Russell’s Mathematical Philosophy

J.-M. Kuczynski PhD

Preface to the Second Edition

This work presents a critical, chapter-by-chapter exposition of Bertrand Russell's *Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy*, offering both exegesis and original contributions to foundational mathematics. While maintaining fidelity to Russell's core ideas, this analysis reveals both the enduring significance of his work and areas where modern developments suggest alternative approaches.

Scope and Contributions

The present work makes several distinct contributions to mathematical philosophy:

1. A novel resolution to certain set-theoretic paradoxes, particularly through the analysis of reflexive pronouns and their role in apparently self-referential statements (Chapter 13)

2. A fresh perspective on the relationship between formal and informal mathematical truth, challenging Russell's assertion that mathematics reduces to logic (Chapter 18)

3. An original analysis of number theory that synthesizes insights from both Frege and Von Neumann while avoiding their respective limitations

4. A new approach to understanding mathematical existence claims through the lens of propositional functions (Chapter 15)

Structure and Methodology

Each chapter contains:

1. A detailed summary of the corresponding chapter in Russell's work

2. Original illustrations of principles that Russell either omitted or inadequately explained

3. Critical assessment of Russell's arguments and conclusions

4. Novel suggestions for resolving technical and philosophical problems that arise

The exposition aims to be rigorous yet accessible, serving both as a companion to Russell's text and as an independent contribution to mathematical philosophy.

Key Themes

Several recurring themes emerge throughout the work:

1. The relationship between formal and informal mathematical truth
2. The nature of mathematical existence
3. The role of construction versus axiomatization in mathematical foundations
4. The limits and possibilities of formal systems

Acknowledgment of Limitations

While this work strives for comprehensiveness, certain areas warrant further development:

1. The treatment of real numbers could benefit from deeper exploration of alternative constructions
2. The relationship between different approaches to cardinal numbers deserves fuller examination

3. The implications of modern set theory for Russell's paradoxes merit additional investigation

These limitations suggest directions for future research while not diminishing the core contributions of the present work.

Notes on the Second Edition

This edition includes:

- Enhanced discussion of real number construction methods
- Expanded treatment of set-theoretic paradoxes
- Additional examples throughout
- New cross-references between related sections
- Chapter summaries and study questions
- An index of key terms and concepts

Intended Audience

This work assumes familiarity with basic mathematical concepts but strives to remain accessible to:

- Advanced undergraduate students in mathematics and philosophy
- Graduate students in mathematical logic and foundations
- Researchers in mathematical philosophy
- Anyone interested in the foundations of mathematics

The technical level increases gradually, with more advanced material clearly marked.

A Note on Notation

While maintaining consistency with Russell's notation where possible, this work adopts modern conventions where they enhance clarity. All deviations from Russell's notation are explicitly noted.

Chapter 1: The Incompleteness of Dedekind's Axiom-set

Introduction

The foundations of arithmetic rest upon our ability to characterize the natural numbers through a set of axioms. Dedekind's attempt to do so, while groundbreaking, reveals fundamental issues about the nature of mathematical definition. This chapter examines why Dedekind's axioms, though accurate, fail to uniquely characterize the natural numbers.

1. Dedekind's Axioms

The axiom set consists of five fundamental statements:

1. 0 is a number
2. The successor of a number is a number
3. No two numbers have the same successor
4. 0 is not the successor of any number
5. If 0 has a property, and n+1 has that property whenever n has it, then every (finite number) has that property

Key Definitions

- The intended domain: The class K of whole numbers
- The intended truths: The class K* of arithmetic truths expressible using:
  * 0
  * successor
  * addition (+)
  * multiplication (×)
  * existential quantification
  * negation

2. The Problem of Unintended Models

The axioms fail to uniquely characterize the natural numbers because they admit models that, while satisfying all axioms, clearly diverge from our intended interpretation.

Model 1

- Let "0" refer to 100
- Let "successor of n" refer to 2n
- Validates all axioms but generates sequence: 100, 200, 400,...

Model 2

- Let "0" refer to 1
- Let "successor of n" refer to "smallest prime > n"
- Validates all axioms but generates sequence: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 11,...

Model 3

- Let "0" refer to 1
- Let "successor of n" refer to "{n}" (singleton set)
- Validates all axioms but generates fundamentally different structure

3. The Categorical Failure

The existence of these models demonstrates that the axioms are not categorical - they do not pin down a unique structure up to isomorphism.

Why This Matters

The common objection that these models involve "misinterpretation" of terms begs the question. The very purpose of axiomatization is to fix the meaning of primitive terms through their logical relationships.

Formal Analysis

If we represent the intended structure as $M = \langle N, 0, S\rangle$ where:

- N is the set of natural numbers
- $0 \in N$
- $S: N \to N$ is the successor function

Then we can show that there exist structures $M' = \langle N', 0', S'\rangle$ that:

1. Satisfy all Dedekind axioms
2. Are not isomorphic to M
3. Cannot be excluded by adding finitely many axioms of the same logical type

4. Implications

This inadequacy reveals several important points about mathematical foundations:

1. Informal understanding often relies on implicit assumptions not captured in formal systems
2. The gap between intended and formal meaning cannot always be bridged through first-order axiomatization
3. Some mathematical concepts may require higher-order logic or additional mathematical machinery to characterize uniquely

Study Questions

1. Why can't we simply add an axiom excluding the unintended models?
2. What does this tell us about the relationship between formal and informal mathematics?
3. Construct your own model that satisfies Dedekind's axioms but differs from the standard interpretation
4. How might this problem relate to Gödel's incompleteness theorems?

Exercises

1. Prove that Model 1 satisfies each of Dedekind's axioms
2. Find a property shared by all numbers in Model 2 that is not shared by all natural numbers
3. Construct a bijection between Model 3 and the standard natural numbers
4. Show that no finite set can satisfy Dedekind's axioms

Further Reading

- Dedekind, R. (1888) *Was sind und was sollen die Zahlen?*
- Benacerraf, P. (1965) "What Numbers Could Not Be"
- Shapiro, S. (1991) *Foundations Without Foundationalism*

Notes

1. The distinction between adequate and complete characterization becomes crucial in modern mathematical logic
2. This problem foreshadows deeper issues in model theory and mathematical foundations
3. The resolution ultimately requires tools beyond first-order logic

Chapter 2: The Nature of Natural Numbers

Introduction

The quest to understand what numbers truly are leads us to a fundamental insight: numbers are properties of classes, not of individual objects. This chapter develops this crucial idea and explores its implications for mathematical foundations.

1. Numbers as Properties of Classes

The Basic Insight

Consider two fundamental statements:

1. "Jim has two cars"
2. "Jim has zero cars"

Key Observation

Neither statement attributes properties to individual cars:

- In (1), no specific car has the property "two"

- In (2), there clearly exists no car having the property "zero"

Analysis

These statements are about classes:

- (1) attributes a property to the class of Jim's cars

- (2) states that a particular class (Jim's cars) is empty

2. The Quantifier Analysis

Quantifiers and Class Properties

- Words like "0" and "2" function as quantifiers

- Similar to "some" and "all" in logical notation

- Example: "Some man is tall" answers the question "How many members does the class of tall men have?"

Double Interpretation

Quantified statements can be interpreted as:

1. Statements about classes of individuals

2. Statements about classes of statements

Example Analysis:

` ` `

"Some man is tall" can mean either:

a) The class of tall men has at least one member

b) At least one statement of form "x is a man and x is tall" is true

` ` `

3. Numbers as Properties of Properties

Key Insight

Numbers are second-order properties:

- 0 is a property of the property "being a square circle"
- 1 is a property of the property "being a U.S. President in 2014"

Formal Definition

For any number n:

- A property has number n iff it has exactly n instances
- A set has number n iff it has exactly n members

4. Frege's Analysis of Cardinality

What It Means for a Class to Have n Members

For each n, we can define precisely what it means:

Zero Members

k has 0 members iff k is empty

One Member

k has 1 member iff:

- For some x, x is a member of k
- For any y, y is a member of k iff y=x

Two Members

k has 2 members iff:

- For some x and y where x≠y
- Each of x and y is a member of k
- For any z, z is a member of k iff z=x or z=y

General Pattern

This pattern extends naturally to any finite number

5. Numbers as Classes of Equinumerous Classes

The Concept of Equinumerosity

Two classes are equinumerous if:

- They can be put into one-one correspondence
- Each member of one can be paired with exactly one member of the other

Formal Definition

Let Kn be the class of all n-membered classes

- 'k has n members' ≡ 'k is a member of Kn'
- We can identify n with Kn
- The property of having n members ≡ membership in n

6. Alternative Analysis: Numbers as Properties

Advantages of Property-Based Analysis

1. Doesn't require infinitely many objects
2. Avoids making number identity contingent on universe composition

Example

The number 2 as:

a) Class-based: The class of all pairs

b) Property-based: The property of being a two-membered class

Study Questions

1. Why can't numbers be properties of individual objects?
2. How does Frege's analysis avoid circularity?
3. What advantages does the property-based analysis have over the class-based analysis?
4. Can you construct a definition for "k has 4 members" following Frege's pattern?

