

ON KINDS OF RELEVANCE (REPLY TO RAYMUNDO MORADO)

RAÚL ORAYEN
Instituto de Investigaciones
Filosóficas, UNAM

I think Raymundo Morado's criticism of my article¹ is right. When I wrote "*Deducibility Implies Relevance? A Negative Answer*"² I tried to prove that A&B's objections to classical deducibility fail, but I agreed with them that some of the inferences justified by classical logic are "irrelevant" in some intuitive sense. As I defended those inferences (in rejecting A&B's objections), my conclusion was, then, that *deducibility does not imply relevance*. Morado makes clear that the only kind of relevance analyzed in my article is what he calls "A&B-relevance", and that this fact leaves open the possibility that *deducibility implies relevance*, in another sense of this last notion. Due to this, my conclusion would be misleading. Morado suggests also a new way of understanding relevance and claims that in this new sense, classical deducibility does imply relevance.³ I agree with the criticism and consider the proposal interesting. I still maintain my objections to A&B are correct (in fact, they are not affected by Morado's remarks), but now I would entitle my article "*Deducibility Implies A&B-relevance? A Negative Answer*", leaving the situation about other sorts of relevance open.

I will finish this note with some remarks about Morado's

¹ The criticism appears in his paper '*Deducibility Implies Relevance? A Cautious Answer*', published in this issue of *Crítica*.

² Published in two parts, the first one in *Crítica*, Vol. XV, No. 43, the second one in *Crítica*, Vol. XV, No. 44.

³ Afterwards, in a paper presented at the IV Simposio Internacional de Filosofía del Instituto de Investigaciones Filosóficas, UNAM, August '83, Morado formally developed this notion of relevance and proved a theorem to the effect that deducibility of the classical first-order calculus satisfies this sort of relevance. (The paper is forthcoming in the proceedings of the forementioned Symposium.)

treatment of relevance. His analysis has a rather surprising result, because by using his notion of relevance it is possible to prove that classical logic is relevant in a more intuitive way than analogue proofs for relevant logics. In fact, there exists a semantics for the relevant system E (developed in the second volume of A&B's *Entailment*), but it is a typical technical semantics, not clearly based in previous "intuitive" semantical notions and hence does not allow one to prove a theorem establishing that deducibility of E implies always a certain intuitive kind of relevance. Javier Sánchez Pozos has developed intuitive semantics for relevant systems,⁴ with the help of which it is possible to define notions of *semantical content* and *relevance* which allow one to prove that the truth-functional relevant deductions are *relevant* in an interesting sense. But his result is less strong than Morado's, owing to two reasons: (i) His theorem applies only to a *fragment of E* (that one which studies the entailments of degree one), and (ii) In order to build such a semantics it is necessary to admit states descriptions that do not satisfy the principles of non-contradiction and excluded middle (that is rather *counter-intuitive*). In contrast, Morado's analysis applies to *the whole classical first-order calculus* and is based on *intuitive notions* that have widespread acceptance among many philosophers. Because of these reasons, I think Morado's proposal can help in the study of deducibility and relevance problems.

⁴ Cfr. his papers 'Semánticas Intuitivas' (Departamento de Filosofía, UAM, México, 1980) and 'Deducción Lógica, contenido semántico y formas normales relevantes' (Departamento de Matemáticas, Facultad de Ciencias, UNAM, 1978). In fact, Javier Sánchez Pozos' formal analysis of relevance yields as a partial result, a theorem for classical logic essentially identical to that of Morado's which is included in the paper mentioned in footnote 3.