

Reflections on Russell's antinomy

Paola Cattabriga
University of Bologna

Abstract

We present Russell's antinomy using three distinct deductive systems, which are then compared to deepen the logical deductions that lead to the contradiction. Some inferential paths are then presented, alternative to the commonly accepted one, that allow for the formal assertion of the antinomy without deriving the contradiction, thus preserving the coherence of the system. In light of this, the purpose of this article is to propose a review of the consequences of asserting Russell's antinomy and, by extension, the widespread belief that any attempt to resolve a paradox is doomed to failure.

1 Introduction

It is not always impossible to demonstrate that a proposition that leads to a contradiction within a system, can also be used to demonstrate that the contradiction does not actually occur within the framework of the system's rules of inference. Said another way, this does not imply that the same system cannot provide alternative inferential paths that preserve coherence. In this paper, we first introduce three distinct approaches to demonstrating how Russell's antinomy results in contradiction: the traditional argument from Zermelo-Frankel set theory, a first-order logic theorem, and the use of semantic trees. Comparing them, the following sections explore other possible inferential paths, their underlying involvement with Leibniz's indiscernibility, and finally a review in light of the Theory of Definition. The first one we recall is the most simple, in Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory ([7], 31).

Theorem 1. *There exists no set which contains exactly those elements which do not contain themselves, in symbols $\neg\exists y\forall x(x \in y \iff x \notin x)$.*

Proof. By contradiction. Assume that y is a set such that for every element x , $x \in y$ if and only if $x \notin x$. For $x = y$, we have $y \in y$ if and only if

$y \notin y$. Since, obviously, $y \in y$ or $y \notin y$, and as we saw, each of $y \in y$ and $y \notin y$ implies the other statement, we have both $y \in y$ and $y \notin y$, which is a contradiction. \square

Next, let us present a development of the same argument using first order logic, which provides deeper insight into the internal logical interconnections of the antinomy¹.

Theorem 2. *The following first order formula is provably false:*

$$\exists r \forall x (x \in r \iff x \notin x). \quad (1)$$

Proof. Suppose that (1) holds, we derive a contradiction. In first-order logic, the axiom (or scheme of axioms, see the Predicative Axiom in [5]) holds

$$\forall x \phi(x, r) \rightarrow \phi(r, r) \quad (2)$$

provided that the replacement of x with r is sound (but it certainly is if ϕ has no quantifiers). By the generalization rule it then follows

$$\forall r (\forall x \phi(x, r) \rightarrow \phi(r, r)). \quad (3)$$

Furthermore, in first order logic,

$$\forall r (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow (\exists r \alpha \rightarrow \exists r \beta) \quad (4)$$

is valid. Let then state the following

$$\phi(x, r) = (x \in r \iff x \notin x) \quad (5)$$

so that $\phi(x, r)$ is free from quantifiers and (2) can be applied, so that

$$\forall x (x \in r \iff x \notin x) \rightarrow (r \in r \iff r \notin r).$$

Let then also $\alpha = \forall x \phi(x, r)$ e $\beta = \phi(r, r)$. As we can notice from (2) we get $\forall r (\alpha \rightarrow \beta)$ and from (1) we draw $\exists r \alpha$, therefore from (4) applying two times modus ponens we have $\exists r \beta$, that is

$$\exists r (r \in r \iff r \notin r). \quad (6)$$

Since $r \in r \iff r \notin r$ is the negation of a propositional tautology

$$(r \in r \iff r \notin r) \rightarrow \perp \quad (7)$$

¹For supplying the following version of the antinomy, many thanks to Giacomo Lenzi.

where \perp refer to false, so by generalization

$$\forall r((r \in r \iff r \notin r) \rightarrow \perp) \quad (8)$$

or for the laws of quantifiers

$$\exists r(r \in r \iff r \notin r) \rightarrow \perp \quad (9)$$

By modus ponens from (6) and (9) we can conclude

$$\perp \quad (10)$$

that is (1) proves the false. \square




Figure 1: Semantic tree proving (11)

We can show a further proof of the antinomy through the semantic tree method as in Figure (1) ([11], 141)([12]). By theorems (1), (2), and the tree in Figure (1), definitely in first order logic

$$\vdash \neg \exists y \forall x (x \in y \iff x \notin x). \quad (11)$$

This theorem is a negation of the existence of an object like the set of all those sets not belonging to themselves. The proof of existence is




