

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/msg03991.html>

- From: "porky_pig_jr@xxxxxxxxxxxx" <porky_pig_jr@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - Date: 21 May 2005 14:41:04 -0700
-

I'm using Latex notation which is fairly common in this group. If you can't understand it, then don't bother to reply. Just don't make an asshole of yourself.

- **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: William Elliot
- Prev by Date: **'Re: 'Navie set theory': why when $S(x)$ is $(x = x)$, the specified x 's do not constitute a set?'**
- Next by Date: **'Re: Calculating slope of roof: What is the arc-sine of (4/12) ?!'**
- 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: **'Re: 'Navie set theory': why when $S(x)$ is $(x = x)$, the specified x 's do not constitute a set?'**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**