

Re: Turing completeness of the functional paradigm?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-07/msg00356.html>

- *From:* William Elliot <marsh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 14 Jul 2005 06:03:07 -0700
-

On Thu, 14 Jul 2005, Tom wrote:

> Mr Elliot wrote:

>

>>> 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?

>

Still confused about what you mean. Oh the wondrous wonders of double negatives: Do not double negative not leave you untied in knots?

Peano's axioms allows a well ordering, indeed a sequential ordering, of the integers. So in this sense, Peano's axioms do impart a spacial orientation, that the integers can be strung along a line like cloth pins on a cloth line.

>>> 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.

>

Tho a man in the street, but not in congress or the White-Lie House, will call a spade a spade, a philosopher will attempt to wax eloquent beyond the compression of even the most abstruse poets.

Philosophy's a joke. If it isn't, you're taking like too seriously.

.

- *Follow-Ups:*

Re: Turing completeness of the functional paradigm?

◆ **Re: Turing completeness of the functional paradigm?**

◇ From: Tom

• **References:**

◆ **Turing completeness of the functional paradigm?**

◇ From: Tom

◆ **Re: Turing completeness of the functional paradigm?**

◇ From: William Elliot

◆ **Re: Turing completeness of the functional paradigm?**

◇ From: Tom

• Prev by Date: **Re: which is more fundamental?**

• 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**