

From: "Noam Chomsky" <[REDACTED]>
To: "jeffrey E." <jeevacation@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: Re:
Date: Tue, 09 Jun 2015 01:27:29 +0000

Just getting to mail and found several letters of yours.

The "boundaries" in question have to do with the very general architecture of the mind/brain, abstracted from mechanisms. At this level, the visual system is an input system, and language is both an input and an output system (trivially) but also (for reasons discussed in the paper I sent you) a central system.

The question of awareness doesn't seem to interact with this analysis of general architecture, as far as I can see. The analogy you give is a good one for a different topic that I've discussed (as usual rejecting standard doctrine): inaccessibility to consciousness of the rule systems that enter into use of language and other actions.

From: jeffrey E. [mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, June 08, 2015 4:50 AM
To: Noam Chomsky
Subject: Re: Re:

as an apparatus to guide your view . think of a cell where the vast majority of its activity is inside its membrane, only what happens on the membrane would be awareness. the activity inside would be inaccessible , but obviously a principled relationship exists. between the activity inside ,outside and ACROSS. the membrane is where the input output occurs. , the membrane is only aware of what transports across it. and as its own ecology.

On Mon, Jun 8, 2015 at 1:20 AM, Noam Chomsky <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Will be interested to learn if that's true. Right now, I don't see the problems you envision. Almost all of what we're discussing is inaccessible to consciousness, much like the principles that govern visual interpretation, or most of what goes on in the organism, including the cognitive.

From: jeffrey E. [mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, June 07, 2015 4:51 PM
To: Noam Chomsky
Subject: Re: Re:

i propose that the boundary can be considered where awareness takes place. the old engineering charts drew boxes and ignored the lines inscribing the modules . the lines/ membranes were overlooked. . I must confess I have not read much of your work, but as i do hopefully the ratio of light to heat will increase. for now Im pretty dim. / like the hindrance brought about by tying metrics to math, I fear the language discussions fall into well worn traps

On Sun, Jun 7, 2015 at 1:47 PM, Noam Chomsky <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Could be, and I'll be glad to be enlightened.

Input-output-central modules seem to me facts about the organism, like a visual system and the enteric nervous system (which I've written about now and then). It's imagine that some more abstract way of looking at things would yield insights that can applied in these domains. Actually I've been involved in such efforts, years ago, some of it jointly with the late M.P. Schutzenberger, a very good mathematician (connections of automata theory with theory of monoids and real variables). And some of this work was picked up by category theorists, but I didn't follow

it from there because what already seemed to be pretty remote from the empirical phenomena of language (though interesting mathematically) was becoming hopelessly remote.

Noam

From: jeffrey E. [mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, June 06, 2015 7:59 PM
To: Noam Chomsky
Subject: Re: Re:

how does one assign a "value " to money? is it any different? 2. probabilities and cat theory . allow abstractions- such as morphism of shapes which are free of the input output module formulations. and algebra, . I guess you could say topology vs typology):: I propose that one of the reasons you do not yet see its benefits are more the shortcomings of my brief explanations than those of the theory.

On Sat, Jun 6, 2015 at 7:12 PM, Noam Chomsky <chomsky@MIT.edu> wrote:

Thinking about it, but I don't see how once can assign a value to a sentence (token or type or looked at even more abstractly, say the proposition expressed) in isolation from contexts, and value will vary all over the map as contexts vary. Take the standard example "the cat is on the mat," typically valueless, but not if the information conveyed is a signal to set off nuclear weapons that will destroy the world. Generalizes.

On 3, there is a place for probabilities in the study of use of language (e.g., Charles Yang's integration of UG and learning theory in study of acquisition), but there is no indication of how they might enter into I-language. The concepts don't seem relevant.

As for category theory, it makes sense to appeal to it if the results obtained at this level of abstraction have implications for the particular system under investigation. I don't see how it would be true in this case. Would we, say, learn more about the roots and implications of the copy theory of displacement if we abstracted to category theory? I don't see how.

I'll ask Valeria if she's gotten the book yet. Sounds like a great evening.

Noam

From: jeffrey E. [mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, June 06, 2015 3:45 AM
To: Noam Chomsky
Subject: Re:

1. the terms - value , money ,and currency- need definition. separate and apart from an intrinsic worth to an individual , the hungry one . or the Indian tooth manufacturer, either can actually be consumed or merely stand as a store of value or medium of exchange. a piece of paper representing either is the familiar form of money, . a dollar bill. . as you know the US version used to say the convertible into something. (gold silver) . now it says trust me. its worth one dollar. . the trading of dollars is well known. I wondered whether sentences (concepts without being necessarily written on paper. could be , looked at the same way. some having intrinsic value and others being used as exchange. I see no reason why not, does that set up an economics of sentences /concepts. .

2 Of course I would love to talk to your friend

3. With nothing more meaningful than sharing a new tasty food with you that I have enjoyed.I think you might enjoy the taste of a new math.

I read your attached paper. I would suggest that the system of analysis suffers from the use of early twentieth century reasoning , ie references to Merge. minimal computation (the set notation can be misleading) or modules. I think a system and notation that might , just might, help and add interesting insights is -category theory. fresher, more useful then either the former popular set theory or group

