

## set.1 Russell's Paradox

sfr:set:rus:  
sec We said that one can define sets by specifying a property that its **elements** share, e.g., defining the set of Richard's siblings as

$$S = \{x : x \text{ is a sibling of Richard}\}.$$

In the very general context of mathematics one must be careful, however: not every property lends itself to *comprehension*. Some properties do not define sets. If they did, we would run into outright contradictions. One example of such a case is Russell's Paradox.

Sets may be **elements** of other sets—for instance, the power set of a set  $X$  is made up of sets. And so it makes sense, of course, to ask or investigate whether a set is **an element** of another set. Can a set be a member of itself? Nothing about the idea of a set seems to rule this out. For instance, surely *all* sets form a collection of objects, so we should be able to collect them into a single set—the set of all sets. And it, being a set, would be **an element** of the set of all sets.

Russell's Paradox arises when we consider the property of not having itself as **an element**. The set of all sets does not have this property, but all sets we have encountered so far have it.  $\mathbb{N}$  is not **an element** of  $\mathbb{N}$ , since it is a set, not a natural number.  $\wp(X)$  is generally not **an element** of  $\wp(X)$ ; e.g.,  $\wp(\mathbb{R}) \notin \wp(\mathbb{R})$  since it is a set of sets of real numbers, not a set of real numbers. What if we suppose that there is a set of all sets that do not have themselves as **an element**? Does

$$R = \{x : x \notin x\}$$

exist?

If  $R$  exists, it makes sense to ask if  $R \in R$  or not—it must be either  $\in R$  or  $\notin R$ . Suppose the former is true, i.e.,  $R \in R$ .  $R$  was defined as the set of all sets that are not **elements** of themselves, and so if  $R \in R$ , then  $R$  does not have this defining property of  $R$ . But only sets that have this property are in  $R$ , hence,  $R$  cannot be **an element** of  $R$ , i.e.,  $R \notin R$ . But  $R$  can't both be and not be **an element** of  $R$ , so we have a contradiction.

Since the assumption that  $R \in R$  leads to a contradiction, we have  $R \notin R$ . But this also leads to a contradiction! For if  $R \notin R$ , it does have the defining property of  $R$ , and so would be **an element** of  $R$  just like all the other non-self-containing sets. And again, it can't both not be and be **an element** of  $R$ .

## Photo Credits

## Bibliography