A Comprehensive Look at Self-Referential Paradoxes and Their Evolution

Hanyu Zhang*

Guanghua International Cambridge School, Shanghai, China

*Corresponding author: rdawson51952@student.napavalley.edu

Abstract. An essential issue that has to be addressed is, what is Russell's Paradox, and why does it matter? The reader must first have a basic understanding of what Naive Set Theory is. In a nutshell, the Naive Set Theory was founded on the so-called Naive Comprehension Schema, which states that a set is a collection of items that meet a certain condition. there is an assumption being made here, and that assumption is that "set" refers to V, which is the collection of all other sets. As a result of the contradiction, we were motivated to reevaluate our understanding of what a "set" really entails. Mathematicians at the beginning of the 20th century were taken aback by this discovery, which led to the Third Mathematical Crisis. This study will focus on this crisis with possible solutions and predict some future outcomes.

Keywords: Russell's Paradox; Set Theory; Formal Logic.

1. Introduction

What is Russell's Paradox and why does it matter would be an important question to be answered [1-3]. The reader first needs to know what is Naive Set Theory. In brief, Naive Set Theory was built on the so-called Naive Comprehension Schema: a set $\{x: \phi(x)\}$, is a collection of objects x satisfying property ϕ.

Russell first constructed a "set" V which consists of all sets. Then pick its subset R, define it as $R:=\{x \in V: \neg(x \in x)\}$. Naturally, we ask: does R belong to itself? If R belongs to itself, then R does not satisfy the property $\neg(x \in x)$ in the definition of R, so it does not belong to itself. If R does not belong to itself, then R satisfies the property $\neg(x \in x)$ in the definition of R, so it belongs to itself. Therefore neither $R \in R$ nor $\neg(R \in R)$. We reached a contradiction by using the Law of Excluded Middle, i.e. either $\neg P$ or P must be true.

The reader should keep in mind that there is an assumption used here: V, the collection of all sets, is a "set". The paradox thus inspired us to rethink what a "set" really is. This was a shock to mathematicians in the early 20th century and caused the Third Mathematical Crisis. Mathematicians at that time thought set theory would be a suitable foundation for mathematics. However, now we met an obstacle, there are limits to the use of the intuitive concept of a “set”.

2. Answers to Russell's Paradox

Russell's very own answer to the problem is the type theory. The most drastic approach would be to remove the Law of the Excluded Middle from the principles of logic. These mathematicians are known as intuitionists and constructivists (led by Brouwer), and they advocated for this position [6].

Among the formalists led by David Hilbert, the approach that is considered to be less radical is to construct an axiomatic set theory. The following are the two set theories that have had the biggest impact: The goal of the Zermelo-Fraenkel Axioms is to replace the Naive Comprehension Schema for sets, which is defined with a constrained version of the schema.

The von Neumann-Bernays-Godel Axioms defined "class" as a more generic instance of "set" in their work. For instance, a "class" is formed by all sets, while a "set" is not formed by all sets.

Russell came to the conclusion that the paradoxes were the result of self-reference. To give a sample of it, one may say this phrase is a complete fabrication.

Russell had the intention of avoiding this, thus he divided things into several categories. It is meaningless to speak about a "set" in its broadest sense; rather, we should discuss sets of specific types, such as the following:

Type 0: tangible items such as tables, chairs, etc. 1, 2, 3

Type 1: sets that are constructed from Type 0 sets, for example. {1, 2, 3}

Type 2: builds constructed from Type 1 models, for example. {{1, 2, 3}}

Now, people provide evidence that R does not belong to any set type. Assume that it is of type n. Then, given a set x of type n+1, since x cannot belong to itself (this is because, in Russell's Type Theory, a member of a set is in lower-ordered types), we get x belongs to R by definition. On the other hand, a set of type n+1 cannot belong to R of type n, because n is a lower-ordered type than n+1. As a result, R cannot be considered a set in Type Theory. Because of this, the dilemma might be sidestepped by excluding R from the idea of sets.

