Journal Academica Vol. 15(1), pp. 19–25, July 20, 2026 – Philosophy of Mathematics
ISSN 2161-3338 - online edition www.journalacademica.org

Discussion Note

Cantor, Axiomatic Set Theory, and the Articulation of Multiplicity

A Note on Metric Abstraction and Zero-Dimensional Continua

Karim Daghbouche

Received February 26, 2026; Revised March 21, 2026; Accepted June 13, 2026

ABSTRACT

A standard construction in fractal geometry yields Cantor-type sets of Hausdorff dimension zero whose cardinality remains that of the continuum. This discussion note uses that familiar limit case as a clarifying exhibit rather than as a source of mathematical novelty. The central claim is that the case helps distinguish metric presentation from formal multiplicity and, on that basis, sharpens a philosophical demarcation between Cantor's conception of set and later axiomatic set theory. Cantor's account of set and magnitude still keeps visible the gathering of many into one whole, whereas axiomatic set theory supplies a formal articulation of multiplicity once identity, distinguishability, and collection are already available. The zero-dimensional continuum case renders one aspect of that contrast especially clear. A brief final section indicates one consequence for the structuralist identity problem.

Keywords: continuum, Hausdorff dimension, Cantor set, abstraction, set theory, unity, structuralism

---

Corresponding author: karim.daghbouche@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Classical mathematics often coordinates geometric space and arithmetic multiplicity so smoothly that their conceptual distinction recedes from view. In ordinary geometric imagination, continuum multiplicity appears together with spread, thickness, and extension. This note studies a mathematically controlled limit case in which a standard metric notion of scaling reaches an extremum while continuum cardinality remains unchanged. The significance of the case extends beyond fractal geometry. It helps clarify the difference between metric presentation and formal multiplicity.

The philosophical pressure behind this inquiry is familiar. Neo-Aristotelian concerns about composing a continuum from extensionless indivisibles continue to function as a recurring touchstone in discussions of continuity and divisibility [White, 1992]. Weyl likewise presents the continuum as bound up with a form of intuition or “given” extension in the background conception of analysis [Weyl, 1949]. These positions register a broader family of philosophical habits according to which continuum multiplicity travels together with some robust notion of geometrical or metric spread. The present note identifies a standard mathematical case that distinguishes those levels with particular clarity.

The mathematical exhibit is familiar. Fractal geometry provides Cantor-type constructions whose Hausdorff dimension is zero although their cardinality remains that of the continuum [Falconer, 1985, Example 4.6]. The purpose of the example here is not to establish new mathematics. Its role is diagnostic. It offers a controlled setting in which one central mode of geometric presentation recedes while full formal multiplicity remains available. That observation in turn helps articulate a philosophical distinction that is often present in the literature without always being stated sharply: the distinction between Cantor’s many-into-one conception of set and later axiomatic set theory as a formal articulation of multiplicity.

A related methodological orientation already appears in Cantor’s remarks on the continuity of space. Cantor treats the usual continuity hypothesis as an optional representational identification: a complete one–one correspondence between the three-dimensional arithmetical continuum (x, y, z) and the concept of space used to describe appearances. As he writes, such an identification proceeds as a “free act” of constructive thought rather than through “inner compulsion” [Cantor, 1932, pp. 156–157]. Together with Cantor’s explicit abstraction from nature and order [Cantor, 1915, ğ 2], this provides the historical point of departure for the extension pursued here.

Cantor’s own set-theoretic framework is often characterized by a two-step abstraction: abstraction from the nature of the elements, and abstraction from the order in which they are given. In that spirit, this note introduces what it will call the *Metric Abstraction*: the methodological step of considering the cardinality of a set in abstraction from its metric realization. The phrase names no new mathematical operation. It names a way of describing, in the present context, a familiar separation between metric and set-theoretic features.

