

# Re: Universal grammar

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2006-10/msg01276.html>

---

- *From:* [haberg@xxxxxxxx](mailto:haberg@xxxxxxxx) (Hans Aberg)
  - *Date:* Wed, 18 Oct 2006 10:08:59 GMT
- 

In article <1161142005.979456.53400@xx>, groups@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

Are you saying you want to look up what was said about linguistic universals to give you new ideas for constructing computer languages?

The original question was actually about linguistic grammar universals, not language universals. I looked up Joseph Greenberg, and he seems to have been into language classification, rather than finding a universal grammar theory. So I suspect, though interesting, it might not be useful.

As for the computer application, programs like Flex/Bison might be worked up to handle natural language ambiguities. I do not think of it as an input for creating computer languages. But there might be some interesting connections:

I write on a theorem prover. And as pure mathematicians do not agree on notation, I build it up around certain semantic constructs, which the parser can translate into. It then does not matter exactly what the input language is, if only the parser is set right. And one can write out in different notation, if one has the opposite of the parser, called "expresser" perhaps.

The idea of a classification of the tenses contains (perhaps) the rudiments of similar ideas.

—

Hans Aberg

.