

# Re: set of a set etc.

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-07/msg03079.html>

---

- *From:* "Jasper" <vfiddlestix@xxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* 19 Jul 2005 14:33:11 -0700
- 

Can you restate your description literally?

The notion of boxes is only a metaphor and doesn't explicitly state the relationships.

---

- *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ *Re: set of a set etc.*
  - ◇ *From:* Dave Seaman
- ◆ *Re: set of a set etc.*
  - ◇ *From:* William Elliot

- *References:*

- ◆ *set of a set etc.*
  - ◇ *From:* Jasper
- ◆ *Re: set of a set etc.*
  - ◇ *From:* Jean-Claude Arbaut
- ◆ *Re: set of a set etc.*
  - ◇ *From:* Jasper
- ◆ *Re: set of a set etc.*
  - ◇ *From:* Jean-Claude Arbaut
- ◆ *Re: set of a set etc.*
  - ◇ *From:* Jasper
- ◆ *Re: set of a set etc.*
  - ◇ *From:* G . Frege
- ◆ *Re: set of a set etc.*
  - ◇ *From:* William Elliot

- Prev by Date: *Re: To Google:*
- Next by Date: *Re: Objections to Cantor's Theory (Wikipedia article)*
- Previous by thread: *Re: set of a set etc.*
- Next by thread: *Re: set of a set etc.*
- Index(es):
  - ◆ *Date*
  - ◆ *Thread*