CREATING A UNIVERSAL INFORMATION LANGUAGE

OSCAR BENDER-STONE

ABSTRACT. Welkin is a formalized programming language to store information. We introduce its use cases and rigorously define its syntax and semantics. From there, we introduce the bootstrap, making Welkin completely self-contained under the metatheory of Peano Arithmetic.

1. INTRODUCTION

Humanity produces a colossal amount of data each year. According to the International Data Corporation, there is currently 163 zettabytes of digital data in the world. Given that the average human can read, on average, 200 words per minute, and approximating a word as 8 bytes, this would require *billions* of years ($7.8675 * 10^9$ minutes). Even in restricted areas, such as academa, the amount of data available cannot be consumed individually. On JSTOR alone, there are over 2800 journals, translating to around 12 *million* articles. Taking the average size of an article to be 5000 words, this amounts to *hundreds* of years ($3 * 10^8$ minutes) for a *single* jounral provider. The sheer scale of this data coincides with the trends in increased complexity, with little further predictions rapidly increasing this total.

In an attempt to tame these large data sets, a key concept called *information* emerged. Within modern databases, this is pronounced in the way data is organized and the relations between them. In modern formalizations, this is best represented by Knowledge Graphs, particulrly OWL and John Sowa's Conceptual Graphs. More recently, AI systems are being more deeply integrated with databases, providing an easier way for users to query accross a large amount of websites or resources at a time. However, most formluations miss on the *underlying structure* behind the data, providing a "shadow" through a model instead of the "thing itself". Additionally, research done in AI aims to provide a good "average"; the amount of fake data produced is a concern, as noted in [1].

Analyzing this problem from a theoretical lens, the natural question arises: *why* is there so much information present? Could it be *compressed* into a smaller form? The leading two theories on the matter provide hard limitations on compression, each with their own notion of "information":

- **Shannon entropy:** Claude Shannon founded information theory and defined informatoin as the "reduction of uncertainty", measured in a probablistic setting.
- **Kolmogorov complexity:** Andrey Kolomogorov founded Algorithmic Information Theory, independently connecting Shannon's work to computability.

However, these theories lack a suitable *semantics*. These were expanded upon in Scott domains, which have been succesful in projects like Prolog. Nevertheless *none* of these theories adequaltey explain what *information* is:

- **Knowledge Graphs** *encode* this structure through First Order Logic, but fall apart through contradictions or fallacious axioms. These can be recitied through logics like Relevant logic, but the emphasis is placed on *truth* rather than *structure*. This falis to provide the notion that information can be false.

- **Shannon entropy** and **Kolmogorov complexity** provide a *measure* of information, not an exact notion of information itself. In the former, this is measured with random strings and focuses on binary strings, whereas the latter gets closer to computation yet studies a *minimum size*, not the properties of a Turnig machine witnessing this bound.
- **Scott domains** come close to providing a semantic basis, but ultimately focus on the *hierarchical structure*, and not the *connections between domains*.

This thesis proposes to rexamine a topic in the literature: the notion of *information*. Using the etymology in Latin, "to form", this thesis develops a formalized programming language to organize information.This provides the missing link to the *semantics* of information, more so than labels within Knowledge Graphs or ones commonly used in AI.

1.1. **Goals.**

The aim of this thesis is to create a formalized programing language, called Welkin, derived from an archaic German word meaning "sky, heavens". The key goals outline the defencies observed in the formalisms above:

-
-
-

2. FOUNDATIONS

We introduce the base theory needed for this thesis. We will keep it self-contained; additional references will be provided in each sub-section. We introduce an informal, set-theoretic definition, followed by the appropriate encoding into the meta-theory.

2.1. **Peano Arithmetic.**

The foundations of Welkin are based on the first-order theory of Peano Arithmetic. We will integrate the presentation of both. We only introduce one notion general to first-order logic:

Definition 2.1.0. The **language** of first-order logic consists of the symbols $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{FOL}} = \{\neg \wedge \vee \to \forall \exists ()\}$, with symbols called:

- **connectives**: **not** $\neg$, **and** $\wedge$, **or** $\vee$, **implication** $\to$
- **quantifiers** called **forall** $\forall$ and **exists** $\exists$
- **left/right parantheses** ()

We will restrict our *primary* language to ensure simplicity of the checker, limited to the language of Peano Arithmetic, but extra notation is added throughout in a meta-theoretic sense.

