reality it is more perfect than if it exists only in my mind. Therefore such a being (called 'God') exists (in reality)."

The parallel proof of the existence of the Devil may be stated as follows: "I have in my mind the idea of a being than which nothing more evil can be conceived. Clearly, if this being exists in reality it is more evil [3] than if it exists only in my mind. Therefore, such a being (called 'the Devil') exists (in reality)."

The existence of the Devil may be orthodox doctrine, but the *necessary* existence of the Devil would seem to raise problems for the doctrine of the omnipotence of God, since it would appear that the God of the Ontological Argument cannot destroy the Devil of the Ontological Argument. But this is a problem which I do not have to face, since I am concerned not with theological consistency, but with religious reassurance.

Received July 18, 1957

NOTES

[1] "The Ontological Disproof of the Devil," *Analysis*, 17:71–72 (January 1957).

[2] As Mr. Grant points out in a note to his article, the notion of degrees of perfection is not strictly tenable. Read, if you like, for "more perfect," "more nearly perfect." I abide by a customary formulation.

[3] It is obvious that in this argument the common-sense notion is maintained that evil is as much a genuine property as is goodness. That evil is *really* only privation of goodness is an important philosophical thesis, and undoubtedly a very profound one. It suffers, however, from the fact that it is, for me at least, unintelligible.

CORRIGENDA

Professor Nicholas Rescher has furnished us with a corrected MS of his paper, "An Axiom System for Deontic Logic," which appeared in the January–February issue. On p. 26, T3.8, T3.9, and T3.10 should read

$$\text{T3.8} \;\vdash [P(p/c) \cdot \sim P(q/c)] \rightarrow P(p \sim q/c)$$
$$\text{T3.9} \;\vdash P(p/c) \rightarrow [P(q/c) \vee P(p/c \sim q)]$$
$$\text{T3.10} \;\vdash \sim P(p/c) \rightarrow [P(q/c) \rightarrow P(\sim p/cq)]$$

On p. 27, T5.8 should read

$$\text{T5.8} \;\vdash O * (p) \rightarrow \sim P * (\sim p)$$

On p. 28, lines 6 and 7, read "$\equiv$" for "$=$". Footnote 9 relates to T5.2 on p. 27, not T6.5 on p. 28.