

Re: Universal grammar

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2006-10/msg01345.html>

- *From:* "Rob Freeman" <groups@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 19 Oct 2006 07:59:28 -0700
-

Tak To wrote:

groups@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

[...]

But you are right. I think the issue is very closely related to that of a general theorem prover in maths.

...
(I have probably missed it -- where did the OP said they were related?)

You didn't miss it. I was drawing the inference from the fact he needs to find universals to implement his theorem prover.

Actually, I didn't think it was still considered possible to build a general theorem prover in maths.

Correct.

(and I am personally convinced that is for the same reason we have not been able to find universals of language or meaning.)

And the reason is?

Because I think there are many distributions which cannot be reduced to logic, Tak.

-Rob

.