UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO   SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

100 YEARS
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
1868 1968
A Tribute to the People of California

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024

March 13, 1973

Dear Prof. Castañeda,

The manuscript of the second part of my paper (or second and third parts if you wish to divide) is now finally ready. As I know of no imminent deadline that has to be met, I'll put the manuscript into the University mail tomorrow. You should receive it a few days after this letter, probably in two separate packages.

The three enclosed yellow sheets are intended to go with the manuscript as instructions to the printer. If you wish, you may simply prefix them to the manuscript when it is sent to be typeset. Or if you prefer to write your own instructions to the printer, the enclosed yellow sheets may be used as a guide.

There remains one matter that is not covered in the instructions on the yellow sheets and that I want to consult you about.

The character ∼ which is used as a negation sign in recent numbers of Noûs is excessively wide. It is not properly a negation sign at all, but is a character which is used in mathematical papers in various fields for any one of a number of different equivalence relations (depending on the context or on the particular mathematical field). There are areas in which the negation sign ∼ and the equivalence sign ∼ have to be used in the same context (e.g. theory of recursive functions, ap-

plications of mathematical logic to abstract algebra) and I dislike the precedent of using the same symbol for both.

It's true that in my paper of 1951, to which my present paper in Noûs is a sequel, the negation sign used is too wide. It is not quite as wide as the character used in recent numbers of Noûs, but it is still properly the mathematical equivalence sign and not a negation sign. I agreed to its use only because it appeared that the alternative would be excessive delay in publication of the book containing my paper.

I would appreciate it if you would find out if your printer has available a negation sign which is similar in shape to the character $\sim$ which you are presently using but is of no more than two thirds or one half the width of this. It either could be bold (like the negation sign which is used in my "Introduction to Mathematical Logic" and in the Reviews section of the Journal of Symbolic Logic, or like the sample which I have pasted in on the first page of this letter), or it could be lightface provided it is of appropriately narrower width.

If you find such a negation sign available, please use it in my paper in place of the excessively wide character.

Actually my preference is to use bold or semibold characters for all connectives of propositional calculus (and not merely the negation sign). The reasons why this is preferable constitute too long a story for inclusion in this letter. But I see that your established style in Noûs is to use lightface characters. And (with the possible exception of the negation sign) I will not ask you to change this in the case of my paper — simply because I recognize that it would make too much difficulty.

Very sincerely yours,

Alonzo Church