Discrete Structures

B10. Cantor's Theorem

Malte Helmert, Gabriele Röger

University of Basel

October 21, 2026

Reminder: Cardinality of the Power Set

Theorem

Let S be a finite set. Then $|\mathcal{P}(S)| = 2^{|S|}$.

Cantor's Theorem

Countable Sets

We already know:

- Sets with the same cardinality as $\mathbb{N}_0$ are called countably infinite.
- A countable set is finite or countably infinite.
- Every subset of a countable set is countable.
- The union of countably many countable sets is countable.

Countable Sets


We already know:

- Sets with the same cardinality as $\mathbb{N}_0$ are called countably infinite.
- A countable set is finite or countably infinite.
- Every subset of a countable set is countable.
- The union of countably many countable sets is countable.

Open questions (to be resolved now):

- Do all infinite sets have the same cardinality?
- Does the power set of an infinite set S have the same cardinality as S?


Georg Cantor



- German mathematician (1845–1918)
- Proved that the rational numbers are countable.
- Proved that the real numbers are not countable.
- Cantor's Theorem: For every set S it holds that $|S| < |\mathcal{P}(S)|$.

Our Plan

- Understand Cantor's theorem
- Understand an important theoretical implication for computer science



https://xkcd.com/1724/

Cantor's Diagonal Argument Illustrated on a Finite Set

$S = \{a, b, c\}$.

Consider an arbitrary function from S to $\mathcal{P}(S)$.
For example:

	a	b	c	
a	1	0	1	a mapped to $\{a, c\}$
b	1	1	0	b mapped to $\{a, b\}$
c	0	1	0	c mapped to $\{b\}$

Cantor's Diagonal Argument Illustrated on a Finite Set

$S = \{a, b, c\}$.

Consider an arbitrary function from S to $\mathcal{P}(S)$.
For example:

	a	b	c	
a	1	0	1	a mapped to $\{a, c\}$
b	1	1	0	b mapped to $\{a, b\}$
c	0	1	0	c mapped to $\{b\}$

We can identify an "unused" element of $\mathcal{P}(S)$.

Cantor's Diagonal Argument Illustrated on a Finite Set

$S = \{a, b, c\}$.

Consider an arbitrary function from S to $\mathcal{P}(S)$.
For example:

	a	b	c	
a	1	0	1	a mapped to $\{a, c\}$
b	1	1	0	b mapped to $\{a, b\}$
c	0	1	0	c mapped to $\{b\}$
	0	0	1	nothing was mapped to $\{c\}$.

We can identify an "unused" element of $\mathcal{P}(S)$.
Complement the entries on the main diagonal.

Cantor's Diagonal Argument Illustrated on a Finite Set

$S = \{a, b, c\}$.

Consider an arbitrary function from S to $\mathcal{P}(S)$.
For example:

	a	b	c	
a	1	0	1	a mapped to $\{a, c\}$
b	1	1	0	b mapped to $\{a, b\}$
c	0	1	0	c mapped to $\{b\}$
	0	0	1	nothing was mapped to $\{c\}$.

We can identify an "unused" element of $\mathcal{P}(S)$.
Complement the entries on the main diagonal.

Works with every function from S to $\mathcal{P}(S)$.
$\rightarrow$ There cannot be a surjective function from S to $\mathcal{P}(S)$.
$\rightarrow$ There cannot be a bijection from S to $\mathcal{P}(S)$.

Cantor's Diagonal Argument on a Countably Infinite Set

$S = \mathbb{N}_0$.

Consider an arbitrary function from $\mathbb{N}_0$ to $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0)$.
For example:

	0	1	2	3	4	...
0	1	0	1	0	1	...
1	1	1	0	1	0	...
2	0	1	0	1	0	...
3	1	1	0	0	0	...
4	1	1	0	1	1	...
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋱

Cantor's Diagonal Argument on a Countably Infinite Set

$S = \mathbb{N}_0$.

Consider an arbitrary function from $\mathbb{N}_0$ to $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0)$.
For example:

	0	1	2	3	4	...
0	1	0	1	0	1	...
1	1	1	0	1	0	...
2	0	1	0	1	0	...
3	1	1	0	0	0	...
4	1	1	0	1	1	...
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋱
	0	0	1	1	0	...

Complementing the entries on the main diagonal again results in an "unused" element of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0)$.

Cantor's Theorem

Theorem (Cantor's Theorem)

For every set S it holds that $|S| < |\mathcal{P}(S)|$.

Cantor's Theorem

Theorem (Cantor's Theorem)

For every set S it holds that $|S| < |\mathcal{P}(S)|$.

Proof.

Consider an arbitrary set S. We need to show that

1. There is an injective function from S to $\mathcal{P}(S)$.
2. There is no bijection from S to $\mathcal{P}(S)$.

...

Cantor's Theorem

Theorem (Cantor's Theorem)

For every set S it holds that $|S| < |\mathcal{P}(S)|$.

Proof.

Consider an arbitrary set S. We need to show that

1. There is an injective function from S to $\mathcal{P}(S)$.
2. There is no bijection from S to $\mathcal{P}(S)$.

For 1, consider function $f : S \to \mathcal{P}(S)$ with $f(x) = \{x\}$.
It maps distinct elements of S to distinct elements of $\mathcal{P}(S)$. ...

