

Re: The Difference between a Set and an Element

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2007-01/msg00321.html>

- *From:* Chris Menzel <cmenzel@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 18 Jan 2007 00:44:21 +0000 (UTC)
-

On Wed, 17 Jan 2007 22:28:28 +0100, G Frege <nomail@invalid> said:

...
I don't think so. We are talking about 2OL here. 2OL is not set theory.

That's a matter of some dispute, but in any case you need to specify a semantics for a second-order language before the discussion can even go anywhere. I was just talking relative to a standard, extensional second-order semantics.

But suppose we assume a countable language and that every formula with at least one free variable signifies a concept.

??? Comprehension just guaranties that for every such formula $A[x]$ there is a concept F such that for all x : $Fx \leftrightarrow A[x]$.

If that's your semantics. You have to tell me what a concept is on that semantics, of course.

On those assumptions, there are at most countably many concepts

I don't think so. Comprehension just guaranties that there are at least countable many concepts.

Yes, of course. The point there was simply that the most that the assumptions in question could guarantee was a much smaller universe of concepts than the one envisioned in which every set is the extension of a concept.

.