VICIOUS CIRCULARITY 1

Authored by

mohammad looti

October 22, 2025

VICIOUS CIRCULARITY

Primary Disciplinary Field(s): Logic, Philosophy of Language, Mathematics (Set Theory), Epistemology

1. Defining Vicious Circularity: The Logical Paradox

The concept of **Vicious Circularity** identifies a fundamental logical flaw arising primarily in contexts involving self-reference or self-inclusion, wherein an entity is defined or predicated upon a totality to which the entity itself belongs. This logical structure prevents the coherent definition or determination of the entity's properties, leading invariably to a paradox or contradiction. The term is most rigorously applied within mathematical logic and the foundations of mathematics, where such circular definitions threaten the consistency of the system itself, particularly concerning basic axioms like those governing sets. When a definition or concept is viciously circular, it becomes impossible to establish the truth value or existence of the defined object without presupposing the object's existence or truth, resulting in an infinite regress or a direct contradiction.

This problem manifests when the definition of a class of objects requires reference to one or more members of that very class, and this relationship of dependence forms a closed loop. For instance, if property P is defined over the set S, but the definition of P implicitly or explicitly requires knowledge of whether S possesses P, the definition is considered viciously circular. The severity of this circularity stems from the fact that it is not merely a rhetorical weakness, but a structural defect that undermines the possibility of formal analysis or truth assignment. Logicians and philosophers, most notably Bertrand Russell, recognized the necessity of eliminating this form of circularity to build sound logical and mathematical systems free from intrinsic contradictions that could allow the derivation of every possible statement from a single premise.

While the term is often used loosely to describe any instance of circular reasoning, its precise technical meaning highlights those specific self-referential structures that produce logical paradoxes. These paradoxes challenge fundamental intuitions about language and existence; they demonstrate that certain statements, while grammatically well-formed, are logically ill-posed because their truth condition relies recursively upon itself. Therefore, the core of **vicious circularity** lies in the illicit creation of a totality that is simultaneously incomplete because one of its defining elements relies on the totality's prior existence.

2. The Problem of Self-Reference

The mechanism that generates vicious circularity is the unregulated employment of **self-reference**. Self-reference, the practice of a statement or concept referring to itself, is not inherently problematic; instances such as "This sentence has five words" are perfectly coherent and

determinable. However, vicious circularity arises when self-reference is used to determine a fundamental property (like truth or membership) in a way that creates an irresolvable dilemma. The quintessential example of this phenomenon is the Liar Paradox, often phrased as "This sentence is not true." If we assume the sentence is true, then what it asserts (that it is not true) must hold, leading to a contradiction. Conversely, if we assume the sentence is false, then its assertion (that it is not true) is false, meaning the sentence must be true--again, a contradiction.

This type of paradox demonstrates how the determination of the truth value of the self-referential statement depends instantaneously on the prior determination of that same truth value, creating a destructive feedback loop that prevents any assignment of truth or falsity. The issue is deeply structural, touching upon the limitations of defining objects within a logical language that is powerful enough to talk about its own contents. The paradox does not merely show a failure to know the truth; it reveals that the concept or proposition itself is logically unstable. If such structures were permitted within foundational systems like set theory, the entire structure of mathematics would collapse, as the contradiction allows for the derivation of any arbitrary statement, rendering the system useless.

The logical consequence of a vicious circularity is the negation of the Law of the Excluded Middle in that specific context, as the statement can be neither true nor false without generating a contradiction. This is distinct from mere ambiguity or undecidability based on lack of information. Instead, the logical machinery itself breaks down due to the circular dependency. Philosophically, this suggests that the scope of reference must be formally constrained, leading to the development of hierarchical systems intended to stratify language and mathematics into levels where reference can only point downwards, never back into its own foundational level.

3. Vicious Circularity in Set Theory

Perhaps the most famous and impactful manifestation of vicious circularity occurs within mathematics, specifically in early attempts at foundational **set theory**. Prior to the 20th century, sets were often defined naively using the principle of unrestricted comprehension, which allowed for the definition of any collection based on a specified property. This freedom inadvertently permitted the construction of sets defined by reference to the totality of all sets, leading directly to Russell's Paradox. This paradox asks us to consider the set of all sets that are not members of themselves (R).

