

Re: Cantor's definition of set

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2007-10/msg00871.html>

- *From:* MoeBlee <jazzmobe@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 25 Oct 2007 13:24:56 -0700
-

On Oct 25, 12:51 pm, John Jones <jonescard...@xxxxxxx> wrote:

OK. But if the members of a set have nothing in common,

Who said the members have nothing in common?

Not only do I not know why you think they have nothing in common, and even though I don't see that anything here depends on such commonality, they do have something in common.

But rather than argue that they have in common being members of the same set, I'll avoid any possible incredulity of that on grounds of circularity by just mentioning that any thing has at least one thing in common with any other thing, even if only that they have in common that they each have the property of being self-identical.

then how can
we have a set of numbers, for numbers are derived from each other –
they have something in common.

What does "derived from" mean there?

Anyway, now I don't follow you at all. In your first clause you worried about them having nothing in common but now you say they do have something in common.

More basically, why befuddle yourself with such meaningless word games as you render when instead you could just look to the axioms that came after Cantor. Take membership as primitive and see what's proven. Simplicity.

MoeBlee

Re: Cantor's definition of set