Definition 2.1.1. The **language** of $\mathbf{PA}$ is the set $\mathcal{L}_A = \{0, 1, +, *\}$, with symbols called:

- **zero** (0) and **one** (1).
- **addition** $(+)$ and **multiplication** $(*)$.
- **less than or equals** $(\leq)$

Note that the full language of our meta-theory is $\mathcal{L}_T = \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{FOL}} \cup \mathcal{L}_A$. We will encode these in the syntax of Welkin; see Section 5.

We require the notion of **well-formed formula** to introduce the axioms, specific to Peano-Arithmetic.

Definition 2.1.2. An **atomic formula** in Peano Arithmetic is defined recursivley:

- **Base case:**
  - The constants 0 and 1 are atomic formulas.
  - Each variable x_i is an atomic formulas.
- **Recursive case**: let α and β be atomic formulas. Then $\alpha + \beta$ and $\alpha * \beta$ are atomic formulas.

Definition 2.1.3. A **well-formed formula (wff)** in Peano Arithmetic is defined recursively:

- **Base case:** each atomic formula α is a wff.
- **Recursive case**: let φ and ψ be wffs.

We add two informal abbreviations:

- **successor function** S, given by: $S(n) \equiv N + 1$
- **inequality**, given by: $x \leq y \equiv \exists z.z + x = y$

Before we introduce proof, we introduce the axioms of $\mathbf{PA}$.

Definition 2.1.4. The theory **Robinson Arithmetic** $\mathbf{Q}$ contains the following axioms:

(Q1) $\forall x.x + 1 \neq 0$
(Q2) $\forall x.\forall y.x + 1 = y + 1 \rightarrow x + y$
(Q3) $\forall x.(x \neq 0 \rightarrow \exists y.x = y + 1)$
(Q4) $\forall x.x + 0 = x$
(Q5) $\forall x.\forall y.(x + (y + 1) = (x + y) + 1)$
(Q6) $\forall x.\forall y.x * (y + 1) = x * y + x$
(Q7) $\forall x.x * 0 = 0$
(Q8) $\forall x.\forall y.x * (y + 1) = x * y + x$

The theory $\mathbf{PA} = \mathbf{Q} \cup \mathbf{I}$, where $\mathbf{I}$ is an **induction schema**, defined over each first-order formula φ in $\mathcal{L}_A$:

(I) $\varphi(0) \wedge \forall n(\varphi(n) \rightarrow \varphi(n + 1)) \rightarrow \forall n\varphi(n)$

$\mathbf{PA}$ enjoys several properties. We will define the first in depth, but it is cited here for clarity.

Theorem 2.1.5. $\mathbf{PA}$ *proves the following:*

- *Every Primitive Recursive Function (PRF) is total.*
- $\mathbf{PA}$ *is infinitely axiomatizable but not finitely so.*

We choose $\mathbf{PA}$ as a well-established theorem and a reasonable "minimal" theory. This contrasts with $\mathbf{Q}$, which is too weak for computability proofs without induction, as well as $\mathbf{ZFC}$, which has oa much larger proof ordinal. Welkin requires a rich enough theory that can *directly* encode its core proofs, even with added verbosity. Note that any of these proofs can be *astronomically large*, but the point is to work in a theory where they are *possible*.

Note that from the work of Sergei Artemov, there is a weak form consistency that can be proven in $\mathbf{PA}$ *and* $\mathbf{ZFC}$,separately. However, $\mathbf{PA}$ is needed as a meta-theory to ensure that Welkin is self-contained; see more in Boostrap for details. $\mathbf{PA}$ can also be used to *define* Turing machines, which we next.

