

Intuitive Explanations of Infinite Numbers for Non-Specialists

STEVEN R. CRANMER¹

¹*Department of Astrophysical and Planetary Sciences, Laboratory for Atmospheric and Space Physics, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO, USA*

ABSTRACT

The mathematical study of infinity seems to have the ability to transport the mind to lofty and unusual realms. Decades ago, I was transported in this way by Rudy Rucker’s book *Infinity and the Mind*. Despite much subsequent learning and teaching of mathematics in the service of physics and astronomy, there remained quite a few aspects of the “higher infinities” that I was still far from comprehending. Thus, I wanted to dive back in to understand those ideas and to find good ways to explain them to other non-specialists. These notes are an attempt to do this. They begin by discussing huge (but still describable) finite numbers, then they proceed to the concepts of fixed points, Cantor’s countably infinite ordinals, transfinite cardinals and the continuum hypothesis, and then to more recent attempts to define still-larger infinities called large cardinals. I should warn the reader that the author is an astrophysicist, so these pedagogic explanations may not be satisfying (or anywhere nearly sufficiently rigorous) to a mathematician. Still, I hope these explanations provide some intuitive insights about concepts that are too large to fit in the physical universe.

1. INTRODUCTION

These notes are an attempt to describe an allegedly “useless” field of pure mathematics. My own experience, via research and teaching, has been much more pragmatic, with a strong emphasis on the “unreasonable effectiveness of mathematics” (Wigner 1960) as applied to the physical world. Why, then, focus on the mathematical study of infinity? Its odd reputation precedes us by more than a century. In response to Georg Cantor’s development of infinite set theory in the 19th century, fellow mathematician Leopold Kronecker called those ideas “mathematical nonsense,” and in turn called Cantor a “scientific charlatan” and a “corruptor of youth.” Henri Poincaré called these theories “a grave disease infecting the body of mathematics.”

Extreme skepticism about the validity and usefulness of infinite mathematics continues to the present (e.g., [Zenkin 2004](#); [Mückenheim 2023](#)).

On the other hand, David Hilbert lauded this field of study as “one of the supreme achievements of purely intellectual human activity,” and also remained steadfast by saying that “no one shall be able to expel us from the paradise that Cantor has created for us” ([Hilbert 1926](#)). Building on the mystical poetry of William Blake, [Jogalekar \(2013\)](#) asserted that “It is through mathematics that we can hold not one but an infinity of infinities in the palm of our hand, for all of eternity.” There is beauty and wonder here, and these notes are an attempt to convey that beauty and wonder to others.¹

It should be noted that the process of developing rules and theorems about infinity does seem to have been useful to obtaining results in other fields of mathematics (e.g., [Dehornoy 1995](#); [Pechenik 2010](#)) and computing ([Daras & Rassias 2018](#)), and it has helped improve our understanding of some aspects of physics ([Augenstein 1984](#); [Narayana Swamy 1999](#); [Thiemann & Winkler 2001](#); [El Naschie 2002](#)). However, this usefulness sidesteps the question about whether or not the actual infinities of mathematics “actually” exist in our own physical universe. Many books on infinity often spend some time talking about cosmology, which we may define as the study of the *utter vastness* of our universe in both space and time. Despite my admiration for Giordano Bruno, I really have no idea if there are any modern theories of cosmology that require the universe to have a truly infinite extent in either space or time (see, perhaps, [Heller & Woodin 2011](#)). These notes are not about that.

I should probably mention a few other things that these notes do not cover. I will assume that the standard use of infinity (as a limit) in calculus and mathematical physics is reasonably well-covered by others. Thus, we won’t need to explore any deep mysteriousness in expressions such as

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dx e^{-x^2} = \sqrt{\pi} \quad \text{or} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(1 + \frac{x}{n}\right)^n = e^x, \quad (1)$$

despite their immense usefulness. Also, before anyone brings it up, I think I will refuse to wade into the clickbait that is

$$1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + \dots = \zeta(-1) = -\frac{1}{12}. \quad (2)$$

If the above is new and meaningless to you, consider yourself lucky. However, if you do want to learn more about this bit of mathematical skullduggery, see [Hardy \(1949\)](#) or [wikipedia](#).

What do we actually cover? Section 2 gets us started by contemplating huge, but still finite numbers. Section 3 dips a toe into the infinite waters by exploring what happens to some finite numbers when they are exponentiated an infinite number of

¹ I have no idea whether the process of reading about and understanding these concepts could assist the reader in approaching a mystical or transcendent state, as [Rucker \(1982\)](#) suggested, but I hope that may be possible. Thus, an alternate title for these notes could be “Grokking the Infinite.”

times. Section 4 then makes the leap to the first type of “countable infinity” and shows how we can keep counting past that point. Section 5 introduces the continuum of real numbers, and eases us into the idea that the size of the set of all real numbers is really and truly *bigger* than the set of all integers. Section 6 then wades deeper into the pool of uncountable infinities, and Section 7 pauses to take stock of where we stand after introducing such strange concepts. Section 8 then barrels forth to introduce even larger infinities that are far more “inaccessible” than the infinities that came before. Section 9 continues climbing the ladder and explains how these levels can be understood on the basis of how complex are the languages used to describe them. Section 10 makes a few final stops before we run out of oxygen, and Section 11 concludes with some philosophical musings.

2. VERY BIG FINITE NUMBERS

I can start with my own first exposure to the “gates” of infinity: huge, but still finite, numbers. I don’t remember how old I was when I learned that the pattern in the names of million (10^6), billion (10^9), trillion (10^{12}), quadrillion (10^{15}), and so on, could be generalized with Latin prefixes as

$$n\text{-illion} \longleftrightarrow 10^{3n+3} .$$

In the 1970s and 1980s, annual editions of the *Guinness Book of World Records* had a section on huge numbers that revealed that the n -illion names could be extended at least up to $n = 100$ (centillion). Conway & Guy (1996) described a system that extends them up to $n = 1000$ and beyond. *Guinness* also introduced me to Edward Kasner’s googol (10^{100} , or 10 duo-trigintillion) and googolplex (10^{googol}), the Buddhist *asankhyeya* (10^{140} , or 100 quinto-quadragesimillion, in some translations), as well as more esoteric quantities such as Skewes’s number and Graham’s number (see below).

Later, I learned about other ways to reach huge numbers by means of repeated mathematical operations. We know that multiplication is repeated addition,

$$x \cdot y = \underbrace{x + x + x + \dots + x}_{y \text{ times}} \quad (3)$$

and that exponentiation is repeated multiplication,

$$x^y = \underbrace{x \cdot x \cdot x \cdot \dots \cdot x}_{y \text{ times}} . \quad (4)$$

However, what happens when we extend this concept? The next step would be repeated exponentiation,

$${}^y x = x^{x^{x^{\dots^x}}} \quad (y \text{ times}) \quad (5)$$

or, in a more computer-friendly notation,

$${}^y x = \underbrace{x ** (x ** (x ** (\dots (x ** (x ** x))))))}_{y \text{ times}} , \quad (6)$$

where the double-asterisk notation for exponentiation is used by both Python and Fortran, and the ordering of the parentheses is important.

Although this type of repeated exponentiation was first discussed by the Marquis de Condorcet in the 1770s, it was [Maurer \(1901\)](#) who devised the ${}^y x$ notation given above, and [Goodstein \(1947\)](#) who called this operation by its (now most well-known) name of *tetration*, the fourth operation in the series starting with addition. On a personal note, learning about tetration led me to Lambert’s W function ([Corless et al. 1996](#)), which allowed me to solve some interesting problems in solar physics (see, e.g., [Cranmer 2004](#)).

[Knuth \(1976\)](#) created an “up-arrow notation” by expressing exponentiation as $x \uparrow y$ and tetration as $x \uparrow\uparrow y$. Thus, taking a number x and tetrating it with itself y times would be called “pentation” ($x \uparrow\uparrow\uparrow y$). Repeatedly iterated pentation would be “hexation” ($x \uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow y$), repeatedly iterated hexation would be “septation” ($x \uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow y$), and so on.

There are many ways to further generalize the up-arrow notation (i.e., Ackermann functions, Conway’s chained-arrow notation, Goodstein’s hyperoperator notation, and so on), but the simplest appears to be just $a[n]b$, where n denotes the order-number of the operation type: $n = 1$ is addition ($a + b$), $n = 2$ is multiplication ($a \cdot b$), $n = 3$ is exponentiation ($a \uparrow b$), $n = 4$ is tetration, and so on. Note that for $n \geq 3$, $a[n]b$ is equal to a , followed by $n - 2$ up-arrows, followed by b . To illustrate how fast things grow when increasing n , we can give an example:

$$\begin{aligned} 4 + 4 &= 4[1]4 = 8 \\ 4 \cdot 4 &= 4[2]4 = 16 \\ 4 \uparrow 4 &= 4[3]4 = 256 \\ 4 \uparrow\uparrow 4 &= 4[4]4 = \text{a number with about } 10^{154} \text{ digits} \\ 4 \uparrow\uparrow\uparrow 4 &= 4[5]4 = \text{a number too large to be written with any usual notation.} \end{aligned}$$

To explore ever-bigger numbers, we need to shift from describing specific mathematical operations to *algorithms* that describe iterated operations. A famous example is Graham’s number, which was devised to prove a theorem in combinatoric number theory (see, e.g., [Gardner 1977](#)). Graham’s number is defined as g_{64} , using a notation defined as

$$g_n = \begin{cases} 3[6]3, & \text{for } n = 1, \\ 3[g_{n-1} + 2]3, & \text{for } n \geq 2. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Thus, g_1 (which is defined as $3 \uparrow\uparrow\uparrow 3$) is essentially indescribable using ordinary numbers, and g_2 (which is writable as 3, followed by $3 \uparrow\uparrow\uparrow 3$ up-arrows, followed by 3) is even more so. Going all the way to g_{64} seems somewhat inconceivable, but the algorithm is straightforwardly defined.

Feel free to take a breath or two at this point. These concepts can be somewhat dizzying. However, we *can* go further. Note that our definition of the algorithm that generates g_{64} was short enough to fit into a single paragraph.

Rayo (2019) described a competition in which the participants tried to outdo one another in finding compact ways of describing the largest possible numbers. The winner, which is now called *Rayo’s number*, is essentially just a description of the *size* of the algorithm needed to describe the number; i.e.,

Rayo’s number is the smallest number that is larger than any finite number that can be named in the language of first-order set theory, using a googol symbols or less.

Putting aside the exact meaning of a first-order theory (see, e.g., Smith 2022)—and what one is allowed to say using the symbols of that language—we would like to know how we might continue making even bigger numbers. Let us define the Rayo number as part of an iterated sequence. We can then call a googol the “zeroth” Rayo number (i.e., $\mathcal{R}(0) = 10^{100}$). Thus, if we make the following definition below, Rayo’s number itself is $\mathcal{R}(1)$. The definition is:

For $n \geq 1$, we define $\mathcal{R}(n)$ as the smallest number that is larger than any finite number that can be named in the language of first-order set theory, using $\mathcal{R}(n - 1)$ symbols or less.

We now have an iterative algorithm that describes iterative algorithms. $\mathcal{R}(2)$ must exceed any finite number describable in a number of symbols given by Rayo’s original number, and it is difficult to fathom how much bigger $\mathcal{R}(2)$ is, in comparison to $\mathcal{R}(1)$. What, then, about $\mathcal{R}(3)$, or $\mathcal{R}(100)$, or even $\mathcal{R}(\text{googol})$?

Then, of course, we could discuss $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{R}(1))$. This is kind of a meta-Rayo’s number. Once we have realized that doing this is possible, we can define $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{R}(1)))$, and then $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{R}(1))))$, and so on. If this is the road we’re going down, it would be convenient to define a new function $\mathcal{Q}(n, m)$, where n is the number of times that $\mathcal{R}()$ operates on an original instance of $\mathcal{R}(m)$. The three examples at the start of this paragraph would then be writable more compactly as $\mathcal{Q}(1, 1)$, $\mathcal{Q}(2, 1)$, and $\mathcal{Q}(3, 1)$, respectively.

Well then, what’s stopping us from considering numbers like

$$\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{Q}(\text{googol}, \text{googol}), \mathcal{Q}(\text{googol}, \text{googol})) ?$$

Despite how much it breaks one’s brain to think about it, the number described by the above expression *is still finite*.

Rayo (2019) discussed other possible generalizations (i.e., replacing “first-order set theory” by hypothetical higher-order theories) and concluded by musing that “Our quest to find larger and larger numbers has now morphed into a quest to find more and more powerful languages!”

Another lesson that can be learned at this point is that, sometimes, one needs to break out of a pattern rather than just continuing it in the usual way. In other words, we are about to see many examples of “thinking outside the box,” “cutting the Gordian knot,” or even “defeating the Kobayashi Maru.”

3. SEMI-INFINITY: A BRIEF REST STOP

Before we move on to the “real deal,” there is another useful concept to examine that is both somewhat finite and somewhat infinite. Consider the *infinite power tower* of exponentiation, which can be expressed as a function y of a positive real number x :

$$y(x) = x^{x^{x^{x^{\dots}}}} = x \uparrow\uparrow \infty , \quad (8)$$

where this is probably the only time that we’ll seriously use the symbol ∞ . Here, we will consider an infinite number of exponentiations, but we will assume only finite values for x . Much more information about this function has been given by, e.g., [Knoebel \(1981\)](#), [Moroni \(2019\)](#), and [Galidakis \(2020\)](#). There are some values of x for which $y(x)$ converges to a constant and finite value, some values of x for which $y(x)$ diverges to infinity, and some values of x for which $y(x)$ keeps oscillating forever between two different solutions.

Another way to think about this is as an algorithm that requires an infinite number of iterations:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} y_1 = x \\ y_2 = x^x \\ y_3 = x^{x^x} \end{array} \right\} \text{ and, in general, } y_{n+1} = x^{y_n} , \text{ so that } y(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n . \quad (9)$$

However, if we are examining a case in which $y(x)$ converges to a finite value, then it means we ultimately reach a *fixed point* in the iteration cycle: i.e., the ratio y_{n+1}/y_n eventually approaches 1. Thus, there exists a self-consistent solution to the equation

$$y = x^y . \quad (10)$$

Notice that the y on the right-hand side of Equation (10) is already equal to an infinite chain of $x^{x^{\dots}}$, so adding one more factor of “ x to the...” onto the stack essentially changes nothing. Thus, the whole thing remains equal to y itself. We will see many more examples of fixed-point relations, so it is important to dig a little deeper into how they work.

We can start by noting that the range of x values for which $y(x)$ converges to a finite value is given by

$$e^{-e} < x < e^{1/e} , \quad \text{i.e., } 0.065988 < x < 1.44467 .$$

Thus if we choose a value within this range, we can see what happens when we apply—and then repeat—the power-tower operation:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{For } x = 1.2 , y = x^{x^{\dots}} = 1.257734\dots \\ \text{For } y = 1.257734\dots , z = y^{y^{\dots}} = 1.368696\dots \\ \text{For } z = 1.368696\dots , t = z^{z^{\dots}} = 1.710757\dots \end{array} \quad (11)$$




Figure 1. (a) Example iterations y_n from three different initial values of x . (b) Multi-valued fixed-point solution $y(x)$, with the stable solutions shown as solid black line, unstable solutions as dotted lines, and the three examples from panel (a) shown with colored points.

