

Re: The set of all JOKES.....

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2007-02/msg00998.html>

- *From:* "charleswehner@xxxxxxxxxxxx" <charleswehner@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 24 Feb 2007 09:13:09 -0800
-

On 24 Feb., 13:46, "LauLuna" <laureanol...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

You propose the following as the definition of one set and one joke:

'this is the set of all jokes that does include itself'

Let's call it 'J' and let me reformulate:

J =def. (x; x is a joke or x=J)

The definiens includes the definiendum. So, it is not a definition.

Quite wrong!

Bertrand Russell gave us "The set of all sets that does not include itself". That is where your last statement came from. The joke is a pastiche of the Russell "Set of all sets".

Your point seems to be that you can fix the circularity by means of 'itself'.

It is an illusion. 'Itself' is a pronoun and is in the place of a noun, and the noun is in this context precisely 'J'.

That is the joke. The word "itself" does not of itself NEED to be used in place of a noun. It is not rigidly, and for all time, condemned to be a pronoun. As a WORD, and nothing but a word, it is a NOUN.

I think some kinds of radical egalitarianism arise from this mistake.

No mistake. You just failed to be flexible enough to see the PUN from

Re: The set of all JOKES.....

both directions.

History advises not to take this as a joke.

History advises that those who speak for history are invariably wrong.

A friend in England said that the "set of all jokes" is something that one tells today, and in twenty years' time, somebody goes "Har, har, har". A sense of humour is necessary if one wishes to understand jokes.

Charles Douglas Wehner