2.2. **Set Theoretic Notions.**

We wish to define our notions in terms of set-theory, as that is predominant in the definitions of computability. To do this, we introduce suitable *encodings* into PA. We will elaborate when necessary.

Definition 2.2.6. We encode the following set-theoretic notions recursively:

-
- Instead of considering arbitrary alphabets, we consider binary $\{0, 1\}$.
- Any finite set is encoded by a natural numb3er

2.3. **Turing Machines.**

Definition 2.3.7. A **Turing machine (TM)** is a 7-tuple $(Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, B, F)$, where:

- Q is a finite set of **states**
- Σ is a finite **alphabet**
- Γ is a finite set of **tape symbols**
- $\delta : Q \times \Gamma \to Q \times \Gamma \times \{L, R\}$ is a **transition function**, where $\{L, R\}$ denote directions **left** and **right**, respectively.

The encoding of TMs is more involved but possible through several mechanisms.

Definition 2.3.8. Let T be a TM. The **description** d_T of a Turing machine is the encoding of its transition diagram into a standard format.

2.4. **Explicit Computability.**

We now enter the first original results produced for this thesis.

Definition 2.4.9. An **Explicit Turing Machine (ETM)** is a 2-tape Turing machine with the following restrictions:

- **Read Tape:** the only transitions allowed are those labeled with right (R)
- **Work Tape:** this cannot contain any inner loops. Can access the read and stack tapes.

A function computable by an ETM is said to be **explicitly computable**.

Lemma 2.4.10. *ETMs are closed under:*

- *Composition*
- *Finite Unions and Finite Intersections*
- *Complements*
- *Kleene Star*

Definition 2.4.11. Let M_1, M_2 be Turing machines. An **explicit transformation** $\tau : M_1 \to M_2$ is an explicitly computable function from the description of M_1 to the description of M_2.

As a natural consequence of the Lemma above, we can completely determine the explicitly computable transformations *only* with explicit functions.

Lemma 2.4.12. *Let M_1, M_2 be Turing machines. Then there is an explicitly computable σ that enumerates through all explicit transformations of M_1 to M_2. We write $\mathcal{E}(M_1, M_2)$ as the set of explicit transformations.*

2.5. **Verifiability and RE Languages.**

Definition 2.5.13. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a language. A **verifier** V of $\mathcal{L}$ is a decider such that:

$$\mathcal{L} = \{w \mid \exists c.(w, c) \in L(V)\}$$

If a verifier of $\mathcal{L}$ exists, then $\mathcal{L}$ is **verifiable**. Moreover, we say $\mathcal{L}$ is **explicitly verifiable** if some verifier V is explicit.

Theorem 2.5.14. *A language is recursively enumerable if and only if it explicitly verifiable.*

Proof. ■

This provides the bedrock of our main definition, inspired by Hoprocroft et. al.

Definition 2.5.15.

- A **problem** is an explicitly verifiable language.
- A **problem instance** is any binary string.
- A **solution** to a problem P is a Turing machine that recognizes P.

2.6. **Bases For Turing Machines.**

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be the set of all Turing machines. We examine a suitable lattice-structure on this set provide a semi-lattice as a step towards organizational optimality.

Definition. Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$. We say $\mathcal{A}$ **spans** $\mathcal{M}$ if there is an explicitly computable, surjective $f : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\mathcal{A} = \{M \mid f(M) = \{M\}\}$. In this case, we call f an **analyzer** of $\mathcal{A}$.

Analogous to group theory, bases enjoy a computable version of the First Isomorphism Theorem.