Exercises

1. Prove that equinumerosity is an equivalence relation

2. Show how the property-based analysis avoids Russell's paradox

3. Construct explicit one-one correspondences between example equinumerous classes

4. Analyze the statement "Most philosophers are logical" using the quantifier framework

Further Reading

- Frege, G. (1884) *The Foundations of Arithmetic*

- Benacerraf, P. (1965) "What Numbers Could Not Be"

- Dummett, M. (1991) *Frege: Philosophy of Mathematics*

Notes

1. The distinction between numbers as classes and numbers as properties remains philosophically significant

2. The analysis here provides foundations for later discussions of infinite cardinals

3. The property-based approach anticipates modern category-theoretic perspectives

Chapter 3: The Definitions of "0" and "+1"

Introduction

The foundation of arithmetic rests on properly defining two primitive notions: zero and the successor operation. This chapter shows how these concepts can be rigorously constructed from set-theoretic principles, avoiding the circularity that plagues naive definitions.

1. Hereditary (Inductive) Relations

The Problem of "And So On"

Traditional definition: "The natural numbers are 0, 1, 2, and so on."

- This is clearly inadequate
- "And so on" requires precise definition
- The very concept we're trying to define seems presupposed

The Correct Definition

(N) The class of natural numbers is the smallest class containing 0 that is closed under the successor relation.

Analysis of Components

1. "Smallest class containing 0"
   - Establishes the starting point
   - Ensures no unnecessary elements

2. "Closed under the successor relation"
   - If n is in the class, n+1 must be in the class
   - Captures the generative nature of numbers

3. "Smallest such class"
   - Eliminates unintended elements
   - Ensures minimality

2. Definition of Zero

Frege's Analysis

0 = the class of all empty classes

Key Properties

1. There is exactly one empty class (by Extensionality)
2. The empty class exists necessarily
3. This definition makes 0 independent of contingent facts

Formal Statement

Let Ø be the empty class

- 0 is identical with {Ø}
- This makes 0 the class whose sole member is the empty class

3. Definition of Successor

Formal Definition

For any numbers m and n:

m is the successor of n (m = n+1) if and only if:

- For any member s of m
- For any member x of s
- The set s* that does not include x but otherwise has the same membership as s is a member of n

Analysis of Definition

1. m is a class of classes (the class of all m-membered classes)

2. n is a class of classes (the class of all n-membered classes)

3. Any m-membered class has exactly one more member than any n-membered class

4. Proofs of Dedekind's Axioms

Axiom 1: 0 is a number

Proof:

1. "n is a number" means "n is a class of equinumerous sets"

2. 0 is the class of all empty sets

3. Any two empty sets are equinumerous

4. Therefore, 0 is a number

Axiom 2: The successor of a number is a number

Proof:

1. Let n be an arbitrary number

2. Let s be an arbitrary n-membered class

3. Let x be an arbitrary non-member of s

4. Let s* be a class that includes x but is otherwise like s

5. s* is an n+1-membered class

6. The class of all n+1 membered classes is a number

   - Because it's a maximal class of equinumerous classes

Axiom 3: No two numbers have the same successor

Proof:

1. Let n and m be distinct numbers

2. Let s be an arbitrary n-membered class

3. Let s* be an arbitrary m-membered class

4. Since $n \neq m$, s and s* cannot be put in one-one correspondence

5. For any x not in s or s*:

   - Let sx include x but otherwise coincide with s

   - Let s*x include x but otherwise coincide with s*

6. sx and s*x cannot be put in one-one correspondence

7. Therefore $n+1 \neq m+1$

Axiom 4: 0 is not the successor of any number

Proof:

1. 0 is the empty set

2. There are no non-empty subsets of 0

3. Therefore, there is no subset of 0 that is better populated than any set

4. Thus, 0 isn't the successor of any number

5. Definition by Abstraction

Nature of the Method

- Defines entities indirectly through equivalence relations

- Avoids circularity while capturing essential properties

- Provides rigorous foundation for mathematical concepts

Examples

1. Length
2. Points in time
3. Points in space

Study Questions

1. Why is the "and so on" definition inadequate?
2. How does Frege's definition of 0 avoid circularity?
3. Why must we prove Dedekind's axioms from our definitions?
4. What role does the Axiom of Extensionality play?

Exercises

1. Prove that 1 is the successor of 0 using the given definitions
2. Show that 2 is the successor of 1
3. Construct a formal proof that 0 has no predecessors
4. Define 3 explicitly using the successor operation

Further Reading

- Dedekind, R. (1888) *Was sind und was sollen die Zahlen?*
- Frege, G. (1884) *The Foundations of Arithmetic*
- Peano, G. (1889) *Arithmetices principia, nova methodo exposita*

Notes

1. The definitions here provide foundation for all of arithmetic

2. These constructions avoid the circularity of naive definitions

3. The approach generalizes to other mathematical structures

Chapter 4: Serial Order

Introduction

The concept of order is fundamental to mathematics, yet its precise characterization requires careful analysis. This chapter examines how mathematical ordering can be rigorously defined and explores the distinction between different types of ordering relations.

1. Basic Concepts

Definition of a Series

A series is an ordered pair <K, R> where:

- K is a class of objects (the domain)

- R is an ordering relation on K

Properties of Ordering Relations

For any x, y, and z in K, an ordering relation R must satisfy:

1. Asymmetry: If xRy, then not(yRx)

2. Transitivity: If xRy and yRz, then xRz

3. Connection: If $x \neq y$, then either xRy or yRx

Formal Notation

For clarity, we can write:

```
Asymmetry: xRy → ¬(yRx)

Transitivity: (xRy ∧ yRz) → xRz

Connection: x≠y → (xRy ∨ yRx)
```

2. Types of Ordering

Strict Ordering

A relation R establishes a strict ordering when:

1. The members of K are connected under R

2. R is asymmetrical with respect to K's members

3. R is transitive with respect to K's members

Example: Natural Numbers

- K = {natural numbers}

- R = "less than" (<)

- Forms <K, R> = <ℕ, <>

Partial Ordering

A relation R establishes a partial ordering when:

1. R is asymmetrical and transitive

2. K's members are not necessarily connected under R

Example: Human Height

- K = {human beings}

- R = "is taller than"

- Not all pairs are comparable (same height possible)

3. Mathematical Examples

The Natural Number Series

Consider <ℕ, <> where:

- Domain: Natural numbers

- Relation: Less than

- Properties:

  * If n < m, then not(m < n)

  * If n < m and m < p, then n < p

  * For any n,m ∈ ℕ where n≠m, either n < m or m < n

The Rational Number Series

Consider <ℚ, <> where:

- Domain: Rational numbers

- Relation: Less than

- Notable feature: Dense ordering (between any two elements exists another)

4. Formal Properties

Important Distinctions

1. Strict vs. Non-strict Ordering
   - Strict: $x < y$
   - Non-strict: $x \leq y$

2. Total vs. Partial Ordering
   - Total: All elements comparable
   - Partial: Some elements may be incomparable

Additional Properties

1. Density
   - For any x,y where xRy, exists z where xRz and zRy
   - Example: Rationals are dense

2. Completeness
   - Every bounded set has a least upper bound
   - Example: Reals are complete, rationals are not

5. Applications

Mathematical Structures

1. Number Systems

   - Natural numbers: Discrete ordering

   - Rationals: Dense ordering

   - Reals: Complete ordering

2. Set Theory

   - Subset relation: Partial ordering

   - Cardinal numbers: Total ordering

Real-world Applications

1. Time Sequences

   - Events ordered by temporal precedence

   - Demonstrates transitivity

2. Hierarchical Structures

   - Organizational charts

   - Taxonomic classifications

Study Questions

1. Why is asymmetry necessary for an ordering relation?

2. What distinguishes a partial order from a total order?

3. Can you find a real-world example of a partial ordering that isn't a total ordering?

4. Why is density important in the rational numbers?

Exercises

1. Prove that the "proper subset" relation is a partial ordering

2. Show that "divides evenly" is a partial ordering on the natural numbers

3. Construct a finite set with a partial ordering that isn't total

4. Prove that if R is a strict ordering, then its inverse is also a strict ordering

Advanced Topics

1. Well-orderings
   - Every non-empty subset has a least element
   - Connection to transfinite induction

2. Order Types
   - Isomorphism classes of ordered sets
   - Role in cardinal arithmetic

Further Reading

- Hausdorff, F. "Grundzüge der Mengenlehre"
- Sierpiński, W. "Cardinal and Ordinal Numbers"
- Birkhoff, G. "Lattice Theory"

Notes

1. The concept of order underlies much of modern mathematics

2. Understanding different types of order is crucial for later chapters

3. Order theory connects to topology, algebra, and set theory

Chapters 5-6: Higher-Order Relations and Similarity Among Relations

Introduction

The concepts of higher-order relations and similarity among relations are crucial for understanding mathematical structure. These chapters examine how different orderings can share the same structure despite having different domains and relations.