Figure 1(a) shows how these three examples converge to their respective fixed-point solutions after a handful of iterations.

It may seem strange that the three example numbers (y , z , and t) are not equal to one another. After all, if z is an infinite tower of y 's, and y is an infinite tower of x 's, shouldn't z also be given by the same infinite tower of x 's, as well? The answer to that is no, due to the fact that exponentiation is not associative. In other words,

$$y \text{ is } x ** (x ** (x ** (x ** (x ** (x ** (x ** (x ** (x ** \dots))))))))$$

but

$$z \text{ is } (x ** (x ** (x ** \dots))) ** \left\{ (x ** (x ** (x ** \dots))) ** \left[(x ** (x ** (x ** \dots))) ** \dots \right] \right\}$$

so $z \neq y$.

There is one additional thing to note about our first example of $x = 1.2$. There is another value of y that satisfies the fixed-point condition of Equation (10). Try plugging in both $x = 1.2$ and $y = 14.767453$ for yourself, and you can show that $y = x^y$. One can find this value by taking the fixed-point relation and inverting it to solve for $x = y^{1/y}$. Figure 1(b) shows the result, and this “hidden” solution is illustrated with a white circle symbol. Note that this new value of y is most definitely *not* a solution to the original power-tower condition of Equation (8). Moroni (2019) explores many more interesting implications of these multiple solutions, including their relationships to stability and instability in dynamical systems.

We went through these examples to demonstrate two general facts about fixed-point relations that will be useful to recall later:

- If we have a fixed-point condition, we can generate multiple examples of solutions by taking the output of a previous solution as the input to the next.

- Sometimes a fixed-point condition “takes on a life of its own” and exhibits solutions that never would have been apparent from the original infinitely-iterated condition that gave rise to it.

4. COUNTABLE INFINITIES

Now we need to back up a bit and think about numbers in slightly different ways. It’s helpful to think about numbers—and groups of numbers—as *sets*. We start with the set of all “counting numbers,” which we can define as zero and all of the positive integers. These will also be called the “natural numbers,” but that is imprecise because some mathematicians exclude zero from that definition. The set containing all of the natural numbers is often called \mathbb{N} , and [von Neumann \(1923\)](#) devised a particularly elegant way of representing each member of \mathbb{N} as sets unto themselves:

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 &= \{ \} && = \emptyset \\
 1 &= \{0\} && = \{\emptyset\} \\
 2 &= \{0, 1\} && = \{\emptyset, \{\emptyset\}\} \\
 3 &= \{0, 1, 2\} && = \{\emptyset, \{\emptyset\}, \{\emptyset, \{\emptyset\}\}\} \\
 4 &= \{0, 1, 2, 3\} && = \{\emptyset, \{\emptyset\}, \{\emptyset, \{\emptyset\}\}, \{\emptyset, \{\emptyset\}, \{\emptyset, \{\emptyset\}\}\}\}
 \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

and so on, where \emptyset is the traditional symbol for the empty set. The set for natural number n contains n members, and these members correspond to the natural numbers from 0 to $n - 1$. Interestingly, this whole edifice is built upon rearrangements of rearrangements of the empty set! This kind of number theory has spurred physicists to think about our actual universe as being constructed from nothing but “bits” of pure information (see, e.g., [Wheeler 1990](#); [Wilczek 1999](#)).

4.1. Taking the Limit

Let us ask the question: What happens when we just start counting, and never stop? Essentially, we start with zero, and then we repeatedly implement operations of the command “add one.” We repeat, and repeat, and repeat, and *then* we slyly say that we are skipping to the end (i.e., taking the limit):

$$0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, \dots, \omega . \tag{13}$$

[Cantor \(1883\)](#) chose the symbol ω for the “end” of this sequence, i.e., the number that follows all of the other finite numbers. It is also called the first infinite *ordinal* number, where we expand on the familiar idea of ordinal numbers as those that tell us where numbers fall in an ordered sequence (i.e., first, second, third, and so on).

Using the language of set theory, a compact way of defining this first infinite ordinal is

$$\omega = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} n , \tag{14}$$




Figure 2. Three infinite ordinals illustrated as telephone poles receding toward the horizon.

where the symbol \in means “is a member of.” In other words, ω is the union (i.e., the full collection of all members) of the sets corresponding to each of the finite ordinals n that make up the set of *all* natural numbers \mathbb{N} .

Does ω really exist? It does not have a known numerical value—which is a feature that one might have assumed to be a key prerequisite for “being a number.” In a way, thinking about ω must involve a cognitive process like chunking (Gobet et al. 2001) or some degree of holistic or Gestalt thinking (Smith 1988). The human mind naturally assembles together related items into groups or categories. When we want to understand something, we often benefit from perceiving it as a unitary whole, in addition to understanding that it consists of smaller parts. Thus, people have developed analogies for visualizing an infinite number of steps in ways that do not require us to think about the truly infinite sequence of numbers that defines it. For example,

- Rucker (1982) discussed the analogy of “speed-ups,” in which we are taking steps that get progressively smaller. If the n^{th} step is of length $1/2^n$, then the total distance traveled is finite, since

$$1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{16} + \frac{1}{32} + \dots = 2 . \quad (15)$$

- Alternately, Conway & Guy (1996) and Sheppard (2014) visualized these steps as if one were standing on a long, straight road that has a row of telephone poles alongside it (see Figure 2(a)). As one looks off into the distance, the poles recede toward the horizon, and the entire collection can be perceived essentially as a finite thing.
- Thomson (1954) coined the phrase “supertasks” for infinitely iterated steps that may or may not be possible to compress into a finite amount of time or space. Philosophers of science and mathematics have associated supertasks with Zeno’s paradox and other thought experiments that appear to allow for mutually contradictory conclusions (see also Clark 2012).

There is another basic property, which all natural numbers have, but ω doesn’t have: ω has no immediate predecessor. All finite natural numbers can be called *successor ordinals* because each number n is the immediate successor of some other

known number $n - 1$. If we try to identify some natural number, which is both less than ω and is its immediate predecessor, we fail. For whatever natural number n we identify, it has an immediate successor $n + 1$ which is not equal to ω . Thus, ω must be an example of a completely new type of ordinal that is not a successor ordinal. We now introduce a new category called *limit ordinals* to describe ω . All ordinal numbers—finite or infinite—are either successor ordinals or limit ordinals. (Strictly speaking, zero is in a class all by itself.)

Where do we go from here? Our impulse is always to keep counting. One answer to the question “what’s bigger than infinity?” is obviously “infinity plus one!” Despite that being a facetious answer, we can consider continuing the original series of natural numbers with

$$0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, \dots, \omega, \omega + 1, \omega + 2, \omega + 3, \omega + 4, \omega + 5, \dots \quad (16)$$

Doing something like this may seem far more esoteric than merely postulating the existence of ω . However, this continuation into additional “transfinite” numbers does make sense, and we will discuss how to visualize and think about them.

One thing we can note is that $\omega + 1$ (and indeed any $\omega + n$, for finite n) may be infinite, but it *does* have an immediate predecessor. Thus, now we have an example of an infinite successor ordinal. Not all infinite numbers are limit ordinals.

At this point, many books divert into something a bit more esoteric, which I don’t think helps us that much. This is the point that “adding” transfinite numbers is no longer commutative,

$$\text{i.e., } 1 + \omega \neq \omega + 1 . \quad (17)$$

Yes, in one sense, it’s true. $1 + \omega$ starts with an extra finite step, but ends in the same limiting place as just plain ω . On the other hand, $\omega + 1$ goes to that limit, and then takes one *more* step. These are ordinal numbers, and for them, ordering matters. However, I’m going to now claim that, in another sense, this distinction is a bit useless, and it can be shown that one can construct a one-to-one correspondence between the members of the set with ω members, the set with $1 + \omega$ members, and the set with $\omega + 1$ members. In that sense, these three sets are all of the same “size.”

An analogy that is often employed to help us understand concepts like $\omega + 1$ is *Hilbert’s Hotel*, a fanciful building with an infinite number of rooms, each numbered according to the natural numbers: 0, 1, 2, 3, and so on (see, e.g., [Ewald & Sieg 2013](#); [Kragh 2014](#)). Suppose, one day, the entire hotel is filled with guests (i.e., a number of guests equal to ω). We can make a list of all guests and match them up to room numbers, such that each guest has a unique room number, and no room is empty. However, what happens when one more guest arrives? Is there room for the newcomer?

Of course! Figure 3 shows how the hotel manager moves the guest in Room 0 into Room 1, while simultaneously moving the guest in Room 1 into Room 2, the guest in Room 2 into Room 3, and so on. Then, the new guest can have Room 0. This means




Figure 3. Adding one guest to Hilbert's Hotel.

that if we made a new list of all of the guests, including the new one, we are *still* able to match them up to room numbers that correspond to the set of all natural numbers. This is what we meant above by constructing a one-to-one correspondence between ω and $\omega + 1$. To paraphrase [Stevens \(2016\)](#), $\omega + 1$ is not actually larger than ω ; it just is the number that comes next, in the ordered list of ordinal numbers, immediately *after* ω .

What, then, about the difference between $\omega + 1$ and $1 + \omega$? [Cheng \(2017\)](#) made the insightful analogy that Figure 3 can be interpreted in two different ways. First, as we discussed above, is the case of starting with ω guests, then encountering one more that wants to check in. This requires all earlier ω guests to move. Second, however, consider the situation where we started with that one guest in room 0, and *then* ω guests arrived slightly later. We could immediately place them into room numbers $n+1$ (for each new guest numbered n), with nobody needing to move. We obtained an outcome of the “same size” (i.e., a filled hotel) each time, but the ordering of events was different.

4.2. Taking More Limits

At this point, I suggest going back and taking another look at Equation (13), and then at Equation (16). Just like we took the limit of Equation (13) to get to ω , we can take the limit of Equation (16) to obtain the quantity

$$\omega + \omega .$$

This is now a second example of a limit ordinal, and it is illustrated using Conway & Guy's telephone poles in Figure 2(b). The compact way to express this number in set-theory notation is

$$\omega + \omega = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (\omega + n) . \quad (18)$$

What do we mean by this? Consider Hilbert's Hotel again. As before, we start with it being full (with ω guests), but now we want to allow *another* ω guests to stay there, too. As shown in Figure 4, we can accomplish this by moving all existing guests (in rooms n) to even-numbered rooms $2n$. This frees up all of the odd-numbered rooms ($2n + 1$) to be filled in by the new guests.




Figure 4. Adding ω guests to Hilbert's Hotel.

Hold on for just a second. This means that the set of all even or odd numbers, despite being “half” of the set of all natural numbers, can be put in a one-to-one correspondence with the full set of natural numbers. This bit of weirdness was first pointed out by the philosopher John Duns Scotus in the 1300s, so we may need to stew on it for a bit, as well. For now, let us be happy that we found a way to better visualize $\omega + \omega$, and to show that it has a one-to-one correspondence with ω itself.

We should note that mathematicians use a range of terms to describe any two sets that have this state of one-to-one correspondence:

- the mapping of elements is an exact *bijection* (i.e., each element of the first set is paired with exactly one element of the second set, and each element of the second set is paired with exactly one element of the first set), which means there are no unpaired elements,
- they are equinumerous (they have essentially the same number of members),
- they are equipollent (they have the same “power”),
- they have the same *cardinality*.

We will treat these terms as synonyms.

This same property applies to the set of all integers (i.e., both negative and positive whole numbers). Let us consider guests arriving to Hilbert's Hotel that are numbered by integers n . It's true that we cannot assign rooms to guests in a strictly increasing order, as before, since the “smallest” integer corresponds to $n \rightarrow -\infty$. However, there is a scheme that can fill up the rooms in an orderly way. We can start by putting guest $n = 0$ into Room 0. Then, guests with $n < 0$ can be given Rooms $(-2n)$, and guests with $n > 0$ can be given Rooms $(2n - 1)$:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Rooms: } 0 \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad 7 \quad 8 \quad \dots \\ \text{Guests: } 0 \quad +1 \quad -1 \quad +2 \quad -2 \quad +3 \quad -3 \quad +4 \quad -4 \quad \dots \end{array}$$

Each unique integer corresponds to a given unique natural number, and each unique natural number corresponds to a given unique integer. Thus, if we're ever asked “how many integers are there?” we can answer confidently: $\omega + \omega$.

After seeing many examples like this, we must realize that there is something counterintuitive about infinite sets that isn't true for finite sets: an infinite set can be put into one-to-one correspondence with a subset of itself! In fact, it was only after mathematicians formally "allowed" this to occur (using a formal axiom, which we will discuss more later) that the theory of infinite numbers could truly proceed with a firm logical foundation.

But we can go farther. Note that our earlier limit of $\omega + \omega$ can be thought of as $\omega \cdot 2$. (Some books tidy up the notation and call it 2ω . Although we're not being too pedantic about the non-commutativity of infinite addition, I still want to stick with the most correct version, which is $\omega \cdot 2$.) Then, we keep adding by ones, as before, and we get to

$$\omega \cdot 2, \omega \cdot 2 + 1, \omega \cdot 2 + 2, \omega \cdot 2 + 3, \dots, \omega \cdot 2 + \omega = \omega \cdot 3. \tag{19}$$

If we repeat this process again and again, we can get to $\omega \cdot 4$, then $\omega \cdot 5$, and eventually take an "outer" limit (sort of an umbrella "limit of limits") to get $\omega \cdot \omega$. We call this ω^2 , and we illustrate it in Figure 2(c). This is an infinite ordinal that corresponds to ω groups with each group containing ω members.

We can show that this quantity applies to the positive rational numbers (i.e., fractions p/q with both p and q being positive whole numbers). The fact that a rational number is represented by a *pair* of natural numbers seems to map quite nicely onto the concept of ω^2 , which is what one gets after taking all permutations of ω with ω . However, the rational numbers are still "countable," and they have the same cardinality as ω itself. To show this, we need to show that *all* rationals can be enumerated in an ordered list.

The most common way to do this is to graph all possible numerators p versus denominators q , as is shown in Figure 5. Then, we can start at the origin and trace diagonal lines through successive groups with identical sums $p+q$. As these lines pass through each unique pair (p, q) , we assign new natural numbers to them, in order. Many books take pains to skip over fractions that are equivalent to ones encountered earlier (i.e., one need not count $2/4$ or $3/6$ after first encountering $1/2$). They also avoid rationals of the form $p/0$, $0/q$, and $0/0$. However, I assert that it is fine to include all of these, since there is still plenty of room for all of the unique, well-behaved rational fractions. The assignment of guests to rooms in Hilbert's Hotel is then:

Rooms:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	...
Guests:	0/0	1/0	0/1	2/0	1/1	0/2	3/0	2/1	1/2	0/3	4/0	3/1	2/2	1/3	0/4	...

