



give me in plain english:

A variant of Lady Lovelace's objection states that a machine can 'never do anything really new'. This may be parried for a moment with the saw, 'There is nothing new under the sun'. Who can be certain that 'original work' that he has done was not simply the growth of the seed planted in him by teaching, or the effect of following well-known general principles.



The objection being discussed is that a machine can never truly create anything new. A quick counter to this might be the saying, "There is nothing new under the sun," suggesting that nothing is ever entirely original. After all, how can anyone be sure that the "original work" they've done isn't just the result of ideas they were taught or the application of familiar principles?



Message ChatGPT