1. Isomorphic Orderings: A Foundational Example

Case Study: Two Different Series

Let's examine two apparently different but structurally identical series:

Series 1 (S_1)

- K: Whole numbers from 1 to 100
- R: "is one less than"
- Notation: <K, R>

Series 2 (S_2)

- K*: Even numbers from 200 to 400
- R*: "is two less than"
- Notation: <K*, R*>

Structural Analysis

1. S_1 consists of 50 links:

   - Link 1: 1 → 2
   - Link 2: 2 → 3
   - And so on...

2. S_2 consists of 50 links:

   - Link 1: 200 → 202
   - Link 2: 202 → 204
   - And so on...

2. The Concept of Isomorphism

Formal Definition

Two orderings <K,R> and <K*,R*> are isomorphic if there exists a rule R such that:

- For any n (1≤n≤50)
- For x,y ∈ K and x*,y* ∈ K*
- R pairs <x,y> with <x*,y*> iff:
  * The nth link of RK begins with x and ends with y
  * The nth link of R*K* begins with x* and ends with y*

Key Properties

1. Preservation of Structure
   - Order-preserving bijection
   - Maintains relationships between elements

2. Equivalence Relation

- Reflexive: Every ordering is isomorphic to itself
- Symmetric: If A ≅ B then B ≅ A
- Transitive: If A ≅ B and B ≅ C then A ≅ C

3. Ordinal Numbers

Definition

An ordinal number is the class of all orderings isomorphic with a given ordering.

Properties

1. For finite sets:
   - Equinumerous sets generate the same ordinal
   - Order type determined by size alone

2. For infinite sets:
   - Equinumerosity doesn't guarantee same ordinal
   - Different orderings possible for same cardinality

4. Mathematical Formalization

Isomorphism Function

For orderings A = <K,R> and B = <K*,R*>, a function f: K → K* is an isomorphism if:

```
∀x,y ∈ K: xRy ↔ f(x)R*f(y)
```

Properties of Isomorphism Functions

1. Bijective (one-to-one and onto)
2. Order-preserving
3. Structure-preserving

5. Examples and Applications

Numeric Examples

1. Positive Integers vs. Negative Integers
   - $<\mathbb{N}^+, <> \cong <\mathbb{N}^-, >>$
   - $f(n) = -n$ establishes isomorphism

2. Dense Orders
   - $<\mathbb{Q}\cap(0,1), <> \cong <\mathbb{Q}\cap(1,2), <>$
   - Linear transformation establishes isomorphism

Geometric Examples

1. Line Segments
   - Different lengths can have same order type
   - Points in correspondence preserve order

6. Higher-Order Relations

Definition

Relations between relations or between structures of relations

Examples

1. "Is more dense than"
2. "Is a suborder of"
3. "Is order-embeddable in"

Formal Treatment

For relations R and S:

```
R ≤ S ↔ ∃f: dom(R) → dom(S):
  ∀x,y ∈ dom(R): xRy → f(x)Sf(y)
```

Study Questions

1. Why can two structures be isomorphic despite having different elements?
2. How does isomorphism differ from equality?
3. Why do infinite orderings introduce new complexities?
4. Can you construct an isomorphism between two simple finite orderings?

Exercises

1. Prove that isomorphism is an equivalence relation
2. Construct an explicit isomorphism between [0,1] and [2,3]
3. Show that the rational numbers in [0,1] are isomorphic to all rational numbers
4. Find two orderings of $\mathbb{N}$ that aren't isomorphic

Advanced Topics

1. Order-preserving embeddings
2. Dense linear orderings
3. Well-orderings and ordinal arithmetic

Applications

1. Mathematical Structures
   - Group isomorphisms
   - Topological homeomorphisms
   - Category equivalences

2. Computer Science
   - Data structure equivalence
   - Algorithm analysis
   - Type theory

Further Reading

- Cantor, G. "Contributions to the Founding of the Theory of Transfinite Numbers"

- Hausdorff, F. "Set Theory"

- Sierpiński, W. "General Topology"

Notes

1. Isomorphism is fundamental to modern mathematical thinking
2. Understanding structure preservation guides mathematical classification
3. The finite/infinite distinction remains crucial

Chapter 7: Rational and Real Numbers

Introduction

The construction of rational and real numbers represents a crucial bridge between discrete and continuous mathematics. These constructions demonstrate how complex mathematical structures can be built from simpler ones through precise logical steps.

1. Key Definitions

Fundamental Constructions

1. +n is the relation that m+n bears to n
2. -n is the relation that n bears to m-n
3. p/q is the relation that x bears to y when xq=yp
4. The real number corresponding to n is the class of all fractions less than n

Implications

- Each cardinal number n is distinct from corresponding rational and real numbers
- Signed integers are relations between cardinals
- Rationals are relations between integers
- Reals can be constructed in multiple ways

2. Signed Integers

Construction and Properties

1. Motivation:
   - The relation borne by 4 to 7 is -3
   - We identify -3 with that relation
   - +3 is the converse of -3

2. Formal Analysis

```
For integers a,b:
+a: relation that (m+a) bears to m
-a: relation that m bears to (m-a)
```

Operations

Addition: Two Distinct Cases

1. Cardinal Addition: "5+3=8"
   - Relation between cardinal numbers

2. Signed Integer Addition: "-3+8=5"
   - Relation between relations between cardinals
   - Denoted by "+RC" (Relation among Cardinals)

Multiplication: Similar Distinction

1. Cardinal Multiplication: "5×3"
2. Signed Integer Multiplication: "-3×4"

3. Rational Numbers

Construction

Definition: p/q is identical with relation that x bears to y when xq=yp

Key Properties

1. Well-defined: Independent of representation
2. Ordering: p/q < m/n iff pn < mq
3. Equivalence: p/q = m/n iff pn = mq

Operations on Rationals

1. Addition: (p/q) + (m/n) = (pn+mq)/qn
2. Multiplication: (p/q) × (m/n) = (pm)/(qn)

Density Property

For any rationals $p/q < m/n$:

- There exists a rational between them: $(p+m)/(q+n)$
- Proves rational numbers form a dense set

4. Real Numbers: Russell's Construction

The Problem of Irrational Numbers

Square Root of 2

1. Proof of Irrationality:
   - Assume $\sqrt{2} = p/q$ in lowest terms
   - Then $p^2 = 2q^2$
   - Shows p must be even
   - Leads to contradiction

2. Implications:
   - Reveals gaps in rational numbers
   - Necessitates new number system

Russell's Solution

Define a real number as the class of all fractions less than it.

Properties

1. Every rational defines a real number
2. Some reals (like $\sqrt{2}$) aren't defined by rationals

3. Ordering is natural: $r < s$ iff class for $r \subset$ class for s

Operations

1. Addition of reals:
   - Let K_1, K_2 be real numbers
   - $K_1 + K_2$ = class of sums of their members

2. Multiplication:
   - $K_1 \times K_2$ = class of products of their members

5. Alternative Construction: Reals as Cauchy Sequences

The Cauchy Sequence Approach

A fundamentally different construction views reals as equivalence classes of convergent sequences of rationals.