2.1. Arguments Against the Type Theory

This model has an excessive number of different categories. It is difficult to find a solution to this problem. One formulation of type theory, which was more rigorous than others, tied n+1 order language to type n. As an example, the domain of first-order language is composed of type 0 sets. Nevertheless, in what sequence do the components of the predicate "is true" appear? It can never be exhausted. How can this issue be fixed? When defending Type Theory, some mathematicians take the position that the idea of "being true" as a predicate is incorrect. Nevertheless, prior to the present day, this viewpoint was never broadly shared.

All forms of self-reference were deemed invalid according to the axioms of Russell's Type Theory. However, not all forms of self-reference may generate paradoxes or be meaningless by themselves. Russell's Type Theory has in some way been responsible for a significant disruption to mathematical thinking.

2.2. The intuitionism

The so-called constructive mathematics was a prominent school of mathematical thinking in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Prior to this research talking about intuitionism, it could be best to first present the constructive mathematics school of thought. In a nutshell, constructivists are those who think that in order to demonstrate the reality of a mathematical entity, one must first physically create it. Therefore, it did not accept evidence that contradicted themselves. Does anything like this really matter? In point of fact, several mathematical proofs have the potential to be constructive. To provide just one example, if one is ready to prove:

It is impossible to count the number of primes. In order to provide a convincing argument for it, one should rephrase the statement as follows: There is an injective mapping that may be constructed from every finite set to the set of primes. Brouwer provided a logical defense for this perspective on mathematical theory. Intuitionism was developed by Brouwer. The primary viewpoint held by intuitionists is that "there exists" and "there exists a procedure to construct it" need to be synonymous with one another.

What then was the reaction of the intuitionist school of thought to Russell's paradox? Because there is no technique that can be defined to build the universal set V, we may say that it does not exist. Take note of the fact that the basis of mathematics that we constructed here is not the same as Naive Set Theory. In addition, as will be shown in the next section, the Law of the Excluded Middle was disproved, and as a result, the contradiction was seen to be invalid in the eyes of intuitionists. The solution to Russell's Paradox was stated like this.

Let's go on to the next step, which is to explain why intuitionists didn't believe in the Law of Excluded Middle. First, we use quantifiers to rephrase the Law of the Excluded Middle as follows:

However, even if we assume that it does not guarantee that we will be able to build an x in such a way that.

The field of mathematics was severely impacted as a result of this. The Diaconescu-Goodman-Myhill Theorem states that the rule of excluded middle follows logically from the axiom of choice. Therefore, in the event that the rule of excluded middle is shown to be false, the axiom of choice will become devoid of any real significance. The axiom of choice, on the other hand, is used in the demonstration of an infinite number of mathematical theorems. For instance, in the field of analysis, a mathematician is unable to establish the intermediate value theorem, and in the field of algebra, a ring has a maximum ideal. As a result of these criticisms, the majority of mathematicians did not accept intuitionism as a viable alternative basis for mathematics. The formalist school, which is headed by David Hilbert, is considered to be the most significant opponent of intuitionism. They developed axiomatic set theories, as will be shown in the following explanation.

2.3. ZF's Axioms

It could be helpful for a more in-depth explanation of ZF's axioms [1]. Now, the purpose of this investigation is to provide a solution to Russell's Paradox via the use of ZF's Axiom of Foundation and Axiom of Pairing. What can we deduce about sets from these two axioms?

First and Fundamental Axiom: An axiom of pairing states that for each given pair of sets, x, and y, there exists a set denoted by the notation "x, y" that is composed of solely the two sets. To be more specific, this suggests that if x is a set, then x itself is a set.

Now it can be shown that: The theorem states that it is impossible for any set x.

