

Re: Questioning the definitions of set and element.

Re: Questioning the definitions of set and element.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2008-05/msg00160.html>

- *From:* "Mark" <user@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 1 May 2008 21:29:14 +0100
-

"Arturo Magidin" <magidin@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
[news:fvd8jt\\$2cl1\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:fvd8jt$2cl1$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

In article <[xmnSj.44\\$SY5.40@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:xmnSj.44$SY5.40@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>, Mark <user@xxxxxxx> wrote:

"Arturo Magidin" <magidin@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
[news:fvcp9o\\$27f6\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:fvcp9o$27f6$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

In article <[oCISj.1209\\$7z4.15@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:oCISj.1209$7z4.15@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>, Mark
<user@xxxxxxx>
wrote:

[...]

I don't see how a logical theory can be based
on the undefined.

Then perhaps you should learn some basic mathematical
logic.

Perhaps you should learn how not to assume things.

You're right. I owe you a big apology. Just because you posted to a
mathematics group (sci.math), with a mathematical question about the
meaning of some mathematical terms of art, quoting a mathematics book
written by mathematicians, and a specific mathematician (Cantor), I
should not have assumed that you were looking for a mathematical
answer.

My deep and sincere apologies. I should have realized that it was just
a fickle twist of fate that directed your question to sci.math instead

Re: Questioning the defintions of set and element.

of alt.usage.english, where it belonged.

--

=====
"It's not denial. I'm just very selective about
what I accept as reality."

--- Calvin ("Calvin and Hobbes" by Bill Watterson)
=====

Arturo Magidin
magidin-at-member-ams-org

Apology accepted. But you're wrong, it does belong here.
I was basically asking whether elements in a set need to share something in
common. That's all.
Why would you think that it would be more appropriate in alt.usage.english?

.