Cantor's Theorem

Proof (continued).

We show 2 by contradiction.

Assume there is a bijection f from S to $\mathcal{P}(S)$.

Cantor's Theorem

Proof (continued).

We show 2 by contradiction.

Assume there is a bijection f from S to $\mathcal{P}(S)$.

Consider $M = \{x \mid x \in S, x \notin f(x)\}$ and note that $M \in \mathcal{P}(S)$.

Cantor's Theorem

Proof (continued).

We show 2 by contradiction.
Assume there is a bijection f from S to $\mathcal{P}(S)$.

Consider $M = \{x \mid x \in S, x \notin f(x)\}$ and note that $M \in \mathcal{P}(S)$.

Since f is bijective, it is surjective and there is an $y \in S$ with $f(y) = M$. Consider this y in a case distinction:

Cantor's Theorem

Proof (continued).

We show 2 by contradiction.
Assume there is a bijection f from S to $\mathcal{P}(S)$.

Consider $M = \{x \mid x \in S, x \notin f(x)\}$ and note that $M \in \mathcal{P}(S)$.

Since f is bijective, it is surjective and there is an $y \in S$ with $f(y) = M$. Consider this y in a case distinction:

If $y \in M$ then $y \notin f(y)$ by the definition of M. Since $f(y) = M$ this implies $y \notin M$. $\rightsquigarrow$ contradiction

Cantor's Theorem

Proof (continued).

We show 2 by contradiction.
Assume there is a bijection f from S to $\mathcal{P}(S)$.

Consider $M = \{x \mid x \in S, x \notin f(x)\}$ and note that $M \in \mathcal{P}(S)$.

Since f is bijective, it is surjective and there is an $y \in S$ with $f(y) = M$. Consider this y in a case distinction:

If $y \in M$ then $y \notin f(y)$ by the definition of M. Since $f(y) = M$ this implies $y \notin M$. $\rightsquigarrow$ contradiction

If $y \notin M$, we conclude from $f(y) = M$ that $y \notin f(y)$. Using the definition of M we get that $y \in M$. $\rightsquigarrow$ contradiction

Cantor's Theorem

Proof (continued).

We show 2 by contradiction.
Assume there is a bijection f from S to $\mathcal{P}(S)$.

Consider $M = \{x \mid x \in S, x \notin f(x)\}$ and note that $M \in \mathcal{P}(S)$.

Since f is bijective, it is surjective and there is an $y \in S$ with $f(y) = M$. Consider this y in a case distinction:

If $y \in M$ then $y \notin f(y)$ by the definition of M. Since $f(y) = M$ this implies $y \notin M$. $\rightsquigarrow$ contradiction

If $y \notin M$, we conclude from $f(y) = M$ that $y \notin f(y)$. Using the definition of M we get that $y \in M$. $\rightsquigarrow$ contradiction

Since all cases lead to a contradiction, there is no such y and thus f is not surjective and consequently not a bijection.

Cantor's Theorem

Proof (continued).

We show 2 by contradiction.
Assume there is a bijection f from S to $\mathcal{P}(S)$.

Consider $M = \{x \mid x \in S, x \notin f(x)\}$ and note that $M \in \mathcal{P}(S)$.

Since f is bijective, it is surjective and there is an $y \in S$ with $f(y) = M$. Consider this y in a case distinction:

If $y \in M$ then $y \notin f(y)$ by the definition of M. Since $f(y) = M$ this implies $y \notin M$. $\rightsquigarrow$ contradiction

If $y \notin M$, we conclude from $f(y) = M$ that $y \notin f(y)$. Using the definition of M we get that $y \in M$. $\rightsquigarrow$ contradiction

Since all cases lead to a contradiction, there is no such y and thus f is not surjective and consequently not a bijection.

The assumption was false and we conclude that there is no bijection from S to $\mathcal{P}(S)$. □

Consequences of Cantor's Theorem


Infinite Sets can Have Different Cardinalities

There are infinitely many different cardinalities of infinite sets:

- $|\mathbb{N}_0| < |\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0)| < |\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0))| < \dots$
- $|\mathbb{N}_0| = \aleph_0 = \beth_0$
- $|\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0)| = \beth_1 (= |\mathbb{R}|)$
- $|\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0))| = \beth_2$
- $\dots$

Existence of Unsolvable Problems

There are more problems in computer science than there are programs to solve them.




THE SAME BASIC IDEA UNDERLIES GÖDEL'S INCOMPLETENESS THEOREM AND ALL BAD DATA SCIENCE.

https://xkcd.com/1724/

Existence of Unsolvable Problems

There are more problems in computer science than there are programs to solve them.

There are problems that cannot be solved by a computer program!



THE SAME BASIC IDEA UNDERLIES GÖDEL'S INCOMPLETENESS THEOREM AND ALL BAD DATA SCIENCE.


https://xkcd.com/1724/

Existence of Unsolvable Problems

There are more problems in computer science than there are programs to solve them.