Clearly, this is not the case. The use of denote and the axiom of pairing guarantees that y is a set. According to the Axiom of Foundation, there must exist an element of y called z, such that, in reality, z is equivalent to x as this is the sole element of y. So. Having said that, if we also have, then this suggests that. Quite the opposite!

By using the preceding lemma, we are able to demonstrate the following:

Theorem: R does not belong to any of ZF's sets.

First, because there is no such set x that exists, which is a lemma that we have already shown to be true. Therefore, we have. In accordance with the definition of V, if V is a set, then, it runs counter to the preceding conclusion. Consequently, V is not a set. Therefore, R cannot be considered a set. This allowed us to circumvent Russell's Paradox, which arises from the fact that mathematicians now understand that a "set" in Naive Set Theory is not necessarily a "set" in ZF.

Remark: Various iterations of set theory hold the position that the Foundation is superfluous. These are indicated with the notation ZF- or ZFC-. Utilizing the axiom of specification is yet another strategy for escaping the conundrum.

2.4. Responses to ZF's Criticisms

It would seem that ZF has found a solution to the contradiction. Nevertheless, what happens if mathematicians wish to work with "classes"? As will be made clear in a subsequent section, the term "class" refers to a more general idea than "set." The difficulty lies in the fact that ZF is unable to deal with classes in a straightforward manner. Due to the fact that this challenge presented itself, we decided to construct an expanded axiomatic set theory in comparison to ZF. This sparked a conversation among us on something known as the Godel-Bernays Set Theory.

Set Theory according to Godel and Bernays and its contrast with ZF would be a good start to this question. A systematic survey of the axioms is [2]. To begin, let us make an observation: these paradoxes are created by self-reference inside a "set" utilizing the connection. This should hopefully be pretty apparent now since the reader should now realize the key is utilizing the Axiom of Foundation to rule out the non-wellfounded sets from the Zermelo-Fraenkel Set Theory (i.e. sets containing themselves as members).

However, what if mathematicians are required to take into account certain sets that are not well-founded? For instance, in the theory of categories, we need to think of a Set as the category that encompasses all sets. This provides us with the impetus to develop further the Zermelo-Fraenkel theory.

The so-called Neumann-Bernays-Godel Set Theory is a good illustration of a common case. The idea of a "class" is presented in this particular theoretical framework. A collection of sets in V (the set-theoretic world) that is "not necessarily a set" is referred to as a "class" in a non-rigorous sense. A "proper class" is a kind of class, however, it is not a set. The attribute of "being a set" is defined precisely as "being an element of another class." It is possible to answer Russell's conundrum and other similar paradoxes, such as the Burali-Forti Paradox, by demonstrating that the class that is being utilized in the conundrum is in fact a genuine class. This research would claim that Godel-Bernay set Theory serves as a basis for mathematics since it can deal with classes directly. This would be supported by the findings of the study. (Note that Neumann, Bernays, and Godel's Theory is, in fact, similar to ZF; but, in comparison to ZF, it is able to deal with classes in a much more straightforward manner. For a more in-depth discussion.)

2.5. Grothendieck Universes

The reader will observe that the difficulty has now become how to prevent the formation of valid classes while doing operations in set theory. The conclusion that may be drawn from this is the "Grothendieck Universes" theory, which was coined in honor of the mathematician Alexander Grothendieck. First, let the definition of universes be introduced briefly:

Definition: A Grothendieck Universe is a set U satisfying the following properties:

1) $u \in U \rightarrow u \subset U$
2) $u, v \in U \rightarrow \{u, v\} \in U$
3) $u \in U \rightarrow P(u) \in U$ $(P(u)$ denotes the power set)
4) If $I \in U$, and a collection of sets $\{u_i ;\ i \in I\}$ satisfy $\forall i, u_i \in U$, then $\cup_{i\in I} u_i \in U$
5) $\emptyset \in U$

The crux of this idea is that in universes one may perform most set-theoretic operations without forming a proper class. This avoided set-theoretic paradoxes generally. Mathematicians inherently question whether or not there are a sufficient number of universes to use. This led to the formulation of the following hypothesis according to A. Grothendieck [3]: $\text{for any set x, there exist a Grothendieck Universe U that } x \in U.$

We had previously gained a "hierarchy" in the past, which consisted of sets, classes (appropriate sets of classes), etc. When seen from the perspective of universes, this becomes much more evident. To begin, we are going to discuss some fresh ideas.

