

CORRIGENDA pour le n° 47,
dans l'article «*The Pragmatic paradox of knowledge*»
de M. E. M. ZEMACH

p. 286, aux lignes 13 à 20, lire:

“This does not show that the skeptic is right in his first argument. The skeptic claimed, as we remember, that ‘ $\sim Kxp$ ’ is true of us. But that was not proved. The only thing I have so far showed is that if we stand in need of an answer whether ‘ Kxp ’ or ‘ $\sim Kxp$ ’ is true, then no answer can be given. Hence it would be a mistake to argue with the skeptic that the correct answer is ‘ $\sim Kxp$ ’ as it would be a mistake to try to prove or show in any way that ‘ Kxp ’ is true.”

p. 287, dernière ligne du texte, lire:

“right in saying that ‘ $\sim KxKxp$ ’ is true of us.”

CORRIGENDA pour le n° 51,
dans l'article “*On the Symmetry of many-valued logical
systems*” de M. J. TALLET

p. 305, ligne 11 à partir du bas, au lieu de:

“or — 1”, lire “or : 1”,

ligne 6 et 5 à partir du bas, au lieu de

“or — \emptyset ”, lire “or : \emptyset ”,

p. 309, ligne 2, lire: “(or — $pv(q \supset r)$)”.

p. 316, ligne 16 à partir du bas, au lieu de

“? $\dashv \emptyset \neq ?$ ”, lire “? $\dashv \emptyset = ?$ ”.

p. 321, ligne 11 à partir du bas, au lieu de

“(A=N)(A=(F+N))”, lire “(A=N) + (A=(F+N))”.