Notre Dame JOURNAL OF FORMAL LOGIC



VOLUME 30, NUMBER 3 SUMMER 1989

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME, NOTRE DAME, INDIANA

NOTRE DAME JOURNAL OF FORMAL LOGIC

Editors:
Michael Detlefsen
John P. Burgess
Mark E. Nadel
Anand Pillay
William W. Tait

Business Manager:
Jan Houseman
Copy Editor:
Jon Beane

VOLUME 30, NUMBER 3, SUMMER 1989

CONTENTS

Introduction. By Michael Detlefsen	13
Logical constants across varying types. By Johan van Benthem	15
Russell, logicism, and the choice of logical constants. By Michael Byrd 34	43
Logical constants as punctuation marks. By Kosta Došen 30	62
Formatives. By George Englebretsen	82
Logical constants and the glory of truth-conditional semantics. By William G. Lycan	9(
Logical form and radical interpretation. By <i>Tim McCarthy</i> 40	01
The completeness of provable realizability. By G. E. Mints 42	20
Propositional functions and families of types. By Jan M. Smith 44	42
Truth table logic with a survey of embeddability results. By Neil Tennant	59

Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic is published quarterly by the University of Notre Dame in the Winter, Spring, Summer, and Fall of each year. The Journal is composed by Beljan, Ltd., Dexter, Michigan and printed by Cushing-Malloy, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan. Second-class postage paid at Notre Dame, Indiana 46556.

Subscriptions are \$45.00 per year for institutions and \$25.00 for individuals. Back volumes are \$20.00 each for Volumes 1-10 and \$35.00 each for Volumes 11-29. Orders for subscriptions and back volumes (accompanied by payment) and changes of address should be sent to the *Business Manager*, *P.O. Box 5*, *Notre Dame*, *Indiana 46556*, *U.S.A*.

Copyright © 1989 by the University of Notre Dame. All rights reserved.

Coden: NDJFAM.

Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic (ISSN 0029-4527)

For the most part, the phenomena with which logic has been concerned throughout its history are marked by a certain "structural" or "formal" character. That is, they are phenomena whose logical characteristics are taken to be due not to the content or subject matter of the expressions involved, but rather to some element of their form or structure. Such linking of logical characteristics with form serves the purpose of *patterning* the logical phenomena of a given language, since forms are things which many different expressions have in common. It also suggests the possibility of finding a kind of form so independent of the content as to be entirely topic-neutral; the nonschematic expressions of these forms would then constitute the "logical constants" of the language.

The linking of logical characteristics with form also leads naturally to a variety of questions. For example: If one of the chief effects of logical structure (or the presence of a logical constant) is the induction of certain patterns of inference, then is it correct to think of any structure which gives rise to a suitably large and varied body of inference patterns as being logical structure (and thus to think of the nonschematic expressions pertaining thereto as logical constants)? Moreover, is it correct to think of "suitably large and varied" as admitting of differences of kind, or only of differences of degree? Similarly, one might ask whether, in naturally occurring languages, there *are* any forms of inference that are so independent of content as to be entirely topic-neutral; and, if so, how one might arrive at a justified opinion of *which* forms of inference these are. Related to, but in certain respects potentially going beyond, all this is the question of *what* logical structure is.

A philosophically satisfying logical theory requires answers to these questions. That no fully satisfying set of such answers has been given is the motive for the present issue. That the work contained herein advances the discussion is its justification.

Michael Detlefsen Executive Editor