A cardinal that satisfies the criteria of being uncountable, having a high limit, and being regular is said to be inaccessible.

In this context, a cardinal is said to be regular if it is infinite and there is no limit ordinal and monotone increasing list of ordinals. An ordinal satisfying is referred to as a limit ordinal, and a cardinal is said to be a strong limit if for any we have. For more information on the concepts of ordinals and cardinals, consult a set theory textbook such as [1].

Now we sketch the cumulative hierarchy of the set-theoretic universe by induction of ordinals:

$$V_0 := \varnothing$$

$$V_{\alpha+1} := P(V_\alpha)$$

$$V_\alpha := \cup_{\beta<\alpha} V_\beta \text{ , if } \alpha \text{ is a limit ordinal}$$

Bourbaki [3] proved the following theorem: Grothendieck Universes are members V_α in the cumulative hierarchy where α is an inaccessible cardinal.

This theorem, in conjunction with the features of inaccessible cardinals, reveals to us the following information: Any operations of members in V_α using ZFC's axioms will not go beyond the scope of V_α. Furthermore, non-rigorously, if we view the members of V_α as "sets", then "classes" are just the members of $V_{\alpha+1} = P(V_\alpha)$. This kind of classification of size is extremely useful in resolving paradoxes as it can avoid self-reference between members of the “same size” , and is mainly applied in category theory, see [4, p.15-36].

On the other hand, it was shown that this hypothesis is not reliant on the Zermelo-Fraenkel Set Theory or the Bernays-Godel Set Theory. In category theory, Grothendieck's hypothesis is recognized as an additional axiom that stands in addition to the set-theoretic axioms that are often used. The Tarski-Grothendieck set theory is a non-conservative extension of ZFC that recognizes Grothendieck's Hypothesis as an axiom. This theory is also known as the Tarski-Grothendieck set theory [5]. It is an appropriate survey to consult if you are interested in the specifics of the Grothendieck Universe and its applications.

3. Discussions

This research has, up to this point, revealed Russell's oldest answer to self-referential paradoxes, which is known as Type Theory. It originated from the fairly intuitive notion that avoiding self-reference may be accomplished by grouping sets into several categories. However, as the reader will see, in order to construct this theory in a thorough manner, there are some challenging language issues involved. The vast majority of mathematicians disagreed with it, and eventually, they gave up on it.

The so-called intuitionist movement, headed by Brouwer, followed after that. In a nutshell, it denied the axiomatic basis of mathematics and refused to acknowledge the law of excluded middle. Paradoxes involving self-reference seemed to be addressed using this approach. However, it was met with a great deal of criticism due to the fact that it ran against the spirit of mathematical reasoning, which is characterized as being rigorous and logical. Additionally, both the axiom of choice and its consequence, the law of excluded middle, were refuted by this argument. As a result, a great deal of mathematical theorems become impossible to prove. As a result, David Hilbert vehemently disagreed with this point of view, and as a result, he was the one who inspired the formalists to construct new axiomatic set theories, the most important of which being ZF and NBG. Here was the beginning of the end for intuitionism, and the beginning of the emergence of the programme of formalism as the basis of mathematics, which has continued to dominate up to the present date.

This study then used several different kinds of set theories throughout the explanation of the impact of paradoxes on the development of the foundations of mathematics: In my opinion, this is a process from mathematics by intuition to mathematics by axioms, and it goes from the Naive Set Theory all the way up to the Zermelo-Fraenkel and von Neumann-Bernays-Godel Set Theories. This study also used several different kinds of set theories.