Figure 2: A semantic tree for (R)

part of one of the most significant debates in contemporary logic, which is between proponents of solely existential proofs and others who believe that a demonstration of existence has to be constructive. In order to accept a proof that objects of a certain type exist, the latter require that a procedure be provided to produce them, while the former do not consider this requirement essential. A classic example of a constructive theorem is the result already known to Euclid around 300 BC: given a prime number, there exists a larger one (which implies that prime numbers are infinite) ([7], 231). An example of a purely existential demonstration can be found in the much more recent (19th century) Lemma of Bolzano Weierstrass: every infinite bounded set has at least one limit point (or accumulation point) ([1], 45-48). We are faced with two profoundly different conceptions of existence in mathematics. The intuitionistic, or more generally constructivist, conception requires much more than the purely existential conception: one can admit that an object *exists* only if a procedure is given that allows one to produce it step by step and in a finite number of steps. According to the classical logical conception, instead, to conclude that a mathematical object of a certain type *exists* is sufficient to show that by introducing it we do not generate contradictions. As we can notice, perfectly aligned with this classical conception, (11) is a theorem of nonexistence based directly on asserting a contradiction. And this happens instead of concluding that $\exists y \forall x (x \in y \iff x \notin x)$ is an object that simply does not exist. It is a mathematical object whose existence may

make sense to assert as a hypothesis in a proof toward contradiction, the classical assumption in a reductio ad absurdum. But does it make sense to assert its existence in a theory when it has already been established that it does not exist? If, indeed, we state in a first order logic inferential system

$$\exists y \forall x (x \in y \iff x \notin x), \quad (\text{R})$$

from the standpoint of classical two-valued logic this is equivalent to assert a contradiction, a falsehood. Figure (2) shows how the negation of statement (R) generates a semantic tree that has no closure, so for the semidecidability of the first-order logical calculus, it is not known whether a refutation is possible.

Since it results in a contradiction of the kind $\alpha \wedge \neg\alpha$, it appears that (R) is rejected by any logical system, thanks to the proof about (11). We might therefore ask why we should persistently insist on affirming (R) within first-order inferential systems, inevitably making the system itself incoherent? In its deductive complexity, if the system can generate (11) then it might also be able to demonstrate to us how to preserve its own consistency, that is, how, by asserting (R), we do not infer any contradiction or falsehood from it. Therefore, we might investigate if there is another inferential route that the system can take. We also recall that theorem (11) does not only concern sets and the membership relation but also holds at first order in general, that is, for every arbitrary binary relation R , $\vdash \neg \exists y \forall x (R(x, y) \iff R(x, x))$ ([13]). The following sections are also in this sense a deepening of the connection between logic and set theory. We have recalled three distinct forms of what is currently accepted as evidence of Russell's antinomy since every distinct notation reveals novel insights that may shed light on these issues.

2 Another inferential path

In the ensuing discussion, we will revise the proof of theorem (2) for a comprehensive inferential analysis before presenting a comparison with the other two kinds of proofs.

Lemma 2.1. If $\phi(x, r) = x \in r \iff x \notin x$ (5) then

$$\forall x \phi(x, r) \rightarrow \neg\phi(r, r). \quad (12)$$

Proof. $r \in r \iff r \notin r$ is the negation of a propositional tautology, then $\neg(r \in r \iff r \notin r)$ is a tautology. Given (5) we have

$$\forall x \phi(x, r) \rightarrow \neg(r \in r \iff r \notin r)$$

so (12) is always true. \square

A further proof displayed in Figure (3). We also observe that the same kind of demonstration holds for γ as any antecedent in $\gamma \rightarrow \neg\phi(r, r)$. If $\phi(x, r) = x \in r \iff x \notin x$ (5) then

$$\gamma \rightarrow \neg\phi(r, r). \quad (13)$$

is always true. Therefore, let's make a revision to theorem (2), in accordance with Lemma (2.1).

Theorem 3. *Stating (R) may also not lead to contradiction (not even in classical logic).*

Proof. Let us suppose that (1) is true. In first order logic, once given (5), provided the substitution of x by r is valid, but it certainly is if ϕ has no quantifiers, thanks to previous Lemma, (12) holds. Now for the generalization rule follows

$$\forall r(\forall x\phi(x, r) \rightarrow \neg\phi(r, r)). \quad (14)$$

We also have

$$\forall r(\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow (\exists r\alpha \rightarrow \exists r\beta). \quad (15)$$