The argument proceeds in five steps. Section 1 reconstructs Cantor’s abstraction program and identifies the role of the gathered whole within it. Section 2 presents the generalized Cantor construction and the zero-dimensional continuum result. Section 3 interprets that result as a case of metric abstraction and separation between spread and multiplicity. Section 4 draws a demarcation between Cantor and axiomatic set theory. Section 5 formulates the relation between gathered whole and formal articulation more directly. A brief final section indicates one consequence for the structuralist identity problem.

2. Cantor's Abstraction Program

Cantor's original conception of set theory stands close to the problem of unity. A set, in his classical formulation, is a collection of definite and well-distinguished objects gathered into one whole [Cantor, 1895, 1915, 1932]. The phrase "into one whole" is philosophically decisive. It indicates that sethood enters together with a unifying act through which multiplicity is held together as one domain.

Within this conceptual field, Cantor's account of magnitude proceeds by abstraction. First, one abstracts from the particular nature of the elements. Second, one abstracts from the order in which they are given [Cantor, 1915, ğ 2]; see also [Cantor, 1932; Hallett, 1984]. The result of this double abstraction is cardinality or *Mächtigkeit*. In this sense, cardinality names a residue of abstraction. Yet that residue still belongs to a framework in which the many are gathered into one whole.

This point matters for the present discussion because it keeps visible a level that later formal accounts often leave implicit. Cantor's program aims at a purified account of multiplicity while preserving the conceptual role of the gathered whole. Set and magnitude remain related to a unifying domain. His framework therefore occupies a threshold position: it advances abstraction powerfully and still keeps visible the passage from many to one.

The present note extends this line of thought in a limited way. If abstraction from nature and order yields cardinality, further determinations also become eligible for abstraction. The additional step considered here is metric abstraction. The aim is not to revise Cantor historically, but to use his abstraction program as a philosophical point of departure.

3. The Zero-Dimensional Continuum Case

There is a well-known construction in fractal geometry that yields a Cantor-type set with Hausdorff dimension zero while preserving cardinality $\mathfrak{c}$ [Falconer, 1985, Example 4.6]. We use this standard variable dissection construction as the mathematical exhibit for the philosophical argument developed below.

Consider a non-stationary Cantor construction C_{k_n} in which the contraction factor $k_n \geq 3$ varies with the stage n. Using a standard Hausdorff-measure covering estimate, the scaling ratio

$$R_n = \prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{k_j}$$

can be driven to a limit at which the Hausdorff scaling profile vanishes. As shown in Appendix A, choosing a super-exponential sequence such as $k_n = 3^{n!}$ yields

$$\dim_H(C_{k_n}) = 0.$$

The same construction also preserves a binary branching pattern at every stage. Each point of C_{k_n} determines a symbolic address

$$\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots) \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}.$$

To resolve dual representations at stage-endpoints, we adopt the standard convention of choosing the address that is not eventually constant equal to 1 [Edgar, 2008, p. 31]. This yields a canonical coding.

Let $\Omega \subseteq \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ denote the set of canonical addresses. The addressing map induces a bijection

$$\phi : C_{k_n} \longrightarrow \Omega.$$

Since Ω differs from $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ by only a countable subset, it has cardinality $\mathfrak{c}$. The construction therefore yields a precise configuration in which a standard metric scaling invariant is zero while set-theoretic multiplicity remains that of the continuum.

The mathematical significance of the example lies in the explicit coordination of two levels: vanishing metric scaling and preserved continuum multiplicity. For present purposes, that coordination makes the case a useful limit exhibit.

4. Metric Abstraction and the Separation of Spread from Multiplicity

The philosophical interest of Hausdorff dimension arises from its precise role as a metric scaling invariant. Set-theoretic cardinality tracks pure multiplicity. Topological properties track neighborhood structure and continuity relations. Hausdorff dimension captures the exponent governing how the number of ε-balls needed to cover a set grows as $\varepsilon \to 0$, equivalently, which power-law scalings yield nontrivial Hausdorff measure [Rogers, 1970; Falconer, 1985]. In this note, the phrase "metric extension" refers to this scaling profile.