Definition of Cauchy Sequence

A sequence $\{a_n\}$ is Cauchy if:

- For any $\varepsilon > 0$
- There exists N such that
- For all $m,n > N$: $|a_m - a_n| < \varepsilon$

Examples

1. Sequence approaching $\sqrt{2}$:
   - $S = (1, 1.4, 1.41, 1.414, \ldots)$

- Each term better approximates √2

2. Sequence for 1/3:
   - (0.3, 0.33, 0.333, ...)
   - Shows rational representation

Formal Construction

Step 1: Define Sequences

Let S be the set of all Cauchy sequences of rationals.

Step 2: Define Equivalence

Two sequences $\{a_n\}$ and $\{b_n\}$ are equivalent if:

- For any ε > 0
- There exists N such that
- For all n > N: $|a_n - b_n| < \varepsilon$

Step 3: Form Equivalence Classes

- Each real number is an equivalence class
- Write [S] for equivalence class containing S
- Different sequences can represent same real

Operations on Cauchy Sequences

Addition

For sequences $\{a_n\}$ and $\{b_n\}$:

```
[{a_n}] + [{b_n}] = [{a_n + b_n}]
```

Multiplication

```
[{a_n}] × [{b_n}] = [{a_n × b_n}]
```

6. Comparison of Approaches

Russell's Cuts vs. Cauchy Sequences

Russell (Dedekind Cuts):

- Reals as classes of rationals
- Static, set-theoretic perspective
- Emphasizes ordering properties

Cauchy Sequences:

- Reals as equivalence classes of sequences
- Dynamic, process-oriented perspective
- Emphasizes approximation properties

Equivalence of Constructions

While appearing different, both approaches yield isomorphic structures:

1. From Cuts to Sequences:
   - Given cut A, form sequence $\{a_n\}$ approaching boundary
   - All such sequences form same equivalence class

2. From Sequences to Cuts:
   - Given sequence $\{a_n\}$, form cut $\{r \in \mathbb{Q} \mid r < a_n \text{ for some } n\}$
   - Equivalent sequences yield same cut

7. Philosophical Implications

Nature of Mathematical Objects

1. Reals not as limits of rationals
2. Reals as classes or sequences
3. Multiple equivalent constructions

Ontological Status

1. Independence from physical reality
2. Necessity vs contingency
3. Abstract vs concrete existence

Study Questions

1. Why can't $\sqrt{2}$ be rational?
2. How do Dedekind cuts differ from Cauchy sequences?
3. Why are two constructions of reals useful?
4. What makes real numbers "complete"?

Exercises

1. Prove that 1/3 has no finite decimal representation
2. Construct the Dedekind cut for $\sqrt{2}$
3. Show that between any two reals there is a rational
4. Prove the density of rationals in reals
5. Show that the sequence (1, 1.4, 1.41, 1.414, ...) is Cauchy
6. Prove that sum of Cauchy sequences is Cauchy
7. Construct two different Cauchy sequences converging to same real
8. Show how to represent π through a Cauchy sequence

Advanced Topics

1. Completeness axiom
2. Cauchy completion
3. Dedekind completion
4. Decimal representations
5. Completion of metric spaces
6. Relation to topological completeness
7. Other types of convergence

8. Non-standard analysis approaches

Further Reading

- Dedekind, R. "Continuity and Irrational Numbers"

- Cauchy, A.L. "Cours d'analyse"

- Weierstrass, K. "On Continuous Functions"

- Russell, B. "Principles of Mathematics"

Chapter 8: Infinite Cardinal Numbers

Introduction

The study of infinite cardinal numbers marks a crucial transition in mathematics, moving beyond finite quantities to understand different sizes of infinity. This chapter explores how such infinities can be rigorously compared and manipulated.

1. Reflexive Classes

Definition and Basic Properties

A class K is reflexive if:

- It can be put into one-one correspondence with a proper part of itself

- The existence of such a correspondence proves K is infinite

- The converse requires the Axiom of Choice

Key Example: Natural Numbers

Let C be the class of cardinal numbers:

- Can be mapped one-to-one with evens
- Can be mapped one-to-one with squares
- Can be mapped one-to-one with primes
- All these subsets have cardinality Aleph-null ($\aleph_0$)

Formal Definition

K is reflexive iff:

```
∃f: K → K such that:
1. f is injective (one-to-one)
2. range(f) ⊊ K (proper subset)
```

2. The Power-Set Theorem and Transfinite Hierarchy

Statement of Power-Set Theorem

For any cardinal n: $n < 2^n$

Proof

Let K be any class and assume function F bijects K with P(K):

1. Define $S^* = \{x \in K \mid x \notin F(x)\}$
2. S^* must be assigned to some $y \in K$ by F
3. Then $y \in S^* \leftrightarrow y \notin S^*$ (contradiction)

Implications

1. Aleph-null < $2^{\aleph_0}$
2. Creates infinite hierarchy of transfinite numbers
3. Each level generates larger infinity via power set

Cantor's Hierarchy

```
ℵ₀ < 2^ℵ₀ < 2^(2^ℵ₀) < 2^(2^(2^ℵ₀)) < ...
```

3. Cardinal Arithmetic

Addition of Transfinite Numbers

1. Basic Properties
   - $\aleph_0 + 1 = \aleph_0$
   - $\aleph_0 + n = \aleph_0$ (for finite n)
   - $\aleph_0 + \aleph_0 = \aleph_0$

2. Proof Method
   - Construct explicit bijections
   - Show absorption of finite quantities

Multiplication

1. Basic Properties

- $\aleph_0 \times 2 = \aleph_0$
- $\aleph_0 \times n = \aleph_0$ (for finite n)
- $\aleph_0 \times \aleph_0 = \aleph_0$

2. Cartesian Products

Example: $\aleph_0 \times 2$:

```
Consider pairs: {<A,1>, <A,2>, <B,1>, <B,2>, ...}
Can be reordered into countable sequence
```

4. Size Comparisons

Countable vs. Uncountable

1. Rational Numbers
   - Proof of countability via diagonal method
   - Construction of explicit enumeration

2. Real Numbers
   - Cantor's diagonal argument
   - Proves uncountability
   - Shows $|\mathbb{R}| = 2^{\aleph_0}$

The Continuum Hypothesis

1. Statement: There is no cardinal number between $\aleph_0$ and $2^\wedge\aleph_0$

2. Independence from ZFC

3. Implications for set theory

5. Subtraction and Division

Subtraction Paradoxes

1. $\aleph_0 - \aleph_0$ is indeterminate

2. Can equal any finite number

3. Can equal $\aleph_0$ itself

Examples

1. Remove evens from naturals: $\aleph_0 - \aleph_0 = \aleph_0$

2. Remove all but finite set: $\aleph_0 - \aleph_0 = n$ (finite)

Division Properties

1. $\aleph_0/2 = \aleph_0$

2. $\aleph_0/n = \aleph_0$ (for finite n)

3. $\aleph_0/\aleph_0$ is indeterminate

Study Questions

1. Why does Cantor's diagonal argument work?

2. How can infinity minus infinity be ambiguous?

3. What makes a class reflexive?

4. Why is the Continuum Hypothesis significant?

Exercises

1. Prove that rationals are countable
2. Construct a bijection between N and N × N
3. Show that algebraic numbers are countable
4. Prove that the power set of a countable set is uncountable

Advanced Topics

1. Cardinal arithmetic in ZFC
2. Large cardinal axioms
3. Independence results
4. Alternative set theories

Applications

1. Set Theory
   - Foundation for mathematics
   - Axiom systems

2. Analysis
   - Measure theory
   - Function spaces

3. Topology

  - Infinite-dimensional spaces

  - Compactness

Further Reading

- Cantor, G. "Contributions to the Founding of the Theory of Transfinite Numbers"
- Cohen, P. "Set Theory and the Continuum Hypothesis"
- Gödel, K. "The Consistency of the Continuum Hypothesis"

Notes

1. The study of infinite cardinals revolutionized mathematics
2. Many paradoxes of infinity resolve through careful analysis
3. Some questions remain independent of standard axioms

Chapter 9: Ordinal Numbers and Infinite Series

Introduction

Ordinal numbers capture the essential structure of well-ordered sets, providing a more nuanced understanding of infinite collections than cardinal numbers alone. This chapter examines their properties and their crucial role in mathematical induction.

1. The Concept of Ordinal Numbers

Basic Definition

An ordinal number is the class of all series isomorphic to a given well-ordered series.

