



Corrections to Where Do Sets Come From?

Author(s): Harold T. Hodes

Source: *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, Vol. 56, No. 4 (Dec., 1991), p. 1486

Published by: Association for Symbolic Logic

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2275488>

Accessed: 07-02-2022 00:57 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Association for Symbolic Logic is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*

JSTOR

CORRECTIONS TO *WHERE DO SETS COME FROM?*

HAROLD T. HODES

My paper [1] contains two egregious errors. Contrary to a remark on p. 151, ZFC + GCH does not imply that all infinite cardinals are acceptable. (I made a similar error in [2].) In fact, ZFC implies that all singular cardinals are not acceptable. (Example: $\text{Power}(\aleph_\omega)$ injects into $\prod_{n < \omega} \aleph_n$, which injects into the set of countable subsets of \aleph_ω .) Thus ZFC + GCH implies that a cardinal is acceptable iff it is infinite and regular. I thank Richard G. Heck, Jr., for straightening me out on all this.

The above shows that, contrary to my claim on p. 162, the Union Axiom is A_{1s} -valid! Setting my embarrassment aside, this is good news. The Union Axiom has never been controversial, and seems self-evident under the limitation-of-size conception of sethood. It should prima facie come out valid in a logic embodying that conception; when I thought it not A_{1s} -valid I felt that counted against A_{1s} (and similarly for MO_{1s}). Now this, at least, is as it should be. Note also that Replacement is A_{1s} -valid (and MO_{1s} -valid).

Finally, the proof of Fact 3.2 can be simplified: since an acceptable model has regular cardinality, by Fact 1.2 the sequence $\langle S'(j) \rangle_{j < \omega}$ can be cut off at $S'(3)$.

REFERENCES

- [1] HAROLD T. HODES, *Where do sets come from?* this JOURNAL, vol. 56 (1991), pp. 150–175.
- [2] ———, *Ontological commitment, thick and thin, Meaning and method: essays in honor of Hilary Putnam* (George Boolos, editor), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990, pp. 235–260.

SAGE SCHOOL OF PHILOSOPHY
CORNELL UNIVERSITY
ITHACA, NEW YORK 14850