The Bulletin of Symbolic Logic
Volume 22, Number 4, December 2016

ERRATUM

In the following abstracts, crucial passages are spoiled, but not by the author.

Metalogical extensions II: First-order consequences and Gödel (BSL *21* (2015), p. 85): In the whole text, the variable a has to be replaced by α. In the 2nd paragraph, the fundamental relation between satisfaction and semantic consequence was defaced. It must be: $\mathcal{M}, V \mid\mid=_\Phi \Box\alpha$ iff $\Phi \mid\mid= \alpha$, whereby the new symbol $\mid\mid=$ is used. $\Box T$ should be $\Box\top$. $\Phi \mid\mid\!- \alpha$ is defined by $\Phi \cup \{\neg\Box\phi\colon \Phi \not\models \phi\} \vdash_{\mathrm{QNI}} \alpha$. In the 3rd paragraph, the completeness theorem: $\Phi \mid\mid= \alpha$ iff $\Phi \mid\mid\!- \alpha$, being a consequence of the uniqueness of the metalogical extension $seq^\Box$, was disguised.

Immanent inconsistency (ibidem, p. 441): In the 2nd paragraph, $\#(\phi)$ is to be $\mathbf{\#}(\phi)$. In the Proof, seq^σ must be $\mathrm{seq}^\Box$. In the last paragraph, the ι was $\bot$, and the marred $\mid\!-\!/\!-$ means, of course, $\nvdash$.

On the possible modalities of a logic (ibid., pp. 239–240): The requirements for *seq* are: $\Phi \subseteq seq\,\Phi$, $seq\,seq\,\Phi \subseteq seq\,\Phi$, and $seq\,\Phi \subseteq seq\,\Psi$ if $\Phi \subseteq \Psi$. The last sentence of this paragraph is one of the lemmata: Φ *is closed iff* Φ *is a consequence set.*

Joachim Mueller-Theys

1079-8986/16/2204-0009
DOI:10.1017/bsl.2016.20