

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/msg03992.html>

- *From:* Dave Seaman <dseaman@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 21 May 2005 21:35:15 +0000 (UTC)
-

On 21 May 2005 13:03:23 -0700, porky_pig_jr@xxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

> 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?

There is a difference between

$B = \{ x \in A : x = x \}$ (1)

and

$B = \{ x : x = x \}$ (2)

in that (1) always represents a set (for each choice of A), but (2) would have to be the set of all sets, which does not exist in the kind of set theory being discussed here.

—

Dave Seaman

Judge Yohn's mistakes revealed in Mumia Abu-Jamal ruling.

<<http://www.commoncouragepress.com/index.cfm?action=book&bookid=228>>

.

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

- **Follow-Ups:**

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

- ◇ From: porky_pig_jr@xxxxxxxxxxxx

- **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

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

- 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**