

I would be grateful for your help, and I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely yours,

Herbert B Enderton

Herbert B. Enderton
Editor

Enclosures

This is to remind you of your review(s) of
the book by Wittgenstein
for The Journal of Symbolic Logic, which is (are)
overdue.



ALNP 1/83
300

²⁰
Sincerely yours,
The Editors

THE JOURNAL OF SYMBOLIC LOGIC

Content

To our reviewers:

We present the following suggestions in the hope that they will facilitate the writing and editing of reviews. Please feel free to raise questions or to convey comments on any aspects of our reviewing program.

The Editors

Undertaking a review

Naturally we hope that you will agree to write the requested review. Under certain circumstances, however, you should not do so. In particular, you should decline if you have already reviewed the publication elsewhere, unless you plan to write for us a substantially different review (perhaps because it would be addressed to different readers). If for any reason you decide to decline to write the review, it would be most helpful to us if you could suggest alternate potential reviewers. Whatever your decision, a prompt reply to our letter of request will help avoid delaying the review.

Occasionally you may want to write a joint review with another person. In that case, perhaps after discussing the project with this person informally, please let us know.

It may turn out that we are asking you to review publications not close enough to your present areas of concentration. If so, a description of your current interests would be valuable to us.

If the review concerns a book, we normally have a review copy available which we will send you on request. If the review concerns a journal article, copyright laws make it in general impossible for us to send you a photocopy. This is so even when the "fair use" principle permits you to photocopy the article yourself. If you prefer, we can ask the author for an offprint of the article, which we would then forward to you.

Time and length

Our request letter specifies a time period within which we hope to receive the review. If circumstances, then or later, make this length of time inadequate, please let us know when you could reasonably expect to have the review finished. Usually the period can then be extended if necessary, but not indefinitely.

Our letter also specifies the normal maximum length for the review. In many cases, your review may well be considerably shorter. In other cases you may find that an adequate review requires more than our normal maximum length. We tend to allow reviews to go somewhat beyond the normal limit, provided this is justified by aspects of the item under review or by other circumstances.

Content

The Journal encourages analytical reviews. In general, the aim is to provide both an account of the contents of a publication and, where possible, a critical assessment.

Ways in which these aims are best accomplished will vary from case to case. Reading various reviews that have appeared in the Journal over the years will provide an idea of the standards we have in mind.

A review should be directly concerned with the item (or items) under review. To provide a proper perspective it is appropriate, at times, to indicate relationships to other publications in the field. In such cases, however, the focus should remain on the item under review. Digressions into matters that are not germane should be avoided. These include the author as a person and, unless directly relevant, the author's other works. Particular caution is required when a reviewer refers to his or her own publications. Such self-reference should be confined to cases where it is essential for an adequate review.

A review may not be used for the purpose of announcing new research results. This applies to results by the reviewer as well as to discoveries by others.

Adverse criticism, when called for, should be made as specific as possible, and expressed in an impersonal, judicious, and undogmatic manner. Important errors should be pointed out, and corrected whenever one can do this profitably. Sarcasm should not be used, nor should condemnation be more severe or sweeping in character than is needed to make clear the shortcomings of the work in question. The author does not have the opportunity to reply in the reviews section of the Journal; it is therefore essential to state matters fairly.

Format

Reviews may be written in English, French, or German. For typographical style and arrangement of reviews, see the recent issues of the Journal. Reviews follow standard paragraph format, except when it is necessary to include very long formulas that must be displayed. References to the literature must be incorporated into the text of the review; footnotes are not to be used, nor may a bibliography follow the review. If your review contains quotations from a lengthy work (e.g. a book), please indicate the number of the page quoted. Review manuscripts should be typed, double-spaced, with wide margins on all sides.

Editing and publishing

All reviews are edited for both style and content. If major editorial revisions are proposed, the revised review will be sent to you for approval. This is not usually done in the case of minor editorial revisions, but you will receive galley proof of your review in any event. Repairs can be made when this galley proof is returned to us.

It is important that galley proof of reviews be returned to us promptly. We may be unable to accommodate corrections that are received belatedly.

Errors of a typographical nature in published reviews will be listed in the errata list appearing at the end of each volume. If there is a substantial correction to the content of your published review that you deem necessary, you should get in touch with us.

THE JOURNAL OF SYMBOLIC LOGIC

U.C.L.A.
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
TELEPHONE (213) 825-1878

March 8, 1983

Professor José Ferrater Mora
Department of Philosophy
Bryn Mawr College
Bryn Mawr, PA 19010

Dear Professor Ferrater Mora,

I am writing to ask whether you would be willing to review the following works for the Journal. (The titles and other bibliographical data are given as they will appear in the printed review.)

Ludwig Wittgenstein. Tractatus logico-philosophicus. A reprint of XV 157, with an index by Max Black. (The German text of Logisch-philosophische Abhandlung, 2811, with an English translation by C. K. Ogden, and the introduction by Bertrand Russell.) International library of psychology philosophy and scientific method. Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, Boston, and Henley, 1981, 207 pp.

Ludwig Wittgenstein. Tractatus logico-philosophicus. The German text of Logisch-philosophische Abhandlung (2811), with an English translation by D. F. Pears and B. F. McGuinness, and with the introduction by Bertrand Russell. International library of philosophy and scientific method. Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, and Humanities Press, New York, 1961, xxii + 166 pp.

Ludwig Wittgenstein. Tractatus logico-philosophicus. Second edition of the preceding. Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, and Humanities Press, New York, 1971, xxii + 166 pp.

We would like to have the review completed in about six months. Normally we expect that this review will not exceed 1000 words, although allowances can be made for special needs.

If you would like review copies of the books, we have copies of the 1961 Pears-McGuinness translation and the 1981 paperback edition of the Ogden translation, and if you need a copy of the 1971 Pears-McGuinness translation, please let us know and we will request one from the publisher. I am enclosing some general suggestions to our reviewers for your guidance.