

## Corrections for CUP and Logic Matters versions of *IFL*

page/line	from	to
87, proof (6)	(from 5, 2 by the table for ‘ $\vee$ ’)	(from 5, 3 by the table for ‘ $\vee$ ’)
99, l. 3	have to introduce a new species	have to adopt a new convention. We can, for example, introduce a new species
159, l. –15	<i>If Jack</i>	<i>Jack</i>
193, proof for <b>C'</b> (1)	$((P \wedge Q) \vee (Q \wedge R))$	$((P \wedge Q) \vee (Q \wedge R))$
205, <b>C</b> (6)	(RAA 2–5)	(RAA 3–5)
208, top proof (7)	(DN 7)	(DN 6)
208, top proof (8)	(CP 2–8)	(CP 2–7)
208, next proof (7)	(Iter 5)	(Iter 6)
211, proof (5)	(Abs 4, 5)	(Abs 3, 4)
289, exercise (b3)	$\forall x \exists y Lxy \wedge Hy$	$\forall x \exists y (Lxy \wedge Hy)$
316, l. 10	and ( $\forall E$ )	and ( $\exists E$ )
320, proof (10)	$\exists E$	$\vee E$
342, proof (2) and (3)	$\forall x (Fa \wedge Gy)$	$\forall y (Fa \wedge Gy)$
345, exercise (c)	wffs (1) to (8)	wffs (1), (2), (4) and (5)
345, exercise (d*)	<i>whole exercise</i>	<i>delete</i>
351, <b>H</b>	$\forall x ((Rxy \wedge Ryz) \rightarrow Rxz)$	$\forall x \forall y \forall z ((Rxy \wedge Ryz) \rightarrow Rxz)$
353, exercise (a6)	$\forall y (\neg Gx \rightarrow Hx) \therefore \forall z (\neg Hz \rightarrow Fz)$	$\forall y (\neg Gy \rightarrow Hy) \therefore \forall z (\neg Hz \rightarrow Fz)$
353, exercise (a7)	$\forall x (P \rightarrow \neg Sx)$	$\forall x (Px \rightarrow \neg Sx)$
374, exercise (b9)	$\forall x = y$	$\neg x = y$
389, (b) 3	in a way rather different way	in a rather different way
390, exercise (a11)	there at least	there are at least
398, (b) 2	$x + 3 = 2$	$x + 3 = 1$
398, (b) 3	$\forall x \neg (x + sss0) = ss0$	$\forall x \neg (x + sss0) = s0$
399, proof (14)	$\forall x \neg (x + sss0) = ss0$	$\forall x \neg (x + sss0) = s0$
405, l. 2	– see Exercises 35(d*).	<i>delete</i>

For why p. 99, l. 3. is wrong as it stands, see [Logicbite 11](#).

The change to p. 345 exercise (c) is not correcting a typo, but just cutting down on unnecessary exercises. But p. 345 exercise (d\*) was wrong in a subtle way.

The proof at the top of p. 399 obviously(!) goes wrong at the very last step when an extra ‘s’ is smuggled in on the right of the equals sign. The simplest repair so that things make sense is to change what the target of the proof is supposed to be (hence the suggested three changes at the bottom of p. 398).

Most of these corrections are due to Pascal Hohmann, and other corrections to Mohammad Reza Amirkhany, Paulo Argolo, Thibaud Cornen, Thomas Gauthier, Noah Landis, and Jose Ortiz. Many thanks!