

Re: Mathematical objects and Discernment

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2006-06/msg00138.html>

- *From:* "LauLuna" <laureanoluna@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 4 Jun 2006 11:59:09 -0700
-

I'm not sure I have quite understood you, but, for all I can gather, you propose to conceive of sets not really as collections (extensionally) but in a pure intensional way: a set should perhaps be identified with the concept its name includes? I assume all names including the same conceptual content are to be considered the same name (?).

You discard the first (so to say) axiom of the usual set theory.

If I have correctly understood you, your proposal seems highly problematic. Sets are extensional from their very definition. If we are to disregard its extensional nature, what is the use of keeping them; can we not do with just concepts (or names)?

Regards

.