There are problems that cannot be solved by a computer program!

Why can we say so?



THE SAME BASIC IDEA UNDERLIES GÖDEL'S INCOMPLETENESS THEOREM AND ALL BAD DATA SCIENCE.

https://xkcd.com/1724/

Decision Problems

"Intuitive Definition:" Decision Problem

A decision problem is a Yes-No question of the form
"Does the given input have a certain property?"

- "Does the given binary tree have more than three leaves?"
- "Is the given integer odd?"
- "Given a train schedule, is there a connection from Basel to Belinzona that takes at most 2.5 hours?"

Decision Problems

"Intuitive Definition:" Decision Problem

A decision problem is a Yes-No question of the form
"Does the given input have a certain property?"

- "Does the given binary tree have more than three leaves?"
- "Is the given integer odd?"
- "Given a train schedule, is there a connection from Basel to Belinzona that takes at most 2.5 hours?"

- Input can be encoded as some finite string.
- Problem can also be represented as the (possibly infinite) set of all input strings where the answer is "yes".

Decision Problems

"Intuitive Definition:" Decision Problem

A decision problem is a Yes-No question of the form
"Does the given input have a certain property?"

- "Does the given binary tree have more than three leaves?"
- "Is the given integer odd?"
- "Given a train schedule, is there a connection from Basel to Belinzona that takes at most 2.5 hours?"

- Input can be encoded as some finite string.
- Problem can also be represented as the (possibly infinite) set of all input strings where the answer is "yes".
- A computer program solves a decision problem if it terminates on every input and returns the correct answer.

More Problems than Programs I

- A computer program is given by a finite string.
- A decision problem corresponds to a set of strings.

More Problems than Programs II

- Consider an arbitrary finite set of symbols (an alphabet) Σ.
- You can think of $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$
  as internally computers operate on binary representation.

More Problems than Programs II

- Consider an arbitrary finite set of symbols (an alphabet) Σ.
- You can think of $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$
  as internally computers operate on binary representation.
- Let S be the set of all finite strings made from symbols in Σ.

More Problems than Programs II

- Consider an arbitrary finite set of symbols (an alphabet) Σ.
- You can think of $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$
  as internally computers operate on binary representation.
- Let S be the set of all finite strings made from symbols in Σ.
- There are at most $|S|$ computer programs with this alphabet.
- There are at least $|\mathcal{P}(S)|$ problems with this alphabet.
  - every subset of S corresponds to a separate decision problem

More Problems than Programs II

- Consider an arbitrary finite set of symbols (an alphabet) Σ.
- You can think of $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$
  as internally computers operate on binary representation.
- Let S be the set of all finite strings made from symbols in Σ.
- There are at most $|S|$ computer programs with this alphabet.
- There are at least $|\mathcal{P}(S)|$ problems with this alphabet.
  - every subset of S corresponds to a separate decision problem
- By Cantor's theorem $|S| < |\mathcal{P}(S)|$,
  so there are more problems than programs.

Sets: Summary

Summary

- Cantor's theorem: For all sets S it holds that $|S| < |\mathcal{P}(S)|$.
- There are problems that cannot be solved by a computer program.

Outlook: Finite Sets and Computer Science

Enumerating all Subsets

Determine a one-to-one mapping between numbers $0, \ldots, 2^{|S|} - 1$ and all subsets of finite set S:

- Consider the binary representation of numbers $0, \ldots, 2^{|S|} - 1$.
- Associate every bit with a different element of S.
- Every number is mapped to the set that contains exactly the elements associated with the 1-bits.

$S = \{a, b, c\}$

decimal	binary abc	set
0	000	$\{\}$
1	001	$\{c\}$
2	010	$\{b\}$
3	011	$\{b, c\}$
4	100	$\{a\}$
5	101	$\{a, c\}$
6	110	$\{a, b\}$
7	111	$\{a, b, c\}$

Computer Representation as Bit String

Same representation as in enumeration of all subsets:

- Required: Fixed universe U of possible elements
- Represent sets as bitstrings of length $|U|$
- Associate every bit with one object from the universe
- Each bit is 1 iff the corresponding object is in the set

Computer Representation as Bit String

Same representation as in enumeration of all subsets:

- Required: Fixed universe U of possible elements
- Represent sets as bitstrings of length $|U|$
- Associate every bit with one object from the universe
- Each bit is 1 iff the corresponding object is in the set

Example:

- $U = \{o_0, \ldots, o_9\}$
- Associate the i-th bit (0-indexed, from left to right) with o_i
- $\{o_2, o_4, o_5, o_9\}$ is represented as:
  0010110001

Computer Representation as Bit String

Same representation as in enumeration of all subsets:


- Required: Fixed universe U of possible elements
- Represent sets as bitstrings of length $|U|$
- Associate every bit with one object from the universe
- Each bit is 1 iff the corresponding object is in the set

Example:

- $U = \{o_0, \ldots, o_9\}$
- Associate the i-th bit (0-indexed, from left to right) with o_i
- $\{o_2, o_4, o_5, o_9\}$ is represented as:
  0010110001

How can the set operations be implemented?

Questions



Questions?