Luis M. Augusto

Formal logic: Classical problems and proofs.

London: College Publications.

1st ed.: 02.09.2019

ISBN 978-1-84890-317-3

Addenda & Errata

(additions in blue; corrections in red; notes in green)

p. 10, l. 3: ... precisely at the same time that ...

p. 35, **Prop. 2.5.1.** ϕ is a propositional variable or has the form $P(t_1, ..., t_n)$.

p. 42, **Example 2.19.** We could have formalized (a) and (b) as $C(fritz)$ and $L(fritz, fish) \wedge \neg L(fritz, pasta)$, but *in the absence of quantifiers and individual variables* these can be treated as propositional formulas, though there are relation symbols involved. (The same remark holds for **Example 2.22.**) This practice, albeit arguable, is not only sanctionable but also pedagogical in this book, in which Herbrand semantics is ubiquitous.

p. 60, l. 5 of main text: Fig. 3.5.1 (Figure 3.4.1 instead of 3.5.1 is a recurrent typo)

p. 85, **Def. 3.14.**, l. 1: ... the set $\{0, 1, ..., n-1\}$

p. 89, **Def. 3.26**, l. 1: ... an interpretation for $\mathsf{L}1$

p. 104, **Def. 4.9.** ... $\psi \in Cn(X)$ or $X \Vdash \psi$.

p. 105, **Def. 4.9.1.** a consequence operation Cn (a consequence relation $\Vdash$) on F_{L}...

p. 134, **Exercise 4.2.** ... by all $X, Y \subseteq F_{\mathsf{L}}$, ...

p. 213, **Footnote 10**: Cf. Exercise 7.3 ...

p. 225, l. 25: ... in Definition 4.56, ...

p. 275, **Example 12.47.** Figure 12.2.2 shows a "proof" in $\mathcal{LK}$ of the FOL invalidity $(\forall x(A(x)) \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (\exists x(A(x)) \rightarrow B)$. (Note how the two branches do not terminate with **Ax**.)

p. 278, **Exercise 12.1.6.** (Step) 3. $\neg(P \vee Q)$

Last updated: April 2020