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Erratum:

(1) p. 337, line 19 should read:

be conveniently represented as $\exists x Qx$, with the understanding that the existential

(2) p. 337, line 23 should read:

the answer to $Q?$ as $\mathcal{Q}?$ and the answers to $\forall x Qx$ as $\forall x\mathcal{Q}x$. A "restriction

(3) p. 339, note 6, line 3 should read:

in part, on the testimony of the other side's other witnesses—rather than force counsel to call such

(4) p. 340, lines 12-13 should read:

$$ (\exists x_1)(\exists x_2)(\exists x_3) \ldots (Q_1 x_1 \land Q_2 x_2 \land Q_3 x_3 \land \ldots \land \bigwedge_j T(Wp,j) \land T(Wp,a)) \vdash* F \lor, \text{ alternatively,} $$

$$ (\exists x_1)(\exists x_2)(\exists x_3) \ldots (Q_1 x_1 \land Q_2 x_2 \land Q_3 x_3 \land \ldots) \vdash* \neg(\bigwedge_j T(Wp,j) \land T(Wp,a)) $$

Corrigendum:

(1) p. 341, lines 1-2 should read:

answers in the line of questioning and the testimony space of the side being crossed and the testimony of the witness being cross-examined and some possible