Key Properties

1. Not identical with series themselves
2. Abstract structural patterns
3. Encode order information lost in cardinal numbers

Formal Structure

For series S = <K,R>:

- K is a class of objects
- R is an ordering relation
- Ordinal captures equivalence class under order isomorphism

2. Series and Ordered Pairs

Definition of Series

A series is given by ordered pair <K,R> where:

1. K is a class of objects
2. R orders K's members:
   - If x,y,z ∈ K are distinct:
     * xRy or yRx (but not both)
     * not(xRx)
     * if xRy and yRz, then xRz

Example

```
K = {1,2,3,...,10}

<K,<> generates sequence 1 to 10

<K,R%> might generate 1,3,2,4,5,7,8,10,9

Both represent same ordinal
```

3. Finite vs. Infinite Ordinals

Finite Case

1. Reordering preserves ordinal
2. All orderings of n elements isomorphic
3. Ordinal determined by size alone

Infinite Case: Omega

1. <ℕ,<> generates series 1,2,3,...
2. Defines smallest infinite ordinal (ω)
3. Different orderings possible:
   - Standard: 1,2,3,...
   - $\omega+1$: 1,2,3,...,n,a
   - $\omega+2$: 1,2,3,...,n,a,b

Beyond Omega

1. $\omega+\omega$: Natural numbers followed by another copy
2. $\omega\times2$: Two copies of natural numbers
3. ω^2, ω^3, ω^ω: Higher-order infinite ordinals

4. Ordinal Arithmetic

Addition

1. Sequential combination
2. Not commutative:
   - $1 + \omega = \omega$
   - $\omega + 1 > \omega$

Multiplication

1. Repeated addition
2. Also not commutative:
   - $2 \times \omega = \omega$
   - $\omega \times 2 > \omega$

Exponentiation

1. Repeated multiplication
2. Creates higher-order infinities
3. Example: ω^ω yields ε_0

5. Well-Ordered Series

Definition

A series S is well-ordered if:

- Every non-empty subset has a least element
- Essential for transfinite induction

Properties

1. Every element except first has predecessor
2. Every bounded set has supremum
3. No infinite descending sequences

Significance

1. Enables transfinite induction
2. Allows recursive definitions
3. Fundamental for set theory

6. The Axiom of Choice

Relationship to Well-Ordering

1. AC equivalent to well-ordering theorem
2. Every set can be well-ordered
3. Enables comparison of arbitrary ordinals

Consequences

1. Enables ordinal arithmetic
2. Makes ordinal comparison possible
3. Supports transfinite induction

Study Questions

1. Why aren't infinite ordinals determined by size alone?
2. How does ordinal addition differ from cardinal addition?
3. Why is well-ordering important for ordinals?
4. How does AC relate to ordinal theory?

Exercises

1. Prove that $1 + \omega = \omega$
2. Show $\omega + 1 > \omega$
3. Construct explicit well-ordering of rationals
4. Compare $\omega \times 2$ and $2 \times \omega$

Advanced Topics

1. Ordinal hierarchies
2. Von Neumann ordinals
3. Ordinal collapsing functions
4. Reflection principles

Applications

1. Set Theory

- Foundation for mathematics
- Transfinite induction

2. Proof Theory
   - Ordinal analysis
   - Consistency proofs

3. Recursion Theory
   - Well-orderings
   - Hierarchies

Technical Notes

Cardinals vs. Ordinals

1. Scalar vs. Vector Quantities
   - Cardinals: size only
   - Ordinals: size and structure

2. Dimensionality
   - One-dimensional manifolds
   - Vector quantities
   - Higher-order relations

Well-Ordering Principle

Key features:

1. Every non-empty subset has least element

2. Essential for mathematical induction

3. Equivalent to AC

Further Reading

- Sierpiński, W. "Cardinal and Ordinal Numbers"

- Conway, J.H. "On Numbers and Games"

- Kunen, K. "Set Theory: An Introduction to Independence Proofs"

Notes

1. Ordinals essential for understanding infinite structures

2. Non-commutativity reveals deep structural properties

3. Connection to mathematical induction fundamental

Chapters 10-11: Limits and Continuity

Introduction

The concepts of limits and continuity form the foundation of mathematical analysis. This chapter examines these concepts through both their formal definitions and their philosophical implications.

1. Convergent Series and Cauchy Sequences

Basic Definitions

Convergent Series

Consider sequence S generated by F(x) = x + 1/x:

```
S = 2/1, 3/2, 4/3, 5/4, 6/5, ...
```

Cauchy Sequences

Definition: Series $\{a_i\}$ where:

- For any $\varepsilon > 0$
- There exists N such that
- For all m,n > N: $|a_m - a_n| < \varepsilon$

Relationship Between Concepts

1. Every convergent sequence is Cauchy
2. Not every Cauchy sequence converges (in $\mathbb{Q}$)
3. All Cauchy sequences converge in $\mathbb{R}$ (completeness)

Example: Root Sequence

Consider S = $\{\sqrt{1}, \sqrt{2}, \sqrt{3}, \ldots\}$

- Non-convergent but Cauchy
- Demonstrates need for real numbers
- Shows incompleteness of rationals

2. Limits of Functions

Formal Definition

Statement: "The limit of F(x), as x approaches a, is L"

means:

```
∀ε > 0, ∃δ > 0: |x - a| < δ → |F(x) - L| < ε
```

Types of Limits

Function Limits

1. Left-hand limits
2. Right-hand limits
3. Two-sided limits
4. Infinite limits

Continuity Definitions

Point Continuity

F is continuous at $x = a$ if:

1. The limit of F(x) as $x \to a$ exists
2. F(a) equals this limit

Function Continuity

F is continuous if:

- Continuous at every point in domain
- Contains all non-terminal limiting points

3. Philosophical Issues

Nature of Limits

1. Not about reaching endpoint
2. About arbitrarily close approach
3. Potential vs. actual infinity

Continuity vs. Discreteness

1. Mathematical continuity
2. Physical continuity
3. Relationship between models and reality

4. Physical Applications

Laws of Physics in Limit Form

Example: Instantaneous velocity

1. Traditional statement:

   "x's velocity at instant t is v"

2. Precise meaning:

```
For intervals I₁, I₂, ..., Iᵢ, ... containing t:
∀ε > 0, ∃n: |avg_velocity(Iₙ) - v| < ε
```

Physical Interpretation

1. No true instantaneous states
2. Limits as idealization
3. Mathematical vs physical continuity

5. Technical Developments

Properties of Continuous Functions

Intermediate Value Theorem

If F is continuous on [a,b]:

- $F(a) \leq y \leq F(b)$
- $\exists x \in [a,b]: F(x) = y$

Extreme Value Theorem

If F is continuous on closed interval:

1. F attains maximum
2. F attains minimum

Types of Discontinuity

1. Jump discontinuity
2. Removable discontinuity
3. Essential discontinuity

6. Space and Time Continuity

The Nature of Points

1. Not primitive entities
2. Constructed from overlapping regions
3. Relative to chosen units

Temporal Continuity

1. Instants as constructions
2. No absolute minimal duration
3. Relativity of temporal measurement

Study Questions

1. Why must every convergent sequence be Cauchy?
2. What distinguishes mathematical from physical continuity?
3. How do limits eliminate infinitesimals?
4. Why is completeness important?

Exercises

1. Prove sequence (1 + 1/n) is Cauchy
2. Show x^2 is continuous at x = 2
3. Construct continuous function not differentiable at point
4. Find limit of (sin x)/x as x → 0

Advanced Topics

1. Uniform continuity
2. Completion of metric spaces
3. Different types of convergence
4. Non-standard analysis

Applications

1. Physics
   - Motion laws
   - Field theories
   - Quantum mechanics

2. Engineering
   - Control systems
   - Signal processing
   - Optimization

3. Economics

- Continuous models
- Market equilibrium
- Growth theory

Technical Notes

1. Distinction between pointwise and uniform limits
2. Role of completeness in analysis
3. Topological aspects of continuity

Further Reading

- Dedekind, R. "Continuity and Irrational Numbers"
- Weierstrass, K. "On Continuous Functions"
- Robinson, A. "Non-standard Analysis"

Philosophical Implications

1. Nature of mathematical existence
2. Relationship between discrete and continuous
3. Physical vs. mathematical reality

Notes

1. Limits fundamental to calculus
2. Continuity bridges discrete and continuous
3. Physical applications require careful interpretation

Chapter 12: The Axiom of Choice and the Law of Excluded Middle

Introduction

The Axiom of Choice (AC) and the Law of Excluded Middle (LEM) are fundamental principles whose relationship reveals deep connections between set theory and logic. This chapter examines their nature, justification, and implications.

