

Re: Turing completeness of the functional paradigm?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-07/msg00354.html>

- *From:* "Tom" <tkorna@xxxxx>
 - *Date:* 14 Jul 2005 04:24:32 -0700
-

Mr Elliot 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.

Yes, Mr Elliot. :-)

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

Oh, I'm sorry. I meant a non-spatial relation really. Well, I meant that no such thing can ever be (i.e. something inexpressible in Peano's system, since as Godel showed through his numbering scheme, even FOL can be expressed this way). Is that so? No nonspatiality whatsoever?

>> 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.

Mr Elliot, I am very happy you kindly cared to criticize me. Thank you.

Kindest regards,
Tom

.

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

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

- Prev by Date: *Penrose's impossible object in 4D*
- Next by Date: *Re: which is more fundamental?*
- Previous by thread: *Re: Turing completeness of the functional paradigm?*
- Next by thread: *Re: Turing completeness of the functional paradigm?*
- Index(es):
 - ◆ *Date*
 - ◆ *Thread*