

REVIEWS

The Association for Symbolic Logic publishes analytical reviews of selected books and articles in the field of symbolic logic. The reviews were published in *The journal of symbolic logic* from the founding of the JOURNAL in 1936 until the end of 1999. The Association moved the reviews to this BULLETIN, beginning in 2000.

The Reviews Section is edited by Herbert Enderton (Coordinating Editor), Geoffrey Hellman, Thomas Jech, Wolfram Pohlers, and Philip Scowcroft. Authors and publishers are requested to send, for review, copies of books to *Herbert Enderton, Association for Symbolic Logic, Mathematical Sciences Bldg. 7332, UCLA, Los Angeles, California 90095-1566, USA.*

In a review, a reference “JSL XLIII 148,” for example, refers either to the publication reviewed on page 148 of volume 43 of the JOURNAL, or to the review itself (which contains full bibliographical information for the reviewed publication). Analogously, a reference “BSL VII 376” refers to the review beginning on page 376 in volume 7 of this BULLETIN, or to the publication there reviewed. “JSL LV 347” refers to one of the reviews or one of the publications reviewed or listed on page 347 of volume 55 of the JOURNAL, with reliance on the context to show which one is meant. The reference “JSL LIII 318(3)” is to the third item on page 318 of volume 53 of the JOURNAL, that is, to van Heijenoort’s *Frege and vagueness*, and “JSL LX 684(8)” refers to the eighth item on page 684 of volume 60 of the JOURNAL, that is, to Tarski’s *Truth and proof*.

References such as 495 or 280I are to entries so numbered in *A bibliography of symbolic logic* (the JOURNAL, vol. 1, pp. 121–218).

STEWART SHAPIRO. *Thinking about mathematics. The philosophy of mathematics.* Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York 2000, xiii + 308 pp.

Stewart Shapiro has written a very good, very useful textbook on the philosophy of mathematics. The book is also sorely needed, for while there are a few textbook-style overviews of the philosophy of mathematics in the literature, they are all badly out of date. What is good about Shapiro’s book is that (i) a large chunk of the book (about a third) is dedicated to bringing the reader up to date on contemporary work in the philosophy of mathematics, and (ii) it takes the old logicism-formalism-intuitionism debate for what it was, namely, as a historical episode, and not as somehow capturing the three main views that one might endorse about mathematics. To most contemporary writers, all three of those views are mistaken (though, of course, there are still some contemporary advocates, and Shapiro covers them). It seems to me that there was something of a divide in the middle of 20th-century philosophy of mathematics: there were very few significant works published on the metaphysics and epistemology of mathematics between 1951, the year that Curry (certainly an old-schooler) published his book on formalism, and 1965, the year that Benacerraf published the first of the two famous papers that, in my view, ushered in the contemporary era in the philosophy of mathematics. The latter era is now a significant intellectual episode in its own right, and it is about time we had a book that provided a survey of this episode. Shapiro’s book does this and does it well.

The book is divided into four parts. Part I provides some background for the rest of the book. Shapiro begins by discussing the question of whether the philosophy of mathematics