1. The Axiom of Choice

Basic Formulation

For any class K of non-empty sets:

- There exists a selection function f
- Such that $f(S) \in S$ for each $S \in K$

Different Cases

Finite Cases

1. Finite collection, finite sets:
   - Selection obviously possible
   - Can be explicitly constructed

2. Finite collection, infinite sets:
   - Selection still clearly possible
   - May not be explicitly definable

Infinite Cases

1. Infinite collection, finite sets:
   - Selection possible but may not be constructible
   - Requires careful analysis

2. Infinite collection, infinite sets:
   - Most controversial case
   - Core of AC debate

2. Non-Constructive Proofs

Classic Example: Irrational Powers

Theorem: There exist irrationals a,b such that a^b is rational

Proof:

1. Consider √2^√2
2. If rational, done (with a=b=√2)
3. If irrational, take:
   - a = √2^√2
   - b = √2
4. Then a^b = (√2^√2)^√2 = √2^2 = 2

Analysis of Proof

1. Doesn't construct specific numbers

2. Uses LEM

3. Shows existence without exhibition

3. The Law of Excluded Middle

Formal Statement

For any proposition P:

- Either P is true or P is false
- No third possibility exists

Constructivist Critique

1. Mathematical objects are mind-dependent
2. Truth requires constructibility
3. Some propositions neither true nor false

Defense of LEM

1. Numbers exist independently
2. Truth transcends proof
3. Lack of construction doesn't negate existence

4. Relationship Between AC and LEM

Logical Connections

1. AC implies many instances of LEM

2. Some versions of LEM imply weak forms of AC

3. Both support non-constructive methods

Common Features

1. Assert existence without construction

2. Enable powerful mathematical methods

3. Philosophically controversial

5. Mathematical Implications

With AC and LEM

1. Every set can be well-ordered

2. Zorn's Lemma holds

3. Rich theory of infinite sets possible

Without AC and LEM

1. Some sets may lack choice functions

2. Some existence proofs impossible

3. Mathematics more constructive but limited

6. Philosophical Analysis

Constructivist Position

1. Mathematics is human creation

2. Existence requires constructibility

3. Rejects both AC and LEM

Classical Position

1. Mathematical objects exist independently

2. Truth transcends verification

3. Accepts both AC and LEM

Middle Ground

1. Different contexts, different principles

2. Practical vs. theoretical mathematics

3. Multiple foundational approaches valid

Study Questions

1. Why is AC obvious for finite collections?

2. How does LEM support non-constructive proofs?

3. Can mathematics proceed without AC?

4. What justifies acceptance of LEM?

Exercises

1. Prove Zorn's Lemma implies AC

2. Construct explicit choice function for finite case

3. Analyze role of LEM in standard proofs

4. Compare constructive vs. classical approaches

Advanced Topics

1. Choice functions in topology
2. Independence proofs
3. Intuitionistic logic
4. Alternative set theories

Applications

1. Set Theory
   - Well-ordering theorem
   - Cardinal arithmetic
   - Transfinite methods

2. Analysis
   - Bases in vector spaces
   - Ultrafilters
   - Measure theory

3. Topology
   - Tychonoff's theorem
   - Product spaces
   - Separation axioms

Technical Notes

1. Different equivalent forms of AC
2. Hierarchy of choice principles
3. Relationship to other axioms

Further Reading

- Zermelo, E. "The Well-Ordering Theorem"
- Brouwer, L.E.J. "On the Significance of the Principle of Excluded Middle"
- Cohen, P. "Set Theory and the Continuum Hypothesis"

Philosophical Implications

1. Nature of mathematical existence
2. Role of construction in mathematics
3. Multiple foundational approaches

Notes

1. AC and LEM fundamentally shape mathematical practice
2. Different contexts may require different principles
3. Philosophical stance affects mathematical methodology

Chapter 13: The Axiom of Infinity and the Theory of Types

Introduction

Russell's Theory of Types was proposed as a solution to set-theoretic paradoxes, while the Axiom of Infinity was introduced to ensure the existence of infinite sets.

This chapter examines both, revealing fundamental issues with type theory and suggesting alternative approaches to paradox.

1. The Axiom of Infinity

Russell's Problem

1. Cardinals as classes of equinumerous sets
2. Requires existence of sufficient objects
3. Empirical assumption problematic for foundations

The Axiom

Statement: There exists an infinite set

- Contains empty set Ø
- If contains n, contains {n}
- Generates sequence: Ø, {Ø}, {{Ø}}, ...

Issues

1. Empirical vs. Logical Status
   - Can't be empirical assumption
   - Logical necessity unclear

2. Type-Theoretic Complications
   - Construction violates type restrictions
   - Creates tension in Russell's system

2. Classical Paradoxes

Russell's Paradox

Original form:

```
Let K = {x | x ∉ x}
Then K ∈ K ↔ K ∉ K
```

Burali-Forti Paradox

1. Concerning ordinals:
   - Class of all ordinals should have ordinal
   - That ordinal must exceed all ordinals
   - Leads to contradiction

2. Resolution:
   - "Class of all ordinals" needs precise definition
   - Posterity definition resolves issue

Cantor's Paradox

1. Statement:
   - Let U be class of all things
   - Power set theorem implies 2^U > U
   - Contradicts U's universality

2. Resolution:

  - Universal class needs careful definition

  - Posterity approach again resolves

3. The Theory of Types

Basic Principles

1. Hierarchical Structure:

  - Objects of type 0

  - Properties of type 1

  - Properties of properties of type 2

  - And so on

2. Scope Restriction:

  - Statement cannot refer to its own type

  - Prevents self-reference

Example Applications

Typical Frenchman Paradox

1. Original Statement:

  "Smith has all properties of typical Frenchman"

2. Type-Theoretic Analysis:

  - First-order properties only

  - Avoids contradiction but artificial

Liar Paradox

1. Statement: "This statement is false"

2. Type Theory Response:

  - Statement can't refer to own truth

  - Different levels of truth predicate

4. Critique of Type Theory

Fundamental Problems

1. Self-Referential Issue:

  - Theory itself violates its principles

  - Cannot consistently state its own rules

2. Multiplication of Concepts:

  - Different types of numbers

  - Different levels of truth

  - Artificial complexity

Alternative Analysis

Reflexive Pronouns

1. Key Insight:
   - "Itself" requires antecedent
   - Free variables in paradoxes

2. Application:
   - Russell's paradox dissolves
   - No type theory needed

Resolution of Paradoxes

1. Russell's Paradox:
   - Contains free variables
   - No proposition expressed

2. Liar Paradox:
   - Distinguishes statement from assertion
   - Simply false, not contradictory

5. Technical Analysis

Grammar of Self-Reference

1. Anaphoric Pronouns:
   - Require antecedents
   - Can't generate paradox

2. Variable Binding:
   - Free variables in paradoxes
   - No truth value assigned

Formal Treatment

```
"K is member of K" means:
"If K is class of classes k such that k doesn't have p,
for some property p such that x belongs to k iff x has p,
then K does not have p"
```

Study Questions

1. Why is type theory's self-reference problematic?
2. How does the reflexive pronoun analysis resolve paradoxes?
3. Why is the Axiom of Infinity controversial?
4. What makes free variables crucial to paradox resolution?

Exercises

1. Analyze other paradoxes using pronoun approach
2. Compare type theory with alternative solutions
3. Examine implications of Axiom of Infinity
4. Construct formal analysis of self-reference

Advanced Topics

1. Category theory approaches
2. Non-well-founded set theory
3. Paraconsistent logic
4. Alternative foundations

Applications

1. Set Theory
   - Foundation axioms
   - Class theory
   - Large cardinals

2. Logic
   - Truth predicates
   - Semantic paradoxes
   - Type systems

3. Computer Science
   - Type safety
   - Program verification
   - Language design

Further Reading

- Russell, B. "Mathematical Logic as Based on the Theory of Types"

- Tarski, A. "The Concept of Truth in Formalized Languages"

- Aczel, P. "Non-Well-Founded Sets"

Notes

1. Paradoxes reveal deep logical structure

2. Simple solutions often better than complex theories

3. Foundations need careful philosophical analysis

Chapter 14: Incompatibility and the Consequence-relation

Introduction

The nature of logical consequence and incompatibility lies at the heart of mathematical reasoning. This chapter examines the relationship between truth-functional logic and mathematical truth, challenging Russell's reduction of mathematical necessity to truth-functionality.

