

Corrections to *Gödel Without (Too Many) Tears*

These are corrections for the original print-on-demand version, which was in fact available just for a couple of days at the beginning of November 2020, then replaced by revisions dated (on the verso of the title page) e.g. 5.xi.2020. Sorry about that! For brevity's sake, I have *not* recorded here a number of very small stylistic changes that were also made between that original version and the revision.

More important revisions

Page	Line	Is	Should be
112	7	if I am not true	if this sentence is not true
119	2–3	so the weaker arithmetic theory W	so the weaker arithmetic theory W (assuming it is equivalent to a fragment of set theory)
122	3		<i>Add footnote:</i> Fine print. The Second Theorem doesn't rule out all possibility of interesting consistency proofs. For a start, it leaves open the possibility of showing that a theory S is consistent by appeal to a theory S' which is weaker in some respects and stronger in others. Gerhard Gentzen, for example, found such a proof of the consistency of PA. But it would take us too far afield to explore this sort of possibility here (though see <i>IGT2</i> §32.4).
129	12	And the arithmetical claim that encodes this fact can also be formally proved:	Assuming that R contains Q , it will be able to formally prove the arithmetical claim that encodes this fact:

Trivial typos

Page	Line	Is	Should be
85	12 ⁻	G_T -is-unprovable-in- T	G_T is unprovable-in- T
105	2–3	sufficiently strong theory,	sufficiently strong,
105	12 ⁻	if φ is a non-theorem, then	if φ is a non-theorem,
107	13 ⁻	no small number	no smaller number
108	15 ⁻	Suppose that $T \vdash \neg\gamma$ is a theorem	Suppose that $T \vdash \neg\gamma$
113	4 ⁻	(3)	(2)
113	4 ⁻	(2) and (3)	(1) and (2)
124	10 ⁻	then T show	then T can show
127	10	a theorem for 1955	a theorem from 1955
127	3 ⁻	gives us an answer's	gives us an answer
128	1	$\overline{\overline{H}}$	\overline{H}
128	3	$\ulcorner H \urcorner$	\overline{H}

With many thanks to Sam Butchart.