

Re: set of a set etc.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-07/msg03340.html>

- *From:* "Jasper" <vfiddlestix@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 20 Jul 2005 20:38:21 -0700
-

Mark Nudelman wrote:

> Stephen J. Herschkorn wrote:

>> Jasper wrote:

>>

>>> The description is what I would call formal, not conceptual. "My cat"

>>> and the set of my cat {My cat} are different conceptually. My cat

>>> likes milk. The "set of my cat" does not, yet the two denotations

>>> are closely related. What is the conceptual relationship between the

>>> two?

>> Your cat is a member of the set of your cat. The set of your cat is

>> not a member of your cat.

>>

>> Sets are collections. A collection is distinct from the objects

>> therein (usually). Put a ring in a box. The box contains the ring;

>> the box and the ring are not the same thing.

>

> Just to confuse matters, W.V.O. Quine in "Set Theory and Its Logic" defines

> the law of extensionality and notes that a consequence of it is that there

> is only one memberless object. That is, since extensionality says that two

> things are identical if they have the same members, and individuals do not

> have members, all individuals are identical to the empty set and to each

> other. To avoid this, he could treat an individual as a different sort of

> object than a set, but instead he defines " $x \text{ \in } y$ " as meaning " $x = y$ " when

> y is an individual. A consequence of this is that individuals are identical

> to their unit sets, that is, $x = \{x\}$ but ONLY when x is an individual. Of

> course, he retains $x \neq \{x\}$ when x is a set. He takes some pains to show

> why this is harmless, but it does seem rather odd.

>

> --Mark

Yes it does. Thanks for the input and the reference. What do you make of it?

Jasper

.

- **Follow-Ups:**
 - ◆ **Re: set of a set etc.**
 - ◇ From: Mark Nudelman

- **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
 - ◆ **Re: set of a set etc.**
 - ◇ From: Jasper
 - ◆ **Re: set of a set etc.**
 - ◇ From: Dave Seaman
 - ◆ **Re: set of a set etc.**
 - ◇ From: Jasper
 - ◆ **Re: set of a set etc.**
 - ◇ From: Stephen J. Herschkorn
 - ◆ **Re: set of a set etc.**
 - ◇ From: Mark Nudelman

- Prev by Date: **Re: set of a set etc.**
- Next by Date: **Re: Check out which site is going to the top?**
- Previous by thread: **Re: set of a set etc.**
- Next by thread: **Re: set of a set etc.**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**