

## 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  $\alpha$ . In the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, the fundamental relation between satisfaction and semantic consequence was defaced. It must be:  $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{V} \models_{\Phi} \Box \alpha$  iff  $\Phi \models \alpha$ , whereby the new symbol  $\models$  is used.  $\Box T$  should be  $\Box \top$ .  $\Phi \Vdash \alpha$  is defined by  $\Phi \cup \{\neg \Box \phi : \Phi \not\models \phi\} \vdash_{\text{QNI}} \alpha$ . In the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, the completeness theorem:  $\Phi \models \alpha$  iff  $\Phi \Vdash \alpha$ , being a consequence of the uniqueness of the metalogical extension  $\text{seq}^{\Box}$ , was disguised.

*Immanent inconsistency* (ibidem, p. 441): In the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph,  $\#(\phi)$  is to be  $\#(\phi)$ . In the PROOF,  $\text{seq}^{\sigma}$  must be  $\text{seq}^{\Box}$ . In the last paragraph, the  $\iota$  was  $\perp$ , and the marred  $|-\!/\!-$  means, of course,  $\not\vdash$ .

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

JOACHIM MUELLER-THEYS