Theorem. *Suppose $(\mathcal{A}, f)$ is a basis for $\mathcal{M}$. The following hold:*

- *Let ρ be the function that takes Turing machines to the smallest Turing machine M' such that $f(M) = f(M')$. Then $g = f \circ \rho$ is an analyzer for $\mathcal{A}$. We call g the **canonical analyzer** w.r.t the basis.*
- *The inverse $f^{-1} : \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A}) \to \ker(f)$ is explicitly computable; we call this a **synthesizer**. In particular, so is g^{-1}, which we call the **canonical synthesizer** (w.r.t. the basis).*
- *Define the following operations on Turing machines:*
  - $M_1 \sqcup M_2 = g^{-1}(f(M_1) \cup f(M_2))$
  - $M_1 \sqcap M_2 = g^{-1}(f(M_1) \cap f(M_2))$

  *Then $\sqcup$ and $\sqcap$ are explicitly computable, and $(M_1, \sqcup, \sqcap)$ is a semi-lattice. We call the induced partial order $M_1 \sqsubseteq M_2 \Leftrightarrow M_1 = M_1 \sqcap M_2$ a **part-hood** relation, and the system $(\mathcal{M}, \sqcup, \sqcap)$ the **Mereological System** of the basis.*

Proof ■

2.7. **Mereological Rewrite Systems.**

We generalize a basis to include rewrite components. This will be the starting point for discussing the optimality of the semantics.

Definition 2.7.16. Let (A, f) be a basis on $\mathcal{M}$. The **Mereological Category** $\mathcal{C}(A, f)$ is the largest category closed under explicit transformations on $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A})$. In detail, it contains:

- Objects: $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A})$.
- Morphisms: $\mathrm{Hom}(A_1, A_2) = \mathcal{E}(g^{-1}(A_1), g^{-1}(A_2))$. If $\mathrm{Hom}(A_1, A_2) \neq \varnothing$, then we write $A_1 \to A_2$.

Definition 2.7.17. Definition. A **progress theorem** is a proposition p of the form $\forall A.\exists D_A.\forall B.D_A(B) \Rightarrow B \to A$ where D_A is a family of explicitly computable unary predicates called the **progress predicate of p**. We say a Mereological Category has **progress p** if it satisfies p. Note that A may be free in D_A. We write $\mathrm{Prog}(\mathcal{C})$ for the set of progress theorems satisfied by $\mathcal{C}$.

Definition 2.7.18. A Mereological Category has **universal progress** if the **Universal Progress Theorem (UPT)** holds: for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$, there is a N such that, for every B with N elements, $B \to A$. This ensures the existence of $m : \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A}) \to \mathbb{N}$, given by $m(A) = \min\{N \mid \forall B, |B| \geq N.B \to A\}$.

Definition 2.7.19. The category of Mereological Categories with universal progress consists of:

- Objects: Mereological Categories.
- Morphisms: $\sigma : \mathcal{C}(A_1, f_1) \to \mathcal{C}(A_2, f_2)$ are the faithful functors.

Our goal is to find the final object in this meta-category above with universal progress.

3. Information Systems

We introduce the bulk of this thesis: providing an optimality criterion for an informatoin system and deriving the best one in terms of explicitly comptuable structures. We first introduce structures, followed by their representations. We then prove that the study to convert betweewn representations is RE-complete, ensuring the theory is sufficiently expressive.

3.1. **Structures.**

In FOL, the usual definition of a structure relies on a tuple of finitely many relations and function symbols on a domain. We simplify the definition; this will be expanded upon in Section 5.

Definition 3.1.0. A **structure** is a **bigraph**, namely a tuple (X, T, G), where

- X is a **domain**, a set of binary strings
- T is a tree on X, the **hierarchy** of X. We make this more precise with the following constructors:
  - We add a symbol $\emptyset \notin X$ called the **root**.
  - There is a **parent function** $p : X \to X \cup \{\emptyset\}$ that is surjective. The preimage $p^{-1}(x)$ is the set of **children of** x. this can be encoded by a binary predicate φ_p such that it is functional,
    $\forall x.\forall y_1.\forall y_2.(p(x, y_1) \wedge p(x, y_2) \to y_1 = y_2)$
    and surjective,
    $\forall x.\exists y.p(y, x)$.
- G is a **hypergraph** on X, encoded by a definable binary predicate φ_G in $\mathbf{PA}$.

Any hypergraph can be used to represent a FOL-structure via a disjoint; the latter can then be considered to be an indexed family of relations.