Accordingly, when $\dim_H(C_{k_n}) = 0$, the case displays an extremal form of metric thinness together with full continuum multiplicity. The set continues to carry rich branching structure, and its cardinality remains that of the continuum. The example therefore isolates a precise form of multiplicity-with-vanishing-metric-scaling: continuum many positions remain available while the Hausdorff scaling exponent reaches zero.

The philosophical point is limited but useful. Metric spread and multiplicity belong to distinct representational levels. The example renders that distinction especially visible by displaying the two features in maximal separation. The point itself is familiar; the present value of the case lies in the sharpness with which it displays the contrast.

The address structure makes this especially clear. When metric scaling is attenuated to a Hausdorff-dimension-zero limit, the structure relevant to tracking points is preserved through the infinite binary strings that encode branching choices. In this setting, the address space Ω functions as the canonical combinatorial invariant by which multiplicity is represented.

The same case also illustrates a second distinction. At the level of addressable representation, one can speak of continuum many distinct positions. Yet these positions belong to one globally given structure. They are differentiations within one support. The limit case therefore serves as a controlled exhibit for discussing the relation between gathered whole and articulated multiplicity.

5. Cantor and Axiomatic Set Theory

The zero-dimensional continuum case now permits a sharper statement of a familiar philosophical demarcation between Cantor's conceptual program and later axiomatic set theory.

Cantor's account remains tied to a gathered whole. His language of collection, abstraction, and magnitude still concerns the passage from many to one whole. Even where abstraction strips away nature and order, the many are already being gathered. Unity remains conceptually visible within the formation of magnitude.

Axiomatic set theory operates at a different level. It gives a formal calculus of membership, hierarchy, and collection once admissible objects, identity, and distinguishability are already available. It articulates multiplicity with great precision. Its formal strength is unmistakable. Its starting point, however, belongs to a level at which the gathered whole is already in place.

This is the central demarcation of the note. Cantor's program is a theory of abstraction toward magnitude within a gathered whole. Axiomatic set theory is a calculus of articulated multiplicity once that gathered-whole level has already been presupposed. The later formalism preserves the articulation of multiplicity while the unifying moment moves into the background.

The zero-dimensional continuum case does not establish this demarcation by itself. It renders one aspect of it especially clear. It shows that full formal multiplicity can remain available where a familiar mode of geometric presentation has receded to an extremal limit. That makes the distinction between gathered whole and formal articulation easier to isolate.

6. Representation and Gathered Whole

The preceding distinction leads to a more exact question about philosophical architecture. Set theory represents unity and multiplicity with great formal power. The question concerns the level at which that representation begins.

Consider the standard set-theoretic account of 1. Formally, one may define

$$0 = \varnothing, \qquad 1 = \{\varnothing\}.$$

This definition is fully serviceable within the formalism. Its philosophical significance is derivative. It expresses oneness through prior objecthood and prior collection. The empty set appears as an admissible object; the singleton appears as a gathered whole containing that object. The definition therefore locates one within a formal articulation of already available determinations.

The same point extends more broadly. Set theory proceeds with variables, identity, distinguishability, and membership already available. It thereby provides a formal grammar of articulated multiplicity. The unity through which objects are first gathered and distinctions first become available belongs to a prior level of description.

The present note treats this as a matter of philosophical architecture rather than as a complaint about formal adequacy. Set theory articulates the many with great exactness. Cantor's language keeps visible the gathered whole within which such articulation proceeds. The difference between those two levels is the main point at issue here.

The zero-dimensional continuum case gives this distinction a vivid if modest illustration. It shows that full formal multiplicity can remain where metric spread vanishes. The example thereby clarifies the relation between support and articulation in a controlled setting without asking the mathematics to settle the broader philosophical issue on its own.

7. A Brief Consequence for the Structuralist Identity Problem

Once the distinction between support and articulation is in place, the structuralist identity problem appears in a revised light [Keränen, 2001; Shapiro, 2008]. The present note makes only a limited point here.

In the zero-dimensional continuum case, each point of C_{k_n} is canonically associated with an address in Ω. The address space thereby provides an interface through which distinct items in the target domain are represented and re-identified. Mathematical individuation proceeds through canonical relational coding together with a globally given support.

