With thanks to: Arthur Falk, Lloyd Humberstone, Jonathan Tapsell

Chapter 3
§3.4, p.52, 2nd ¶ of proof
It should be $C = \neg\Diamond(B \wedge \Diamond A)$ and $D = \neg\Diamond(A \wedge \Diamond B)$

§3.6
p. 56, proof of (51), second line from end,
read "is in *u*" for "*is* demonstrable"

p.59, line 3 from bottom, read "(50)" for "(35)"

§3.9
p.67, line 7, read "necessity" for "permanence"

Chapter 4

§4.3
The notation $\pi(B \mid A)$ for the probability $\pi(B \wedge A)/\pi(A)$ of B conditional on A, introduced on p. 76, is sometimes reversed on the following pages.
In particular, displayed item (14) on p.77 should read

(14) $A \rightarrow B$ is assertible iff $\pi(B \mid A)$ is high

and the last two lines of the paragraph below it should read

But there would still be a point to telling us that $\pi(B \mid A)$ is high if it is, because $\pi(B \mid A)$ can be low even if $\pi(\neg A \vee B)$ is high.

In the Lewis trivialization argument on p.78, lines iv and vi should read as follows

iv $\pi(B \S A) = \pi(B \S A \mid A) \cdot \pi(A) + \pi(B \S A \mid \neg A) \cdot \pi(\neg A)$
vi $\pi(A \mid B) = \pi\,(A \mid A \wedge B) \cdot \pi(A) + \pi(A \mid \neg A \wedge B) \cdot \pi(\neg A)$

also, at the end of the proof the justification for (ix) is that it follows from (vi)-(viii).

Incidentally, though the trivialization argument in question is due to Lewis (from whom the author learned it), some would reserve the label "Lewis argument" to the published version, which is a little different. Futher variant versions are discussed in the work of Bennett cited.

§4.9
p.97, lines 4-5 from top, read "it will be that not *B*" for "it will be that *B*"

Chapter 5

§5.2
The terms *analytic* and *co-analytic* are reversed several times. It is analytic implication that requires the topic of the consequent to be contained in the topic of the antecedent, while co-analytic implication requires the reverse. Specifically

on line 20 "second" should be "third"
on line 22 "third" should be "second"

on lines 9 and 6 from the bottom, "analytic" should be "co-analytic"
on lines 9 and 7 from the bottom, "co-analytic" should be "analytic"

§5.3
The right disjunction introduction rule (7) on p.106 is misstated. It should be

from $\Pi, A \vdash \Sigma$ and $\Pi, B \vdash \Sigma$ to infer $\Pi, A \vee B \vdash \Sigma$

Chapter 6

§6.9
Displayed item (65) on p. 140 should read

(65) $\forall\alpha\neg\neg\exists n\ \alpha(n) \neq 0$

(Given this, if we had $\forall\alpha(\exists n\ \alpha(n) \neq 0 \vee \neg\exists n\ \alpha(n) \neq 0)$ we would have $\forall\alpha\exists n\ \alpha(n) \neq 0$ contrary to (66).)