1. Truth Values and Connectives

Basic Concepts

1. Truth Values:

   - True (T)

   - False (F)

2. Sentences:

- Have truth values
- Basic units of logical analysis

Truth-Functional Connectives

A connective * is truth-functional if:

- For n-tuple of sentences <$s_1 \ldots s_n$>
- Truth value of *($s_1 \ldots s_n$) determined by:
  * Truth values of $s_1 \ldots s_n$
  * Nothing else

2. Analysis of Basic Connectives

Conjunction ("and")

Example: "Snow is white and grass is transparent"

- Structure: And<'snow is white', 'grass is transparent'>
- True iff both components true
- Truth table determination

Disjunction ("or")

Example: "Snow is white or grass is transparent"

- Structure: Or<'snow is white', 'grass is transparent'>
- True iff at least one component true
- Inclusive interpretation

Negation ("not")

Example: "Grass is not transparent"

- Structure: Not<'grass is transparent'>
- True iff component false
- Truth value inversion

3. Non-Truth-Functional Connectives

Modal Connectives

1. "Necessarily"
2. "Possibly"
3. "Probably"

Epistemic Connectives

1. "Knows that"
2. "Believes that"
3. "Doubts that"

Causal Connectives

Example: "Because"

- Truth values insufficient
- Requires analysis of meanings/relations

4. The Scheffer Stroke

Definition

p/q is true iff not both p and q are true

Completeness

All truth-functional connectives expressible:

1. not-p = p/p

2. p and q = (p/q)/(p/q)

3. p or q = (p/p)/(q/q)

5. Mathematical Consequence

Russell's Position

1. In mathematics:
   - No distinction between:
     * p/(q/q) (incompatibility with not-q)
     * Necessary consequence

2. Reasoning:
   - Mathematical truths necessarily true
   - No modal distinction needed

Critique of Russell

Formal vs. Model-theoretic Entailment

1. Formal Entailment:

  - $p \vdash q$: q derivable from p in system

  - Relative to axiom set

2. Model-theoretic Entailment:

  - $p \vDash q$: no possible world where p true, q false

  - Independent of formal system

Important Distinctions

1. Different Axiom Sets:

  - Same proposition

  - Different derivability relations

2. Strength of Entailment:

  - Formal stronger than model-theoretic

  - Smaller extension

6. Technical Development

Truth-Functional Completeness

1. Definition:

  - Set of connectives complete if

  - Can express all truth functions

2. Minimal Complete Sets:

   - Scheffer stroke alone

   - Negation plus conjunction

   - Other combinations

Formal Systems

1. Components:

   - Axioms

   - Rules of inference

   - Derived theorems

2. Properties:

   - Soundness

   - Completeness

   - Consistency

Study Questions

1. Why isn't "because" truth-functional?

2. How does formal entailment differ from model-theoretic?

3. Why is Russell's position inadequate?

4. What makes Scheffer stroke significant?

Exercises

1. Express standard connectives using Scheffer stroke
2. Compare different complete sets of connectives
3. Analyze modal statements in mathematics
4. Construct truth tables for complex expressions

Advanced Topics

1. Modal logic systems
2. Proof theory
3. Model theory
4. Categorical logic

Applications

1. Mathematical Logic
   - Formal systems
   - Proof methods
   - Foundation theories

2. Computer Science
   - Circuit design
   - Programming languages
   - Verification systems

3. Philosophy
   - Nature of necessity

- Logical consequence
- Mathematical truth

Technical Notes

1. Distinction between syntax and semantics
2. Role of formal systems
3. Limits of truth-functionality

Further Reading

- Tarski, A. "On the Concept of Logical Consequence"
- Quine, W.V.O. "Mathematical Logic"
- Kripke, S. "Naming and Necessity"

Notes

1. Consequence relations fundamental to mathematics
2. Multiple notions of logical necessity
3. Truth-functionality insufficient for mathematics

Chapter 15: Propositional Functions

Introduction

Propositional functions form the bridge between logic and mathematics, enabling us to understand quantification, existence claims, and the nature of mathematical truth. This chapter examines their structure and significance.

1. Basic Concepts

Definition

A propositional function is:

- The meaning of an open sentence
- Maps individuals to truth values
- Example: "x is tall" maps each individual to T/F

Structure

1. Components:
   - Variable(s)
   - Predicate
   - Logical operators

2. Formal Notation:
   ```
   ϕ(x): propositional function
   ϕ(a): proposition (when 'a' substituted for x)
   ```

2. Quantified Generalizations

Formation

1. Starting point: propositional function

2. Bind variables with quantifiers

3. Result: complete proposition

Example Analysis

"Five men are tall" means:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\exists x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4,x_5(\\
&\quad Man(x_1) \land Tall(x_1) \land \\
&\quad Man(x_2) \land Tall(x_2) \land \\
&\quad \ldots \\
&\quad \land\, x_1 \neq x_2 \land x_1 \neq x_3 \land \ldots \\
&)
\end{aligned}
$$

3. Properties of Quantified Statements

Class-Level Properties

1. About classes, not individuals
2. Example: "For some x, x is tall"
   - Not about any specific tall thing
   - About class of tall things

Modal Properties

1. Different from individual statements

2. Example:
   - "Smith is tall" contingent
   - "Something is tall" different modal status

4. Temporal Quantifiers

Analysis of "Always"

1. "Jim always smokes" means:
   ```
   ∀t(Jim-smokes-at(t))
   ```
2. Property of class of propositions
3. Subset relation to true propositions

General Form

"A is always B" means:

```
∀x(A(x) → B(x))
```

- Class relationship
- Not about individuals

5. Existence Claims

Structure

1. "A solution exists" means:

```
∃x(Solution(x))
```

2. About class intersection

3. Not about specific entities

Properties of Existence

1. Property of propositional functions

2. Intersection with true propositions

3. Not property of individuals

6. Role in Reasoning

Four Basic Operations

1. Positing existence

2. Denying existence

3. Attributing truth

4. Attributing falsity

Relationship

1. Truth attribution = existence positing

2. Falsity attribution = existence denial

3. All reasoning reduces to these

7. Technical Analysis

Formal Structure

For proposition P:

```
To affirm P = assert existence of fact making P true

To deny P = assert non-existence of such fact
```

Examples

1. "A is on top of B":

   - Assemblage of objects exists

   - Not identical with objects themselves

2. Complex statements:

   - Built from simple existence claims

   - Hierarchical structure

Study Questions

1. Why aren't quantified statements about individuals?

2. How do existence claims relate to classes?

3. Why is "always" a class property?

4. How do propositional functions enable reasoning?

Exercises

1. Analyze complex quantified statements
2. Compare individual and class properties
3. Formalize temporal statements
4. Examine existence claims structure

Advanced Topics

1. Higher-order functions
2. Type theory connections
3. Modal aspects
4. Semantic theory

Applications

1. Mathematical Logic
   - Formal systems
   - Proof theory
   - Model theory

2. Philosophy
   - Existence claims
   - Abstract objects
   - Truth theory

3. Computer Science
   - Programming logic
   - Verification
   - Type systems

Technical Notes

1. Distinction from predicates
2. Role in formal systems
3. Relationship to classes

Further Reading

- Frege, G. "Begriffsschrift"
- Whitehead & Russell "Principia Mathematica"
- Quine, W.V.O. "Methods of Logic"

Notes

1. Functions ground mathematical logic
2. Enable precise analysis of quantification
3. Connect logic to mathematics

Chapter 16: Classes

Introduction

While Russell claimed classes don't exist and are merely convenient fictions, this chapter demonstrates why this view is inadequate and offers a more nuanced understanding of the nature of classes.