Let us consider (5) so that $\phi(x, r)$ is quantifier free and we can apply (14). Let also $\alpha = (\forall x\phi(x, r))$ and $\beta = \phi(r, r)$. We can notice that (14) yields $(\alpha \rightarrow \neg\beta)$. By generalization we get $\forall r(\alpha \rightarrow \neg\beta)$. Affirming $\exists r \forall x(x \in r \iff x \notin x)$ (1), i. e. $\exists r\alpha$, and from $\forall r(\alpha \rightarrow \neg\beta) \rightarrow (\exists r\alpha \rightarrow \exists r\neg\beta)$ we obtain $\exists r(\neg\beta)$, that is

$$\neg(r \in r \iff r \notin r), \quad (16)$$

which is the negation of false, i.e. is true. That is, no contradiction. \square

Remark 1. We can now clearly observe that (12) in Lemma (2.1) has the opposite consequent to that in (2), and that in the proof of Theorem (2), (5) directly conflicts with the application of the Predicative Axiom. The application of a substitution, namely the substitution of x by r , is also evident in definition (5). Indeed, Lemma (2.1) directly calls into question the applicability of the Predicative Axiom to obtain (2).

We also observe that since $\phi(r, r)$ is the negation of a propositional tautology, not only is (13) valid, but

$$\phi(r, r) \rightarrow \gamma \quad (17)$$




Figure 3: Semantic tree proving (2.1)

is also valid. γ in (13) and (17), stands for any statement, i.e. for something whose semantic content we do not know or do not discern.

Next section deals with first-order logic with identity, showing that there are laws that allow us to explore this unknown, finding a way to discern between the sets x and y in (R) , namely between the set of sets not belonging to themselves and its members. We will deal with the Law of the Indiscernibility of Identicals, $\forall x\forall y[x = y \rightarrow (\phi(x) \iff \phi(y))]$, and how this law can help us learn to discern between sets. For the next section, we will follow Chang Keisler using the symbol ‘ \equiv ’ for the identity between terms ([5]). For derivations from the Identity Laws the reader can refer to ([7], 25), Ch. 8 in [11] and Ch. III in [15]; see also Basic Law (III) in ([8], 20), and ([6], A-26) for the two Laws, Indiscernibility of Identicals and Identity of Indiscernibles, as consequences of Basic Law (III).

3 (In)-Discernibility

It is possible to demonstrate that logical systems that allow formalizing expressions of type (R) , but prove (11), such as theorems (1), (2), and the tree in figure (1), can be considered as lacking something about identity, as they neglect or ignore the Laws of Identity and their implications. In other words, within these systems are allowed inferences that mystify the validity

of replacement in terms of the quantifiers and the validity of substitution in terms of the rules of identity.

Lemma 3.1. Given $\phi(x, r) = x \in r \iff x \notin x$ (5) and the Laws of Identity then

$$\forall x(\phi(x, r) \rightarrow \neg(x \equiv r)) \rightarrow \neg\phi(r, r).$$

Proof. At the axiomatic deductive level, considering the Identity Axioms (see 1.3.7 [5] 25), we have both $x \equiv y \rightarrow (\phi(x, y) \rightarrow \phi(x, x))$ and $x \equiv y \rightarrow (\phi(x, x) \rightarrow \phi(x, y))$, and thus also

$$x \equiv r \rightarrow (\phi(x, r) \iff \phi(x, x)) \tag{18}$$

whence

$$x \equiv r \rightarrow (x \in r \iff x \in x). \tag{19}$$

By the counterposed

$$\neg(x \in r \iff x \in x) \rightarrow \neg(x \equiv r), \tag{20}$$

then

$$(x \in r \iff x \notin x) \rightarrow \neg(x \equiv r). \tag{21}$$

From $\phi(x, r) = x \in r \iff x \notin x$ (5) and from (21) by modus ponens

$$\neg(x \equiv r). \tag{22}$$

Which clearly means, since (5) defines r as a set whose members do not belong to themselves, then, of course, thanks to the Laws of Identity, r is not equal to x . Whenever (5) then always

$$\phi(x, r) \rightarrow \neg(x \equiv r),$$

and by the Generalization rule

$$\forall x(\phi(x, r) \rightarrow \neg(x \equiv r)). \tag{23}$$

Thanks to (22), x and r are not identical, x cannot be replaced by r within (5), and consequently

$$\forall x(\phi(x, r) \rightarrow \neg(x \equiv r)) \rightarrow \neg\phi(r, r). \tag{24}$$

□




Figure 4: Semantic tree proving (21)

We can validate and at the same time explain Lemma (3.1) by showing the two semantic trees with applications of the identity rules in figures (4) and (5), respectively at nodes $x \in x \iff x \notin x$ and $\neg(r \equiv r)$. For semantic trees with identities, see ([12]). About the tree in figure (4), we notice that if we had used the constants a and b instead of respectively the variables x and y , we would always have obtained a closed tree, namely the formula also applies independently of the quantifiers. The tree also shows that (22) is true in itself. That is, it holds both independently of and as a consequence of the axioms, as demonstrated by the deductions from (18) to (21). Consequently, it generally holds in first-order logic

$$\vdash \forall x \forall y [(x \in y \iff x \notin x) \rightarrow \neg(x \equiv y)]. \quad (25)$$

The semantic tree of figure (5) displays further that

$$\vdash \forall x (\phi(x, r) \rightarrow \neg(x \equiv r)) \rightarrow \neg\phi(r, r),$$

which confirms (24).

