2002), 286–297.

[30] W. H. Woodin, Strong axioms of infinity and the search for $V$, *Proc. ICM Hyderabad* (2010). Available online at http://www.mathunion.org/ICM/ICM2010.1/ Also the corresponding lecture can be viewed online.

## A.1 Exam errata

Past exams obtained from some sources are "as given" while those obtained from the Mathematical Institute sometimes have errors (or obscurities) corrected. The latter are therefore recommended. The solutions which are available from the MI archive often contain mistakes or omissions, but are usually useful as at least a rough guide to a solution.

Here are a few errata from recentish exams:

**2017.2.b.ii.** The set $X$ should be assumed non-empty.

**2015.1.b.ii.** Remove 'strictly', or it's wrong!

**2015.2.b.ii.** Beware that 'contained' here means as a subset (not as an element).

**2015.3.c.ii.** Has a too easy (but correct) solution.

**2014.2.c.iii.** This is too hard and should not be attempted.