Again, if we don't mind multiple-counting the duplicates and including rationals with either $p = 0$ or $q = 0$, we can use Cantor's pairing function

$$n(p, q) = \frac{1}{2}(p+q)(p+q+1) + q, \tag{20}$$




Figure 5. One way to line up the rational numbers in a countable order.

which generates the full set of natural numbers, in order, from the traced sequence of points shown in Figure 5. The inverse function, which gives p and q for any n , is

$$w = \left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{8n+1}-1}{2} \right\rfloor, \quad q = n - \frac{w^2+w}{2}, \quad p = w - n + \frac{w^2+w}{2} \quad (21)$$

where $\lfloor x \rfloor$ is the “floor function” of x , or the greatest integer less than or equal to x . If you have never seen these formulas before, I encourage you to program them into a computer and verify for yourself that they do what I claim they do.

Anyway, this one-to-one correspondence may seem more unusual than the earlier ones, since there is an “infinity’s worth” of rational fractions in between every pair of integers on the number line. In fact, even if you choose two rational fractions that are very close to one another, but not equal, you can *still* squeeze in an infinity’s worth of other rational fractions between them!

Before we move on to even larger ordinals, we can note one more interesting thing about ω^2 . Because this is the same quantity as $\omega \cdot \omega$, we can go back to Equation (3), the definition of multiplication, and write ω^2 in another way:

$$\omega^2 = \underbrace{\omega + \omega + \omega + \dots}_{\omega \text{ times}}. \quad (22)$$

Because this is now an infinite chain of additions, we can say that ω^2 is the first ordinal a for which $\omega + a = a$. In other words, putting another $\omega+$ in front doesn’t really change anything. This is another example of a *fixed point*, a value that doesn’t change when subjected to a given transformation.

We can keep going. We managed to construct ω^2 , so that means we can go on to construct ω^3 , then ω^4 , and so on to another limit. If we go back to Equation (4), the definition of exponentiation as repeated multiplication, it allows us to define ω^ω as the first ordinal a for which $\omega \cdot a = a$. Yet another new flavor of fixed point!

The ordinal ω^ω has a few interesting analogies. Davis (2000) discussed the “space” of all possible *polynomials* with natural-number coefficients and exponents. There are ω possible zero-order polynomials of this kind (i.e., constants), and there are ω^2 possible first-order polynomials (i.e., $ax + b$, with the two constants a and b each varying over the full range of natural numbers). Then, there are ω^3 possible second-order polynomials ($ax^2 + bx + c$), ω^4 possible third-order polynomials, and so on. It’s possible to say that the total number of polynomials of this kind is

$$\omega + \omega^2 + \omega^3 + \omega^4 + \dots = \omega^\omega \quad , \tag{23}$$

but we haven’t really dealt with the kind of weird *ordinal addition* on display here. I think it’s possible to understand it, more or less, just as a limit. If we continue the sequence described above, we see that the “largest” polynomial would be an ω^{th} order polynomial. When all of its coefficients are counted, there would be $\omega^{\omega+1}$ of these polynomials. This number is equivalent to $\omega \cdot \omega^\omega$, and this is kind of “just another iteration” of the fixed-point transformation discussed above (i.e., $\omega \cdot a = a$). Thus, we can think of $\omega \cdot \omega^\omega$ as being essentially the same number as ω^ω .

Another interesting way to imagine ω^ω is as an infinite regress of countably infinite objects that encompass all prior ones. Quoting Baez (2016),

First, imagine a book with ω pages. Then imagine an encyclopedia of books like this, with ω volumes. Then imagine a bookcase containing ω encyclopedias like this. Then imagine a room containing ω bookcases like this. Then imagine a floor [of a] library with ω rooms like this. Then imagine a library with ω floors like this. Then imagine a city with ω libraries like this. And so on, *ad infinitum*.

We can now keep going and extend the sequence further. What is the limit of the sequence

$$\omega \quad , \quad \omega^\omega \quad , \quad \omega^{\omega^\omega} \quad , \quad \omega^{\omega^{\omega^\omega}} \quad , \quad \dots \quad ?$$

Performing one more step of limit-taking, we can now think about an infinite chain of ω to the power ω to the power ω to the power... and so on. This is a fixed-point defining an ordinal a for which $\omega^a = a$. We have seen this kind of power-tower before in Section 3, but only for finite arguments. Now we must confront its infinite cousin. Cantor gave this ordinal the name ε_0 , and we can define it as

$$\varepsilon_0 = \omega^\omega = \omega^{\omega^{\omega^{\dots}}} \tag{24}$$

i.e., this is ω tetrated to the ω , and it can be expressed in set-theory notation as

$$\varepsilon_0 = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (\omega \uparrow\uparrow n) \quad . \tag{25}$$

One can keep going with even higher analogues to the mathematical operations, like

$$\dots^{\omega} \omega \omega \omega$$




Figure 6. A function that gives a one-to-one mapping of the reals in the range $[0,1]$ to the full range of reals.

set of *ALL* real numbers is uncountable. We will offer up a proof of this provocative statement in a bit.

First, though, we can make life easier for ourselves in one specific way. We actually do not need to consider the *entire* set of real numbers from $-\infty$ to $+\infty$. We only need to deal with a finite “line segment” of the real number line, which we choose as the space between 0 and 1. Consider a real number x that can take on any value between 0 and 1, and compute the function

$$y(x) = \tan\left[\frac{\pi}{2}(2x - 1)\right]. \quad (29)$$

Figure 6 shows this function, and it is clear that y covers the full range of real numbers from $-\infty$ to $+\infty$. Every real value of x corresponds to a unique real value of y , and every real value of y corresponds to a unique real value of x . In other words, this function gives an exact one-to-one mapping between the reals in the range $[0,1]$ and the full set of reals. Thus, everything that we prove for the interval $[0,1]$ will also be true for the entire real line.²

Our job now is to come up with some nice, ordered list that enumerates all possible decimal expansions of the real numbers in this range. Maybe we start with 0 (which is really 0.000000...), and then include the nine numbers describing tenths (0.1, 0.2, 0.3, ... 0.9), and then the 99 numbers describing hundredths (0.01 to 0.99), then the 999 numbers describing thousandths (0.001 to 0.999), and so on. By grad-

² If this argument was not completely convincing, there are some other good ones given by [Cheng \(2017\)](#).

ually filling in all trailing zeros, it's essentially the same as counting up the natural numbers like in Equation (13).

No matter what system we use to enumerate these decimals, we can create a table that looks like:

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= 0.d_{11}d_{12}d_{13}d_{14}d_{15} \dots \\ x_2 &= 0.d_{21}d_{22}d_{23}d_{24}d_{25} \dots \\ x_3 &= 0.d_{31}d_{32}d_{33}d_{34}d_{35} \dots \\ x_4 &= 0.d_{41}d_{42}d_{43}d_{44}d_{45} \dots \\ x_5 &= 0.d_{51}d_{52}d_{53}d_{54}d_{55} \dots \\ &\vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \end{aligned}$$

and each digit d_{ij} is known. If this matrix extends forever in both directions (i.e., both going down and going to the right) then surely it must contain every possible real number, right?

Surprisingly, the answer is no. In 1873, Georg Cantor showed that there are many possible real numbers that are *not* contained in this enumerated list. Here we will describe Cantor's *diagonal proof*, but this was only one of several different proofs of this key idea that he developed.

Let us take the known digits d_{ij} and define some new digits:

$$D_k = \begin{cases} d_{kk} + 1, & \text{if } d_{kk} \neq 9, \\ 0, & \text{if } d_{kk} = 9. \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

In other words, we take the digits that go down the diagonal in the above table (d_{11} , d_{22} , d_{33} , d_{44} , and so on) and create a new series of digits D_k by adding 1 to each, and cycling back to zero if the digit was 9. Then, we create a new real number

$$x_{\text{new}} = 0.D_1D_2D_3D_4D_5 \dots .$$

Does this new real number occur in the table? Well, we know that it differs from x_1 in the first digit after the decimal, and that it differs from x_2 in the second digit after the decimal, and that it differs from x_3 in the third digit after the decimal, and so on. The real number x_{new} cannot occur in our enumerated list!

Note that our methods of constructing both the ordered list (x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots) and x_{new} were quite arbitrary. There are literally an infinite number of other ways we could have chosen to carry out this process, and x_{new} still would not appear in the ordered list.

A key implication of this result is that there can never be a countable enumeration of the real numbers that actually, exhaustively, includes all of them. In fact, it would seem that there are infinitely *more* of these uncountable real numbers (all of them being irrational) than there are countable ones. If you were to randomly throw a dart at the real number line, the probability that you would hit a rational number is so

infinitesimally small that it is indistinguishable from zero. (See Appendix A for the outlines of a few proofs that show this is the case.)

Using the symbol \mathfrak{c} to refer to the cardinality (size) of the real continuum, we have now shown that

$$\mathfrak{c} > \aleph_0 . \tag{31}$$

Amazingly, this demonstrates that there exist fundamentally different “sizes of infinity.”

Cantor also showed that the multi-dimensional continuum (i.e., the area bounded by any plane, the volume bounded by any cube, and so on) has the same cardinality \mathfrak{c} as the one-dimensional continuum of real numbers discussed above. Trying to prove this was a long-time source of consternation to Cantor, who said in a letter “*je le vois, mais je ne le crois pas*” (I see it, but I don’t believe it).

However, we can start to understand this, for the 2D plane that covers the square region $[0, 1]$ in x and $[0, 1]$ in y , by finding a one-to-one correspondence between the real numbers and the coordinates (x, y) . Let us write out the decimal expansions of the coordinates,

$$x = 0.a_1a_2a_3a_4a_5a_6 \dots \quad \text{and} \quad y = 0.b_1b_2b_3b_4b_5b_6 \dots$$

and then interleave the digits, like when trying to fit ω additional guests into Hilbert’s Hotel:

$$r = 0.a_1b_1a_2b_2a_3b_3a_4b_4a_5b_5a_6b_6 \dots$$

Everything that you can do with x and y —including feeding them into Cantor’s diagonal proof to generate uncountably more numbers—can be done with r , as well. Thus, every real number r can be made to correspond to a unique point in the 2D plane. Another way to construct this kind of one-to-one mapping is to define a fractal-like *space-filling curve* (Sagan 1994) that, when iterated an infinite number of times, can eventually wiggle around to reach every point in the 2D plane, while simultaneously maintaining a known 1D path that is mappable to the real number line.

Lastly, we note that the set of all *complex numbers* is essentially the same thing as the full set of points in a two-dimensional plane. Thus, it is also true that the complex numbers also have cardinality \mathfrak{c} .

6. UNCOUNTABLE INFINITIES

Are there other ways to construct a quantity with cardinality greater than \aleph_0 ? Trying to do this opens up the way to the “higher” infinities.

6.1. Alephs and Beths

At this point, we are going to start talking more explicitly about *cardinal numbers* such as \aleph_0 and \mathfrak{c} . This is really the same concept as cardinality that we have been

discussing for a while, but we are now labeling each size-class with a unique number. Note that each cardinal number corresponds to a given lowest ordinal of that size-class (i.e., \aleph_0 corresponds to ω), but there are multiple ordinal numbers that correspond to a given cardinal (i.e., $\omega + 1$, $\omega \cdot \omega$, ω^ω , and ε_0 all have cardinality \aleph_0 , too).

Mathematicians define \aleph_1 as the “next largest” cardinal number after \aleph_0 , and \aleph_2 as the next largest after that, and so on. At this point, you may be wondering how we can guarantee that successively larger and larger cardinalities actually exist. If so, stay tuned for just a few paragraphs.

Another way to conceptualize the \aleph numbers is to define the successor operation using superscript $+$. For any finite natural number, $n^+ = n + 1$. For an infinite cardinal κ , the next largest cardinal is defined as κ^+ , and this is *not* the same thing as $\kappa + 1$. Thus, the \aleph notation gives us a way to define each successor as

$$\aleph_{n+1} = \aleph_n^+ . \tag{32}$$

Because \aleph_0 corresponds to a *countably* infinite cardinality, we see that the succeeding \aleph_n cardinals (for $n \geq 1$) must correspond to sets that are *uncountably* infinite. Thus, \aleph_1 describes the smallest number for which it is *impossible* to fit that number of guests into Hilbert’s Hotel.

When comparing cardinalities, we see that

$$\aleph_0 < \aleph_1 < \aleph_2 < \aleph_3 < \dots \tag{33}$$

One way to think about any arbitrary \aleph_n is that this is the cardinal number for which there exist n smaller \aleph -numbers. Because there cannot be any gaps in the chain of \aleph -numbers, [Zuckerman \(1974\)](#) noted that *every* infinite cardinal must be an \aleph -number. Lastly, we can quote [Conway & Guy \(1996\)](#) to describe the first few aleph numbers as follows:

- \aleph_0 is the number of finite ordinal numbers.
- \aleph_1 is the number of ordinal numbers that are either finite or in the \aleph_0 class.
- \aleph_2 is the number of ordinal numbers that are either finite or in the \aleph_0 or \aleph_1 classes.

and so on.

Just going by the above definitions, it is difficult to understand how to visualize or construct anything that corresponds to these higher aleph-numbers. Also, as we hinted above, we still aren’t quite sure if there’s an actual necessity for anything to truly *exist* at any given higher-aleph cardinality.

A path forward—which guarantees that we can keep building new rungs onto the top of this ladder as we climb it—is found by considering the *Power-Set* of some set S . This term is defined as the set of all possible subsets of S (including the empty set and the “full” original set). [Figure 7](#) illustrates this with a finite set that has

Then, like before, we can construct a new subset S_{new} out of the diagonal members of the above matrix, after swapping Y for N and N for Y.

A word of caution: In the particular example enumeration shown above, I think S_{new} will consist of nothing but Y's. I probably chose the most boring possible enumeration of Y and N, and nearly all other books that discuss this proof give more interesting enumerations. However, for those, one usually has to take it on faith that there is an actual *pattern* that eventually accounts for all countable combinations. For mine, at least, that pattern is evident. (If that pattern isn't evident, I suggest looking up how to write the natural numbers 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, ... using base-two, or binary digits instead of base-ten.)

Whatever S_{new} looks like, it cannot be a member of the originally enumerated list. Thus, the *complete* set of all subsets of the natural numbers must be uncountable, and it must have a cardinality bigger than \aleph_0 . We have now proven that

$$2^{\aleph_0} > \aleph_0 . \quad (34)$$

To help put these quantities in perspective, some mathematicians define the “beth” numbers, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \beth_0 &= \aleph_0 \\ \beth_1 &= 2^{\beth_0} \\ \beth_{n+1} &= 2^{\beth_n} , \quad \text{and so on.} \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

In other words, each new \beth number has the cardinality of the power-set of the previous \beth number. Thus, when comparing cardinalities,

$$\beth_0 < \beth_1 < \beth_2 < \beth_3 < \dots \quad (36)$$

Unfortunately, though, it is not easy to figure out how Equations (33) and (36) relate to one another. In other words, we still do not know how the \aleph numbers and the \beth numbers are *interleaved* with one another.

