

# Re: Turing completeness of the functional paradigm?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-07/msg00350.html>

---

- *From:* William Elliot <[marsh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:marsh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Thu, 14 Jul 2005 00:17:37 -0700
- 

On Wed, 13 Jul 2005, Tom wrote:

- > It seems to be the case that \_on the absolute scale of things\_
- > temporality is entirely eliminable within the functional paradigm (with
- > the ideas of state / assignment being merely abstractions, and a state
- > machine simply a set of spatial, and atemporal sequences).
- >
- > (This is hinted by Prof. Abelson in a lecture on streams (L6b):
- > <http://swiss.csail.mit.edu/classes/6.001/abelson-sussman-lectures/>
- > with a remark on the nonplausibility of such an approach
- > implementationally. Still, it is the absolute case that I am after.)
- >

It is implausible the quote, tho grammatically correct, is coherent or if coherent, meaningful.

- > Actually, having pondered Peano's axioms a little more carefully, I
- > have concluded that there seem to be no nospacial relations whatsoever.
- >

What's a nospacial relation?

- > Please, is my thinking erroneous (again, on the absolute scale of
- > things, and not implementationally)?
- >

Erroneous is a complement. I think it attains unto erudite gibberish.

.

---

- *Follow-Ups:*
  - ◆ ***Re: Turing completeness of the functional paradigm?***
  - ◇ *From:* Tom

- *References:*
  - ◆ ***Turing completeness of the functional paradigm?***
  - ◇ *From:* Tom

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Completeness***
- Next by Date: ***Re: Completeness***

Re: Turing completeness of the functional paradigm?

- Previous by thread: *Turing completeness of the functional paradigm?*
- Next by thread: *Re: Turing completeness of the functional paradigm?*
- Index(es):
  - ◆ *Date*
  - ◆ *Thread*