Lecture 7: Logical Consequence

Philosophy of Logic and Language — HT 2017-18

Jonny McIntosh

jonathon.mcintosh@balliol.ox.ac.uk

Works by Tarski

The main text by Tarski this week is 'On the Concept of Logical Consequence'; 'Truth and Proof' is a very accessible presentation, written much later:

Alfred Tarski (1936) 'On the Concept of Logical Consequence' in his (1983) *Logic, Semantics, Metamathematics*, 2nd revised edition (Hackett).

— (1969) 'Truth and Proof' in *Scientific American* 220, pp. 63-77.

Secondary Reading

Starred items (*) are more introductory, and good places to start. Coffa (1991) traces the historical roots of Tarski's account of logical consequence (among other things). Quine attacks the analytic/synthetic distinction in his (1951) and defends a version of the substitutional conception in his (1986). For more discussion of formality, see in particular Etchemendy (1983) and Macfarlane (2000). Etchemendy (2008) is the best place to start for his objections, though see his (1990/1999) for extended discussion. For responses, see McGee (1992), Sher (1996), Hanson (1997), Gómez-Torrente (1999), Soames (1999), and Paseau (2013).

*JC Beall and Greg Restall (2005/2013) 'Logical Consequence' in E. Zalta, ed. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*: https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/logical-consequence/

*Patricia Blanchette (2001) 'Logical Consequence' in L. Goble, ed. *The Blackwell Guide to Philosophical Logic* (Blackwell).

J. Alberto Coffa (1991) *The Semantic Tradition from Kant to Carnap*, ed. by Linda Wessels (CUP).

John Etchemendy (1983) 'The Doctrine of Logic as Form' in *Linguistics and Philosophy* 6(3), 319334.

John Etchemendy (1988) 'Tarski on Truth and Logical Consequence' in *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* 53(1), pp. 51-79, §2.

John Etchemendy (1990/1999) *The Concept of Logical Consequence* (CSLI Publications).

John Etchemendy (2008) 'Reflections on Consequence' in Doug Patterson, ed. *New Essays on Tarski and Philosophy* (OUP).

*Mario Goméz-Torrente (2006/2014) 'Logical Truth' in E. Zalta, ed. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*: https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/logical-truth/

William Hanson (1997) 'The Concept of Logical Consequence' in *The Philosophical Review* 106(3), pp. 365-409.

John Macfarlane (2000) *What Does it Mean to Say That Logic is Formal?* University of Pittsburgh PhD thesis.

Vann McGee (1992) 'Two Problems with Tarski's Theory of Consequence' in *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 92, pp. 273292.

Alexander Paseau (2013) 'The Overgeneration Argument(s): A Succinct Refutation' in *Analysis* 74(1), pp. 40-47.

W. V. O. Quine (1951) 'Two Dogmas of Empiricism' in *The Philosophical Review* 60(1), pp. 20-43.

W. V. O. Quine (1986) *Philosophy of Logic*, 2nd edition (Harvard UP), Ch. 4.

*Mark Sainsbury (2001) *Logical Forms*, 2nd edition (Blackwell), Ch. 1 and 6.

Gila Sher (1996) 'Did Tarski Commit "Tarski's Fallacy"?' in *The Review of Modern Logic* 61(2), pp. 653-686.

Scott Soames (1999) *Understanding Truth* (OUP), Appendix to Ch. 4.