1. Russell's Position

Core Claim

1. Classes don't exist
2. They are convenient fictions
3. Can be eliminated from rigorous discourse

Russell's Argument

1. A class of three objects isn't their conglomeration
2. Therefore, it isn't spatiotemporal
3. Therefore (Russell claims), it isn't anything

Initial Assessment

1. First premise correct
2. Second premise correct
3. Conclusion doesn't follow

2. Critique of Russell's Reasoning

The Spatiotemporal Fallacy

1. True: Classes aren't spatiotemporal

2. False: Only spatiotemporal things exist

3. Many non-spatiotemporal entities exist

Example: Relations

1. Consider "taller than" relation

2. Not a physical object

3. Not better qualified than rocks/trees

4. Yet clearly exists as abstract relation

Instance vs. Property

1. Different instances of same relation

2. Properties have instances

3. Properties distinct from instances

4. Properties necessarily non-spatiotemporal

3. Positive Account of Classes

Essential Properties

1. Independence from members:

   - Class {my computer, my desk} unchanged

   - Even if objects separated

   - Even if objects destroyed

2. Abstract nature:

- Non-spatiotemporal
- But not fictional
- Real abstract entities

Relationship to Properties

1. Classes correspond to properties
2. Different from properties
3. Both equally real

4. Technical Considerations

Empty Class

1. Exists despite no members
2. Different from non-existence
3. Has definite properties

Class Identity

1. Determined by membership
2. Extension principle
3. Independent of arrangement

5. Philosophical Implications

Ontological Status

1. Real entities
2. Abstract existence
3. Objective properties

Relationship to Mathematics

1. Foundation for number theory
2. Set-theoretic constructions
3. Mathematical structure

6. Alternative Views

Nominalism

1. Denies abstract entities
2. Classes as constructions
3. Problems with mathematics

Conceptualism

1. Classes as mental constructs
2. Issues with objectivity
3. Mathematical platonism

Study Questions

1. Why does non-spatiotemporal ≠ non-existent?
2. How do classes relate to properties?

3. What makes empty class real?

4. Why is Russell's view inadequate?

Exercises

1. Analyze class identity conditions

2. Compare class and property existence

3. Examine empty class properties

4. Evaluate competing ontologies

Advanced Topics

1. Class theory variants

2. Category theory

3. Structural realism

4. Abstract objects theory

Applications

1. Mathematics
   - Set theory
   - Number theory
   - Structure theory

2. Logic
   - Type theory
   - Model theory

- Proof theory

3. Philosophy
   - Ontology
   - Abstract objects
   - Mathematical reality

Technical Notes

1. Class vs. set distinction
2. Membership relation
3. Extension principle

Further Reading

- Quine, W.V.O. "From a Logical Point of View"
- Benacerraf, P. "What Numbers Could Not Be"
- Lewis, D. "Parts of Classes"

Notes

1. Classes are legitimate abstract entities
2. Not reducible to spatiotemporal objects
3. Essential for mathematics

Appendix: Formal Development

Basic Principles

```
Extension: ∀x∀y(∀z(z∈x ↔ z∈y) → x=y)

Comprehension: ∃y∀x(x∈y ↔ ϕ(x)) [with restrictions]
```

Class Operations

1. Union
2. Intersection
3. Complement
4. Power set

Chapter 17: Descriptions

Introduction

Russell's Theory of Descriptions addresses the logic and meaning of definite descriptions ("the ϕ"). While influential, the theory requires careful examination and reveals both insights and limitations.

1. Russell's Theory of Descriptions

Core Propositions

1. "The ϕ is ψ" means:
   - Exactly one thing has ϕ
   - Anything that has ϕ also has ψ

```
∃x(φx ∧ ∀y(φy → y=x) ∧ ψx)
```

2. "The φ exists" means:

  - For some x, x is a φ

```
∃x(φx ∧ ∀y(φy → y=x))
```

3. "The φ doesn't exist" means:

  - For no x, x is φ

```
¬∃x(φx)
```

2. Russell's Motivation

Identity Problems

1. Example:

  - "The man in the white hat is tall"

  - ≠ "Smith is tall" (even if Smith is the man)

  - Different truth conditions

Reference Issues

1. No direct reference
2. Descriptions as incomplete symbols
3. Contextual definition

3. Analysis of Key Cases

Existence Claims

1. "The gnome on the desk exists"
   - False if no gnome
   - True if exactly one gnome

2. "The gnome on the desk doesn't exist"
   - True if no gnome
   - False if any gnome

Identity Statements

1. "The morning star is the evening star"
2. "The author of Waverley is Scott"
3. Different cognitive value despite same reference

4. Critique of the Theory

Problems with Russellian Analysis

1. Meaning vs. Truth Conditions

   - Theory confuses these

   - Different semantic roles

2. Reference Role

   - Descriptions can refer

   - Not merely quantificational

3. Speaker Intentions

   - Not captured by theory

   - Pragmatic aspects ignored

Alternative Approach

1. Semantic Distinction

   - Reference vs. sense

   - Truth conditions vs. meaning

2. Pragmatic Elements

   - Speaker reference

   - Contextual factors

5. Technical Development

Formal Analysis

1. Scope distinctions:

```
Primary: ∃x(ϕx ∧ ∀y(ϕy → y=x) ∧ ψx)

Secondary: ψ(ιx.ϕx)
```

2. Uniqueness condition:

```
∃!x(ϕx) ≡ ∃x(ϕx ∧ ∀y(ϕy → y=x))
```

Logical Properties

1. Existence entailment
2. Scope interactions
3. Modal contexts

6. Applications

Mathematical Descriptions

1. "The smallest prime number"
2. "The square root of 4"
3. Functional notation

Natural Language

1. Definite articles
2. Proper names
3. Complex descriptions

Study Questions

1. Why aren't descriptions simply referring terms?
2. How do scope ambiguities arise?
3. What role does uniqueness play?
4. How do descriptions work in mathematics?

Exercises

1. Analyze complex descriptions
2. Compare competing theories
3. Examine modal contexts
4. Evaluate mathematical cases

Advanced Topics

1. Free logic
2. Modal descriptions
3. Complex descriptions
4. Donnellan's distinction

Applications

1. Mathematics
   - Function notation
   - Unique existence
   - Definition theory

2. Logic
   - Formal semantics
   - Proof theory
   - Model theory

3. Philosophy
   - Reference theory
   - Meaning theory
   - Truth conditions

Technical Notes

1. Scope distinctions crucial
2. Uniqueness conditions
3. Existence presuppositions

Further Reading

- Russell, B. "On Denoting"
- Strawson, P.F. "On Referring"

- Donnellan, K. "Reference and Definite Descriptions"

Notes

1. Theory reveals logical structure
2. But oversimplifies semantics
3. Needs pragmatic supplement

Appendix: Alternative Theories

Frege's Approach

1. Sense and reference
2. Semantic complexity
3. Truth-value gaps

Strawson's Critique

1. Presupposition
2. Reference failure
3. Truth-value gaps

Donnellan's Distinction

1. Attributive use
2. Referential use
3. Pragmatic factors

Index

References

Aczel, P. (1988). *Non-Well-Founded Sets*. CSLI Publications.

Benacerraf, P. (1965). "What Numbers Could Not Be." *Philosophical Review*, 74(1), 47-73.

Benacerraf, P. (1973). "Mathematical Truth." *Journal of Philosophy*, 70(19), 661-679.

Cantor, G. (1895). "Contributions to the Founding of the Theory of Transfinite Numbers." *Mathematische Annalen*, 46, 481-512.

Dedekind, R. (1888). *Was sind und was sollen die Zahlen?* Vieweg.

Donnellan, K. (1966). "Reference and Definite Descriptions." *Philosophical Review*, 75(3), 281-304.

Frege, G. (1884). *Die Grundlagen der Arithmetik*. W. Koebner.

Gödel, K. (1931). "Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und verwandter Systeme I." *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik*, 38(1), 173-198.

Hausdorff, F. (1914). *Grundzüge der Mengenlehre*. Veit & Comp.

Kripke, S. (1980). *Naming and Necessity*. Harvard University Press.

Quine, W.V.O. (1960). *Word and Object*. MIT Press.

Russell, B. (1903). *The Principles of Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press.

Russell, B. (1905). "On Denoting." *Mind*, 14(56), 479-493.

Russell, B. (1908). "Mathematical Logic as Based on the Theory of Types." *American Journal of Mathematics*, 30(3), 222-262.

Sierpiński, W. (1965). *Cardinal and Ordinal Numbers*. PWN.

Tarski, A. (1935). "Der Wahrheitsbegriff in den formalisierten Sprachen." *Studia Philosophica*, 1, 261-405.

von Neumann, J. (1923). "Zur Einführung der transfiniten Zahlen." *Acta Scientiarum Mathematicarum*, 1, 199-208.

Whitehead, A.N. & Russell, B. (1910-1913). *Principia Mathematica*. Cambridge University Press.

Zermelo, E. (1904). "Beweis, dass jede Menge wohlgeordnet werden kann." *Mathematische Annalen*, 59, 514-516.