

MAREK TOKARZ **A correction to my paper “Connections between some notions of completeness of structural propositional calculi”**

There is a mistake in my paper “Connections between some notions of completeness of structural propositional calculi”, *Studia Logica* XXXII (1973), namely the definition of inconsistency of a logic (p. 78₅) is not correct. The correct definition is as follows:

The consequences which satisfy the condition $Cn(X) = S$ for every $X \subseteq S$ will be called *inconsistent*.

In fact, my definition in the paper mentioned just constitutes a definition of a *trivial* consequence. It is defined the following way:

A consequence Cn is called *trivial* provided for every $a \in S$, $Cn(a) = S$.

According to the above remarks, one more fragment of the paper “Connections...” needs changing. The phrase “no consistent structural calculus would be Post-complete”, p. 80¹⁴, has to be replaced by the following: “no non-trivial structural calculus would be Post-complete”.

I am very indebted to Professor David Makinson who called attention to this error.