'Navie set theory': why when S(x) is (x = x), the specified x's do not constitue a set?

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005−05/msg03972.html

---

- *From*: "porky_pig_jr@xxxxxxxxxxx" <porky_pig_jr@xxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: 21 May 2005 13:03:23 −0700

I"m reading 'Naive Set Theory' and the end of Section 3 there is a
following sentence:

[quote]
In case S(x) is (x \notin x), or in case S(x) is (x = x), the specified
x's do not constitute a set.
[quote]

The first one, (x \notin x) is Russell's Paradox, that one I
understand. I"m not clear what's wrong with the second one, (x = x).
Seems like this is tautology, always true. So if I have something like

B = { x \in A : x = x }

then B = A, since (x = x) is valid for all x's in A.

I assume I'm missing something, but what?

TIA.

.

- ***Follow−Ups***:
  - ♦ ***Re: 'Navie set theory': why when S(x) is (x = x), the specified x's do not constitue a set?***
    - ◊ *From:* Dave Seaman
  - ♦ ***Re: 'Navie set theory': why when S(x) is (x = x), the specified x's do not constitue a set?***
    - ◊ *From:* William Elliot

- Prev by Date: ***Re: truncated icosahedron angle problem***
- Next by Date: ***Re: truncated icosahedron angle problem***
- Previous by thread: ***Moment generating function and Fourier Transform***
- Next by thread: ***Re: 'Navie set theory': why when S(x) is (x = x), the specified x's do not constitue a set?***
- Index(es):
  - ♦ ***Date***

'Navie set theory': why when S(x) is (x = x), the specified x's do not constitue a set?

- ***Thread***