Nevertheless, there are issues to be concerned about here. First, the range of sets has become too narrow; what happens when mathematicians wish to discuss more extensive collections, as V (all sets) in Zermelo-Fraenkel Set Theory? As a result, it is only reasonable for us to want an expanded definition of the term "class," which was first presented in the set theory developed by von Neumann, Bernays, and Gödel.

Let us further observe: Using ZFC as an example, when we answer Russell's Paradox, what we really do is eliminate V from the sets since it does not meet the Axiom of Foundation. This is what we did when we solved Russell's Paradox. This is, without a doubt, a very difficult task. When we do an operation in set theory, do we need to make sure that we haven't gone beyond the boundaries of the term "set" each time? Mathematicians, as one would expect, do not support this position.

In addition, as a result of the set-theoretic hierarchy that we covered in the previous section and the development of category theory, the hypothesis of Grothendieck Universes was presented as a new axiom in order to answer these paradoxes in a more comprehensive sense. In addition, the authors of this research would like to bring attention to a recently developed theory that is contentious but intriguing and is connected to the solution of such paradoxes. In-depth debates are beyond the scope of what is covered in this article. There is a theory known as the Non-Wellfounded Set Theory that acknowledges the existence of sets that are not well-founded and does away with the Axiom of Foundation as a result. We can only hope that this new idea will prove to be correct, see [6].

4. Conclusion

In conclusion, the several steps of axioms' extension that this research has just described represent significant forward movement in the field of mathematical foundations. It is certainly the readiness to resolve self-referential paradoxes more widely and conveniently that has led to and inspired all of these advancements, as the author claimed at the beginning of the article. A reassuring passage penned by the eminent thinker Alfred North Whitehead provides support for the underlying perspective of this investigation, and it reads as follows: "In formal logic, a contradiction is the signal of defeat. However, in the evolution of real knowledge, a contradiction marks the first step in progress towards a victory." To summarise, the purpose of this paper is to conduct a review of the influence that self-referential paradoxes have had on the development of foundations for architecture, particularly set-theoretic foundations. This work established the Third Mathematical Crisis by using Russell's Paradox as a concrete illustration. This crisis was followed up by numerous programs like intuitionism, formalism, and even Russell's own Theory of Types. After that, we conducted an investigation into the factors that ultimately led to the predominance of formalist beliefs among mathematicians. This study therefore discussed some axiomatic set theories and the resolutions of the paradoxes in such axioms, and further outlined Grothendieck-Tarski's Set Theory influenced by Category Theory and computer science, which involved adding in new axioms, which inspired us to further search for wider foundations of mathematics. In addition, this study discussed some axiomatic set theories and the resolutions of the paradoxes in such axioms.

References

[1] Kunen K. Set theory an introduction to independence proofs. North Holland (1983 the second impression). 2014.

[2] Mendelson E. Introduction to mathematical logic. CRC press. 2015.

[3] Grothendieck A, Verdier JL. Théorie des topos et cohomologie étale des schémas. Lecture notes in mathematics (Théorie des topos et cohomologie étale des schémas. Tome I: Théorie des topos. Vol. 269. Séminaire de Géométrie Algébrique du Bois-Marie 1963–1964 SGA IV, Dirigé par M. Artin, A. Grothendieck, et J. L. Verdier. Avec la collaboration de N. Bourbaki, P. Deligne et B. Saint-Donat. Berlin: Springer-Verlag). 1972.

[4] Shulman MA. Set theory for category theory. arXiv preprint. arXiv:0810.1279. 2008.

[5] Trybulec A. Tarski Grothendieck set theory. Journal of Formalized Mathematics. 1989. Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tarski%25E2%2580%2593Grothendieck_set_theory.

[6] Moss LS. Non-wellfounded set theory. 2008. Retrieved from the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. URL: https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/nonwellfounded-set-theory/.