

## Re: Cantor's definition of set

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2007-10/msg00907.html>

---

- *From:* John Jones <jonescardiff@xxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Fri, 26 Oct 2007 13:09:51 -0700
- 

On Oct 26, 12:26?am, MoeBlee <jazzm...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Oct 25, 1:37 pm, John Jones <jonescard...@xxxxxxx> wrote:

If I take membership as primitive etc., then I don't know whether I should take a set of cows to be a herd, or whether I should try to spell 'a set of unforeseen moevments' correctly or not.

Take it up as a problem in zoology or problem combined in zoology and natural language.

Taking 'e' as primitive won't tell you much of anything about any matter whatsoever, except what you're going to infer from the axioms that use the primitive 'e'.

Anyway, if the members of a set are unique,

Every thing is unique by virtue of being, by virtue of being a thing.

then I would not like to say that they have anything in common.

Okay, so you insist on a self-defeating notion. I can't help you there. I've never heard of such a notion of uniqueness requiring a COMPLETE lack of common properties with other things. It's almost as if you misunderstand the very basic concept. X is different from Y by virtue of X having SOME property that Y does not have. And X is unique by virtue of having SOME property that no other Y has. But we don't require that X is unique only if X has NO property that any other Y has. What a bizarre notion.

So if numbers are unique, then

Re: Cantor's definition of set

I would not like to say that they have anything in common.  
Don't look at me. I am simply using the definition of a set.

No you're not just using the definition of 'set'. You're also invoking  
bizarre and immediately self-defeating stipulations.

MoeBlee

Ok.

.