

geometry: left=2.5cm

From Carnapp's 'Introduction to Semantics'

1. (p4) Finally a patient explanation of object language, meta language and meta theory.
2. (p5) Carnapp says that we treat all utterances in a language in 'linear form', because it is convenient as it enables us to specify positions of signs in an expression.
 - This reminds of of geometry-algebra translation, geometry being understood pictorially, like in Euclid's proofs. The known fact of 'grasping things all at once' in this pictorial mode contradicts this 'linear form'. Querying '(euclid) formal visual language logic' we find:
 - 'Proofs, pictures, and Euclid'
 - 'On the Insufficiency of Linear Diagrams for Syllogisms'
 - '<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/diagrams/>'
 - 'Formal semantics of visual languages using spatial reasoning'
 - This also reminds us of finite automata, as a language. We could say it is a pixel based language. Also, even though it can be linearized, does this not modify and/or break the language somewhat? This might not be a 'trivial translation', especially when the 'interpreter' is human.
 - Here we remember the important quote about the three parts of Semiotics (p8)
3. test