CORRECTION

In my paper 'Creative and Non-Creative Definitions in the Calculus of Probability', this journal **15** (1963) 167–186, I asserted the independence of two formulae (25 and 26) of two axiom systems (without axiom C and C1), while in fact they are independent only of one of them. My main argument is not affected by this mistake; but the following corrections should be made. On p. 175, in the line after (25): insert, before 'depends', the words: "in the system A1 to C1"; and insert '1' after 'C'. In the third line after (26), insert "A1 to C1" after 'system', and in the next line '1' after 'C'. On p. 176, delete line 14 from the bottom of the page, and insert between lines 11 and 10 (from the bottom of page) the sentence: "And so does (4), and therefore B, for $a=3$, $b=e=2$, $f=1$."

This indicates that the example on p. 176 (a Boolean algebra and valuation) establishes the independence of C and C1, together with (25) and (26), within the system A1 to C1. In order to establish the independence of C and C1 within both systems, A to C and A1 to C1, the same Boolean algebra may be combined with the following valuation: $p(a, b)=1$ if either $a=1$ or $b=0$ or $a=b$, otherwise $p(a, b)=0$. Then C fails for $a=2$, $b=1\neq c$, and C1 for $a=1\neq b$, $c=2$. A, B, and A1 to B2 are all satisfied.

K. R. POPPER

University of London