6.2. Back to the Continuum

For now, it's helpful to go back to thinking about the real continuum \mathfrak{c} . Notice that the two diagonalization proofs given above told us that $\mathfrak{c} > \aleph_0$ and that $2^{\aleph_0} > \aleph_0$. The details of those proofs were almost identical to one another. In fact, they would have been *exactly* identical if we had expressed the real numbers using binary digits, rather than decimal digits! Thus, because these two identical proofs essentially describe a one-to-one correspondence, it is true that

$$\mathfrak{c} = 2^{\aleph_0} = \beth_1 , \quad (37)$$

i.e., the cardinality of the real continuum is equal to the cardinality of the power-set of the natural numbers.

Equation (37) always kind of amazes me, but set theorists seem to take it in stride. As we will see below, there remain some deeply unsolvable mysteries about the real continuum. However, it is nice that we can hang our hats on Equation (37), which tethers the big, unfathomable continuum to something specific and grounded about the more-well-behaved natural numbers.

Georg Cantor strongly believed an additional thing to be true. This thing is called *Cantor’s continuum hypothesis* (CH):

$$\mathfrak{c} = \aleph_1 . \tag{38}$$

In other words, Cantor believed that there are no “other” cardinals squeezed in between \aleph_0 and \mathfrak{c} . This is a tempting idea because there are deep conceptual similarities between \aleph_1 and 2^{\aleph_0} . Because \aleph_1 is the cardinality (size) of the group of all numbers that are either finite or in the \aleph_0 category, it means that it’s equivalent to the *total number of countably infinite numbers*. Similarly, because $\mathfrak{c} = 2^{\aleph_0}$ corresponds to the power-set of \aleph_0 , it seems to be equivalent to the *total number of countable sets*. Given the von Neumann (1923) correspondence between numbers and sets that we showed in Equation (12), why would one ever doubt that $\mathfrak{c} = \aleph_1$?

In more recent years, there has arisen an even broader idea, called the generalized continuum hypothesis (GCH), that proposes

$$\aleph_{n+1} = 2^{\aleph_n} = \beth_{n+1} \quad \text{for any finite } n . \tag{39}$$

In other words, GCH is the assertion that there are no levels of cardinality intermediate between any \aleph_n and its corresponding power-set 2^{\aleph_n} . If GCH is true, then taking the immediate successor of a cardinal is the *same thing* as taking the power-set of that cardinal. This also makes sense because it is essentially what Equation (12) does for all finite numbers.

Unfortunately, using the currently developed version of set theory (Zermelo–Fraenkel theory, augmented with the Axiom of Choice, or ZFC), there is no way to conclusively prove or disprove CH or GCH. In other words, they’re “undecidable.” Quoting Rucker (1982),

In 1940, Kurt Gödel was able to show that CH is consistent with ZFC. He showed that one can never prove $\mathfrak{c} \neq \aleph_1$ from the axioms of ZFC. This does not mean that Cantor was *right*—it only means that he was *not provably wrong* on the basis of ZFC.

In 1963, Paul Cohen proved that the negation of CH is consistent with ZFC. He showed that one can never prove $\mathfrak{c} = \aleph_1$ from the axioms of ZFC. This does not mean that Cantor was *wrong*—it only means that we *cannot prove that he was right*, using only the axioms of ZFC.

[...] The situation is a little like asking what Scarlett O’Hara did after the end of *Gone with the Wind*... one can consistently write a sequel in

which she gets back together with Rhett, and one can consistently write a sequel in which she never sees Rhett again. But the book itself does not give us enough information to draw either of these conclusions with certainty. In the same sense, ZFC is not a complete enough description of the universe of set theory to tell us what the power of the continuum is.

In the preface of the updated 2005 edition of [Rucker \(1982\)](#), there’s a discussion of recent work that may be starting to point to the plausibility of $\mathfrak{c} = \aleph_2$ (see also [Foreman et al. 1988](#); [Bekkali 1991](#)).

Before we move on, we can say a few more words about ZFC. It is much more powerful and internally consistent than the earlier versions of set theory that developed at the end of the 19th century. Like many other mathematical theories, it is built on a foundation of *axioms*. These are assertions, or postulates, that seem so self-evidently true that they are just assumed at the outset and never actually proven. ZFC uses several prosaic and sturdy axioms from finite set theory, and it also includes the “Axiom of Choice” mentioned above—which took a few decades for mathematicians to wrap their heads around—and it adds one more:

The Axiom of Infinity: There exist sets that have a one-to-one correspondence with subsets of itself.

(This is just one of many ways to state it.) Without this axiom, one cannot rigorously work with infinite concepts like ω and the \aleph and \beth numbers.

The process of tacking-on new axioms is something that we will encounter a few more times before the end of our journey. Strangely, this process is both constricting and freeing. It is constricting because the more axioms one adopts, the more rules one must obey, and this limits us to a smaller volume of theoretical “space” in which to play. However, it is freeing because these new axioms allow us to confidently define and prove *new* things that would only be uncertain and undecidable without them.

7. BEYOND THE CONTINUUM?

Recall that $\mathfrak{c} = \beth_1$. Thus, if the CH is true, then we may have $\beth_1 = \aleph_1$. However, if the CH is not true, then the continuum must sit somewhere “higher up” in the chain of uncountable cardinals, such that $\beth_1 > \aleph_1$. This implies a more general inequality:

$$\beth_n \geq \aleph_n \quad \text{for any } n . \tag{40}$$

Thus, if GCH is not true, then taking the power-set of a cardinal (i.e., going up one step in the \beth chain) represents a fundamentally *bigger step* than just taking the immediate successor of that cardinal (i.e., going up one step in the \aleph chain).

Is there anything interesting to say about \aleph_2 or \beth_2 ? Consider the power-set of the real numbers; i.e., the set of all possible subsets of real numbers. This has cardinality

$$2^{\mathfrak{c}} = 2^{2^{\aleph_0}} = \beth_2 . \tag{41}$$

What else has this level of cardinality? Some say that the set of all possible *functions* of real numbers (i.e., functions that map real numbers onto real numbers) has cardinality $2^{\mathfrak{c}}$. However, it would probably take many more pages to properly specify which kinds of functions are applicable to this concept, and which ones are not. One thing we can say for sure is that the *smallest* possible cardinality that the power-set of the reals can have is \aleph_2 .

One can keep going up the ladder of higher n for both \aleph_n and \beth_n , and then take that process to an infinite limit to obtain, say, \aleph_ω and \beth_ω . Using the set-theory notation discussed earlier, we can define these more precisely as unions of smaller sets; i.e.,

$$\aleph_\omega = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \aleph_n \quad \text{and} \quad \beth_\omega = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \beth_n . \quad (42)$$

Note that \aleph_ω is the smallest \aleph -number for which there must exist a countably infinite number (ω) of other \aleph -numbers that are smaller than it.

There's an interesting piece of trivia about \aleph_ω . It has been shown with ZFC that this is the first uncountable cardinal that *cannot* be equal to \mathfrak{c} (see, e.g., [Easton 1970](#)). Unfortunately, this does not put an upper bound on speculations about the continuum hypothesis, since all it tells us is that $\mathfrak{c} \neq \aleph_\omega$. Thus, it *may* be the case that $\mathfrak{c} > \aleph_\omega$.

We can finish this section by taking stock of the cardinals that we know about so far, and we can sort them by whether they are successor cardinals or limit cardinals (see Section 4.1 for this distinction amongst ordinal numbers). Note, however, that there are now two ways to pin down whether one cardinal comes “after” another. First, there's the standard successor operation (i.e., going from κ to κ^+). Second, there's the power-set operation (i.e., going from κ to 2^κ). Both of these operations create a cardinal that is larger than the original one, and mathematicians often use this distinction to split up the definition of a limit cardinal into two types:

- A *weak limit cardinal* has no immediate predecessor, using the standard direct successor operation. This is the same meaning of “limit cardinal” that extends from our use of “limit ordinal” earlier. The technical definition is that κ is a weak limit cardinal if and only if, for every other smaller cardinal $\lambda < \kappa$, it is true that $\kappa > \lambda^+$. If we were able to find a λ for which $\kappa = \lambda^+$, then λ would be the immediate predecessor of κ , and thus κ would be a successor cardinal, *not* a limit cardinal.
- A *strong limit cardinal* has no “power-set predecessor.” The technical definition is that κ is a strong limit cardinal if and only if, for every other smaller cardinal $\lambda < \kappa$, it is true that $\kappa > 2^\lambda$. If we were able to find a λ for which $\kappa = 2^\lambda$, then λ would be the power-set predecessor of κ , and thus κ would not be a strong limit cardinal. (It still may be either a weak limit cardinal or a successor cardinal.)

Depending on the status of GCH, the size of the “step” taken when doing the power-set is either larger than or equal to the step taken when doing a successor operation (see Equation (40)). Thus, all strong limit cardinals must also be weak limit cardinals.

Here is a summary of the status of the cardinals we know about so far:

- As before, let us just skip zero because it’s a special case.
- The finite positive numbers $n = 1, 2, 3, 4, \dots$ are successor ordinals, because they all have immediate predecessors. Each one corresponds to a unique and finite successor cardinal number, which we use the same numerals to denote.
- The first infinite ordinal ω has no immediate predecessor, so it is a limit ordinal that corresponds to the (first!) limit cardinal \aleph_0 . In fact, this is also a strong limit cardinal because one cannot find any finite number n for which 2^n is equal to \aleph_0 , either.
- $\aleph_1, \aleph_2, \aleph_3$, and all \aleph_n for finite n , have immediate predecessors, so they are successor cardinals.
- $\beth_1, \beth_2, \beth_3$, and all \beth_n for finite n , are also successor cardinals, but it is not clear where their predecessors fall in the \aleph hierarchy.
- \aleph_ω has no immediate predecessor, so it is a limit cardinal. Because we don’t know much about how it connects to its neighbors via the power-set operation, it can only be a weak limit cardinal.
- \beth_ω cannot be written as the power-set of any lesser cardinal, so it is a strong limit cardinal.
- \mathfrak{c} , the cardinality of the continuum, could be a successor cardinal or a limit cardinal. If we stay within the axioms of ZFC, we just don’t know.

8. BEYOND THE ALEPHS?

We are now entering the domain of the *large cardinals* (see, e.g., [Drake 1974](#); [Jech 2003](#); [Kanamori 2009](#); [Bagaria 2013](#); [Honzik 2017](#); [Srivastava 2022](#)). This is also taking us beyond the usual confines of standard ZFC set theory, because the actual existence of large cardinals cannot actually be proven rigorously in ZFC. This is the realm of active, exploratory research.

8.1. Initial Concepts

One can conceive of cardinals that break out of the hierarchy defined above. For example, we already started to discuss the possible meaning of \aleph_ω . If we momentarily ignore the distinction between ordinals and cardinals, we can write this as

$$\aleph_{\aleph_0} ,$$

and then we can start to think about what *its* successor may be. Because ω and $\omega + 1$ have the same cardinality, I don't think it makes a lot of sense to talk about

$$\aleph_{\aleph_0+1} .$$

However, there is one obvious way to write down a cardinal that is most definitely *larger*. That would be

$$\aleph_{\aleph_1} > \aleph_{\aleph_0} . \tag{43}$$

We should be clear that \aleph_{\aleph_1} is immensely larger than \aleph_{\aleph_0} , and is not its immediate successor. Still, this now lets us “leap” to still higher cardinalities, with the sequence

$$\aleph_{\aleph_0} , \aleph_{\aleph_1} , \aleph_{\aleph_2} , \aleph_{\aleph_3} , \dots , \aleph_{\aleph_{\aleph_0}} \tag{44}$$

corresponding to ever-larger cardinal numbers. Taking that kind of limit is just the first step in an even more expansive sequence that would let us write down

$$\aleph_{\aleph_0} , \aleph_{\aleph_{\aleph_0}} , \aleph_{\aleph_{\aleph_{\aleph_0}}} , \dots , \aleph_{\aleph_{\aleph_{\aleph_{\aleph_0}}}} . \tag{45}$$

Once we have an infinite chain of subscripts, adding on another subscript \aleph changes nothing. We can recall that \aleph_n is defined as the cardinal preceded by n smaller \aleph -numbers. Thus, our new infinite-chain \aleph number is preceded by a number of smaller cardinals essentially equal to itself! We define a cardinal κ to be an \aleph -fixed point if

$$\kappa = \aleph_{\kappa} . \tag{46}$$

There is a similar definition for \beth -fixed points, which we can express as

$$\lambda = \beth_{\lambda} , \tag{47}$$

and we can extrapolate from Equation (40) to conclude that $\kappa \leq \lambda$.

Recall that this is not our first encounter with fixed points. We saw a bunch of them in Sections 3 and 4. The last one we saw at the “end” of the countable infinities was $\varepsilon_{\alpha} = \alpha$. This bears the most resemblance to our current situation, since the quantity that the condition defines is in the subscript of some other quantity.

Inspired by Rucker (1982), let us assign the general symbol θ to this new class of numbers corresponding to \aleph -fixed points. “We’re far from the shallow, now,” but we can dip a toe into the deeper waters by contemplating analogies in this chart (slightly modified from one given by Rucker):

0	1	2	...	ω
0	ω	\aleph_1	θ

Let us discuss going from the 1st column to the 2nd column. On the top row, this is a transition from nothing (0) to something (1). On the bottom, it is the transition

from finite to infinite; specifically, to the *first* infinite ordinal. Thus, we can think of the bottom row as an “infinitely boosted” analog of the top row.

Going from the 2nd to the 3rd column is a “successor” operation: 2 is the successor of 1, and \aleph_1 is the successor cardinal of ω (i.e., \aleph_0).

Then, going from the 3rd column to the final column, we see the limit of taking an infinite number of successor operations. The top represents a *countably* infinite number of successors, which gets us to ω . It may sound like a tautology to say that the only way to reach ω is to take ω successors, but it is useful to think about it in this way. When we go to the bottom row, we cannot merely take ω successors again. That would get us to \aleph_ω . The “boosted” bottom row requires us to consider an *uncountably* infinite number of successors. For now, I’ll state without proof that the inheritor of this crown is θ . There are some important caveats to make below, but for now let us just say that the only way to get to θ is to take θ successors. One cannot reach it by taking any finite (or even any *countable*) number of successor operations on an \aleph number.

The top row of Rucker’s chart gets us to the first infinite number ω . By analogy, the bottom row gets us to the first *large cardinal*.

8.2. Inaccessibility

When I introduced \aleph_ω back in Section 7, I was surreptitiously introducing a completely new type of cardinal. Up until the advent of \aleph_ω , every new cardinal that came along was truly “the first of its kind.” For example, \aleph_0 corresponds to ω , the very *first* countably infinite number. Then, when we stepped from \aleph_0 (countable) to \aleph_1 (uncountable), it was assumed that we took a leap to the *first* uncountably infinite number of this kind.

These “firsts” have the property that there is no way to describe them using only the numbers that came before. Specifically,

- There’s no way to juggle a *finite* collection of *finite* numbers to completely describe ω .
- There’s no way to juggle a *countably infinite* collection of *countably infinite* numbers to completely describe \aleph_1 .

The only way to describe any such cardinal is by using... itself! Cardinals of the above variety are called *regular cardinals*.

