1. We have explained why the Russell class  $\mathcal{R} = \{x | x \notin x\}$  is a proper class. Show that each one of the following is also a proper class.

- 1. the class  $\mathcal{C}$  of all sets.
- 2. the class  $\mathcal{D}$  of all 1-element sets.

(You should express both  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  as classes, and then that they are proper.)

1.  $C = \{x | x = x\}$ 

*Proof.* Assume C is a set. Then  $C \in C$ . But this contradicts the Axiom of Foundation because  $C \cap \{C\}$  is nonempty.  $\Box$ 

Alternative proof:

*Proof.* Then by the Axiom of Separation, we can predicate on  $\mathcal{C}$  and form the subset  $\{x \in \mathcal{C} | x \notin x\} = \mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ . But we have already established that  $\mathcal{R}$  is not a set.  $\Box$ 

2.  $\mathcal{D} = \{x | \exists y \forall z (z \in x \iff z = y)\}$ 

*Proof.* Assume  $\mathcal{D}$  is a set. Then  $\{\mathcal{D}\} \in \mathcal{D}$ . By the Axiom of Pairing,  $y = \{\mathcal{D}, \{\mathcal{D}\}\}$  is a set. But then  $\{\mathcal{D}\} \in \mathcal{D} \cap y$  and  $\mathcal{D} \in \{\mathcal{D}\} \cap y$ , which contradicts the Axiom of Foundation.