THE JOURNAL OF SYMBOLIC LOGIC
Volume 56, Number 4, Dec. 1991

CORRECTIONS TO *WHERE DO SETS COME FROM?*

HAROLD T. HODES

My paper [1] contains two egregious errors. Contrary to a remark on p. 151, ZFC + GCH does not imply that all infinite cardinals are acceptable. (I made a similar error in [2].) In fact, ZFC implies that all singular cardinals are not acceptable. (Example: Power($\aleph_\omega$) injects into $\prod_{n<\omega}\aleph_n$, which injects into the set of countable subsets of $\aleph_\omega$.) Thus ZFC + GCH implies that a cardinal is acceptable iff it is infinite and regular. I thank Richard G. Heck, Jr., for straightening me out on all this.

The above shows that, contrary to my claim on p. 162, the Union Axiom is A_{ls}-valid! Setting my embarrassment aside, this is good news. The Union Axiom has never been controversial, and seems self-evident under the limitation-of-size conception of sethood. It should prima facie come out valid in a logic embodying that conception; when I thought it not A_{ls}-valid I felt that counted against A_{ls} (and similarly for MO_{ls}). Now this, at least, is as it should be. Note also that Replacement is A_{ls}-valid (and MO_{ls}-valid).

Finally, the proof of Fact 3.2 can be simplified: since an acceptable model has regular cardinality, by Fact 1.2 the sequence $\langle S'(j)\rangle_{j<\omega}$ can be cut off at $S'(3)$.

REFERENCES

[1] HAROLD T. HODES, *Where do sets come from?* this JOURNAL, vol. 56 (1991), pp. 150–175.

[2] ———, *Ontological commitment, thick and thin*, ***Meaning and method: essays in honor of Hilary Putnam*** (George Boolos, editor), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990, pp. 235–260.

SAGE SCHOOL OF PHILOSOPHY
CORNELL UNIVERSITY
ITHACA, NEW YORK 14850

0022-4812/91/5604-0023/$01.10