Another way to say this is that κ is a regular cardinal if it is impossible to “reach it” (using any form of counting) in less than κ steps.

Now, however, there is a new beast in town: \aleph_ω . It is the largest member of the set that contains

$$\aleph_0, \aleph_1, \aleph_2, \aleph_3, \aleph_4, \dots \text{ and all } \aleph_n \text{ (for finite } n \text{)} .$$

As we said when discussing Rucker’s chart, \aleph_ω involves taking the limit of a series that contains “only” ω members. In this sense, it *is* possible to juggle a countably infinite

If θ is the ω^{th} \aleph -number . . .	$\theta = \aleph_\omega$ (not inaccessible)
If θ is the θ^{th} \aleph -number . . .	θ is the first \aleph -fixed-point (still not inaccessible)
If θ is the θ^{th} \aleph -fixed-point . . .	θ is the first 0-inaccessible cardinal
If θ is the θ^{th} 0-inaccessible cardinal . . .	θ is the first 1-inaccessible cardinal
\vdots	\vdots
If θ is the θ^{th} a -inaccessible cardinal . . .	θ is the first $(a + 1)$ -inaccessible cardinal
\vdots	\vdots
If θ is a θ -inaccessible cardinal . . .	θ is the first 0-hyper-inaccessible cardinal
If θ is the θ^{th} 0-hyper-inaccessible cardinal . . .	θ is the first 1-hyper-inaccessible cardinal
\vdots	\vdots

Figure 8. Renaming and reframing the first few generations of large cardinals.

all, is what we meant by the dots (\dots) going all the way back to Equation (13). Note that this description involves the union of “only” ω members, so it is similar to the example of \aleph_ω . Thus, we must conclude that the *smallest* \aleph -fixed point is a singular cardinal.

However, we know that fixed-point conditions allow for multiple solutions. What about those? If we counted up a finite number of succeeding solutions to $\theta = \aleph_\theta$, or even a countably infinite number of them, we are still in the land of singular cardinals—since their description involves numbers of smaller cardinality than the cardinal that we’re trying to describe. In order to really define a cardinal that is fundamentally larger than everything that has come before, we need to take *that number* of succeeding solutions to the fixed-point relation. Tarski (1938) proved that the first of these, which we now call θ_0 , is both a limit cardinal and a *regular* (not singular) cardinal. So far, the only other example of this combination has been \aleph_0 . Earlier than that, Hausdorff (1908) introduced the term *inaccessible* to describe regular limit cardinals, and we add to that by restricting the definition to all regular limit cardinals greater than \aleph_0 .

To reiterate: one can only reach the smallest inaccessible cardinal θ_0 by making an infinitely long list of succeeding larger and larger solutions to the \aleph -fixed point condition, and not stopping until one counts θ_0 of those solutions! Another way of laying out these self-referential conditions is shown in the first few rows of Figure 8.

One can also make distinctions amongst the inaccessible cardinals by defining the weakly-inaccessible cardinals (corresponding to regular weak-limit cardinals) and the strongly-inaccessible cardinals (for regular strong-limit cardinals). Note that all inaccessible cardinals are \aleph -fixed points, but not all \aleph -fixed points are inaccessible cardinals. All strongly-inaccessible cardinals must be both \aleph -fixed points and \beth -fixed points, and if GCH is true then these distinctions disappear.

The reason these quantities are considered to be so very *inaccessible* (i.e., unreachable from lower levels of cardinality) comes from the combination of the two defining properties:

- Because it is regular, it cannot be reached by taking unions of sets smaller than itself.
- Because it is a limit cardinal, it cannot be reached by “leaping from cardinal to cardinal” (either via the direct successor operation or the power-set operation, depending on whether it is strong or weak) with any number of leaps smaller than itself.

Essentially, inaccessible cardinals occupy a “tier” unto themselves, in that none of the standard set-theory operations that can be done to cardinals in the lower (accessible) tiers can produce them.

8.3. Degrees of Inaccessibility

Just like there were infinitely many ε ordinals (i.e., ordinals that satisfy the fixed-point condition $\omega^a = a$), it is true that there exist an infinite number of inaccessible cardinals that satisfy $\theta = \aleph_\theta$, too. Thus, it may be possible to systematize them as a sequence of cardinals that we can write as θ_n , for some numerical index n that sorts them by largeness. Actually, this enumeration may only cover a subset of *all* of the possible inaccessibles, but as long as it counts *some* of them—and it orders them in cardinality from least to greatest—it is useful to think about the sequence:

$$\theta_0 < \theta_1 < \theta_2 < \theta_3 < \dots < \theta_\omega < \dots < \theta_{\theta_0} < \dots$$

I have seen it suggested that one way to reach a larger inaccessible is to start with θ_n and then take the limit of the sequence

$$\theta_n, \aleph_{\theta_n}, \aleph_{\aleph_{\theta_n}}, \aleph_{\aleph_{\aleph_{\theta_n}}}, \dots \tag{50}$$

and then call that new cardinal θ_{n+1} . However, if we recall Section 3, it may be that there are inaccessible cardinals that are solutions to the \aleph -fixed-point equation but are *not* expressible as infinitely iterated chains of \aleph subscripts. No matter what method is chosen to find successively larger inaccessibles, one can eventually reach θ_{θ_0} , then eventually $\theta_{\theta_{\theta_0}}$, and so on. If that process is taken to its own limit, we obtain yet another new type of cardinal,

$$\nu = \theta_{\theta_{\theta_{\dots}}} \tag{51}$$

which is now our first example of a *1-inaccessible cardinal*. This is kind of a bland name, but it implies that what we have been calling merely inaccessible should have been called *0-inaccessible* all along.

Whenever we see that infinite chain of subscripts, we should now be ready to see a new fixed-point relation. It's true that 1-inaccessible numbers like ν satisfy such a relation:

$$\theta_\nu = \nu . \tag{52}$$

Just like the first 0-inaccessible cardinal θ_0 was the θ_0^{th} \aleph -fixed point, one can think of ν as the ν^{th} 0-inaccessible cardinal. In other words, we define ν as 1-inaccessible if ν is 0-inaccessible, and if there are at least ν 0-inaccessible cardinals less than ν . [Rucker \(1982\)](#) provided one final way to wrap our heads around this concept (despite using slightly different terminology). Recall that 0-inaccessible cardinals were considered “out of reach” because of two criteria: they are regular cardinals, and they are limit cardinals. Well, a 1-inaccessible cardinal is even *more out of reach* because of three criteria:

- Because it is regular, it cannot be reached by taking unions of sets smaller than itself.
- Because it is a limit cardinal, it cannot be reached by leaping from cardinal to cardinal (either via κ^+ or 2^κ).
- Because it is also the limit of an infinite sequence of 0-inaccessibles, it cannot be reached by “leaping from inaccessible to inaccessible.”

Maybe it is overkill to include all three items in this list, since the third item requires the first two to be true already.

Of course, once we have 1-inaccessibles as the limit of the infinite sequence of 0-inaccessibles, we can define the 2-inaccessibles as the limit of the infinite sequence of 1-inaccessibles. This is followed by 3-inaccessibles, 4-inaccessibles, and then by the now-infamous words “and so on...” to obtain the $(a + 1)$ -inaccessibles as the limit of the infinite series of a -inaccessibles. A few of these steps are illustrated in the middle rows of [Figure 8](#).

Where does *this* railroad take us? As one steps up the ladders of a -inaccessibility, there is an infinite limit at which adding one more more layer of inaccessibility changes nothing. Thus, we define a large cardinal κ to be *hyper-inaccessible* if it is κ -inaccessible. (Maybe another way to refer to it is “itself-inaccessible!”) This is a new fixed-point that is a bit more difficult to express as an equation. Let us attempt to do that by defining some new terminology. The 0-inaccessibles can be called $\theta_n(0)$, then the 1-inaccessibles are $\theta_n(1)$, and the general a -inaccessibles are $\theta_n(a)$. Then, we can see that

$$\text{if } \theta_\kappa(a) = \kappa , \text{ then } \kappa \text{ is } (a + 1)\text{-inaccessible, and we write it as } \theta_n(a + 1) . \tag{53}$$

Note that the new notation $\theta_n(a + 1)$ has an undetermined subscript n , which indexes the infinite number of inaccessibles at this new tier. Now, after repeating the above

fixed-point procedure an infinite number of times, we reach the hyper-inaccessibles. For them,

$$\text{if } \theta_n(\kappa) = \kappa, \text{ then } \kappa \text{ is hyper-inaccessible, and we write it as } \theta_n(0, 1). \quad (54)$$

Please don't move on before taking note of the subtle indexing shifts that happen as one goes from Equation (53) to Equation (54). In the mathematical literature, there are quite a few alternate definitions of the different levels of inaccessibility and hyper-inaccessibility, and I cannot guarantee that the above corresponds to the most commonly found versions.

I hate to keep rushing down the rabbit-hole without much of a pause for breath, but it is possible to generalize even more. What we called hyper-inaccessible above can be called 0-hyper-inaccessible. Then, we can define κ as a 1-hyper-inaccessible cardinal if κ is already 0-hyper-inaccessible and if there are at least κ 0-hyper-inaccessible cardinals less than κ . The same limit-taking gives us 2-hyper-inaccessible cardinals, 3-hyper-inaccessible cardinals, and so on. We can unify all of these tiers using the notation defined above, as

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_n(i, 0) & \text{ for the } i\text{-inaccessibles, which we used to call } \theta_n(i). \\ \theta_n(i, 1) & \text{ for the } i\text{-hyper-inaccessibles.} \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Then, as we climb the ladder of i -hyper-inaccessibles, we can take the limit once again to define a large cardinal κ to be *hyper-hyper-inaccessible* (or hyper²-inaccessible) if it is κ -hyper-inaccessible. Of course, we can then go on to define hyper³-inaccessible, hyper⁴-inaccessible, and so on, and the notation generalizes to

$$\theta_n(i, h) \text{ for the } i\text{-hyper}^h\text{-inaccessibles.} \quad (56)$$

Note that the 0-hyper⁰-inaccessibles are just the original “plain” inaccessibles.

Carmody (2015) outlined how we can keep climbing up the ladder of inaccessible cardinals. We saw that when the i -index is taken to an infinite fixed-point limit (i.e., when we defined a new cardinal κ as being κ -inaccessible), we were uplifted from the inaccessibles to the hyper-inaccessibles. The h -index can also be taken to an infinite fixed-point limit, and that means we can define a large cardinal κ that is hyper ^{κ} -inaccessible. Carmody (2015) called this new tier the *richly inaccessible cardinals*, and our notation blossoms forth with a third index in parentheses; i.e., we can use

$$\theta_n(i, h, r) \text{ for the } i\text{-hyper}^h\text{-richly}^r\text{-inaccessibles,} \quad (57)$$

where the smallest richly inaccessible cardinal would be called $\theta_0(0, 0, 1)$. Carmody (2015) found useful results by rocketing up at least five additional tiers and defining the *utterly*, *deeply*, *truly*, *eternally*, and *vastly inaccessible* cardinals, which we can go on to specify as

$$\theta_n(i, h, r, u, d, t, e, v). \quad (58)$$

Of course, we didn't have to stop there, but it probably makes sense to look at things in a slightly different way.

8.4. Top of the Heap?

Mahlo (1911) defined a class of cardinals that sits at the end of the above conceptual chain of inaccessibles. Such cardinals, for which some use the notation ρ , are now called *Mahlo cardinals*, and they must be ρ -inaccessible, hyper $^\rho$ -inaccessible, richly $^\rho$ -inaccessible, utterly $^\rho$ -inaccessible, deeply $^\rho$ -inaccessible, truly $^\rho$ -inaccessible, eternally $^\rho$ -inaccessible, vastly $^\rho$ -inaccessible, and so on for *all* subsequent tiers. In fact, for any ρ that is a Mahlo cardinal, there must also exist ρ smaller cardinals (call them κ , with all $\kappa < \rho$) that are ρ -inaccessible, hyper $^\rho$ -inaccessible, richly $^\rho$ -inaccessible, and so on, with all of those smaller κ 's not being Mahlo. Thus, although a Mahlo cardinal must satisfy all of the above inaccessibility properties, not all cardinals that satisfy these properties are Mahlo cardinals.

Rucker (1982) extended the two-row table that we introduced in Section 8.1 in order to help us wrap our heads around how large Mahlo cardinals really are:

0	1	2	...	ω	→	\aleph_1
0	ω	\aleph_1	θ	→→→	ρ

Recall, back in Section 4, that we experienced a somewhat exhausting process of building up more and more complicated (countable) ordinals that started from ω . This process never really got us to the next (uncountable) number \aleph_1 until we conceptualized things in a fundamentally new way. Well, here we built up more and more complicated degrees of inaccessibility, hyper-inaccessibility, and whatever-inaccessibility, starting with our first discussions of θ , but it never quite got us to that next fundamental stage, which we now call ρ .

Rucker (1982) used one additional way to describe how ρ is so much larger than what came before. This analogy may come the closest to the precise set-theory definition of Mahlo cardinals. (Note that I haven't given this definition, because I don't want to parrot concepts that I still do not really understand!) Despite being inaccessible (and thus regular), ρ really cannot be thought of as “the first of its kind” in any concrete way. Try to envision any imaginable fixed-point property P that an infinite cardinal might obey. We've seen quite a few examples of these so far, and there must be an infinite number of additional examples. For any P that you can envision, if a Mahlo cardinal ρ obeys P , then there always must exist a smaller cardinal $\kappa < \rho$ that also obeys P . This makes it immensely more difficult to “reach” ρ from below.

Despite how far we have climbed, it is still a possibility (if GCH is not valid) that the cardinality of the real continuum $\mathfrak{c} = 2^{\aleph_0}$ may in fact be sitting at this height; i.e., it may be of a comparable magnitude as ρ .

9. FURTHER UP THE LARGE CARDINAL LADDER

9.1. Axioms and Consistency Strength

Recall, back in Section 2, we quoted Rayo (2019), who said that “Our quest to find larger and larger numbers has now morphed into a quest to find more and more

powerful languages!” From this point on, the study of large cardinals definitely echoes this quest, but the languages in question are the highly abstract logical systems of set theory.

It has been known since the 1960s (see, e.g., [Koellner 2014](#)) that climbing the ladder to define ever-larger cardinals requires adding *more and more new axioms* to the basics of ZFC set theory. These new axioms appear to sort themselves into a strict linear order in terms of their “consistency strength.” Consider a given axiom A_1 that produces a theory that is both self-consistent *and* can be used to prove that the theory given by axiom A_2 is also self-consistent. However, axiom A_2 is not able to prove that the theory given by axiom A_1 is self-consistent. This means that axiom A_1 is stronger than axiom A_2 , and also its corresponding large cardinals occur (usually) higher up on the ladder.

