

Re: Universal grammar

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2006-10/msg01391.html>

- *From:* "Rob Freeman" <groups@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 19 Oct 2006 21:34:06 -0700
-

Hans Aberg wrote:

In article <1161269148.965379.301930@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, "Rob Freeman" <groups@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Is it possible to reduce all of mathematics to logic?

In principle, yes, of the part of mathematics that deals with theorems and proofs, though there are practical problems when trying to implement it into a computer. Working math also consists much of human cognitive information, which is then lost, in as much it is not described in formal logical terms. The best hope for the immediate future is though a program that aids the human in writing proofs, proving things that might be technical but not depending so much on cognition and is not overly structured.

So you want to factor some "human" factor X out of mathematical proofs?

I find the idea that there is an indefinable "human" element in mathematical proofs quite radical. This is something quite new, and unique to your own work, isn't it?

Still, it is not inconsistent with Goedel's own interpretation, which was that absolute "truth" existed, but that it must be outside of maths itself.

I still find it ironic that people should interpret the failure to observe something (absolute "truth") as evidence that it does still exist, but that it exists only in some sense which is innate to humans (or beyond.) Why are we moved to push everythi