

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

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

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-05/msg03989.html>

- From: "porky_pig_jr@xxxxxxxxxxxx" <porky_pig_jr@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - Date: 21 May 2005 14:45:45 -0700
-

Yes, thanks. I kept reading the book and realized that probably we cannot assume that $x \in A$. So we, to quote Halmos, 'draw from the non-existent universe'.

• References:

- ◆ 'Navie set theory': why when $S(x)$ is $(x = x)$, the specified x 's do not constitute a set?
◇ From: porky_pig_jr@xxxxxxxxxxxx
 - ◆ 'Re: 'Navie set theory': why when $S(x)$ is $(x = x)$, the specified x 's do not constitute a set?'
◇ From: Dave Seaman
-
- Prev by Date: Re: Calculating slope of roof: What is the arc-sine of (4/12) ?!
 - Next by Date: Re: Where can I find the proof of this theorem?
 - Previous by thread: Re: 'Navie set theory': why when $S(x)$ is $(x = x)$, the specified x 's do not constitute a set?
 - Next by thread: Calculating slope of roof: What is the arc-sine of (4/12) ?!
 - Index(es):
 - ◆ Date
 - ◆ Thread