

Re: New symbolic/numeric/dynamic/intuitive programming language

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2008-02/msg03514.html>

- *From:* "Mark Nudelman" <markn@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 21 Feb 2008 11:31:35 -0600
-

daveparker@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

On Feb 21, 8:04 am, Aatu Koskensilta <aatu.koskensi...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

No it isn't.

Yes it is.

The power of a computer language lies in it's ability to translate human desires into actions by the machine.

In Flaming Thunder, the program to write "Hello world!" is:

Write "Hello world!".

That makes Flaming Thunder powerful enough for even elementary school children. Which is far more powerful than C, C++, Java, etc, since none of those can translate the human desires of elementary school children into actions by the machine.

What you seem to be claiming is that Flaming Thunder is easy to use or easy to learn. It is very nonstandard to call this a measure of how "powerful" the language is.

What makes

Write "Hello world!".

better than

```
main() { printf("Hello world!"); }
```

?

Is it the smaller number of characters?

In Perl, the same program is

```
print "hello world!"
```

Does the lack of punctuation after the statement make Perl that much

Re: New symbolic/numeric/dynamic/intuitive programming language

more "powerful" than Flaming Thunder? Isn't Perl easier to use because it doesn't need to be compiled?

Do you really believe that elementary school children are incapable of programming in C but can easily program in Flaming Thunder? Writing a non-trivial program requires skills that are mostly independent of the language. Do you believe that children can start programming in Flaming Thunder without learning the language first? Do you have any empirical evidence that Flaming Thunder is easier to learn than C or Perl?

--Mark

.