Errors in *Logic for Philosophy*:

1. p. 60, step 5 of the proof for "contraposition 2" should cite step 4, not step 3.

2. p. 61, line 4 of the proof of the second form of negated-conditional should be $\sim\psi$.

3. p. 61, in the proof of "excluded middle MP", no need for line 5 (and thus no need to use exercise 2.11c). Instead, move directly from lines 3 and 4 to ψ, using PL3 and modus ponens twice.

4. p. 62, exercise 2.11, when doing parts c and d students should not use contraposition 2 or negated conditional or excluded middle MP (since the proofs of those theorems in the text depend on exercises 2.11 c and d).

5. p. 62, exercise 2.12 should read: "Give axiomatic proofs corresponding to rules of inference from our sequent system. For example, in the case of $\wedge$I, show that $\phi, \psi \vdash \phi \wedge \psi$—i.e., give an axiomatic proof of $\sim(\phi \rightarrow \sim\psi)$ from $\{\phi, \psi\}$. You may use the toolkit. Omit $\rightarrow$I; and for $\vee$E and RAA show, respectively, that $\phi \vee \psi, \phi \rightarrow \chi, \psi \rightarrow \chi \vdash \chi$ and that $\phi \rightarrow (\psi \wedge \sim\psi) \vdash \sim\phi$".

6. p. 86, Exercise 3.14 should be worded "Show that any wff with value 1 in a trivalent interpretation using the Kleene tables is supertrue in that interpretation."

7. p. 87, the sequence 0123456789 is in fact known to appear in the decimal expansion of π; see `http://oeis.org/A101815`.

8. p. 155, in the proof for the S4-validity of the formula (middle of the page), "in some B-model" in line (i) should be "in some S4-model".

9. p. 216, exercise 8.3(c), $P \rightarrow R$ should be $P \square\!\!\rightarrow R$

10. p. 216, exercise 8.4(a), the intended wff was $\sim(P \square\!\!\rightarrow \sim Q) \rightarrow (P \square\!\!\rightarrow Q)$.

11. p. 248, one-third down the page, the new clause for the $\square$ should read: "…and if $[\alpha]_{\mathcal{M},g} \in \mathcal{D}_v$ for each…"

1

12. p. 249, first paragraph of section 9.6.4, the new clause in the definition of the valuation function should relativize truth-value to worlds, so that its left-hand side reads: "$V_{\mathscr{M},g}(\forall_p \alpha \phi, w) = 1$"

13. p. 254, exercise 10.1 should read "Show that the new definitions of validity and semantic consequence for MPL are equivalent to the old ones."