Remark 2. As showed by Lemma (3.1), when (5), the premise of (24) is true, then $\neg\phi(r, r)$ is also true. With Lemma (3.1) and figure (5), the system offers an inferential investigation of (12) and Lemma (2.1).




Figure 5: Semantic tree for (24)

Theorem 4. *Thanks to the Laws of Identity, in first order logic, no contradiction arises in affirming (R).*

Proof. Suppose that (1) is true, then from (23) and (24) it follows $\neg\phi(r, r)$, i.e. $\neg(r \in r \iff r \notin r)$, i.e., the negation of the false, which is the true. No contradiction. \square

4 Uniqueness

Having reached this point, we can ask ourselves, exactly what does the problem of Russell’s antinomy consist of? Why did Frege write his famous appendix in *Grundgesetze*? As well known, the potential for expressing antinomy through Basic Law (V) appeared to be the cause of the system’s incoherence ([8]). Frege himself attempted an amendment to the Basic Law (V), obtaining an inferential path, which did not lead to contradiction in the expressions of the antinomy in *Grundgesetze*. For a long time in the related literature the finger has been pointed at the axiom of Comprehension, which derives from Frege’s Basic Law (V), from which (R) can be straight expressed. According to theorems (3) and (4), with due consideration of Extensionality and Basic Law (III), even respectively in Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory and Frege’s *Grundgesetze*, given Russell’s antinomy, the contradiction does not arise ([2][3]).

(1), but we chose to extend it to display the second possible semantic path associated with Extensionality. The tree in Figure (6) can be regarded as a *ZF* expansion of the tree in Figure (5) further shedding light on the contradictory nature of $\phi(r, r)$ and its inferential connections.




Figure 7: Semantic tree for Theorem (5)

The Axiom of Comprehension can be considered as a schema originally conceived for defining sets. Because of its role in introducing new sets, i.e. in bringing into existence ever new mathematical objects, this certainly concerns the rules for introducing new symbols into already well-established theories. We refer here to the rules of the Theory of Definition based on the two Criteria of Eliminability and Non-Creativity, originally by S. Leśniewsky ([2], [14]). In particular, by the rule for defining a *new operation symbol* (or a new individual constant, i.e., an operation symbol of rank zero), we are required to have a preceding theorem which guarantees that the operation is uniquely defined. If the restriction on the uniqueness is dropped then a

contradiction can be derived ([14], 159) ([2], [3]).

Extensionality, without any additional axioms, implies that for every condition $\varphi(x)$ on x (in Comprehension) there exists “at most” one set y which contains *exactly* those elements x which fulfil the condition $\varphi(x)$ ([7], 31), ([2]). In other words, if there is a set y such that $\forall x(x \in y \leftrightarrow \varphi(x))$, y is unique. It can be shown as follows. If y' is also such, i.e. $\forall x(x \in y' \leftrightarrow \varphi(x))$, then we have, obviously $\forall x(x \in y' \leftrightarrow x \in y)$, and then by Extensionality, $y' = y$. ([7] 31). Noticeably, the proof in Theorem (1) involve only the axiom of Comprehension. As is easily demonstrated, the contradiction in its proof does not occur when defining (R) if Extensionality is used in addition to Comprehension ([2], [3], [4]). In set theory, Extensionality is a derivation of the Laws of Identity, which in turn are in Frege’s Grundgesetze a derivation from Basic Law (III) ([2] [3]). By Extensionality the above proof of Theorem (1) can not be concluded.

