

Re: Cantor's definition of set

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2007-10/msg00990.html>

- *From:* G. Frege <nomail@invalid>
 - *Date:* Sun, 28 Oct 2007 01:45:37 +0200
-

On Sat, 27 Oct 2007 16:16:26 -0700, John Jones <jonescardiff@xxxxxxx> wrote:

But have I not said this already – that a set is defined by its name?

I don't know. But if so, then it's wrong.

In other words, a set has no properties of its own.

Well, one might claim that a set is completely "determined" by its elements.

THAT is why he said a set has no name.

Never mind, it's wrong. A common name for the empty set is –as you may know– the symbol "0". This "proves" that (certain) sets DO have names.

Q.: if something, like a set, has no properties, how can it have a name?

Who told you that a set has no "properties"? (Hint: It's wrong.)
For example, the empty set (i.e. 0) has the property to be empty.

F.

—

Re: Cantor's definition of set

E-mail: info<at>simple-line<dot>de

.