This suggests a more exact location for the problem. One may distinguish:

1. the underlying structure,
2. the interface through which that structure becomes mathematically accessible and trackable,
3. and the background resources through which the distinctness of interface elements is sustained.

In the present case, C_{k_n} supplies the underlying support, while the canonical address space Ω supplies the interface through which points of that support are accessed and re-identified. The note's claim is simply that this distinction helps locate the identity problem more precisely. The broader structuralist debate remains exactly where it is.

8. Conclusion

This note has used a standard fractal construction to isolate a limit case in which a metric scaling invariant, Hausdorff dimension, vanishes while set-theoretic cardinality remains $\mathfrak{c}$. The resulting example brings into focus one precise sense in which metric presentation and formal multiplicity come apart: continuum many positions remain available while the Hausdorff scaling profile reaches zero.

The significance of that case is philosophical rather than mathematical. It helps articulate a demarcation between Cantor's abstraction program and later axiomatic set theory. Cantor still stands near the passage from many to one whole. Axiomatic set theory formalizes articulated multiplicity once gathered whole, identity, and collection are already available.

The broader lesson therefore concerns the distinction between gathered whole and formal articulation. Set theory gives a formal grammar of the many, while Cantor's formulation keeps visible the unity within which multiplicity is gathered. The zero-dimensional continuum case serves as a useful exhibit for that distinction.

A. Hausdorff Dimension Estimate

At stage n, C_{k_n} is covered by 2^n intervals of length R_n. For $s > 0$, the Hausdorff s-measure obeys

$$\mathcal{H}^s(C_{k_n}) \le \liminf_{n\to\infty} 2^n R_n^s = \liminf_{n\to\infty} \exp\left(n \ln 2 - s \sum_{j=1}^{n} \ln k_j \right).$$

Given the super-exponential sequence $k_n = 3^{n!}$, the ratio

$$\frac{n \ln 2}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \ln k_j}$$

vanishes in the limit. Hence for any fixed $s > 0$, the exponent tends to $-\infty$, so the covering bound tends to 0. Therefore

$$\mathcal{H}^s(C_{k_n}) = 0 \quad \text{for all } s > 0,$$

which implies

$$\dim_H(C_{k_n}) = 0$$

[Carathéodory, 1914; Rogers, 1970; Falconer, 1985].

Statements and Declarations

Competing Interests

The author declares no competing interests.

References

Cantor, G. [1895]: 'Beiträge zur Begründung der transfiniten Mengenlehre. I', *Mathematische Annalen*, 46(4), pp. 481–512.

Cantor, G. [1915]: *Contributions to the Founding of the Theory of Transfinite Numbers*. Trans. P. E. B. Jourdain. Chicago: Open Court.

Cantor, G. [1932]: *Gesammelte Abhandlungen mathematischen und philosophischen Inhalts*. Ed. E. Zermelo. Berlin: Springer.

Carathéodory, C. [1914]: 'Über das lineare Maß von Punktmengen: eine Verallgemeinerung des Längenbegriffs', *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse*, pp. 404–426.

Edgar, G.A. [2008]: *Measure, Topology, and Fractal Geometry*, 2nd edn. New York: Springer.

Falconer, K.J. [1985]: *The Geometry of Fractal Sets*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hallett, M. [1984]: *Cantorian Set Theory and Limitation of Size*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Keränen, J. [2001]: 'The Identity Problem for Realist Structuralism', *Philosophia Mathematica*, 9(3), pp. 308–330.

Rogers, C.A. [1970]: *Hausdorff Measures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shapiro, S. [2008]: 'Identity, Indiscernibility, and *ante rem* Structuralism: The Tale of i and $-i$', *Philosophia Mathematica*, 16(3), pp. 285–309.

Weyl, H. [1949]: *Philosophy of Mathematics and Natural Science*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

White, M.J. [1992]: *The Continuous and the Discrete: Ancient Physical Theories from a Contemporary Perspective*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.