The logical question arising from this definition is whether R is a member of itself. If R is a member of itself, then by its own definition, R must satisfy the criterion of not being a member of itself, leading to a contradiction. Conversely, if R is not a member of itself, then it satisfies the criterion for membership in R, meaning it must be a member of itself--again, a contradiction. This devastating result demonstrated that the concept of "the set of all sets that are not members of themselves" is

viciously circular because the definition of R requires a reference to the universe of all sets, including R itself, in order to determine its own membership status.

Russell's discovery in 1901 revealed that the seemingly intuitive definition of sets contained an intrinsic contradiction, proving that the concept of a set being the member of itself must be strictly prohibited within a consistent mathematical framework. The resolution of this crisis necessitated the abandonment of naive set theory and the introduction of highly constrained, axiomatic frameworks, such as Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory (ZFC), which includes the **Axiom of Regularity** (or Foundation). This axiom explicitly forbids any set from belonging to itself, thereby formally eliminating the specific structural form of vicious circularity that generated Russell's Paradox.

4. Vicious Circularity as Circular Reasoning

In a broader, less formal context, **vicious circularity** is often used synonymously with **circular reasoning**, or the argumentative fallacy known as *petitio principii* (begging the question). While both involve a circular movement in logic, their technical status and consequences differ significantly. Circular reasoning is a rhetorical or epistemological failure wherein the premise used to support a conclusion is logically equivalent to the conclusion itself. The argument is formally valid (if the premises are true, the conclusion must be true), but it is unsound because it fails to offer any independent evidence or justification for the conclusion, thereby failing to convince a rational opponent.

For example, an argument stating, "The Bible is the word of God because it says so, and everything the word of God says must be true," is circular. The premise (The Bible is the word of God) and the conclusion (The Bible is true) mutually support each other without establishing external grounding. This type of circularity is epistemologically vicious because it prevents external verification or genuine proof; it locks the argument into an insulated system of justification. However, unlike the paradoxes of self-reference, circular reasoning does not typically lead to a formal logical contradiction where a statement must be simultaneously true and false.

The distinction lies in whether the circularity produces undecidability or merely unjustified assertion. The logical paradoxes (Liar, Russell's) create a state of logical breakdown; they are contradictions that destroy the consistency of the underlying system. Circular reasoning, conversely, maintains consistency but fails as a convincing argument because it assumes what it seeks to prove. While both are failures of reasoning, the former is a technical problem solved by foundational restructuring (like the Theory of Types), whereas the latter is a persuasive fault requiring external evidence or alternative premises for resolution.

5. Historical Context: Russell's Theory of Types

The rigorous historical attempt to resolve the threat posed by vicious circularity was formalized by

Bertrand Russell and Alfred North Whitehead in their monumental work, *Principia Mathematica*. Faced with the contradictions inherent in naive set theory and the linguistic paradoxes, Russell developed the **Ramified Theory of Types**. This theory was designed explicitly to prohibit the formation of vicious circles by establishing rigid hierarchical structures for both language and mathematical entities, ensuring that no object could refer to a totality of which it was a constituent part.

The core principle of the Theory of Types states that any collection of objects cannot contain members defined only in terms of that collection. This is enforced by assigning 'types' or 'orders' to all entities. An individual (Type 0) belongs to classes (Type 1), which in turn belong to classes of classes (Type 2), and so on. Critically, a statement or definition concerning entities of Type N can only be made using entities of Type N-1 or lower. This stratification prevents self-reference across the hierarchical boundary, thus rendering the paradoxical statements (like the Liar Sentence or the set that contains itself) grammatically ill-formed within the formalized language. They are not false; they are simply syntactically prohibited.

Russell's solution, while successful in eliminating known paradoxes, introduced significant philosophical and practical complexity. The ramified version was particularly cumbersome, requiring the **Axiom of Reducibility** to maintain the functionality of classical mathematics, an axiom many found logically tenuous. Despite these drawbacks, the Theory of Types established the vital principle that unrestricted self-reference concerning foundational properties must be prevented, profoundly influencing subsequent developments in logic, especially the development of lambda calculus and type systems in computer science. The fundamental insight that contradictions arise from mixing logical levels remains the enduring contribution of this historical response to vicious circularity.

6. Logical and Semantic Paradoxes

The phenomenon of vicious circularity underlies a variety of specific paradoxes categorized as either logical (related to classes and sets) or semantic (related to truth, meaning, and definitions in language). These examples demonstrate the pervasive nature of the problem:

The Liar Paradox: A purely semantic paradox rooted in the concept of truth, demonstrating that a self-referring assertion about its own falsehood creates an unavoidable contradiction, as discussed above.

