

## **CALL FOR PAPERS**

**Topoi: An International Review of Philosophy**

### **LOGICAL PLURALISM AND TRANSLATION**

**Deadline for submission:** April 30, 2016

**Guest editors:**

Francesca Ervas (University of Cagliari),  
Antonio Ledda (University of Cagliari),  
Francesco Paoli (University of Cagliari),  
Giuseppe Sergioli (University of Cagliari).

**Overview:**

Translation plays a keynote role in logic, philosophy of language and philosophy of logic. On the one hand, logical pluralism and translations of logics are at the forefront of the current debates on the philosophy of logic. Both streams have attracted an ever growing interest among scholars, against the backdrop of the plurality of different non-classical logics that extend, or compete with, classical logic. On the other hand, linguists and philosophers of language developed effective semantical tools explaining a variety of linguistic and conceptual phenomena by inquiring the conditions under which a sentence in one language can be properly said a translation of a sentence in another language, and when it is that case that such a translation can be considered sound.

**Possible topics:**

This extremely rich and diversified situation suggests a number of intriguing philosophical issues including, but not limited to, the following ones:

- The translation of several linguistic phenomena seems to call for a pluralist account: what sort of logic do we need to translate “expressive terms” or “scientific terms” without running into untranslatability or incommensurability? Is the translation of indexicals completely captured by Montague's or Kaplan's semantics? Does the translation of natural kind terms necessarily require Putnam's semantics to be fully explained?
- The translation of proper names has proved to raise difficulties for (Neo)Fregean and direct-reference semantics: could such difficulties be overcome by adopting other logical perspectives, as, for instance, possible worlds semantics? Could the struggle between descriptivist and Kripkean explanation be settled in a pluralistic framework?
- Since the concept of translation can be “taken for granted” in formalized languages, Davidson's model of meaning takes Tarskian theory of truth for formalized languages as a model for explaining the concept of translation in

natural languages. How far could Davidson's programme be extended to other theories of truth for formalized languages? Could we expect further results by using different logical systems to explain translation in natural languages? To what extent can the concept of translation be "taken for granted" in formalized languages in order to understand translation in natural languages?

- In place of formal logic, the Gricean account of speaker's meaning requires "the logic of conversation" to take care of implicatures and other implicit usages of language. Is conversational logic necessary to clarify the translation of speaker's meaning? Could alternative logics provide a more comprehensive explanation of speaker's meaning?

- Which translations of logics preserve the meaning of logical constants? Quine's meaning variance argument against non-classical logics casts doubts on the claim that the so-called homophonic translations are meaning-preserving. How are we to assess this allegation? Is the classical counterpart of, say, an intuitionistic disjunction provided by its homophonic translation or by its Goedel-Glivenko translation?

- We encounter several classes of translations on the market (conservative, definitional, etc.). What is the philosophical import of these technical concepts?

- There are translation-based approaches to the concept of deductive equivalence between consequence relations. These approaches allow us to compare consequence relations across different languages (Gyuris) or across systems with different data types (formulas, sequents, equations: Blok-Jonsson). Is there a significant common abstraction that encompasses both?

### **Invited contributors:**

J.C. Beall (University of Connecticut)

W.A. Carnielli (State University of Campinas)

M. Carrara (University of Padua)

D. Marconi (University of Turin)

P. Rawling (Florida State University)

M. Santambrogio (University of Parma)

S. Shapiro (Ohio State University)

K. Wehmeier (University of California, Irvine)

### **Submission process:**

Contributions must be original and not submitted elsewhere. Papers must be in English and should not exceed 8,000 words (references and footnotes included). Each submission should also include a separate title page containing contact details, a brief abstract and list of keywords for indexing purposes. All papers will be subject to double-blind peer-review, following international standard practices. Manuscripts should be submitted exclusively through the Online Manuscript

Submission System (Editorial Manager), accessible at <http://www.editorialmanager.com/topo/> Please save your manuscript in one of the formats supported by the system (e.g., Word, WordPerfect, RTF, TXT, LATEX2e, TEX, Postscript, etc.), which does NOT include PDF. Make sure to select the appropriate article type for your submission by selecting “S.I.: Logical pluralism and translation (Ervas/Ledda/Paoli/Sergioli)” as the appropriate tab from the scroll-down menu.

**For any further information please contact:** Francesca Ervas ([ervas@unica.it](mailto:ervas@unica.it)); Antonio Ledda ([antonio.ledda@unica.it](mailto:antonio.ledda@unica.it)); Francesco Paoli ([paoli@unica.it](mailto:paoli@unica.it)); Giuseppe Sergioli ([giuseppe.sergioli@gmail.com](mailto:giuseppe.sergioli@gmail.com)).



<http://www.springer.com/journal/11245>

Topoi

An International Review of Philosophy

Editor-in-Chief: Paglieri, F.

ISSN: 0167-7411 (print version)

ISSN: 1572-8749 (electronic version)

Journal no. 11245