Theorem 5. *Thanks to the Axiom of Extensionality, in Zermelo-Frankel set theory, no contradiction arises in affirming (R).*

Proof. If, as an example of Comprehension, we define

$$x \in y \iff x \notin x \tag{26}$$

then by Extensionality we always obtain (Figure (4) and ([2] 3-6)),

$$(x \in y \iff x \notin x) \rightarrow \neg(x = y), \tag{27}$$

so by modus ponens

$$x \neq y. \tag{28}$$

Given (26) and (27), by (28) in the domain of interpretation x and y are not the same individual, so y cannot be considered identical to x . Precisely, Figure (7), $\forall x \exists y x \neq y$, so that for any x there exists at least one y such that $x \neq y$. This is an applicative case of the uniqueness condition. Indeed a special case because it involves negation and therefore complementation (wrt. (25)). For this reason, the inference of the proof of Theorem (1) cannot be terminated since “ $x = y$ ” cannot be assumed and we do not obtain “ $y \in y$ if and only if $y \notin y$ ”. ([2], [3], [4]). \square

As we can notice, comparing the arguments of the theorems (1) and (2), (5) is an example of Comprehension formula like (26), (27) is (21) and (28) is (22). Further, (24) is quite close to the consequences of Frege’s amendment of Basic Law (V) ([8]), so to block in a quite similar way the derivation of

the contradiction, with the only difference that (24) is simply derived from the Laws of Identity, i.e., from Basic Law (III), leaving Frege's Basic Law (V) untouched (for any details see [2], [3]).

Frege amended Basic Law (V), embedding the negation of the identity between the function defining the class of classes not belonging to themselves and its extension. On a strictly deductive level, such a negation blocks the derivation of the contradiction, although as shown by S. Leśniewski, the amendment of the axiom is not formally satisfactory.

As already demonstrated, there is no need of this restriction of the Basic Law (V) ([2], [3]). The restrictive clause instead of being included in the Basic Law (V), can simply be deduced from the Basic Law (III), in a manner quite analogous to what is shown in Lemma (3.1) and in Theorem (4). This prevents the contradiction from being derived, with inferences strikingly similar to those of Frege, but this happens by deducing the restriction from the axioms of the system, without modifying them.

5 Ending Note

There is a specific reason why, when introducing a new symbol into a theory, one must take into account uniqueness and therefore, as we have seen, implicitly the Laws of Identity. In a first-order logic system, identity is *relative* to the language of the system, that is, identity is a relation that refers only to previously defined predicates. The uniqueness violations implicitly mean opening the universe to objects with characteristics that are not yet well defined. In the case of infinite sets, each time we add a new element, we must require that the relations between the previous elements remain unchanged, that is, that they are not modified by the new addition. As seen thus far, in a first-order set theory, it is essential to consider the uniqueness of each new set through Extensionality when Comprehension introduces some set defined by self-reference as in (R).

References

- [1] Boas R. P. Jr., *A primer of real functions*, The Mathematical Association of America, 1996.
- [2] Cattabriga P., How to release Frege's system from Russell's antinomy. Abs. Bulletin of Symbolic Logic, Vol. 13, Number 2, 2007 p. 269. [arXiv:0705.0901](https://arxiv.org/abs/0705.0901)

- [3] Cattabriga P., Paradox free, poster presented at WIL2021.
- [4] Cattabriga P., Uniqueness Violations, *Logic & Artificial Intelligence*, SLAI-2022 Proceedings, Vladimir Andrunachievici Institute of Mathematics and Computer Science, Chisinau 2023, pp 134-144.
- [5] Chang C. C., Keisler H. J., *Model Theory*, North-Holland, 1990.
- [6] Cook R. T., How to read *Grundgesetze*, Appendix in *Basics Laws of Arithmetic*, Oxford University Press, 2016.
- [7] Fraenkel, Abraham A., Yehoshua Bar-Hillel and Azriel Levy. *Foundations of Set Theory*, North-Holland, Elsevier Science Publishers B.V., Amsterdam, 1984.
- [8] Frege G., *Grundgesetze der Arithmetik*. I, Jena, 1893. II, Jena, 1903. G. Olms, Hildesheim, 1966. (*Basics Laws of Arithmetic*, Oxford University Press, 2016.)
- [9] Hatcher, W.. S., *The Logical Foundations of Mathematics*, Oxford, Pergamon Press, 1982.
- [10] Lavrov, I. Maksimova, L., *Problems in Set Theory, Mathematical Logic and the Theory of Algorithms*, New York, Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publisher, 2003.
- [11] Mendelson E., *Introduction to Mathematical Logic*, Fourth Edition, Chapman & Hall, 1997.
- [12] Nolt J, Rohatyn D., Varzi A., *Theory and Problems of LOGIC*, Second Edition, McGraw-Hill, 2004.
- [13] Salehi S., ‘Sometimes a paradox’, now proof: Yablo is not first order, *Logic Journal of the IGPL*, 30:1, 2022 pp. 71-77.
- [14] Suppes,P., *Introduction to Logic*, Dover Publicatios, Inc., New York, 1999.
- [15] Tarski A., *Introduction to Logic and to the methodology of deductive science*, Oxford University Press, 1965.