Russell's Paradox: A logical paradox concerning the foundations of mathematics, arising from the circular definition of a set that attempts to define itself by referencing the collection of all sets (including itself).

Grelling-Nelson Paradox: This semantic paradox deals with adjectives. It defines an adjective as

heterological if it does not describe itself (e.g., "long" is heterological because it is not a long word). The paradox arises when asking if "heterological" is heterological. If it is, it must describe itself (be autological); if it is not, it fails to describe itself (is heterological), thus creating the circular contradiction.

Berry Paradox: This paradox is linguistic and arises when considering the "smallest integer not definable in fewer than nineteen syllables." Since this very phrase defines the number, the definition becomes self-referential and circular, implying that the number is definable in fewer than nineteen syllables, contradicting its own definition.

These distinct instances confirm that vicious circularity is a universal threat wherever a system allows for definitions or membership criteria that depend upon the totality of the things being defined or categorized. The consistency of any formalized system requires safeguards, whether through explicit axioms (like those in modern set theory) or through syntactic restrictions (like the Theory of Types), to prevent the logical leap that turns harmless reference into destructive circularity.

7. Philosophical and Epistemological Significance

Beyond the technical domains of mathematics and logic, vicious circularity holds significant **philosophical and epistemological significance**. It serves as a limitative principle, defining the boundaries of what can be consistently defined, known, or asserted within a given framework. Epistemologically, the paradoxes underscore the difficulties inherent in establishing absolute foundationalism--the idea that all knowledge rests upon unassailable, non-circular basic truths. If the attempt to define or justify the most basic elements of a system (like the definition of a set or the truth of a statement) leads to circularity, then absolute foundationalism faces an insurmountable hurdle.

Philosophically, the problems associated with self-reference are crucial in understanding the nature of language and meaning. The existence of semantic paradoxes suggests that ordinary language, due to its expressive power and capacity for self-reference, is inherently unstable or inconsistent if left unregulated. This led philosophers of language to investigate how to restrict language to ensure coherence without sacrificing expressive capacity, often relying on hierarchical models that separate the object language (what is being talked about) from the metalanguage (the language used to talk about the object language).

Ultimately, the study of vicious circularity forces a confrontation with the limits of formal systems and the nature of infinity. The paradoxes are not mere curiosities; they are markers of structural boundaries, compelling researchers to adopt more restrictive, yet ultimately more reliable, axioms and principles when attempting to construct a coherent, comprehensive theory of reality, knowledge, or mathematics. The failure to resolve a vicious circularity implies the failure of the

system itself to achieve consistency.

8. Criticisms and Modern Perspectives

While the Theory of Types successfully eliminated the known paradoxes arising from vicious circularity, it faced historical and technical criticisms, primarily regarding its complexity and the non-intuitive nature of its axioms. A key development that provided an alternative perspective was the work of Kurt Gödel. Gödel's Incompleteness Theorems demonstrated that sufficient expressive power in a formal system necessitates the capacity for self-reference, even if that self-reference is used to express limitations rather than contradictions. Gödel's proof relies on encoding statements about the system within the system itself (arithmetization), a form of controlled, non-vicious self-reference.

In modern mathematics, particularly set theory, the preferred method of handling vicious circularity is not Russell's complex Type Theory but rather the axiomatic approach of ZFC. ZFC avoids the creation of paradoxical sets through specific axioms that restrict set formation, most notably the Axiom of Regularity, which forbids infinite descending chains of set membership (e.g., A is a member of B, B is a member of C, and C is a member of A), thereby eliminating the possibility of a set being a member of itself. This approach maintains the structural simplicity of classical mathematics while rigorously preventing the circular definitions that lead to contradiction.

Finally, alternative logical approaches, such as **paraconsistent logic**, attempt to deal with paradoxes like the Liar by constructing systems where contradictions (including those stemming from vicious circularity) do not necessarily lead to the total collapse of the system (*ex contradictione quodlibet*). These systems permit, under certain constraints, the truth of contradictory statements, offering a radical departure from the classical desire to eliminate all forms of vicious circularity absolutely.

9. Further Reading

Liar Paradox (Wikipedia)

Russell's Paradox (Wikipedia)

Gödel's Incompleteness Theorems (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

Type Theory (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)