

Re: set of a set etc.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-07/msg03375.html>

- *From:* k wallace <wallace.k@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 21 Jul 2005 02:16:43 -0700
-

The last point is a key one I think -- by this route, everything is a class to Quine, which simplifies some things. It's important to keep in mind that this is just the way Quine's axioms work. Many (probably most) other axiomatic systems don't consider $x = \{x\}$ to be true, even if x is an individual. So there's no one true answer to the question about what this means, it depends on the axiom system you're using. But there's no argument when talking about multi-element sets: for Quine as for everyone else, the set $\{x,y\}$ is different from the set $\{\{x,y\}\}$, since the first has two elements, and the second has one element.

--Mark

just learning about sets, so if this is a dumb question please pardon me.

In your last sentence, is $\{x,y\}$ different from $\{\{x,y\}\}$ because the first has two elements (x and y) and the second has one element, the set $\{x,y\}$? So, would you say that the second has one element, and that one element contains two elements? Or would that not be valid?
thanks
k wallace