Because the “higher” theories are bound by more and more arbitrarily chosen axioms, they are restricted to ever-narrower domains of set theory. However, over the years mathematicians have discovered new interconnections between the “lower” levels, which were not evident until they climbed higher up and expanded their view. The hope is that these interconnections will eventually knit themselves together into a denser cluster of roots that will provide more and more evidence (circumstantial though it may be) for the plausibility of the whole edifice. Quoting [Gödel \(1947\)](#),

There might exist axioms so abundant in their verifiable consequences, shedding so much light upon a whole discipline, and furnishing such powerful methods for solving given problems (and even solving them, as far as that is possible, in a constructivistic way) that quite irrespective of their intrinsic necessity they would have to be assumed at least in the same sense as any well-established physical theory.

Figure 9 shows my attempt to synthesize several diagrams found in books (e.g., [Kanamori 2009](#)), papers (e.g., [Nielsen & Welch 2018](#)), and online that illustrate the hierarchy of the large cardinals and their associated axioms. I cannot vouch for its exactness or completeness. Note that the inaccessible and Mahlo cardinals discussed above are at the very bottom. There’s much more beanstalk to climb.

9.2. Formal Languages and Hierarchies

Defining the next level of large cardinals requires discussing the formal language of set theory that is used to constrain their properties. One can reach up to larger cardinals by using more sophisticated languages, and we will provide only the roughest outline of what is meant by “more sophisticated.” For more comprehensive introductions to how these kinds of formula descriptions work, see texts such as [Sullivan \(2013\)](#) and [Newstead \(2022\)](#).

[Lévy \(1965\)](#) first outlined a hierarchy of formula classification that was then extended in an attempt to describe the indescribable. We can start with a few simple




Figure 9. The author’s idiosyncratic diagram of the large cardinal hierarchy, with the strongest consistency strengths at the top. Blue arrows point from theories that directly imply other theories.

examples of statements in this formal language, such as:

$$\forall n \exists m (m = n + 1) , \quad (59)$$

which means: for all values of a natural number n , there exists a natural number m that is equal to $n + 1$. This is a true statement, since it could be stated with more brevity that “every natural number has a successor.”

However, note how the meaning changes when the order of the unbounded universal quantifier (\forall , “for all”) is swapped with the unbounded existential quantifier (\exists , “there exists”):

$$\exists m \forall n (m = n + 1) . \quad (60)$$

This statement means: there exists a natural number m , such that for every natural number n , it is true that $m = n + 1$. This is false, since it is claiming that there is some number m that is the immediate successor of *every* natural number!

Another example helps us come up with another way to describe the first infinite ordinal ω :

$$\forall x \exists y (x \in y) , \quad (61)$$

which means that when we consider all possible sets corresponding to the natural numbers (x), there exists a set (y , which we call ω) that all of those natural numbers are contained in. Is it true? Well, it is if you accept the existence of infinite sets.

In this case, swapping the order of the quantifiers would say essentially the same thing, but with a different subject/object emphasis:

$$\exists y \forall x (x \in y) , \quad (62)$$

which means that there exists some set (y) that contains every natural number (x). However, starting again with Equation (61) and swapping the orders of x and y in both places produces a false statement. For example, consider

$$\exists y \forall x (y \in x) . \quad (63)$$

This means that there exists something (y) that is a member of every possible set (x), which is not true. In some versions of set theory, the “opposite” of Equation (61) is used to define the concept of the empty set:

$$\forall x \exists y (x \notin y) , \quad (64)$$

where the symbol \notin denotes “not a member of.” The above statement says there must exist a set (y , which we call \emptyset) that contains *none* of the universe of other possible sets (x).

We want to be able to classify statements in formal language on the basis of their complexity; i.e., how well they can convey increasingly intricate and multilayered concepts. There are two general ways that a statement can be made more complex: (1) its chain of alternating, nested quantifiers can be made longer, or (2) each of its variables can be made to represent more and more complex ideas. Let us examine both options.

9.2.1. Language Hierarchy: Quantifier Alternation

Lévy (1965) noted that longer chains of nested \exists and \forall quantifiers provide more powerful ways of describing complex ideas. Thus, it is possible to classify a statement by counting the number of *alternations* between quantifiers that occur:

- The simplest statements contain no unbounded quantifiers, and they are classified as being of type Σ_0 or Π_0 . (These two symbols are equivalent to one another, and are sometimes called by the single name Δ_0 .)
- Σ_1 statements consist of any number of $\exists x$ quantifiers, followed by a Π_0 statement.
- Π_1 statements consist of any number of $\forall x$ quantifiers, followed by a Σ_0 statement.
- In general, Σ_{n+1} statements consist of any number of $\exists x$ quantifiers, followed by a Π_n statement.
- In general, Π_{n+1} statements consist of any number of $\forall x$ quantifiers, followed by a Σ_n statement.

Above, we saw how the exact ordering of \exists and \forall quantifiers makes a difference in the meaning of a statement, so it makes sense that it matters when making these classifications, too.

Some examples of statements that correspond to different levels of the Lévy hierarchy, which we provide only in words (see, e.g., Marks [2021] for details), are:

- “ x is an ordinal” can be written as a Σ_0 or a Π_0 statement.
- “ x is countable” can be written as a Σ_1 statement.
- “ x is a cardinal” can be written as a Π_1 statement.
- “There exists an inaccessible cardinal” can be written as a Σ_2 statement.
- The generalized continuum hypothesis (GCH) can be written as a Π_2 statement.

9.2.2. Language Hierarchy: Logical Order

There is another independent hierarchy that describes how to create increasingly complex statements: the “order” of predicate logic that is being used to define the variables x , y , and so on. Our example statements above were all taken from *first-order logic*, in which the variables can only be straightforward “individuals” in the adopted domain (in this case, either numbers or sets). The most basic form of ZFC discussed earlier is a first-order logic, but there are some versions that allow the variables to only be numbers and not sets.

However, there also exist *second-order* logical systems, in which the variables can be either individuals or relations between those individuals. In second-order logic, one

can use more abstract quantifiers such as $\forall f(x)$ (for all functions of x) or $\exists C$ (there exists a class of objects, or a set of sets). Specifying either \forall for \exists on the power-set $\mathcal{P}(S)$ of some unknown group of sets S is also straightforward to do in second-order logic.

Moving on even higher-order logic systems is less common to see, but they exist. Third-order logic, for example, allows one to define variables for functions of functions, properties of properties, or classes of classes. Although there are cases in which equivalent statements can be rephrased in clever ways that allow one to “translate up or down an order” (see, e.g., [Väänänen 2021](#)), there are *some* things that just cannot be stated in a lower-order logic that become easy to discuss in a higher-order logic.

The basic Lévy hierarchy, which classifies statements on the basis of the number of quantifier alternations, can be extended to also express the logical order of those statements. This now involves adding a superscript m , which corresponds to the statement being in $(m+1)$ th-order logic. Thus, the general classifications are Σ_n^m and Π_n^m , with

- Σ_n^0 or Π_n^0 corresponding to statements in first-order logic. This defines a system called the *arithmetical hierarchy*.
- Σ_n^1 or Π_n^1 corresponding to statements in second-order logic. This defines a system called the *analytical hierarchy*.

A statement that can be classified as both Σ_n^m and Π_n^m is sometimes called Δ_n^m . In general, going up one step in order number m is interpreted as making a “bigger” leap in complexity than just going up one step in Lévy subscript n . In fact, one way to think about going up to the next order is to take the limit of the subscript to (countable) infinity:

$$\Sigma_\omega^m = \Pi_\omega^m = \Delta_\omega^m = \Sigma_0^{m+1} = \Pi_0^{m+1} = \Delta_0^{m+1} ,$$

although this may not be rigorously true in all situations.

9.3. Indescribable Cardinals

The introduction of Σ_n^m and Π_n^m notation allows us to make some definitive statements about different kinds of infinite cardinals that can be described (or not!) using a given level of language in this hierarchy. [Hanf & Scott \(1961\)](#) first made this connection by defining *Q_n^m -indescribable cardinals* as cardinals that cannot be described by any statement made at level Q_n^m of the hierarchy, where Q could be Σ or Π or Δ . We will see that this language can be used to classify a number of different kinds of cardinals at different levels of the tree shown in [Figure 9](#).

Note that if a cardinal is, say, Q_n^m -describable, then it must be describable for all higher values of both m and n , too. Going to either higher m or n opens up one’s universe of expression, but it also always encompasses what came before. However, if a cardinal is Q_n^m -indescribable, then two things must be true: (1) it is also indescribable

at all lower values of m and n , and (2) it *may* become describable at a higher m or n (or it may not). The larger the indices get for a Q_n^m -indescribable cardinal, the more difficult it becomes to describe it using finite language, and thus its cardinality tends to be larger.

Here is a summary, expressed in words and not in formal language (for which, see [Drake 1974](#); [Jech 2003](#); [Kanamori 2009](#)), of how we can begin to wrap our heads around these different levels:

- The “smallest” class of infinite cardinals, like \aleph_0 , \aleph_1 , and \aleph_ω , were discussed in Sections 6 and 7. These can all be called *accessible* because they are all Π_n^0 -describable, for some n . Our first-order definition of ω , given in Equation (61), is an example of this describability.
- Next, we make the leap to inaccessible cardinals (Section 8) and we can state that every inaccessible cardinal is Π_n^0 -indescribable, for all $n > 1$. As we mentioned earlier, large cardinals like the inaccessibles cannot be proven to exist in standard ZFC set theory. Thus, it makes sense that these quantities are not completely describable using a first-order logic system like ZFC (i.e., $m = 0$ in the superscript). It has also been shown that inaccessibility is equivalent to being Σ_1^1 -indescribable.
- Strongly-inaccessible cardinals are Π_0^1 -indescribable. If GCH is not true, then strongly-inaccessible cardinals are larger than weakly-inaccessible cardinals.
- [Erdős & Tarski \(1961\)](#) introduced the *weakly compact cardinals*, which sit directly above the Mahlo cardinals in Figure 9. These correspond precisely to being Π_1^1 -indescribable, and they can be considered the limit of cardinals that are Mahlo, n -Mahlo, hyper-Mahlo, richly-Mahlo, and so on (although we never actually defined these higher levels of Mahlo-ness).
- [Jensen & Kunen \(1969\)](#) introduced the *ineffable cardinals*, which generally correspond to being Π_2^1 -indescribable.
- [Ulam \(1930\)](#) introduced the *measurable cardinals*, which we now know sit higher up in Figure 9 than many of the ones discussed above. If κ is measurable, then it can be considered the κ^{th} weakly compact cardinal. All measurable cardinals are Π_1^2 -indescribable. Note how even third-order ($m = 2$) logic isn't up to the task of describing cardinals at this level!
- *Totally indescribable cardinals* are Π_n^m -indescribable for every finite natural number m and n . They are also Σ_n^m -indescribable and Δ_n^m -indescribable.

Note that the above list skips several steps in Figure 9. However, it is often the case that if cardinal A is directly above cardinal B in the ladder of consistency strength, one can say that all cardinals of type A are also of type B .




Figure 10. Groupings and nested subsets of different types of numbers. Note that even the smallest set (the natural numbers \mathbb{N}) contains a countable infinity of members.

9.4. Another Visit with the Continuum

As we continue to climb past landmarks on the mountain of cardinality, we can still wonder about where \mathfrak{c} , the cardinality of the real numbers, may be. Back in Section 6.2 we outlined some plausible-sounding arguments in favor of $\mathfrak{c} = \aleph_1$ (i.e., the continuum hypothesis). However, now let us discuss a few additional concepts that *may* support the idea of \mathfrak{c} sitting in the neighborhood of the indescribables that we have just, um, described.

Take a look at the diagram shown in Figure 10. We started this whole journey with \mathbb{N} , the set of all natural numbers. That was just a subset of the positive and negative integers (which use the set symbol \mathbb{Z}), and the integers are a subset of the rationals (which use the symbol \mathbb{Q}). This region of *countably infinite* sets is outlined in green. Everything outside that region (shown in yellow) corresponds to the set of irrational numbers that are either real (with symbol \mathbb{R}) or complex (with symbol \mathbb{C}), with both of those full sets having uncountable cardinality \mathfrak{c} . There are a few interesting sets of numbers in between these extremes:

- The *algebraic numbers* (for which we use the symbol \mathbb{A}) consist of the full set of roots of polynomials with integer coefficients. Thus, all rational numbers are algebraic, but there are many irrationals that are also algebraic. Note that $\sqrt{2}$ is a root of the polynomial $x^2 - 2$, so this famous irrational number is a member of \mathbb{A} . Some of these roots are imaginary and complex, so note that the set \mathbb{A} crosses over into \mathbb{C} . We can recall from Section 4.2 that the number of polynomials with integer coefficients is essentially ω^ω , and this corresponds to cardinality \aleph_0 . Thus, despite the algebraic numbers sitting in the yellow

realm that includes the full set of uncountable irrationals, the set \mathbb{A} by itself is countable. The algebraic numbers can fit into Hilbert’s Hotel!

- The next larger subset shown in Figure 10 corresponds to the *computable numbers*, for which I’ve seen people use the symbol \mathbb{K} . These are numbers that can be computed to arbitrary precision by use of a finite algorithm. All algebraic numbers are computable, but not all computable numbers are algebraic. Most famously, transcendental numbers such as π and e are computable, as one can show by programming a computer to spit out as many decimal digits of these numbers as one wants. Turing (1936) showed that the set \mathbb{K} is countable.
- Lastly, there is the set \mathbb{D} of *definable numbers*. These are somewhat similar to the computable numbers, but here the specification involves being able to describe the number precisely using formal mathematical language. If one can write down a formal expression that defines a number, then it is definable. One can also show that all computable numbers are definable, but not all definable numbers are computable. It is not easy to come up with examples of definable but uncomputable numbers, but see Simonsen (2005) for the fascinatingly weird case of “Specker sequences.” Although the possible number of formal expressions one can write is infinite, it is nevertheless a *countable* infinity. Thus, the set \mathbb{D} is countable, with cardinality \aleph_0 , and its members can fit into Hilbert’s Hotel, too.

Despite the sets \mathbb{A} , \mathbb{K} , and \mathbb{D} covering larger and larger parts of the uncountable set of irrational numbers, each of those sets by itself is countable. There are arguments given in Appendix A for why the set of all rationals \mathbb{Q} takes up negligibly small space in the full set of reals \mathbb{R} . However, we can create a one-to-one correspondence between the members of any countably infinite set. Thus, we can replace \mathbb{Q} in these arguments by, say, \mathbb{N} , \mathbb{Z} , \mathbb{A} , \mathbb{K} , or \mathbb{D} . This means that the huge set of definable numbers, which are all numbers that can be described by the formal language of set theory, is still a *negligibly tiny part of the real continuum*. In this sense, the full diversity of numbers contained in \mathbb{R} is indescribable using formal set theory!

Does the above set of arguments imply that we can jump to the conclusion that \mathfrak{c} is an indescribable cardinal? Not really. Although the total number of possible formulas that can be written down is “only” of cardinality \aleph_0 , we also know that *some* of those formulas can describe infinite cardinalities larger than \aleph_0 . In any case, this line of thinking shows how we may start to come to terms with the CH being false—and with the possibility that \mathfrak{c} *could* be a much, much larger cardinal than \aleph_1 .

