Most of the contemporary research in logic is carried out with respect to formal languages. Logic, however, is said to be concerned with correct reasoning, and it is natural language that we usually reason in. Thus, in order to assess the validity of arguments in natural language, it is useful to formalize them: to provide matching arguments in a formal language where logical properties become perspicuous. It has been recognized in the literature that formalization is far from a trivial process. One must discern the logical from the nonlogical in the sentence, a process that requires theorizing that goes beyond the mere understanding of the sentence formalized [1]. Moreover, according to some, “logical forms are not to be discovered but rather established and ascribed to expressions within processes of the reflective equilibrium” [2]. I concur. I argue that logical forms are imposed, and that furthermore, they carry a normative force in the form of commitments on behalf of the theorizer.

In previous work [3], I proposed a model-theoretic framework of “semantic constraints”, where there is no strict distinction between logical and nonlogical vocabulary. The form of sentences in a formal language is determined rather by a set of constraints on models. In the present paper, I show how this framework can also be used in the process of formalization, where the semantic constraints are conceived of as commitments made with respect to the language.