CORRECTION

Correction to: Depth Relevance and Hyperformalism

Shay Allen Logan[1]

Correction to: Journal of Philosophical Logic
https://doi.org/10.1007/s10992-021-09648-y

Tore Fjetland Øgaard has pointed out in correspondence that there are unfortunately counterexamples to Lemma 1, Corollary 2, and Theorem 5 in the above paper. For example, $\neg p \vee \neg(p \rightarrow \neg p)$ is a theorem of DR but $\neg q \vee \neg(p \rightarrow \neg p)$, which is clearly a depth-substitution instance of it, is not. Thus the claim that DR is closed under depth-substitutions is false.

The problems stem from the disjunctive rules R4, R5, and R6. The argument I give for the inductive clause concerning their non-disjunctive cousins does not generalize to them.

The results do hold for the system that we get by omitting the disjunctive rules R4, R5, and R6. In [1], I call this system DR^-. Since DR^- contains the logic DW and all of its sublogics, the results still hold for a range of interesting and well-studied relevant logics. But I should probably not call the results actually proved in my paper the strong and weak Brady theorems, but rather something like the strong and weak restricted Brady theorems.

References

1. Logan, S. A. (2021). Strong depth relevance. *Australasian Journal of Logic, 18*(6), 645–656.

The original article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1007/s10992-021-09648-y.

✉ Shay Allen Logan
salogan@ksu.edu

1 Department of Philosophy, Kansas State University, 1116 Mid Campus Dr North, 66506 Manhattan, KS, USA