10. HOW MUCH HIGHER CAN WE CLIMB?

10.1. The Constructible Universe

We can keep ascending the ladder of large cardinals shown in Figure 9, but it becomes increasingly difficult to talk about them using plain language. Earlier, I quoted

Rucker (1982), who discussed that Gödel (1940) showed how Cantor’s continuum hypothesis (CH) is consistent with ZFC. This did not prove that $\mathfrak{c} = \aleph_1$, but it did show that one can never prove that $\mathfrak{c} \neq \aleph_1$. However, this work had additional consequences for whether or not large cardinals can exist past a certain point, so we need to talk more about it.

Up until this point, nearly everything we have been discussing has applied to what is called the *von Neumann universe* of set theory. The term “universe” applies to the collection of all sets that satisfy a given property. The von Neumann universe, which is called V , starts with the sets corresponding to the natural numbers, which we illustrated in Equation (12). Note how each successor set encompasses all subsets of the preceding set. V is the union of all of these sets, as well as all other sets corresponding to infinite successor ordinals (which have immediate predecessors) and infinite limit ordinals (which don’t have immediate predecessors). One thing that we can say about V is that there are *a lot* of potential ways to reach some arbitrarily high level of cardinality. It’s also amenable to adding lots of new, exploratory axioms, as we have already discussed. Thus, V is kind of a wide-open “wild west” of set theory.

Gödel (1940) decided to try a minimalist thought-experiment. Maybe, he thought, it is possible to wrap our heads around things more easily by defining a parallel universe of set theory that is *more restricted* in how one is allowed climb to the higher levels. In other words, if we limit ourselves to stricter definitions (i.e., of how the higher levels are constructed on the foundations of the lower levels), then the results may be less dependent on the whims of theorists who like to play around with axioms. Thus, Gödel defined a *constructible universe* and used the symbol L for it (for “Law!”). The strictness comes into play in the definition of what we mean by a successor. Our existing definition of a successor essentially tops out at the power-set; i.e., we’re guaranteed to leap up to a higher level of cardinality by taking the set of all possible subsets of what came before. Gödel replaced $\mathcal{P}(x)$ by a more rigidly definable operator $\mathcal{D}(x)$, which is the same as the power-set for finite sets, but is limited to what can be specified by Δ_0^0 -type formulas (using only first-order logic) for infinite sets. Strictly speaking, $\mathcal{D}(x)$ specifies a subset of $\mathcal{P}(x)$, so that means the entire universe L must be a subset of V .

The question then becomes: How far can we go by assuming that $V = L$? It would be nice if the $\mathcal{D}(x)$ successor operation was all that we really needed. Also, it would be nice if we were able to extract all of the useful results of infinite set theory by staying inside the safe confines of L ; i.e., a universe that is so much easier to work in, because of its restrictedness. Gödel (1940) postulated an *Axiom of Constructibility* that postulated that $V = L$, and here are some consequences of that assumption:

- When working in “plain” Zermelo–Fraenkel theory (ZF), it is not possible to disprove the Axiom of Choice. Thus, if ZF is self-consistent, then so is ZFC.
- Both the CH and GCH are true, so $\mathfrak{c} = \aleph_1$ after all (in the L universe).

- Thus, all weak-limit cardinals are also strong-limit cardinals.
- However, in L , there exists a boundary in consistency strength (see the horizontal line labeled $V = L$ in Figure 9) above which large cardinals *cannot exist*. Inaccessible, Mahlo, and weakly compact cardinals sit below this boundary, but measurable cardinals sit above it.

Thus, L has some benefits, but it also has limitations. In order to go above the $V = L$ line, one has to posit new axioms that allow for the existence of “non-constructible” sets; i.e., sets that wouldn’t be able to exist in L . For this reason, quite a few mathematicians believe that the “universe” is quite a bit larger than L .

10.2. Reflection from the Ultimate Heights

To climb higher, I think we need to discuss one additional concept: *the Reflection Principle*. To begin discussing it, though, we need to begin wrapping our heads around the idea of Absolute Infinity... i.e., the cardinality associated with the utter totality of the von Neumann universe V . The Absolute is the highest degree of infinity, which by definition includes all other possible ways of conceptualizing it. Cantor contemplated this idea with earnestly religious reverence. Using one interpretation of Cantor’s writings, one can use the symbol Ω to refer to the Absolute as the union of all ordinals, and \aleph (the final Hebrew letter, “tav”) as the union of all cardinals.

The Reflection Principle can be stated as the claim that, for any statement that can be made about the von Neumann universe V , it is possible to find a subset of V for which that statement is true. [Rucker \(1982\)](#) provided the following explanation:

The motivation behind the Reflection Principle is that the Absolute should be totally inconceivable. Now, if there is some conceivable property P such that the Absolute is the only thing having property P , then I can conceive of the Absolute as “the only thing with property P .” The Reflection Principle prevents this from happening by asserting that whenever I conceive of some very powerful property P , then the first thing I come up with that satisfies P will *not* be the Absolute, but will instead be some smallish rational thought that just happens to reflect the facet of the Absolute that is expressed by saying it has property P .

According to its proponents, if we deny the Reflection Principle, we are claiming that the Absolute can be “pinned down by finiteness.” If we could find some finite thing to say that defines the Absolute (by applying only to it, and not to any smaller subsets of it), then what we *thought* was the Absolute couldn’t have really been the Absolute! [Welch \(2019\)](#) noted that

Historically reflection principles are associated with attempts to formulate the idea that no one notion, idea, statement can capture our whole view of V .

It may be surprising to see that we’re discussing how to climb higher in Figure 9 by contemplating “skipping to the end” of all possible infinities. It also sounds somewhat theological, like Anselm’s ontological argument for the existence of God, or Aquinas’ argument about degrees of perfection (see, e.g., [Welch & Horsten 2016](#)). In addition, it may not be surprising to learn that the Reflection Principle seems to skirt up against the boundary of contradiction! After all, one “property” of V is that it contains all sets. However, no subset of V (that is not equal to V itself) has *that* property. The philosopher Bertrand Russell began to study this apparent paradox at the beginning of the 20th century. Since then, mathematicians have proven themselves clever enough to formulate more precise versions of the Reflection Principle that sidestep the contradiction by specifying their terms in well-formed ways (see, e.g., [Bagaria 2023](#)).

In any case, the Reflection Principle has been used to help specify the precise set-theory definitions of just about all of the large cardinals, from the inaccessible on up. However, once we reach the uppermost heights of Figure 9 and start encountering the *extendible cardinals* (introduced by [Magidor \[1971\]](#) and [Reinhardt \[1974\]](#)), I can’t help but wonder if *some* aspect of the Reflection Principle starts to break down. I can only report on the descriptions made by others to state that an extendible cardinal is so large that it becomes difficult to distinguish where we even are in the hierarchies of cardinality and consistency strength.

[Rucker \(1982\)](#) provided the poetic analogy of climbing up a steep cliff-face. As we climb, we can look down to see the lowest levels of cardinality (i.e., the inaccessible and Mahlo cardinals), and we can see that there is still a lot of cliff above us, yet to climb. What would happen if we closed our eyes, and an eagle grabbed us and flew us up, up, up, and dropped us off at some higher place on the cliff? If we had started at some middling level (say, at the measurable cardinals), when we opened our eyes we *would* be able to notice the change. It would be possible to see how much further above the lowest levels we have flown, and how much closer we are now to visible landmarks above us. However, if we had started in the vicinity of the extendible cardinals, there would be *no way* to tell the difference. The extendible cardinals are so large that virtually everything surrounding them takes up enough real-estate to make all other distinctions of size seem insignificant in comparison.

11. CONCLUSIONS

Unfortunately, this is where I have to stop. I really haven’t begun to understand many of the large cardinals, not to mention the huge, superhuge, ultrahuge, and rank-into-rank cardinals near the top of Figure 9. At the *very* top sits a statement of utter contradiction, $0 = 1$. This essentially means that the “strongest” possible way to proceed is to start with an axiom like $0 = 1$, which would then mean that we could prove *anything we want*. However, I probably need to paraphrase *The Incredibles* and

note that when every possible statement is mutually consistent, then nothing really is.

I began this journey with appreciation for [Rucker \(1982\)](#), and I should mention that he spent a lot of time discussing how contemplating the infinite can be considered a union of two opposite modes of thinking. On one hand, it’s the pinnacle of pure MYSTICISM. In what other mode of life would one dare to approach “the all?” We mentioned Cantor’s religious reverence of the Absolute Ω , and I think it bears some resemblance to the concept of *nirguna brahman* (unmanifest infinite reality) from the Hindu Upanishads, too. In addition, recall all the times that we were required to think in new and creative ways, doing an end-run around some established idea. This reminds me of how wizards and shamans were said to battle one another—by reshaping reality to outwit the other—in myths and stories.

On the the other hand, because every step of this effort has been buttressed by the need to prove things from first principles, it also seems like the pinnacle of pure RATIONALITY. This is likely what Hilbert meant by “the paradise that Cantor has created for us.” It is an amazing thing that our finite brains have been able to derive and discern truths about concepts that may in fact be too big to fit into our physical universe. The process of learning more and more logical detail about how the world works should make it all more wondrous, not less.³ That thought may be a cliché, but others have explored it in fascinating detail (e.g., [Eiseley 1960](#); [Nalbantian 2008](#); [Deutsch 2011](#)).

Lastly, I need to acknowledge that I haven’t really covered every interesting development that led to the full blooming of the tree shown in [Figure 9](#). I also ended up not mentioning many related topics—e.g., the Cantor set, the Banach-Tarski paradox, or the intricacies of ordinal and cardinal arithmetic—that didn’t seem to be crucial for the process of climbing that tree. My ultimate goal is still to understand and explain all of the different varieties of infinity for a non-specialist audience, and I will amend these notes if I find interesting new ways to do that.

APPENDIX

A. PROOFS THAT THE RATIONALS HAVE “MEASURE ZERO”

It turns out that there are several interesting and complementary ways to show that the *countable* set of all rational numbers essentially takes up zero space along the *uncountable* real number line. This is discussed frequently in textbooks on real analysis (e.g., [Rudin 1976](#); [Boas 1996](#); [Carothers 2000](#)) and measure theory ([Tao 2011](#)), but I have not been able to find a concise collection of these multiple proofs

³ And, by “the world,” I mean much more than the physical universe of atoms and energy.

written for non-specialist audiences. The subsections below present a few interesting examples.

A.1. Repeating Versus Non-Repeating Decimals

This first one is only a plausibility argument, not really a proof. However, it has the benefit of involving relatively familiar concepts. Consider the fact that all rational numbers have decimal expansions that end in an infinitely repeating pattern of digits. Whether it is only a single repeating digit, such as

$$1 = 1.000000\dots = 0.999999\dots \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{8}{9} = 0.888888\dots = 0.\overline{8}$$

or repeating clumps of multiple digits, like

$$\frac{1}{13} = 0.076923076923076923076923076923\dots = 0.\overline{076923} ,$$

if a number can be represented as the ratio of two natural numbers, then its decimal expansion eventually terminates in a repeating pattern.

Once we know this, we see that it is possible to *deviate* from this pattern and obtain an irrational number. We must be careful about how this is done. If we start with a given rational number and change only one digit, with all succeeding digits still obeying the original pattern, the new number is still a rational number. It is now a different one from the original number, but it's still rational. However, there are an infinite number of ways of producing infinitely perturbed (but not regularly-spaced) deviations! For example, consider something called Liouville's constant, which is determined by starting with zero and adding 1-digits at non-periodic intervals determined by the factorial function:

$$x = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{10^{n!}} .$$

Thus, $x = 0.1 + 0.01 + 10^{-6} + 10^{-24} + 10^{-120} + \dots$. Every digit is well-determined, but it does not ever terminate in the kind of infinitely repeating pattern that defines a rational number.

Now consider generalizing Liouville's constant to something like

$$x(a, b, c) = \sum_{n=a}^{\infty} \frac{b}{c^{n!}} ,$$

where a , b and c can be any positive integer. Then, consider adding every possible value of $x(a, b, c)$ to a given rational number. This gives us at least $\omega \cdot 3$ different ways of "perturbing" that rational number's digits so that it becomes an irrational number.

Of course, there is an even more vastly infinite number of *other* ways of defining a non-periodically perturbed decimal expansion, besides using the factorial function. As one more example, consider Champernowne's constant:

$$0.12345678910111213141516171819202122232425\dots$$

i.e., the concatenation of each succeeding decimal numeral in the set of all natural numbers. This is irrational, too! One could also define ω different unique versions of this kind of constant, simply by starting at a different natural number (besides 1) after the decimal point. Each rational number can be transformed into an infinite number of new irrationals by adding these constants to it.

Thus, for every rational number, there exist infinitely many irrational numbers. If one stakes out some piece of the real line (say, the interval $[0,1]$ that we examined before), the rational numbers inside that space must occupy a vanishingly small part of it.

A.2. Reals and Rationals as Continued Fractions

Our familiarity with decimal expansions (as the default mode of expressing real and rational numbers) may just be a historical fluke. There are other ways of representing numbers to arbitrary precision, and for this application there is one that may be superior to the decimal expansion. Consider the *continued fraction*,

$$a_0 + \frac{1}{a_1 + \frac{1}{a_2 + \frac{1}{a_3 + \frac{1}{\ddots + \frac{1}{a_n}}}}}$$

which is an iterative way of expressing a number as the sum of reciprocals that involve only integers a_n . The collection of partial quotients is often expressed using a more compact notation

$$[a_0; a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, \dots, a_n] ,$$

and each unique collection of a_n quotients has a one-to-one-correspondence with a specific real or rational number.

The key fact to know is that rational numbers can always be represented by a *finite* number of partial quotients, but irrational numbers always require an *infinite* number of partial quotients. Some irrationals (like π) have no discernible pattern in their infinite list of partial quotients. Others (like $\sqrt{2}$) have infinitely repeating digits in their pattern, and still others (like e) have non-periodic patterns reminiscent of the decimal representations of Liouville's or Champernowne's constants. The irrational number with the slowest possible convergence is the golden ratio,

$$\varphi = \frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2} = [1; 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, \dots] .$$

Thus, there is a clear distinction between a countable collection of finite sets (which correspond to the rational numbers), and an uncountably *larger* collection of infinite

sets (which correspond to irrational numbers). Thus, our concept that the rationals occupy much less space than the irrationals is essentially another way of stating that $\aleph_0 < \mathfrak{c}$.

A.3. The Standard Textbook Proof

This is probably the most frequently seen proof. First, let us choose a finite piece of the real number line. The familiar interval $[0,1]$ is a fine choice. Then, let us create an enumerated list of all rational numbers that fit into this interval. This is a similar procedure to the one outlined in Section 4.2, but here we should be careful to exclude any fractions that are divided by zero, and also exclude duplicates (i.e., once we include $1/2$ in the list, we should skip $2/4$, $3/6$, $4/8$, and so on). Now that we have an ordered list of rationals, let us call them Q_n , where the subscript n covers all of the natural numbers.