3.2. **Bases For Turing Machines.**

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be the set of all Turing machines. We examine a suitable lattice-structure on this set provide a semi-lattice as a step towards organizational optimality.

Definition. Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$. We say $\mathcal{A}$ **spans** $\mathcal{M}$ if there is an explicitly computable, surjective $f : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\mathcal{A} = \{M \mid f(M) = \{M\}\}$. In this case, we call f an **analyzer** of $\mathcal{A}$.

Analogous to group theory, bases enjoy a computable version of the First Isomorphism Theorem.

Theorem. *Suppose $(\mathcal{A}, f)$ is a basis for $\mathcal{M}$. The following hold:*

- *Let ρ be the function that takes Turing machines to the smallest Turing machine M' such that $f(M) = f(M')$. Then $g = f \circ \rho$ is an analyzer for $\mathcal{A}$. We call g the **canonical analyzer** w.r.t the basis.*
- *The inverse $f^{-1} : \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A}) \to \ker(f)$ is explicitly computable; we call this a **synthesizer**. In particular, so is g^{-1}, which we call the **canonical synthesizer** (w.r.t. the basis).*
- *Define the following operations on Turing machines:*
  - $M_1 \sqcup M_2 = g^{-1}(f(M_1) \cup f(M_2))$
  - $M_1 \sqcap M_2 = g^{-1}(f(M_1) \cap f(M_2))$

  *Then $\sqcup$ and $\sqcap$ are explicitly computable, and $(M_1, \sqcup, \sqcap)$ is a semi-lattice. We call the induced partial order $M_1 \sqsubseteq M_2 \Leftrightarrow M_1 = M_1 \sqcap M_2$ a **part-hood** relation, and the system $(\mathcal{M}, \sqcup, \sqcap)$ the **Mereological System** of the basis.*

Proof ■

3.3. **Mereological Rewrite Systems.**

We generalize a basis to include rewrite components. This will be the starting point for discussing the optimality of the semantics.

Definition 3.3.1. Let (A, f) be a basis on $\mathcal{M}$. The **Mereological Category** $\mathcal{C}(A, f)$ is the largest category closed under explicit transformations on $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A})$. In detail, it contains:

- Objects: $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A})$.
- Morphisms: $\mathrm{Hom}(A_1, A_2) = \mathcal{E}(g^{-1}(A_1), g^{-1}(A_2))$. If $\mathrm{Hom}(A_1, A_2) \neq \varnothing$, then we write $A_1 \to A_2$.

Definition 3.3.2. Definition. A **progress theorem** is a proposition p of the form $\forall A.\exists D_A.\forall B.D_A(B) \Rightarrow B \to A$ where D_A is a family of explicitly computable unary predicates called the **progress predicate of p**. We say a Mereological Category has **progress p** if it satisfies p. Note that A may be free in D_A. We write $\mathrm{Prog}(\mathcal{C})$ for the set of progress theorems satisfied by $\mathcal{C}$.

Definition 3.3.3. A Mereological Category has **universal progress** if the **Universal Progress Theorem (UPT)** holds: for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$, there is a N such that, for every B with N elements, $B \to A$. This ensures the existence of $m : \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A}) \to \mathbb{N}$, given by $m(A) = \min\{N \mid \forall B, |B| \geq N.B \to A\}$.

Definition 3.3.4. The category of Mereological Categories with universal progress consists of:

- Objects: Mereological Categories.
- Morphisms: $\sigma : \mathcal{C}(A_1, f_1) \to \mathcal{C}(A_2, f_2)$ are the faithful functors.

Our goal is to find the final object in this meta-category above with universal progress.

4. Syntax

5. Semantics

5.1. **Terms.**

We expand upon to anaylze the ASTs generated from Section 4.

6. Bootstrap

7. Conclusion

References

1. Romano, A.: Synthetic geospatial data and fake geography: A case study on the implications of AI-derived data in a data-intensive society. Digital Geography and Society. (2025)

Department of Mathematics, University of Colorado at Boulder, Boulder, CO
Email address: oscar-bender-stone@protonmail.com