The question now becomes: How much “real estate” do these numbers occupy along the number line? That is a difficult question to answer because each number is really just a dimensionless point with no width. However, let us err on the side of potentially *overestimating* this result by defining some finite widths around each rational number. Inspired by the speed-up’s defined by Rucker (1982), let us specify some finite quantity ϵ and posit that each rational number Q_n is surrounded by an interval

$$\left[Q_n - \frac{\epsilon}{2^{n+2}}, Q_n + \frac{\epsilon}{2^{n+2}} \right].$$

In other words, Q_0 corresponds to a finite line segment of total length $\epsilon/2$, Q_1 corresponds to a finite line segment of total length $\epsilon/4$, Q_2 corresponds to a finite line segment of total length $\epsilon/8$, and so on. Given the infinite series of Equation (15), we see that the total length occupied by the full set of rationals is equal to exactly ϵ .

Aside: We should admit that the total length may be a bit less than ϵ because the finite interval for any one rational number may overlap a bit with the finite intervals for some of its neighbors. But the total length cannot be *more* than ϵ .

Note that we never specified a value for ϵ . All we really know is that it must be a positive real number, so that each interval has a non-zero length. The key insight is that the above argument works perfectly well if we assume that $\epsilon = 0.0000001$, or even if $\epsilon = 10^{-999}$. Thus, it is safe to assume that ϵ is infinitesimally small compared to the actual length of the real interval between 0 and 1. Thus, because our entire ϵ construction was always an overestimate, it is perfectly fine to conclude that the full set of rational numbers (of ordinality ω^2 , or cardinality \aleph_0) takes up virtually no space along the real number line. The technical term, which is useful if you want to search for additional information on this, is that we have shown the rationals have “Lebesgue measure zero.”

REFERENCES

- Augenstein, B. W. 1984, “Hadron physics and transfinite set theory,” *Int. J. Theoretical Phys.*, 23, 1197–1205 [DOI]
- Baez, J. C. 2016, “Large countable ordinals (part 1),” johncarlosbaez.wordpress.com, the blog of the Azimuth Project [URL]
- Bagaria, J. 2013, “Set theory: An introduction to the world of large cardinals,” online lecture notes, Nordic Spring School in Logic 2013 [URL]
- Bagaria, J. 2023, “Large cardinals as principles of structural reflection,” *Bull. Symbolic Logic*, 29, 19–70 [DOI] [URL]
- Bekkali, M. 1991, *Topics in Set Theory: Lebesgue Measurability, Large Cardinals, Forcing Axioms, Rho-functions*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1476 (Berlin: Springer) [DOI]
- Boas, R. P. 1996, *A Primer of Real Functions*, 4th ed. (Washington, DC: Mathematical Association of America) [URL]
- Cantor, G. 1883, “Ueber unendliche, lineare Punktmannichfaltigkeiten,” *Math Annalen.*, 21, 545–591 [DOI]
- Cantor, G. 1915, *Contributions to the Founding of the Theory of Transfinite Numbers*, translated by P. E. B. Jourdain (New York: Dover)
- Carmody, E. 2015, *Force to Change Large Cardinal Strength*, Ph.D. Dissertation, City University of New York [URL]
- Carothers, N. L. 2000, *Real Analysis* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge U. Press) [DOI]
- Cheng, E. 2017, *Beyond Infinity: An Expedition to the Outer Limits of Mathematics* (New York: Basic Books)
- Clark, M. 2012, *Paradoxes from A to Z*, 3rd ed. (London: Routledge) [DOI]
- Conway, J. H., & Guy, R. K. 1996, *The Book of Numbers* (New York: Springer-Verlag) [DOI]
- Corless, R. M., Gonnet, G. H., Hare, D. E. G., Jeffrey, D. J., & Knuth, D. E. 1996, “On the Lambert W function,” *Adv. Comput. Math.*, 5, 329–359 [DOI]
- Cranmer, S. R. 2004, “New views of the solar wind with the Lambert W function,” *Am. J. Phys.*, 72, 1397–1403 [ADS]
- Daras, N. J., & Rassias, T. M. 2018, editors, *Modern Discrete Mathematics and Analysis: With Applications in Cryptography, Information Systems and Modeling* (Cham, Switzerland: Springer) [DOI]
- Davis, T. 2000, “Infinity,” *Mathematical Circles* web page [URL]
- Dehornoy, P. 1995, “From large cardinals to braids vis distributive algebra,” *J. Knot Theory & Ramific.*, 4, 33–79 [DOI]
- Deutsch, D. 2011, *The Beginning of Infinity: Explanations that Transform the World* (New York: Penguin Books)
- Drake, F. R. 1974, *Set Theory: An Introduction to Large Cardinals* (Amsterdam: North-Holland)
- Easton, W. 1970, “Powers of regular cardinals,” *Ann. Math. Logic*, 1, 139–178 [DOI]
- Eiseley, L. C. 1960, *The Firmament of Time* (New York: Atheneum)
- El Naschie, M. S. 2002, “Quantum loops, wild topology and fat Cantor sets in transfinite high-energy physics,” *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, 13, 1167–1174 [DOI]
- Erdős, P., & Tarski, A. 1961, “On some problems involving inaccessible cardinals,” in *Essays on the Foundations of Mathematics*, ed. Y. Bar-Hillel, E. Poznanski, M. Rabin, & A. Robinson (Jerusalem: Magnes Press), 50–82
- Ewald, W., & Sieg, W. 2013, editors, *David Hilbert’s Lectures on the Foundations of Arithmetic and Logic 1917–1933* (Berlin: Springer) [DOI]
- Faticoni, T. G. 2012, *The Mathematics of Infinity: A Guide to Great Ideas*, 2nd ed. (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley) [DOI]

- Flannery, D. 2006, *The Square Root of 2: A Dialogue Concerning a Number and a Sequence* (New York: Springer-Verlag) [DOI]
- Foreman, M., Magidor, M., & Shelah, S. 1988, “Martin’s maximum, saturated ideals, and non-regular ultrafilters: Part I,” *Annals Math.*, 2nd series, 127, 1–47 [DOI]
- Galidakis, I. N. 2020, *The Problem of the Infinite Exponential*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Agricultural University of Athens. [URL]
- Gardner, M. 1977, “Mathematical Games” (November 1977), *Scientific American*, 237, 18–28 [DOI]
- Gobet, F., Lane, P. C. R., Croker, S., Cheng, P. C. H., Jones, G., Oliver, I., & Pine, J. M. 2001, “Chunking mechanisms in human learning,” *Trends in Cogn. Sci.*, 5, 236–243 [DOI]
- Gödel, K. 1940, *The Consistency of the Axiom of Choice and of the Generalized Continuum-hypothesis with the Axioms of Set Theory*, *Annals of Math. Studies*, 3 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton U. Press)
- Gödel, K. 1947, “What is Cantor’s continuum problem?” *Am. Math. Monthly*, 54, 515–525 [DOI]
- Goodstein, R. L. 1947, “Transfinite ordinals in recursive number theory,” *J. Symbolic Logic*, 12, 123–129 [DOI]
- Hanf, W. P., & Scott, D. S. 1961, “Classifying inaccessible cardinals,” *Not. Am. Math. Soc.*, 8, 445
- Hardy, G. H. 1949, *Divergent Series* (Oxford: Clarendon)
- Hausdorff, F. 1908, “Grundzüge einer Theorie der geordneten Mengen,” *Math. Annalen*, 65, 435–505 [DOI]
- Heller, M., & Woodin, W. H. 2011, editors, *Infinity: New Research Frontiers* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge U. Press) [DOI]
- Hilbert, D. 1926, “Über das Unendliche,” *Math Annalen.*, 95, 161–190 [DOI]
- Honzik, R. 2017, “Large cardinals and the continuum hypothesis,” in *The Hyperuniverse Project and Maximality*, ed. C. Antos, S.-D. Friedman, R. Honzik, C. Ternullo (Cham, Switzerland: Springer), 205–226 [DOI]
- Jech, T. 2003, *Set Theory: The Third Millennium Edition, revised and expanded* (Berlin: Springer-Verlag) [DOI]
- Jensen, R., & Kunen, K. 1969, “Some combinatorial properties of L and V ,” unpublished manuscript [URL]
- Jogalekar, A. 2013, “An eternity of infinities: the power and beauty of mathematics,” *The Curious Wavefunction*, a Scientific American blog [URL]
- Kanamori, A. 2009, *The Higher Infinite: Large Cardinals in Set Theory from Their Beginnings*, 2nd ed. (Berlin: Springer) [DOI]
- Knoebel, R. A. 1981, “Exponentials reiterated,” *Am. Math. Monthly*, 88, 235–252 [DOI]
- Knuth, D. E. 1976, “Mathematics and computer science: Coping with finiteness,” *Science*, 194, 1235–1242 [DOI]
- Koellner, P. 2014, “Large cardinals and determinacy,” in the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2014 Edition), ed. E. Zalta [URL]
- Kragh, H. 2014, “The true (?) story of Hilbert’s infinite hotel,” preprint, arXiv:1403.0059 [URL]
- Lévy, A. 1965, “A hierarchy of formulas in set theory,” *Mem. Am. Math. Soc.*, 57, 76
- Magidor, M. 1971, “On the role of supercompact and extendible cardinals in logic,” *Israel J. Math.*, 10, 147–157 [DOI]
- Mahlo, P. 1911, “Über lineare transfinite Mengen,” *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*, 63, 187–225 [JFM]

- Marks, A. 2021, “Set Theory,” online lecture notes [\[URL\]](#)
- Maurer, H. 1901, “Über die Funktion $y = x^{[x^{[x^{(\dots)}]}]}$ für ganzzahliges Argument (Abundanzen),” *Mitt. Math. Ges. Hamburg*, 4, 33–50
- Moroni, L. 2019, “The strange properties of the infinite power tower,” preprint, arXiv:1908.05559 [\[URL\]](#)
- Mückenheim, W. 2023, *Transfinity: A Source Book* [\[URL\]](#)
- Nalbantian, S. 2008, “Neuroaesthetics: Neuroscientific theory and illustration from the arts,” *Interdisc. Sci. Rev.*, 33, 357–368 [\[DOI\]](#)
- Narayana Swamy, P. 1999, “Infinities in physics and transfinite numbers in mathematics,” preprint, arXiv:math-ph/9909033 [\[URL\]](#)
- Newstead, C. 2022, *An Infinite Descent into Pure Mathematics*, version 0.5, online lecture notes [\[URL\]](#)
- Nielsen, D. S., & Welch, P. 2018, “Games and Ramsey-like cardinals,” *J. Symbolic Logic*, 84, 408–437 [\[DOI\]](#)
- Pechenik, O. 2010, “Large Cardinals,” *Oberlin College Honors Papers*, 388 [\[URL\]](#)
- Rayo, A. 2019, *On the Brink of Paradox: Highlights from the Intersection of Philosophy and Mathematics* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press)
- Reinhardt, W. N. 1974, “Remarks on reflection principles, large cardinals, and elementary embeddings,” in *Axiomatic Set Theory*, ed. T. Jech, *Proc. Symp. Pure Math.*, Vol. XIII, Part II (Providence, RI: Am. Math. Soc.), 189–205
- Rucker, R. 1982, *Infinity and the Mind: The Science and Philosophy of the Infinite* (Boston: Birkhäuser) [\[DOI\]](#) [\[URL\]](#)
- Rudin, W. 1976, *Principles of Mathematical Analysis*, 3rd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill)
- Sagan, H. *Space-Filling Curves* (New York: Springer Science) [\[DOI\]](#)
- Sheppard, B. 2014, *The Logic of Infinity* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge U. Press) [\[DOI\]](#)
- Sierpiński, W. 1965, *Cardinal and Ordinal Numbers*, 2nd ed. (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe)
- Simonsen, J. G. 2005, “Specker sequences revisited,” *Math. Logic Quarterly*, 51, 532–540 [\[DOI\]](#)
- Smith, B. 1988, editor, *Foundations of Gestalt Theory* (Munich & Vienna: Philosophia Verlag) [\[DOI\]](#)
- Smith, P. 2022, *Beginning Mathematical Logic: A Study Guide* (Cambridge, UK: Logic Matters) [\[URL\]](#)
- Srivastava, R. 2022, “The landscape of large cardinals,” preprint, arXiv:2205.01787 [\[URL\]](#)
- Stevens, M. 2016, “How to count past infinity,” Vsauce YouTube Channel [\[URL\]](#)
- Sullivan, B. W. 2013, *Everything You Always Wanted to Know About Mathematics (But Didn’t Even Know to Ask): A Guided Journey Into the World of Abstract Mathematics and the Writing of Proofs*, Doctoral Dissertation, Carnegie Mellon University [\[URL\]](#)
- Tao, T. 2011, *An Introduction to Measure Theory* (Providence, RI: Am. Math. Soc.) [\[DOI\]](#)
- Tarski, A. 1938, “Über unerreichbare Kardinalzahlen,” *Fund. Math.* 30, 68–89 [\[URL\]](#)
- Thiemann, T., & Winkler, O. 2001, “Gauge field theory coherent states (GCS), IV.: Infinite tensor product and thermodynamical limit,” *Classical Quantum Grav.*, 18, 4997–5053 [\[ADS\]](#)
- Thomson, J. F. 1954, “Tasks and super-tasks,” *Analysis*, 15, 1–13 [\[DOI\]](#)
- Turing, A. M. 1936, “On computable numbers, with an application to the Entscheidungsproblem,” *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, Series 2, 42, 230–265 [\[DOI\]](#)
- Ulam, S. 1930, “Zur Masstheorie in der allgemeinen Mengenlehre,” *Fund. Mathematicae*, 16, 140–150 [\[DOI\]](#)

- Väänänen, J. “Second-order and higher-order logic,” in the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2021 Edition), ed. E. Zalta [\[URL\]](#)
- von Neumann, J. 1923, “Zur Einführung der transfiniten Zahlen,” *Acta litterarum ac scientiarum Regiae Universitatis Hungaricae Francisco-Josephinae, Sectio scientiarum mathematicarum*, 1, 199–208
- Welch, P. D. 2019, “Proving theorems from reflection,” in *Reflections on the Foundations of Mathematics: Univalent Foundations, Set Theory and General Thoughts*, ed. S. Centrone, D. Kant, D. Sarikaya (Cham, Switzerland: Springer), 79–97 [\[DOI\]](#)
- Welch, P., & Horsten, L. 2016, “Reflecting on absolute infinity,” *J. Philosophy*, 113, 89–111 [\[DOI\]](#)
- Wheeler, J. A. 1990, “Information, physics, quantum: The search for links,” in *Complexity, Entropy, and the Physics of Information*, ed. W. Zurek (Redwood City, CA: Addison-Wesley), 354–368
- Wigner, E. P. 1960, “The unreasonable effectiveness of mathematics in the natural sciences,” *Comm. Pure & Applied Math.*, 13, 1–14 [\[DOI\]](#)
- Wilczek, F. 1999, “Getting its from bits,” *Nature*, 397, 303–306 [\[DOI\]](#)
- Zenkin, A. A. 2004, “Logic of actual infinity and G. Cantor’s diagonal proof of the uncountability of the continuum,” *Review of Modern Logic*, 9, 27–82
- Zuckerman, M. M. 1974, *Sets and Transfinite Numbers* (New York: Collier-Macmillan)